

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 16, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. Resolution 9, Item 4. (e)(1) — the Member for Virden.

MR. McGREGOR: Regarding this passing of the three plants, I guess we'll call now, does Portage necessarily employ all Manitobans, or does Manitoba get its share of all three plants somewhere near a percentage of what they put into the program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Not necessarily all Manitobans' Mr. Chairman.

MR. McGREGOR: But over the three plants, would it be fair to assume that you do get somewhere near one-fifth — in other words, are there Manitobans working in the other plants, maybe that would be . . . ?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, there are, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, the other question then, the subscriptions to this, how many paid-up subscriptions are there, say, in the last year, at present, or . . . ?

MR. DOWNEY: Approximately 1,200 or a little more than that over the three provinces, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McGREGOR: This \$474,000 that I believe we heard from the Minister earlier, will that necessarily go down, and I mean by that, some of this will be the Capital cost of putting the buildings up, so if that's reduced, there is nothing in the future then but an escalation, even be minor, in the years ahead?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is indication that the operational costs have reduced a very small amount this last year. They've reduced from \$464,000 to \$446,000, a reduction of \$22,000.00. I don't look for any big change in that, however we will be working towards trying to cut down somewhat and not impairing the operation of the research facilities.

MR. McGREGOR: Then, Mr. Chairman, who really guides this program between the three provinces? Is it some of each minister's staff, or is there a designated board to run all three provinces, or is there indeed separate boards individually for each province?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there's a board set up from within the three provinces. Each province has, I believe, it's three from each province to operate the three institutes. Also, I am informed that there is an additional chairman besides that.

MR. McGREGOR: Well, is there any way . . . I'm still concerned with the protection that the farmers get from their main power unit, and now I'm thinking of the tractor, who, we know the Nebraska test tests the output, horsepower, the pumps tell you how much pressure or how much fuel you use, but the workings of that tractor is never really put down on paper, and I realize a testing plant could not put 2,000 hours on a tractor to give it the real test. But is there not a mechanism where new tractor owners could indeed report to each provincial plant saying, and taking any kind of a tractor; I can think of tremendous manufacturers that maybe come out with a tractor known as the Comfort King. So help me, that had to be the roughest tractor that ever God put breath in; but those are just things that, until it's in the field, and the farmers report, that name was off,

and they still had a good tractor. I've got one of them. And there's a couple of other manufacturer s of tractors that had been notoriously building and selling, I would say, bad tractors. I certainly won't name them, but they are ones that anyone in the farm business could certainly name pretty quickly; and some of us get not hooked with them, but buy them at maybe reduced prices, and if, you know, we know there's cummings diesels, or we know there's diesels, we know the pumps, and bought the gears — and caterpillar maybe a very good manufacturer of farm tractors had several models with extremely weak bearings; and many people bought and had the problems of breaking down.

I was thinking it over at supper hour, that there surely is a way that a secretary or a part-time secretary could keep track of those, so that I think every owner would be glad to report that such-and-such a universal consistently gave out; or that the draw bar, at an angle, that at certain corners wore faster than the rest of it; minor things that that company maybe didn't have a chance to test out for, as I say, probably a couple of thousand hours before those things show up; and also with the fact that there are many European tractors coming in.. Per horsepower, their rated horsepower, I guess in the Nebraska test maybe people are over there also, but per horsepower, I'm thinking of 150 horsepower 4-wheel drive, you can probably bring a Russian or German make in, or a Czechoslovakian make, at \$10,000 or \$12,000 less than the North American built one; and I wonder again if we didn't have somewhere of getting hold of a book; getting hold of a report; because we know salesmen are there to sell you these things, and the companies do not really brag about their weaknesses. I used to admire back in the '60s, when a similar thing as this, a dealer who had that on his desk, I looked at to be an honest dealer, and those are the kind of things . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, again we go back to say that maybe there's a possibility that some of the information that comes out in the Nebraska Test — maybe some of that information could be put into more perspective for the western Prairie farmers through the Prairie Agriculture Machinery Institute, that they could relate it to how that type of engine or horsepower unit would perform under Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta conditions.

Again, go back to show the concern that I would have, the money that it would cost to go into a complete tractor testing operation, I think it would be far too costly for us to enter into as a total tractor type testing, but there could be parts of it that could be recommended to the board to be considered for a more practical type of report for western farmers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, does this bracket also include the Farm Machine Board?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MCGREGOR: I must compliment the Manitoba Farm Machine Board, who I know one of the members is to my immediate right, but I have had nothing but success in taking a problem that a part was sitting here in somebody's machine shop. the local dealer backordered, backordered, backordered, and they come to a member, maybe me, and that afternoon that part was out on the way to that garage. And they were very appreciative of that action of the Machine Board, and the problem is, why it took them to jolt two different companies and two different kinds that were completely out of my constituency, but we got action real quick, and I hope that kind of a board stays in action to, in this case, just simply jack up the companies and get them to look in that bin and the part was there. So is there any change in the membership on the board in recent months?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: No, there hasn't been, Mr. Chairman. The operation of the board will continue as it has been in the past. The plans are to have it continue on in the future to service the farm community, and give consideration to some of the problems that are developed between companies and the user. In lots of cases, I'm sure that there have been many dealers who have looked to the board to help them with solving of some of their problems too.

MR. MCGREGOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister would take note that I would like to see something done so the new tractor owners can lay their complaint unofficially somewhere that

anyone can look at and say "There's the 1505 or the 1805 or the 990 or the 1426, whatever those makes, there's what 200 reports are". There is a universal and I certainly know of that, so with that Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would take that into consideration in the future, I would like to know the members of the board and talk to them on that very point. Is there not a way, and I'm sure I wouldn't want the expense of going into the large field tests that are necessary, but I think the actual farm conditions are the real test, and I think the majority of farmers would appreciate having the opportunity to take part in sending a report in. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, in his comments dealing with the prairie agricultural testing labs in the three prairie provinces, hinted that he favoured the one-province concept. Could he elaborate on his position on that, indicating — at least that was my impression — that he certainly could not agree with the decision of having three separate testing units.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the reference I made was, I believe, in the concept of the machinery testing institutes that they, in fact, can serve a useful purpose for not only the total agricultural community, the farm people, but for the development of machinery for western Canada, for potential producers of certain kinds of machinery.

I feel that the three facilities built — they were built, I will agree, they were built three different years — starting some three years ago, that in fact we — and I again will be monitoring it fairly closely — see the use of those three facilities, if in fact the staging of them, one each year for three years wasn't a little more rapid than possibly we required, and might have been able to be built over a period of, say, six years with reducing the operational costs which all three provinces are now involved in picking up.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister indicating that the operational costs regardless of where the units are built, if you are going to be testing certain kinds of equipment, that the operational costs will be similar or very similar regardless of where they are being tested? Whether you have one unit or three units? If I am wrong, I would like the Minister to elaborate on it because I am not sure whether his position of now saying that there should have been only one unit or is he indicating that the whole concept once it was agreed to went off the ground faster than he would have liked. Is that what he is telling us?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, what I am referring to directly is the operational costs of three facilities, that if you only had one facility to pick up the operational costs it would have been somewhat less than the operation of those three plants and I feel that again, monitoring of those three plants after a full year of operation will tell us if, in fact, we are over-capacitated in having the three facilities available.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister tell me how he views about being over-capacitated in terms of the number of machines tested in each centre or what is he really referring to?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, I guess what I am referring to are the types of machinery the capacity of an individual plant's capacity to test either all the machinery that needs to be tested in a given period of time or as the demand increased for testing of other machinery, that the facilities provided after the need be demonstrated.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, correct me if I am wrong. But as I understand the testing stations, each station in each province tests a set of equipment designed for a particular line of equipment. I believe the Manitoba one is primarily dealing in forage crops and harvesters and the like and Saskatchewan, I think, is primarily the combines and combine related testings or cereal crops and the Alberta one is another line. Is the Minister indicating that if all these were combined into one unit that the central unit would not have to be expanded to the point to be able to adequately test these three, shall we say, industry sectors of equipment, or what is he indicating?

MR. DOWNEY: What I am indicating is, Mr. Chairman, if a plant or a facility that is available to test machinery, in fact, has equipment in it for testing forage as he referred to, or combines that after that machinery reached its total capacity of use, then that section of it could be transferred to one of the other provinces.

All the point I am trying to make is that I feel that the rate at which it was built and we are looking at the operational costs of those three plants, the government might have moved a little more rapidly than it should. I'm not saying that we shouldn't have advanced to the three plants, what I'm saying is, the speed in which it took place without the total demonstrated need of those three plants. Operational costs are high. I think he'll admit that almost a half a million dollars, which is only 20 percent of the operations, is a lot of money going into that particular type of testing of machinery. Needed? Yes, but it might have been somewhat less if hadn't had to operate three buildings.

MR. URUSKI: That's fine, on this one. Mr. Chairman, the Minister — last, I believe, October, if I recall correctly, reading in the Co-operator — made a speech to the Manitoba Institute of Agronomists, wherein he, amongst other things, indicated that when the Canadian Wheat Board — and I questioned this in the House some time ago — the Canadian Wheat Board up a review committee to review the quotas on deliveries to country elevators, and that they were seeking submissions; the Minister, at the Institute of Agronomists indicated that the province, and he said he would be making a submission to the Canadian Wheat Board with respect to the quota reviews that were made. I believe that that review has been completed and I am wondering whether the Minister would be prepared to indicate his government's statements and policy direction that it has given to the Canadian Wheat Board with respect to the review that was conducted.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the member if he is still on the Technical and Economics Branch of the department? Is that what he is referring to?

MR. URUSKI: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. I believe that it would be likely the Economics Branch, and if it's not the place to discuss it, I won't, would likely be providing information to the Minister of any other Branch in terms of the Wheat Boards. If there is another place that it should be discussed, I have no difficulty there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would refer the member to 6.(c) where we get into grain transportation and marketing, if he would discuss it at that point?

MR. URUSKI: No problem at all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Farm Machinery Board falls under this section and I would like to ask the Minister and I believe the Branch is aware of some concerns that some dealers, and I am specifically speaking about dealers dealing in one particular area and there may be other commodities or other machines. The one I refer to specifically is a round hay baler of U.S. manufacture. I believe the baler name is Lundell, is the manufacturer I think, from Iowa. That corporation, and I don't have my correspondence with me, but that corporation put out a round baler that was delivered into this province a number of years ago. Several dealers took delivery of that baler throughout the province and attempted to market, as a matter of fact, some of them who tried it out had little success in making the machine operate. But the problem that arose was not so much . . . well, it stems from the machine not being able to operate. It so happened that the Canadian distributor had his office in Edmonton, Alberta, and the Winnipeg outlets were I guess an office and a telephone number, that after a period of time, disappeared, and the Manitoba dealers had to resort to dealing with the Alberta distributor which, needless to say, the Machine Board and the dealers in question, through their own means and legal action, were able to contact them but received very little, if any, response to corrective measures and/or whether the manufacturer would take the equipment back.

The last information that I had on my file was to the effect that the manufacturer had indicated that he was willing to supply the necessary modifications to the unit and those dealers should be receiving same very shortly. And I think that very shortly has now taken maybe several, one year or two years. Those modifications are neither here nor there. The balers have been, by the dealer that I am aware of, was virtually paid for as acceptance on delivery, but whether all of it was paid for is unknown. But anyway, the dealer, I believe invested around \$5,000, which may have been the wholesale price of the baler, and they are stuck as a dealer, not only as a farmer. I gather the bond provisions within the province are to the degree that if the bond was called, those dealers would be in a very poor bargaining position or a poor position to receive maybe any more than 25 or 30 cents on the dollar in terms of their investment. I'm wondering whether the department and the minister is considering modifications to the Act or changes in regulations if that is possible

with respect to the bond provisions as they now relate to distributors within the Province of Manitoba, of farm machinery?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member brings up a point as far as changing legislation to protect the dealers who would get involved in such a situation. The Chairman of the Board informs me that they have a Review Committee at this particular time, reviewing legislation to recommend the changes to it to take care of such problems that are before us. As far as making it retroactive I think it would be very difficult. The people who are involved, I guess if the bond is called, and there is a shortfall then it's unfortunate, but my understanding is that the kits that were sent up have been tested on the balers that he refers to and in fact have not panned out to be what they should have done, and the Chairman of the Board informs me that they are calling the bond of that particular company.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I understand that there was correspondence from sister provinces as well to this manufacturer. I believe that in the interests of maintaining a healthy dealership in Manitoba of farm machinery, that it is incumbent even on the government to make sure that they are not put into a straightjacket and to be financially liable any more than they should be, and in a case like this, I believe that whatever action should be taken by Manitoba should be, or at least consultation should be held with the sister provinces, whether they are moving along the same lines, and if they are, will the province be moving at this session or when will it be moving in this area?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: It has been indicated to me, Mr. Chairman, that the other provinces are moving in this same direction and we will consider the legislation that will correct this anomaly in the coming year.

MR. URUSKI: There is likely not, from what the Minister tells me, there will be no legislation put forward with respect to this type of a situation, this session.

MR. DOWNEY: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)—pass. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister just what else we can talk about, under this item. As I understand the item, it deals with two aspects, technical services and economics. I understand there are two directors involved in this one particular branch. Is that not correct?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, there will only be one director involved in this program, in this appropriation, after the re-organization. The other parts of the department that we have in here — the general farm management; CanFarm, which we are not any longer involved in with the Federal government; the administration of the Beef Income Assurance Plan, there's one position in here for that; and then the entomology extension; pesticide licensing; the insecticide distribution, apiary specialists and apiary inspection are the other areas that are in this Technical and Economics branch.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister tell us who the people are that are heading up the respective components within this appropriation. There are two directors. Who are the directors now?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there is only one director, and that's Terry Oatway.

MR. USKIW: So, the Minister is telling us that we have one director, who is in charge of the technical services program and the economics branch?

MR. DOWNEY: That's right. Anything to do with the economics that's in the area that we're discussing.

MR. USKIW: All right, well then I would like to know who is the director of Economics then, in the department?

MR. DOWNEY: At this particular time, Bill Johnson is in that position, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: I'm trying to understand. Is that particular component the item that we are now debating as well?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, the part in which we're discussing now, with the re-organization, we have the the economics and that relates to the production, as I referred to, CanFarm, General Farm Management, in this department, which comes under the directorship of Terry Oatway.

MR. USKIW: The problem. Knowing the individual, my understanding of it, that he was an engineer, not an economist, and I don't know how he is going to head up CanFarm and all the economics activities with an engineering certificate. I'm trying to understand how this Minister is mixing those two things.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member may have a hard time understanding that, but as I explained, CanFarm is no longer within the department and really, we are looking at department re-organization and within that we have, as far as being the head of the programs, when we look at the General Farm Management we have Gerry Therrien, who is heading up that particular part of the department.

MR. USKIW: Maybe I'm a little slow this evening, Mr. Chairman. Would the Minister tell me then what the respective roles are of the head of the economics branch, which we have sitting with us here, and the other director which is Mr. Oatway. What are their respective responsibilities, and should we be debating them under separate headings?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the individual who I refer to, Mr. Oatway, who is in charge of this as a director, it's the service to the department, to the production part of our department, the other individual who is referred to, we can debate that under the marketing branch, Mr. Chairman, where the balance of the Economic branch is now transferred to . —(Interjection)— That's right. t, What hasn't remained, Mr. Chairman, with the departmen the Technical and Economics Branch that we're discussing right now which I said was general farm management who is under the control of Gerry Therrien.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the head of the Economics Branch is to be debated under the other item which is another page down, then what is the logic of not having the director of this particular expenditure with the Committee as opposed to the director of the Economics Branch? I am trying to understand why we don't have Mr. Oatway here instead of Mr. Johnson.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I understand the director is unable to be with us because of another meeting elsewhere.

MR. USKIW: I would now like to ask the Minister whether there is any provincial funding of CanFarm.

MR. DOWNEY: Not in this year's estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Is the Minister telling us that we are through with the program as far as financial involvement of the taxpayers is concerned?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I want to get into the area of the insecticide distribution program. What is the policy with respect — well Mr. Chairman I'm not finished yet. What is the policy with respect to the purchase of insecticides? Has there been a change in policy where we have provided supplies of chemicals to municipalities, individuals, etc.?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we've had no major outbreaks of where the chemical would have to be used. As far as any change in policy of any part of that program it remains the same as it's been over the last few years.

MR. USKIW: Yes, well, Mr. Chairman, I would presume then that we also can debate the Agricultural Water Services Programs under this item, is that not correct?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, they would come under the Item 7, Agricultural Land and Water Development Division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 12.

MR. USKIW: Resolution 12 — Land and Water Development Division.

Well, more specifically, Mr. Chairman, I'm talking about the technical services that are provided for the establishment of sewer and water facilities. Is that still under that item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, that can be debated under Agricultural Land and Water Development Division, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Yes, what are the range of technical services provided under this appropriation, then?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the total entomology section of the department; the agricultural engineering on buildings on the farm waste; power and machinery; the Farm Machinery Board; and again we've discussed the Agriculture Machinery Institute; plus a portion of the general farm management section.

MR. USKIW: Yes, with respect to agricultural wastes, what is the Minister's position re the recent report that was tabled in the House with respect to environmental control and waste management, and so on? Has the Minister adopted a policy pursuant to that report, or is it too early to expect that at this stage?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, because of our involvement in the last few days, and we will be having the department review the report completely and I will have an opportunity then to take a look at it and come forward with our position as far as the report is concerned — the final report.

MR. USKIW: Well, with a specific item then, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell us what the department's involvement is at the present time, or was recently, with respect to the pollution problems at East Selkirk?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I've been informed that there has been some involvement by the Director in looking at the problem. I have no report that has been presented to me on that specific issue that the member brings forward. However, I'm assured by Mr. Hudek that he has been in discussion with the environment people so there has been some contact with our department.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the Department of Agriculture has made any recommendations that either have been followed up on by the owners of the ranch or the feed lot, or whether they have made recommendations that have not been acceptable and are still being debated and challenged?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am informed that there aren't any reports or evidence that the feed lot that is in question is contributing to the contamination or to the problem that the member is referring to.

MR. USKIW: Well, perhaps this isn't the Minister's jurisdiction but, then why is the government involved in diverting the drainage from that farm into the adjacent creek bed if there is no particular problem relative to the drainage from the farm into the area?

MR. DOWNEY: I guess, Mr. Chairman, the best way would be to have the Director who is responsible report when he is available to me so that I can report to the Committee on that specific item, and I would refer back to it.

MR. USKIW: Would the Minister then agree that he would furnish to this Committee or to the House, if this Committee has completed its work, all of the information that he has through his technical people relative to this department's involvement in that issue in that particular

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can check with the department to see what their involvement was and report to the Committee at that particular time. Then we can decide whether, in fact, that information — there's anything that would be useful to the Committee.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister wants us to unduly prolong the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. That wouldn't be in keeping with the position of this department. Perhaps if he would simply agree that when the information becomes available that that information be tabled in the House, and that would satisfy our members of this Committee.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, again I would have to check and see what information was available, what really has been done as far as our department's concerned, before I can indicate . . .

MR. USKIW: I should refresh the Minister's memory on this one, or perhaps even give him some information. I am aware, and I think the department is aware, that our technical staff have been involved on that particular site for a number of years giving advice, or whatever, but they were involved, and they have been involved since the problem of ground water pollution has presented itself. So all I want to know is what this department's role was with respect to that problem. What were the recommendations, if any, and if they were followed? And if there were no recommendations, then I have no problem but I would like to know that at whatever time the Minister has that information.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, again Mr. Chairman, I'll go back and see what role was played. The member indicates to me that there was. I would check with the individuals responsible and report back what, in fact, there was for a report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Yes, well do I take it then the Minister agrees that if there is information then does become available, that we will have it tabled in the House or a statement from him, or whatever.

MR. DOWNEY: That's right, Mr. Chairman. I will indicate to the Committee if there is a report that is of some consequence that to satisfy him and the Committee that I would consider — but first I want to see what the involvement of the department has been. I have not had a report to this time and I will not say, well, I'll table it, until I've had a chance to see what is available.

MR. USKIW: The Minister is hedging all over the waterfront here. All I want to know from him is whether he's prepared to indicate to us either in this Committee or to the House if this Committee has completed the role that his department played with respect to that problem, and whether or not his department has made any recommendation and, if so, what they were and if they are being adhered to or accepted. That's all I want to know, it's very very precise and very very simple, Mr. Chairman. Now the Minister is telling me that he doesn't know if he can answer me until he sees what the report is, if there is a report or what the information is, if there is information. You know, that is a bit of nonsense. I mean, we are debating his Estimates and if there is information there we are entitled to have it. That is the purpose of going through the Estimates debate, Mr. Chairman. We cannot function unless we are provided with information that is available to the Minister and should be available to this Committee, you know. If there is nothing there, we'll be satisfied that there is nothing there. But if there is a recommendation that flows from the Department of Agriculture and their involvement in that issue, then we have a right to know what it was and whether or not those recommendations are being followed up on.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I go back . . . I know that the member has been questioning the Minister responsible for Environment, how they came up with their recommendations, if in fact there was some input from the Department of Agriculture, I would have to find that out. He is possibly receiving the same information from that Minister and I would make the decision if there is any more to add, I would consider adding to that as far as our department was concerned.

MR. USKIW: The Minister either isn't listening or he doesn't want to give us an answer. You know, he keeps telling us about giving consideration to giving up of information to this Committee. And that has been one of our problems of this particular debate, Mr. Chairman, since Day One, is that he talks in terms of maybe, maybe not, I will determine that sometime in due course. Well, this Committee can't function that way. If he doesn't want to give us the information then I can give a speech on why he doesn't want to give us the information. If he wants to give us the information

then let's not waste time in debate and let's agree that whenever it is forthcoming that we will have it. I'm not interested in a big debate on it. All I want to know is whether it will be available when the report is available to the Minister and if there is anything to report.

MR. DOWNEY: Well again I go back, Mr. Chairman, to what I have said. Firstly, I will indicate to the members of the Committee what the input was from the department and as far as the report that went through from the Department of Agriculture, I'm sure was used in the total recommendation or what has been proceeded by the Department of Environment. I cannot indicate to him anything more at this particular time.

If there's information that can add to the debate with the Department of Agriculture as it is a part of what we're discussing, then I would again make that information available.

MR. USKIW: Can the minister take as notice and bring back the information whenever he receives it either to this Committee or to the House whether the Department of Agriculture has made any recommendations to Environment or to anyone with respect to diverting the flow of drainage from Right Angle Farms that normally flowed into a quarry, but was diverted very recently to Cook's Creek.

Can the minister tell me whether that was a recommendation of his staff, and that's all I want to know, Mr. Chairman? It either was or it wasn't.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would find that out for the member.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the minister just what is the role of the technical services people in terms relative to the Water Services Program that has been part of this department's program for now four or five years, what is the present role of that group?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, they have been transferred over to the Land and Agricultural Lab and Water Development Division. —(Interjection)—.

MR. USKIW: So we can debate that under that section. All right.

MR. DOWNEY: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the member finished?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the minister indicate specifically in the Economics Branch, how many staff were there within the Economics Section?

MR. DOWNEY: The numbers that directly relate to farm management that are in the department at this particular point are 12, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the minister indicate to me how many staff were within the Economics Branch that would have normally made it up with this transfer? Now, how many would have gone over to the Marketing Branch?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, 3 were transferred to the Marketing Branch — 3, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, when the minister talks about general farm management I'd like to be able to understand that better. What do you really mean by . . . when he mentioned about 12 staff under the general farm management portion, could you indicate what that means ?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, when we speak of general farm management, we speak of production, economics, support staff to the Regional Farm Management in the area of bookkeeping and general farm management cost of production, that type of work. —(Interjection)—.

MR. URUSKI: . . . analyses, as if it would be made the cost of production for example to the Income

Assurance Plan and those costs that would be related the farm economics courses that are offered rurally; accounting courses and those kinds of things are part of that . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, that type of information as far as some of the work it will be now in the Marketing Branch; it relates more with the marketing and that type of management within the farm units. It's supportive to the total agriculture production Division and it's pretty hard to cut the distinct lines of what responsibility is as he is quite aware and as we're all quite aware that farm management covers quite a large area.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in his reorganization, could the minister tell me whether his reorganization of his department has been completed?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman. We are in the process of reorganizing the department at this time, and it is not finalized at this time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister made an announcement in his speech that the department has been organized into four areas, four prime areas, including the General Management Division, which would be Management, Agricultural Production, Regional Extension, Marketing and Land and Water — five areas. What other reorganization are we intending to see?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I believe I indicated there were four areas, not five.

MR. URUSKI: There were four major areas, plus Administration.

MR. DOWNEY: Well no Mr. Chairman, we are in the Agricultural Production Division, we're in the Agricultural Market Development Division, we're in the Agricultural Land and Water Division, and we're in the overall Administration Management of those divisions, Mr. Chairman. And we are in the process of reorganizing. There are certain people involved who, as I stated earlier, we have two ADM positions that aren't filled at this particular time, and we are in the process, and that is the departments in which we'll end up with.

MR. URUSKI: If I may, Mr. Chairman, the extension, the Regional Agricultural Extension Branch, is that also under Agricultural Production?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: So then we have two fairly large divisions under one position, then, is that correct? It's shown as two separate votes, other than your statement.

MR. DOWNEY: That's right, Mr. Chairman, it is shown as two parts to the Estimate Book, but it comes under one division.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that of the Economics Branch, 12 staff are remaining within the Agricultural Production Division, but 3 are being transferred to the Marketing Branch, in my questions to him. Is that where the Director of Economics will be, with those 3 staff?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, we have three positions that transferred to the Marketing Division, of which two have people in them, and one is vacant at this particular time. There was a reduction of three because of the CanFarm, which I stated the other day — the reduction of CanFarm. The Director that you're referring to is not transferred to the Marketing but is in fact part of the planning and management of the department, which we discussed earlier, Mr. Chairman, which comes under 1.(c).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: No, Mr. Chairman, now the Minister has me confused. Does the Minister have a Director of Planning and Management, within the department?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, would the member ask the question again? I'm trying to get the information for him here.

MR. URUSKI: I believe I'm the one that's confused. The Minister indicated that the Director's position, the Director of Economics, since the Director of Technical Services is the Director for the Resolution that we're under, 4.(e) Technical and Economics Branch, and that the present Director of Economics, his salary is to be found under the Planning and Management Branch, and I asked the question, well, is there not already a Director of Planning and Management in the department?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, there is no Director in Planning and Management. That is the gentleman referred to, Mr. Johnson, is working in that area but not as a Director or an ADM.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Planning and Management then is headed up by whom, an ADM?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: And that's Mr. Lacomby, I presume?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Then what would Mr. Johnson's role be in that area?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, he is involved in the economics and the discussion that we talked about earlier, in the stabilization work that is being done, in that particular area at this time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, now maybe the Minister has me confused because I thought he just told me that those 12 staff were remaining in the Technical Services Branch of Economics, and that is handled by someone else. Could he tell me who is handling what, then?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I stated, Mr. Johnson, who is now in Management, who comes under the Greg Lacomby shop ; an ADM, is working in that area. We have three individuals, as I stated, moved to the Market Research or to the Market Division of the department. We have three CanFarm people who have been deleted, and we have nine that remain in the Technical and Economics that we have been discussing.

MR. URUSKI: Those, if I may make sure that I understand . . .

MR. DOWNEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman; I have one other addition. There were three individuals that were a part of the Planning Secretariat under Statistics.

MR. URUSKI: Those are under this present 4.(e)?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, now did I understand the Minister correctly that the present Director of Economics has been transferred to the Planning and Management Division of the department, outside of a directorship role? He is no longer a Director?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Does that constitute a demotion, or what is the score? Can the Minister explain that?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman that we're speaking about was a Director of the Economics Branch. Now we know that the Economics Branch has been broken up, the greatest portion of nine staff plus four of the statistics, I believe, stayed with the Technical Services Branch, Technical Economics Branch. Three went to the new Marketing Branch under 6.(b), although the Director didn't go there. The Director came back to the Administration Branch, of which he is no longer a Director. Now, what does that tell you, Mr. Chairman? Is that a demotion or what is that? Can the Minister explain?

MR. DOWNEY: The honourable member can figure it however he likes. It is not a demotion. As I said, we're not totally finished with the reorganization of the department as far as classification is concerned, and the individual is being used as a support to the Deputy Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, since the Minister doesn't what he is going to do, or at least that's what he is letting on to us, that he doesn't know what he is going to do, he has already set the targets but he doesn't know where he is going to get the shells, in terms of his reorganization. Can he tell me what responsibilities he will be assigning to the Director that he has demoted?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, how many times do I have to tell the member that he is not demoted, and if he wants to use that terminology he is quite free to do so in this Committee but that is not the case, Mr. Chairman. He is in advisory capacity to management and is at the same pay as he was as a Director. If the individual recommends that he should be reduced, I would have to disagree with him. I think that we have a lot of work to do in the area of Research and support to the management of the Department of Agriculture, of which this individual is highly qualified.

We still have, as I indicated, two ADM positions that are not filled at this particular time. We have some other work that we're doing and I feel confident the individual that is supportive to the administration at this time is fully qualified.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing about anyone's qualifications; I am asking the Minister what his intentions are, because it is not I who am reorganizing the department, it is he who is reorganizing the department. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's own words, that we had a Director who was in charge of a Branch of some roughly 15 people. The Branch was broken off. Some were left with the present Director and three were transferred elsewhere. What other assumption can one come to other than the Minister is indicating to us that, yes, we had a Director but we really now can't find anything for him to do, so we have put him into the Administration Branch and that's where he will sit until we find what we're going to do with him.

Now, the Minister says that that's not it; this is what our intentions are. That's what I want to hear. The previous administration certainly didn't have any quarrel with the qualifications because of the direction we gave and the position that the man held. It is your government now that has toed this reorganization and has made the changes. You explain the changes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, I will go back and say that the individual is being used as an advisor and a co-ordinator to management, and I don't know what more explanation the individual wants.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister define the scope of duties of the work that the Director is doing now, or the former Director is doing now?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I referred to some of the work in stabilization that is being looked at. We have been in discussion with the federal government, I talked about it earlier today that in fact there had been discussions taking place. He is the individual that is on that Committee, as far as the government is concerned, and because of his experience in the Economics field over the past few years, we feel that that is pretty much a full-time job at this particular time.

MR. URUSKI: The full-time job in terms of federal-provincial relations in dealing with stabilization plans, is that what you're referring to, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, plus supportive to the general administration of the Department of Agriculture in other Economics areas. I'm sure that, if not full-time in that area, he is available to the department to . . . if you want to get into specifics' I suppose we could . . .

MR. URUSKI: I want to. I want to understand what he's doing because his staff has been removed from him, and so what does he do?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, again, he is involved with what members are quite familiar with, I'm sure, and that is the general support to the senior administration, which in fact over the past few years have had a Planning Secretariat and that type of support staff. This is the area in which the individual is working at.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, are there any staff under his direction, in terms of the Planning Secretariat that the Minister is talking about, or who is assigned to him?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: No what, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, the question you asked, why there any staff underneath the individual and I said "No".

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me who he co-ordinates and what he co-ordinates?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, with the other branches of the Department of Agriculture as far as the economics are concerned.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, is this an area of duplication of responsibility, in terms of positions, where we have an Economics Branch and we have the Technical Services Branch doing two things, and then we have the former Director of Economics co-ordinating the two? Is this a duplication or what is this?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, perhaps the Minister would be in a position to indicate to us what role the department is playing with respect to, I presume it's the Economics Branch, meetings, seminars, etc., involving production of different commodities in the area of marketing.

MR. DOWNEY: I don't quite . . .

MR. USKIW: All right, I will be specific.

MR. DOWNEY: Could he be more specific, Mr. Chairman?

MR. USKIW: Yes. What role was the department involved in at a meeting, I believe, of corn growers in Steinbach? What was the department's role at that meeting very recently?

MR. or DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it could have been the ag rep the GDA Corn Committee under the new Value Added Crop Agreement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Can the Minister tell me who paid for the marketing spokesman, consultant, speaker, or whatever his title was, at that particular meeting, whether it was a departmental expense or whether it was at some other organization's expense?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it wasn't a government expense.

MR. USKIW: Was it a government sponsored meeting? Was it MDA that . . . I see.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, at this point I have very little information on the meeting that the member is referring to. To our knowledge, there has been no approval to pay anybody to be a part of that meeting, as far as the Acting Deputy or me, as the Minister, to authorize payment.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, apparently there was a meeting and, as I understand, it was sponsored by the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, and the subject was marketing and the use of the futures market and apparently the spokesman that was there was advocating to the farmers that they get into this futures business and get into the Commodity Exchange business. And on questioning from the audience, he admitted that 75 percent of the participants in that particular marketing system are losers and 25 percent are winners, and I'm wondering on what basis the Manitoba Department of Agriculture would want to encourage farmers to get involved in something that they might not be able to handle adequately and, in which case, it could result in bankruptcies of farms, and so

on. I think it's a very important point. If MDA staff are doing that, I would hope that the Minister is aware of it and, if he is aware of it, that he is prepared to defend that kind of a use of departmental staff and money.

So I simply give him notice that I would want that information. If we're not involved, fine. If we are, I would like to know the logic of it.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, again I think we can debate that point over in the area of Agricultural Marketing and Development, but as far as I'm concerned the Department of Agriculture, under the Economics Branch, is more to the support to the production side to the farm people and to the department. As I say, we can get into that debate, which I'm sure we will, when it comes to the Marketing Division of the department. It will give him an opportunity to . . .

MR. USKIW: I'm not terribly interested in taking up the time of the Committee. If the Minister will undertake to answer the question that I have put, then I will leave it at that. There is no point in belabouring the issues. Okay.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to provide that information and enter into the debate with the member at that particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)—pass; (e)(2)—pass; (e)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate whether the department made submissions to the Clean Environment Commission on the study of animal waste?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Was the submission made on behalf of the Department of Agriculture, as far as professional staff?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate whether the final report incorporated and utilized the recommendations made by staff members?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I haven't had an opportunity to fully analyze the final report so when I indicate, on the other question I was asked, as far as the involvement of the department and the report in which it was brought forward, our response to it. We will know at that particular time the input that came from the department how it was looked upon.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister have a copy of the department's submission to the Clean Environment Commission? Could that be made available to members of the Committee?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(2)—pass; (e)—pass; (f)(1) Agricultural Training: Salaries—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we can't just pass that item. That's just not right. Yes, I wonder if the Minister would tell us what he is doing in this particular section of his department.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we're in the area of the 4-H and youth specialists, under which comes the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. 4.(f) Agricultural Training: (f)(1) — the Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would expect to have order in this Committee so I can discuss the Estimates of the department, and I am referring to the 4-H and youth specialists, which are in the central region. I'm sorry, not the central region, the Winnipeg office. We go to the area of the Agricultural Extension Centre, the administration and the food services in Brandon.

Under the grants we have the — and I'll just discuss them briefly — we have the Farm Vacation Association, which will receive a grant of \$15,000 this year. Community Studies \$25,000.00. The Manitoba Women's Institute, which is made up of \$24,000.00. We have some transfers out of the department to the Department of Manpower, and I will get to those. We also have the Agricultural Manpower Services, the Portage Action Program. We have the Selkirk Training Plant, which has been transferred to the Department of Manpower.

MR. USKIW: Which program to the . . . ?

MR. DOWNEY: The Selkirk Training Plant, Mr. Chairman. It's not in the Department of Agriculture Estimates; I said it has been transferred to the Department of Manpower. And then the Branch Administration, which is basically the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass? The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. He gave us the 4-H Youth Specialists, Winnipeg Office. Of the total budget that we have, \$1.226 million, what does the branch, 4-H Youth Specialists, Winnipeg Office, entail in terms of dollars and staff?

MR. DOWNEY: The staff, Mr. Chairman, is made up of 2.3 staff man years and dollars of \$62,500.00.

MR. URUSKI: The Agricultural Extension Centre in Brandon?

MR. DOWNEY: The Ag. Centre, Mr. Chairman, the total staffing, when you look at the Food Services and the Residence Service, a total of 11.26 staff man years and approximately \$275,000, in the operation of the Agricultural Centre.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the three grants that the Minister had indicated, \$15,000 for the Farm Vacation, how does that compare to last year?

MR. DOWNEY: That's an increase of \$1,000, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister explain the Community Studies? What does he mean by Community Studies?

MR. DOWNEY: That, Mr. Chairman, is a research program that's in combination with the Brandon University on historical projects and updating of information in agricultural regions and community internal problems within the agricultural regions of the province. It's a resource centre for interested groups or people to update information on historical pasts, and that type of thing.

MR. URUSKI: How many staff in this, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: In the grants, Mr. Chairman, there aren't any.

MR. URUSKI: Is this a direct grant to the Brandon University, then?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's to the Resource Centre, which I don't know what the connection directly is with the . . . It's housed at the University but independent of the operations of the Brandon University.

MR. URUSKI: Who operates that Resource Centre?

MR. DOWNEY: I have a lady by the name of Mrs. Fulton. She is the Chairman of the Board, a fine lady from out in the Birtle district. We have the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Barry Hood, from the Carberry area and some fine outstanding citizens from the rural community.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm not doubting the sincerity of the members of the community who are on the board, but is there other funding that this group receives from government or from any other department in addition to the Department of Agriculture?

MR. DOWNEY: Not to my knowoedge, Mr. Chairman. I believe that this is the only grant that they

receive from the government.

MR. URUSKI: Is it possible that they receive funding from the Universities Grants Commission, through the Brandon University?

MR. DOWNEY: The only input that comes from the university my understanding is that they provide secretarial support to it and housing for the operations of it.

MR. URUSKI: Is there a time limit on this program, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman. I would think that they have to justify each year the work that they are doing to have continuing funding.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, is there a time limit in terms of the length of time that they are — I gather the Minister indicated they were studying problems and areas in agriculture and in rural life — is there a time limit to the completion of their works, that the department has?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to think that there was an end to all the problems in rural Manitoba and possibly they will be able to see a light at the end of the tunnel, but it would be a little early to assume that particular —(Interjection)— No, in seriousness, I would think that they are an ongoing committee that have some meaningful objectives and the money that is given to them is being used in a useful manner.

MR. URUSKI: The outcomes of their studies are to be published, or is it being published?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: It is available through the Department of Agriculture?

MR. DOWNEY: The most direct route would be through the Resource Centre itself out at the Brandon University.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, is this the second year for grants to the Farm Vacations Association?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated there was a grant last year of \$14,000 and \$15,000 this year.

MR. USKIW: This grant is an increase, or had there been . . . ?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I understand there has been a gradual increase. The first grant, I am informed, was \$12,500.00.

MR. USKIW: Who is in charge, or how is the department monitoring the value of the program to determine whether or not grants should continue?

MR. DOWNEY: As far as the numbers of people using the farm vacation service, the importance of it to Manitoba, as far as I am concerned, is totally displayed by the popularity, the reports that I hear, reporting to the director, and of course general public acceptance. I think it is a real good program. I think it allows urban children the opportunity to become a part of agricultural communities, to enjoy a different way of life that they are not used to, and it is exposure for the individuals who live in cities to participate in farm life activity.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would hope the Minister takes seriously the points that I want to make because, as I understand it, there have been some problems. There was a very bad situation occurred in one instance, which I am sure staff is aware of. The other is, does the Minister have a mechanism through which he can make certain that no one individual doesn't overly commercialize this whole program, which really would mean that the department is involved in a subsidy to someone who is making all kinds of money out of it, which I don't think was the original intent. You know, there is a limit to which I would want to see this commercialized.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would think that would be one of the cautions that we would have to certainly be aware of, but I do know that they are very much self-policing as far as the Farm Vacations Association is concerned. There has been a gradual increase in the past few years of the numbers of individuals using farm vacations. They have been unable to keep up to the requests for school tours throughout the province; the demand far exceeds the capacity to be able to handle them.

I know the majority of the individuals involved — or have had a recent opportunity to discuss with them some of their problems — I would think that being the self-policing type organization that they are, their objectives are, I do not believe to over-commercialize, and if that were the case I would think it would be pretty much monitored from within their own group and I know that the individual who is involved with the department and in contact with them, would be reporting of such situations that might be developing.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would want to encourage the Minister to take a very conservative approach to this program because it seems to me that if members of this association — as I understand it, they have to pay a membership fee to belong to it and so on and then of course their particular farms are advertised and people are invited to take vacations on those farms for a certain fee per day or month or week or whatever — if it becomes evident to the department that the members of the association are indeed making this program as sort of another income or a source of revenue to the farm, then one has to raise the question of whether there is a need for public subsidization. You know, I can understand innovation grants and so on to get something started, but you know if a given farm is netting \$1,000 or something like that out of this kind of a program, then it seems to me their membership fee should be high enough to cover the service that they are getting from being members of this association and should not really have to draw on the public purse to keep it going.

So that's the kind of caution I would want to urge on the government, that we don't want to provide grants where they are unnecessary. If it is necessary, that's fine, because it is relatively new, but if it is getting to the stage where there is reasonable profiteering on the part of the members of this association, then you know in a period of restraint in particular, it is a time that you would want to pull back provincial funds.

Can the Minister tell me what the average profit was of the members of this association last year?

MR. DOWNEY: No, I cannot, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Can the Minister tell me whether there was any profit to the members of this association?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Can he agree to find out and to tell this committee at the appropriate time, or to the House — give us the answers to those questions?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to go back and say that I think it was 1972, when he was a member of the government, set up a grant to the Farm Vacation Centre. At that particular time, it was something like \$12,500.00. It is now sitting at \$15,000; there has been an increase in need for the use of the farm vacation homes. I do not see where there is anybody making a large amount of profit out of really what has been initiated and I'll go back and say it was a good program and I think that they were wise in putting money into that particular association.

As far as the operation of the farm vacation centres, or farm vacation farms, I do not believe it is the total objective of those individuals to make a great amount of money out of individuals who are unable to share in farm life. It is more of a filling of need or that kind of —(Interjection)— Well, yes, he refers, some do, and I would think that there are some commercial operations. But I think the general thrust of the farm vacation homes are more to expose city children to farm life and there always will be one or two people who will try and take advantage of a system. I am a firm believer that the individuals who are in control and operating the Farm Vacation Program will not allow that to happen. I can assure you that I would not like to see that happen, that provincial money should be used to support the general thrust of non — well, not totally non-profit — but service to the city children.

If I can just elaborate a little more, I would think that the total amount of money that is used

to advertise or support their — I think there's 45 or 50 farm vacation members at this particular time — and if at a point they felt they were unable or not in need of the provincial grant, I would think, as any responsible government, we would consider discussing the grant. I know the member knows what it is like when you talk about removing anybody's grant; we do not intend to remove it at this time but if it appeared somebody was taking advantage of it, then we would certainly act responsibly.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, those are very flowery statements that the Minister has injected into this debate, but I can assure him from my experience, that once you start someone off with a grant or assistance, that even if they are in a healthy financial position, they tend to become addicted to grants and assistance if it is available free of charge, as long as someone else pays the bill. That's human nature. I know that virtually every branch of the Minister's department would like to grow, even if it is only for the sake of growing to have a bigger empire, and so the Minister's role is to make sure that that doesn't happen beyond reason. So, Mr. Chairman, human nature being what it is, I would hope that there is a monitor and that when this program reaches a stage where it can be self-funded, then that is the time that the province should say, you are now on your feet and you should be able to carry on.

If the association means anything to those people, that membership in the association means something, surely they will determine for themselves the value of that membership and whether they can carry on or not. There has to come a time when you have to make these evaluations and it's either a good thing or it isn't. It is either worth subsidizing or it isn't, or it is self-sustaining or it isn't, and at some stage that evaluation should be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1) — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us something about the Portage Action Program that he referred to. Is that a new program? Could the Minister tell us what that is all about?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, that is a support to the vegetable growers and the vegetable workers to co-ordinate their efforts in the development of a work force to support the vegetable growers in the Portage region. There has been the same staff involved in that program this year as there was last year. There have been good results as far as the growers are concerned. We're carrying on with the program to help support that particular industry, not only support the industry but to work with the Portage workers to better equip themselves to fulfill the needs within the agricultural community.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister tell me whether or not there has been an agreement struck with respect to Mexican labour brought into this area?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, he refers to an agreement. An agreement with whom would he be referring to?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows there is an Association of Workers there and there is an Association of Employers, and that Mexican labour has been one of the sore points between the two. And I would like to know whether that has been sorted out and whether there has been some agreement entered into between the two groups re the question of outside labour.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the member refers to a problem which . . . or it apparently had been a problem some two years ago. Last year we were able to, the department and the Vegetable Growers were able to work with the local people and were allowed to bring in some 19 out-of-the-province employees from Mexico. It appeared that there was a fairly good working relationship between the individuals. I go back again and state my position that first of all we want to see Canadians employed and Manitobans employed. That is the most desirable position to be in. But in certain cases we were unable to have a total labour force used from within, that they weren't able to totally fulfill the needs of the industry, and through discussions with the workers and — the growers, there were 19 people, that's correct and discussions with Canada Manpower. There were 19 individuals last year. We are in a discussion process now and I believe there will be something like 18 available to the vegetable growers this year.

I think it's important that the individuals who have had long-term experience, such as the Mexican workers, to come in and complement the work force that we have, supports the workers and it

supports the growers.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister would want to read his own statements and perhaps examine his philosophy on that. He thinks it's relatively reasonable to bring in labour from outside of the country to supplement the local labour force, and really, you know, I wish he would have said it the other way, that it's important to develop our own labour force and that we shouldn't go outside of our own province, our own country, unless there was absolutely no other choice available to us. If he had used that kind of verbiage I would have said, well, yes, that's quite right; that's the way it should be, but he introduced his comments by suggesting that it's very reasonable to bring in outside labour to supplement local labour. Well, that is only reasonable under certain circumstances, and I'm not sure that the circumstances at Portage are such that it makes it reasonable. Maybe they are. That's why I raised the question, is there an agreement between the Association of Workers and the Association of Producers. And additional to that, what is the department doing, either themselves or with provincial Manpower Training Programs or with federal Manpower Training Programs, to try to gradually eliminate the need, if there a need for outside workers, through some sort of a training program? You know, are we involved on all fronts to deal with this issue or are we ignoring the fact that there are tens of thousands of people that could be employed in these industries, in these particular specialized agricultural production units, but it requires some training input or whatever, to make that happen.

And I know it's a tough process, Mr. Chairman. I'm not trying to suggest to the Minister that that can be done overnight. It's just that I would hope that we are on the right direction and that programs are in effect that would gradually eliminate the need, if there is a need — I'm not sure that there is — for out-of-province and out-of-country labour, especially when unemployment rates are high. And I know the Minister can rationalize that by telling me that, well, yes, but it's not the traditional type of work that those that are unemployed would care to attach themselves to, and that's very common. But my real point has to do with whether we are gearing up, through training or other methods, to become self-sufficient with this kind of labour. And if he is saying we are, then for the moment I will have to accept that, in their discretion, I suppose those odd numbers of out-of-the-province labour people have to be acceptable to us, but not in isolation and not without the other approach to the problem, Mr. Chairman. If it's a dual approach, fine; if it's a cop-out approach, well, we're not prepared to spend dollars to train local people. Then, Mr. Chairman, it is not acceptable.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member, I hope, didn't try and turn what I said around. I believe I indicated to the Committee that there was, through an agreement, discussion with the workers and the growers, and the Department of Manpower. There were discussions with these individual groups to agree on X-number of people to come in to complement — I didn't say to take away the jobs; I said to complement — the workers that are here in the province.

And in addition to that, I can enlighten the member that in fact we had three courses this winter to work with the workers to help upgrade their ability so that they could provide the proper labour force, the proper technical input that is required or requested or needed by the growers to supply their needs. We are, in fact, working with the growers to educate them and help them be prepared to supply the needs of the growers. Plus the fact that we put a course on to work with the growers on how to work with some of the labour people that they're expected to work with.

So we have been working, as far as the department are concerned, with the development of our local labour supply. We have been in discussion with those labour people, those technical people that work in the vegetable fields, our local people, and with the growers, and with Canada Manpower an agreement to allow 18 Mexican people in. Hopefully, we would be able to, at some point in time, be able to not require any out-of-province workers, that we are able to supply the labour force, the technical input that is required in vegetable production, handling and processing, that that whole industry can be supported by Manitobans and Canadians. That is the objective. But to totally paralyse or to cripple the industry because of a critical labour shortage in one specific area would be unfair to both the workers and to the growers, because in fact it is a developing industry in the province, as all members are well aware, and it takes a bit of time to develop our people, and we are doing that in co-operation with the Canada Manpower, through the allowing of Mexicans in to work with our people. I think it's a good program; we are working with training programs and hopefully we will be able to supply the total labour requirements with Manitoban people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicated that there are three courses offered

this winter. How many people are being trained for this coming year, in terms of supplying the needs of growers?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there is indication that there were approximately 60 workers involved in those courses.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate as to how many workers are there in the pool now to supply the producers? What are the numbers that are part of the Labour Pool, as I understand has been mounted by , whether it's the Indian Brotherhood or the local group in the Portage area?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member asks a very difficult question, how can we separate or single out certain people who want to become involved in the vegetable industry? I don't think we should try and classify people. Say that you are qualified only to work in the vegetable fields, if that's what he is referring to. I can't, because I think it's an industry, that it should be available to all Manitobans to become a part of the production and processing of vegetables.

So, to answer the total question, I think it would be totally unfair. I think it's a growing industry. I think that there are job opportunities all the way through it. If he is referring to a special segment of it or individuals that we have been dealing with, I guess we could say there might be approximately 200 people that are in the immediate area that could be, the Labour Pool which he is referring to.

But I want to go back and again say I think that there are job opportunities for all Manitobans in the production of vegetables, and to try and classify and identify individuals who should or should not be in that is totally unfair to the work force in Manitoba.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister is trying to play games with me. The Minister well knows of the situation in Portage that developed between the workers and the growers and the attempt of workers to organize and to set up a bargaining unit and a work force to supply the growers in Portage. The Minister well well knows that the amount of off-shore labour can only be brought into this province with the concurrence of the provincial government. The federal government will not bring in off-shore labour. So that there must have been an agreement between the province to allow the number of workers.

Now, we know that there is an organization that represents the Portage workers. They must have a number of people who are willing to and able to, according to them, to work in the industry. The farmers, if there is a co-ordination going on between the provincial department and the Department of Manpower, must have figures available to it as to the number of employees that the industry requires, in terms of their employment. The Training Program is involved. What kind of numbers are we talking about, Mr. Chairman? I don't want the Minister to give me this song and dance that there is a job for everybody in the agricultural industry. We know we're talking about one specific problem that has surfaced over the last couple of years.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess, to be more specific, if the member is referring to the numbers of Native Canadians that are in that area that have an interest in the vegetable growing industry, that in fact there are some 150 to 200 that are identified as individuals who are desirous of becoming employed in that particular industry and are identifiable as a source of labour for the industry.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister and the government recognize this group of workers as a bargaining group of employees, in terms of a group whose labours can be pooled for the agricultural industry? Does your department recognize them, or do they not?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, that particular group that he is referring to, they have the Workers Association and they are the work force that have been involved in the production of vegetables in the Portage area, and I'm sure, I've said it twice if not three times tonight that they have been involved. The Workers Association in Portage have been involved; the growers have been involved and Canada Manpower have been involved in the discussions of bringing in out-of-the-country workers to assist in the production of vegetables.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate of these 150 to 200 workers the 60 that have come off course, are the 60 part of that 200 people that are in that pool?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: How many would the department indicate are to be — if the entire 200 amount is to be retrained, and I am making that assumption — how many of them are now presently upgraded sufficiently in terms of being able to be part of the labour pool, if they so desire?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think as the member is well aware, that there are certain and varied jobs in the particular production of vegetables as there are in the production of any agricultural — and there are individuals who have certain levels of training and involvement in that production. To be nailed down to numbers, specific figures, I think he is asking pretty near an impossible question. —(Interjection)— Well, I guess we have 60 people. Well, Mr. Chairman, if we can use a figure of 60 who have come off a training course this year, they are all available for the work force.

I'm sure that we could use an estimated figure of that many people who have been involved at the practical level, working in the farm fields with the producers who have been working with them to develop them, that we could be looking at 120 people who are qualified on the labour force. That would leave potentially approximately 80 to continue on with the work training program for next year and I can assure you that it is the intent of the department to carry on with that kind of a program. I have said that earlier; I think that is the type of objective we have to carry on with, to supply the people in the production and the processing of vegetables, the people who are in the work force, an opportunity to better themselves to supply the needs right here at home and that's really what we want to do.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that that is the target and that's what I'm trying to get at, as to what he sees in terms of a timetable range and the number of employees who conceivably could be trained and of course the question is, will they remain in the work force in that area? No one knows that amount. But is there a timetable in terms of estimates within the department providing certain patterns are followed in terms of training, when the number of offshore workers will be brought down? What time frame — are we going to be seeing 19 or 18 offshore workers from now for the next 10 years? If that is the case, then the Minister's intent goes right out the window.

As sincere as he might sound to this committee, he really is not indicating that his program is really intended to supply and upgrade workers from the Manitoba economy. If that is what he is saying, then let him say so, but if he is intent on moving in that direction, then let him make himself clear.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if the Member for St. George would just stop and think for a minute, that if you are looking at an industry such as the vegetable industry in Manitoba, the development, the potential, the type of soil that is in the area, particularly in the Portage area, the advantages that we have in Manitoba to produce vegetable crops, the desire for the individuals to participate in that kind of production, that in fact you can see a continual growth. I can see a continual growth in the need for people to work in the vegetable crop, in the row crops in particular.

So for me to sit here and say when we reach job opportunities for 200 people, that we are going to say we have accomplished what we want to accomplish. I don't know where his eyes hit the horizon; I think they hit it about six inches in front of his feet because really we are in a province that is conducive to growth, and particularly in that kind of production. As the vegetable industry grows and expands and the processing of those goods grows and expands, we produce more jobs for people in Manitoba. We produce not only jobs for those 200 people and opportunities, we could produce jobs for a multiple of that number of people.

So, our objectives aren't just to provide jobs for 200; we want to supply an opportunity for a multitude of people through the production of vegetables. And in the total cycle, you are increasing the total wealth of the province. Everybody is a part of making that grow. So when he says that my objectives aren't proper or there is something wrong with them when I'm saying, look, we are going to try to reduce from 18 to 19 workers coming in from Mexico, I'm sure that with an expanding industry it would be very unfair for me to sit here tonight and say, I think we should just sit with 18 or 19 or go to zero because we just want our vegetable industry to grow so big, or we only want X number of acres.

What I am saying is that I think that we can develop our people who are involved in the labour force, the 200 that are in the pool, if we can use that number — maybe it can be 400 people that we provide jobs for right in that immediate area — plus an additional group of support workers from offshore or out of the province. Let us not put those kind of limitations on what we are able to do. If that is the kind of agriculture policy that he can foresee, then I can assure him that he is totally out of step with really what is happening in Manitoba agriculture.

The basic industry can provide a multitude of jobs for people. Our people involved in the area

of extension, in working with people, we want to develop people who can work in that industry. The 200 that are there is the first objective. To support them with some offshore workers is also an objective. If the size of the industry drops, then we have qualified staff and people, and we don't need offshore people. But I can assure him that if we have the labour support, the people in this processing and the production, that we will see growing and we won't have to stop at 200 jobs, we will see a total expansion and a multitude of job opportunities.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, now we have really got the Minister telling us that he has no intent on reducing the offshore support in the agricultural industry. Mr. Chairman, the Minister told us that his training program is going to train 60 people, which is three times the annual amount of offshore workers, annually.

MR. DOWNEY: We trained 60 this year, Mr. Chairman, and we are carrying on with the program. For further information, we are carrying on with the program. If there are 60 who want to take it next year, we'll train 60. If there are 60 the following year, we will train 60. Those people have to be desirous of taking the training.

MR. URUSKI: That's really the point I am getting at, Mr. Chairman. There comes a time when the department can see within the industry that there will be a close matching of numbers of trained personnel in the industry versus the number of workers who are requested by employers within the industry in terms of training. At that point in time, the Minister says we will still be bringing in offshore workers to complement them. Mr. Chairman, that's what I heard from the Minister. If that's not the case, let him tell me that as we see the numbers of trained personnel within our province increasing to the point where we will be matching numbers of people within the industry with the numbers of jobs available, that the numbers of offshore workers will be reduced correspondingly and that there will be a point . . . At the rate we are going now, the Minister can't tell me that the 18 workers are handling the jobs of 200 or 120 who are now trained in the industry. Surely there must be a desire in terms of training our own people to be self-sufficient within the industry? Also, of course, there has to be a desire on the farmers in the area to be able to accept the people who are in the training program and move in that direction. Is that the way the department is moving?

MR. DOWNEY: I thought I had made it fairly clear, Mr. Chairman, that that is quite true, that if the total needs of the labour force are obtainable within the province, of trained people, then there is no requirement for offshore workers and that, of course, is the number one objective. But let us not stop there, Mr. Chairman, and say if the vegetable industry is growing and can expand, let us not restrict that growth and expansion because of an unavailability of labour supply because if we are in the same position at this particular time, or will be at that particular time, as we are now, we possibly would need some additional offshore workers to assist in the development of more people to develop themselves to be available to the production of vegetables. So I think that should be fairly clear to the member. I don't know how much more clear I can make it.

MR. URUSKI: I want to ask the Minister, how will the importing of offshore labour increase the amount of labour for the vegetable industry in this province? How will the importation of offshore labour increase the development of labour in the vegetable industry in this province?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be very obvious that the individuals who are producing vegetables at this particular time, or any agricultural crops that are labour intensive, will continue to expand and diversify into different types of crops that they are growing. For example, I can use any crop, but certain onion crops or certain carrots or root crops that are highly labour intensive, probably there will be new producers that will enter into the production of those particular crops that will expand the need for more employees.

The agricultural community, as much as the Member for St. George I guess can't get in his mind that it is an expanding industry and diversifying, and particularly in that area. So what I am saying is, the more availability of qualified people to those people who are experienced in the production of some of these different crops, and they probably could be from Mexico, that in fact those individuals will work with the people of Manitoba, to work with them to help them develop in working with those kinds of crops. That's the type of thing that I can see taking place and as our labour force is trained in that area, through the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, through working with the farmers and in discussion with Manpower and with the labour and with the growers, that we keep the numbers of offshore workers to a limit that is not taking away the jobs of Canadians, but as I said earlier, complementing those people who are working

in that type of production.

So I don't know how the member can say or ever think that it doesn't add more jobs to the total job opportunities. It in fact expands it at a lot faster rate than us not allowing people in to assist and help our people in their techniques of production and handling of those kinds of crops.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me how many job opportunities are open now or are estimated to be required? How many personnel will be required for this coming season in the vegetable industry in the Portage area?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the full-time jobs that are being indicated to the department now out of the vegetable industry, we are looking at a total of approximately 60 permanent jobs and some 90 casual jobs throughout the production season, and that is just in that particular Portage project that we have been discussing. So I think that when we are discussing the 60 that have been trained this winter, some other 60 that I may have indicated could be trained, so we are looking at 120, we are looking at 150 jobs available to those 120 people, both casual and full-time jobs.

Now, some of those people probably don't want — I can't determine whether they want a full-time job or whether they don't want a full-time job — but there is a surplus of work is what I am saying and I think with the involvement of some offshore workers to allow the producers to produce some other crops that they haven't been growing, that they were in fact able to encourage more of these workers to become more qualified in a broader range of production.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister indicated that the potential in the Portage area is for 60 full-time and 90 casual workers. Are any of those full-time positions now filled, or is that in addition to what is being filled now? Are those 60 the figures of jobs or approximate figures? Are any of those 60 filled at this present time, or are they still open?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, some of them, Mr. Chairman. The jobs are there if there are people there to fill them. I don't know what the complement is in relationship to the jobs that are available. I couldn't say that there are 60 jobs and there are 60 people in them. What I have indicated to the committee, that we've had indication that there are 60 full-time jobs available.

MR. URUSKI: So the minister has indicated that with the 60 full-time and the 90 casual that will be coming up as seasonal employment as the crops come in, there's approximately 150 job vacancies in the area. Of that 150, there are presently about 120 workers that have been . . . some have been trained and some in various stages, and I presume that there will be another group in through a continued training program this coming year, if I understand the minister. How many will be put into a training program this summer, or how does the training program work? Specifically, what type of a program is involved in terms of the working crew?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's been indicated to me and it's the way the programs work, that there are off-season courses that are performed in the wintertime. Some of them would be individuals who would be coming back for a second time; it wouldn't be that each program is the same, that it would involve production techniques or handling techniques of a different variety of a crop. So we're not talking new individuals in certain cases. The member grabbed onto a figure of an estimate that I put forward of 60 people that were trained, and 60 people that may have been trained through field experience. He asked me for a ball park figure, and I gave him one, and, you know, I think we're dealing with numbers here that could mean . . . I think we're fairly close, but I think we've got to be well aware of the fact that the training is in the wintertime, and off-season, and that some of those individuals can participate in more than one course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: I appreciate the opportunity of speaking at this time and about this program. First of all, I want to stress that the need is definitely there for a supplement work force to make certain that the expensive crops that are being grown in the Portage area is going to be cared for at the peak times.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat in on some of these programs that are being supplied in Portage for our local people, and I can assure you that I can see progress being made by these programs, but let's not get carried away with the idea that the minister has already stated where some 60 staff attended these programs, but when there are 60 of local people attending the programs laid

down, it's certainly not a case where there's going to be 60 qualified individuals come out of that course. There's a percentage of them that, through the lack of interest, through the lack of ability to fill the need, is just not going to pass that course.

The offshore workers, I maintain, there's going to be need for them to supplement the local workers regardless of the numbers at this time. The fact that these crops that we are growing in Portage la Prairie requires this special care at the feed dollars, there's not much more that I can say any more than let's not lose sight of the need for the offshore workers to supplement the local labour force around Portage la Prairie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Member for Portage finished?

MR. HYDE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell me . . . the minister has made similar comments to the Member for Portage and that's the direction that he is taking, that there will always be a need for offshore labour in the Portage area. I want to know whether the minister subscribes to that kind of thinking because we're almost at the point of having a trained work force with an employee representative group that is prepared to supply the labour needed. What as well is required is a willingness on behalf of both sides, the producers as well as the workers to be able to accept their style of employment and their working habits and their backgrounds, to be able to work them into their system.

Now, unless there is a determination on behalf of a) the government to train those numbers of people, b) the government's attitude and stance portrayed to the farmers, that they will ultimately phase out the offshore labour, that there will always be per annually a request for offshore workers because they will claim that the offshore workers will certainly out-produce and out-perform the local help, no matter what, and that there will always be a need. And this will be the continuous battle between some of the farmers, who I believe may not be prepared to work with local people, who will only rely and want to rely on offshore help, and if that is the case I want to know that it is the government policy that they will continue to provide offshore labour irrespective of the number of trained workers that they can mobilize in the Portage area through their own employee group. If that is the case, let the minister say so because it's certainly evident by the comments of the Member for Portage, the way he puts it, that there will always be a need.

I want to know that the minister is saying, that even if we have a trained work force that will be trained, even at say, 300 employees, and now there's jobs for 150, that there will be phased over a period of time 300 people that have worked within the industry and have some background. We know that there is a transition because of changing jobs and better working conditions in other areas so the work force as mobile as it is, will keep moving on.

And it will be even worse, Mr. Chairman, if the government continues its present policy and is not prepared to say that, yes, once we hit the point of time when we have a work force that is very close to the requirements, that we will phase out the offshore labour so that there will be increased opportunities through the local labour force. If the local workers see that there is really no intention of reducing the number of offshore workers, and then they will say, well, all we are there is to . . . you can take us whenever you need us for the casual help, whenever you need us to do certain jobs we are there because we can't move out, but you will take the offshore labour for the full-time market and you will keep us all summer — when the season is through you will send us back. Thereby, we will have a large pool of casual labour to pick from us whenever you can, and when there's a full market, you will bring those in from Mexico. If the minister is shaking his head in the negative, let him tell me that that's not the case because that's really what his training program is meant to be. It is really meant to produce the full-time help from elsewhere, and that the local labour force shall be, even if it's 500, but we will only use them for casual help. We will only train them to the point where they will not be put into the permanent full-time jobs within the industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, I just have a brief comment to make. I've explained the position that we're in. He's referring to us just using the local Manitobans as casual labour. He knows very well that the casual labour are the Mexicans, that in fact the full-time jobs are available to Manitobans. So I don't know why he's trying to put on the record that we are going to just use Manitobans as casual labour, that it's in fact the reverse — Manitobans have the full-time jobs, the temporary

employment is from offshore workers, or it is provided by offshore workers.

We have reduced or . . . we haven't reduced — the workers and the growers in discussion with Canada Manpower, have reduced this year from 19 last year to 18 this year. There is an indication that this year there are probably less people required.

Now again I go back to what the Honourable Member for St. George appears to not understand — is that he would restrict the growth of job opportunities for Manitobans because of making unavailable to the industry, to give them the opportunity to produce a wider range of goods in the vegetable production or in agriculture. He would restrict job opportunity development for Manitobans because of his philosophy in not allowing offshore workers to come in and help develop that industry. That's what he's saying, Mr. Chairman, and if that's what he's saying, let him say it in as many terms.

I'm very disappointed in the Member for St. George because he gets totally . . . under under a policy that he would be a part of, would in fact see the vegetable industry back-up because the starvation of the labour supply to it, and in fact at the same time, not only keep the vegetable industry from growing because of the shortage of labour, he would in fact, deprive Manitobans of job opportunities which could be developed through the involvement of more and a wider variety of occasional part-time help that could come in from Mexico. So, let's put it on the record. If that's what he is saying, let's say it that way, and that's what he is saying. He, in fact, does not want to develop job opportunities and create jobs for Manitobans.

MR. URUSKI: I appreciate the minister's attitude, Mr. Chairman, because that attitude shows us that the Minister of Agriculture is back to the 1930s or before. If the Minister of Agriculture was really intent, as he says, of improving the job opportunities for Manitobans, then he should have a training program that will tell the farmers of the Portage area that I have the trained manpower for you within the Province of Manitoba. We have an unemployment rate in excess of 6 percent — (Interjection) — in that area the employment ratio is, as the Member for Ste. Rose indicates, probably in the 50-60 percent range, and maybe in some areas even higher than that — that they have been for years on the welfare syndrome, and in the last number of years they have banded together and formed an employee group and were prepared, at least to attempt, they were prepared to supply all the labour that the farmers required.

But, Mr. Chairman, let's recognize it for what it is. There is an attitude problem. The farmers, not all of them, of course not all of them, there is an attitude problem towards native help in that area. And there is a resistance towards that native help and local help by some producers in that area. Why, Mr. Chairman? It has been a historical thing because of the . . . I think historically many farmers figured that they could come on the reserve and pick up a man and take him to do whatever they wanted him to do, the most menial labour, put him in a shack, house him, and then when they didn't need him they'd take him back to the reserve. That has been the . . . it's happened even in my area, Mr. Chairman, historically.

same situation I'm sure existed in the Portage area, and as a result, the people in that area said, Look, why should I be the pool of labour and the slave to be picked up whenever someone needed me and then discarded when that job was done? So there has to be an education process conducted by the Minister, if he is really intent on doing on his job. If he is really intent on indicating that we want to become self-sufficient and have the number of workers in our industry, he would say we will not import any labour and our commitment will be to train people in this province, to have that labour pool right within this province. If he is interested in that, then produce the training and have those jobs done, not continue to support the off-shore labour. Because if he is indicating that there will always be a need, then why bother with the Manitoba work force at all? Bring in all off-shore labour.

Surely he is not telling me that that's all the off-shore labour that is willing willing to come into this province. Surely he is not telling us that. Surely the farmers of the Portage area would love to have 100 workers in the industry and they would be able to expand even more. If that's not the case, then let him tell me so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. LLOYD D. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear tonight here right now that I am not against the local labourers, not a bit; I am not, and I will accept to say this right now that the program that we've ongoing for the last couple of years is gaining, and we are certainly improving our local labour force by the program that has been in force, but, let us not . . . I want to suggest to the Member for St. George if he was farming in the Portage Plains with millions of dollars worth of crop lying on the field and we couldn't just locate these local labourers when we need them and the Mexican boys are there ready to go to work, would he not be one to go out and promote

this program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would just advise the Committee, if you don't hold your hand up I don't know who is wanting the mike, so I'm just looking at the House. Whoever has got his hand up get's recognized. I will try and go back and forth. The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of questions for the Minister. On the Training Program, where there is approximately 60 people being trained this year, is there a follow-up by the department to determine how successful the Training Program has been in terms of how many of the 60 have remained employed or stay at the job?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is a follow-up analysis of the success of the programs, to see if in fact the program met the needs of the workers and the employers.

MR. ORCHARD: Has there been a follow-up, say, on the program a year and a half ago to see how successful it was, whether there needs to be any changes?

MR. DOWNEY: There was not a formal assessment but a continual monitoring of the advancement of the workers and the situation. So not a detailed report but a monitoring of what is taking place.

MR. ORCHARD: By all appearances, would you give this Training Program marks of seven out of ten for success? Like is it providing the type of labour that they need and want?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, this whole area of off-shore workers is quite, I suppose, a touchy and a delicate area, you know, where all of us, as consumers, are caught on the horns of a dilemma, add I'm sure that dilemma has to affect every one of us.

The Member for St. George made a statement that the growers are very much interested in off-shore workers because normally they will out-perform Manitobans and, you know, I have no particular arguments pro or con to that particular statement. But, you know, I think the objective of the vegetable industry in Manitoba, and then we I think we have to give it good marks for what it has done to date — it's a growing industry — but it is a very, very economic-oriented industry; you have to produce at a cost that the consumer can afford to pay and to compete with imported commodities, etc., etc., and that leaves the grower with investment of many hundreds of dollars per acre on crops, caught in the situation where he has to get that crop from the field and to the market. And I know that members opposite are very conscious about the food prices. We have had a number of speeches in the House to that regard, where the price of food is going up too fast for the lower income and fixed income people. —(Interjection)— Well, you know the members say that incomes aren't going up fast enough to cover the cost of food. Well, income, if you take a look at the cost of food, it's primarily labour costs that compose the major portion of food prices.

So I'm sure that the members opposite must, in their efforts to assure that Manitoba labour is used entirely in the vegetable industry, have to view that very carefully because the first reaction that is going to happen if we used entirely Manitoba labour, number one, I think we'd find a labour shortage. I don't think there is enough.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think that happened a year ago, in the fall, not last fall but a year ago in the fall, I think there was a CBC news file footage on a fellow out their disking up a field of cabbages because . . . the availability of labour just plain wasn't there to enable him to harvest it.

Now, a situation like that, Mr. Chairman, does one thing. It removes foodstuffs from the market, and when you remove foodstuffs from the market you put the price up to the consumer. And it must be quite a quandry for members opposite on one hand, with all good intention — and I will admit that, Mr. Chairman — with all good intention, to employ strictly Manitoba labour in the vegetable industry. But let's look at it realistically. In a growing industry, if you haven't got the labour force now that is trained to do the job, as was very evident a year and a half ago, two falls ago, that you try to solve the problem in providing a training program for Manitoba labourers but if you haven't got enough Manitoba labourers are you going to let the crops rot in the field and the consumer pay more price?

So, you know, they are caught in quite a quandry. On one hand they want all Manitoba labour and, on the other hand, they want cheap food for the people of Manitoba. You can't solve both

those problems at once, and it is a problem and it is a dilemma. I think in a growing industry, such as we have in the vegetable industry, that if we don't have enough of the labour that is required to enable our growers to recoup the tremendous investment that they put in yearly into the vegetable industry, then I think any government, whether it would be a Conservative government or an NDP government, would be doing the people, the consumers of Manitoba, less than a good service if they prevented that crop from being harvested by sticking dogmatically to no imported labour. And I think the consumer of Manitoba would have a fair bit to say about that. So it has to be quite a quandry that everybody is caught in in this vegetable industry, and I think that these training programs, as carried out by the Department of Agriculture, will do nothing but improve the situation for, number one, the vegetable industry in Manitoba, and, number two, the growers of vegetables in Manitoba, and, number three, the workers desirous of being employed in that industry. But let's not cut off our nose to spite our face and dogmatically insist before the industry has enough workers in Manitoba to supply the labour force that we cut off and eliminate all the off-shore labour. They still perform a very useful and very needed role in the vegetable industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(f)(1)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pembina pleads a case that we have heard all too often in recent years but he misses the whole point of the problem. Yes, yes, he misses the main point of our dilemma. And really it's not an ideological thing, Mr. Chairman, hardly. The problem that Canadian agriculture has, Mr. Chairman, is that it doesn't have income stability comparable to that of other sectors of society. Because it doesn't have that, it is somewhat handicapped in competing for a labour force with those other sectors. I mean mean that's part of the whole scenario, Mr. Chairman. And so this Minister, as well as other Ministers in the country, have to address themselves to that problem, the problem of how to stabilize agricultural income on a current basis that would allow agriculture to compete for a labour force in a way that would be competitive with the industrial area.

Now, that's a long way to go, Mr. Chairman, but I, quite frankly, don't blame anyone that doesn't want to work for anyone, be it farmer, entrepreneur or an industrialist, for \$3 or \$4 an hour; I don't blame anybody for not wanting to take that on. I mean, what's the incentive? To live in poverty forever and a day? That's really what we're looking at, Mr. Chairman. So if you're going to solve the problems of labour for agricultural production, they go far beyond the question of importing labour or training programs. Those are merely small side issues, Mr. Chairman. The big issue is to have agriculture on a financial footing in such a way that they could afford to pay the wages that General Motors pays to their employees to build cars. Yes, when we get to that stage, Mr. Chairman, I think we wouldn't have to worry about bringing in labourers from Mexico, when we get to that stage. And that is the direction that all governments should be going, Mr. Chairman. We have to talk about income stability for agriculture that would enable agriculture to pay the kind of wages that should be paid for a day's work, not the kind of misery that people are subjected to at the minimum wage or slightly above. Because that's what it is, Mr. Chairman, it is absolute misery and it is slavery of the worse kind. Let's not misunderstand what it is. —(Interjection)— Oh yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is true; that is true. And we paid our role in that respect; that is true. And in many instances we were successful. Unfortunately, it is a situation where you make a couple of yards of progress and maybe one yard of retreat; I agree with the Minister's observation. It is very difficult to put these pieces together in a country that has 11 governments, you know. There is no question about that.

But the fact of the matter is that, you know, I have said this before, I don't hear, at least in my neighbourhood I don't hear students saying, God, you know when we're through with our university we are going to apply for a job on the farm of the Member for Pembina. He has got a great job opportunity for us. I don't hear that amongst the high school graduates. You know, I hear them talking about wanting to take up trades; I hear them talking about wanting to take up professions, but I don't hear the average students talking about I'd like to work for some farmer in Manitoba. And until you change that, you will have the problem that you now have. And the only way you're going to change that is if you structure the industry in such a way that it can afford to pay the kind of wages that we should be paying for the production of goods or for the delivery of services.

So, Mr. Chairman, all the talking in the world and all the training programs in the world, and all the offshore labour or whatever in the world, isn't going to get us away from that one startling reality, and that is the job that this Minister has for the next two years, Mr. Chairman. I don't give him more than two, but two I'll give him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(f)(1)—pass; 4.(f)(2)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, (2)Other Expenditures.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in the two components that we have of (f)(1) and (2) we have a total of \$600,000.00. We had a total of \$275,000 approximately for the Ag Centre, and approximately \$65,000 for the grants, the Farm Vacation Community Studies and the Manitoba Women's Institute, and another \$65,000, \$62,000 for the 4-H, about \$400,000. Could the Minister indicate the additional \$200,000 of the \$600,000?

MR. DOWNEY: Did you have Branch Administration? Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Branch Administration is approximately \$111,000. Leadership Training under the 4-H and Youth, we have \$30,000, and Projects and Activities under the 4-H Program of \$53,000.00.

MR. URUSKI: That's in addition to the \$62,500 for the Youth Specialists?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes. Correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: The Leadership Training Program, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister outline the scope of the Training Program and what it entails?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it is supportive to the 4-H Program throughout the province, training programs for individuals who are volunteers, who work with the 4-H Program throughout the province. That is the moneys allocated for that particular program to support the general community who are working with 4-H members.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the program that was involved in rural leadership training where there were members of the farm community involved in studying the Parliamentary System of the Municipal Government, Provincial and Federal Government, was that under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture, or is that course ongoing?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, that was under the Department of Agriculture under the Community Affairs. We do not have any funds in the Budget for this year, and there was some under the FRED Agreement for that particular program.

MR. URUSKI: There are no funds at all in your Estimates for anything this year?

MR. DOWNEY: No, there are not, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(2)—pass; (f)(3)—pass — the Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes, I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, the Minister how many A, B, and C active societies are there in the province?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we have two A societies, six Class B societies, and 54 Class C societies.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, have any C Associations discontinued to operate in the last year or is that 54 . . .

MR. DOWNEY: That's the same, Mr. Chairman, as a year ago.

MR. MCGREGOR: Then would the increase in expenditure here indicate that there has been some reclassification upward, and I'm thinking now possibly in the C fairs as there is 1, 2 and 3 classes under the C, for as many as there are. Are there some of them have moved upwards?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there have been some reclassifications. There has also been a 10 percent increase in the prize money for the fairs.

MR. MCGREGOR: Then I'm taking that to be A,B and C as a general — they've all increased 10 percent.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George. The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if under the Agricultural Societies' Budget for this year there might be any funds specifically earmarked as an additional grant or additional funding to any of the Agricultural Societies who are celebrating, say, a hundredth year of continuous fair, etc., etc.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, in that regard we are looking at some special recognition —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Lac du Bonnet recommends buffalo pins. I'm sure that that would be more than what he would have given them. He'd have probably provided buffalo chips but anyway, the Member for Pembina indicated — but I would support the Member for Pembina. But to get back to it, Mr. Chairman, as far as any additional financial funds from the department, no, there aren't, but we are in fact working on forming some special recognition and I am aware of the fact that Carman, which is in your constituency, the Member for Pembina, that we are working on some special recognition for towns that have accomplished that goal of having a 100 years of Agricultural Societies, their tribute to agriculture, the work which they've done to support the agriculture industry and give farm people and rural communities an opportunity to intermingle and have a display of their goods. So we are as a department working out some special recognition, whether it be buffalo pins, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet suggested. We aren't able to fully discuss what it is because we haven't got any finalization but there will be some special recognition.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, I'm very pleased to hear that because it's not only because Carman is celebrating her 100th year that I ask that, but I personally have worked with an Agricultural Society at home. There is a tremendous amount of volunteer effort that goes into these fairs. It's not effort that is reimbursed. It's done by these people as a matter of community pride and it is that kind of effort that has given us, you know, a thriving agriculture in Manitoba, and I would have no hesitation as I think no members opposite would have any hesitation whatsoever in providing a certain amount of funds if they could serve a useful purpose in helping these Agricultural Societies in celebrating or carrying out a fair which reaches something like the 100th anniversary landmark of continuous fairs. I think it's a small thing that we could do as a government of the province to recognize the tremendous effort over the years, even through the lean years, to keep their fairs operating and in good financial shape and keep the crowds coming. It's taken a lot of dedicated and hard work. There's a lot of individuals who deserve the kind of recognition that we possibly could show through some form of grant or recognition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(3)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: I think this is the first time in this Committee that the Member for Pembina has made a very good suggestion, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I think that's an excellent idea. I thought of buffalo pins only in the context of a very conservative restraint program, Mr. Chairman, but I would urge the Minister to give some consideration to what the Member for Pembina suggested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(3)—pass; (f)—pass; (g)Communications Branch: (g)(1)—pass; (g)(2)—pass — the Member for St. George. On which Item are you speaking?

MR. URUSKI: On Communications Branch, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, could the Minister outline the expenditures in this Branch?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the communications within the department — the funds that we're requesting in this particular appropriation — we are continuing on with programs such as Farm Scene, which are TV programs, to update the agricultural people in the communities with events that are taking place and highlight activities in the areas of production, carrying on with the radio programs, such as Country Comment, programs relating to gardening activities, consumer comments to update the consumers with the current information in relationship to the actual production of garden goods.

We're also in the area of continuing on with the educational program as far as the control of Dutch Elm disease, and in general updating the resource material for the agricultural community through the provision of library services, publications on new cropping techniques, and in general

information in relationship to the total farm community.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that includes the full scope of this branch. Am I correct, Mr. Chairman? Could the Minister break down the expenditures in terms of, say, the television costs and the radio costs and the publications. I presume this expenditure also covers the publication of the booklets, all the various resource booklets on herbicides and the like. Is that done by the Publication Branch?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, that is correct. I think it's easier to break it down into three areas: one in the area of communications, which is made up of \$412,000; the area of publications, which is \$177,000; and Library, which is \$9,000. Those are the three areas in which the breakdown takes place.

MR. URUSKI: The \$9,000 figure, is that primarily for providing the material to Provincial Libraries or to the Ag Rep office, the publications material?

MR. DOWNEY: It's mostly in the area of subscription to the extension offices and that type of expenditure.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the education on Dutch Elm disease, to what extent are we faced with a continued destruction of the disease in the province? Is it in the increase? Is it being contained? To what extent is the province being hit this year?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would think that a good opportunity to discuss that would have been in... Soils and Crops was the area for Dutch Elm, Mr. Chairman. We are now in the Communications Branch.

MR. URUSKI: I have nothing else I want to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, the \$412,000 item, does that appear somewhere else other than in this item?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, it's in Communications. As you see, the total request is \$598,000.00.

MR. ADAM: Oh. It appears in both items, or in part of each of the items shown?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: I had another question in regard to market news. Is that being done by the department, providing — there used to be monitoring of retail food prices. Is that done by this department?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, the monitoring of retail food prices is done by this Communications Branch, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: And how is it published?

MR. DOWNEY: It is a weekly publication, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: What about livestock marketing news? Is that in there too, or not?

MR. DOWNEY: That's in the Marketing Branch, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. What is the nature of the increase in expenditures?

MR. DOWNEY: The major increase, Mr. Chairman, is a project which is — we refer to it as a multi-media extension course which we are entering into for the first time. It has worked successfully in one other province that we're familiar with' the Province of Alberta, Mr. Chairman. It is a home study course which provides again update information to the rural people and that is the major area of increase.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, since there's a new program here it seems to me that it would be reasonable for the Minister to tell us what it is.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I may also indicate to the Committee members that it is a pilot project and the one program which we are going to be working on is the production of rapeseed and some of the update material. I'm not totally familiar with the content but it is a new extension technique which we are entering into as a pilot project.

MR. USKIW: Well yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd simply want to know how this is put together. It's called multi-media but what does that imply? Does that imply that the Minister is giving grants to certain media to carry out certain programs, or does that mean that we are buying time on which the department is going to show programs or what does it mean? What does the term "multi-media" signify?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the type of program that we're referring to is a — in discussing it as a multi-media type program, we're talking about radio and TV broadcasts, some forms of meetings, and also correspondence packages which would accompany or be a part of the program. As I said, Mr. Chairman, it is a pilot project and will be monitored very closely because we feel, or I feel, that there is a need to update the information and use of the media as a tool for extension work to support farm people's efforts.

MR. USKIW: Perhaps the Minister can give us one or two examples of the kind of information that he is going to be conveying to this new program.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I referred to the rapeseed production as one of the types of programs that would be introduced' some of the production techniques, some of the problems that can be encountered, some of the planting, seed bed preparation, and a total use of the media to explain to new farmers or beginning farmers or farmers who are desirous of getting involved in the production of crops such as rapeseed.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that there is ample material available within the department, communications program that it available to the farmers that have an interest here, but it's probably in written form, I suspect, and I'm just wondering whether it wouldn't have made some sense to switch programs, to go from that type of program delivery to a media program delivery for the same dollars rather than adding to the dollars that are being spent in communications, given the fact that the province is short of money, should have there not been a trade-off situation here because we're going to have parallel programs as I see it. We must be talking about rapeseed in brochures and other things that the department now utilizes as a communication media. So now this is an additional component rather than a trade-off component. What would be the logic of adding to the number of sort of media components that we're going to employ?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be fairly easily explained. As far as our approach is concerned is the fact that it is a pilot project. To totally remove the existing facility or the existing type of delivery or the backup information that are available to farm people would be irresponsible. I think that we're looking at it as a pilot project. We introduce it. We take a close review of the results, the acceptance by the farm community, and then we can look at the reduction in the coming year of that same amount of money that this particular program would replace, and I think the member should be able to understand that particular approach, that we aren't saying that this will be the total delivery system. We won't be running two in the future years but, in fact, we would hope that we would be able to convert over and make better use of the available information to the farm people through a multi-media news service. So that is the reason for carrying on with continued Information Services on the same field that we are now in a pilot type project which we can analyze and see if it is acceptabl and then we can look for a reduction in the other area of backup information.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I accept that and will be watching it with a degree of interest in the

years ahead. Could the Minister though elaborate on what he referred to when he mentioned the correspondence course and meetings? What kind of correspondence course is he talking about?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, in referring to that type of package that I'm suggesting we are looking at, there is a farmer registration fee where, in fact, the individual can register to become a part of the program and it is my understanding in the Province of Alberta where it is now in place and working that it is now a total cost recovery. So, in fact, being a pilot project we have an end of the road in sight where, in fact, if farmers want to participate they are able to do so. They get the correspondence package along with the information that's provided on the multi-media service. So again I go back to the point that I made that it is a pilot project, the acceptance we have to find out. There is a registration fee and we will see how it's accepted. If it isn't accepted then we would not plan on carrying on with it another year.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I simply would want to know what is the substance of the course. What are we going to be teaching in that course?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, I guess if the member wants a more detailed brochure or package my feeling of what is in the program or is involved in it, would be production techniques, disease problems, spraying, tillage, recommended varieties, seeding dates, right through from the seeding and seed bed preparation right through to the swathing, harvesting, because rapeseed in particular is one of the real specialized crops that timing is of the essence, and I'm sure that that kind of information, if it's made available to new producers, farmers who are getting involved in new crops in particular, then in fact it's important that we keep them updated on the necessary information. I refer only to rapeseed and it is a pilot project, and it's quite an accepted crop in the province. I know a lot of people are trying to learn more about it all the time. Their time is limited. With some of the modern agricultural equipment that's available to them it's possible that they'll be able to take a course right on the tractor in the field with their radio system that they have available to them. You know, I'm just using this as the type of thing that could take place.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is telling me that this is a technical type of course having to do with production and so on. If that is the case, that's fine. Is he going to provide radios for those farmers who don't have radios on their tractors since he suggested that that would be the way in which it would be acceptable from his point of view to receive the information and so on?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, and something that might bother the honourable member opposite is the fact that the rapeseed probably will some day reach the open market, which will bother him more than anything.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could he give us a commitment that at least our Caucus could receive one copy of this package. We don't need a number of them, but at least one.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: That's good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the pilot project that the Minister speaks about, is he having the one pilot project on rapeseed or is he doing a pilot project on one or two or three different commodities?

MR. DOWNEY: The pilot project is just on one, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: And that is on rapeseed?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate, is the increase in this Branch entirely to this program?

MR. DOWNEY: The increase from 519 to 598, roughly \$80,000, is for this media extension. There is another increase on more of a comprehensive package that will be provided by the department on other types of specialized crops, Mr. Chairman, a little more extensive package than has been available in the past.

MR. URUSKI: He says more extensive in terms of production and disease and the like?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's a further refinement of the information that is available to the people now. It's an update by the department to try and further inform people in the agricultural community of changes and ongoing production and disease problems and that type of thing, a more refined type information package.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, could the Minister give me the two figures that he's talking about, the increases — he indicated that there are two increases. What are the costs associated to each?

MR. DOWNEY: The pilot project was \$60,000 for the multi-media pilot project, and \$10,000 for the more comprehensive information package that's available, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: On the staffing in the Branch, is there a change? I think we got the overall picture but . . .

MR. DOWNEY: A reduction of one, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: That position was filled or vacant?

MR. DOWNEY: It was a vacant position, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (g)—pass; (h)Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement: (h)(1)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement that we're looking at in the Estimates is the continuing of the Department's support to development of gardening projects and northern 4-H. The numbers of staff, I believe I indicated the other day, we are looking at 5.26 staff man years in opposition to the 4 plus 2-½ contracts last year, so there is just a reduction of about one or one and a little more —(Interjection)— a reduction yes, Mr. Chairman. As I say we are continuing on with our northern gardening project and also our northern 4-H program.

MR. USKIW: Yes, who is in charge of the northern program now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: Jim Portree, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Is he the individual that is supervising the other staff or what is the relationship there?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as far as the horticulture is concerned, not the 4-H.

MR. USKIW: I wonder if the Minister could tell us or advise us as to whether or not the program is progressing, that is, are northerners interested and expanding their participation in this program?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the northern gardening program is holding about constant; there isn't any real increased demand or expansion in that area, it appears to be somewhat consistent with what it's been over the past. I think when we get into the 4-H program. . . I feel it a real important program to continue on with for the northern people, that in fact it is providing a program that will assist young people in some of the remote areas to . . . it avails them of programs that are in the human development area, and I think it's important that as a department responsible for 4-H to carry on with that and fully support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member from St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, there is a reduction of maybe about \$30,000 approximately from last year. What does that, the staff man year and. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the majority of that is made up in a staff man year plus some of the expenses that go along with that position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (h)(1)—pass; (h)(2)—pass; (h)(3)—pass;(h)—pass. Resolution 9. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,794,000 for Agriculture—pass.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I move Committee rise.

MOTION presented and carried.

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would direct the honourable members to Page 52 of the Main Estimates, Health and Community Services, Clause 6. Manitoba Health Services Commission. We are on Item 3. Hospital Program—passthe Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to be for about 10 seconds and I hope not longer. In the unlikely and unaccustomed position of agreeing entirely with the Minister of Health, when he says that the responsibility for this problem rests with the federal government. Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no question of that, that if one reads "Federalism and the French Canadian" which is the book which launched Trudeau on his path to becoming the Prime Minister of Canada, he indicated in that book that he believed that the federal government of the day was making encroachments in the provincial areas; that all of the spending programs of the federal government, in particular the hospitalization program and not yet the medical program, were programs which were causing trouble in in Canada, because they had the central government spending money in an area which was a provincial jurisdiction and thereby, Mr. Chairman, becoming in fact, a government which encroaches on provincial jurisdiction. And very softly at first, but certainly in the last years, the federal government has done everything possible to revert to a position whereby it took itself out of national programs which were based on shared-cost activities with the provinces and which were based further on setting out guidelines which the provinces had to accept in order to get the money.

So if the honourable member, and it's an appropriate time to say it, is saying that the federal government was the government which made this entire scheme possible, which made it entirely possible for the federal government to wash its hands of any involvement in health care, on the basis that ultimately it could extricate itself from the responsibility of maintaining a national health plan throughout this province, he is perfectly right, Mr. Chairman.

But it doesn't stop there, Mr. Chairman, the federal government could have done nothing in this area without first, the urging of Conservative administrations throughout this country, who started by saying that they didn't want the federal government to do this and the First Minister of this province from that Chair, the Honourable Walter Weir, said that he and the Premier of Alberta, who was then a Social Creditor, said that they were going to sue the federal government for dragging this province into Medicare and for the years that followed followed.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Boniface is perfectly right, the Premiers of Alberta, the Premiers of Ontario, the Premiers of Quebec for different reasons kept on saying to the federal government, "You should never have required the provinces to be spending money outside of our priorities." We are asking for the federal government to get out, we are suggesting that in replacing the federal government, we either get tax points or other schemes which will make up for the fact that the federal government was using federal powers of spending, and as a result in 1976 I think it was, the Federal Government said: "Okay". —(Interjection)— 1976, 1977. "Okay, we are extricating ourselves. We are not going to leave you holding a financial bag, but we say to the Conservative Governments of Alberta, Ontario, and to the Government of Quebec," which was not a Conservative Government but which had the same objectives, "we are going to now block fund this Health Care".

And, Mr. Speaker, they said, "We are going to give you the same amount of money, as a matter of fact, we are going to give you more for a little while, but we're going to take the strings off". That's what they said.

And they made it possible, Mr. Speaker, they share the first responsibility, but, Mr. Speaker, we cannot stop there. They didn't make it mandatory; they made it possible. It's the Minister of

Health and the Conservative administration that made it mandatory because nothing that has happened up until now has required the Conservative Government of the Province of Manitoba, to do anything else but what was happening previously and that is to share the cost of Medicare on a 50-50 basis and keep putting in that amount of money which the Federal Government was putting in in order to maintain the service. There was nothing which required the Minister of Health of this province or the Minister of Finance of this Province to have that money, Mr. Chairman, used to take care of their other budgetary problems.

And for the Minister of Health to get up and say this is entirely the responsibility of the Federal Government is, Mr. Chairman, without question, what will be an impossible attempt to avoid responsibility on his part, because he cannot avoid the responsibility. Mr. Chairman, it is as if Pierre Elliott Trudeau said from Ottawa: "So let it be written," and the Minister of Health of this province said: "So let it be done." All that they are saying, is that the money that you are getting is no longer tied to medical and hospital care or no longer tied to health. They have not prohibited the Conservative Government from continuing to provide the same kind of provincial input into the health field as they did. Mr. Chairman, there is a good reason why they didn't do it and this is why I say that primary responsibility lies with the Federal Government, because they knew that the Minister of Health would do their dirty work for them. They knew who they were dealing with; they knew that the major provinces, the wealthy provinces in this country, primarily Alberta and Ontario, and they were aided and abetted by certain other provinces who got on a provincial rights kick for other reasons, were going to take that program, and try to do, Mr. Chairman, what they said from the very outset. The Federal Government was never — and in particular, the existing Prime Minister — was never a fan of the national health program; the Conservative provinces were never fans of national health programs, and by this device, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government was making it possible for the provincial governments to kill the health plan.

And the Federal Government hoped to get away with this by saying that we didn't do it. We kept providing the money. It's the provincial governments that did it.

So the federal government, Mr. Chairman — we have two governments trying to dodge responsibility. The federal government said, "We didn't do it, because we continued to provide the funds". The provincial government says, "We didn't do it, Ottawa is the one who changed to block funding". Both have the same objective in mind, and both are using the other, Mr. Chairman, to accomplish that objective. The federal government is using the Conservative governments in the provinces to undo what they never wanted in the first place, and the Conservative governments here are doing what the Minister of Health is doing; they're saying that it's the federal government who changed the system.

Mr. Chairman, what we do know is that one could not have been accomplished without the other. And the Minister of Health, in everything that he read, indicated that it's the federal government who provided this flexibility. Well, does flexibility, Mr. Chairman, preclude the Minister of Health from dealing with this question on a basis that would preserve the health programs in our province — and I'm not talking about, and please understand this, I'm not talking about making more money available to the medical profession.

I'm not suggesting, as has been suggested in Ontario' that the doctors would be better off, and there would be less of a problem with regard to Medicare, if the medical profession were to receive the kind of money that was available if the province had not reduced its own commitment to the health scheme. I don't think that that's the way of saving the medical plan.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is no question that the future of a comprehensive, universal health scheme such as we have in the Province of Manitoba, primarily at the medical end, but also at the hospital end, is in danger. Because if, Mr. Chairman, the medical profession becomes more and more militant, which it seems to me this government is encouraging them to become, they could in greater numbers opt out of the scheme. And if they opt out of the scheme in greater numbers, it will become more and more difficult for people to find a fee-for-service lawyer.

And theoretically, they could all opt out of the scheme. I'm not suggesting that they would, but they could, and if they all opted out of the scheme, Mr. Chairman, we would have gone full circle. We would be right back to the position of people looking for doctors on the basis of their individual power to pay them, but there would be one change. And that is that there would be a guaranteed income at the medical profession level which was very very high and guaranteed by the state.

The only thing that the state did not guarantee, and I hope the Minister will not guarantee, is that they're going to collect that money from the patient after the health plan pays the patient, that the health plan will not facilitate by way of assignment or any other scheme, the doctor in getting the money from the patient. If the doctor is so independent that he will not be paid for by the state under any circumstances, then I presume that he would want to be, in the same way, independent as to not have the state facilitate him getting his money from his patient. He will use the good old-fashioned way. He will set up a collection agency, he will send out accounts. Those

accounts that he can collect, he will collect; those that he can't, he will have the right to sue for. But under no circumstances — and the Minister has held the line so far and I urge him to continue to hold — under no circumstances will he facilitate a doctor who decides that he wants to be completely independent of the state, under no circumstances should the government help him in collecting those accounts which he says he doesn't want tainted with state money or any state involvement. And that is a principle that the Minister has maintained despite what I know has been considerable pressure and that is one that I hope he will continue to maintain.

So that's not the area, Mr. Speaker, that I would say is in greatest need. I respect the doctor's desire to earn a greater income and to remain at that part of the economic scale that he has had the custom to enjoy. I don't think that there are any groups in society who are anxious to come down.

But, Mr. Speaker, at the same time I say that the medical profession is not amongst the most needy in terms of income despite the fact that they have, I would think, moved somewhat down the scale. They are not, I have noticed, rolling their own cigarettes, they are not driving around in secondhand automobiles, they are not living in the less affluent areas of our city, their houses are not run down, they are still doing decently well and I do not begrudge that to them. But I do say to the Minister that he has to, if he wants to preserve a universal health system in this province, he has to start thinking of what are the alternatives to fee-for-service medicine on an exclusive basis. Now I am not saying to the Minister that he should rule out fee-for-service medicine — and we made that commitment to the medical profession and had no difficulty making it — that as far as I know, and as far as one can see in the indefinite future, the medical profession in the Province of Manitoba will have a right to work on a fee-for-service basis. And I have no difficulty in saying that the Minister can commit himself to that. What he should not commit himself to and what the profession asked us to commit ourselves to, is that fee-for-service medicine will be the exclusive way of obtaining medical assistance in the Province of Manitoba. And it seems to me that the Minister heads in that direction when he starts to discontinue, however small the contribution is now and however primitive he may think it to be in terms of achievement, he should not be discontinuing, he should be using the money that my friend the Member for St. Boniface and my friend the Member for Seven Oaks is talking about to start creating not competition for the medical system but optional forms of health services in this province.

And rather than doing that, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has been doing the reverse. He has been suggesting and putting into jeopardy those very infant organizations that can set up that type of system.

And rather than putting them into jeopardy, Mr. Speaker, he should be making a commitment to them. And not to them, but to me and to the public of Manitoba generally, that That Manitoba will have as a project of this government, of the Government of Manitoba, fee-for-service medicine and alternative forms of medicine which will be available through community health clinics which are now growing in the province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the minister, rather than talking about reducing funding of community health clinics, should be talking about starting new ones and using the information that he has obtained in this area from the ones that are started in the city and the ones that are started in other parts of the country, to be setting up an alternative form of health system. And Mr. Speaker, the fact is, that the minister will be able to obtain information that it is not true, as the Medical Association would have him believe, that the only form of medicine that is available and the only way in which doctors will work is on a fee-for-service basis. It is not true. One of the best examples of non-fee-for-service medicine is the medicine that is practised, I believe still at this time, in the Kaiser Clinic in California which was set up, not as a government state-sponsored institution, but as an institution which was publicly sponsored, probably with a great deal of medical people involved, in which many many medical practitioners of the highest competence work not on a fee-for-services basis, but work as a part of a publicly operated clinic — when I say publicly operated in this connection I'm not talking about state operated, I'm talking about an organization which employs the doctors, is run by a Board of Directors which I'm sure includes many medical people and which offers the best possible type of medical service. And I think that the minister is completely ignoring and does ignore this type of availability. And by ignoring it, Mr. Chairman, he is in league with the Federal Government, he is not to be talking as if he is divorced from them and has repudiated their actions. He has not repudiated their actions; he has complimented his actions. He has made the Federal Government position of the block funding of medical care, of the health programs in this province, without strings attached, could not result in a reduction in spending without the aiding and abetting and the collusion and the help and active participation of the Provincial Government.

So if he says, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government is to blame — and you know, the Member for Morris sometimes refers to us as being in bed with the Federal Government when he

looks at the record of the New Democratic Party in 1972 — well, Mr. Chairman, if we are the Federal Government's mistress, the Minister of Health is his executioner. And when I say executioner I'm not talking about executing the Federal Government, I'm talking about executing the Federal Government's intentions, because the Federal Government's intentions meant nothing without the participation of the Minister of Health.

It is especially important, Mr. Chairman, that this point be raised now. The Member for St. Boniface said that the federal election is not relevant to him, and I'm sure it isn't, but it cannot be dismissed as an irrelevance to everybody. And the fact is that at this moment when the slogan, which is laughable, on the part of the Federal Government, is for a strong central government that will fight the provinces, it is ludicrous that that slogan is presented by Trudeau, who yielded to the provinces on this question. It wasn't he who initiated the block funding, it wasn't he who initiated this program. He let it be initiated by the various provincial rights provinces and in particular by Alberta, Ontario, and the Province of Quebec and then made it possible, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to do exactly what the Member for St. Boniface has complained about in the speeches which he has made on this subject which are right to the point. It was amusing to watch the Minister of Health get up and try to pretend that the Province of Manitoba was an inactive participant in this insidious attempt to destroy universal health care, not only in the Province of Manitoba, but in Canada.

The Minister of Health is an active accomplice in that objective, Mr. Chairman. The Conservatives have never changed their minds about the universal health program. They were brought into it in 1969 kicking and screaming and dragging their feet. The Federal Government was brought into it kicking and screaming and dragging their feet. The Federal Government now wants out; the Provincial Government wants out. They want to prove that it wasn't a good program in the first place and, Mr. Chairman, despite the protestations on behalf of my honourable friend, they are doing their best to destroy it and the blame for such destruction, unless there is a complete reversal in the kind of thing that is going on, both at the federal and provincial level, the reversal of that course of destruction can only take place if there is a reversal in the policies that are being pursued by my honourable friend who thinks that he can get away with it by opening, significantly, the second envelope.

You will all recall that the first envelope was the one where he said he blamed the previous Minister. He blamed the previous Minister and they all over there continue to blame the previous Minister for what was an extraordinarily short period of time, Mr. Chairman, because that kind of currency was debased very quickly. People were not listening to them, and now the Minister gets on his feet and he opens up his sheaf of notes and what does the sheaf of notes say? It is the second envelope — blame the Federal Government. So he blames the Federal Government even though he is knee-deep in their operation himself. I suggest to the Honourable Minister that he open the third envelope because that's the kind of thing — and I'm not looking to it as an unwelcome thing — but that's the kind of thing that that kind of protestation is going to lead to. The Minister is certainly accurate when he says who was *thesine qua non*, the thing without which nothing would have happened. In the law, we say *thesine qua non* is that without this, nothing would have happened and we refer to an initiating force or the original element as *thesine qua non*.

But, Mr. Chairman, he is the *causa causans* and the *causa causans* is the causing cause. There is, yes, without the Federal Government having done this nothing would have happened but the Federal Government having done what they did nothing would have happened without a *causa causans*, and the *causa causans* is the Government of the Province of Manitoba not the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: 3.—pass— the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon before we broke the Minister spent a considerable amount of time trying to justify what has occurred in Manitoba and he quoted the Prime Minister, and he quoted the former Minister of Health and Welfare Mr. Lalonde, and he quoted Donald Macdonald the former Minister of Finance, and he quoted some of the excerpts of the May 1977 Budget which I presented, all in an attempt to justify what has happened. In his usual way, Mr. Chairman, this Minister who has now become famous in Manitoba for using a lot of verbiage and a lot of talk in trying to divert attention from the main issue by drowning it in words. Mr. Chairman, no matter what he says, he can talk about the Social Services funding formula which never came, which never really developed, there was talk about it and it died aborted. So that's not an issue, but he spent 50 minutes flailing that.

Then he talked all about the fact that Trudeau at one time said to the other First Ministers of the Province that under EPF block funding there'd be no requirement for matching by the Provinces. There is nobody in this House that didn't say he didn't have a legal right to do what he is doing.

No one said that. He quoted Mr. Lalonde as saying: Just three principles, flexibility — and there is no question, that's one of the advantages of block funding is flexibility — the savings of any moneys due to capping would accrue to the provinces, that was a very cute number two item that the Minister of Health and Welfare, Mr. Lalonde brought out at that time. I can tell the Minister of Health, our Minister of Health that the concern by the Provinces was that Federal capping would in time drive down the share of Federal funds. That's why it was done. It wasn't done so that any funds or savings would accrue to the provinces. The reason that the Federal Government decided to put a limit on its participation because it wanted out of an open-ended situation and the way they put it though was that well the savings would accrue to the provinces. Nonsense, the savings if any were going to be Federal. They would benefit because they had a limit on what they were going to spend. It was a known limit. It was fixed. It would grow with GNP. That's it.

The third one was and he indicated that their estimates, their computer models indicated that more money, more Federal funds would flow to the provinces and obviously that has occurred at least in the early years. Eventually I don't doubt that the fears that I expressed time and again, other provinces expressed, that by putting a cap, moving from the 50-50 cost sharing and putting a cap on Federal spending in the fields of Health, whether it be hospital or medicare or extended care, that the Federal Government was getting out of an open-ended program. No doubt about it. They admit it. They did it as my colleagues, both from St. Boniface and Inkster pointed out, because they wanted to do that, because they were yielding to provinces that wanted them to do that. Quebec for its reasons, Alberta, Ontario who led the parade supported by B.C. after the election of the present government.

Then they quoted Mr. Lalonde again saying the only conditions are, they are very broad conditions, comprehensiveness, the universality, excessibility, portability, these are the only ones. The only quotation that somehow didn't quite fit that pattern was the one he quoted, I think Donald Macdonald, where he indicated that Donald Macdonald did say that they anticipated, they expected that the Provinces would at least equal the Federal contribution. —(Interjection)— No apparently he did but it would be up to the provinces because it's true the Federal Government was . And washing their hands of it I have never, nowhere, anywhere, will you find me on record, or any representative of Manitoba on record as saying yes we want the Federal Government out. If anything we have always been on record as saying that the central Government, the national Government has a responsibility across the country, and whether you live on the east coast or the west coast, Canada has something unique as far as North America is concerned, we had a national health scheme. It was something that every citizen was entitled to have no matter where he lived and I predicted then that if this change goes through, that what you may be faced with is a Balkinization of services in this country. That the poorer provinces could not deliver at the same level as the wealthier provinces and that Balkinization would develop and from that would develop the Balkinization of the country generally in other areas and we are seeing that happening now. We are seeing that happening.

So, if the Minister gets up and flails away and says that this is a manufactured issue I can tell him it's maybe, he may feel it's a manufactured issue by the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare, cause frankly she's a Johnny-come-lately into this. Where was she when her colleagues were shafting these programs? I gather she was silent. But, Mr. Chairman, he has a responsibility to the people of Manitoba. He has a responsibility to see that the programs that he has been so proud of, that he can get up and say this is the best in Canada, this program is the best in Canada, we're proud of this in this program, we're leading the rest of Canada in this, in another area, it's unmatched in Canada. He has a responsibility, for goodness sake to defend it, to protect it and he is not.

He is trying to pull in a red herring by trying to make this a Federal election issue and I say to the Minister if the Federal election had not been called he couldn't point to them and what we are saying on this side of the House would still be said because, as my colleague from St. Boniface pointed out, this Government across the way is busily using Federal funds to put into these programs at the same time cutting back on his participation.

Block funding has with it the benefit of flexibility. No one denies that and that's the only good thing about it, flexibility, providing there is sufficient money in that pot so you have some flexibility to work with. But this Minister isn't doing it. He's cutting down provincial contributions. He is limiting the alternatives which we always hoped we could use the money for, whether it be community health centres, that's another way of delivering a service; whether it be single unit delivery systems; whether it be using the primary units, family units of care in hospitals, developing them so that people can start relating to them; whether it be part of the actual hospital or adjacent to, so there wouldn't be duplication; trying to use doctors rather than on a fee-for-service on a sessional basis or an annual basis, an annual fee basis. These are alternatives that have to be tried, but this Minister is almost wedded to what I would call a backward, not traditional, but the backward way of delivering

medical services. He seems to be locked into the fee-for-service concept. He seems to be locked into a freestanding, acute care hospital. That's it. He was very critical a few days ago about Seven Oaks Hospital. He referred to that monolith and that first floor with its open spaces where he said we have to look at that very closely because they were going to deliver primary care there. He doesn't want that. He wants a hospital to be a traditional acute care hospital where people are brought in if they're sick and they're either carried out when they get well or when they die, or perhaps they can walk out under their own steam.

He doesn't see it as just a facility where, within that facility, the total spectrum of services is offered, not just the sickness oriented services, illness oriented services, but the total spectrum of health care. Now, the World Health

Organization defines health as being the well-being of persons, which just isn't just whether you're having a problem today with your appendicitis or your tonsils, or what have you, it is the total care of a person's well-being and that is what is meant by alternatives. And so when the Federal Government moved to block funding that was the time, that was the opportunity for this government, the Government of Manitoba today, to say, "Okay. Now, we're not all that happy with this but once it's done let us at least be able to move and try alternatives. Let's try alternatives." Instead, what did we get? We get a lecture that this is a phony issue, and I'm sorry that there's a Federal Election called now because, you know, he may even get away with that with some people.

It's not a phony issue. It's a very real issue. This government is just not spending the Manitoba dollars that it should be in the field of health, they're using federal dollars. Now, I know that they're going to say, well, they've lost revenue from Ottawa in some other program but, you know, it's this government that, within days of getting elected, convened a Session and rapidly gave up revenue like, you know, they did it so fast, they couldn't wait till the winter they had to do it in November of 1977 to announce the elimination of certain taxes so that they could be relieved of certain revenue sources. They've done that. Then they came back in the winter of '78 and they proceeded to introduce legislation which, once again, meant a loss of revenue to Manitoba. And because they've done this, because they've lost that revenue, now they're in an awkward position and so they're taking it out on the health program by cutting back on Manitoba dollars and instead of matching, or even coming close, to matching what the Federal Government's paying out in the established program financing funding. The gap between the province and the Federal Government is growing all the time and, oddly enough, it's growing differently than we had feared because those of us who were involved at that time feared that, if anything, it would be the other way. The Federal Fund input would decrease as the provincial expenditures would increase, and instead of it being 50-50 it would be 60-40 with the provinces having to put up the 60. And our fear was a valid fear because it was a field, a labour intensive field, where we felt that you could not simply use the straight GNP growth factor because in any labour intensive field the costs were going to grow higher than what GNP might. But it took this government to do it. They're miracle men. They worked it out, and they worked it around in such a way that the federal input is greater than the provincial input.

The result is our hospitals are in dire straits, they're suffering. They're trying to play ball with the government. They are not screaming, they are not making loud protests and why they're not, I leave to them. There are perhaps many reasons for it and one of them is fear. But there's no doubt at all that the services in the hospitals have been cut back, the staff has been thinned out, people are not replaced as regular as they should be, as often as they should be. When people go on holidays there isn't the replacement put in. The service is not at the high level it was before.

Community Health Centres — we still haven't heard from the Minister what he's going to do in the final analysis but the first notice we had of it was that they were called in and it looked like this was the end of the Health Centres. So he's not using the money. He'll say, "All right, we've got to get tough on the traditional services. We've got to get tough on that. We're going to use the money to try alternatives, to develop alternatives." They're not doing that. You know, if they did that I might even be on his side but, no, they're not doing that. They're cutting down on their contribution and whether they're hiding it off somewhere, or they're using that money to build roads with, or shoulders on the paved roads with, I don't know what they're doing, but I know it's not going into Health Services. It's not going into the hospitals. That we do know. We do know that generally there's a hold the line sort of. In Pharmacare we know that the individual increases went up 24 percent while the province's only increased by 16 percent in the same period of time, so you have the charge to the individual going up 24 percent; the cost to the province going up only 16 percent. We know that in Pharmacare, 50 percent increase in the first deductible.

So all the way through we get this pattern, and if the Minister had said, "Well, the money was not forthcoming from Ottawa, established 4M financing didn't bring out the kind of money that we anticipated, that it's true the fears expressed in the past were valid, that in fact the capping by the Federal Government going to block funding in a formula, that the fears were justified in

the fact that the money coming to Manitoba was less than had been anticipated."

But that's not the case. The fact is that the federal input is increased — what is it, the Federal Government's up 32 percent, something like that, I believe my colleague from St. Boniface said — the provincial is down 14 percent. Plus a 32 on the one hand, minus 14 on the other within a two-year period. You know, that's a fantastic swing. So, when this Minister gets up and says he is all in favour of a sound health system, and he is all in support of a good hospital system, and he is all in favour — you name it, he's in favour of it. He always is. I've never heard him knock anything, but he just starves it. He just, you know, he didn't cut off their heads; he just cut the jugular vein so that they're just bleeding to death and he's forcing them to cut down on services in little ways, perhaps, in many cases they may be minor, but let me tell you one on top of the other, the net result is that over an 18 month period we've seen a deterioration across the board which is felt by the hospitals, it's felt by the other facilities — whether it be nursing homes or what have you, it's felt all around. The people are not getting the service and simply because this government is playing games with dollars from Ottawa. And now they're claiming it's a manufactured issue. They've manufactured it, nobody else. They have manufactured it. You know, if he's resentful of the fact that the Minister of Health and Welfare of Canada came into this province and tangled with him on a radio show, he gave her the opening. He gave her the opening. If he had done as the Minister responsible for Health and Social Services in Manitoba should have done, he should have said, "Look, we in Manitoba have one of the finest systems there is. We want to maintain that and we want to develop alternatives so we can get even a better system, put more controls on it, more accessibility, more accountability and a better system, a more responsive system." Then, she would have had no cause to come to the Manitoba, and him having tangled with her. But he didn't do that. He started to play games. Last year he talked about a 2.2 percent or a 2.8 percent increase. This year he's talking about an 8 percent but if you average him over two years, it's nothing.

In an area where we know costs of inflation, inflationary costs are very high. In these institutions food is a very big item. Salaries are a big item. Supplies, the surgical supplies are very very expensive. They're mostly, you know, mostly American so the Canadian exchange makes them even more costly. And he has the gall to stand up here and say, "This isn't an issue, it's not really an issue, it's only an issue because of the federal election."

Now, Mr. Chairman, he can't get away with that. The people in Manitoba are not fools. The hospital administrators, the hospital boards, the people who run the personal care homes, the public generally, are not that silly as to believe that when one level of government puts in 14 percent less, while the other is putting in 32 percent more, that that is just a fiction of somebody's imagination or that it's a manufactured issue.

It is not a manufactured issue, it's a real issue, and it's one unfortunately which is costing the people of Manitoba, costing in the services, costing in the standards of care, level of care, which at one time we could be proud of but which this minister in his usual way with a volume of words, is trying to set up straw men so he can knock them down, creating issues where there are none, and avoiding the real issues that he and his colleagues have chosen to hurt, and perhaps critically hurt, the health scheme that we in Manitoba, have achieved over the years, and which now I believe is being threatened. I honestly believe that. I wasn't sure before, but I am now. And they're doing it simply because they are so wedded to certain economic theories they have, certain dogmas that they believe in, that they're wedded to them to the point where they will undercut a system which has achieved results, which has achieved the respect of the citizens of the province, which has achieved the backing of the people in the province, and which they, you know, let's face it, 1977 during the election, they pledged to maintain and to improve.

And they're not improving it, they're not maintaining it. As a matter of fact, as I said, it is gradually slipping in scope and content from month to month. And the Estimates we have before us are not going to help, they're going to make it that much tougher to recover lost ground a year from now. And maybe the minister thinks that the year of the election or the year before the election, the money they squirrel away will suddenly be brought forward and they'll make these wonderful grandiose gestures and promises, and maybe even sweeten the pot with something or other, and that will win everybody's support come an election. And they may be right. Maybe that's how they run elections and that's how they win elections. It's a very cynical way of doing it, I'm sorry to say. I can't approve it. But, they may, you know, they may just do it.

But I find it unacceptable and really sad that the health and hospital services that we've achieved in Manitoba, and the health services we've achieved are now being jeopardized because of a certain basic position which the Conservative Party has favoured, as my colleague from Inkster put it, consistently back in the 1960s early 1960s, late 1960s, and even now well into the 1970s.

And I recall the Member for Morris, I think, saying in this House, that the elimination of premiums is a mistake. If he had his way it would not have been done. He can go back to it. You know,

that I think is still on record. —(Interjection)—

In Ontario, the family fee now is \$582.00 per family, that's the premium today. Now, I don't know if they're headed in that direction, I don't think they're that crazy because I think they realize that's dynamite — you can't unscramble the eggs entirely. But what they are doing is through another means, they're simply withdrawing supports to these services, and they're doing it by — which was difficult to spot — by withholding provincial monies so that more and more of the federal funds will pay for it, and less and less of provincial funds will go into the pot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take up the time of the House, except to ask or make a couple of points that I think probably are germane. One was this afternoon, the statement by the Member for St. Boniface, that last year he tried to no avail to acquire the figures on the funding with regards to the EPF, and I think it . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: On health I said, don't change that.

MR. CRAIK: On health, well, Mr. Chairman, combine them both. I want to point out that on that question, that if the member had taken the time to have a look at the figures that were filed in this House on April 10 of last year, the figures were there. The figures were there on health. The recoveries from the Federal Government were tabled at that time to show the relationship of last year over the previous year. Now, if he raises the question about this coming year, that's a different matter because the Budget has not yet been presented. And when it is, presumably it will corroborate the figures he's using. I'm not indicating that they will.

MR. DESJARDINS: What page of Hansard was that?

MR. CRAIK: I can't say that they won't. Well, Mr. Chairman, you know I left the member alone, he got up and he called us everything under the sun or the moon or anything else. You know, he went up one side and down the other side and said everything he could, and indicated to the minister that last year he had refused to give the figures. I just want to say that before the Minister of Health ever presented his Estimates last year, the recoveries from the Federal Government, under the established programs transfer and under the Department of Health, were both given in the budget and that was tabled, and the comparisons with the year before were given — 1979-80 is not in yet, but last year the budget and the revenue recoveries were available prior to the health Estimates.

Now, that's the only point I want to make, you know, when you're called everything under the sun, at least you have the opportunity for a response, and that's what's happening. The Minister of Health has been told all sorts of things about what he refused to do last year. I want to simply say that the information was available. It was tabled.

The second point I want to make is that I think the arguments that have been made are valid, and I don't think in terms of the objectives and desires in terms of health care support, that you'll find a great deal of difference on this side of the House. We'd like to do it too.

But if we had gone to match dollar for dollar the support that was forthcoming last year, or closely approached it, what would the members opposite suggest we do in the field of education? It has been suggested here over and over again that we are taking the money out of health and plowing it into highways. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, it has been certainly said.

Now, I want to point out that the information, in very rough terms, in the last two years are estimates, the other years are taken from the Public Accounts, that in 1970 the Highways budget was 13 percent; this year it is 7.6 percent estimated. In 1970 the total Health was 27.6; this year it is 39.5. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously the members opposite say it doesn't mean a thing and I think that are two or three of them — at least one of them — over there knows it means something when you come to striking the budget because you know that in terms of the total picture that within the priorities you set, you also end up at a final figure and the final figure in terms of the total amounts of money available that go to Health or Education or another area, are subject to the priorities that emerge through the Estimates process and Health has not gone down in terms of the priorities of the government.

But I don't discount the validity of the arguments made and I don't want to suggest that there are not the best of intentions behind them that are being suggested by the Opposition. I think the intentions are good and they are valid. I want to say on the other hand that I think they have made a good argument. I think that there are a couple of points about the arguments they made though that can't go unpegged and I have tried to make those two points. One is that the information

was available to you last year; the comparisons with last year over the year before were there and they were available before the Minister of Health stood up in his Estimates. The second is the question of the setting of the priorities. If you had wanted us to match the federal government dollar for dollar, what would you have suggested that we ought to set as the total deficit that we could go to in 1978-79 or in 1979-80, because in 1977-78, the actual combined deficit was in the order of the \$200 million to \$220 million mark? Would you have suggested that we go to that again? Are you suggesting that we go to it again this year, because that's what it boils down to?

The Member for St. Boniface said this afternoon he didn't expect us to go back and give it back to the federal government, the amount of money. There was not, in the written arguments presented, the tabled arguments — and I want to remind you that this was a fait accompli before this government came into power, this was negotiated by two other governments. It was done by a Liberal federal government and an NDP provincial government and it was inherited by the present Conservative government. We find no evidence in the statements that were made by the Prime Minister, by the former Minister of Health federally, nor are there any indications from the former Minister of Finance, and there may be many other references, but certainly any references that we may have found weren't of the nature that bound us to not treat the money coming from the federal government as block funding. The Minister of Finance formerly, the now Member for Seven Oaks, of course has indicated that while he could see what was coming in the way of the EPF, he thought the federal government was overstating the amount of money that was going to go to the provinces in total and although they may in fact — he couldn't prove that they may not be quite right — he brought up the question of what would be in stock for the Province of Manitoba by the way of revenue sharing, which of course indicates that you can't take one source of funding alone from the federal government.

We have seen them cancel a number of things in the last six months. We have seen them cancel the Neighbourhood Improvement Program. We have seen them change the formula on the Equalization to not allow in the calculations Crown land leases that had a fairly dramatic effect in the calculations by reducing the amount in the initial instance that Manitoba was to get, from an increase of 14 percent to what was stated to be 10 and worked out to be 3.

You can't do this, and I think that at least one member opposite realizes that you can't do one entirely in isolation from the other. But let's not becloud the argument. I think the points made by the opposition are valid points and points that have to be made in the Health Estimates. I simply want to reiterate that there was no information that was withheld from the Member for St. Boniface last year. The information was available before the Health Estimates were presented to the House. And secondly, if in fact their arguments are to go the full distance in every letter of what they are saying, then I think the questions has to come back to the Members of the Opposition. They have had some 50-plus hours to impart, to make their point on this issue. What would you do? I'm not asking you to strike the Budget for the Province of Manitoba, but you are making the issue, you know, to take it to the next chapter, what would you do? If you matched them dollar for dollar, are you going to do the same for Health or are you going to take those dollars out of health? Are you going to cut the program on Highways down, drop it from not 13 to 8 that it now is, but down to 5 or 4 or 3 of your total budget? Or are you simply going to increase your deficit about the \$220 million? That's the way it boils out because that's in effect what essentially it would come out to.

But, Mr. Chairman, again, a couple of basic points that boil out of this: We weren't any more anxious to go into block funding from the point of view of the social programs, and I presume it was on the same grounds that the former government was not anxious to get out of the shared-cost programming on the EPF. The reason is that Manitoba has made probably better use of the shared-cost programs over a period of years than a number of other governments have in Canada and although you gain initially, you lose in the long run, and that's going to be the same on the social programs in the long run. But we're going to accept those eventually too, on the shared-cost programs, on the other programs that were to have come into effect this year but have been delayed one year. But when that happens, we're going to find that Manitoba gets an initial bump on that as well, simply because we have been making more use of the shared-cost programs than some other provinces have and unfortunately one of the biggest provinces, Ontario, has not taken advantage of the shared-cost programs and the social programs to the same extent as Manitoba has. So in the early years, we get a bump, but within a very few years after that, it goes down so that we are at an approach to the national average and when we get to the national average, we are going to be much lower than we are right now because we have taken more advantage of shared-cost programs in that field.

Now, we didn't like the idea because we could see what was coming. But we don't really fight in basic principle the idea of block funding, and I'm not sure that the members opposite did either, but this is the way it's worked out, and that's the way it's going to continue to work out particularly

if we go into this next series on the block funding of the social programmes.

And somewhere down the line, of course we're all going to have to go through the next phase which is going to be another fight and it's not going to be Health and it's not going to be social programs, it's going to be equalization formula, because the equalization formula brings in roughly the same amount as the health programs bring in, \$250 million roughly on equalization, and what the federal government has now said is that anyone that exceeds the Part 2 of equalization or that exceeds the national average is cut off from equalization. And Manitoba is now at 96 percent of the national average on the basis of the . . . calculator.

When we hit the 100 percent according to the way they're indicating it to the provinces now, we would be cut off from equalization. Well, can you imagine what that's going to be like? You know, Manitoba is not a "have" province in that sense. It's been on the receiving end of equalization for I don't know how long — 20 years, maybe more? Whenever the formula came in on equalization. Well, whenever the formula came in, we've always been on the receiving end. You know, we're not as wealthy as Ontario, Alberta, B.C. and rapidly Saskatchewan —(Interjection)—. Well, you know, my friend from St. Johns can't help but get his nickel's worth in, but in actual fact, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the pure revenue gaining ability of the province, Saskatchewan is rapidly emerging into the position where they will probably be out of equalization within a matter of a year or two, and that's finished, so we will be in the position of still being on the receiving end of equalization.

So, if the federal government in fact achieves their goal, first of all of reducing by such changes of disallowing factors such as the Crown land leases that they did this year which affected it fairly dramatically but more importantly, if they go to the disqualification that if any province exceeds the national average they get zero, then you can see what will really happen. It will make the argument that's been bandied about in the House for the last several days and all through the Health Estimates a very minor argument. So I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that the argument that has been taking place in terms of the pure dollars and cents part of it is an argument that probably deserves the amount of energy that's gone into it.

I think that the argument deserves it from the point of view of the aims and desires of the opposition to ensure that we maintain a strong health care system and from that point of view, nobody disagrees, but from a pure point of view of the other factors, I don't think that there's a strong case to be made across the way. There's just too many other variables that go into the equation. Again I repeat that the information the one member said and has stated several times was withheld last year, it's not the case. The revenue information with the federal government was made available prior to the tabling and presentation of the Health Estimates in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted to hear the Minister of Finance get into this discussion, because I've been sitting here wanting to just propose a little view of one constituent but after listening to the Minister of Finance —first you see it, then you don't, then you see it again, it sounds like the shell game that I've seen at the fairs. First of all, he says the federal people are responsible for the amount of money we've got, but he forgets conveniently he calls it a nickel argument, to give away \$83 million in tax concessions. You know, that's what I mean by the shell game, they give it and they take it away at the same time. I don't know how they justify that in Washington, but this is what happens.

But aside from all this high finance, what it really boils down to is that they were going to maintain the services, at least the standard of services that had been up until they took office, and that hasn't happened. I'll get to that in a moment.

They were also going to give people freedom of choice and I find that that hasn't happened because I have a constituent who has a particular problem and he wrote me about his particular problem and I of course sent the information on to the Minister of Health and, in due course after about a month and a half, I received further information on it and that's what I wish to talk about — that there is a curtailment in services and that it's deliberate because there has been less money going to the hospitals.

This particular constituent had a knee operation in 1978 in April. He needed both knees operated on but they could only do one at a time — he had to have a prosthesis put in, that is, a special artificial knee. Now there's a number of kinds of operations in this regard, but this particular patient had it done at the St. Boniface Hospital, and the next one was supposed to be done in August of the same year. Now what happened, lo and behold, in August there was no further money for prosthesis and where the freedom of choice comes in, the individual couldn't even get it done if he had wanted to pay for the prosthesis himself. So therefore, he kept asking what was going to be happening, and they said, well, hold off until we get our Budget. And of course, that didn't happen

because when they did get their budget, which I believe they are having now, or getting now, prior to that this constituent wrote me and I wrote the minister, and of course he made an enquiry and the enquiry came back with the answer that they were no longer going to provide this kind of an operation at the St. Boniface Hospital.

Now this particular patient or constituent of mine has a doctor who can only practice in St. Boniface and Victoria, and they do not provide this particular service at either one of those anymore. So now his freedom of choice is to find himself another doctor, not the one he wants, but someone else, and simply because the province has been cutting back on the amount that it's been giving to the hospitals. Now, there's been some discussion as to whether it's been matching the federal government or not and that's beside the point.

The point is this — that the amount that they have been giving the hospitals has not been commensurate with the rising costs and consequently those hospitals have been cutting back on services. Some of them have been cutting back in one area; others have been cutting back in another area, and what it amounts to is that no longer is the standard of care what it used to be.

Now here we have a particular person who has a particular problem because he has to go around on crutches because he cannot walk on that knee until he has that operation done.

He has now been paneled to see his doctor about the middle of next month, then he will be told which I already know, that he will not be able to have that service done at the St. Boniface, he'll have to make some further arrangements to have it done at the Health Sciences Centre or the Misericordia because it's being done at a number of other hospitals, but not at the hospital where he had his first operation and where it was part of the procedure and where it has been cut out as part of the procedure because of the cutback in money.

I'd like to have the minister tell me what my constituent should do now? Where can he find another doctor that he can trust? He's had this one who has already made one operation on his legs and now he's got to go ahead and find out another one because the same doctor that operated on his knee will not be able to operate in any of the other hospitals. This is the system that they have — they can't operate in all hospitals so consequently my particular constituent will be without a doctor in the near future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, before we move on to the next item and still dealing with Hospital Programs, I would like to take a few moments of the Committee's time to deal with a matter of considerable concern to my constituents, to people in north Winnipeg in general, and even the matter of concern going beyond the boundaries of my constituency and, in particular, to the medical students in our Faculty of Medicine and the nursing students, and that is the future of the Seven Oaks Hospital with respect to the programming that'll be offered there.

Now I know that my colleague, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks had raised this matter with the minister, and I do know that the minister did assure us that the construction is on track and it's proceeding, but there still appears to be considerable doubt in many peoples minds as to the nature of the program that will be offered within that hospital despite the fact that the bricks and mortar end of the development of the facility is proceeding.

A student, a graduating student from the School of Nursing, Mr. Chairman, who did some research on this brought this matter to my attention and she did interview Mr. Myrdal, the Executive Director of the hospital; she tried to meet with the minister and wasn't able to, but she did meet with his Executive Assistant; she met with the Chairman of the Seven Oaks Hospital Board and attempted to determine what is happening or what is the present state of the development of the programs for the hospital, what attitude is the minister taking toward the programs that are to be offered there. And in compiling her data, and she even went beyond the individuals that I mentioned too and checked back on the press reports going back to 1969 and up to the present time, and reading the press reports reaffirmed the suspicion that she had that the people really do not know what type of program to expect to be offered at Seven Oaks Hospital.

Perhaps, the minister knows in his mind; there might be some others working closely with him who may have a clearer idea of what programs will be offered, but the public at large doesn't know. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that the public is entitled to know the type of program that the minister hopes to give approval to at the Seven Oaks Hospital. At the present time, the information that this student obtained, and perhaps I can also add that I worked rather closely with her in developing this because the student happens to be my daughter, and at the present time the whole future still appears to be in doubt.

I'll just point out to you, Mr. Chairman, some of the concerns that she had expressed in her

conclusions after doing the research work that she did. For example, Mr. Myrdal, the Executive Director of the hospital indicates that essentially the hospital is still proceeding with the development of the program which received approval in 1973. There might be some changes, some modifications that may be made, but essentially, until such time as the hospital hears to the contrary, that is what they're proceeding with. But they're not really sure whether that is the type of program that they will be able to deliver. And then when she continued with her research, this is the type of information that she obtained in the minister's office, Mr. Chairman, from his Executive Assistant and I just want to read into the record some of the comments and statements made by his Executive Assistant and let the minister confirm or deny whether his Executive Assistant was in fact speaking for the minister and expressing the views of the minister or not.

In interviewing the Executive Assistant, she tried to make it very clear to him that she does not want the Executive Assistant's views or personal views or opinions, but she did want to obtain the minister's, and she feels that she does have the minister's, but anyway, I would like the minister to confirm or deny it. His Executive Assistant said that the minister is looking towards, and this is with reference to Seven Oaks Hospital, a more traditional type of hospital that will meet priority needs, and has given these guidelines to MHSC. So the Executive Assistant said that those are the guidelines that the minister has given the Health Services Commission. So you know, their hands are tied, they're locked in within the parameters and the directives given by the minister. —(Interjection)—

That's right. Now, his Executive Assistant said that the MHSC has looked at the kind of hospital that is developing at Seven Oaks; he said that his minister's interest is to put those facilities that will meet the spectrum of need into the Seven Oaks Hospital. He sees that the current need is for geriatric and psychiatric beds, and then he went on to say that his minister is not desirous of — and this is in quotes so I would presume that these are the actual words of his Executive Assistant — “super clinics and those kinds of hospitals.” Then she says that when she asked his Executive Assistant why the minister was reviewing the functional program at Seven Oaks even though he himself stated that the province's health care program should be geared towards prevention to avoid the establishment of a — and I'm quoting using the expression used by the minister — sickness system, he replied that the minister doesn't deny that preventive and promotive programs are important concepts, but he questions whether they're good enough.

He stated that unless his minister can be shown statistics that indicate that the cost of preventive and promotive programs are outweighed by the benefits he will not implement these programs. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the minister knows full well that certain things are easier to evaluate than measure in statistical terms and hard data of that kind, but health programs, many education programs, people programs in general are more difficult to measure in terms of very concrete, definite, specific facts and information.

How does one measure the effectiveness of a preventative health program? How does one measure the value of teaching trigonometry in Grade 12, or of teaching Latin or teaching Greek or whatever, but for the lack of such information, we don't discontinue teaching those subjects.

Then, she goes on, well, in the course of the discussion, and he used this by way of an example because — that is the Minister's Executive Assistant — he stated that this was the reason why an AFM program teaching juveniles about alcoholism was discontinued. He stated that the AFM could not provide the Minister with any statistics that proved their educational program for juveniles did decrease the number of alcoholics. —(Interjection)— He didn't say that? Well, he will have an opportunity to deny that.

Then he further, the Executive Assistant, the Minister's Executive Assistant, further stated that the Minister is waiting to see the results of preventive and promotive clinics in the North End, and until they can prove their worth, his Minister will be reluctant to implement more programs of the same. Then the Executive Assistant expressed a personal view, and she is quoting him in saying that if things are cost effective, then they are health effective. Well, I would like the Minister to indicate whether that is also the view of the Minister. And furthermore, he stated that a problem with preventive and promotive programs is that you can't put initiative into people to be responsible for their own health. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether that too is the opinion of and the view shared by the Minister?

Then, what surprised her even more because she thought that this matter had either been forgotten or swept under the rug or discarded or whatever, but the Minister's Executive Assistant added that all options are being considered with respect to the future of the Seven Oaks Hospital and that he believed — now apparently he hedged on that because he said he believed, he wasn't certain — but he believed the Misericordia move was still being considered. Well, perhaps the Minister can — and this, Mr. Chairman, I should remind you, this is not something that was done a year ago or so, this was done the latter part of January, two months ago, nine weeks ago, 10

weeks ago at the very most when apparently the option of moving the Misericordia program to Seven Oaks is still being considered.

Then she asked the Executive Assistant whether other hospitals would carry the additional load created by the movement of the hospital; his reply was, I should hope so. So this really makes her wonder whether the government has really considered this question.

Then, in conclusion, the Executive Assistant stated that the future of the Seven Oaks Hospital will be determined on the basis of economics. Since his Minister is not convinced that Community Health Programs are not cost effective, it would seem that the future of the Seven Oaks Hospital lies in a traditional type hospital with a decreased emphasis on community health.

So those are her concerns, the concerns of many people in Manitoba, concerns of graduating nurses and doctors, particularly those who were over the past number of years looking forward to a new and innovative concept in the type of program that is to be offered there because, as she says, she is also concerned about the future of the functional program at Seven Oaks Hospital. The program that was approved in March, 1973 was a highly innovative program combining a traditional type of a hospital with a facility that had a heavy emphasis on promotive and preventive community health programs. But then the Minister's Executive Assistant stated that the future of the Seven Oaks Hospital will be determined on the basis of economics.

And then, what puzzles her even more, is that there seems to be a contradiction with what the Minister had said a couple of years ago in speaking to District 1 of the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses, about 15 months ago, in January of 1978, when he stated that the province's health care system was to be geared more toward preventive medicine to avoid the establishment of a sickness system. Then the Minister further stated that his government is committed to a policy of improving health habits and lifestyle to ease the burden on the health care system and in quoting the Minister, he said, "It is not possible to improve our health care system by focusing on remedial care; we have to focus on preventive medicine."

Now, Mr. Chairman, what appears to be coming on track at the Seven Oaks Hospital is not what the Minister had endorsed 15 months ago but something quite the opposite, a remedial care program rather than preventive.

So those are some of her concerns and my concerns, and concerns of others, Mr. Chairman, that I think the Minister ought to respond to and ought to remove all doubts that presently exist in the minds of the people of Manitoba as to the exact type of program that will be offered at the Seven Oaks Hospital. What I find equally puzzling is that here the government is proceeding with the building of a physical structure and the nature of the program is still in doubt. What, if after the building is complete, somebody comes along and says, well to deliver the type of program that we think ought to be delivered here, you know, everything has to be changed around, the wiring, the plumbing, and so on and so forth. Now, surely, Mr. Chairman, in building the physical structure, one has to have some general idea of the type of programming that is going to be offered within it. So I would hope that the Minister will clarify that point and also dispel the concern about the Misericordia Hospital once and for all, the concern about the possible move of the program from the Misericordia Hospital to the Seven Oaks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say a few words at this stage in connection with a matter that the Minister has been involved with, dealing with the hospital which was to be proceeded with in the Town of Selkirk. The sod was to be turned, in the early summer of 1978. Plans were completed in that connection by the late Jack Donner who just recently passed away and the entire community was looking forward to this very important, very essential need being fulfilled. The Minister announced his freeze in November of 1977 and the Minister is quite aware of the concerns which have been expressed to him, particularly by members of the medical profession, that have very very clearly outlined to the Minister the serious and fundamental medical problems that they are confronted with within the existing facility.

I have present with me two letters which have been forwarded to the Minister from members of the medical profession within Selkirk and they very clearly outline to him the concern. I would like to read excerpts from the one it letter dated September 8, 1978, from Dr. Smith to the Minister, mentioning that, "Long before now I had expected to hear this decision protested by the people in Selkirk. I had expected community meetings and petitions and the gathering of signatures, all culminating in a strong voice of protest over your decision." Then he continues, "I feel embarrassed and ashamed at the public apathy." Well, let me tell the Minister that the public apathy is no longer continuing and there is now very much, if there every existed, very much now increasing momentum of concern about the Minister and about his failure to take action in this respect.

The doctor continues: "My personal anger at your decision is continued and I feel compelled

to write this letter. I feel you must be informed of the consequences of your decisions." He refers to the physical conditions in the hospital and the fact that he proposes that the Minister ought to be sitting with a patient in a sweltering room, wander past people lying in the corridors in the hospital on stretchers, spend some time in the patient's lounge, talk with relatives who have spent days or weeks visiting the sick and dying and ask them if they think their relatives have been comfortable while they have been treated in this hospital.

Then the physician concludes his remarks — the Minister has a copy of this letter — by indicating that unfortunately the memory of the Minister will not be that of an honest or a compassionate man insofar as the Town of Selkirk is concerned.

Another letter which was forwarded to the Minister outlined the same problems by another member of the medical profession, indicating the serious medical problems in the area of surgery and other fields' including the fact that on the main floor, there were stretchers in the halls because of the lack of facilities available, the overcrowding, two patients recently sent home rather than admitted because of the bed situation. Both died shortly after being at home and of course I cannot say that they would have lived had they been admitted to the hospital but certainly it was an intolerable and is an intolerable situation.

The Minister has those letters which were forwarded to him in August and September of last year. The Minister made a visit in on November 22 of this year to the hospital and excuses himself from any action at that time pertaining to the hospital, and I quote from the local newspaper of November 22 in that respect. The Minister is stating that the present government inherited these problems and that the Selkirk Hospital did not deteriorate on the day that the new government had come into power in October, 1977. He hoped that people didn't lose sight that they had had this problem when they took over in government. He said that they had inherited a wide number of blueprints that the government cannot afford. Then he proceeded to suggest if the project plans can be formalized they will be in a decision to make this decision. As Minister of Social Development, he is going to fight for every needed dollar. He then proceeded to also indicate, or try to excuse the fact that he had not proceeded with the hospital construction on the basis that he claimed there had been a sizable debt which had been left over when his government had taken office.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I regret very much the fact that when the Minister did announce hospital construction and personal care facilities being approved in various centres throughout the province, that he did not see fit to announce a positive decision pertaining to this hospital. It was in the making for many years; the plans had just about been completed; approval had been given prior to the change in government. The sod was to be turned in early summer of 1978. The Minister himself has visited the facilities; he has seen the plight of the present facilities, the conditions and circumstances under which the patients are compelled to exist. He knows the working conditions that the doctors and the nurses there operate under. He has heard from members of the medical profession; he has heard from the community at large and I would like to hear from the Minister, because all that he has said to date is that this matter is under investigation, nothing further than that, despite the very clear and very obvious concerns that have been expressed, which I know that he has observed personally as a result of his visit to the hospital, and yet there has been no action on his part in that respect. I would like to hear the Minister's comments in respect to this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of points raised that I would like to deal with. The Honourable Member for Kildonan raised the issue of a constituent with a particular knee ailment that he had brought to my attention. He asked me what can his constituent do. All I can say to him, with all sincerity and with appreciation for the problem that his particular constituent has, is have his doctor refer him to the Health Sciences Centre. It's not possible to establish and maintain, and pay for a system of medicine in this province, on our base, that will provide the opportunity for specialist attention for individual and somewhat relatively unique problems that each of us may have from time to time in our lives, at every single individual hospital and facility that exists in the City of Winnipeg or the Province of Manitoba. In the same way that if my honourable friend requires open heart surgery he cannot go to the Grace Hospital and get it. There are a number of hospitals he can't go to to get it; he has to be referred to the Open Heart Surgery Unit at the St. Boniface General. He has to be referred, I would suggest, to Dr. Morley Cohen at St. Boniface and that is where he will have his operation.

I regret very much that he has a constituent who needs a particular knee operation performed that cannot be performed at St. Boniface, but it can be performed at the Health Sciences Centre and he can be referred to the Health Sciences Centre, and I think that he has been advised of

that situation. I repeat that it is not possible to establish a system where we can deal with all of these individual cases at every single facility.

With respect to the contribution of the Honourable Member for Burrows, I don't intend to comment. I do not intend to inject myself in this Committee into a debate on a university student's paper that was done by two parties independent of me that I did not participate in, that was not done by a qualified journalist, who does sit down and attempt in the most conscientious manner to comprehend and explore and examine and assess everything that is said to him or her, but it was done rather by a person who, although she might well possess the desire to be that objective about it, does not have the training to be that objective, nor did any of us when we were university students preparing university papers. And I don't think that it serves any useful purpose for me to judge and adjudicate a university paper done by a student who discussed the situation with someone other than myself. I can only say this: That whatever interpretation that particular university student has placed on that conversation, it is one that I disassociate myself from, in its entirety.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the Selkirk General Hospital, I have been to Selkirk; I have been to the Selkirk General Hospital, as he knows, and of course I'm concerned with the condition and the situation of the Selkirk General Hospital. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition says that he regrets very much the lack of an announcement having to do with capital projects for this year, on something for Selkirk and the Selkirk General Hospital. Well, I don't find that surprising. I would expect that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the MLA for Selkirk, would regret very much. If he didn't regret it very much, he would hardly be serving as a very effective advocate for his constituency. But there are other members of this House that can say the same thing with respect to the particular needs in their constituencies, and the Honourable the Member for Selkirk well knows from his own role in government that there is only a certain amount that a government can do in a given year and one normally tries to be equitable and to put first priorities first.

I do not diminish the priority at Selkirk. Obviously my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, did diminish it for eight years, when he was in a government that did nothing about the Selkirk General Hospital. I do sincerely hope to get to a solution for the Selkirk General Hospital. We announced 13 Capital projects for this year. It was not in that list of 13 priorities. Others took precedence. Other Manitobans with other needs took precedence over those who have sincere and legitimate needs in Selkirk, and the sincere and legitimate needs of those in Selkirk are very, very prominent in our consideration and my attention, and I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that I hope very much to be able to do something about it during our administration but it was not possible to include it in the list for this immediate few months ahead.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, just let me say that the remarks of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks with respect to the whole hospital, medical and health care field struck me as pretty exaggerated in tenor, flavour and tone. They were an extension of the kind of message that the Member for Seven Oaks and others — but the Member for Seven Oaks in particular has become rather proficient at in recent weeks and recent months, the cry of doom about the health care system in this province, the cry of decay, disintegration and impending disaster, all of which, of course, Mr. Chairman, is utter nonsense. There is no evidence to support the kinds of doom-saying and doom-crying that have lately peppered many of the speeches and remarks and comments of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, who used to, it seems to me, approach these areas with a greater degree of objectivity than he exercises now on the front benches of the Opposition.

You know, he talked, for example, Mr. Chairman, about the . . . He said there is no one in this House who has ever questioned that the Manitoba Government has a legal right to do what it's doing. Well, that's absolutely untrue. There are persons in this House and outside this House, in both the NDP and Liberal Parties, who have said that we are breaking an agreement, that we are breaking conditions; we are breaking strings and conditions that were attached to that EPF Agreement.

But that's beside the point, it simply sort of illustrates the kind of exaggeration that the Member for Seven Oaks seems to feel compelled to engage in on this particular debate. He talks about the things we're cutting back, the things that we're giving up, the things that we're renegeing on — he didn't use the term "renegeing" but that is essentially what he implied.

I'd like to ask him what, I mean what a torrent of crocodile tears, Mr. Chairman. We're looking here at an expenditure in health this year, not Health, Community Services and Corrections, which is \$702 million and approximately 39½ percent or 40 percent of the total \$1.7 billion, but just in Health we're looking at \$535 million in expenditures this year, a 7.8 percent increase over 1978-79, \$39. million more being spent in Health, not Community Services and not Corrections, in Health in this province in 1979-80 over last year. In a year which is difficult for all Canadians from coast to coast; in a year which is difficult for all North Americans — and I have many clippings here

about the kinds of things that are being discussed and debated in various states in the United States, in addition to provinces in Canada, with respect to the problem of getting health care costs under control and getting budgets, in general, runaway budgets, under control. That's not bad: 7.8 percent in Health, \$39.1 million in Health, \$535 million this year as against \$496 million last year.

He talks about the reductions and the cutbacks, and we're looking at, for example, in the Hospital Program, which is the one we're discussing at the present time, a requested appropriation this year of \$287.5 million as against \$260.25 million last year. I don't call that a cutback; I call that an increase. We're looking in the Personal Care Program at the province's share of \$68.8 million as against \$64.1 million. Again, I call that an increase.

In the Medical Program, we're looking at \$110.7 million as against \$102.5 million. Where does he get this nonsense about reductions? The basic fact in this whole issue, Mr. Chairman, is that you are a taxpayer, everybody in this House is a taxpayer, everybody in this province is a taxpayer and that the taxpayers of Manitoba are \$702 million on Health, spending \$535 million on health care' Community Services and Corrections, and that represents substantial increases over last year.

Now, they can cut it anyway they want, and I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that essentially the manufactured issue that I am talking about is related to the federal election but the fact of the matter is that it has been used in this Chamber, as well as on the federal election campaign trail, and they can cut it any way they want, Mr. Chairman, but surely what it comes down to is how much the Manitoba taxpayer is spending on health. And we are this year, in total, taking Health, Community Services and Corrections in total, are spending, Sir, 39.6 percent of our budget in that area. In 1971-72 it was 32.4 percent. A year later it was 32.8. A year later it dropped to 30.8. A year later it was 32.7. A year later it dropped to 31.8, then it went to 33.3; then to 35.8. In our first year of administration it went to 39.0 and this year it goes to 39.6. Now, how in heaven's name can the Member for Seven Oaks or any of his colleagues construct an argument that says that the government of Manitoba is underfunding, undercutting and generally abandoning the commitment, the responsibility that we have to the health care of our people and to health care in this province? The facts simply don't bear it out, regardless of all the arguments back and forth about EPF financing. And I believe that our position is the correct one.

But setting that aside for a minute, to come right down to the most basic pragmatic approach to it, Mr. Chairman, what's all the fuss about? What does it matter? It's a global amount of money that you and the Members of this House, representing taxpayers of this province, have to work with, whether the money comes from Ottawa or it comes from Winnipeg. And out of that global amount of money, I, with the support of my colleagues, fought for and got a 7.2 percent increase in the Department of Health and Community Services and a 7.8 percent increase in Health, reflected in the millions of dollars that I have referred to. And those millions are going to those channels and those avenues.

So, Sir, I say that the kind of dialectic argument that has been raised, although it makes for good debate, amounts to nothing more than a torrent of opposition crocodile tears.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just cannot permit the Minister to get away with a statement, which I believe he made carelessly without adequate thought or consideration. Otherwise I don't believe that he would have made the statement. It's a statement, I believe, that reflects very badly on all those that were involved in the design and the planning and the consultation and the discussions which had taken place for a number of years, which had led to approval of the Selkirk Hospital, approval which had been given approximately, the latter part of 1976 and which approval had permitted the local staff at the hospital, as well as the architect, to proceed with the plans, plans which were just about completed when the Minister froze the construction.

So when the Minister indicates that nothing had been done for eight years, either the Minister is not familiar with the file and hasn't given it the consideration that I hoped that he had, or he otherwise is just playing politics on the question of the hospital.

The letter which I had referred to earlier by Dr. Smith, and I want to read to the Minister so he knows the work that went on by the medical staff, and by the nurses, and by the architects,

and by others pertaining to this hospital, is well presented in the letter that I referred to earlier, Dr. Smith, September 8th, 1978, to the Minister, so the Minister is fully aware of the work that had gone on, in which the doctor indicated: "During the planning stages for the new hospital, I attended several meetings arranged by the architects and the hospital board to acquaint the staff of the evolving design, to obtain opinions and suggestions from the people who would be working in the new building. These meetings were as expected not always congenial as free exchanges of opinion took place, nevertheless the atmosphere always conveyed optimism. At last we thought we will have a new and more adequate building to replace our aged and overcrowded hospital. Now that optimism has vanished, having been replaced by bitterness, anger and frustration. The hospital staff are demoralized, wondering how much longer they will have to contend with patchwork solutions to problems that can no longer be solved in the present building." So let not the Minister stand in his place and suggest that nothing was done for 8 years. A lot of work was done by a lot of people in order to bring about a decision which had been announced a full one year before the October 1977 election to indicate the plans were all but completed when the Minister announced his freeze. The sod turning was to occur within months thereafter. A lot of work, a lot of effort was went into the situation in which the hospital board found itself in November of 1977. A lot of cost, a lot of expense was encountered by the local hospital board as well in preparing for the plans, the designs, and the decision that had been arrived at, and I believe that the Minister ought to more fairly represent the situation than to suggest that nothing had been done during the 8 years of the former Government. A great deal was done and the decision had been arrived at to proceed and that decision was being effected through the development of plans which had been all but completed at the time that the Minister saw fit to freeze further work on those plans.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is not going to respond to a student or to a group of students because as he said they lack the skill, the objectivity of a trained journalist, to do a proper investigation and report thereon, therefore he's just going to pass it over very lightly. Now that doesn't surprise me, Mr. Chairman, because that seems to be the general attitude of the Minister in many other areas. I had indicated to the Minister that that is not the concern only of one student but it's a concern of many graduating students. Students graduating this year, next year, who are wondering, they're asking what types of employment opportunities will the Seven Oaks Hospital offer them?

In the university graduating class, the nursing graduating class of this year, they're somewhere in the order of 50 students, and they want to know. But as I have said obviously the Minister isn't concerned about informing them what type of program is going to be available there, in fact, the Minister seems to be quite happy in spending \$15,000, \$20,000 of public money, of your money and mine, Mr. Chairman, to train nurses and let them find jobs elsewhere. At this point in time I know that many of them have jobs in other provinces, some in British Columbia, wealthy British Columbia, some in the United States of America but not here. And at the same time they're asking the Minister if the Minister would simply indicate what type of program is going to be offered there, and the students graduating from the School of Nursing at the university are particularly concerned about this because the entire program offered there is largely geared toward preventative care, toward preventative health care programs rather than remedial. So having been trained in that type of environment they look to Seven Oaks Hospital as an exciting place within which to work. But now if the Minister is not going to accept the untrained comments of a student, and if he feels that it's only the journalists who can be most objective and most skillful in reporting things as they are, well then I would like to refer the Minister to what the so-called objective and trained and skilled journalists had to say and I would like the Minister to respond. I'm not going to refer to any comment made by any student whom he just brushes off as, you know as comments unworthy of his response.

I would like to take the Minister back, and to refresh his memory, to the Winnipeg Free Press, 24 of December, 1977, at which time a story appeared — "Seven Oaks Hospital plan abandoned, new Misericordia instead." Now of course the Minister refused comment in response to that story. Then 3 days later — "No decision made yet on future Misericordia, Sherman says Winnipeg Free Press, 27 December 1977 — And this, Mr. Chairman, I'm quoting from the so-called objective and skilled reporter that the Minister speaks of. And then Sherman on the 11th of January, 1978, on Page 6 of the Winnipeg Tribune, the Minister will find a story headlined: "Sherman to discuss Hospital's future." He is talking about the future of Misericordia but that is tied in with the plans for the Seven Oaks Hospital. And so it continued that without any definite response to the people, without any definite response to those most interested as to the exact nature of the future of the programs offered within it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind you again, that I am not making reference to some comments made by a student whose opinion and whose wishes, hopes, and aspirations the Minister

seems to disregard, but I am referring to his so-called trained, objective, skilled reporters and what they had to say and the issues that they raise to the people of Manitoba and which still to this day have been unresolved and continue to remain unresolved. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba are entitled to a definite answer on that particular issue as to the future of the type of a program within the Seven Oaks Hospital because if there is any likelihood of the programs that were approved in 1973 going on track, then some of those graduating this year, they might be prepared to wait in the province of Manitoba and pick up whatever other jobs may come their way until the Seven Oaks Hospital gets into operation and apply for employment there.

On the other hand if the answer, if the Minister's answer should be that no it's only going to be a traditional type of hospital and some of the innovative programs which had been approved 6 years ago are going to be scrapped, then those graduates should have a right to know that and seek employment wherein it would meet more with their satisfaction and enable them to do the type of work that they had trained themselves to do and which they want to do as a career person, be it in nursing or in any other related field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I gather that the Minister of Health has not committed himself on the question of the Selkirk Hospital and I gather that the commitment is not to proceed and that is somewhat alarming, Mr. Chairman, because we have been led to believe that the freezing of that project by the Government was something of a temporary nature and now we find that there are other approvals being made for other parts of the province which were really not on the batting order so to speak, that have been developed over the years and that this project is set aside somewhat further.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health which I have always somewhat admired on the TV screen, long before I knew him in politics, may think that it is adequate to put on a show in this particular Chamber and that that will somehow get him through this particular debate and that he would not have to commit himself to anything. Well, Mr. Chairman, you know that can only help him win academy awards you know, a show that he is capable of putting on may be all right in that field but it's not good enough in the field of responsibility of the provision of health care facilities throughout the Province of Manitoba. I don't think that the answers that he has given or the lack of answers that have been forthcoming from him is going to satisfy the numbers of people throughout the province who have good reason to expect that they are going to get due consideration and fair consideration.

Now the community of Selkirk, has for a long time now prepared, has been preparing rather for some period of time, plans for a new hospital program, a new health program, plans which were approved and construction was set to proceed and that the only thing that came between their wishes and the eventual construction program was this Government. It was the election that stopped the project, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister knows that, and to try to suggest to the Leader of the Opposition, my colleague, the member for Selkirk, that we had eight years and nothing is done is just nonsense. He knows it. The file is there. He knows that we know it, Mr. Chairman, that the project was approved and ready to go and that the hospital district was proceeding in a very diligent manner towards the construction phase. He knows that so why would he want to try to impress upon the people of this province, and in particular the people of the community of Selkirk and surrounding area, that somehow this was not ready and that really it was not approved or that really it was the previous Government that should have acted faster. That's a lot of nonsense, Mr. Chairman. He knows it.

So I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Health would level with the Hospital Board of Selkirk. If he doesn't want to level with us in this Chamber here that's fine, but at least he should confirm the project with the Hospital Board at Selkirk so they can proceed as they were proceeding 2 years ago, Mr. Chairman. So that the construction can get under way and that the wishes of that community can be fulfilled in this regard. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: THE Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Minister seems to be inclined to answer questions on various matters in a sort of seriatim fashion so I want to raise a matter that has not been discussed tonight but which I mentioned last week, last Thursday, and that was the survey which had been reported on in the March 27, issue of the Tribune dealing with the survey made by the assistant professor of Social and Preventative Medicine stating that 90 percent of tonsillectomies are unnecessary and stating that in his opinion there was a very serious overservicing of the operation

of tonsillitis. I'd like to know what the Minister and the Government do and did as a result of this information which no doubt was presented to him, and how they are dealing with that kind of an issue. And I raised that in relation to what I spoke about on Thursday and that is any consultative mechanism that exists where they actually deal with specific items which could result in substantial savings of energy, of time consumed by experts in the Health Services and the use of facilities which apparently are considered by this doctor in this survey to be excessively used.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—Pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, we nearly always get readings, readouts, reports from the College of Physicians and Surgeons on statements and presentations of that kind. To this point in time, we have not heard from the College of Physicians and Surgeons on Doctor Henteleff's remarks, but I would agree with the Honourable Member for St. Johns that their study and assessment, I think that they reflect a general atmosphere or environment that we referred to at least in part last week when we were discussing the medical Item of the Estimates and that is the attitude that has developed among us all and among all jurisdictions, I would suggest, in North America that found many of us going to surgeons, going to physicians, perhaps unnecessarily.

I think the case of tonsillectomy, tonsil surgery which became popularized some three or four decades ago may well represent a case in point of that kind of attitude, that kind of unnecessary over-usage, but not being a doctor myself, I rely on the assessment that is brought to that kind of presentation by those on my staff who are doctors and by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and I expect I will be hearing from them if they feel that that is a matter of serious over-use and concern and they feel that there are unnecessary tonsillectomies being performed, then I am certain that in concert, we will discuss the subject with the Manitoba Medical Association and make known the opinion that's been expressed and do what we can to do what we can to reduce that kind of activity.

But I would have to have an opinion from the College of Physicians and Surgeons and other advisors to the department on that, Mr. Chairman. It would be most irresponsible to act short of that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I am reacting to the minister . . . the Member for Sturgeon Creek, he reacts to everybody once he's in the room and it's always nice to have him here because he creates a sort of a aura or an atmosphere that is so healthy for legislation, for the legislative process.

Mr. Chairman, I think the minister just gave us an unacceptable response. Here, the newspaper tells us, now it's just the newspaper but the newspaper reports the results of a six year survey done by University of Manitoba researchers at a cost of \$180,000 funded by the people of Canada through the Health and Welfare Canada, where they speak in very large terms — 82 to 94 percent of tonsillectomies did not meet accepted criteria.

Did you hear what the minister said, Mr. Chairman? Were you listening to the minister just a few minutes ago? He said, well, we'll wait to hear from the College of Physicians. Well, he said, I'm not a medical doctor but I have medical personnel in my department. Well, if they deem it advisable to tell me about it, they will do so. Or, we will talk to the MMA, the MMA incidentally, Mr. Chairman, in case you don't know it, and the minister ought to know it, is a lobby group, a study group, a group which negotiates on behalf of doctors; it is not, it does not have the responsibilities given to it by government that the College of Physicians and Surgeons has, but maybe he didn't need the MMA, maybe he meant the College. But, Mr. Chairman, we're dealing now with an Item of how many millions of dollars in hospitals for whom the Manitoba Health Services Commission is responsible and that's the very Item we're dealing with; the minister is not aware of this study, he has not investigated it, he knows about it because if he didn't read it or was told about it by anyone else, I told him about it last Thursday, and he has not said that because of this survey, I will ask for an enquiry, I will ask for an investigation, I will ask for recommendations, I will consult with the Health Services Commission. It reminds me, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairperson, of the extent to which the minister spoke of an independent free standing Alcoholics Foundation and where he directed them, he gave them an order, but here the Health Services Commission which in his mind may be independent, free standing, he doesn't even go to them and say what are you doing to cut out what is here estimated in this article as being a use of 25 hospital beds in continuous operation year round in Manitoba.

I wonder if the minister would mind telling us how much a hospital bed year round costs the people of Manitoba? And after multiplying that by 25, whether he is not concerned about the possibility that with his direction, with his leadership, with his desire to keep the costs within reason, he has said to the Health Services Commission, I expect you who are responsible for financing

hospitals to report back on that amount of money, 25 times the cost of maintaining a hospital bed in Manitoba. But he didn't say that — he's going to wait and hear in case the College of Physicians or the doctors on his staff decide that it's worthy of his attention to know about this. —(Interjection)—.

Mr. Chairperson, I agree with the Minister of Economic Development. I would hope, I would hope that the minister takes professional advice, but Mr. Chairman, I don't think he has to wait for it nor do I think he has the right to sit back and say, well, it's got to come. He should seek it out, he should find it.

I would not want him to be influenced by reading newspapers. I would not want him to use his own judgment, although God knows, he used it when he dealt with an educational matter of the Alcoholic Foundation, he did that, he gave orders, but let's set that aside.

I agree with the Minister of Economic Affairs, you know, it's as he says, he is shocked as I am shocked that he and I should agree on something, but it so happens, that we do. He should take professional advice, but you should seek out professional advice, he is the minister, 39 percent of the Budget of Manitoba is under his responsibility. And when he is here given an opportunity to investigate the use of 25 hospital beds year round and I do hope he will do us the courtesy of telling us approximately what that amount of money is in the year. I hope he'll do it when he responds now, that this may be an example, may be a symptom of other cases he could be dealing with instead of sitting and waiting and twiddling his thumbs, Mr. Chairman, because that's the way I interpret his answer. I am waiting, and if I hear, I'll be interested in listening.

This minister, with all the terrible responsibility he carries — and I believe it's very great — should, when a matter like this comes to his attention, should whip out a little missive in his own handwriting, — and if he needs this clipping I'll be glad to send it over to him — just addressed to Dr. George Johnson, hey George, what about this? Will you respond? Or to Mr. Gordon Pollock. Hey Gordie, what about this? Will you respond?

But he doesn't do that. He says, if they think it's worthwhile, they'll let me know. Mr. Chairman, that's his way of running a department, but it's not a good way. If you see the possibility of saving 25 hospital beds in continuous operation year round, then you don't sit around and wait, you act. And I think the minister ought to be acting, rather than sitting back and waiting. He didn't use the word monitor because monitor means a continuing observation of which I'm critical, but in this case, he's not even doing that. He's sitting back to see if he gets any comments from anyone else.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the Minister for Economic Development did intervene and did interrupt me because I must tell him that in spite of the fact that for years now we've had various differences of opinion, I believe that he is a person who acts, I've received the impression in the last two years that he does not sit back and wait but that he actually enters into problems and deals with them. I think in many cases he's dealt with them wrongly; I think that he has to end it by saying "no", but at least I've the impression that he deals with them. But the Minister of Health in this case, obviously, was not prepared to take leadership in this field, but to sit back. And, you know, Mr. Chairman, I think if for nothing else but for the reputation of the government of the Province of Manitoba, to have a newspaper headline — which you can read from here, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure your eyesight is probably better than your hearing and that you can see this and if you can't it should tell your Conservative eyes that it's saying something that's pretty critical about one aspect of health delivery service here.

I think that the leader in the Province of Manitoba in health care should be prepared to make a statement so that he could clarify for the people who read this newspaper just what he's doing about the fact that this is brought to his attention. This is not a political document, this is not a fly-by-night outfit that flew into Winnipeg and made a statement and flew out again, this is a person who led a team and he is in the School of Medicine in Manitoba. You can't ignore it, but this minister is sitting back and waiting to hear a response. I'm very disappointed here, I hoped that when I brought this to his attention, that he would say — as he would have done if we got up in the Question Period and said, What are you doing? — he would say, well, I'll take that as notice. But I didn't do it that way. I waited here to give him a chance so we could discuss it, and I am disappointed to know that his answer was in effect if, as and when the College of Physicians and/or the doctors on his staff bring it to his attention, he will look at it. Well, that's not good enough, that's not service to the people of Manitoba, that's not carrying out his responsibility to the people through the government of Manitoba.

That means that he is only prepared to act when he is prodded, and I am sure that I don't have the ability to prod him into action. I think that it's probably a matter of his own conscience that will have to do that, and I hope his conscience will prevail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.—Pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the Honourable Member for St. Johns that I don't only act when I'm prodded, I act when I believe that I'm acting on the facts, on the basis of reason and taking a step that will justify itself to the people of Manitoba and a step that will be correct.

I hate to disillusion the Honourable Member for St. Johns, he did not bring the matter to my attention. I am just as capable of reading the newspapers as he is. Further to that, I knew about it long before it was in the newspapers. As a matter of fact, the study was done in cooperation between Dr. Henteleff and the College of Physicians and Surgeons. The subject has been discussed between my Associate Deputy Minister and myself; it has been discussed in discussions with doctors and myself; it will be dealt with when we have a consensus as to the best and most reasonable, most sensible and healthiest way to go.

The Member for St. Johns may not know it, but subjects of this nature draw as many opinions in the medical profession as almost as there are practices. Subjects such as whether tonsillectomy should be automatically performed on a child at the age of five or six, or whether one should retain one's tonsils until it's absolutely necessary to have them out, is one of the oldest ongoing controversies in the medical field. He may rule by divine right, when he was minister he may have felt that he could act arbitrarily and dictatorially, I don't and we don't.

We will act when we believe that we have all the facts in front of us and that we have a reason for acting that justifies the responsibility of the action in the public interest. That will be forthcoming out of the kinds of discussions that we have all the time. I don't have to dash off and see Mr. Pollock or my Associate Deputy Minister or make a special appointment or hold a special meeting on it. We meet and discuss issues in the medical field all the time and when a consensus convinces me that we have the proper perspective refined and defined on an issue such as this, we will take the action. It won't be because we are prodded, it will be because we are right.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I would challenge the Honourable Minister, at his leisure to read the speech he made before I spoke about prodding, and the speech he just made now. I believe that he will see that the first time he made a speech of double talk and not saying anything and the second time, he did respond to the point I raised. At no time did I suggest that he go charging in on a white horse with a spear and say, I will make decisions. I suggested — clearly, Mr. Chairman, what I said was, dash off a memo to George Johnston saying what about it George? Dash off a memo to Gordie Pollock saying, heh Gordie, what about this? Never once did I suggest that he should go in and tell the hospitals or the doctors what to do. What he infers from what I said is only an indication, Mr. Chairman, that he hasn't even got the ability to sit and listen. —(Interjection)— Do you hear that, Mr. Chairman, ever since I stood up he has been talking. Now we have a little peace.

Mr. Chairman, I'm glad I could get through to this Minister. I'm glad that I could break through that veneer which he had earlier when he said nothing — I am waiting, I will hear, I will see — to now saying, oh, yes, I knew about it, I acted on it, I've discussed it, we are studying it, we will deal with it when we know what to do. That is all I would have expected from him. But it took that much to get him to say it, Mr. Chairman, and I still challenge him, when he has time, at his leisure, let him read what he said the first time, and realize that he said nothing, and let him read what he said the second time and realize that he responded in a positive way, acknowledging that he has had notice of what may be a problem, acknowledging that he has already entered into discussions, acknowledging that he is awaiting a report and when he is ready and has the facts, he will act. Had he said that the first time, we would have saved a lot of time, Mr. Chairman, but I'm suggesting that he has fallen into the habit of talking around rather than specifically to the point. And now that he has spoken to the point, I am quite satisfied that I can follow this up, I can see later on what did happen. But at least I got an answer out of him and that's why he is here.

Do I have to remind the Minister, with all his years of experience in parliamentary affairs, that he is here to respond to questions, to programs dealing with his department, and had he responded in a positive way, the way he did the second time, then it wouldn't have been necessary for him to speak twice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister earlier this evening, a few minutes ago, commented on the fact that in this session my comments to him were sharper, more critical perhaps than last year, and I have to tell him that that is the case. Last year I was prepared to give him the benefit of the doubt. Last year I was dubious but I was prepared to accept these statements that he likes

to make about he is seriously interested and he is concerned and whenever he spoke to various groups, he would seem to portray a great interest in what they were saying and showing a deep concern for what they were trying to do and the programs that they were involved in. Everywhere he went, he was a nice guy.

Well, that was last year. This year I have been looking at what has happened to our health services, and I'm sorry I have to be this critical. You know, he is throwing figures around and saying this year it's 39 percent, six years ago it was 30 percent, or whatever, five years ago. Of course, he neglects to point out — I assume incidentally when he is giving these comparisons, that he is comparing apples and apples, he is taking both the Capital and the Current Expenditures in gross amounts and he is therefore making the comparison. Otherwise, he is not comparing apples and apples; otherwise, I don't know what he is comparing, because when you change from the method of accounting to include Capital into the totality of your Estimates, then you can't use a kind of simple arithmetic.

What we know is this, Mr. Chairman, we know that over a two-year period — last year it was 2.9 or 2.2 percent and this year he says it is 10, but over a two-year period, they haven't even kept up with the inflation rate, never mind an increase, they haven't even kept up with inflation. So he can throw all the figures he wants out, it isn't going to help him. I say to the Minister of Health, perhaps he should learn something from the Minister of Finance. I'll say this for him tonight, he got up and he said, look, he as Minister of Finance, had to look at the totality of funds that he felt were available and he said, and we took it out of health. That is honest and above board; he took it out of Health.

But this Minister of Health isn't prepared to say that because he has promised a lot of things to a lot of people. So instead of saying that the Minister of Finance was correct in saying, yes, we were going to take money out of somewhere, we took it out of Health; that's the decision we made; that is our priority. That is what the Minister of Finance said. The Conservative Party's priority is take it out of Health.

All right, we will argue that, but at least we have a straightforward answer. But the Minister of Health can't live with that because he knows that when he has got to go out there and speak to various groups, whether hospital boards or nurses or LPNs or doctors or whoever it is, or the public generally, he doesn't want to say we took it out of Health. He wants that image that all is well, all is fine, and that they are doing as well if not better than had been done in the past.

The Minister of Finance knows that isn't so. The Minister of Finance said it very bluntly, we took it out of health. I can argue with the Minister of Finance and say, Mr. Minister of Finance, you sent out a circular with your picture on it about a month ago to your constituents where you applauded yourself and you stated in there that you reduced taxes by \$83 million. That's what that little pamphlet said. So I can argue with the Minister of Finance that he has got his priorities screwed up, that if he gave up \$83 million, he can't come into the House and then plead poverty, you can't have it both ways. But that's the argument I have with the Minister of Finance.

But, you see, the Minister of Health is in an awkward position. He is in the awkward position where he wants to continue to look like something positive is happening in the health field in Manitoba, where in fact it isn't, and the Minister of Finance confirmed that today — "We took it out of Health, that's where we took it." And that's what is stinging and hurting the Minister of Health, because now he is in the awkward position where he has got to go out there and admit that, yes, he and his Cabinet colleagues decided to cut down on health expenditures. So all these global figures that he is throwing around don't mean a darn thing. The fact is that over the two-year period, the 18 months that they have been in office, one set of Estimates, now the new set of Estimates, we now know that they are not keeping up with the inflation rate and therefore there is in fact a decrease, because if you don't keep up with the inflation rate, you obviously can't maintain the services. It is as simple as that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 67—pass. Resolution 64, Social Services and Community Health, Item (t) Regional Personal Services, (1) Salaries—pass - the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this was being held at the request of my colleague from Transcona who unfortunately is not well and that's why he is not in the House tonight. He might be here tomorrow but we're not even sure of that.

This is the area of Regional Personal Services, as I gather. It consists of departmental field resources, delivering social services, public health nursing, family planning services, home economic services, vocational rehab, child and family services, mental health and mental retardation, and includes funds for the field services provided by Community Health Centres.

Mr. Chairman, I'll keep my comments short on this. It is our feeling that the field services are

also feeling the pinch of curtailments and cutbacks, that it is being done through a thinning out of staff, whether by positions not being filled as they become vacant; in other cases where there are no substitute people brought in to cover off when people go on holidays and particularly over summer months when most people take holidays. Whereas normally they would bring in somebody, they are just left to fend as best they can. The result is that the field services simply cannot respond as they have in the past to requests for service or demands for service and certainly — they have to they have no choice — they don't reach out. They are forced to pretty well sit back passively and wait for people to come to them and if the people don't come to them, they are so happy that they are not going to rock the boat.

In the case of the Community Health Centres themselves, Mr. Chairman, there we still don't have an answer from the Minister. We do know that some of the Health Centres were called in and were told in meeting with the Health Services Commission that their days might be numbered but it was sort of left hanging and after that there was quite a reaction to that in the community and we still don't know what the results are. The Minister did distribute some information from the Health Services Commission and frankly, although I didn't read it in detail, the Member for Transcona did, I did glance at it and I noticed again the method they used in trying to evaluate a program. I recall that they talked in terms of the medical services provided in the health centres and they compare that to the fact that within the neighbourhood, that geographic area, there are private medical practitioners. And this they consider an overlap.

The purpose of Health Centres is to have total health services, total outreach services, so people can go there not just for medical needs, and by medical I mean sickness needs, but also for another kind of medical service, in a sense a social service, to deal with the problems of the person in its entirety and not just with the illness which may come about because of some other problem and eventually what starts out as a psychomatic illness ends up as a medical illness.

So our concern is that if the Health Services Commission, and I think by their very structure and background will inevitably try to judge and to measure a health centre as if it was a free-standing hospital or as if it was a private medical practice. It is not, it was never designed to be that. It was designed, as I say, to develop a contact between the community and that health centre for all their health and social service needs, so they could respond both to the individual or to the family if that's the answer, and particularly to people who are not that sophisticated and know where to go. In other words, it is a place where people can develop a habit for looking to for their assistance, whether it be in family counselling, whether it be in a direct medical matter, or an unrelated health matter. You know, I can't say that in fact they are going to be discontinued because we haven't heard from the Minister yet. But it would be a very sad day if in fact the decision was made to discontinue the funding of these Community Health Centres.

I would be very concerned if what the government did was to say to the Health Centres, well, now we won't cut you off entirely but what we will do is this, we will put your medical staff that you are paying on a monthly basis a salary, let them bill the Health Services Commission on a fee-for-service basis. That would be the end of the Health Centres. Because the Health Centres, by their very nature, should not operate on a fee-for-service basis, and if they start operating that way they are inevitably going to be compared to the number of patients a private doctor sees, the output that the private doctor has. They are not comparable, and if we're ever going to beat the fee-for-service problem then we have to encourage Health Centres, so that they can develop, with medical people on staff, on a salary or sessional basis and not on a fee-for-service basis. Because if there are doctors who want to practise on an other than fee-for-service basis, we have to encourage them. If we're going to seek alternatives in how to provide health services, then you cannot lock and should not want to lock doctors into a fee-for-service practice.

I know the MMA is not in agreement, and I don't expect them to be. The MMA speaks for the existing private practice mold. I recall many years ago when the MMA, the same MMA, was up in arms in Manitoba because a doctor called Dr. Thorlakson dared to open the Winnipeg Clinic. They fought him tooth and nail. They wanted solo practice. That was the way to operate. They didn't like this idea of a large clinic with doctors working on salary to the Winnipeg Clinic. They lost that battle and, Mr. Chairman, in time they're going to lose the battle on fee-for-service, but it will take time, but the community health centres have to be allowed to exist. They have to be allowed to expand. They have got to be allowed to develop a base and to kill them off now, either by forcing them to go on a fee-for-service basis for medical services or by cutting their funding so that they can do less work. If we do that, only after in some cases, I think, three years of operation, before they really had a chance to establish themselves in their communities, it would be a disservice to all of the work that has been put into it and a disservice in the long-run to the possible hope of finding an alternative, because that's what they are looking for.

The Minister has said it. He talked about alternatives. He talked about preventative prevention. He is high on that. That's the problem. Our Minister, in whatever group he talks to, he says what

they want to hear, and then of course he cannot live up to it.

So those are the concerns we have on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, the fact that in the regional offices their services are being squeezed because of manpower shortage, because of a manpower lack, and, in the case of community health centres, because of the way it's being handled where they were suddenly confronted with the possibility of simply being closed down. I'm afraid that if they're not closed down and it may not come to that, it may be sort of the kind of strangulation that will, in effect, change the complexion of the health centre because their medical staff will be forced to operate on a the basis of a fee-for-service.

So those are the concerns we have, Mr. Chairman, and I don't want to take up any more time. We have spent a lot of time already on these particular Estimates. I want to ask one question. I believe last year the Winnipeg City Health Department was in this particular category, was in this item. I believe it was, and all I want to know from the Minister, it's not shown this year, and is that the amount which is shown in the Reconciliation, that \$1.6 million, which is now part of the block funding for the City of Winnipeg; am I correct in that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have had considerable debate and discussion among officials of my department, the Health Services Commission and my office, and the Directorates of three Community Health Centres in Winnipeg, Nor'West Co-op, Citizen's Health Action and Clinic, on the future of community health centres and the government's policy with regard to the centres.

I must say that in the examination of the health centres that we have carried out, we have been impressed by the work that the health centres do, by the particular dedication and commitment that they feel with respect to their roles, and that they demonstrate with respect to their roles, and in particular with the kinds of initiatives and services that they offer in terms of preventive health activity. And this, of course, is one of the areas that concerns and intrigues me most, and I say that with all sincerity because I have not talked about preventive medicine merely for the sake of talking about preventive medicine. I do believe that we have to, in Manitoba and in Canada, move with more vigour in the area of preventive medicine and move with more imagination to attempt to change the shape of our health care system into one that is better oriented to preventive care, more oriented with respect to preventive care rather than placing all the influence on the repair aspect of the system, as it has come to develop over the past many decades.

So I have particular interest in and concern for the role and the function, at least ideally, that the community health centres and the community health centre concept should play and is intended to play.

The big problem that we have with community health centres really relates to the three that I have mentioned: Citizen's Health Action, Nor'West Co-op and Clinic. With respect to those that are situated in other geographic areas of the province, we have not found reason to question them beyond the initial examination of the idea and the concept that all of them had to undergo, at least at the level of my office and the Health Services Commission, but we have not found any ongoing reason to question their existence or their role to the same degree as has applied in the case of urban centres, because the rural ones do serve particular socio-demographic populations and areas that do not have access to the conventional forms and systems and institutions of health delivery that exist in a highly urbanized centre like Winnipeg, for example.

You might ask about the Mount Carmel Clinic, which is one that we have certainly looked at but have not included in the initial kind of assessment for reduction that was carried out with respect to Citizen's Health, Nor'West and Clinic. The reasons, Mr. Chairman, are that in the case of the rural ones that I have referred to and in the case of the north and even in the case of Mount Carmel, they do serve neighbourhoods and communities that are otherwise not served, as I have suggested. At least not to entire satisfaction by conventional health facilities and institutions.

In the case of the three that we have been looking at very closely, the primary concern that we have had has been the concern of duplication. It has been the concern that must be raised and pursued not only by government but by opposition, by any responsible Legislature, for the expenditure of the public's money, for effectiveness as well as cost-effectiveness.

I suggest in all sincerity to the Member for Seven Oaks and others, Mr. Chairman, that when one considers that within the general area of Clinic we have the Misericordia Hospital, with a large Emergency and Outpatient Department functioning, we have a community health centre operated by the City of Winnipeg just across the Osborne Bridge, and, in the case of Citizen's Health Action we have the biggest Emergency Department and Outpatient Department in western Canada at the Health Sciences Centre, plus a number of private medical clinics within very short walking distance, and, in the case of Nor'West Co-op we have private clinics, private physicians practising in the area and the Seven Oaks Hospital coming on stream within the next 12 months, then I suggest

that one seriously has to question, Mr. Chairman, where is the most effective and the cost-effective opportunity for husbanding the public's money.

I don't dispute the fact that community health centres deal with particular individuals who have come to accept that as their mode and their method of receiving medical attention, plus other social services. I don't dispute the fact that they have come to be more than community health centres; they have come to be community centres for many individuals.

But, Sir, one of the biggest problems that we face in medicine today and in the hospital program today, in terms of costs — and this has been discussed under the Commission items — is the very, very extensive, very, very heavy use of Emergency Departments and Outpatient Departments in our general hospitals. As I have pointed out in discussion of this item earlier this month, the hospital system in the main, not just in Manitoba but in all provinces, but we're dealing with our own, the hospital system in the main experiences extensive over-usage and over-demand on its Emergency and Outpatient Departments, to the degree that the generally accepted recognized statistic for Emergency visits to those units of hospitals indicates that some 70 percent are not emergency cases at all.

Now, I'm not debating whether those people should go to Emergency because they feel that they have got an emergency, that's another debate, but it is a reality that we're dealing with that kind of volume, that kind of market, that kind of traffic. And when you have that problem on the one hand and you have the availability of those Outpatient and Emergency Departments and there apparently doesn't seem to be any reduction or decline in the use of those Outpatient or Emergency facilities, and you have them located in the same geographic areas as community health centres, then I think that it's not other than responsible, Mr. Chairman, for an Opposition, as I say, as well as a government, to question the effectiveness, the viability and the justification of having the two systems operate in parallel fashion.

Now, if my honourable friends want to suggest to me that we can rely on the facilities at Klinik and rely on the facilities at the Winnipeg City Community Health Centre on River — I think it's on River, River or Stradbroke; River, I believe — and that we don't need the Emergency and Outpatient Department at the Misericordia Hospital, well, that's an argument. I'm sure that there would be a very strong counter-argument raised by the persons who rely on Misericordia. If they want to raise that argument with respect to Citizen's Health Action and say that we don't need that huge facility we have going in OutPatient and Emergency capacities at the Health Sciences Centre, fine, that's an argument. But again, if there is a very strong counter-argument, I can assure you that it would be a most vocal and articulate one.

The Seven Oaks and Nor'West Co-op situation is a little bit different because Seven Oaks Hospital hasn't come onstream yet and we do seriously, at this juncture, question whether there should be the substantial outreach program, Social Service and Outreach Program planned for Seven Oaks and included in the functional programming operation of the hospital as was originally envisaged, but should it come onstream with that kind of capacity, then again the question comes up, "Are you prepared to go with Nor'West Co-op and say we don't need that at Seven Oaks?"

I know you can't refine the argument purely to an either/or situation, that there are persons of different temperaments, different approaches, different capacity to relate to medical facilities, and so some will use one type of service and others will opt for another. But you can't altogether ignore the fact, Mr. Chairman, that there is that parallel system operating where Citizens Health Action, Nor'West Co-op and Klinik operate. There is that duplication. There is that expenditure, and members opposite have been quick to pounce on the Health Budget last year and this year, demand to know why there aren't more dollars going into such and such a program, why there aren't more resources available for this or for that, and those are very legitimate questions, but I don't think you can ask that question without also honestly raising the question of whether all your dollars are going in the most justifiable and cost-effective way and whether you can afford duplication or not. So that that lies at the root of the examination that we have been undertaking.

In the case of the rural centres we don't anticipate much, if any, change. I can tell my honourable friends that the Seven Regions Health Centre at Gladstone will experience a \$60,000 reduction in their budget this year which will be on the Departmental Funding side. As honourable members know, the Centres are funded both by the Department of Community Health and Services and by the Manitoba Health Services Commission for their medical services. That situation has been discussed with Seven Regions. They're not, obviously, wildly enthusiastic about it but they have accepted the decision.

In the case of the Churchill Health Centre, which had Departmental Funding for outreach this past fiscal year of \$408.9 thousand dollars, it's being proposed to cut that funding back by \$100,000, and that is justifiable on the basis of population, on the basis of market, and on the basis of persons and personnel served. That has been accepted by the Churchill Health Centre personnel, and as

I suggested, it's justifiable in reduced population terms.

There are no significant changes anticipated with respect to the others on the list, but in the case of Citizens Health Action, Klinik, and Nor'West Co-op, what we want to do, Mr. Chairman, is continue an evaluation for the next six months of Calendar 1979 involving the City of Winnipeg, which is in the Community Health Centre business too, involving those Community Health Centres themselves, involving consumers of the Health Centres, involving the Manitoba Health Services Commission and officials and advisers to me and to my office so that we may make a reasonable and responsible decision next fall for inclusion in the kinds of decisions that we have to make next winter for the 1980-81 Provincial Budget.

To that end we're proposing that there be no increase in funding for either of those three Winnipeg Community Health Centres that I've mentioned for 1979-80, that they will operate on the same funding level as they received in 1978-79. All of them have surpluses and they will be expected to use those surpluses to help maintain their operations, and that a study of the kind we have been embarked on for a year and of the kind that we have been embarked on very intensively in recent weeks will be intensified even further, if that is possible, but certainly will be elongated and expanded to include discussions with personnel over the next few months this summer so that a responsible and reasonable decision on the future of Community Health Centres can be made in the fall. As I say, we have serious reservations about the duplication and about the ability of the people of Manitoba to be able to afford that duplication but we have found that we have been impressed certainly by the services that the Community Health Centres offer, particularly in the Social Service field and particularly in the Preventive Medicine field, so that is the course of action that we propose to follow in Calendar 1979.

I want to say that when one is considering the funding for the Community Health Centres that it should not be overlooked, Mr. Chairman, that over and above the specific sums that are carved out in the department's budgetary and fiscal line-up, there also are allocations for home care services for five of those Community Health Centres, Lac du Bonnet, Seven Regions, Hamiota, Churchill, and Leaf Rapids. A total of \$80,320 was appropriated last year and there's no intention to change that.

For Home Care in those particular spheres of activity of those particular Health Centres and in the North, of course, through the Churchill Health Centre there's \$55,000 that has been approved already in the Estimates to provide dental services under the Children's Dental Health Program. Those are independent of the straight outreach funding and medical services funding that is provided.

That is our position with respect to Community Health Centres at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat that I suggest with all sincerity to members of the opposition that it is not that easy a question when one is trying to determine the most equitable distribution of funding on the limited bases of funding that we all have to operate on, and we have to explore that question of duplication very thoroughly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that the Minister has announced tonight a six-months hoist on the operations of the Health Centres. I'm sorry it's only six months because we won't be in Session when and if the axe falls and so —(Interjection)— my colleague says I'm cynical — well, I've learned to be very cynical. —(Interjection)— We might be but I doubt if we'll be in Session. And so that six months from now when the House is not in Session the Minister can announce that after due consideration he has cut the programs.

However, I want to say to the Minister the words he uses, a parallel system, duplication — that's right, Community Health Centres were conceived as a parallel system to the traditional system because in time they could become an alternative to the traditional system, and if you don't have a parallel system going you will never break out of the mold. He said — you know, these are nice words again — he believes in Preventive Medicine, that he would like to see changes in the shape of the medical practice to get away from the repair aspect. These are all commendable goals. He's saying the right things. But then he says, "Well, we've got to look at this because it's a parallel system." Well, of course it is. Any time you want to change a system, you cannot unfortunately simply cut off one and swing to something else. You have to ease into it. You have to continue to offer the services, the traditional ones, and then allow a new system to grow alongside it, and initially that is costly. A few years ago, before this present funding arrangement with Ottawa came into being, there was even talk in Ottawa of a former plan they put forward of special funding with a thrust fund as they called it, a thrust fund to allow for that kind of what he might call duplicate, but parallel system to develop. And unless you allow that to develop, foster it, encourage it, then you're going to be left always with the traditional one and then you're going to deplore the fact

that it hasn't changed, that nothing is changed. And so I urge the Minister to keep this in mind. These are not overly expensive. What is the — Nor'West I believe, is about \$180,000, \$200,000 a year. It's really not all that expensive. They've only been in existence for three years. Give them time to build up within the area they serve the kind of confidence that people will have in them so they will look to them more and more for primary care, so they will look to them more and more for emergency care, so they won't trot off to a hospital.

You know, he poses the question — did he say, should we close down the Health Sciences Centre Emergency Department because the Community Health Action Centre is available. It's not an either/or situation, as he well knows and he himself said, but given time, more people will tend to look to the Health Centres for all their needs. Whether it's at night or whether it's weekends or what have you they will have the service available. They'll give the service and the Emergency Departments which should really be for emergencies, real emergencies, the pressure on them will ease.

But you've got to give both the public and the citizenry, who's not used to it, to whom it's new, and to the Community Health Centres, who also are new, you've got to give them time to develop that outreach so the community acquires confidence in them, so they can give the services when called upon, and the more they do it year after year the greater their appeal will become, the more people will seek them out, the more people will look to them as their primary source for care in the entire field and the net result will be less dependence on the private practitioner, less dependence on the emergency facilities of hospitals, and maybe, perhaps, and this is in the long run but it is in the long run even more important, by the proper kind of preventive services which are offered in a Health Centre, less need for downstream — and I'll use a term that the Minister likes — a downstream, high cost of repair medicine. If something is caught early perhaps an operation can be avoided. Perhaps a long stay in a hospital might be avoided, but you've got to get at it early. You just don't deal with the symptom when there's nothing left to deal with except that.

So Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that the Minister has decided to maintain them for another six months and that there will be continued discussions with the Community Health Centres and the Commission, but I say to the Minister, don't just leave it to the Commission. The Commission, by its very nature, which was established many years ago, is really a pay-out operation. It receives bills from hospitals and pays it out. It receives bills from doctors and it pays them out. Their whole perspective is on that basis and I ask the Minister to become personally involved in that because of his concern and his stated being in favour of preventive medicine, trying to change, as he says, the shape of medical practice, of how medicine is practised in Manitoba, because that's where it's all at, that's where the big pay-off is — down the line, downstream — so he shouldn't look at the immediate cost but look at the cost downstream. In the long run I think we'll have a healthier community. We'll have better health services, and we'll be able to give a better service overall for the same dollars than if we simply continue in the traditional way, every year so much more to doctors, so much more to Acute Care Hospitals, so much more to Personal Care Homes, without the kind of services that a Community Health Centre can develop and provide to an area once they get the confidence of the residents of that area. And that will come. If it hasn't already come it will come, and I believe in some of the Health Centres they have shown that within a very — 30 months in some cases, 36 months — more and more people are looking to them for their primary care, for the primary care contract.

And that is important because they can go there, it's easy to go there, the atmosphere is different. It's not a hospital atmosphere, it's not even a doctor's private office atmosphere. The tendency is to go there before you really have to go there rather than wait until you're sick, and then there's no alternative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the Member for Seven Oaks has defined, in a very clear, straightforward manner, the essential difference between the Community Health Centres and the former traditional way of the delivery of the health service.

I must say that I do not have too much faith in the present government supporting the growth of Community Health Centres because I think it is contrary to the tradition, contrary to the establishment approach to the delivery of any service, it is contrary to what is known and has been respected over many years, and therefore, I do not expect the Conservative Government to be imaginative enough, to be brave enough, to be progressive enough, to explore the advantages that were described by the Member for Seven Oaks. In the interests of the community and the interests of the control of the costs of health care, I hope I'm wrong, and I hope I will be proven to be wrong. If I am then maybe I will have lost some political advantage but the people of Manitoba will have gained by it. But I do believe, and I sometimes wonder how we differ — the New Democratic

Party and the Conservatives. I'm glad the First Minister has just come in and joined us because now I can expect him to start talking about Marx and Socialism and Communism, and go back to Russia or go to Chile, and all those silly expressions which he has adopted as his form of speech in order to confound the issue.

But I think that when one stops to examine what is the difference in philosophic approach — why are we debating this at all? It is because we have shown in our movement an acceptance of the need for change to improve systems. We are prepared, and have been prepared to look at new ideas, new ventures, because we are not satisfied with the present system. And the result is we have done things in the last eight years, various programs that we have brought in, some of which failed. At least we were attempting to make changes, and I believe that the Conservative Party, and with all respect I say that, because I'm not critical of the fact that they have a different approach than I do, but I believe that they are prepared to live with the past, to live with the traditional forms, to try to improve them, and that's why I always laugh about the free enterprise system because government supporting free enterprise are the ones who started a way back to try to keep it safe by making it less free and more controlled. But in this respect, it needs imagination and courage to try something different, and that is in the face of the objections of the establishment.

The strongest, most powerful lobby in United States has been the American Medical Association. Interestingly enough, I think the second most powerful is the gun lobby —(Interjection)— well, rifle, the hunting . . . well, not just hunting. In the States —(Interjection)— the right to bear arms, that's the movement, and they are, I think, the second most powerful. That's an interesting juxtaposition, but what I was referring to was the American Medical Association, which proved to be the most reactionary body in United States, and which had tremendous power. I'm glad to believe that the Canadian Medical Association is not quite as reactionary as the American Medical, although when I read what Dr. Wylie had to say, and I did read excerpts from a report last week, I'm not too sure.

But I have to say that I expect that just like the minister earlier referred to, "I haven't yet heard from the College of Physicians and Surgeons. When I do we will deal with something," that it is the inclination of this government to accept the leaders in the health field, who are the doctors, accept their opinion and follow it. Now they should certainly be influenced by it, there's no question about it that they are the most expert in the field, but they have something at stake, and that is a method of practise.

Now, the Community Health Centres really are different from the general concept of the delivery of service. Doctors have practised on their own, or in groups with others, in small groups, and now in larger groups. They have a fee for service system, they have a system of using the hospitals to assist them in the practise of medicine, which still continues on that basis. They are justifiably concerned about the hours that they spend a week in practise, and they are concerned to maintain complete control of the delivery of health services. And indeed they are, through hospital boards, through committees, through the control of the care of the patient, both in hospital and out, and the Community Health Centre does attack that concept, because the Community Health Centre tries to promote the active participation of a board of lay people, who become involved in the preventative services that are offered, and actually do, do in fact take away from the doctor complete control of the practise of medicine.

Now, it has been tried elsewhere and it has been successful in some places and failing in others, but unless a government is prepared to give it an opportunity to develop, then that government is not going to attempt to improve, to reform, to make more acceptable, more available to the general public, those services. For example, and I hope the minister will respond to this question. He spoke the other day, and again today, about the fact that 70 percent of the emergency cases are proven not to be emergency. And I think he said today he's not sure whether that's good or bad. I think he said that. But I'd like to know, you know, I didn't know that statistic. 70 percent of emergency cases are not emergencies. Well then how do they arise? And I'm asking the question, I'm not giving the answer, I don't know the answer. But the minister should have the answers or opinions on it. But it must be that in many cases, and this we know to be true, a patient in some distress, off hours, will phone his doctor, and say, "Doctor, I'm in distress, what do I do?" And the doctor will say one of several things. One he might say, "I'll be right there to see you" or he might say, "Go to the emergency care of this and this hospital, and I will meet you there." Or he might say, "Go to the emergency centre, and they will phone me after they examine you, and then I will decide what's to be done." All of which are reasonable methods of dealing with it. So maybe it's okay. Some patients that don't have doctors think that they're in trouble and go to the emergency care. Where else should they go? How can they be told, you may not go.

Well, now if the Medical Health Centre has a provision that its members, who come regularly to it, know that they can come at any time, in cases of distress. Is that not better? Is it not cheaper? What about the cost of maintaining emergency care services as compared with the 24-hour service

that might exist at a Medical Health Centre? Is it not true that per patient it should be less expensive in a health centre? How is the department or the Health Services Commission going to measure this? What are their criteria? How are they going to use the next six months to best determine the long-range benefits? You know, we have dealt with but we're not through dealing with the question of children's dental care. How are they being measured? What are the criteria being used? How long ahead do we look because, Mr. Chairman, it is the long-range thing we're talking about, as the Member for Seven Oaks said, and I'm not going to repeat what he said. But is six months enough? Have they now determined that in six months they will know the answer? And I am predicting, and I'm sorry to be in that position, of predicting that it is a negative approach that will determine that this government will not support the health centres. I say that because there's nothing in the record of this government to indicate that they are prepared to be objective, but rather there's more to indicate that they have a preconceived idea, which predetermines the position they will take, and that is the unfortunate aspect of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (4)—pass; (t)—pass; Resolution No. 64—pass.

Resolution No. 62, (1) Executive Function (a)(1) Ministers Compensation—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of items that I want to raise with the minister under the salary, and I'll start in with . . . possibly I'll raise them all and see how he deals with them all.

Firstly, on the question of the dental care for children, in my memory I become a little confused as between the minister's undertaking to let us see a copy of the proposed agreement of consultation with the medical profession, which I think he later indicated he is not prepared to file with us because of the objection of the Manitoba Medical, but that made it unclear as to what his position was on the correspondence he had with the dental association dealing with the Review Committee on the dental health program. He favoured us with a copy of his letter to the President of the MDA of March 22, 1979, wherein he referred to a letter from the MDA to him of February 13, with suggestions on terms of reference. I am not sure now whether he agreed to, or whether he refused to let us have a copy of that letter, which would be more of a package of correspondence. The reason I would be anxious to see that is that I would like to see and determine what are the terms of reference. I do that because I am concerned about the utilization statistics that have yet to come, and therefore I would like to know whether or not we're going to get terms of reference, whether or not this committee established to review the Manitoba Dental Association's program, will also review the government program, and if it's going to review the government program, then what different standards do they have for measurement as between the government program and the MDA program?

Therefore, I am more than interested on knowing who was on the committee because the honourable, the minister, I think . . . well, now again, he told us who was on the Consultative Committee with the Medical Association. I don't believe that we know who will be the Review Committee of the Dental Association. From the letter he filed with us, it seems that he will have two representatives from the department and two from the association, and he has been thinking of having a university person named, who is familiar with program review, which means he doesn't have to be a dentist; he has to be more of an expert on program review.

But it seems to me that during the discussions he also mentioned the Dental Faculty being involved in it, and therefore I would like clarification and I'd like to know the extent to which he will be using people from the School Boards, School Trustees' Association, whatever, and I hope that we will hear more about who will be on the Committee so that we can judge what are their biases, what are the points . . . their predisposition on that. And I say that because we now know, if you will recall, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Boniface referred to some letter, some distribution of a letter from a Dr. Nowazek, which was unsigned, talking about making sure to show the greatest possible utilization in order to be able to influence the government to give them more and more responsibility in the field of delivery of the service and also suggesting clearly that an effort be made to cut down on the use of dental nurses, and very much of a self-serving letter.

Mr. Chairman, you may recall that when I wanted to read from that letter you said, no, you can't do it, so I didn't read from it. But what is interesting, Mr. Chairman, is the day after that little discussion we had in the House there is a report in the Free Press dated April 3rd, 1979, where Dr. Nowazek was interviewed and stated that he was the author of an unsigned confidential memo read in Committee of the Legislature studying the \$2.9 million. So that now . . . I believe he in the President of the Dental Association — he has agreed that it was his memo — it's a confidential memo — and therefore took full responsibility for saying "We should make sure that

we can show a very favourable result, show great utilization, because we have something at stake which is self-serving."

And in the light of that I'd like to know whether the Minister is still prepared to turn over to that group, headed by that dentist, an evaluation of their program so that they, along with two members of his department, will come back and give an objective review of the program that they're delivering. I'd like to hear him comment on that.

I want to move on, Mr. Chairman. I will just package all my items, even though they're not related, so that the Minister can deal with them. The next matter I wanted to deal with was an article that appeared in the newspaper, the Free Press, on March 30th, 1939, (?), in a column by Alice Krueger where she speaks about treatment in nursing homes. —(Interjection)— I did say '39; I had written '39, but it almost reads like it would be '39 because it is so ancient in the manner in which it appears to have dealt with people. My own note was wrong and should have said '79. Alice Krueger is much younger, much too young, and although I was around in '39, I know she was not.

Nevertheless, what's more important than my error in the year is the report that she makes about the treatment of certain individuals who are inmates, residents, in some nursing homes. And in this particular article she mentioned two people by name with their address and reports rather devastating comments. Starts out by saying, "It's like the concentration camps of Nazi Germany." I don't believe that, Mr. Chairman, I always hate it when people compare the atrocities in Nazi Germany with any other bad treatment, because I think that it results in minimizing the atrocities that took place in Nazi Germany, which are separate and horrible in their own way. However, this was her statement.

"The immediate reaction," says Ms Krueger, "was to dismiss that kind of over-statement as nothing more than hysteria; it couldn't be that bad." And that would be my reaction. But then she says, "She came to the office with a long letter documenting the alleged mistreatment. Her accusations were serious." Then, "had she complained to the administrator or the provincial Health Department? Oh yes, she said, she had taken it right to the Minister's office but she had gotten no satisfaction. Had an inquest been held? No, she said, because I knew I wouldn't get anywhere, anyway." Of course, that person didn't have the right to order the inquest; the Minister of Health, no doubt, did.

Ms Krueger goes on and then mentions another case with another name and another address and another home and speaks of particular bad treatment, and then deals with two other cases of which she was made aware but doesn't give the names and addresses.

But in this case, the Minister had available to him two names with addresses dealing with treatment in Winnipeg nursing homes, and I want to ask him what he can tell us about these cases' which I'm sure were brought to his attention. He indicated to me that it wasn't I who told him about the Dr. Henteleff Report, he knew about it because he, too, can read the paper and this is his department so I'm sure he made the investigation. I'd like to hear about it and I'd like what he is doing in attempting to prevent a repetition of that kind of complaint, or justification for that kind of complaint.

I move on to the next item. There was a little debate last Thursday with the Minister where he was saying although 10 percent of the doctors were opted out of the Health Services scheme — and he implied that that was the normal and I don't think it was; I don't think it has been as high as 10 percent for quite some time — but in any event of that 10 percent he said approximately half extra bill. And we questioned that and the Minister then, in a very righteous way, said, well, I believe my informants — that would be the College of Physicians, although how they know that or even get involved in it, I don't know, because in my opinion it's none of their business — the Commission and the profession has told him that, and it boils down to the fact that he was told that by persons who he thinks would be knowledgeable on it, and based on their knowledge, based on discussions they have with their colleagues and some personal experience with persons who deal with opted out physicians, that is probably an accurate educated guess.

Then he went on to say — I have to quote this because the Minister may not read his own speeches in Hansard but I did on this occasion because I wanted to get it — he said, "I put it to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, it is a figure based on the credibility and the voracity of those who work in the profession." You know that voracity means having a huge appetite, being ravenous, being insatiable, and I would not like that to remain on the record. I would guess that the Minister said veracity, which was interpreted as voracity, but I couldn't help but point out to him that maybe it's what they call a Freudian slip on his part, certainly not on the reader's part; I don't think anybody would accept that.

But the point I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman, is that we're involved in very big issues. We're involved here, and I referred the other day to the Minister's public debate with the federal Minister of Health, where they talked about opted out doctors and they talked about extra billing doctors. Opted out doctors are very easy to count. They have names and there are numbers; they have

addresses and you know who they are. Extra billing is a different thing, and the Minister made a strong point to the federal Minister of Health that it's the extra billing that is much more important than the opting out. In other words, you could have 100 percent opting out but if there is no extra billing then there is no danger to the program.

Well, since he agreed and the federal Minister agreed and, if it helps anything, I agree, the extra billing is a very, very important issue. Is it enough for this Minister to go, by way of conversations he has had with whomever? I think it should not be difficult to find out from doctors if they have a practise of extra billing. I know there are doctors, maybe all of the doctors who have opted out or all of the doctors who extra bill, who don't extra bill everybody. And if a doctor extra bills some and not others, that doctor is still extra billing. I suppose if that doctor has one patient whom he extra bills, then that already is an indication that his opting out is for reasons of extra billing.

Because what I don't understand is the suggestion that doctors have opted out that are not extra billing, therefore they have opted out because of less bureaucratic interference. I don't think that's true, and I hope the Minister will tell us, with his knowledge, the extent to which there is less bureaucratic interference for an opted out doctor than there is for an opted in doctor, because my impression is that the opted out doctor still fills out all the forms for his patients, sends them all in to the Health Services Commission, and is subject to the same review for abuse or over-use or patterns of practice as the opted in doctor, and I don't know the extent of bureaucratic interference that exists to an opted in doctor more so than to an opted out doctor, but there may well be and I ask the Minister to tell us the extent of that and whether he agrees that that is a justifiable reason for opting out. Extra billing is clearly a justifiable reason for opting out, but does he believe any other reason is one?

I had occasion to have some medical tests done to me, where I didn't even meet the doctor. It was a lab. test. I didn't meet the doctor who did the work, but he was opted out. And I wanted to know what kind of doctor-patient relationship he and I have established that is greater than that of my doctor that I deal with, who is an opted in doctor, when in my case I see my doctor and he sees me and we have a relationship, and yet this other doctor, who is opted out and whom I don't know, whose name I don't even know because he goes under the name of a group and bills me out of a group, how he can have a better doctor-patient relationship. Is it because the cheque is more direct or the billing more direct?

When I come to billing, I would think there is more bureaucratic work involved in an opted out doctor, who sends a report in to the Health Services Commission, waits until he learns that his patient has received the money, then sends a bill, and more than on bill and several bills, to the patient. He hopes he will get paid, and when he does get paid he then has to enter a separate receipt and do all the bookkeeping that is necessary to show the money was paid, and how that is justifiable for opting out.

I hope the Minister will respond to this question because I really sincerely want to know: a) Should he not have a much more accurate report on which opted out doctors extra bill, what number do — not who they are but what is the percentage. Secondly, does he justify their decision to opt out on the basis of bureaucratic interference, and if so, to what extent and why?

I personally have never condemned a doctor for opting out, because he is given that right in law, in practice. He can opt out, and not only can he opt out, he can extra bill. And he has that right. I don't think I have ever criticized a doctor who decided to extra bill.

But clearly, if this Minister and his federal counterpart, and I believe Ministers of Health in other provinces, who have decried the extra billing to the extent where they have threatened to do something serious about it if the extra billing practise grows more extensively, I hope the Minister will give me the benefit of his thinking.

And while I'm on that, I can't help but comment again, as I did last Thursday, on this report by Dr. Wiley. The more I read it the more distressed I am to have the President of the Canadian Medical Association say that government under-funding of Medicare has forced the physician to practise assembly-line medicine and to overutilize the system to try to maintain his income.

I believe sincerely, Mr. Chairman, and I have had occasion to study professional ethics and concepts of professionalism and the duties as well as the benefits and rights of professionals, I really think that his statement that doctors are overutilizing the system to try to maintain the income is an accusation which the College of Physicians ought to take seriously and if they find doctors who indeed are guilty — and I use that word guilty — of doing as Dr. Wylie says they do, see to it that there is some kind of disciplinary review of doctors who may do as Dr. Wylie says they do. And I mean quite seriously that this is a matter that I think the Minister has to become involved in. I think the Minister has to respond to something like this and I don't know that he has nor do I know that he has had time to do so. This report appeared on April 12, 1979, and I think the Minister really ought to be telling us about it, because if the President of the Canadian Medical Association, a Winnipeg doctor, is prepared to make statements such as are reported in this

I think the Minister who is responsible for the delivery of health care in this province should respond to it, accept it, reject it, challenge it, but respond and say I do have a reaction to this.

I move to another item, Mr. Chairman, and that is the Law Reform Commission in the last week or two, or maybe its longer than that, has published its report on the mentally ill and makes some very profound statements, makes some very far-reaching comments and recommendations. The Law Reform Commission makes recommendations for legislation. Now, I don't know whether the Minister — I doubt if he has had much time to read the report — but I wonder whether he can give us an assurance that the Law Reform Commission report is being studied with a sense of urgency to the extent that there may be certain recommendations which could be brought into play very quickly and have legislative review in this session? It may be that that is too much to be hoped but I think that the Minister ought to see to it that a committee within his department reviews rapidly, and they have already done so, the report, come to conclusions as to what has to be dealt with over a longer period of time, what can be dealt with immediately, and try to bring in those matters which have a sense of urgency and are able to be dealt with in this session and bring it in. I think that I could assure him that I would think all Members of the Legislature on both sides of the House would be most accommodating to try to see some needed reforms brought in quickly. I would like the Minister to assure us that it is being looked at with a sense of urgency only to the extent of, can we do something in this session or must we wait for another one?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the fact that I did a fairly extensive report on professional societies, their powers and their obligations, and filed it with the Minister some time last fall. I invited the Minister to publish the report, attributing it to me only because it is not a report that was prepared by or for the New Democratic Party. It was not a report that was ever seen by any member of the New Democratic Government nor of its caucus, it's my own report, and I thought that it might be useful, if it is any good at all, as a review mechanism for people who are interested in that field, governments, professions, lay people, and thought that it might be something that he could do without appearing to give it any sense of sponsorship by his government or his department, but rather a report that came in to him, probably long overdue because I hadn't completed it until after the change in government. But I have heard nothing about it so I assume the Minister does not think it worthy of publication. I was tempted, Mr. Chairman, and I could still do it, you know, to make a speech reading the whole report and as a result, I could get the whole thing published in Hansard — it might take several issues on several occasions because it may take more than 40 minutes to get it in — but I could probably do it that way but it shouldn't be that necessary for my gratification or conceit to have it published except that there was a lot of work that went into it, not only my work but that of others, and I have the impression that it has some value.

So I would like to ask the Minister what he has done with that report — it was prepared with taxpayers' dollars — what he has done with it, what he intends to do with it, even if he is going to throw it in a wastepaper basket, I would at least think that he is telling me his reaction, and finally to tell us what he himself is doing about the fact that a number of professional associations, to my knowledge, are coming to government and asking for changes in their legislation.

The report that I prepared included a draft bill of an omnibus — that's not the term — of a form that could apply as it would, as a sort of umbrella over all professional associations, setting out the type of review process that should take place for measuring qualifications to practise the profession, measuring the rights to discipline members of the profession, measuring their right of appeal for various actions by the body that supervises them, mentioning the rights of individual people who may have complaints against individuals. Therefore, I would like to know what is the Minister doing about this whole field of professionalism and the fact that not only is it a matter that interests me, which need not interest him at all nor does he have any need to tell me what he wants to do, but rather all the various professional bodies that are anxious to have changes made in their legislation, what is his intent with that?

Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed, I think, six different items and I'm looking forward that maybe tomorrow the Minister would be prepared to respond to them and I would appreciate hearing from him in this regard because they are questions that I have held back for his Salary and hope that we can hear his response to them.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to deal with the questions raised by the Honourable Member for St. Johns as informatively but as concisely as possible. In some cases I am not going to be able to give him perhaps as precise an answer on this occasion as he would like, but I will supply him with information and a report on the situation as it stands at the present time.

With respect to the agreement with the MMA on the consultative committee process, I did advise him, I think, last Thursday, that the agreement should be signed by both parties, I believe on the 21st of April, and once that is done, I see no reason whatsoever why that should not be made

available to the Opposition caucus of the Legislature. But there was a strong feeling, certainly on the part of the MMA and I must say that my own office had some reservations too, that it was not very politic, if I may use that term, to distribute the agreement when it hadn't even been signed yet by either party. I don't anticipate any difficulty in the signatory process, but one is never absolutely certain. So that was the reason for that decision.

On the Review Committee between my department and the Manitoba Dental Association to deal with the Children's Dental Health Program in which the terms of reference are discussed, the honourable member is quite correct that I have said to him that I will do my best to supply him with the correspondence that sort of links the correspondence, copies of which he did receive from me a little bit earlier. I know that he is interested in particular in a letter that I think was dated February 13, 1979, or thereabouts, that's the date that I recall, in which the Manitoba Dental Association president posed to my office their suggestions for terms of reference for the committee, and I responded with a letter, I believe dated March 22, saying that I was in general agreement with many of their suggestions, and a copy of that letter was made available to the Member for St. Johns.

Now, I don't mean to be obstructive in this situation. I believe that I can make that correspondence available to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, but I owed the Manitoba Dental Association, as a party to that correspondence, the courtesy of their expressing any reservations, if they had any, with respect to an opinion as to whether they regarded the correspondence at this juncture as confidential until we had actually hammered out the terms of reference. It is for that reason that I have not yet been able to make the correspondence available to the Member for St. Johns. I believe I will be able to make that correspondence available but, once again, somewhat in the nature of the agreement with the MMA on the consultation process, there is not yet any contract, even of a letter of agreement or verbal nature, between the MDA and my office as to precisely what the terms of reference of that review committee are. It might be desirable, for the same arguments applied in the first instance, to request of the Member for St. Johns that he give me a few more days while that is finalized because it is in the process of being finalized right now.

I might say to him that the letter to which I have referred that came from the president of the MDA in February suggesting terms of reference, proposed a five-man review committee that was going to consist of three members appointed by the MDA and two members appointed by the Minister of Health and Community Services and that the committee would be chaired by a member of the MDA. It also spelled out some general guidelines for the kinds of review process, examination, assessment, evaluation process in terms of measuring the effectiveness of the MDA involvement in the Children's Dental Health Program in terms that were not fully definitive and specific but were more or less advanced for the sake of discussion and examination, refinement and then ultimate agreement between my office and the MDA. I did not accept the suggestion of a five-member committee consisting of three members of the MDA and two appointees by my office, or a chairman appointed or selected or nominated by the MDA.

My counter-proposal was that the committee should consist of two members nominated by the MDA, two members nominated by my office, and an independent chairman who may well be from the academic sphere of dentistry. The response to that from the MDA was one of acceptance of the idea, and they proposed the name of a particular dental professional with some ongoing academic connections, I believe, from eastern Canada. Once again, I must say that I have not accepted that idea, because I believe that the Chairman should be someone who has close connection with and experience in the environment in this province. So, we are in the process of trying select and settle on an individual for that particular role.

Now, the Member for St. Johns has suggested that there should perhaps be representatives of school boards involved, or school trustees involved. That is a good suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and one which has been considered in my office in recent weeks — and dental nurses too — but by way of reservation, let me say that I think that it would be desirable, all things being equal, to keep the formal committee relatively small and manageable, and then establish where and as necessary sub-committees or ad hoc committees related to it, to advise and counsel.

But that's a debatable point, I'm certainly flexible on it. It might be, and I'm prepared to take under — certainly under advisement — the suggestion of the Member for St. Johns, that the committee should embrace representation from a number of related disciplines, and persons with a particular interest in the program such as school trustees, which may well, indeed, recommend itself and may well then, thus call for a larger committee of a formal nature than we were contemplating.

I would assure the Honourable Member for St. Johns that I am prepared to make the names and the membership and the makeup of the Review Committee known, obviously, just as soon as it's struck, and that I would see no difficulty in releasing the terms of reference at that same, and

that we are on the threshold of having those two responsibilities completed. However, I also recognize the position that he would probably quite legitimately take with respect to that, that being that he would like to know those things before the fact rather than after the fact. I can assure him of this, that his suggestions with respect to a larger committee than I had contemplated will be taken under advisement, and I will direct my attention very seriously to including representatives of the kind that he has suggested, if that will satisfy him.

There was a reference by the Honourable Member for St. Johns to Doctor. Nowazek's letter, and some of the, I thought, rather debatable, to put it discreetly, rather debatable terminology and suggestions used in his letter. I would prefer to say as little as possible about that letter. I had not seen it; I had not received one; I have let the Manitoba Dental Association know that I thought it was unfortunate, and certainly unnecessary and I can assure the committee that the executive of the Manitoba Dental Association concurred in that opinion. There will certainly be an objective and an honest review of the utilization, and the effectiveness, of the MDA involvement in the Children's Dental Health Program. I want to assure members opposite that there will be no contrived approach, no vested interest approach, no predetermined kind of approach countenanced by me, or by my department, with respect to the approach taken on that review and I would think that perhaps the less attention paid to that particular letter, the better.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns made reference to a column by . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order? The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the Minister would care to let me just make a few comments on the dental thing before he leaves it, so that we don't keep coming back and hopping around. He has nodded his acquiescence, Mr. Chairman.

Firstly, I must say I'm rather amused by his use of the term "an independent chairman", which implies an adversary system: two dentists, two department and an independent chairman — it may be a slip, that he didn't intend it that way, but it certainly is not a surprising comment.

One question I asked him specifically was, will this same committee review the government program, and the other question I must ask him is, why he has not considered calling in the same three eminent people who reviewed the Saskatchewan system, who are, I believe, the Deans of Dentistry of McGill, Toronto and Alberta. I believe that's correct. And why he's not using these people, who have already objectively and independently reviewed the Saskatchewan system, have both the experience there and have a control mechanism already built into their knowledge by knowing what goes on in another province with a similar program?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, in terms of searching for a chairman, Mr. Chairman, that is the type of professional and experienced professional that we very definitely have in mind. We had, I must report, not contemplated assigning or commissioning all three of them to act in the capacity of this particular review, but certainly for chairmanship it's that calibre that we are considering. That's the type of person, among other names, that is being considered, and it may well be that one or more of them winds up on the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the question as to whether they will review the government program or not, only insofar as there has to be a comparison between what the Manitoba Dental Association is able to produce, and what has demonstrably been produced under the government program. We have not considered a wholesale assessment or examination of the government program at this point in time. We want to see whether the Manitoba Dental Association can deliver the program, and can deliver it effectively and cost-effectively and satisfactorily. If they can, it would be our intention to continue expansion of the program through use and involvement of the MDA. If not, then we will continue to rely on the government program on the grounds that it's in place, and a Children's Dental Health Program is there, and we don't want it to disappear. But at this juncture, no, we're not considering a wholesale study of the government program.

The honourable member asked me about a column by Alice Krueger of the Free Press having to do with maltreatment of elderly persons in certain nursing homes. Mr. Chairman, we were very upset by that column, I was and . my officials were, and we were thinking of — and very close to — calling the people identified in the article. But we checked with the Commission first, and found that there was no instance whatsoever, Sir, of a complaint having been registered, and so we decided to ask the Standards Division of the Commission to see if they could go into the home and identify any possibility or any reason or any justification for that kind of a charge of maltreatment. I do not have a conclusion to that investigation to report to the honourable member tonight, but I will do so during the lifetime of this Legislative Session. But there was no complaint filed with the Health Service Commission, and we felt the best way to proceed was through the Standards Division personnel, at this juncture.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we checked for evidence of that complaint very conscientiously and found none. There have been other references in that column in particular to unacceptable treatment or conditions in some nursing homes. The difficulty is that they are, in most cases, anonymous. This instance that the Member for St. Johns refers to contains names, but most of them are anonymous, and I think that you would agree that it is extremely difficult to pinpoint a problem unless one is given some kind of a direction as to where the problem is. If anyone will identify those homes to us, and they don't need to identify the personnel, because obviously that would be a condition that many people would be reluctant to undertake; but if they would just identify the homes to us, we could go in and check them out in a special, separate way. We check them all out anyway, through our Standards Division, but we would make certainly a special immediate investigation, but we can't do it if the home isn't investigated.

On the question of opted-out doctors, and extra billing by physicians, we have two opted-out doctors serving on the board of the Manitoba Health Services Commission: Doctor Ewart and Doctor Elliott, both of them opted out, and certainly the view that I have expressed with respect to the amount of extra billing engaged in by opted-out doctors in Manitoba, is a view that has been expressed by them and also by MMA representatives with whom I've discussed the subject. I repeat what I said last Thursday, and in this case trust for a correct spelling, that I rely on the veracity of the professionals who have reported that that's the situation.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, we have not had any complaints, certainly not of any significant number — I can't recall any in my time as Minister, but I wouldn't argue that there'd never been any — but there certainly has been no measurable or significant level or element of complaint from people in Manitoba about extra billing by doctors.

The Member for St. Johns asked me, well what's the justifiable reason for opting out, why do doctors opt out if they're not going to extra bill? Lots of them opt out simply on a matter of principle. In Quebec, that's why most of those who are opted out in Quebec are opted out. —(Interjection)— Well, that's certainly a reason for a good many.

You know, the Medical Post did a survey not long ago on the attitude of the medical profession towards medicare, and the biggest complaint, the highest percentage of those expressing dissatisfaction with medicare was not on the income earning opportunity, although that certainly ranked as a high grievance, but the highest grievance was on the climate of bureaucratization that they felt they were impressed into under medicare. There are a great many doctors who simply don't like to be considered, or to consider themselves as mechanics of the state, as it were. I think that a great many of them feel that way under medicare.

I don't suggest that that's justified, I don't suggest that that's justified, I'm just telling you, Mr. Chairman, the way it is with a great many doctors who, in the main, are persons of pretty independent perspective and temperament, and they are not, as a group, as a class, as a category, very happy with either the paper work or the regulation, or what they refer to as the bureaucratization of Medicare. They would prefer to be out on their own, free of what they feel is a rather cloying, pervasive government-control atmosphere, whether justified or not. And that's one of the big reasons for their opting out, whether they ever extra-bill or not.

The Member for St. Johns asked me about Dr. Wylie's article about assembly-line medicine, and suggested that the Minister should respond to it. I want to answer that question two ways, Mr. Chairman. In the first place, I don't feel that the Minister of Health, or the Minister of any department in this government, or any other government, needs to respond all the time, needs to verbally compete all the time, with statements, no matter how provocative, that are made by spokesmen for certain groups in our society. Oftentimes, it's unproductive and negative to respond to statements that are made from a particular perspective of interest by a spokesman for an interest group, all it leads to is additional public argument and debate, and I just don't . . . I think the Member for St. Johns and I have entirely different perspectives on this. I don't think it necessarily serves any useful purpose to respond necessarily, just because somebody has said something that commanded a provocative headline in the newspaper.

However, having said that, let me undermine my own argument to some extent by telling the Honourable Member for St. Johns that I did respond to it, not voluntarily, not on my own initiative, but because the media came to me about it, and asked me about it, I did respond. I made my comments, and they were contained in the same paper that carried Dr. Wylie's comments, which was the Winnipeg Tribune, on Saturday of this past weekend.

I respect Dr. Wylie's opinions and his right to express his opinions. I don't necessarily agree with them. I don't agree that we have entered an era of assembly-line medicine to any degree. There is some assembly-line medicine practiced, no doubt, but it's very severely examined and checked by colleges of physicians and surgeons, by medical associations, and by bodies such as our Health Services Commission, to ensure that it is not being practiced to a degree that is detrimental to quality medical care. And it's something that we do watch very closely in my office,

and that I've had serious and strong consultations on, both through my Associate Deputy Minister and through the Commission. We don't want assembly-line medicine practiced here, and pressures and persuasion of the strongest kind is brought to bear to discourage it, and to ensure that it doesn't occur. That doesn't say there aren't some instances of it, but I think one has to recognize that Dr. Wylie speaks for a particular professional interest group that is not particularly happy with Medicare, that's plain, from the CMA, and from every provincial medical association in this country. He has a particular professional position to put, and he's going to put it, the same way as a spokesman for any other community or professional interest group is going to put their position. I don't accept it. In fact, I reject the content of it, but in a free and democratic society, I have no objection to his letting off steam if he wants to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for his response. I just want to make one point; I would not be critical of assembly-line medicine, as I know it to be practiced in the Mayo Clinic in Rochester — I believe that could be called assembly-line medicine. What I was critical of was the statement that they over-utilized the system to try and maintain their income, and I'm more critical of that aspect than of the term "assembly-line medicine", because I think that might be a way of cutting costs, and as long as a high quality of care is given, then the method is of less concern. It's the purpose that I challenged about Dr. Wylie, and my thought was that it's the kind of thing that should be disciplined by the College, not by the Minister. I'm sorry I interrupted, but I thought I'd make a comment on the thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: That's fine, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. Thank you. Two other questions that the Honourable Member for St. Johns asked me, one having to do with the recommendations to the Law Reform Commission respecting mentally ill patients, persons in mental institutions; I don't anticipate the opportunity to do anything legislatively this session on that problem, Mr. Chairman, but I am meeting with the Attorney-General on it. I have asked for and arranged a meeting with him, the subject being one that is of importance, that is equal to my department. In fact, my department perhaps even has a greater interest in it than the Attorney-General's department does, and I do believe that reforms are necessary and that we can and should move forward as swiftly as possible in this field. But it will not be, I suggest, possible to do it in this session. Hopefully we can work out the approach in time for a session in the near future.

Finally, the question of the honourable member's report on professional and self-governing associations, and what has the Minister done with it, or going to do with it, and what am I doing about the question generally; we have in front of the government at the present time, Mr. Chairman, a proposal on legislation for self-governing professions and associations. The Member for St. Johns is probably aware that we have requests for either new legislation, or amended legislation, from more than a dozen — I think it's fourteen — individual self-governing associations, or would-be self-governing associations or professions, in the health field alone, not to mention in many other fields. But in the health field alone, I think we have 14 proposals in front of us.

We do not want to deal with them on an ad hoc basis, as that would be a long, prolonged and probably impossible kind of process. We're trying to deal with them collectively and universally, and there is a proposal, a legislative proposal, in front of government, in front of Cabinet, at the present time, to deal with their requests generally. I hope that we'll be able to move on that in this current session.

As far as the report prepared by the Honourable Member for St. Johns is concerned, I want to assure him it's not in the wastepaper basket or gathering dust at the bottom of a shelf somewhere, Mr. Chairman. It has been of use to officials in my department. I do recognize the work and the effort that the member put into it. I don't think we're going to be able to make direct, practical use of it by publishing it ourselves, but I recognize his interest in the subject, and I think he will probably be gratified to some extent by the legislation that we are hoping to bring in very soon in the same area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It worked out again. We are at the end of our tape, if we could just have a very short time we'll put on another tape. Just when the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, as per usual.

The tape is now in place. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that any one can say that I've been taking too much time tonight, and I certainly don't intend to start at this late hour. I just have

a few minutes, but there are some statements that have been made on the record that I do not want to go unchallenged at this time, so I would like to take a few minutes in answer to some of the statements that were made tonight.

First of all, as far as the Selkirk Hospital is concerned, it was announced in the five-year program, and what was announced was that it was a new 75-bed hospital, Health and Social Development space, and 80-bed personal care home replacing the 77-bed hospital and 77 or 78-bed personal care home, and the line drawings were being prepared. So that was approved and to say that the Leader of the Opposition belonged to a government that didn't intend to do anything, or that it didn't do anything on that, is wrong.

I also want to touch on the situation of the opted-out doctors in Quebec. The opted-out doctors in Quebec, it is true what the Minister is saying, that they do not extra bill. But the main reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is that Quebec, and that's the only province that does that, if a doctor has opted out and he doesn't extra bill, the situation is the same as here. The doctor will send his bill to the Commission, and the Commission will pay the patient the amount that it would pay the doctor had he been opted-in. But if an opted-out doctor extra bills in Quebec, he doesn't get anything, and the patient doesn't get anything, and that's the only province that does that. So that's the main reason, I would think, why they're not extra billing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer some of the statements made by the Minister of Finance. He said, first of all, that there wasn't any information withheld, and he said that it was tabled here during last year's session, but he forgets to tell us, Mr. Chairman, that it was again lumped between Health and Education, and that is not the figure that I wanted, and that is not the request I had made of the Minister. And the Minister knows that, because he said he didn't have the amount.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance also said that they inherited something that was worked out between a federal-Liberal government, and a provincial-NDP government. It is right to say that he inherited something that had been decided previously, but I want to make it quite plain, quite straight, Mr. Chairman, that it is not something that we did negotiate. It wasn't that at all, it was something that we did not want at all, because we felt that something would happen the same as had happened now, especially if there was a Conservative government in power.

And we had reason to believe that, because the people that, as I said, and I'll repeat, those that didn't want any part of a new type of funding from the federal government, and wanted to get away from this type of cost-shared program, was the Conservative government of Ontario, the Conservative government of Alberta, and the present government in Quebec, but for different reasons. In Quebec, they've always felt that they wanted to run their own show, and this is why they were in bed with those other governments for, as I say, different reasons.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should make it quite clear, also, if it needs to be repeated, that I've never heard one member of the Opposition . . . well, I'm going to correct that, I'm not too sure what the Honourable Mr. Axworthy said when he was in the House on that, but of the New Democratic Party, say that the government did not have the right to spend the money as they wished, the money that was in the consolidated fund. It was said that it was contrary to the intent of an agreement, but legally I don't know. The first time that I heard, and any of our people heard that this was illegal, is when we heard the National Minister of Health on the radio, . . . answering our Minister of Health here, and she said that this was illegal. Now, I don't know, this is not our battle with this government at all. The battle with this government is the question of cost first and need second. We feel that that is the wrong priority.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance was very temperate in his remarks and said that he agreed with us, but he still tried to mislead and I think he tried to take this thing away from our attack. Now, he said, "What would you do?" At no time, and Mr. Chairman, having been the minister that tried to negotiate a better agreement with the federal government, and I knew what the minister said. I was very much aware of what the minister said today — the Minister of Finance, so on, that said over a period of years, "It will be equalized to the average province over ten years." We know that, Mr. Chairman, we know that and I was the first one, when I made these figures public, I did state that I felt that they shouldn't necessarily put all the money in there. I did say that, in all honesty, Mr. Chairman. So, when the Minister of Finance says, "What would you do?" Well, I'll tell you what we would do, and I'll tell you why we brought this thing up. If you remember, Mr. Chairman, it was after that memo from the St. Boniface Hospital, the Chief of Staff of the St. Boniface Hospital came out — and this is our concern, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat again; first of all, I didn't play with the figures at all, I took the figures from Ottawa, I drew a sum, subtract the sum to pay for 26 percent of the personal care homes and that's exactly the way it was in 1976-77. And then, what was left, I matched it against what the province did; and we have a situation here, Mr. Chairman, that is so exaggerated. We have a situation that in 1976-77, the total for hospital and medical was 323.3 and of that the province paid 152 and the federal paid 171.4.

Now, that year, Mr. Chairman, when you count everything, including the personal care homes, the Province of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba paid \$6.4 million more than the federal did. All right, and you will see if that makes sense. The next year, it was a reversal; the next year, the province paid approximately the same amount for hospital and medical, about \$.5 million more, and this time the federal government had made a contribution of \$17.3 million more. And that was inherited also, by the government of my honourable friend. And in 1978-79, Mr. Chairman, then the cost for hospital and medical was 362, quite an increase, but the share of the Province of Manitoba went down, from 152 the first year to 132. \$20 million difference — instead of going up with the inflation and so on. And then, the federal government contribution was now 66.4 percent million dollars more. And the last year, this coming year, the provincial government is only putting 133 on a total of 398, which is only 33 percent or 1/3 percent and again, I've deducted the amount for personal care homes and I took enough money to cover 26 percent. And the share of the province was 133 and this time, Mr. Chairman, there is a difference of \$97 million. Well, there is a limit, I agree that you shouldn't put every single cent on that, but Mr. Chairman, the minister said, well, it's 37 percent or it was 33 percent — that doesn't mean very much, Mr. Chairman, if you switch certain things. This government is switching. Their policy is to switch as much as possible on the private sector and take the involvement of government out of it. So, that doesn't mean very much, when you look at the percentage that you do to keep these facilities going.

Now, Mr. Chairman, last year there was an increase in the hospital according to the minister of 2.2 and you have to look at two years. If we were talking about this year and then an increase on 6 percent, if there had been a 30 percent increase last year, you would understand. You might say, "Well, things have to be a little tough." And they did that that year and there wasn't that much criticism; we criticized the idea of them going on 2.2 because it was based on what, nobody every knows. But this year, Mr. Chairman, the minister is talking about 6 percent and I'm talking about hospital now, 6 percent for hospital following a 2.2 percent, Mr. Chairman. Now, it's not all black and white, it's not saying put all the money and it is true that in 10 years, we will get less money in ten years. It will equalize and there will be less of an increase. And this was based, Mr. Chairman, the previous government felt that that wasn't enough for health under this new setup. But this government is now not even using this on health. And they've talked about paying a debt, paying a debt because they're better managers. I just finished telling you, Mr. Chairman, that this year alone, they're going to get \$97,000 more than they're putting in — \$97 million. That will pay for the deficit; they're getting the money, not being better managers, but by taking it away from a certain service by getting it from Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when you look at this; if everything was fine, you know, you can have restraint and that's fine, and if you figure that the service wasn't suffering, but Mr. Chairman, I don't want to spend that much time, I'm not going to go into detail, but let's go back to that memo that came up from the St. Boniface Hospital for instance, where they had to cut, what — four, was it four million dollars or something? The minister said 6 percent.

Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, roughly in the budget of a hospital about 70 percent is the labor force — approximately, it might be less than that now, because there are more. But it used to be a little more than 70 and now it's about 70 or 69 or something. And out of that, Mr. Chairman, they have a contract, and the contract alone has gone from eight or something like that, so of their 70 percent, they got 2 percent less — just that hospital, right then and there, with no increase for anything else, just the wages.

Now, the food, the food has gone up about — according to the hospital and so on, is about 21 to 25 percent. Now, the equipment and these kind of things — well, then with the Canadian dollar being what it is, it's gone up to about 30 percent, Mr. Chairman, and that is why we brought this thing here, because previous to that, the minister who is now blaming the federal government, was saying we didn't get — and that's one of the things that he was saying to the doctors, "We're not getting enough money from the federal government." And that is the reason why I went out to find out what they were getting.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if they don't qualify in some of their agreements to another program and another department, that's something else. They shouldn't rob the health department to take care of something else. If they can't do it — fine. Now, there's another possibility; if the minister, like some other ministers in other provinces are very clear, and if this government wants to tell us, we'll listen. There's too many frills, this program is too rich, you can't afford it, so we are cutting. That, we can debate, you know, but at least we would debate on something that we believe and we would say, "Well, it is wrong." And this government could make a case to say, "Well, it is too rich, we only have a million people." Because, you know it doesn't stand to necessarily — it doesn't have to be right, but whatever program we had, we had it exactly on the right track. Maybe we were too rich — some people said that maybe it was too poor, but that is not what the minister is arguing. The minister is saying, "All right, there is no difference, there is no difference in the

hospital, there is no difference in the personal care homes, there is no difference in the food, there is no difference in the staff." Well, he's not saying there's no difference in the staff, but there's still enough of a staff to give you a minimum of care and that's what we're arguing about. We're arguing that if he needs more money, then he has to look at the need first — the need and then the cost. Not necessarily the need only, but the need has to be the first priority, because you know, when they got into power, what did they do?

First of all, before looking, my friend I'm sure — they didn't know a thing about his department. The first thing they did, they lowered the succession duty tax; they took it off and they lowered taxes, because that was a commitment. They did what they felt were certain commitments that they made during the campaign, and they forgot about others. And that is what we're arguing today, we're not saying, take all this money and put it in. We're not saying that. But we're saying that you shouldn't cut the hospital the way you are doing now and don't forget, my honourable friend did not want to wait for his estimate, he said he's got enough money and he told me in this House, Mr. Chairman, that if a hospital, for instance, like St. Boniface, didn't have enough money, needed more 6 percent, they would get it somewhere, but somewhere else from that same pot of hospital. That amount of money he said, wouldn't change, so they will have to get it from the Health Sciences Centre. I challenged the minister earlier, Mr. Chairman, I stated that probably only the Misericordia Hospital would not have a deficit of the city hospitals and in Brandon — I'm talking about the city here, Mr. Chairman.

So, this is the case that I'm trying to say, when this government is reducing — when the total amount is going down by \$20 million in one year, at least if they would spend the same amount of money. If they say, well all right, we need this money, we got to keep a cushion, but you would think that they would spend the same amount of money as they did in 1976-77. That would give them \$20 million more. Would that be that exorbitant, to say, "Okay, there will be a restraint, you won't go any higher, but spend the same amount of money." But they reduced it by \$20 million, Mr. Chairman.

So, that is the difficulty that we see. It's not necessarily the legal — none of us here stated that; I checked again with my honourable friend, we didn't state this at all, we said quite the opposite — that it was in the consolidated fund, they could spend it the way they wanted. But we felt that it wasn't right and because of the figures that I'm talking about today, when they reduce — they can say, "Okay, I'm going to keep part of this 96, but at least if they would have the same amount as they spent two years ago, it would make a little more sense, Mr. Chairman. Now, they're going to have \$96,000 more from the "feds", \$96 million, Mr. Chairman, that could pay for the deficit.

All right, but then let them not tell us how good managers they are; they just took money, robbed the money that was for health to pay something else or to reduce the taxes, and we say, Mr. Chairman, that the first priority was to see the need. This government, that froze everything about the construction, why didn't it freeze everything? Why did they not lower taxes until they found out what was needed in Manitoba? But they didn't do that, Mr. Chairman, they had a commitment to big business. They kept this commitment, but they didn't keep their commitment to the people that the health programs would not change, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in spite the lateness of the hour, I've been waiting for some time to bring up a rather important health matter with the minister, a matter that seems to be of very little importance, judging by the fact that it's not mentioned in the Estimates at all. When I asked the minister when we got to Page 48 or something, where was the appropriate matter to bring up the matter of hearing loss? He told me that we passed it on the previous page, yet no where under that appropriation is there any mention of hearing loss at all.

One reason that I bring it up at this time, is that I was contacted by a constituent some little time ago, who complained to me about the level of noise in the beverage room of a local hotel that he'd been in. He claimed that it was impossible to carry on a conversation when he was sitting there and wanted to know if anything could be done and just what the situation was of it. I suppose it would be easy to reply to him, that maybe he should have gone to a different place where they didn't have a loud rock band, with these very loud speakers in it, but he made the point, a very valid point that there are certain health standards, certain regulations for the health and the comfort of patrons in there, having to do with the decor and the seating and the sanitation arrangements. Yet, there did not appear to be any regulations governing the health of people's hearing. He went on to explain to me also, that he was recently retired from the armed forces with a hearing loss in one ear, and he was very sensitive that he should maintain the hearing that he had, and that it should not be put in jeopardy.

He told me that he had been in contact with the city, and with the Environment people, and made a few other phone calls, and couldn't find anyone that had the responsibility for setting standards as far as noise was concerned. I had to sympathize with him, Mr. Chairman, because, like many members of this Chamber, I suppose that they have to go to a number of socials, as I do, and whether it's a band or someone playing music from records or tapes, the noise level is invariably high, and it's always being put out at very loud volume by some very high-powered speakers.

I also wonder what sort of young people we are raising, when the only way they apparently can listen to rock music is at deafening volume. I've noticed from time to time speculation by various people that we will have a generation of deaf people by the time these teen-agers get into their thirties. However, I made a few enquiries following this phone call, Mr. Chairman, and I found a few rather interesting facts. First of all, the matter of hearing loss seems to be divided between the Department of Health and the Department of Labour. I'm very glad to see that the Minister of Labour is here, too. It always seems to be a problem when a matter falls under the jurisdiction of two different departments, it seems to get sloughed off by both of them.

I discovered also that, according to published reports, some 20 percent of the whole population suffer from some degree of hearing loss, and this is more than suffer from cancer, heart attack and stroke put together. Yet those are the glamour industries, there is a great deal of research and money spent on them, people suffering from them get the benefit from some very expensive, intensive care units. Yet when it comes to hearing loss, the matter seems to be down-graded in importance, and there seems very little money spent in research or screening or treatment in this area.

I found out another rather interesting fact, Mr. Chairman, and that was that hearing loss can be caused by many different causes; it might be congenital, it might be caused by disease, or by old age, but another important cause of loss of hearing is noise-induced loss of hearing. I was interested to learn that noise-induced hearing loss can be detected and differentiated from hearing loss by other causes, apparently in an audiogram or whatever the term is to check a person's hearing, there is a particular little notch in the curve which indicates that the hearing loss was most likely caused by noise level.

There appears to be no standards for noise levels within the province. The City of Winnipeg does have an anti-noise by-law which refers to external noise, noise that might be caused by construction work, or traffic, or a neighbour's lawnmower, but it does not seem to cover inside noises.

The Department of Labour appears to have some responsibility, or some involvement, as far as noise levels in the workplace are concerned, but I was really unable to find out how extensive this is, and indeed I was faced with something of a problem as to whether to raise this in the Health Estimates, or the Labour Estimates, or under the Attorney-General's department when we reached the Liquor Control Commission, but it would appear that it would be a health hazard, no matter whether it comes under the Department of Labour or Health, and I would expect to see that the Minister of Health would have the most involvement with it. I just had another thought occur to me too, that there is apparently some screening within the public schools for both hearing and vision loss, where the Minister of Education would appear to have some involvement, but we will ask those questions of him when we get to his Estimates.

So I would like to ask the Minister of Health if he has any figures, or if he can inform us as to the extent of the problem of hearing loss within the province. What is being done by his department in that regard, and what degree of that hearing loss is caused by excessive levels of noise? Does he have any figures as to what those danger levels of noise are, and for what length of time? Perhaps he can inform us as to whether any steps are being taken through his department to screen Manitobans for hearing loss, and specifically for noise-induced hearing loss. Perhaps he could answer those questions for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to also get a couple of answers too, and this is in regard to health inspection in respect to litter. My understanding of the situation in the City of Winnipeg is that the inner-city as such is inspected in respect to litter by city inspectors, but the perimeter, or what used to be the suburbs, is under the provincial inspection branch, and unfortunately my constituency generally falls into that particular area, and I find that constituents are phoning me up and not getting any satisfaction. They're sort of buffeted between the province and the city, back and forth. When they complain to the city about the litter in adjoining areas close to their homes, they're told it's a provincial matter and when they phone in respect to the Health Inspection Branch of the Province, they are informed that the litter problem is a city problem. So I would

like to get clarification from the Minister as to what areas are covered by the Provincial Health Department in respect to inspection in these particular areas, and where a citizen can go in order to get service when he's having a particular problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the Honourable the Member for St. Vital with respect to hearing problems, and hearing as a health problem and the hazards that exist in society today. My own department is expanding the hearing conservation program, as he probably knows. We're putting another unit into service in Dauphin, with two staff persons who are being redeployed into two vacant positions to serve the Parklands Region, and that will give us three services of that kind, one in Brandon, one in Thompson, and one in Dauphin.

In addition to that, I think he's aware of a new program introduced under the Health Services Commission this year to provide hearing aids to children under 18 years of age. The general problem that he refers to is best dealt with under the Workplace Safety and Health legislation, which primarily is the responsibility, as he suggested, of my colleague, the Honourable the Minister of Labour. My department, though, and the Medical Public Health Service, and the Hearing Services Branch of that service, are very anxious to work with the Director of Workplace Safety and Health in tackling some of the problems, commercial and industrial, that the honourable member has referred to. I think that he can expect to see, and look forward to seeing, mutual initiatives taken by our own Hearing Services and Hearing Conservation people, and the Directorate and staff responsible for Workplace Safety and Health to get a solution to the problems that he's identified.

If he has specific problems relative to individual sites that have not been attended to up to this point in time, he could either check with the Workplace Safety and Health directorate, or with the Health Sciences Centre, where there is a centre for particular problems of this kind. I can't give him precise figures on hearing loss in the province, but through the screening process that is carried out for our department in the school system, the results indicate that some 13 percent of children so screened are referred for further assessment. They will go through the initial assessment process and something is detected that makes it desirable for them to have a further assessment, and some 7 percent require medication or medical treatment, or surgery, to correct their hearing deficiency.

The Hearing Conservation Program expansion that I've referred to helps to identify this serious problem in young children, and prevent the incapacity for them that results from hearing impairment, and usually has a very harmful effect on their schooling, their education, and their learning process. So it is a program that I am interested in, we are interested in expanding as rapidly as we can.

The question raised by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, I think I would have to refer to my colleague, the Minister responsible for Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. My department does not have responsibility in the field of litter and littering problems. The member has correctly pointed out that the City of Winnipeg is responsible in the inner-city. In the outer-ring or suburban area, the responsibility lies with the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the Honourable Minister for the information that he has given me. I'm a little alarmed to hear that some 13 percent of school children are referred because of some hearing loss or hearing impairment. It would suggest that my figure of 20 percent for the population at large would be low. If the figure is 13 percent for children, what happens with older people, people who have been exposed to noise or industrial noise pollution for some time — this surely must push the figure up to a very considerable extent.

The part I was really concerned about was noise-induced hearing loss. The Minister was a little bit vague as to whether his department was undertaking any research in this regard, whether they had any figures. Are there, in fact, any recognized standards for safe noise levels? Are there, in fact, any regulations, in fact, in this or any other province in Canada?

We have heard from one of my colleagues about the problems of lead poisoning and the fact that what were acceptable standards just two and three and four years ago are no longer acceptable, and that the danger level has been reduced quite considerably.

I'm a little concerned that we might be looking at some rather old noise level standards, if in fact there are any. Does the Minister have any further remarks on this matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, my department is, in fact, carrying out some industrial screening in this area, on this problem, in Brandon, and it's more in the nature of an individual test project, or pilot project. We're not carrying out any research that I can report on, Mr. Chairman. As I say, we have had discussions already with the Workplace, Safety and Health directorate and are confident we are going to be able to work with them in the field. But, in terms of what it is the Member for St. Vital is talking about precisely, I think that I would have to refer him to the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management, and my colleague, the Minister of that department, as I have done in the case of the question raised by the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

There is work done by that department to measure noise levels; that kind of thing is conducted by the environmental laboratory, and I think noise levels are measured and identified, but I cannot assure him that specific standards or regulations or limitations for noise levels in industry have been set yet. I would have to refer him to that department. No doubt it's something he would want to pursue with that particular Minister as a worthwhile objective for health in industry in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass; (a)—pass; Resolution No. 62—pass. That completes the Department of Health and Community Services. Committee rise.