



Third Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

28 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVII No. 31B

8:00 P.M. Monday, April 2, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 2, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

BILL NO. 26 — THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1979

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the dinner hour, we were discussing some of the economic trends as shown by the most current statistics in the province of Manitoba. The reason we were doing that, Mr. Speaker, was to show that this government — that the Progressive Conservative government — in its first full year, the year of 1978, has failed dismally as a government. They have failed on every front.

The last statement we went over, Mr. Speaker, was the increase in the unemployment rate. As I said earlier, there has been a 10 percent increase; 1978 unemployment percentage rate over 1977, the highest in Canada — one more failure. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the number of jobs available or the vacant number, for every 100 people unemployed, went down from 7 to 6. It would stand to reason that when you have a higher unemployment rate, you also have less vacancies available for the unemployed; but it is just another example of how this government has failed.

I was having dinner two nights ago, over the weekend, with an employee of the Potash Corporation in Saskatchewan, and that Corporation was having an article done about it by a business magazine or a magazine firm in the province of Manitoba, that does articles on businesses, corporations, construction, etc., and I was talking to the young woman who was doing the article, and I said to her, "How are things? You have a lot to do with the business people in the province, you're talking to them on a day-to-day basis, how are things going?" And she told me, Well, "Mr. Speaker, they're going well in Alberta, and they're going well in Saskatchewan, but it's the pits in Manitoba." The business climate in Manitoba is the worst that she has seen it in her tenure as a writer for that magazine; and that is a fact. I don't think it can be denied.

The construction industry, itself, if we look back on the last year and we see the high levels of unemployment in the construction industry, where you have close to one-third or over one-third even of your skilled trades people unemployed, you have to admit that things are not all well in the construction industry. And when you have a strike that lasts — the magnitude and the length of that strike — that is of the magnitude and lasts the length of that strike, then you also have to admit that something is amiss in the construction industry.

Talking about strikes, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a subject that should capture our attention for a few moments. In 1977, the increase in strikes in 1978 over 1977, was 1,000 percent, excuse me, I'd better rephrase that; the number of days lost due to strikes and lock-outs, was over a 1,000 percent increase in 1978 over 1977, and that was . . . —(Interjection)— . . . the Member for Pembina asks about Wage and Price Controls.

Well, I can only suggest to the Member for Pembina that our leader will be discussing this at some length tomorrow, and I suggest that he listen, because the record for Manitoba has not only deteriorated internally, Mr. Speaker, but it has deteriorated far more in respect to the records of other provinces. We have had far more strikes, workdays lost due to strikes and lockouts as a percentage than the other provinces that our past record would indicate. So this was a government that told us they were going to come in, and they were going to create a climate, and they were going to create the economic environment where we would have mutual agreement and trust between the working people and the employers; they would have a much better record when it came to work days lost due to strikes and lockouts, and just the adverse has happened, Mr. Speaker. There are far more days lost on a percentage basis through strikes and lockouts. And it's partly — although not entirely — but it's partly due to the economic philosophy and economic strategy of the government across this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the average worker in Manitoba in 1978, experienced a real loss in wages of almost 3 percent. That's an annual loss, roughly — and we're speaking in rough terms — of \$336 for every worker in the province over the last year; that's the first full year of the Conservative Government. And they can't deny these facts, and they can't deny these figures, because they are

very real and they are very accurate. Rising prices — the increase, 8.5 percent which is a 5 percent increase over 1977, but 8.5 percent in 1978 — must assume some responsibility for the decline in workers' purchasing power. But we also have to look at the decline in the average weekly wages as a percentage basis, 1978 over 1977.

When we talk about unemployment, Mr. Speaker, we cannot talk about it in isolation. We have to talk about it in respect to the other movements of labour within the labour market. In 1977, Mr. Speaker, there were 2,753 more Manitobans leaving the province than were entering it, and we're talking about that favourite subject of the First Minister's now, about migration. In 1978, the first full year of the Conservative Government, this figure more than tripled to 9,162. If 50 percent of those additional 6,409 net immigrants would have been looking for work in Manitoba, we wouldn't have had that 5.6 percent unemployment rate; we would have had a 6.3 percent unemployment rate, which is probably a truer picture of the unemployment picture than just looking at the unemployment rate alone, Mr. Speaker.

I mentioned previously, that this reporter I was talking to mentioned that the business climate in Manitoba was on the decline since this new government. I mentioned that, Mr. Speaker, to point out that that was the one thing that the Tories came in and promised us, that business would boom, that we would have an increase, that it would be better for the business people in the Province of Manitoba when they took over the government. And it has not. They had told . . . and we knew this was going to happen, we knew, Mr. Speaker, that they were going to attack the workers because historically they have always attacked the workers. We knew that they were not going to give minimum wage increases to the minimum wage earners, because historically they have always held back on that. They have governed for their friends; the privileged few. We knew that was going to happen and the voters of Manitoba knew that was going to happen if they had any sense about them, and I believe they do.

But they said: "Business is on the downswing now. The economy is on the downswing. We have to elect another government. We're willing to suffer with those abuses of the workforce, to elect a government that promises they are going to do something about the economy." They promised us an upswing, and they didn't even give us that, Mr. Speaker. They didn't even give the voters of this province that. The economy has declined by every known indicator. Mr. Speaker, we talked about the minimum wage earners on a regular basis in this House, and I think when we talk about the minimum wage earners we also have to talk about the low wage earners, the people who are not making a living wage. Whenever this subject comes up, I hear members opposite say, "Oh but how many of those people are really sole supporters of families. How many of those people are responsible for bringing home the bread for their family?"

Mr. Speaker, statistics tell us and studies tell us, the government tells us as a matter of fact, that there are 30 to 40 thousand minimum wage earners in the Province of Manitoba. Studies and other statistics show us that approximately 25 to 33 percent of those are going to be sole supporters of families. So let's take the lower figure, 25 percent. That means that there are 10,000 people, Mr. Speaker, trying to support a family on minimum wage earnings and they can't do it.

There was an interesting article in the paper just this weekend and it talked about how people were reacting to the food price increases which have been increasing astronomically for the past year, Mr. Speaker. The poor people said, well we're going to eat less meat, we're going to have a less nutritional diet, we're going to cut back, we're going to suffer, is what they were saying in actuality. The member says, "Ah come on", well I suggest the member should go out there on \$2.95 per hour and try to support his family as 10,000 other Manitobans are doing and he would not sit back in this comfortable plush chair and say, "Ah come on" because they are suffering and they know they're suffering and you should know they're suffering and you do know they're suffering and you refuse as a government to do anything about it. You sit on your hands, and you say, "Ah come on, Member for Churchill you don't mean that." I do mean that and they mean it and they're going to tell you how much they mean it in the next election. —(Interjection)— 10,000 I told you and if you don't believe me, you prove me wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he address his remarks to the Chair. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I will address my remarks to the Chair if the other members in the Chamber would be so kind as to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, there is a problem with the minimum wage situation in the Province of Manitoba and that government refuses to do anything about it. —(Interjection)— The poor said we are going to suffer, we are not going to have the vegetables and meat and I'm not going to go through the whole list again, but do you know what the rich said, because they did a survey and they talked to the more well to do. They said, "we like steak so we're going to have steak no matter what

steak cost." That's what they said. It's going to cost us more money but we have more money, we have more money. So that's how they treat the minimum wage earners, Mr. Speaker. That's how they treat the powerless because that's what we're talking about.

We're talking about a group that does not have the bargaining power that the other groups in the province do. And they rely upon the good will and they rely upon the sincerity and they rely upon the good sense of the government and they are relying upon the wrong government when they rely on that government for those three things, Mr. Speaker. So we talk about the minimum wage earners, we talk about the unemployed —(Interjection)— Again they beat their breasts and pop their chests and say thousands of more jobs. We always have to come back to their reality, to the truth, Mr. Speaker, 4,000 more unemployed this year than last year.

We see what they have done in regard to the needs of the senior citizens and I'm not going to go into great detail tonight because I feel it has been covered appropriately by my colleagues. We see the reaction to the people that come to them in need of decent housing. We see the reaction they have to the students; we see the reaction they have to people needing medical care. Arrogance, callous, cruel, uncaring and a whole list of adjectives that I don't care to go on into in these Chambers. What do we see happening, Mr. Speaker? Because they are putting the economic squeeze on the people in Manitoba — that's what they are doing; they are grabbing them and squeezing till it hurts. —(Interjection)— My team mates, the member for Wolseley says.

Mr. Speaker, it's a physical reality that when you squeeze something hard enough and long enough, something has to give, something has to burst, something has to break out, because you are putting pressures on people that they cannot stand and we've seen it in Easterville — we have seen it in Easterville over the past number of weeks, and we have seen it in this press release that I read earlier from the MMF and MIB and the MFL, saying that they are concerned that unless this government does something, unless this government gets off its hands and lives up to its commitment to govern, not on an ad hoc basis, but on a systematic organized approach, then there are going to be more protests and more civil disobedience, and that is the type of climate that they are creating. That is the Manitoba that they are leaving us, that is the legacy that they are creating. —(Interjection)— You know, the Member for St. James is yelling across their gut reaction — it used to be one about the hydro bill, but the gut reaction now is, "Spend more taxpayers' money, spend more taxpayers' money." They are spending more taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker, they are spending more money — the budget is up — they are spending more money than they did the year before and last year they spent more money than they did the year before that, and we are getting less.

A MEMBER: But it's not enough.

MR. COWAN: We are getting less. It's not being spent efficiently and effectively, that's the problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. COWAN: Talk about throwing money . . . have problems.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. Order please. Let's have one speaker at a time. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you for your kindness, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the fact is they are spending more money; and the fact is that the citizens of Manitoba are getting less for that money. And they are doing it and they are talking and throwing around the buzz word, "restraint, restraint, restrain fiscal prudence." It's not happening, Mr. Speaker, they are changing, altering the society, the formation of society, they are prioritizing for their friends. That's where that money is going, Mr. Speaker, and their friends aren't the working people in this province and their friends aren't the general public of this province. Their friends sit across in the Great-West Life Building and other buildings such as the . . . It is a disaster, an unmitigated and an undeniable disaster what has happened in northern Manitoba since this government has come to power.

And the Member for St. Boniface says in southern, in east and west, for certain it's a disaster throughout the province, but especially in northern Manitoba. And you know, Mr. Speaker, it hurts all that much more in northern Manitoba, because they're not hurting Inco, they're not hurting Sherritt-Gordon, they're not hurting the wealthy, the well-to-do. They're hurting the native people. —(Interjection)— They're hurting the native people, who have showed them in every instance, they've showed them that they are being hurt by the policies of this government, and there's no denying it. There is no denying it whatsoever. And I don't even know why they would attempt, or why they

would try, because it's a futile effort on their part. The native people know they're being hurt; we know they're being hurt and the public know they're being hurt. And they won't stand . . .

A MEMBER: It's federal policy.

MR. COWAN: It's federal policy. The member says it's federal policy. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was not the impression of the previous government, although there is federal jurisdiction involved in this regard. There is . . .

A MEMBER: We didn't change it.

MR. COWAN: Didn't change it? Mr. Speaker, there will be time and time again to discuss what this government didn't or did change. . . But I'm looking at the Minister of Education and he can tell me if he so desires that they didn't change the policy in the Department of Education in regard to native people. He can tell the native people about the cutbacks that are happening right now also, Mr. Speaker, and he can assure them that nothing's changed. But they know better; I know better and the public knows better. That's the important thing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, they say they are saving the citizens of Manitoba money. That's their whole reason for being. That's their whole reason for existence. They are saving them . . . they're spending more money. I don't know how they're doing it, it's beyond me, but perhaps they can explain it. They are spending more money, but they are saving the people of the Province more money at the same time. They aren't saving them any money. That money is being spent in different ways — far less productive ways — and far more costly ways.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the rise in unemployment costs in northern Manitoba, and they're astronomical. We see percentages to 100 percent, 150 percent increase in UIC payouts. They may say it's federal money; I expect to hear it. I don't know why they haven't said it yet. But the fact is, it's taxpayers' money.

The welfare payouts, Mr. Speaker, are increasing astronomically in Thompson region, yet we're seeing a population loss at the same time. They're driving people out, and they're forcing the province, the people of this province, to pay more money to support the people who are there, because they refuse to take a grip, they refuse to get a grip, they refuse to take a handle on the economy of this province.

They're scared by Inco, by Sherritt-Gordon Mines — they quit. They say if we do anything we'll drive them out of the province. That's what they say, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Exactly. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting, but the nickel in Sudbury and Thompson is the cheapest nickel in the world to produce. And Inco is going to produce it — unless there are mitigating circumstances. And this government says, if we do anything offensive to Inco, or if we try to protect the interests of the working people of this province over the interests of Inco, Inco is going to leave. You know, Carter, I believe it is — and I may be wrong in the name, I may stand corrected, but let us just say that it was a senior level executive at the presidency or vice-presidency level of Inco — in an interview in Forbes after, I think it was October 1st issue, said you know why we didn't pull back in Guatemala and Indonesia, why we didn't curtail operations, why we didn't cut back there and lay people off? Because the governments of Guatemala and Indonesia wouldn't let us. They wouldn't take kindly to that sort of activity. So they did it where the governments would let them. They did it where the governments would take kindly — where they knew they had no problems with that sort of treatment of the working people.

And now, we are paying for it as citizens, Mr. Speaker. And we will pay for it far into the future, because the climate, the legacy, the environment they are creating will be a disaster for years to come. And it will take us a number of years in the next couple of years to straighten it out the way it should be straightened out.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could indicate to me how much time I have left on this.

MR. SPEAKER: Ten minutes.

MR. COWAN: Ten minutes, Mr. Speaker, well not enough time to go into detail, but I think we should talk about them, Mr. Speaker. I think we should talk about them. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to all honourable members that there is a time for members to speak if they so desire. After they by the are recognized by the Chair. Those that have been recognized Chair, I hope you would extend to them the courtesy of listening to their remarks. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Nearly a year ago, approximately a year ago, we found out — and when we found out, Mr. Speaker, one of the first things we did was tell the government, the then Minister of Labour — that there was a problem in the lead-using industries in the province of Manitoba, that there was a major problem. At the time, I have to admit, we didn't know how extensive the problem was, and I have to admit that even today we don't know how extensive the problem is. But we did know there was a problem. So we prodded and we probed and we tried to encourage them to take some positive action, to do something positive about the problem, at least to define what the parameters of the problem were. At least to find out what sort of effect these hazardous levels of lead were having on the workers in this province. To find out how many workers were involved. As a matter of fact, I recall writing a very detailed letter to the then Minister of Labour, outlining what I myself and the unions involved thought might be appropriate definitions of activity for a Royal Commission.

The answer from the Minister of Labour was, "Thank you for your concern in the lead situation in the province of Manitoba", and I'm paraphrasing. She said, and I'm paraphrasing, Mr. Speaker, "Don't worry about it too much, because the Workplace, Safety and Health Division is taking care of it". This is the same Workplace, Safety and Health Division that they have, if not cut back, at least restricted. At least restricted. Yes, I'm speaking of lead to the former Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, we then had to have the government table a report on the lead conditions at one secondary smelter in the Manitoba area. And we found out that lead levels were exceeding the permissible exposure levels by 59 times. Not 59 percent, but 59 times.

We were told after that not to worry about it, because the Workplace, Safety and Health Division was going to take care of it. And I don't want my remarks to be taken as any sort of criticism of the people and the employees of the Workplace, Safety and Health Division, because I think they're doing the best job that they can do, given the commitment to the Act that this government has displayed. But they refuse to do anything about it.

In the first two months of this year, we found that there were 14 or 15 persons that had to be booked off work because they were lead poisoned, and I don't care to quibble with the Minister of Labour, who is not a medical authority and who does not have much of a medical authority to back him up on this. I don't mean to quibble with him, but over .08 milligrams per 100 grams of whole blood, is considered to be a level at which the worker is exposed to hazardous levels of lead in the blood, is a level at which — to use common terminology — the worker is leaded, which is the level — to use even more common terminology — the worker has lead poisoning. And they still, and they still did not act, Mr. Speaker, so we pressed some more, and we pressed some more.

And it's interesting that this government takes the path of least resistance all the time. It will go here if you press here; and then if you press a little bit that way, it will go back that way, and press again, it will go back that way. You know, it's a government of the path of least resistance. You know, a river that takes the path of least resistance, is known as a crooked river, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— I don't know what a politician who takes the path of least resistance would be called, but I do know that it will be an ineffective government and an ineffective politician. A government and a politician that rule on an ad hoc basis.

Mr. Speaker, we found, around that time, that the government had come up with their so-called lead control program which the Minister assured us had been put together by the companies and the unions and the workers alike, and was unanimously accepted — he kept assuring us that it was unanimously accepted — and yet I kept getting mail, I kept getting letters in my mailbox that said: "This is from CAIMAW; this is from the Motors and Allied Workers; this is from the United Steelworkers of America; this is from the Manitoba Federation of Labour", and they all said the same thing, Mr. Speaker. They said: "We don't like the program. We don't like the program and we want a royal commission". That's what the workers were telling that government and yet, they were coming in here and trying to tell us an entirely different story, Mr. Speaker. And if we did not have the evidence to disprove what they were saying, then the public would have believed them. I wonder how many other examples such as that are happening, where we don't have the evidence to disprove them, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, they are going ahead with their so-called lead control program. And to use the terms of the unions: it's weak, it's ineffective and it won't work, but they are moving. In the long run, Mr. Speaker, they will find that they need a royal commission. They will come to that realization in time, and nothing is to stop them, Mr. Speaker, from implementing an ad hoc program during the time that a royal commission is doing its work. Nothing is to stop them from doing that. That's a phony excuse if I ever heard one. But they will find that they will need it and we will have it, and we will find out exactly what the problems are in the lead using industry in this province, because they are far more widespread than we expected to begin with and than we can find at this time.

Mr. Speaker, government as a whole, should act in the best interests of the greatest number, and that to me — it may sound simplistic to you, but that to me is probably a good axiom for a government to work on, that they should work in the best interests of the greatest number.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately for the people of Manitoba, this government and Progressive Conservatives at any level — federal, provincial, and historically progressive conservatives — have always considered the greatest number, Mr. Speaker, to be Number One.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I was not motivated to speak this evening until I —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I know that you have difficulty as I do, attending to the affairs of this House and concerning yourself with the affairs of the House when friends opposite make so much noise and cause such an obstreperous disturbance during the course of our proceedings and it's for that very reason that I am motivated to rise to speak.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of my honourable friend for Churchill's remarks, several members opposite, most particularly the Member for St. James, and the Member for Pembina — presumably in order to . . . my friend in order to put him off his presentation — continued to make remarks which, frankly, I found most distasteful; they were remarks that were directed at my honourable friend's national origin. This, Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention because I think that such remarks go beyond the bounds of propriety, are not within the accepted limits or latitude of "heckling". I think that they are extremely distasteful and I don't think they are in keeping with the character of our House.

MR. MINAKER: If you're sensitive to Canadian feeling, that's your problem.

MR. CORRIN: Well, the Honourable Member for St. James suggests that I have a problem if I am sensitive to Canadian feelings. Mr. Speaker, it is true that I am sensitive to Canadian feelings because, we in this country, as the Member for St. James perhaps should learn, are representative of many backgrounds, many national origins, many religious persuasions. We are indeed a mosaic, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, on this side, I might add, we have members who were born in Poland; we have members who were born in Great Britain; my predecessor in Wellington was born in the United States, Reverend Philip Petursson. For that matter a very honourable member in our Party, Mr. Stanley Knowles, was born in Los Angeles—(Interjection)— My friend from Pembina says that's his problem. I would suggest to my honourable friend that he should consider before he makes such an outlandish remark, he should consider the record of those men and compare his own record to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's incumbent on you because I know that this catcalling, this heckling does not pass unnoticed by you. I feel that it's incumbent on you to draw the line, and I would ask, because this has occurred on several occasions, this was not the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that it is highly improper for any member of the Chamber to give instructions to the Speaker. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't presuming to give you instruction. What I rather was doing was asking for your intercession and intervention. Mr. Speaker, I note that it is not my responsibility to call these matters to your attention, but I feel that when they have reached an inordinate point, when the extent of the interference has reached a point where it has become offensive to many members of the House, I feel that it's necessary that somebody rise in order to apprise of the member's feelings, and I think this is such an occasion, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know whether my honourable friend was intending that last remark that he made, he was referring to me as a Fascist, I certainly might add that I find that distasteful as well. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I might say that perhaps that sort of demeanour does indeed characterize members opposite; perhaps it does represent in no small measure — no small way — the character of that government. Perhaps that sort of callous indifference to the nature of our peoples, that sort of callous insensitivity to the right of free speech; to the right of equal representation; perhaps that sort of callous indifference will play a telling role in the history of this government; and perhaps that government's history will be very short indeed, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Question before the House is the Motion for second reading of Bill No. 26, on the Motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Opposition. on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering whether it is the intention of the government to proceed with Committee on the third reading of this bill?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister Responsible for MHRC, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the following bill for third reading, Bill No. 26, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1980.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bill No. 26, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE — INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats, (Radisson): Bill No. 26, Item 1.—pass; Item 2.—pass; Item 3.—pass; 4.—pass; 5.—pass; 6.(a)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)—pass; (d)—pass; 6.—pass; 7.—pass; 8.—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass; Bill be reported.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READING — INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System that Bill No. 26, be now read a third time and do pass.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephones, that the first report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House received by the Assembly on March 22, 1979 be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration and thence to the House for concurrence.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to go through the report paragraph by paragraph? Page by page? Line by line?

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I was requested by one of the members of the opposition with regard to Rule 21(3), which is on the first page, right down at the bottom, "where business other than

the motion on the Order Paper is under consideration when the House adjourns for the day, that business is terminated when the House adjourns for the day and shall not be continued at the next or any subsequent sitting of the House."

Now, my reply to him was that this was to ensure that a motion of grievance, which we had dealt with in the past and permitted a member who was speaking at 4:30 to speak the next day, that this was not intended and the rules were intended to clarify it. But I now see that the grievance motion is 21(4), and I wonder if the House Leader can recall to the House what 21(3) was intended to deal with. It was intended to deal with that type of question, but I just want to have specifically mentioned what 21(3) was intended to deal with. I gather it may be an urgency motion. I can't remember the kinds of motions that would fall under that rule, because when I answered the honourable member from our side, who asked me, I related it to the grievance motion which is 21(4).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that 21(3) deals with emergency debates that may be precipitated during the course of the day and have not been concluded at the end of the day. Rule 21(4) deals with the grievance motions. There are, Mr. Chairman, two separate occasions when this could occur, and the motion is intended to deal with both of them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder how that would work in practice then, if an urgency motion was introduced and was not terminated by 10:00 in the evening, people were still debating it. Would it mean that it would have to be reintroduced? Because if I have been lax in letting this occur, then I regret having to raise it now, but I did not believe that it would affect a motion that was in the course of being debated and where debate had not been completed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: The intention is that at the end of the day that whatever debate coming under either of those rules that had been initiated, would be concluded whether it be an emergency debate or whether it be a debate on a grievance. The intention is that they will be concluded, both of them, at the end of the day's sitting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the first page, Clause 1—pass; Subrule 21(3)(2)— pass . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, just because it was raised and I gave an incorrect answer, I wonder if we can leave 21(3) to be dealt with, deal with the rest of the report and come back out of committee and then deal with 21(3) by going into committee tomorrow, just because I did give an answer to a member who was interested, which was not correct, and I want to at least clear it with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader, is that acceptable?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, that's satisfactory with me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 2.21(4)—pass; Subrule 22(4), Clause 3—pass; Subrule 22(5), Clause 4—pass; Rule 29(1), Clause 5; 29(1)—pass; Subrule 35(5), Clause 6, 35(5)—pass; Subrule 49(1), Clause 7—pass; Subrule 64(3), Clause 8—pass; Rule 73(1), Clause 9.73(1)—pass; Rule 94, Clause 10—pass; Subrule 105(1), Clause 11—pass; Subrule 105(2), Clause 12—pass; Subrule 106(1), Clause 13—pass; Subrule 106(2), Clause 14—pass; balance of the page—pass.

We have returned to Subrule 21(3), Clause 2. 21(3) — the Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm suggesting that committee rise. We have adopted the report with the exception of one clause and we will deal with that clause by going into committee tomorrow. The reason that I ask for that indulgence from my honourable friend is that I did tell one of our members that 21(3) meant something which it did not mean and I would like it explained before it is passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: I agreed that that course of action was agreeable to me, so we have passed all of the report with the exception of that one clause and we can come back to that tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: I move, seconded by the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephones that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, because of the pending arrival of His Honour, that we only go into one committee for the time being.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 48 in the Main Estimates, the Department of Health and Community Services; Resolution No. 64, Social Services and Community Health, Clause (j) Dental Services, (1) Salaries—pass, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House, in last year's Estimates an amount requested was \$1,223.3 million — what amount, and I assume the figure shown here is simply an adjustment for the general salary increase, was that spent, was it underspent, could he give us an accounting on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the total amount in salaries expended for 1978-79 was \$1,265.2 million so that . . . —(Interjection)— yes, that is actually spent \$1,265.2 million. On Other Expenditures the total for 1978-79 is \$1,180.6 million. —(Interjection)— No.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Before we start the debating in this item, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister certain questions, I think, that might be helpful to the Committee.

I'd like to know how many divisions had the program before the Dental Association got involved, how many new ones if any, or extra ones are now covered, how many school divisions are being serviced by the government program, and how many by the Dental Association, how many years are covered in both programs, the total list of those that are eligible, the percentage of utilization, the average cost per child for each program and the percentage of those that figure on the utilization? Out of that percentage how many have all their work finished. The standards of the program, of both programs if there's any change, the evaluation of the government program, the other one I guess wouldn't have any evaluation it's just starting? What data is being kept by the government and the Dental Association? Is there a free choice, the division between the two programs or are they told where to go, what program? Those that have started with the government were they asked

if they wanted to have the program changed, administered by the Dental Association or do they prefer to remain with the government program?

I'd like to know, under the new program, if the children have to travel and what is the maximum mileage that they have to cover, and while discussing the standard, I'd like the Minister to tell us if the element of education and prevention is still as important as it was before? If we can get some of these answers, Mr. Chairman, we can go from there.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the program as a provincial program was in twenty school divisions and the 1978-79 school year, the school year that we're in at the present time, saw the introduction of the Manitoba Dental Association into the program in nine divisions, 8-2/3 to be exact. Excuse me, let me correct my opening statement. The program was in 29 divisions, I said 20. The program was in 29 school divisions. In the school year that we're now in, the Manitoba Dental Association was introduced into the program in 8-2/3 of those divisions. The two thirds comes about by virtue of the fact that in one division we are in two schools, but the provincial program is still operating in the third of three schools in that division. There is a 30th division that is the site of a pilot project, that's Turtle Mountain, which is separate and distinct from the 29 to which I've referred insofar as the actual mechanics of billing and procedures related to billing are carried out in a different way in that Turtle Mountain pilot project than they are in the other 29 2/3 divisions.

The questions that the honourable member raises about the aspect of prevention and the emphasis on prevention, I would answer by saying, Mr. Chairman, that there's no change in terms of the approach that we want to take through the program for proper dental care at an early age for prevention of dental disease, that our dental nurses and our public health nurses still pursue the Rinse program that was introduced and is designed to meet the preventive requirements among children of early school age. The main difference in the program as it operates at the present time, from the program that we inherited, is of course the fact that the Manitoba Dental Association now is responsible for operating the program in approximately nine of those divisions, 8 2/3, as I said. Those nine divisions are Lord Selkirk, Agassiz, Hanover, Interlake, Dauphin-Ochre River, Swan Valley, Intermountain, The Pas and Flin Flon, and it's in The Pas .. where we operate on a split basis, two-thirds MDA and one-third government. The total number of children in 1978-79 eligible for care was 9,400, Mr. Chairman. Of these approximately 7,780 for 83 percent of those eligible were enrolled by the parents. The age group serviced and covered by the program has been expanded —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon?

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister is giving me everything together. I want it broken down now that I have the work that is being done by the two programs because you have two programs going on now and I'd like to have that broken down.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the number of children eligible, as I say, is 9,400. That's right, in the last school year. This school year because of the expansion in age groups we're looking at a total program reach of 15,500 under the Dental Health Services Program and 7,050 eligible under the Manitoba Dental Association Program. —(Interjection)— No that's for the other 20. The government program in the school year 1978-79 should reach an eligible 15,500 children, that is the number of children eligible in those 20 divisions being served by the government program. The number of children eligible in the nine and two-thirds divisions served by the Manitoba Dental Association, that includes the pilot project in Turtle Mountain, is 7,050.

The projections for 1979-80, because of additional groups are, for the government program, the number of children eligible 19,185, and for the Manitoba Dental Association program, the number of children eligible 9,900. So the 9,400 to which I've referred was the number of children eligible for the last school year, that was 1977-78 that ended last June and then this past fall we introduced the Manitoba Dental Association into the program. —(Interjection)— That's right, that's the 15 and 7.

In the Dental Health Services program 1977-78, which was the last school year, not this school year, but the last school year, there were two age groups added and those were the children born in 1970 and 1971. There were none, of course, in the Manitoba Dental Association Plan because it wasn't in existence. But this school year, 1978-79, the government program is expanded to embrace five age groups, children born in 1969-70, 1971-72 and 73, and the Manitoba Dental Association covers three age groups, children born in 1970-71 and 72. Complicating it further is the fact that the pilot project in Turtle Mountain covers two age groups, children born in 1972-73. The projection for 1979-80, the year that we're coming into will see one year added to each of those classifications so that in the government program we'll be covering children born in the years 1968 to 1973 inclusive. In the Manitoba Dental Association Program we'll be covering children born

in the years 1970 to 1973 inclusive and in the north, we will be covering children born in the years 1970 to 1972 inclusive.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister gave us the utilization rates for two years ago but what about this present year, the 15,500 on one side, and 7,050. What is the utilization rate there, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just give me one second here, looking at the program overall, the number of children and the number enrolled and examined and treated — the utilization rate up to this point in time overall in the program is 80 percent. I don't know that I can give him a breakdown at this juncture. I'll get him one, but I don't know that I can give him a breakdown at this juncture for the utilization as between government and private plan. The overall utilization is 80 percent across the 29, actually 30 divisions.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to be cute. There's no doubt that I want this broken down. I think the Minister can give me that — I don't say tonight. You had a program that was going quite well; you introduce another program — I want to see the comparison between the two, and I want to be able to see what the utilization, the true utilization rate is. I understand the Minister's staff isn't here today, but this is something that I would like to have before we pass this item, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister indicate that this will be . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can certainly obtain that. I don't have those figures broken down in front of me, but I will get that information.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I wanted to know what the average cost per child was, what it is in the first year, what it is in this current year, if he has any figure on what is anticipated; and again, I want the two programs separately. I want to know what are the standards in the program? Are there increased standards in the Dental Association Program? I wanted to know if there's any new divisions this year, and where they will go, in which program? I want the Minister to tell us how the evaluation is being made, is being compared and I wanted to know which data is collected; and I wanted to know also if there was a choice — if the division had a choice, do they have a say into which program that they can enter? And then I also ask the Minister if the children in this new program had to travel and how many miles did they have to travel and was that covered in the plan.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, as far as the average cost is concerned, in the government program in 1977-78 the average operating cost per child eligible was \$143.00. That included, Sir, the cost of public health preventive services. It was \$143.00. For 1978-79 I can't give him the average cost per child eligible at the moment because the school year is obviously not ended yet, but in terms of the Manitoba Dental Association Program, both in Turtle Mountain and in the new divisions where the MDA is supervising the program, the arrangement with the Dental Association is \$105, operating cost per new child eligible, and \$80 for children who have previously been treated in the program.

Turtle Mountain is an exception to those other 8-2/3 divisions; the price in Turtle Mountain is \$125 per child for this pilot project year — \$125.00. But in the other divisions where the MDA is operating it's \$105 per new child and \$80 per child previously treated.

The former Minister, the Member for St. Boniface, asked me about standards and the standards, Sir, are the same standards as were in effect before, except that the Manitoba Dental Association in those divisions in which it is operating is responsible for running a computer check on the utilization.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will interrupt proceedings for Royal Assent.

IN SESSION

ROYAL ASSENT

The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed The Honourable the Administrator in the following words:

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach The Honourable the Administrator with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for The Honourable the Administrator the acceptance of this Bill:

Bill No. 26, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1980.

MR. CLERK: The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to this Bill in Her Majesty's name. *His Honour was then pleased to retire.*

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson, will you please resume the Chair in the Committee of Supply?

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - TOURISM AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger: Committee come to order. I'd like to refer the Members of the Committee to Page 78, Resolution 107: 3. Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources. 3(a)(1) Cultural Grants \$3,633,600 — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there's several grants that I wanted to question the minister on. One day she rose in the Legislature and commended the Treble Teens of Steinbach on their accomplishment in being selected to represent Canada at the World Youth Festival in Vienna, and you know, I think all of us were very much impressed with their achievement and certainly commended them on their accomplishment. Nevertheless, I was somewhat surprised later when I learned that the honour included a bill for \$60,000, that apparently it would require that amount of money to send them there. So I realize that the minister sent along her good wishes, as did we all, but I was wondering whether she was also intending to send along any financial support or whether the Treble Teens must raise all of their own funding or whether there is any federal funds available for their . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: I believe for the Member for Elmwood that the \$60,000 represents a total expense that they are going to have, and that they will be doing some fund raising and getting from a number of sources. I haven't been approached for any definite amount from them, but I know there's quite a number of sources they will be drawing from.

MR. DOERN: I gather that although the minister could be confronted with a request and may respond to that request, she hasn't and that she also hasn't offered any funds to the group.

MRS. PRICE: Not at this point.

MR. DOERN: I would then like to ask the minister if we could briefly discuss the Festival du Voyageur, if she could confirm the Provincial Government's funding. I gather it's about \$15,000 a year and this amounts to about 3 percent of their budget. Could she explain what the provincial funding was in the last fiscal year for the Festival?

MRS. PRICE: The usual \$15,000.00.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister sort of explain her comment again today. I asked her in the House whether she was planning to meet with the Directors and whether she was planning to enrich the

amount of funding for the Festival?

MRS. PRICE: Well, as I did mention in the House to the Member for Elmwood, we received their briefs on the 28th of March. The other ministers who they have requested to meet didn't get theirs till Friday at 4 p.m. by Pink Lady. They have requested a meeting and we have a tentative meeting set for Thursday with them. There has been no dialogue with the ministers or the people from the Festival du Voyageur at this point.

MR. DOERN: Is it reasonable to assume that there might be increased provincial funding? My impression, Mr. Chairman, is that the Festival is in very serious trouble and that it is not unreasonable on their part to request increased funding. It strikes me that in an annual Budget, I don't know if it's a half a million a year, let's see, \$550,000 annual budget, out of that amount, they receive fairly substantial funds from the City of Winnipeg and they are now asking, in effect, for \$97,000 from the province and from the federal government. I assume that the minister appreciates the fact that this is probably the main winter festival in Winnipeg and one of the major winter festivals in the province, and also has an added dimension of French language and French culture which is somewhat unique, and therefore, it would be, I believe, a tragedy if the Festival actually stopped. I doubt if that will happen, but if it completely ground down that would be a very sad day, so I assume that the minister will look hard at the Festival and attempt to see whether she can free up some funds.

Now, having said that, I would also assume that in her examination of the Festival and assuming an increased funding, that she might also look at the Festival itself in terms of what they are doing, in terms of what they are accomplishing, because you know, I only speak from not having attended this year. I don't know whether the minister was there this year or not, but I have seen some of the goings on and it strikes me that some of the activities of the Festival are very worthwhile and that some are really, if not useless, certainly are not cultural in the true sense of the word. I don't know whether beer gardens or gambling and things like that are really desirable activities, I'm not saying that they're not fun, but I don't know whether that sort of activity is unique or distinctive or contributes to the cultural advancement of the province. So I'm simply asking the Minister in general whether she is going to attempt to do something? I mean, having studied the matter when she gets to that point, whether she is going to make an attempt to provide additional funding, maybe to try to insure that the Festival is operated on a sound basis, you know, fiscal responsibility and all that, balance budgeting and also in so doing, without trying to interfere too much and trying to call all the shots, whether she might also perhaps look at some of the activities and perhaps comment to the Festival organizers on the make up of the celebrations as to whether certain things are in fact useful and desirable and others are less so or perhaps should be wound up.

MRS. PRICE: I most certainly agree with the Member from Elmwood that it is one of our very major attractions in the province, particularly that it takes place in the winter when we certainly need all the augmenting of tourist attractions that we can and I highly endorse what he has said about it. We are presently reviewing their financial crisis. We are looking at a short term for the initial crisis now and then we're also looking at the long term for the future. I think one of the problems that has faced the Festival du Voyageur is that they have been sort of shifting from the commercial attractions to more of a cultural level and it's not that rewarding from a money point of view, but we are reviewing all the aspects and as I say, there will be a meeting on Thursday with the four Ministers and then we will go back to Cabinet for a decision.

MR. DOERN: Prior to this crisis, let's say in the past portion of the Minister's term, is there someone in the Department who has been working with the Festival either directly in an advisory role or, well let's just take that point - has anyone been sort of involved on an ongoing basis?

MRS. PRICE: Well, the Member will appreciate that they are an autonomous group but I would like to assure you that before there is any financial arrangement made there will be a good hard look made at their present structure and some guidance in a way that they can improve their way of managing their Festival and there will certainly be guidelines drawn up that we will expect them to follow.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister again, given that we have been providing \$15,000 annually, has someone from the Department had any say in terms of the Festival, either just a silent observer or one who has offered suggestions or positive input, or has it just we send a cheque and then see what happens?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, there have been Members in the Cultural Affairs Department on an ongoing basis that have been offering suggestions to them. I think there will probably be a closer look than there has been in the past, and a closer liaison with them.

MR. DOERN: I wonder whether any red flags were raised by members of Cultural Affairs in the past year or previously as to perhaps risky ventures or loose budgeting or something of that sort or has the department been passive in its role?

MRS. PRICE: I wouldn't say that the department was passive. I understand, before my time, that they were warning them that things like this were going to happen, and of course the weather being what it was this year, which was something that nobody could avoid, made a tremendous difference in their attendance, their gate receipts, and as a result, they were some \$80,000 short.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to the Winnipeg Symphony and I would like to begin by congratulating the minister on providing, through the government, additional funding for the Symphony, and for the other artistic organizations, which are really the backbone of Manitoba and I suppose in the minds of some people, the sort of raison d'être of this entire province, department, and so on, and so on. I just thought I'd throw that in to balance Abe Kovnats' French Speech at the beginning of the Session. And so at any rate, I think that is to the minister's credit.

I wanted to ask some questions about the Symphony, and to make some comments as well. I wonder if I could begin with something which may not be easy to answer, and that is this peculiar concert that was arranged in New York — was it, I don't know, the Symphony Europica or whatever it was, Symphonica Europica, that sounds like Latin or Italian, and I think the public had the following impression.

The Winnipeg Symphony went to New York, took the town by storm, made a pile of money, half a million dollars, and returned all aglow. And then of course, unfortunately, the curtain fell, and the bad news came about, you know, the big shake up, the deficit, etc. But just on the concert itself, I believe that the average person and observer felt that the Symphony made that money, and that that money would go to offset their deficits. In fact, I gather that that did not occur and that the money went into this non-profit corporation or whatever, that Mr. Gamba is involved in, and perhaps that was all to the good, but that rather than making money on the venture, the Symphony may even have lost money on the venture in that their travel costs and other costs may not have even been covered. So, just on that portion I would ask the minister whether in fact the Winnipeg Symphony had their travel costs, room and board and flight covered, by that organization, or was a portion of it covered and the rest came out of the Symphony, which would unfortunately only add to its deficit?

MRS. PRICE: I would like to assure the Member for Elmwood that there wasn't any cost at all borne by the people of Winnipeg or Manitoba. The proceeds from the concert after the expenses of the Symphony people, their room and board, was paid for. The rest of it was put into the fund of the Symphonica and that is for the development of musicians. The only moneys that were spent were federal money that was spent for chartering the plane, but there was absolutely no money taken out of the province.

MR. DOERN: Right. And there's no money . . .

MRS. PRICE: Or brought back.

MR. DOERN: Right. Both that there was no costs to Winnipeg and the Symphony and the government, but also, no profit. It was self-liquidating.

I wonder if the minister has any figures on ticket sales for the Symphony because my information is, and it may not be correct, that over the past few years there has been a falloff in season ticket holders, and I just wondered if we had any figures for the last couple of years as to what's happening: Are they selling more season tickets or less season tickets?

MRS. PRICE: They are selling less season tickets. I think right now they're working on a revamp of their programs that they're having with the hope that they'll be of more attraction to the people of Manitoba.

MR. DOERN: Well, I'm not sure what the minister's saying there. Is she saying that they are going to attempt wider, popular appeal in the sense of more pop concerts, or are they going to attempt

to attract their sort of basic audience which was, I suppose, to a certain extent, a highbrow and certainly a classical music type of person. And my understanding is that they've lost some of those, so I guess they're caught in a dilemma of going wider and more popular and maybe losing some of their classical fans, or are you saying that they are attempting to reach into that former group and expand that group and perhaps not go as much for the wider? Or are they attempting both?

MRS. PRICE: Presently they're reviewing their complete program on a seasonal basis and, as you've said, they are looking into the programs with the idea of attracting the multitude just not the people who like the very serious music, but something that can be a sort of a mix that would be an attraction for all types of people.

MR. DOERN: You know, as an observer, Mr. Chairman, I know that the minister attends the Symphony occasionally as I do, and my impression is that in the last few years, without naming any names, there have been some pretty corny promotions by the Winnipeg Symphony. I'm not too impressed about bring in Mohammed Ali to read poetry, etcetera. It may make sense, it may have some appeal, but it struck me that the Symphony was being sold like soap and that it was perhaps losing support as a result. Mitch Miller, twice a year for ten years, after he was washed up didn't seem to have any tremendous appeal to me. —(Interjection)—. Well, I'm certainly getting a lot of singing from the Members of the government, at any rate.

The other thing that I wanted to ask the minister in particular was this. I assume that the provincial funding is going to significantly increase, that it's going to on an ongoing basis be doubled and I wonder if the minister could give us figures again on percentages. I believe we've been contributing about 5 per cent . . . Is that the rate?

MRS. PRICE: Six per cent.

MR. DOERN: Six per cent? And is the minister contemplating an ongoing standard provincial grant, say that's in the order of 10 to 12 to 15 percent?

MRS. PRICE: Are you particularly referring to the Symphony at this point? Of course you realize that that goes through the Manitoba Arts Council, but the Chairman has realized they have been under funded for the last number of years and that there will have to be certainly a look at it and have to increase it in order for them to have a survival.

MR. DOERN: So that raises another question, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly support that and encourage the minister in that regard. Then that sort of raises the question of the Board and management of the Symphony. I'll refrain from making, or trying to make any artistic comments on the Symphony which I don't feel that qualified to do, and I don't want to talk about the program and the musicians, and the conductor and so on — holding that all aside — but I do feel that there has obviously been a serious problem in terms of the Board and the management of the Winnipeg Symphony and I suppose that that presents a dilemma to the minister and to the Arts Council, but I think it's obvious from the newspaper accounts and from speaking to people who are associated with the Symphony and who are people who attend the concerts and know or appear to know what's going on that the fundamental problem at this time is the Board.

Perhaps previously it was the management, perhaps it's still the management, but ultimately if you're going to point a finger at the problems of the Symphony, I believe that you correctly appoint to the Board because the Board is the managing arm of the organization and that presents a problem, namely how are you going to direct the Board at the same time leaving them as an autonomous organization? I would like to ask the minister how she is going to give more money to this organization, a very important cultural organization in the province which has been in some very rocky times recently, how is she going to provide them with more funds, which I believe she should do and which she is doing, and at the same time ensuring her department and the government and the taxpayers that this money is just not going to be completely thrown away and another crisis appearing a year from now followed by another crisis, followed by more funding, emergency funding, permanent funding and so on?

How is she going to do that and for example, is she considering say, government appointees to the Board? For example, there are organizations that get government funding that have a representative number, for example two or three members, on a Board like that. What is she going to do to ensure that the Board will act responsibly, will undertake fund raising, and will not rack up bigger and bigger deficits in the next fiscal year?

MRS. PRICE: I have been speaking to the Chairman of the Arts Council and they've had a number of meetings with the Board members. I think, basically, the Board consists of some pretty top-drawer business people in the city. There could have been some personality conflicts, which have been unsatisfactory at this particular time. But they are going to present a five-year program of their projected programs and deficits, and we find that it works well with the others that have been working, in that respect, namely the art gallery, and we have great expectations that this will follow the same. They are also going to be looking into their fund raising in a much more active way than has been done in the past.

MR. DOERN: Well, is the Minister considering or does she have a position on the value of appointing two or three government representatives, who could be citizens but sort of would have a direct responsibility to herself and the provincial government?

MRS. PRICE: Well I would think the Manitoba Arts Council is going to be working very closely with them, and of course they are an extension of the government. So I would say that, in that respect, Mr. Benson and the people on his Board will be monitoring their working habits very closely.

MR. DOERN: Is it one of the main responsibilities — I believe it is — the main responsibility of the Board is to raise funds, that among other terms of reference and other responsibilities it is one of their prime objectives to raise funds, and that that has been a problem, that although there have been some people raising funds on the Board that, as a whole the Board has been deficient in that regard and that has been a major problem, in terms of the recent crisis. Could the Minister comment on that?

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned a couple of minutes ago, there is going to be a concerted effort to raise funds, on a much more serious level, I guess, than has been in the past. And a part of the Board's function is also, not only to raise funds but to oversee management.

MR. DOERN: One of the problems that the Symphony had last year was that they lost their \$15,000 summer concerts in the park, and I think they complained to the government about that. I just wondered if there was any prospect that that would be reinstated to provide them with additional revenue and to give people a chance to see the Symphony in the summertime.

MRS. PRICE: Of course they were replaced by some of the other types of cultural entertainment, but then these people also — the Symphony aren't the only ones that need funds. These other little groups are also dependent on getting extra revenues, and they were more or less spreading the funds around, letting other people have an opportunity to display their cultural abilities.

MR. DOERN: Is that not a decision of the Minister as to which groups receive those funds?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it is.

MR. DOERN: And has the Minister now decided on which groups will receive those grants for this summer?

MRS. PRICE: We haven't gone into that yet.

MR. DOERN: I'd also like to ask the Minister what she is going to do in her government. She made a comment, which I believe is true, that she is concerned about Cultural Affairs, in terms of her government's spending restraints, that when people are looking around for things to cut one of the first targets is the cultural area. And later on we will talk about libraries. I believe that that is a perennial problem, but particularly related to her own government, and she said she was worried that they might be, her department, which I believe is a very important responsibility, that you always have this problem of Cultural Affairs is the first "victim" — I believe that was a direct quote from the Minister. And she said that she wants to develop policies to prevent that. I wonder if she could comment, again, on how she is going to ensure continuity in cultural programs for cultural organizations in Manitoba so that we don't have slashes in the Symphony and the Ballet and the Museum, the Art Gallery, and then another couple of million being thrown into the road program.

MRS. PRICE: I would like to correct the Member for Elmwood. When I made reference about the

programs being slashed, I think you will find that I was referring to the federal scene, when they were practising restraint. That was part of my opening statement.

MR. DOERN: But does she have any strategy or any plans to protect the cultural organizations of Manitoba from any crippling restraints or cutbacks?

MRS. PRICE: Well, we are doing our best with the moneys that we have to work with, and, as I mentioned — and I meant it sincerely — I have a genuine interest in the cultural side of my portfolio. We have a number of projects that we're studying right now that will enable people in the cultural end of things to be able to display their talents in not only the summer season but we're going to look into extending the season that we would have programs such as Folklorama, but from a cultural point of view, which I think could be great for people in the Arts in Manitoba, as well as the spinoff that it would have for Tourism.

MR. DOERN: I'd also like to ask the Minister, in terms particularly of the Theatre Centre, the Ballet and the Symphony, it struck me that a few years ago there seemed to be a lot of travelling through Manitoba, that I can recall years ago, like 20 years ago, being up at The Pas or Flin Flon one time and there was the Winnipeg Ballet at the local theatre, and the Symphony did some travelling — I don't know how much — and I know the Theatre Centre did some fantastic school programs that were really the best I have ever seen in terms of generating interest on the part of students. I have the impression — and I'd like to know what the answer is — that there seems to be a decline in the amount of travelling done within the province. For instance, the Winnipeg Ballet spends a great deal of time in a bus driving through the American mid-west, playing all the little stops, and I suppose that's good because it gives them a chance to travel, not under very good conditions, but also it gives the Ballet Company a chance to meet their payroll.

So I was just wondering if the Minister could tell me, or could comment on how much of an opportunity the Ballet and the Symphony and the Theatre Centre have of travelling through rural Manitoba, in particular, and the north, and how much those people have a chance to see those things. I mean it strikes me as ridiculous that the Ballet is shooting down to Kansas and North Dakota and playing all those towns and may not be playing the Manitoba scene. Could the Minister comment on that?

MRS. PRICE: Well, the Royal Winnipeg Ballet does have a season in Brandon. I agree with the member that we'd like to see more if funds would permit, but I would also like to remind you of the pilot project that I said that we have instituted in Manitoba, where we have five volunteers in the different regions. It has been found in the past that some of the cultural groups would go to a little town and probably, you know, like they were more or less foisted on the people of the province just because this was part of the program, that they would go to Steinbach, for instance, and maybe Steinbach didn't want the Symphony, that they would have preferred to have the Ballet or something. So we now have these volunteers there, who have their ear to the ground and to the people in those particular areas, and they will feed back to our department the type of programs that the people in their regions would prefer. We're looking forward to this program very excitedly.

MR. DOERN: Well, I would just like to say to the minister that I would suggest that she do her utmost to provide funding and to encourage the main cultural groups to travel through the province, through the schools and also through the various towns. I don't think there's enough of this. I gather that to get certain Canada Council grants you have to have certain Canadian composers play. There may be some kind of a ratio, but I was just wondering whether there was any encouragement by the government, by the Arts Council, to have the Symphony, as an example, used as an outlet for Manitoba composers, to encourage Manitoba playwrights in relation to the Theatre Centre, and so on — if she has any comments or programs to give local Manitoba artists, in terms of writers and composers, an opportunity to have their works produced, Canadian? Because if all we're doing is playing the great German composers and Ibsen, and other playwrights who are magnificent, but nevertheless how are you ever going to develop your own culture? Are there any opportunities or are there any new programs to encourage the creative people to get their works produced in Manitoba by the Symphony, the Ballet, Theatre Centre, etc?

MRS. PRICE: There are literary grants through the Manitoba Arts Council to encourage and help these Canadian artists. With reference to your remarks about the Ballet touring in the States, I think that's part of their bread and butter too. However, the Symphony breaks up into smaller groupings and travels through the province. Then there are programs where it's impossible to take cultural groups out to — such as the Theatre Centre where it's not always feasible to take them

out, there are arrangements made where students can come into the city to have an opportunity to view them or hear them.

MR. DOERN: Does the department have any program of purchasing tickets that are then provided to say, underprivileged groups or senior citizens?

MRS. PRICE: Oh yes, I don't know about the school children, but I do know we do have for the senior citizens — your tickets to the opera and some of those. I think we could do that on a larger scale because the empty seats tonight cannot be filled tomorrow, and we are going to look into that with that idea, to fill the seats, and we are going to be speaking to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of general comments that I wish to make with reference to this particular branch. Perhaps some of the comments that I am about to make may be of general application to the branches, which we have dealt with, but I think that they are of more greater and direct relevance to this branch than to the others. And, I think that I have to go back into the recent history of this department because I think what had occurred or rather what had not occurred is a matter of concern to the people of Manitoba.

Now I appreciate the fact that, Mr. Chairman, that this minister has only had this portfolio for the past five or six months, but nevertheless she, as a member of Cabinet, has to share the responsibility with her colleagues for the government's action or inaction, as the case may have been.

Firstly, and I very deliberately deferred this comment until now to congratulate and welcome your Deputy Minister. I think it's an appointment long overdue because you will recall, Madam Minister, that the department had been without a Deputy Minister and acted with an Acting Deputy for practically a year. And now . . . although I hasten to add in the same breath, but I do recognize and I think the people of Manitoba recognize the ability of the Acting Deputy Minister, who had performed his role extremely well, but in order to have the assurance that the future of the department and its programs is secure, it's essential to make the appointment of a Deputy Minister definite. And so our best wishes to your deputy, Mr. Prefontaine. We certainly wish him well, and I think that if extending good wishes of that kind is of any assistance to him he will certainly need all that he can get because you, Madam Minister, you will have a very difficult row to hoe. And the Deputy Minister is indeed a very nice guy, whom I have known for many, many years, and had occasion to work with him. Both of us were involved in education at that time, and I'm certainly glad to see him back in the Province of Manitoba.

Now I stress the matter of appointment of a Deputy Minister, Mr. Chairman, because it is in this way that you can hope to, or that the minister can hope to restore the confidence of the people of Manitoba in the future of our cultural program and the future of its growth and development. My only regret is, Mr. Chairman, that some of the minister's colleagues have not followed her example and appointed full-fledged deputy ministers of their departments, but some we've had struggling along with an acting deputy for a period far in excess of a year, in fact, since Day One that this government took office.

Now, this particular branch of the department is of particular concern to me because, you will recall that when we became the government in 1969 it was the New Democratic Party government that established a Department of Cultural Affairs, and later it was amalgamated with Tourism and Recreation, and in that structure I had the honour of heading that department during the years 1976 to 1977. And I must say, Mr. Chairman, that of all the departments after October 11, this was one, the future of which became most uncertain, dullest and bleakest, because immediately the rumour mill started which originally I had discounted, I had wanted to discount, but unfortunately we did witness a few months later the resignation of the former Deputy-Minister, and then the consequences, as I had indicated a moment ago, an Acting Deputy was appointed and nothing more happened. Then, of course, the response of the government was that it's awaiting the report of the task force. The task force reported and it made certain recommendations. Then eventually the department, as it was formerly structured, was splintered into the various departments that we have now, but in the meantime the Acting Deputy-Minister did continue and finally a couple of months ago, two and a half, three months ago, we had a Deputy-Minister appointed.

But I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that looking back over the most recent 17 months or so that it may be somewhat late to — disappointment may have come a bit too late if the Minister still hopes to do a good job in this particular department because, as I've said, the Deputy-Minister, and with the Deputy-Minister, the Minister, herself, has a very, very difficult task ahead of her.

You know, this reminds me of a program in the Department of Health, an education program

titled, "Putting the Pieces Together", which had been debated in the Health Estimates a few days ago, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that that is exactly the task that this Minister is now faced with. It's unfortunate but, you know, after a lapse of practically a year some of the pieces which ought to constitute part of this branch of her department may have been broken, destroyed beyond repair, others lost —(Interjection)— well, the Honourable Member for Pembina refers to Humpty-Dumpty and that may be his fate come the next election too, and I'll remind him of that then.

So, for that reason, Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba do have the fear that the pieces that this Minister is now in the process of putting together may not resemble that which originally was and which, over the twelve month period, may have somewhat eroded or have been destroyed. And at this point, Mr. Chairman, I'm not even talking about the money, and we'll come to that later, I'm simply talking about the effect of the government's state of inaction and indecision, on the Minister's staff, and on the community in general, because, Mr. Chairman, all of us know that an Acting Deputy-Minister — he can not, or she can not plunge into his or her job and tackle the assignments with the same enthusiasm as a full-fledged Deputy-Minister because the Acting Deputy says, "Well, my future is uncertain. The future of the department, as it then was, was uncertain", and because of the uncertainty, then this has a bearing upon the Acting Deputy's dealings with the public, has a bearing upon the Acting Deputy's dealings with his department. So, at best, because of the uncertainty of the whole thing the Acting Deputy and the staff and the Minister during that time must say, "Well, we can only keep the existing programs surviving as best we can. We must mark time until the whole thing is finalized and put on a more certain footing." And this in turn, Mr. Chairman, does lead to a lack of motivation in staff, a lack of motivation in the community, and a lack of motivation in staff to bring forth the types of proposals, to bring forth the types of issues of which they become aware of in their day to day work which may require a policy decision by the Minister.

A staff person within the Civil Service may become aware of a certain issue, of a certain problem, but then he says to himself, to herself, "Well, there's no point in preparing a paper on this because likely nothing will happen at this point in time anyway, until such time as a Deputy-Minister is appointed." And that, Mr. Chairman, was the state of affairs for the past year and in the meantime we saw the French Cultural Centre toss their keys on the Minister's desk and say, "You run the building." —(Interjection)— Yes. It's on the way to being straightened out, and I'll come to that in a moment again — in the usual fashion, waiting for a crisis to develop and then dealing with the crisis, or attempting to deal with the crisis.

And the Art Gallery, Mr. Chairman, the Art Gallery — yes, the Art Gallery was open evenings when we were the government. Now, it's in darkness. Now, it's in darkness, and why? It's in darkness because of this penny-pinching government. That's why it's in darkness at night. That's why they can't open the Art Gallery in the evenings. And even in the daytime, they can't open it at an early enough hour in the morning to accommodate morning tours from schools, and all the Honourable Member for Pembina need do is tomorrow, just walk a block and a half down the street and speak to the manager of the Art Gallery, speak to the President of the Art Gallery and he'll tell you that because of restraints and restrictions they cannot open the Art Gallery at nine o'clock in the morning to bring in tours of students so that a group of students could complete their tour during the morning half day and then return to class in the afternoon. Instead, if they're going to come in the morning the whole day is shot because the Art Gallery doesn't open till some time after 10 o'clock, and by the time they get back to the school and have lunch it's two or three o'clock in the afternoon.

The Museum of Man and Nature is having its problems, and then the most recent one, my colleague, the Member for Elmwood, had referred to the Winnipeg Symphony incident and, you know, here after having really made it, as it were, internationally they come home to be faced with the prospect of a bailiff appearing on their doorstep later that day or the next day. —(Interjection)— I don't know whether the Member for Wolseley is acting for the creditors. He may be. He may be. And those, Mr. Chairman, are just some of the more glaring examples, not to mention the effect that the government's lack of action for the past 12 months has had upon budding, budding up and coming artists looking for a future in Manitoba, looking for a future locally. And as has been indicated by some of the members from the government side, speaking out of turn while I was speaking earlier, that the only time that the government attempted to come to grips with the problems facing the various Arts groups was in a crisis situation, and even at that, all we hear really is announcements of assistance to be offered in the future, or monitoring, working out some arrangement to put the various Arts groups on a more sound financial footing and so forth.

But, Mr. Chairman, when you're in a crisis situation, that is not the time to do any rational, reasonable, long-range planning, because you have to deal with the crisis first. That's what's facing you, glaring you in the eyes right there and then. That has to be coped with. And then after you have resolved that, then you can hope to sit down to deal with long-range planning.

Now, I have been talking about the effect on the department, on the staff, and I believe the Honourable Member for Pembina is just itching to get into the debate, and if he has something worthwhile to say, which I doubt . . . If it's going to be the type of yakking that we have been hearing him chatter away for the last 10 or 15 minutes, we can Very well do without that type of dribble. —(Interjection)— I think I must ask the Chairman to tell the honourable members to shut-up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The Member for Burrows.

MR. ORCHARD: I think that is not a parliamentary expression, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe that's the only type of language that the Member for Pembina understands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I ask the members to address . . . ? Order please. Could I ask the Members of the Committee to address their remarks to the Chair, please. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that those are one of the few three and four-letter words in the vocabulary of the Honourable Member for Pembina, so I appreciate your assistance in keeping him in order.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to comment briefly upon the effects of the government's inaction on another group in our community and that is the volunteers. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that of all the Ministers in government this Minister probably has the largest group of volunteers working with her of any Minister, because I would suspect that there must be tens of thousands of volunteers throughout the whole province of Manitoba, all the volunteers that are associated with the organization and the conduct of various cultural festivals in Winnipeg and Fairs, and so on and so forth, there must be thousands of them — tens of thousands. And they were working with increasing enthusiasm but, you know, Mr. Chairman, when the volunteers look at government and they see that the government appears to have or does not provide the type of interest and support and commitment to Cultural Affairs that they would hope government to have, then they themselves lose interest, and when they sense that their ship is sinking then they desert it. Because the average person says that if a government has no commitment, has no long-range program, no philosophy with respect to a cultural program, then why should they be there slugging it alone.

You know, Mr. Chairman, it's only through teamwork, government together with the volunteer groups, that our cultural program can hope to succeed, and if the public sees that the government is committed and is supportive of our cultural programs then they will be motivated to support.

The same, Mr. Chairman, can be said of the financial supporters. They react no differently. The financial supporters from the community, if they find that the level of support from government isn't there or that the government is merely funding a starvation diet or a starvation level diet then the financial contributor from the community, he says, "Well, why should I contribute money merely to prolong the life of an organization which appears to be on the way to death anyway?"

Now, as I have said, I know that this Minister isn't to blame entirely, because this portfolio has been her responsibility only for the past five months, but as Member of Cabinet she must share the responsibility with her colleagues.

So again I say, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister in this portfolio and in this particular Branch, in particular, does indeed have a tough row to hoe: putting these pieces together; repair the broken pieces; search for the missing ones; replace those that can't be found, if they can't be found. Because during the 17 months of inaction the cultural program in Manitoba has been set back about 10 years, because it will take at least five years to catch up to where we were 17-18 months ago and a further five years to put us on a level where we would have been had Cultural Affairs not suffered this setback.

Now, here it has become quite apparent and as we look at the Estimates, in general, of all the various Branches under this appropriation, Resolution 107, that here again the government is choosing the easiest way out — cut programs, people programs, and we find evidence of that in grants that are barely keeping up, in fact some are not even keeping up to the inflation factor. And we will come to that later. The grants to libraries are a perfect example of that. —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Pembina now wants to debate economics. If he wants to learn something about economics and how not to run a government, I think that this year's Estimates is the best example of how not to run a government. Mr. Chairman, cutting programs rather than

finding ways and means of providing for all the needs, including Cultural, on a reasonable and a rational basis.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, first of all, I very vehemently object to the remarks that you have made of the type of operation in my department when I had an Acting Deputy Minister. I will tell you that the Acting Deputy Minister performed as well as any person without the terminology acting in front of him. There were no programs halted because he was there in a temporary capacity. Anything of the creativity, the ideas, the production, everything went on as if he was the Deputy Minister and I object very strongly to all the remarks you made about him.

Then another thing I would like to set the Member for Burrows straight on is that the cultural grants are certainly not going backwards. We have a 17 percent increase this year. So I am going to tell you that we have not suffered any setbacks. We inherited many, many of the problems that we have today from the former government. So don't sit there so pure and tell me about all the problems that we have, that we will never have an opportunity, that it's too late for us to gain momentum or anything positive; you are entirely erroneous and I take exception to many of the remarks that you made.

And another thing I would like to correct the Member for Burrows on, he made remarks about the Culturel Centre folding up because we had it during the tenure of the Acting Deputy Minister. That was not true. It was when we had a Deputy Minister there, previous to that.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, when we get to dealing with the details of the cultural grants, then we will see whether in fact there was a 17 percent increase to the various cultural groups or not.

The comments that I made about the Acting Deputy Minister, if the Minister will read Hansard she will find that I did give the Acting Deputy Minister credit. —(Interjection)— You see, Mr. Chairman, there they go yakking again. However, I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, don't pay any attention to them. Nobody else on this side of the table is paying any attention to them. They are not worth paying attention to. —(Interjection)— If we ignore them, they will go away; I think you're right. I think that's exactly what will happen to them, and eventually they will fade away.

In making reference to the Acting Deputy Minister, again I say I realize that he did the best job that he could under the circumstances. There is no question about it. But the fact still remains that, Mr. Chairman, I would be most happy to hear the Honourable Member for Pembina enter the debate of this department in a proper manner, rather than yakking away in the way that he has become accustomed to. You know, it's hardly ever that he speaks while in order, either in the Chamber or here, you know, just garbage like this. This is all that we have been hearing from him for the last 17 months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood on a point or order.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have to spring to the defence of my colleague and say that if he were given the opportunity to speak, I think that we would make some progress and perhaps be able to finish this particular item, which I believe he is attempting to do, and that I will attempt to do. So if you can restrain some of the members on the opposite side of the table, I think my colleague will be able to address himself to what he wants to deal with, and we can proceed. Otherwise we are going to get bogged down right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'd like to call the attention of the members that I'd prefer to see the member that is recognized by the Chair to speak. Anybody else wishing to speak can indicate and I will put him on the agenda. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. However, you know it's the Minister's Estimates that are under consideration and if members of her caucus choose to waste time of the Committee in this stupid fashion well it's their Minister's Estimates that they're dealing with and the time assigned to the consideration of their Minister's Estimates. But obviously they have very little respect for their own colleagues on the Treasury Bench.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I am recognizing the Member for Burrows. Would the Member for Burrows address his remarks to the Chair, please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am, because I am attempting to deal with the Estimates and I was simply commenting upon some of the interjections, the assinine interjections and

that you had been subjected to for the past while that this Committee has been sitting tonight.

Now, for the information of the Minister of Agriculture, who isn't even aware what item we're on, we're on Resolution No. 107, that I'm speaking to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture, on a point of order.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I was directing my question to the Chair on the item. I hadn't been in too long and the way the Member for Burrows was rambling on criticizing the opposition, I was unaware of the item that you're on. Would you please indicate which item you're on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're dealing, on Page 78, Resolution 107, 3.(a)(1) — 3.(a), my apologies. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So with respect to the comments that I made about the state of the department during the period of time that it was under an Acting Deputy Minister, I repeat again that I appreciate that he did a fine job. He did as good a job as he could, under the circumstances. I'm not faulting him. I'm not faulting him; I'm faulting the government for not having appointed a Deputy Minister.

Now, if the Minister prides herself on the fact that she was able to operate with an Acting Deputy ever bit as effectively as with a regularly appointed Deputy, then why the hell did she appoint a Deputy? There is no point to appoint one. In other words, if she is saying, "Look, there is no change. We were able to do our job and work just as effectively with an Acting Deputy as with a full-fledged Deputy," then why go to the bother of appointing a Deputy Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Let's get on with the Estimates.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, that is part of the Estimates. The Deputy Minister is responsible for this Branch, as he and as the Minister is for other Branches.

MRS. PRICE: I guess the Member for Burrows is entitled to his opinions, but I am also entitled to mine, and my department ran very smoothly and there wasn't any cessation of any programs while we were awaiting the appointment of our new Deputy, at no time, and now that we have gone through that very thoroughly we understand your viewpoint on it and, as I said, you're entitled to it but I would suggest it's 10:30 and that we carry on with our Estimates so we're not here all night. Let's get on to the more important aspect of it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as we proceed through the Estimates we will see how the Minister's comments will square with the response that we will receive from some of the other Ministers, with the response that we will receive from the Minister of Agriculture who is sitting across the table from me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I was listening to my colleague for Burrows, Mr. Chairman. I couldn't help but go back and I was just thinking what a debt of gratitude we owe to Maitland Steinkopf in this whole area. It is regrettable that we haven't got more men of his calibre around, with no reflection whatsoever on present staff. But I was just thinking also just exactly how important it is in our society — it has been well demonstrated in the past 10 or 15 years — as to how important cultural things are in our society, roots and things like that. But I will be one who will wait to see what the Minister does in this area because leadership is crucial in this area, I believe.

But I wanted to ask the Minister a question. One of the things that concerns me in this area is that in Manitoba, primarily in Winnipeg, it used to be the case that much of the money which was directed into these fields came from private funds, by donations, bequests and things of that nature. I wonder what effect is being felt in the field of cultural affairs because of the advent of

such things as lotteries? I guess that is one of the reasons why I happened to think of Maitland Steinkopf. In 1970 when we introduced the lotteries bill, Maitland was one of the ones who prevailed upon me to change my mind and support a bill establishing lotteries for the purposes of the Centennial year. You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that the initial bill was just for the Centennial year that we were going to have a lottery and that this bill would die at the end of the Centennial year and we would go on to other things.

But nevertheless across the country, this milieu has changed and in some areas where there was a dependency on private donations to keep these organizations going — I'm thinking primarily of the delivery of some health and social services — but there has been a growing expression of concern in that there is developing an attitude that if there isn't some sweetening of the pot, then people aren't contributing as much to things of a cultural nature. Here recently we have had the case of the Symphony and I know inflation is causing them concern but I wonder, has the staff of the department done any assessment of the impact of the two things in that there has been, I think, a decrease in the amount of money which has been bequested by people who felt that they should put some of the wine back into the ground. Their attitude even over in another area where I know the Minister and I will disagree, relative to estate taxes, but nevertheless there has been this general attitude that there should be other ways of funding cultural things, either through direct government financing, in other words the attitude is getting more and more to, let the government do it, sort of thing.

So is there any evidence that, number one, lotteries in general are having an impact on the amount of money which is available to such things as cultural affairs; and has there been a decrease in the amount of money which has been bequested by people in the settling of their estates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: It might surprise the member to know that Manitoba has the highest per capita from private donations. They have 96 cents per capita and it is the highest in Canada.

MR. BOYCE: Ninety-six cents?

MRS. PRICE: Yes. From private donations.

MR. BOYCE: Ninety-six cents per individual of private donation. We're talking about 96 cents vis-a-vis \$10.00. In other words — in this year's Estimates you are asking for \$11 million, so that's \$11.00 — so it's 96 cents from private donations in comparison to \$11.00 from the public. Is that a fair extrapolation of those figures?

MRS. PRICE: The 96 cents per capita is for the major performing arts, the contributions that have been made from private donations for the 94 major performing companies.

MR. BOYCE: I'm not trying to throw a curve at the Minister at 10:30 at night. I raise it as a matter of concern and perhaps if the figures by staff aren't presented in a form which can answer my question, she can take it as notice and we can discuss it at a future time. Ninety-six cents as compared to what in other jurisdictions? Nevertheless my question was originally, is there any evidence of an impact by people taking the money which they have to dispose of, well, let's say frivolously if you will, by taking a chance on a lottery or something like that, rather than donate to the carrying on of things of a cultural nature?

MRS. PRICE: I'm not sure that I really know the depth of the question that the member is asking and I would suggest that I'll take it as notice and I'll come back to you with an answer tomorrow.

MR. BOYCE: The other part of the question: Has there been any diminution of the amount of money bequested to cultural organization in the past several years? I wonder if the Minister could take that question as notice also.

MRS. PRICE: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering, to get down to some serious discussion about the cultural grants, if the Minister could give us —(Interjection)— Yes, the points that you were

making . . . But I want to get down to a serious discussion about the actual dollars and cents in here.

I'm wondering if the Minister could give us a breakdown of the \$3.6 million which, according to the Minister's arithmetic, that shows a 17 percent increase. But I would like to remind the Honourable Minister that in actual fact the \$3.6 million is a 3 percent decrease from the 1977-78 Estimates. It depends on what the base is for your comparison. The Honourable Minister is using last year's appropriation, which is true, this year's appropriation is 17 percent more than last year. But the fact of the matter is that in 1977-78, this appropriation showed \$3.7 million. Last year it was \$3.099 million and this year \$3.633, which is still about \$80,000 less than 1977-78. So if the Minister could give us a breakdown of the \$3.6 million, which is 3 percent less than 1977-78.

MRS. PRICE: The 1977-78 wasn't \$3.7, it was \$3.5 million.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Very well, then, so then it is not a 17 percent increase if it was 3.5; then it's about a 4 percent increase, but not 17. But could the Minister give us a breakdown.

MRS. PRICE: You want a breakdown of the 1979-80, is that what you are saying?

MR. HANUSCHAK: That's right, yes, please.

MRS. PRICE: The Museum of Man and Nature got \$1.3 million; Manitoba Arts Council \$417,000; Winnipeg Art Gallery \$793,000; the Western Manitoba Centennial Auditorium in Brandon got \$49,000; the Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain got \$103,000; the Centennial Corporation got \$885,000; and the Ukrainian Culture Centre got \$25,000; for a total of \$3.6 million.

MR. HANUSCHAK: What about multi-cultural projects? Are those not included in there?

MRS. PRICE: They are funded through lotteries.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I see. So, Mr. Chairman, we can see from these figures that the Art Gallery is receiving a reasonable increase in the level of support. The Museum of Man and Nature, in actual fact, in terms of comparing the purchasing power of today's dollar with that of two years ago, is in fact receiving less because in 1977-78 it received \$1,327,000, now it is \$1,300,000 two years later and we know what has happened to the dollar over the past couple of years.

The Manitoba Arts Council — it is Arts Councils I would believe . . .

MRS. PRICE: No, the Arts Council.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Just the one. In 1977-78 the level of support was \$584,300; now it is down to \$417,000.00.

The Centennial Auditorium, only a very modest increase that again barely takes care of inflation.

La Centre Culturel Franco-Manitobain, in 1977-78 it was \$100,000; now it is only \$103,000.00.

The Centennial Centre Corporation from \$909,000 in 1977-78, is down to \$885,000.00.

So as I had indicated to you, Madam Minister earlier, and the breakdown of the figures does show it, that it is no 17 percent increase, that in actual fact over the past two years, all these groups are in fact receiving less money than they formerly received.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(a)(1)—pass — the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: How does the museum attendance, the most recent figures that you may have on the museum attendance, how does it compare with that of the previous year?

MRS. PRICE: The museum attendance in 1977-78 was 266,000; in 1976-77 there were 245,000; in 1975-76 there were 1.2 million.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And the Art Gallery?

MRS. PRICE: The Art Gallery: In 1977-78, 215,000; and in 1978-79, 217,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(a)(1)—pass; 3(a)(2) — the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I note, Mr. Chairman, that the Salaries item for the two years is approximately constant. There is only a difference of \$200.00 and I believe that when we had asked the Minister a similar question under previous appropriations, she had indicated that there was allowance for increases in salaries. So if there is an allowance for any salary increase here, it would seem then that there is a staff reduction. Is there a reduction in the number of SMYs?

MRS. PRICE: There was a vacancy for a period of time, two, I think.

MR. HANUSCHAK: How many SMYs are there in this branch.

MRS. PRICE: There are seven.

MRS. HANUSCHAK: Seven SMYs.

MRS. PRICE: Nine. There's the seven and then the two that were just filled, there's nine.

MR. HANUSCHAK: There's some federal assistance for the operation of the Secretariat, is there not? Federal, any federal money?

MRS. PRICE: I don't think so. We don't have any federal moneys in this, no we don't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood. We're on 3.(a)(2). 3.(a)(2)(a) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: The last remarks that I wanted to deal with tonight we're on the Cultural, so I'll save whatever I have left for the minister's Salary and I would also say to the minister that I assume that when we pass this item, I'll leave my colleague make some comments here, I would like to then adjourn and deal particularly with Libraries and some Miscellaneous items tomorrow, if that's agreeable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(2).

MRS. PRICE: You're going to finish this one first, though?

MR. DOERN: Yes. 3.(a)(2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(2)(a)—pass; 3.(a)(2)(b) — the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Is the program, the Summer School program for Teachers of German, is that continued? It seems to me that there was no reference to it in the Annual Report. The one similar to the one for teachers of Ukrainian, I believe French, it's a summer program.

MRS. PRICE: It alternates between teachers from the Ukraine and teachers from Germany.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Oh, I see, one year apiece, I also note, Mr. Chairman, that for the year 1977-78 the number of students enrolled in the Linguistic Support Program has decreased by some 10 per cent from 5,243 to 4,656 in the year 1977-78, and this being 1978-79 so I suppose the minister would not have more recent figures. Could the minister indicate what the reasons are for the decline?

MRS. PRICE: They not only declined for the Member for Burrows. In 1977-78, there were 5,200 students and anticipated for this year is 5,500.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, according to the Report tabled in the House on Page 7 under Number of Students, the column headed 1976-77 shows 5,243, the column headed 1977-78 shows 4,656, which appears to be a decline.

MRS. PRICE: Well, I'm telling you the numbers for 1978-79, the anticipated is 5,500.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The anticipated is 5,500.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What happened to the Cree Program?

MRS. PRICE: To the which?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Cree. The teaching of Cree.

MRS. PRICE: Apparently there was no demand for it to continue.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It just dropped off from 550 to 0?

MRS. PRICE: I'm advised that there wasn't enough demand for it and therefore it was dropped. You still continue? Correction, it is continued but on a much smaller basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(2)(b)—pass; 3.(a)(2)(c) — the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: To whom is this grant for 10,000 paid or grants?

MRS. PRICE: They're bursaries for students from France.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Now, where do we find the funds for the Linguistic Support Program if this only covers the bursaries for students from France?

MRS. PRICE: They'll be coming out of Lottery revenues.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And what does the government anticipate it'll pay out in nts for the Linguistic Support Program for the forthcoming fiscal year?

MRS. PRICE: 53.6.

MR. HANUSCHAK: 53.6. So here again, Mr. Chairman, we find evidence of a reduction in the level of support certainly from 1977-78, because in 1977-78 for fewer students there was 54,000 paid out in grants and now the minister tells us, she anticipates 5,500 students and an increase of between 9 and 10 percent, but a decrease of \$1,000 in the level of support. What is the present formula, what is the present formula for the calculation of grants for this Program?

MRS. PRICE: I'm just getting the formula for you. It's \$10.00 per capita or one-third of the approximate cost and apparently it's the same formula that the previous government had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(c)—pass; 3.(a)(3)(a)—pass; 3.(a)(3)(b)—pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Hold it, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as I just indicated previously, I thought you were still on Dominion-Provincial. I would like to adjourn the Committee or have the Committee rise at this time, because I believe we have an hour or two on Libraries, so I would like to move that the Committee rise and we complete this department tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For clarification purposes, could I establish we have 3.(a)(1); (2)(a)(b)(c) passed?

MR. DOERN: Yes, wait a minute. Are you talking about now Dominion-Provincial Cultural Relations?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DOERN: Yes, that's passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we are now up to 3.(a)(3).

MR. DOERN: If we can stop at Provincial Archives and commence there tomorrow, and do the Archives and the Library tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Finish it off tomorrow afternoon?

MR. DOERN: Well, I don't know about the afternoon, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you please . . . The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Afternoon and/or evening because we may only have an hour in the afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will proceed tomorrow with.. . The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Could we then take a half hour more this evening then in order to . . . the reason I ask is because, we could do the Archives or something, something that won't take long and then come back to the Libraries tomorrow.

MR. DOERN: I know the minister indicated she may have some commitment or something, but I would prefer to adjourn now unless the minister has something tomorrow night that's precluding her.

MRS. PRICE: I do have . . .

MR. DOERN: You do. Well, all I can say is that we can attempt if we have an hour tomorrow, we will attempt to finish in that hour, but I cannot give that assurance, you know.

MRS. PRICE: Could we not then do syy, the Archives or the Historical Resources or something, something that doesn't take long tonight and leave the Library for tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(3)(a) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, we'll go a few minutes on the Archives if the minister likes. I wanted, in particular, to . . . there's really only one point there that I wanted to deal with and that is the Hudson Bay Archives. I wanted to, you know, in particular focus on that one single point. It was considered to be a major achievement when we acquired the Hudson Bay Archives which were brought from London and that was almost the sort of shining jewel in the Archives crown, and that Archives building which our government spent considerable time and energy and money to renovate the old Auditorium which I believe, in my opinion at least, is really one of the finest buildings today in the province. I think it was beautifully done and well done. You have now some very attractive facilities in there and you have more people using the library and the archives than ever before as I understand it and the fact that the Hudson Bay Archives are there is one of the main attractions. I don't want Miss Combaz to feel slighted in me saying that, but nevertheless I realize there's great attractions in the Library, but that there's something special about the Hudson Bay Archives and that there are students working there and scholars working there and so on.

But I have one concern and that is that I am informed that the filming, the microfilming and perhaps the cataloguing I guess, which is really the main objective of the exercise, has fallen behind, and I believe there's only a couple of employees there when there apparently should be more — I don't know whether we're talking about two SMYs compared to three, or whether we're talking about two SMYs compared to four. But I gather from people who are well versed in the Hudson Bay Archives and in the commitment given by the province that we are not living up to our commitment. Now, whether the Hudson Bay Company will crack the whip on us and pull the Archives, which would be very deplorable, or whether in the future we're going to be confronted with the Hudson Bay Company being bought out — every week somebody else is buying them out. It's a case of a larger fish swallowing a larger fish and a larger fish swallowing that. The Bay suddenly blossomed as a major, even more major retail store and corporation. Then we had Weston's going after them and so on and so on. The Thompson interest, we don't know what else. But I simply ask the minister this. Are we behind in terms of living up to our commitment and does she have any intention of providing more staff so that we can complete the microfilming and the cataloguing which is vital to historical purposes and I suppose is of some concern to the Hudson Bay Company itself.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I do share the Member for Elmwood's concern about it and we have been understaffed but I would like to advise him that we are right at the present time trying to get a

microfilm inspector in to document and restore. We have the two staffing actions before Treasury Board right now. So the problems that we have had should be rectified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Is there any financial support from the Hudson's Bay Company towards the maintenance and operation of the Hudson's Bay Archives?

MRS. PRICE: They provided us with the microfilm equipment; I think that is the extent of it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: In light of recent public statements that at least two have demonstrated an interest in the Hudson's Bay Company, one being Thomson and the other Weston, if either of the two were to occur, is there a binding commitment that we would be able to hold a purchaser of the Hudson's Bay Company to? Is there a commitment to which we could hold the purchaser of the Hudson's Bay Company, in the event that — and there has been public discussion that both Thomson and Weston are interested in buying out the Hudson's Bay Company — if that should happen, will that end the support that the Hudson's Bay Company is presently giving us?

MRS. PRICE: There is a contract and we're hoping in the event of there being a new owner, that they would honour the contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass; 3.(b)—pass.

There is a motion that committee rise. The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: If you will assure me that you will finish it tomorrow afternoon; otherwise, I would prefer to stay for a while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman —(Interjections)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I direct the members to direct their remarks to the Chair, please. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wants assurance as to whether we will be able to complete the consideration of her Estimates tomorrow, then I would suggest that she direct that question to the members of her own caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I think there is every possibility of finishing tomorrow afternoon and I would say, again, we will give you the assurance that we will attempt to complete tomorrow afternoon if the Minister will give us the assurance that she will also control her own back bench. On that basis, I believe we should have the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: In terms of standards and enforcement of standards and adherence to standards and the whole question of utilization, we have through my office met at length with the Manitoba Dental Association Executive on that subject. It was part and parcel of very intensive meetings that were held last summer to initiate and establish the program. The Manitoba Dental Association is charged with the responsibility in those divisions in which it's delivering the program to maintain records of utilization, maintain records of procedures and services offered.

They have reported to us via computer print-out on a quarterly basis, or are in the process

of reporting to us on a quarterly basis. We've only had initial quarterly reports because the actual MDA Program was not in place and in action in those divisions until late in calendar '78, so they've only had about 3 months experience and up to this point in time obviously conclusions are based on a short run, but they are reporting to us with complete comprehensive computer print-outs of the utilization and the services and procedures performed.

They report that in those school divisions that they're operating in, where there are 6,521 eligible children —(Interjection)— Well, in the divisions that they're operating in at the moment, where there are 6,521 eligible children, they have an 80 percent enrollment of eligible children. Those children were enrolled by their parents and they're onstream for treatment in dentists' offices. The initial examinations are carried out in the schools and the total figure that they report is 5,199 of such children, which would amount to 80 percent.

Looking at the 9,400 children that we referred to in the preceding school year who were eligible for care under the government program, of those approximately 7,780 were enrolled by parents for a utilization figure of 83 percent, so that that's the comparative figure up to this point in time.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, is it really a comparable figure, because out of the 7,500 or 6,000 — I don't know — the Minister told us it was 7,000; now he's talking about 6,000. I must admit that I'm somewhat mixed up, at a loss to understand exactly what that is. But this year in the dental program, in the Association program, they cover 1970-71-72, the Minister said. Am I correct?

MR. SHERMAN: Right.

MR. DESJARDINS: And that would be the utilization for those three years. All right, out of that 1970 and 1971 was practically finished, quite a bit of work was done under the former program. Could that be broken down? Also, what is the utilization rate of the new people that they have in this program? In other words, in 1972.

And in the cost, the Minister said that 80 — is that 80 for the year 1970 and 1971, the average cost, or the agreement that you have with the Dental Association, and 105 for those in 1972 or any new ones that they're going to have? Is that it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the cost is \$105 per new child. —(Interjection)— Well, it's in that 1970 to 1972 age group, and \$80.00 for any child who hadn't been enrolled, who hadn't been treated previously ' but otherwise it's \$105 for any child coming in the first time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, they wouldn't be any 1970 and 1971 that would be coming in for the first time; it would be only those in 1972 because 1970 and 1971 were in the other program. And when we're talking about per child, is that per child that is eligible, or the utilization rate, those that are actually getting the treatment, or that is the number that are eligible?

MR. SHERMAN: I believe that's the number eligible, Mr. Chairman, but I'll have to check on that point. I believe that's the number eligible.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member had asked me about the extension for this year and I can give him the details of where the program is projected to go, basically in the north, this year. —(Interjection)— Well, new communities, northern communities. The two programs will operate side by side, the Manitoba Dental Association program and the Departmental program. The Departmental Program is going into bay-line communities, places including Jenpeg, Ilford, Pikwitonei, Thicket Portage, Wabowden and Cormorant. That's for the Departmental Program. There is a funding supply of \$40,000 appropriated or requested to provide dental care to 485 children in those bay-line communities.

And the MDA Program will be expanded into Leaf Rapids, Lynn Lake, Snow Lake, Gillam, Cranberry Portage and Cold Lake. It'll cover approximately 705 children.

MR. DESJARDINS: Those are all new children, new programs.

MR. SHERMAN: Those are all new children.

MR. DESJARDINS: Fine. The Minister did not answer the data, what kind of data will be available, and for instance, the visual oral examination by regional dentists — when that is done, does that go in the utilization if there has been a visual oral examination? Does that mean that that then counts as part of the utilization? Well, there's no treatment.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the initial examination and then any treatment or follow-up program stems from there obviously, but that is the initial examination following enrollment. Yes. —(Interjection)— To this point it is, yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, what about the choice of the divisions to select the program that they would prefer? Is that being given to them?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, the decision to introduce the Manitoba Dental Association into those divisions in question as supervisors of the program was done in consultation with the School Divisions. They now are the agency delivering the service. Where there is, of course, more than one dentist, there is available to the parents a choice of dentists, but the government program does not operate side by side in those divisions with the MDA.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: If I could just for a moment pursue that question, could the Minister indicate whether or not the School Division had the option to conduct its program with the government program only and not through the MDA?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman. I don't think there's any one of those nine divisions in question where the option was presented in that way. The School Divisions were advised that the government program was going to be replaced by a program operated by the Dental Association and there was resulting discussion with some of the School Divisions about it but all agreements were reached amicably, and it wasn't put on the basis of an option.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, in pursuit further to that, could the Minister confirm that the Lord Selkirk School Division did indicate a preference for the government program as opposed to the MDA Program if they were able, in fact, to have continued on with that option?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't deny that but I can't confirm it without checking it. I don't know whether the Lord Selkirk School Division raised any particular objections but I will certainly check the records.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, could I inquire then from the Minister if he could further elaborate on that point? Why, in fact, since his government espouses the principle of freedom of choice as being very fundamental and very important within our society, why a School Division would not be given the opportunity to continue with the program that they felt was most beneficial from both a cost benefit point of view rather than to change horses and proceed towards a program which was sponsored by the MDA. It doesn't seem to be quite consistent with the message that his Party presented throughout prior to the last election and up to the present time. Why would that freedom of choice not be provided to the School Divisions through their local representatives to freely determine the direction in which they wished to go in respect to childrens' dental care?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that of course gets back to the fundamental basic debate about the Childrens' Dental Health Program to begin with, and as I stated in the House last year, it was our opinion and the opinion of the Dental Association and others with whom we consulted that we wanted to involve the profession in the delivery of this kind of service, that we did not subscribe to or endorse the concept of a totally state-run and totally government-run service. We wanted to see what the Dental Association could do. We never made any bones about that, either in opposition or in government. This is part of that particular approach to and concept of a children's Dental Health Program. We want to use the profession, provided the profession can deliver. When the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition talks about freedom of choice, I suppose we could go back to the inception of the program and ask him what freedom of choice was applied or employed then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding the dentists could always operate within the program, that there was an area of freedom of choice earlier which apparently doesn't exist now. Can the Minister advise whether or not the school divisions that are presently receiving the program through the MDA, whether they are being monitored, carefully monitored, during the forthcoming year and whether any careful analysis is being done and will continue to be done over the next year, as to the cost benefit relationship there as to the previous year and the years prior to that, when they were operating through the government program — the extent of utilization?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, there will indeed, Mr. Chairman, and I want to assure the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that that is a central point in the exercise on which we are embarked with the Dental Association. It's very difficult, after three months in place, for anyone to draw any conclusions, other than, as I say, that there appears to be, at this point at least, an encouraging enrolment. But one of the primary conditions of the agreement between the government and the MDA for getting involved in this program was that utilization would have to be demonstrated. Utilization would have to be high, maintained high, comparable to the utilization under the government program, and we would need demonstrable proof of that. That will be demanded and required of the Manitoba Dental Association on a quarterly basis through this year, as I say, and by midsummer we should have, I think probably, a fairly reliable reading. Up to this point in time, it's a little early to base definitive conclusions but it appears to be encouraging.

MR. PAWLEY: After this period of monitoring is completed and if, as a result of the analysis done during the monitoring period, the school division, which I assume will receive all this data that the Minister refers to, determines that they would prefer to return to the government program because of the lack of demonstrable proof that in fact the Manitoba Dental Association Program has been better. But in fact if it's their considered view that it has not provided the same utilization, would the Minister, at that point, permit a school division to freely return to the program which they felt was better as per the basis of the calculations and analysis that's done from the monitoring that he referred to?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't be prepared to guarantee that or to raise that kind of consideration in the minds of the school divisions at the present time. I think it's hypothetical. Let us see what the response of the school divisions and the parents and the utilization of the children is. Obviously if the plan isn't working, if it's not acceptable, if it's not properly utilized then the government will have to admit, and I will be prepared to admit, that the experiment with the Manitoba Dental Association didn't work. But I'm not trying to duck the question but I really think that's hypothetical. We believe that the Manitoba Dental Association can deliver the program in large part where it is required in the province, and we think a fair test is justified before being drawn into any commitments on hypothetical questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2) — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for St. Boniface was about to . . . I will defer to him.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister be candid then and tell us straight? The Minister is saying that it was the intent to switch to a government program administered by the Dental Association and it seems to — and I wonder if the Minister would confirm that — that as fast as they can they will take over more and more school divisions from the government program, until there is no longer any government program. Is that the intent of the government at this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, when the honourable member says as fast as they can, or as fast as we can, let me put it this way; that we would like to have it demonstrated that the Manitoba Dental Association can deliver this program, and we'd like to integrate them into the program and

take it over from government as soon as it's reasonable and practicable for them to do it, division by division. They have, in fact, requested the opportunity to go into a significant additional number of divisions next Fall, but no undertaking has been made by government, no commitment has been made because we want to see what is going to happen through this school year. I don't know — and I think I suggested last year — I'm not sure that a province like Manitoba can be serviced, in terms of children's dental health care, entirely by either government or by the private profession, in a totally cost-effective way, if one attempts to do it exclusively by one agency or the other. There may always be a mix necessary. So I'm not prepared to say that the MDA will take over every division. But if they can demonstrate that they can do the job in a cost-effective and a health-effective way, then we would proceed with phasing them in to more and more divisions. The answer is absolutely yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Minister is mixed up himself or if he is trying to mislead the Committee; I don't think he is, but it has the same effect when the Minister says that there cannot be only one plan. Now, we are not talking about the delivery of service; we are talking about the administration, because the government program sure also needed the dentists, as everybody knows. Now, we're talking about administration. If they are going to take over the administration, the Minister is saying, "Yes, it is the intention to more and more switch the administration over to the Dental Association," but he doubts if they will be able to take it all completely. What does that mean? If it is their plan eventually — and the Minister makes no bones about it — why wouldn't they take all the administration? I don't understand that. Why couldn't it be done, if that is the intention of the government?

Now, I'd like to know why the Minister in this government is taking over a program that has been working very, very, very well and if the Minister has any doubt about that, if he knows anything that I don't know, I'd like him to tell the members of this Committee why is it that he is going to take this program and turn it over to the Dental Association when he himself doesn't know if they will be able to do it, to deliver and it was done quite well by the government.

So could the Minister give us the reason, not just to say, "Well, we believe that it should be done by the Dental Association"? There must be a reason. We're dealing with the taxpayers' money. We're dealing with the health of the children of Manitoba. Why is a program that is working very well, why is it turned over and then there is an attempt to kill it — because that's what it is; in effect it will be killed — why is that turned over to another group?

The Minister has been saying, and in this Autopac debate they wanted to see the two work together and let them compete. Now the Minister told us tonight there is no freedom of choice. They are told, the division, they don't even keep the data, the data will be kept by the dental profession themselves. Now you're going to ask these people to evaluate their own program. Does the Minister really think that they're not going to bend over backwards to make their program look good? Isn't that human nature when it depends on the evaluation to see if they can do the job or not? Or is the Minister going to wait until finally it comes out that maybe they can't do the work? And in the meantime what's going to happen to the dental nurses that we have now? This is something that I'd like to know, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member asks me questions that I think, in some respect, reflect questions that would be unwise to answer in a hasty manner when the final conclusions have not been achieved yet. When I talk about some doubts about whether or not a program of this kind can be delivered exclusively in a province like Manitoba by one agency alone, I simply am expressing doubts that I think are legitimate parts of a dialogue on a subject like this, at this time. It may well be that one agency alone can do it all in the most cost-effective and health-effective way, but I suggest that that's an open-ended question at this juncture, until we have moved a little further along the road. The government program is not that old. Certainly the MDA program is brand new. The government program itself is not that old, and I think that it's not entirely responsible for me, or any other Minister or any official critic, to suggest that we can have the total and final answer as to whether one or the other should be able to do the whole province until we have gone a little bit further down the road on the question. I simply leave that as an open-ended question, at the moment. I think there are areas of the province that, simply because of our type of province, may be unserviceable on a purely government basis or a purely private profession basis. It may have to be a combination of both forms of service to get into some of those areas, I don't know. This is largely experimental at this juncture, and we believe that the experiment is justified, in terms of the profession that's involved and in terms of the taxpayer.

When the honourable member asks me why did we take a program that was working well and decide to change it, all I can do is go back to the original debate that we had on the program, and in fact to days when we were on opposite sides of the House, and remind him that we said

that we believed that the dental profession was a profession whose expertise we wanted and needed to utilize, that it was not, we felt and it felt in its expressions to us, being utilized in the program and, as a consequence, Manitobans were being short-changed of the professional expertise of that profession. That is a debate on which there will be continuing disagreement. I appreciate the honourable member's position, but ours has been quite clear on the other side of that question.

The question that he raises about dental nurses is one that does not present any crisis or any difficulty or any problem for us at the present time. The dental nurses who have gone through the program up to this point in time are all working. They are all employed — the 20 to 22 that came out the first year and the 27 or 28 that came out this past year. They are either all employed or all pursuing further dental training.

MR. DESJARDINS: As dental nurses?

MR. SHERMAN: Some of them are employed as dental nurses in the government program; some of them are employed as dental nurses in private dentists' offices; some of them were employed as dental auxiliaries in private dentists' offices. That would not necessarily be classified as dental nurses, but dental assistants, dental auxiliaries in the office. Some of them are pursuing further dental training. They were all accommodated one way or the other. A couple of them are practising as dental nurses in Saskatchewan. We do have one class still to graduate. That is the class of 1979 that comes out this June and I can only reiterate about them what I said about the class of 1978 in the House last year and that is that I will guarantee them every effort to accommodate them. We succeeded with respect to the class of 1978 and we will certainly do our utmost with respect to the class of 1979, but we are not taking any more in. There are no more going to Wascana College on bursary.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is not candid at all. There is no doubt — this Minister is now saying, give these people a chance; give this program a chance. He did not have the courtesy to give the other program a chance, for no reason at all except for the ideology and nothing else, although in one of his first interviews when he was made Minister, he said, "We will not go on ideology; we will look on what is best for the people of Manitoba." How can you go ahead and say, okay, we'll give them a chance, when you didn't give the other side a chance? When the Minister was sitting on this side, the Minister, he didn't say that he was going to change it. He wanted to know if there had been any discussion and he doubted that, and he told me that there hadn't been any discussion until I tabled a stack of documents this big, Mr. Chairman, then I didn't hear one more word.

Mr. Chairman, there is no way. They won't be able to go back. A program is being destroyed. There won't be any more dental nurses and there will be only one program. That is exactly what is being done now. There is lack of information. The people can't even give their impression; they are told to keep their mouth shut or they will be out of a job. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Minister — let's read this and I think that anybody that pays attention to this document will see what is going on. This is a personal and confidential document that was sent to different regional dentists in the Dental Association plan. This is marked "Personal and Confidential. On February 9, the MDA met with the government to try and determine what their objections and priorities were. What came out of this session was the fact that the government has a pool of money for the dental program. This pool will not be increased at all and no expansion of the present program will take place this year." Now the Minister tells us that there is more. "The only way for the MDA to be further involved at this time is by taking over more of the schools divisions that the government program is now in.

"To this end, we have subsequently requested MDA involvement in a further 16 school divisions. Our involvement in these further 16 school divisions will depend on two things and this was made abundantly clear by the government. They are, of course, utilization and costs. Costs we can readily determine but utilization is a bit of a problem. This is basically the reason for this confidential memo and it is to urge all regional co-ordinators to do all you possibly can to get utilization as high as we can.

"In about six weeks, the Minister will have to face the Legislature for his budget Estimates presentation, so to help the MDA get the further 16 school divisions, we would like him to be able to relate high utilization and reasonable costs. Now, if these are not favorable, then our further involvement in the expansion of our program will be stopped. The extremely important reasons for having these two areas favorably and in ultimately expanding our program into the 16 schools divisions are, first, to stop this government from hiring the 38 dental nurses graduated from Wascana in June; and, second, to get them to finally and firmly decide in favour of our program so that

they will have to in fact terminate employment of the dental nurses in the 16 school divisions we will go into. This will not be an easy task since we also know the government is not reducing or cutting back any further staff or bureaucracy. However, because of their admitted limited pool of money, we will have a decision either for or against our position and if for, then no other choice would appear open but to terminate employment of dental nurses. So do all you can to get our utilization up so the Minister can present favorably to the House and to the media and the public. That is what it all depends on.

"This attached list of schools and children enrolled in your division is for you to use to identify those who are not in the program to date. If you would like to discuss any of this with me, please phone me at Brandon 1-727-5099." Which is a dentist, I believe, who is responsible for this program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that you can read, I mean you know what is going on about the utilization and about this. Now we are going to get the data from these people; they are going to evaluate their own program. And what are they doing with the dental nurses? The Minister said, "We will give you meaningful employment." He told us in this House, they would stay as dental nurses. Now, there are six of them on contract, seven or six. They don't know if they will be rehired when their contract is finished and five of them are working as not dental nurses, technicians or assistants and so on, people who have been trained for something else. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said himself that there would be meaningful employment.

Now, the profession wrote this letter and this is who they recognize. It is not the ability, it is when. "The Manitoba Dental Association board of directors at their October, 1978 meeting did pass a motion that accepted the Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Science Dental Nurses Program as a formal course of training for those graduates who were bursaried by the Manitoba Government. Your letter of January 26, 1979 intimates that this motion was never taken care of by the Manitoba Dental Association. If you want to discuss this further, please phone."

Now, there is one young lady who is taking the course; she is paying for it. Now she won't be recognized as a dental nurse. In these days when we are talking about prevention, education and saving money and plateauing the money in this restraint — this is a government of restraint that is saying that we have got to cut down — you have got people who are doing better work than the dentists in certain areas where they are trained. I am not knocking down, I am not ridiculing the dental profession — we need the dental profession, there is no doubt about that, we need them in the plan, we need them in the government plan — but for the work that they are doing, they do a better job because they are doing it all the time. It stands to reason. Now, that plan is going to go out the window. It wasn't given a chance. What did we hear? The only thing was, it was never utilization. It wasn't even the dental nurses. It was the cost; it was based on the cost. Well, let me tell you the latest from Saskatchewan. They started on the average cost, it was in the first year \$158.00. We told the Minister the same thing, that it would be high the first year but that it would cut down, that it was a very new program. Now, the dental profession said that this wasn't the case. Now last year in Saskatchewan, with inflation and so on, Mr. Chairman, from a few years before, it went down to \$83.00 and this year with inflation it went down to \$74.00. \$74.00, that's the cost. The administration went from \$25.99 per child; last year it was \$7-something; this year it is \$5.57. Now, is that the cost?

Now we are going to have people who are trained to do good work, and I made a statement that they were doing better work, of the limited things they were doing. I didn't invent that. They didn't tell me that. It was highly qualified dentists who made an investigation in Saskatchewan — and what did they find? They found, in what they investigated, that the work that was being done by the dental nurses, as compared to the dentists — Unacceptable by the dentists 21.1 percent, by the dental nurse 3.7 percent, Mr. Chairman; Superior, the dentists, 16.5, by the dental nurse 17.7, Mr. Chairman. Adequate: 62.4 by the dentists and 48.6 by the dental nurses.

Mr. Chairman, my point is this: This is not something that is going to hurt the dental profession and if it did, we are not here to generate revenue for somebody in the health field. People are trained because there is a need. There is a need for many more dentists in Manitoba, especially those who will go into certain areas, because they won't go. Now we have a program that was working; the cost was going down and it was working very well. There were some people trained to do a certain job. They were doing it well. We had all kinds of people who were praising the program. When the Minister brought in his program, many school divisions wanted to go along and stay with the government and there are some members of the backbench, there's one who is sitting there, if he was here today — no, just besides you — who would tell you what he thinks of the program or what the people in his area think of the program.

We will be asked, what kind of data would it be? The Minister says the original visual oral examination counts as utilization. They go right into the school, what we were doing, and they do that. I don't know if there is any charge, the parents know nothing about it. Some of that was

done in the school division of Hanover and they haven't heard, in one of the areas, anything since then. And where do they have to travel to get this service? They have to come to Steinbach. The people of Stony Mountain are coming to Winnipeg. And you mean to tell me we're going to have the utilization. We're talking about utilization now for a program that they have three years, but two years was already done under the other program. So what are you talking about costs? It is going to cost more.

You think this is going to work? Right now there are some dentists who want no part of it. And then you have to coax, you have to write these kinds of letters. Then it has been suggested in certain areas, keep the cost down this year; don't do too much work this year because you have got to keep the cost down and make sure the utilization to go up by any means.

Mr. Chairman, we'll be faced with these people who will evaluate their own program. The Minister and the government, for no other reason — and I defy and I challenge the Minister to give me any other reason — is it because of cost? Is it because the work was being done? Is it because the children were taken care of? Is it because the utilization rate was too low? No, Mr. Chairman, it is because of ideology you are ready to kill a group. You don't care about this profession. How else are we going to keep the costs down if we don't go to paramedicals? How else? When you are trained to do a certain amount of work and you do it well, you do it better — they are not more qualified than the dentists, there is no doubt about that. The dentists who made the survey didn't say that. But for the work they were doing, because they were trained to do it and they did so much of it and they did only that and they specialized in that, they did darn good work.

And this program is going to disappear? And this is a government that is talking about restraint and it is going to cost more. When all the nurses are gone, it will be too late. Why didn't the Minister go with the suggestion that I made last year. They had 29 divisions. Why didn't the government continue with that and let the dental profession go and do the rest. There is lots of Manitoba that is not covered. Wait a few years and then compare and then say, all right, this is the program we are going to do. But no, the Minister has the gall to stand up today and say, give them a chance, but he hasn't given the other program a darn bit of a chance. He has tried to kill it; he is killing it. Mark my words, Mr. Chairman, you will see what is going to happen to this program because the dental profession, most of them, haven't got the time to do this work. They haven't got the time to do this work and they are not going to go — we have tried everything and this government has tried everything, and the Dental Association has tried everything to try to get dentists to go into certain areas — they won't do it.

This program of the government wasn't a fight with the dental profession. It wasn't competing with them at all. It was trying to get some of the dentists — not take dentists away from their patients. They are busy. You phone and try to get an appointment and see how long it will take you. And there are a lot of the dentists who don't want any part of this program, that all of a sudden they are working with adults and then they have to fit in a kid when they are busy now, when you have to wait two or three months for an appointment. It wasn't competing with these people; it was trying to get some of them to work, either those who were starting, young dentists who didn't have a practice, to help them on. That's what we were ready to do and that's what we wanted to do. And then have some who, because of their age or for any other reason wanted to take it a little easier and to retire or semi-retire, they were ready to work in this program.

This is not something new. This is a program that was tried in different areas. They tried it in Quebec and it didn't work, and Quebec was looking at this other program to go in this program. In Saskatchewan it's working very well. And these are the figures — this is the kind of work they're doing. Everybody likes it; the dentists aren't panicking. They're not panicking at all. This work will not be done, Mr. Chairman, and the rural members will have to face their constituents, who will ask them, "Why did you destroy that program?"

And what about these dental nurses? They're human beings too. They don't count. You know, the Minister said you didn't discuss this with the Dental Association, although I tabled documents this high, but did he discuss it with the dental nurses? They can't open their mouths or they'll be tired. That's what's going on. And I don't know about his staff now, but every single member of that staff, anybody that had anything to do with this program, was 100 percent in favour of the Government Program. Have they changed? All right, they work for the government and they have to change, but did they tell the Minister that he has a better program? I doubt that very much. I doubt that very much.

The Minister wanted to look at the program, but he was afraid that this program would be a success because it was a success and it had been a success in Saskatchewan, so they're trying to destroy it, and he's working in the hands of some people, for what motives I don't know except for their own personal reasons, or maybe that they feel that this is going to help them. They want to control this. When we're talking about delivering the service there is no doubt that we could

work with the Dental Association. If we could, this government could. If they felt that the NDP wanted a confrontation with everybody well then, this government could. He had every chance in the world. He could have kept that program the way it was going. It was going down. There was all kinds of money spent. There were thousands and millions of dollars spent to educate people. The government had a commitment, not a legal commitment when you change government, but what about the moral commitment? Doesn't that count any more in society, or with government?

And they had a chance to go on a program that was working well. They could have waited, and if there was one little thing, they could have cancelled it. But there was no way. And the Minister has the gall today to get up and say, "Well, give them a chance. That's a new program." And this is the government talking about freedom choice. Now, we're talking about the Administration, and it makes as much sense, Mr. Chairman, if they don't want to govern' I don't know why they ran for office if they're afraid to take responsibility, and if it's a sin to have a program.

Who's going to administer they have about hearing aids for the kids? Who's going to administer that? Why should the big, bad government administer it? Are they going to do away with the Manitoba Health Services Commission? Is he doing away with the Institution is Selkirk and Brandon and Portage la Prairie? Who's going to administer that?

Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for the program that we had. We had a darn good program and I challenge and I defy every member of this House to get up and say this program wasn't working and give me one little reason, give me one, and I defy and I challenge, especially the rural members that represent an area that was served by the government, to stand up and say, "I'm glad glad. This program wasn't working." Where are they? They're not here. Where's the member sitting here — Emerson? Oh, I'm sorry, he's Chairman. I'm sorry. That's right. —(Interjection)— Yes, I think they're sitting now. They'll sit until the Lieutenant-Governor . . . Yes, I'm sorry, I forgot that this — but I would like to hear from those people because, Mr. Chairman, we are ruining a good program. We are ruining a program and, mark my words, Mr. Chairman, and remember, remember this date, April the 2nd, 1979 when you read Hansard, and I say that in five or ten years if this program is there, that it's going to be very costly when all the dental nurses are chased out, and they realized that they spent two years of their life, or three or four years, for nothing, that they don't count, not with this government. When you realize that they're all gone and then there is no way that you can back down, and if you're going to have the program, it's going to be administered — not the work, I'm not talking about the work — administered by the Dental Association, the Dental Profession. Who do you think is going to set their fees? What do you think they're going to ask for? What do you think they're telling their members now? Why do ymu think some of them are doing this at cost or at loss, or going through that? Because then they're going to squeeze and when you have a program, that's it.

And Sir, I feel and I say that it'll be very difficult, unless the government changes the system of collecting data, of vvaluating this program. I've never heard — I've never heard where a program is evaluated by these people that are trying a pilot project or they are on trial. Now, it's going to be evaluated by these people. Does that make sense? Do you know anywhere else that that is being done? You know, you can play with figures when you talk about utilization. You know, you can have a doctor going to school and a dentist going to school, and make a visual, oral examination and that ends there in certain areas, and that's exactly what has been done and that counts on the utilization rate? The utilization rate that we had, Mr. Chairman, the work had started and in 90 percent of the utilization rate the work was practically all done, and it was doing so well that we had to take other years. Now, in this new program, how are you going to compare? How are you going to compare when the Dental Association's program has two of the three years that were already started and most of the work is done, but you're still giving them \$80.00 for that — \$80.00 for that when the work is practically all done, and you're going to count that in utilization rates. How do you make that comparison, Mr. Chairman?

And what about the — now, the service was brought in the schools, what about those that have to come to Winnipeg now? Is that what's being done? And what about those in the rural areas that have to go to Steinbach or other centres? Do you think your're going to have the proper utilization rate? And when there's only one dentist who's very busy. Now, I don't remember the area but there was one in this Hanover School Division where the dentist went in the school to do this visual examination, and that counts, you chalk it down as utilization, so it goes on for the rate of utilization. Nothing is done for these children. And then the Minister is one that is talking about prevention.

Do you know what they used to do in this program? They'd be patient and teach them and show them how to brush their teeth, give them a little pack of samples, toothbrush and toothpaste, and show them how to do it and educate them and talk about prevention. Do you think the dentists will have time to do that? The one with the dental nurses, maybe, for a while, but then the dental nurses will disappear. Why shouldn't they? Why should they challenge the profession.

You know, at one time that was tried with the RN, but they're too strong now. And that is one of the problems that we have in this Health care. That is why the cost is so high. Because certain people want to control it all, and the Minister said last year that the dental nurses would be recognized. Some of them had worked for the dentists and the dentists in turn, for the work done by the dental nurses, would charge the same rate that he would charge if the work was done by himself. And you're talking about the restraint? You're talking about the high cost of Health? This would not start the program yet, but after that it would not be a costly program, Mr. Chairman.

And how do you explain the letter that I wrote? How do you explain that if it's not obvious what the intention is, Mr. Chairman.

And what about the commitment of the Minister that the dental nurses would have meaningful work when they are now working as assistants instead of dental nurses? I wonder if the Minister would like that? He can say, "Well, that's meaningful work. They're getting paid." That's just the same as saying his Legislative Assistant should be the Minister. It's the same thing. There's no difference. It's meaningful work.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is wrong. I think that this is one program that the government had no reason to destroy. There is no reason in the world, and if they felt that we hadn't been fair with the Dental Association or with the dentists, and if they felt that they wanted them to run the program, why didn't they let them start from scratch and start their own program instead of taking over something that was well done, that was established for a few years and then try to compare prices? Why, Mr. Chairman? Then we would have seen — then it would have been clear for all Manitoba and then a Conservative Government could have said, "See, you were wrong." But they knew that wouldn't be the case, Mr. Chairman, so what are they trying to do now, and the Minister is very candid, they're going to take over as soon as they can, but he's leaving a door open. I don't think that one group could do it all, because they will go in certain areas up in the north and the government will still have to do that, the same as if you had Autopac, that who would have the gravy — who's going to get the gravy and the dirty work will be left by the government and you'll say, "Here", and that's one of the reasons they say the government couldn't run a peanut stand, because they have certain responsibilities, the motive is not profit, they have a responsibility to their work, and when nobody else wants to do the work the government does it, and then it costs a lot of money. There's no doubt about that, Mr. Chairman.

Well, mark my words, Mr. Chairman, I know that this government and the Minister will steam roll, will go ahead with this plan, and I know that we'll have trouble getting the evaluation and it will not be an evaluation that we could be proud of on evaluation day that we can see because it will be by the people that are on trial, that are working in a new program and they'll be the ones that will evaluate that program. That, Mr. Chairman, is a joke, and I think that the government — it might not be too late to do this: Keep those School Divisions with that program, and let the program go independently, not side by side in the same division in certain areas and compare, get the same type of School Divisions in the two programs and let them run. There's enough. It could work. And the Minister then could still turn around and give it to the Dental Association in a few years. They won't be able to do this that fast.

And then the Minister said that he wants to go up north, there's room for both programs, so the Minister can go ahead. Let the government run their, what? — what do they have there? 20, 20 or so, I think they still have 20 School Divisions. Leave them alone. Let them run and let them do the best they can, and then let the other one . . . Competition is great. This is a government, this is a party that talks about competition, and the Dental Association will have lots of work because there's a lot of areas, outside of the city there's a lot of areas that have not covered, and let's wait for a few years and then make a comparison and it's not too late. You know, it can't be an ideology hang-up that you have to say, "The profession has to run it." The medical profession, they don't run the Health programs. They work. They're the ones that deliver the service. Fine. That's what they're trained for and they do that, but they don't run the programs.

The government runs the programs and the Minister runs his program, and he tells the hospital how much money they have. He doesn't care about the medical profession at St. Boniface Hospital when they say, "Well, this is ridiculous", and you can't go along. Why? Why is it a crime? And I'm not criticizing that, I'm not criticizing that the government and the Minister have a right to run

programs in the field of Health. There is no doubt about it. But the Minister wants to go more and more. He wants to have Personal Care Homes that'll be built for profit. And you know what happens in the States? You know what happens in the States when things are for profit, you start cutting corners and it's one strip of bacon and then two strips of bacon less, and the sheets, and then you keep the people drugged because then you haven't got the staff to take care of them so you keep them drugged. That's easy.

And you know the horror stories in the States in some of the areas. I'm not saying this is the case here. I'm talking about profit-motivated organizations, and if that is good for Personal Care Homes, why not for hospitals? Why not for hospitals? Why can't a group of doctors decide that they're going to establish their own hospitals? Why not?

Now, you know, I'm ready to fight an election on that with the Minister, and on this program of dental programs, because I don't think that this is a service. I'd like to see anybody get up and defend that program and defend the action of the government and tell their constituents, especially the rural members, that know how good this program was, and tell it that this was a lousy program and the only people that run the program is the Dental Association. You know, the government likes to see, and I suppose after tonight it will be said that I wanted a confrontation with the dentists, that I didn't like the professionals. That's what they're going to say. You know, you don't dare open your mouth here and defend the people and talk about the facts, that you always have a motive; it is to hurt a profession. And right away, you know this government said that they pushed so much that the press took it, and so on, that I always had confrontations with doctors, and I will have more to say about that. You know, because we took our responsibility of managing seriously, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to, if I can find it, I'd like to table this letter and I'd like to see the . . . Mind you, it will be in Hansard but I'd like to see this memo, because that will come back to haunt these people, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Environment.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has asked to have one of the rural members speak with respect to the dental program and I feel that I should put a few remarks on the record and provide a little history as to how the program operated in my area. I happened to be part of the Turtle Mountain School Division when the Member for St. Boniface was the Minister of Health and Social Development and had attempted to get the program implemented into that school division. I well remember at the time how the letter was sent out, emphasizing that this was a free service with the "free" underlined in the letter, but those of us on the School Board at the time raised some questions, and I suppose we were one of the few School Boards that did raise the question to look beyond the superficial aspect of this program being free and to see what kind of effect that it might eventually have on the dental services that could be provided in our area, because we were concerned not only that there be dental services provided to children of school age but that there be dental services available in the community for those that were beyond the age, that would eventually be covered by this program. And we could well see that by the program going into the schools, being run by the government, that that would eventually have a very high probability of just simply further eroding the base of the private dentists in the area. We would then be left with a program for children, perhaps, that was run by government in the schools but that the dental services for the rest of the community would be gone from that area.

Therefore, we undertook to talk to the Dental Association and to try and come up with an alternative to the government delivering the program. And we were able to work out what seemed to those of us on the School Board to be a very reasonable alternative.

Mr. Chairman, it now comes as a great surprise to me to hear the Honourable Member for St. Boniface talk about ideology and there is room for both programs, and try them out. When we, in the Turtle Mountain School Division, tried to get that program, to implement it as an alternative to the one being offered by the government at that time, we were flatly rejected. There was no way that any kind of alternative system was going to be tried by that government.

Now, that was ideology, Mr. Chairman. They were not prepared to let any other system have a go at providing the sorts of services that were required in our area.

Now, the honourable member stands up and says, "There is room for both." Well, Mr. Chairman, his thinking seems to have changed. The period in opposition now seems to have given him a little different perspective and he sees that perhaps both government and the private dentists should be given an opportunity to provide those services. That was not the case two or three years ago, Mr. Chairman.

So I think that the honourable members opposite have not adequately understood the whole

system of the delivery of dental services in the rural areas. And while the provision of dental services to the children is certainly a desirable objective that it has to be considered in light of the entire spectrum of dental services available in those communities. And that is, to a great extent, the concern that members in the rural areas had, couple that with the blind ideological approach that the previous Minister was taking in absolutely refusing to consider any alternative.

This Minister and this government, Mr. Chairman, are undertaking to follow a number of procedures which will ultimately lead to providing us with a workable dental system that not only gives service for children of school age but to the entire population of the rural areas.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, when you have some of the information but not all the information, there is always a danger in making statements such as were made by the last gentleman that spoke.

First of all, let me say that he knows only part of the story. He is absolutely right that when we received a letter, the budget was prepared and so on, when we received a letter from that School Division telling us that they didn't want any part of our program — and it wasn't compulsory — that they wanted one from the Dental Association. We said we weren't ready to finance that. He is absolutely right.

Now, I did not say — I am not afraid to say, that we had certain givens in the discussion with the Dental Association that we insisted on, and that's the kind of program we want. We designed a program; we studied the program. We did an awful lot of studying. We looked in other jurisdictions; we looked in Quebec. The people of Quebec came in to study what we were doing, and so on, because they weren't satisfied in their plan.

Now, there were three givens, Mr. Chairman. One of them that definitely we were recognizing the dental nurses, that the Dental Association did not want to do, because they felt that this would be harmful, not for the work they were doing — here it is; this is what some of the dentists were saying and this is what they told me privately — that they weren't afraid that that could be changed.

Secondly, that the program insist that the service would be taken over to the children in the schools. They wanted big clinics and that the kids would be bussed from all over the place, and we didn't —(Interjection)— Yes, that's exactly; you weren't there. You weren't there when I was discussing. I am giving you the background of that division and I'm giving you the background of what was done and what was discussed with the Dental Association.

And then we said that for the initial visit it would not be fee for service but it would be a flat sessional fee, and that's what you're doing now. That's what they're doing anyway. That's what the Dental Association, they're doing \$5 to a dentist to go and have a visual examination and then they're giving him so much per child, or the Association is getting so much and then they're paying them so much.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt, if you want to call it ideology, that the service that a government should administer — and this is what was being done — would be delivered by dentists and then the student would have the choice of selecting the dentist that they wanted for whatever was covered, if there was extra work, but not the initial thing, because of the cost. And I make no bones. There is no doubt that once we got started in this program this is what we wanted, but let me say to my honourable friend that in my discussions with the Dental Association they asked me, the President of the day asked me, what if we prepared a program, could we try it? Could we have a pilot project? And I said, "Yes, bring that to me." And you know, Mr. Chairman, and to the honourable member, I never received that. They refused to do that when they were asked. They didn't come up with a program and say, "Okay, we want to try that." I told them that we would go ahead. —(Interjection)— I'm not talking about the school division. I'm talking about —(Interjection)— Yes, and now you're a Minister; you have certain responsibilities and you don't have to take back to the Division and ask the Minister of Education. You don't abdicate those responsibilities. This was a government program. If the Division wanted their own program, they were free to start it. There is no doubt about that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when the program was already started, when there was a letter that said we want our own program, what government in its right mind would have said "yes" at that stage when the Dental Association, after requesting that they could try a pilot project, never came forward with such a program.

I make no bones about it, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that you have to employ the paramedical people, and this is what we were doing, and this is why we brought the program. If not, we were not ready to institute a dental program with the costs — you know this restraint that we're talking about — with the costs that this would occasion. We weren't ready to bring that kind of program;

we were ready to bring a program in the schools by a lot of the work done by the dental nurses under the supervision of a dentist. That's the program we offered.

Now my honourable friend is saying, "Well, why didn't you open it up?" You open it up, if you want. You give that program. You cover everybody under the dental program, like you do in Medicare, if that's what you want.

You destroyed and you're destroying a program that we brought in that was working well. And I make no bones. We have listened, and this gentleman sitting in front of you had a lot of discussions with your School Division. That was a politically motivated thing, and you know it. As you say, you were a member of that Board, and there were others also. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, it was and you know darn well it was. You know darn well it was. There were people like you in there, who were trying to . . . —(Interjection)— You had a cheaper plan. All right, remember April 2nd, 1979, and we will come back, even if we're not all sitting in here, and we will see in five or ten years maybe the program will not exist and you will see if they will doing it like Saskatchewan and we will compare it to Saskatchewan because the Saskatchewan program will still be there, no matter what government is in office. And we will compare, and we will compare the utilization, and we will coare an honest evaluation, and we will compare the work done and we will coare the education and the projections. —(Interjection)— No, but you are and you were. You were, definitely.

MR. RANSOM: Anybody that opposes you guys is politically motivated.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, not everybody that opposes but certainly some do. That's exactly what you wanted to do. You wanted to kill that program. And I make no bones about it that I don't think in the field of health, and I know that people should be paid for what they're doing but the administration and somebody should take over and should have a monopoly in hospitals in delivering of service in personal care homes. I think this is wrong. I think this is wrong, and look at what's happening in the States and you will see some change in the States.

But, Mr. Chairman, as I said, there is no way that we're going to steamroll that. There is no way at all that we will be able to come back and we will be able to keep on looking every year, and as long as I'm in this House I'm going to come back year after year and show you the Annual Report of Saskatchewan, and then this work. The evaluation was done by dentists here. What do you have to say about that, if the work wasn't done? —(Interjection)— Oh, they're the same. These people are educators. They are people from the University of McGill and some of those universities out there. We didn't select them. They are the ones, and what did they say? In case you weren't here, I'm going to tell you. I'm going to tell you; maybe you didn't hear this. They said that the work done by these dental nurses as compared to dentists, for limited work, unacceptable 21.1 percent, by the dentists. —(Interjection)— I don't understand. All right, let's see. You're more clever, you're very smart. You're very smart and you're clever, now do you know what that means "unacceptable"? Do you know what that means? Do know what a service is that is not acceptable, with all your cleverness? —(Interjection)— You know, you can look down at the people on this side and tell us how smart you are.

MR. RANSOM: That's what the NDP was in 1977, unacceptable.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, all right, that's fine. And we were turfed out of office. But you're doing the opposite. You're doing the opposite. "Unacceptable, dentists, 21.1 percent, and acceptable, dental nurses 3.7 percent."

MR. RANSOM: Are you saying that dentists are unacceptable?

MR. DESJARDINS: I am saying that the work that they had done, according to dentists, was unacceptable. That's exactly what I'm saying or what I'm reading; I'm not saying it, I'm reading it. "Superior from the dentists was 16.5 and dental nurses 47.7." He says, that's what you were in 1977, unacceptable. All right, we're sitting on this side because we were unacceptable. He's absolutely right.

But what happened in this program, tell me? In Manitoba, when you have facts like this in front of you, that there is more unacceptable work done by dentists in certain areas than the dental nurses; you don't do anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the government at the time had a limited program; it wasn't opening dental care the same as medicare. It was bringing education, prevention and certain work and it would have created more work for the dentists because those people were not going to a dentist. Those people were not going to a dentist at all. What do you have in there? You have people in this service who cannot keep up with the service because it has been changed all of

a sudden; it has been taken out. I say, Mr. Chairman, you know, we can argue until we are blue in the face. The Minister said they don't want this program; they don't care about the dental nurses. —(Interjection)— Well, you're allowing it. Did you read this letter; did you hear this letter that they want him to destroy. . . ? Are you going to tell me that you are going to give a job to all those who are coming back? You guaranteed a meaningful job to some of them so they would remain as dental nurses and five or six of them are now working as helpers, as assistants. Somebody who graduated as a nurse is now an assistance, and that's all right. Can you just imagine if we had done something to somebody like this in the dental profession, what you would hear here today? And this is what you are doing.

Now, who recognized these people? It was a government, a duly accepted government that at the time was accepted, was acceptable, that certainly had a mandate to do it — recruited some young people, paid for their education, to start a program. All of a sudden the Dental Association decides who will be recognized. Now what do they say? They have some people who have taken the course, the same course — the course was paid for them by the government of the day — they were forced, because the Minister told us last year that he was going to insist on that — it was not something they wanted, it was a political thing because he didn't dare throw all these people out of work. He probably would have had to go to court to defend his action. And what do they say? They say those who got a scholarship, we recognize. Now, a young lady took the same course, is paying for it now, but she won't be a dental nurse because the Dental Association here in Manitoba says no. That's fair, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to two or three points raised by the Member for St. Boniface. Before I do, I would like to just, for the record, make sure that a couple of figures that I gave him are accurate. I want to make a couple of minor revisions and explain to him that the figure in one or two instances that I gave him, was an estimate and I now do have the precise figures in front of me. When we were talking about the number of children eligible for this school year, 1978-79, in the Manitoba Dental Association Plan, I gave him 7,050, and then I referred later to 6,521. The reason for that, Mr. Chairman, was that when I first responded to the question, I was working from my House book, which is an estimate. The actual figure is 6,521 plus the 286 in Turtle Mountain. So we are actually looking at 6,807 rather than 7,050. That is the number eligible in 1978-79 in the 9-2/3 divisions being served by the Manitoba Dental Association.

On utilization in terms of enrolment, I told him 80 percent of the eligible children in the school divisions served by the MDA were enrolled. The actual figure, Sir, is 82 percent. I apologize for the discrepancies but we terminated the Interim Supply Debate and went into Estimates a little faster than I think either he or I had expected and I didn't have the exact figures in front of me. The actual figure is 82 percent. In terms of the government-operated plan, enrolment there in the past school year, 1977-78, was 83 percent.

So I just want to —(Interjection)—

MR. DESJARDINS: What about breaking down the age group, 1970, 1971 and 1972. Two of them were already enrolled in the other plan. What about 1972; what was the utilization rate for 1972? And utilization, there is utilization. The Minister said that as long as they had a visual examination, that counts. I'm talking about treatment. In the program when we were talking about 83, about 90 percent of these people would practically finish the work. Now, how many of them have had any work done at all, or even that the parents heard about it, being contacted?

MR. SHERMAN: That figure, Mr. Chairman, I have to get for my honourable friend, and I will.

But I wanted to correct those discrepancies for the record, for the media, and for my honourable friend and ensure that he and the record had the absolutely correct figures in those instances. I'll get the other figure for him.

Let me just turn to some points made by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Chairman. He has talked about restraint and the fact that this program, now that it is shifting in its emphasis to an MDA operation rather than a government operation, belies and betrays the whole government's philosophy and policy with respect to restraint. Actually, Sir, the total opposite is the truth. The fact of the matter is that in the Dental Services Program in the appropriations being requested for this year, as the honourable member can see himself, we are asking for a modest increase of approximately \$.5 million, which in fact turns out to be 20 percent in total, which is more than a modest increase; it is a substantial increase. But it represents a position of control and of responsibility in the area of spending in this field, which we feel is absolutely necessary and in keeping with the government's overall budgetary program.

Had we persisted in the government program along the lines that it was designed, conceived

and implemented, we would have been into a substantially higher commitment for dental services this year than we now are. Because, as the Member for St. Boniface well knows, to continue with the concept as it was designed and implemented by the previous government meant expanding age groups every year in perhaps a more rapid dimension than we are intending to do. It meant expanding into different school divisions than those that we have chosen to expand into. It called for expansion this year, 1979-80, into urban centres. Now, whether they would have been able to achieve that or not is a moot point but it called for expansion into urban centres, including Winnipeg and Brandon. It called for and required continual additional classes, courses for incoming dental nurses, dental dental nurses on bursary at Wascana College in Regina. It called for the hiring of 1-½ student assistants, at least, for every dental nurse added to the program and it called for the hiring of supervising dentists.

In fact, Sir, if you sat down and looked at the program in concept, it was virtually open-ended. It was expansionary by nature and it would have cost considerably more millions of dollars each year for the taxpayers of Manitoba than had been expended up to that point in time and than was being asked for up to that point in time, where, when the previous government left office, we were looking at a program that was costing the taxpayers something in the neighbourhood of \$2 million. We would have, had we persisted in their plan, been into something substantially more than that in the fiscal year just ended and something substantially more than that in the fiscal year upon which we are entering. Instead of that, we are looking at an increase from \$2.4 million to \$2.9 million. If the honourable member challenges us in the area of restraint, I say to him that the evidence is there. It is precisely because we are interested in responsible control of public expenditure and precisely because that is demonstrated by the appropriation we are asking for this year, that in restraint terms, if in no other and there are many other, but in restraint terms, the shift in emphasis from government operation to operation by the private profession can be justified. It can be justified without challenge and without question.

Now, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface accuses us of killing the program. He says, "Mark my words, you will remember April 2, 1979, it will rank with May 8, 1945."

MR. DESJARDINS: I didn't say that; those are your words.

MR. SHERMAN: "It will rank with December 7, 1941; it will rank with Dieppe. This is going to go down in history as a day that you will rue, that we will remember on April 2, 1979, he stood in the Legislature to pronounce that this program was effectively destroyed by the present government."

MR. DESJARDINS: Being destroyed. Exactly.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, that is a conjectural argument and only time will tell. But I say to him that that is exaggeration and extravagance of the highest, or the lowest order depending on which way you want to look at it. It is another case of attempting to spread panic in the streets. There is no destruction of the program. In fact, the program this year starts to do the thing that a Children's Dental Health Services Program should always attempt to do in the Province of Manitoba, and that is serve some of those regions, some of those areas that are underserved in terms of dental health. I have told him and I have told the committee that we are moving into the north, that the MDA is moving into certain communities in the north and that the government program is moving into certain communities in the north, communities that have not had this kind of service in the past, communities that certainly, surely must be the primary targets, must be the markets and the communities that deserve the primary consideration for service of this kind. So that far from destroying the program, we are recasting and reshaping the program into what it should be in terms of service to the people of Manitoba who need it.

Now, he talked about the dental nurses and my commitment to give them meaningful work. I say to him that I believe that my department officials, that my colleagues in the government and I fulfilled our commitment, fulfilled our pledge to ensure that they were taken care of, that they either had an opportunity of work to go to or they had an educational opportunity to go to within the dental field. We bent over backwards. There were hours spent trying to make the compromise, resolve the difficulties and differences that had developed between the Manitoba Dental Association and the "Government of Manitoba" regardless of party, but the differences between the Manitoba Dental Association and the Government of Manitoba as an institution, that had developed for whatever reasons over the years. I'm not about to get into an argument with my honourable friend on that point but I think he can't deny the reality of the fact that there was a very difficult, cynical, mutually suspicious climate that existed.

We had to work very very hard to get to the point where we had a program that would serve

Manitobans by respecting those who had in good faith gone into training for this kind of service, the dental nurses who had gone to Wascana, that would respect the other dental auxiliaries in the field, including the dental hygienists who had considerable concerns of their own, that would keep in mind the necessity of delivering service to our children, particularly in those areas of the province that are underserved in dental health, and that would take advantage of an excellent profession in existence in the province that was capable and desirous of serving the people of Manitoba and contributing in a program of this sort to the people of Manitoba and that was not being utilized, that was not, for whatever reason, incorporated into and being utilized in this essential service. Who better to deliver this kind of a service, a dental service, to the people of Manitoba, to the children of Manitoba, than those who went to college to learn dentistry, and to practise that profession. I think our position on that is entirely, entirely justifiable and quickly and easily recognizable by any reasonable person anywhere. Why would you go into a program of this kind and not utilize the dental profession? The people, the men and women who should know what dentistry and delivery of dental services is all about. —(Interjection)— whether they said it or not, whether they said it or not, Mr. Chairman, the fact is the dental profession was not being utilized.

You know, the honourable member and his colleagues stand in their places across the Chamber and accuse us from time to time and certainly accuse me from time to time of spending all our time reviewing things, monitoring things, not taking action, not making decisions, not taking initiative. Mr. Chairman, they can't have it both ways. We have been entirely consistent in the time since we were elected, with the position we espoused vis-a-vis the children's dental health program, when we were in opposition. We made it abundantly clear that we did not believe that a state-run, government-run, state-oriented system, was the best way to go, and we made it abundantly clear or I did at any rate, that I believed in a children's dental health program, when I said publicly outside the House as well as in, that I believed in a children's dental health program but that we did not believe that it should be run, operated, controlled, delivered entirely by government as an agency of government, as a state system, for two reasons essentially.

1) that it was creating an unnecessary and artificial hostility where the dental profession was concerned, and we, as Manitobans, need that profession and need its help, and 2) like any government program, it stands in the potential danger always, of expanding upon itself, bureaucratizing itself, becoming more and more costly, more and more expensive, and more and more of a burden for the taxpayer. Those are two sound, conservative, philosophical reasons, and if the honourable member wants to accuse us of practising philosophy, I accept the accusation. That I believe is what, in large part, what politics is all about. What's wrong with practising political philosophy? And we never made any bones about the philosophy we held with respect to this program or what we would do when we were elected to government. We have set about trying to do that. The honourable member doesn't like that. He would prefer that we were monitoring it, and reviewing it, and comparing it. But if we're monitoring, reviewing and comparing some other program, we're accused of not taking any action. We're accused of spending all our time monitoring.

Here we took some action, and they don't like that. So it only goes to reinforce, Mr. Chairman, the fact that after all it is a political debate; it is a philosophical debate. I respect the position my honourable friend takes because he takes it from a sincerely held political, philosophical position counter to mine, but mine is as equally sincere in the manner in which I hold it. I am equally sincere, and I say to him that we don't believe in a state-run society. We believe in, as far as possible, a society run by individuals with the freedom to expand on their own opportunities, and a society that relies on and utilizes to the full, such professional resources and talents as exist within it, and that includes professions such as the dental profession.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member says why didn't we let the dentists start somewhere new instead of taking over in those school divisions in which the government plan was already operating? The basic reason we didn't do that, Mr. Chairman, is that the taxpayers of Manitoba couldn't afford it. If we had stayed exactly as we were, with the government program operating in those divisions, we would have been into, and I can assure him from my own processed budget and estimates process, we would have been into an expansionary expense, requiring new dental nurses, new dental nursing students, new dental assistants, and new supervising dentists, that would have pushed the costs of the program far beyond what we feel that the taxpayers of Manitoba can afford on a year by year basis in this particular field.

So that is why we didn't let them stay exactly where they were and suggest to the MDA that they go somewhere else. The whole point was to try to get control of this program, whose costs were visibly going to expand and escalate on us, potentially, Sir, from something in the neighbourhood of \$2 million a year, potentially I say, to something in the neighbourhood of \$10 million a year, and we weren't prepared to commit ourselves to that kind of a taxpayer burden, in that short a period of time.

Now I want to say something about the question of evaluation which the Member for St. Boniface is highly concerned about. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, what we have asked the MDA to do is report to us on utilization, report to us on figures that can be checked, figures to which we ourselves will have access on reasonable, legitimate computer print-outs, as to the utilization both in terms of the children enrolled and the children using the program, and the procedures employed on those children in treatment. That is what the MDA is doing, reporting to us on use and utilization. The evaluation, the assessment, the determination as to whether we're satisfied or not, whether the program is good or not, will be carried out by a committee that will include personnel from my department, personnel from the dental college and personnel from the MDA. It'll be a committee that has a cross-section of representation and a committee that has a responsibility that represents a direct line of contact and communication with the electorate, because it will be a committee that will include personnel from my office, under my direction, under the government's direction, so that there is no question about a put-up job of evaluation being done by the people, the people who are running the program themselves. We're not asking the people, who are running the program to evaluate themselves. We're asking them to report, and the evaluation will be done.

MR. DESJARDINS: I thought you said two weeks ago.

MR. SHERMAN: The evaluation will be done by a Review Committee. It'll be constituted of the kind of personnel to which I have referred, Mr. Chairman, and there is correspondence on the record between the President of the Manitoba Dental Association and myself, which attests to that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me just express to the Member for St. Boniface once again what I have expressed in the past about our approach to this program. And that is that we want to get dental services into those areas of Manitoba, which are underserved in that respect. In the same way, we want to get medical services in there. One of the primary goals of this program for us is to get more dentists into our rural communities, into our rural and northern communities. One of the primary objectives is that. And this approach, this recasting, reshaping of the program as we have undertaken it, and initiated it, will serve to do that. It will serve to provide the initiative, the incentive, and we believe the demonstrable opportunity very shortly, to put, attract, dental practitioners, dentists, into rural communities, who now are not going into rural communities — to serve rural and remote and northern communities with dental professionals who now are not served by such professionals. That is one of the primary goals of the program. You can't do that in a vacuum. Much as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would like to see a pure, pristine, state-run approach to this thing, and he believes that government should have the final authority for the administration and delivery of all these programs. I suggest to him that that, if it weren't so naive, it would be doctrinaire.

MR. DESJARDINS: What are you doing with the hospitals? Is the medical profession running the hospitals?

MR. SHERMAN: Essentially it's being naive. In order to get that kind of development, that kind of advance and progress in these areas that don't have dental services, we have to cooperate and work with the professionals in this province who can do that, who can deliver it. Surely we have to work with our professionals to achieve that. By allowing the people of Manitoba to be served by the MDA through this program, we will open up interests and attractions and incentives for young dentists, male and female, to go into some of those communities that have long lacked that kind of care. That is part of the arrangement and the agreement with the Manitoba Dental Association. They have pledged, they are committed, to working with us, to attract more dentists into the rural areas. That, Sir, would be a major, significant, progressive advance in this province worth far more to the children and the people of this province than blind, tunnel vision, continuing commitment to the kind of doctrinaire approach that the Member for St. Boniface defends in the government program. —(Interjection)— Let us not allow ourselves to be misled by the kinds of arguments that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface raises. This is a philosophical debate about a state-run program and about a government that does not subscribe to the theory that the state can do everything best. We've never deviated from that, we made that position in opposition, we made that position on the public hustings, in the campaign, we made that position when we were elected to government, we introduced it last year, I have never ducked from that position, I've never shied away from that position.

We don't believe that a state-run system is necessarily the best. We're going to see what our private professionals can do. —(Interjection)— And if they can do it better, they'll be allowed to do more and more of it. If they can't then perhaps we'll have to come back with some modifications, and I'm prepared to do that if necessary, Mr. Chairman, but not until we have a chance to

whether it can be done better by the private profession.

So, I am not impressed by the rage that the Member for St. Boniface flies into, and I'm not going to be lured into a ferocious, bombastic debate with him because the battle lines on this one are quite clear. He believes in a state-run system, for all I know he may believe in a totally state-run society.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh yes, I'm a Communist. Say I'm a Communist, go ahead.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the honourable, the minister spoke about a ferocious argument and I was late coming in, I did not hear the first remarks made by the Member for St. Boniface, but Mr. Chairman, if he compared his prediction of today, April 2, 1979, with Pearl Harbor, then I think it was a terrible thing to do and I would reprimand him very strongly. I don't think he ought to be comparing the bombing, the unexpected, unknown bombing of people, citizens, children in Hawaii, without any warning, without a declaration of war, to compare that with the development of a dental program. If the Member for St. Boniface said that Mr. —(Interjection)— I'm told he did not say that, Mr. Chairman. I wasn't here, but the minister quoted him as saying that. I understood the minister to say that he was comparing the two dates. —(Interjection)— I wasn't here, but I took the minister at his word. —(Interjection)— I was here when the minister was talking and saying that there was a comparison made between Pearl Harbor and today's date, and now that I discover that it was not indeed true, that the Member for St. Boniface said it, then I can only put it in the same category as reference to jackboots and other expressions that fall so glibly from the mouth of the Minister of Health.

talked about believing that our side wanted government to run programs. I would say that that is not the case. There are occasions when, and many occasions, when the people, through their selected instrument, run programs for their mutual advantage, and those are done in the public school system. It wasn't always that way, Mr. Chairman. There was a time when there were no public schools or paid for by the taxpayers on an ability to pay basis. There are other methods of delivery of service that are operated by the people through the instrument of government and this government has not rejected it. However, they have rejected some and that is, I suppose, a major difference in ideology. When there is a discussion of ideology, and the Minister of Mines was talking about it, I saw a difference between Conservatives and New Democrats and to me the difference is the question of universality. I think that on our part, we believe that it is necessary to provide a service, an essential service, to all members of society, giving them complete and fair and equal access to these services. We have that to some degree in our public school system. I say to some degree because you still have to recognize the difference in the social and economic background of many of the pupils and the fact that some are much less able to take advantage of a public school system than others.

I think that also applies in what we now consider a free medical aid system. When we call it free, we have eliminated medicare premiums which this government has not yet dared to change and I believe that they are playing with that. But even there, there is still a hardship on people who are working on a hourly rate, aay, to take time off to go to their doctor's office or to a hospital and sit and wait to be attended to as compared with those whose income continues to run whether or not they are at work. So that there isn't really complete access, universal access.

But nevertheless I think that is a basic principle. We expouse the principle of universality of access to certain important, necessary, vital programs. We believe that to accomplish that, the people can best do it and should best be able to do it through the instrumentality of those that they elect for that purpose. Conservatives believe, and the Minister of Health is one of those who believes that people should do for themselves. The trouble is that when people do for themselves, they often do it at the expense of others. That is one of the problems we face and that's where we differ and it's fair enough to say that that's where we differ.

Now, to say that we are committed to a state-run — you know, the Member for Rhineland is usually a very quiet, co-operative individual in committee or in the House and I don't know what happened to today but he is not performing as he usually does, and I regret that. However, I can take that. If he represents the voice of the people of his area, then I suppose he has a right so to do better on his feet than on his seat.

Mr. Chairman, what I don't consider a matter of ideology is method of delivery of that universal program I'm talking about. There there are different ways of doing it and there we can have ideas, some fixed, some firm, some flexible, on what is the best way of delivering a universal program. I say that we are ideologically committed to universality of program. We are ideologically committed to equality of opportunity to take advantage of programs and we are ideologically committed to

paying for that program through a system which imposes a greater burden on those better able to pay for that service.

But when it comes to the method of delivery, then it is absolutely stupid, it is absolutely ignorant to say that we will only do it through a state operation because that is ridiculous and it's laughable, except for those who have fixed ideas and like to use rhetoric to attack others, rather than logic. I don't even mean rhetoric, I really mean abusive language and vituperative attacks — polemics is a word supplied to me.

But the method of delivery is what counts in carrying out the principles I have espoused. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are really on this continent, in the western world, what they call the free world, although I don't believe that this world is free, that the important problem that is facing us other than horrendous ones such as what has been going on in Pennsylvania, is the attempt to impose a universal access and make it work on an existing system which may not be equipped to handle it. Let me be more specific. The President of the United States has made a commitment on behalf of the Democratic Party in the United States, that they would bring in a health system such as we have in Canada, a system which is recognized to be the most progressive in the world, let us say, in the western world certainly. They find that they are having difficulty and the reason they find they are having difficulty is that it is very difficult to provide universality of access to health care on a national basis and at the same time continue the system that now exists of freedom of practice, freedom of choice, universality, of fee for service. These things are a problem. And the thing is we don't have this freedom of choice. Why, the Minister of Mines pointed out that the fear of people in the Turtle Mountain School Division was that they would lose a dentist. You know, Mr. Chairman, they obviously did not have freedom of choice in the Turtle Mountain district, of dentists, because they were so afraid that in any way affecting the earnings base of dentists, they would lose — I don't know how many they have, but obviously the few that they have — because apparently they did not feel that they could maintain dentists in the Turtle Mountain district without making sure that they were somehow guaranteeing them some income. So that freedom of choice is really not there. I would think in all of Manitoba, the only places where one can think one has some freedom of choice of delivery of health care is in an urban centre like Winnipeg.

So it is a question of method. Now, I admit freely that I believe that it is impossible to achieve universality by continuing a fee-for-service basis, to have the delivery of that service delivered by the top paid professional in the field. I believe, and I really believe it sincerely and it's not a dogma and it is not an ideology, that one should use the services of a lesser trained person who can do a job as well as the more highly skilled person at a lesser cost and without taking away the time of the person who is more highly skilled. I think it is absolutely stupid to go to a professional, and in this case a dentist, who is highly skilled in the work of let's say root canals, and take up his time with doing simple fillings of say simple caries, as was indicated to me. It is stupid to do that. One should not use the greatest skill to deliver a service that can be delivered by others. Which means a greater and greater reliance on paraprofessionals. It makes sense. They are being used in the health field to a very great extent. Doctors have learned to use paramedical people in the hospitals, in their offices, in their labs. They train people to do special jobs and then they learn that those people can do them better than the doctors who trained them so to do and that makes sense.

That's not a matter of ideology; that's a matter of practicality — how do you deliver a service? Now, we believe — I believe and obviously the Minister of Health and I was not part of that decision but I concurred with it — that one had to train people to do a job of a limited area with limited parameters and to do it well without having to go through a complete dental training to do many other things. It made sense and it was proven that way. It's not a new idea; they were doing it in Australia or New Zealand. They were doing it in our neighbouring province of Saskatchewan. They were training nurses to do special jobs and it made sense. If you can get a nurse to do it at a third or a quarter of the cost that a dentist would do it, and if you would release the time of that dentist to do the kind of work that the Minister of Mines was afraid they would lose in Turtle Mountain, then it would be foolish not to take advantage of these people.

So the government decided to train them and to give them the legal right to do the work. The dentists, for some silly, peculiar reason, became nervous that their control was being endangered. Well, if their control of the economics was being endangered, I don't worry too much about it. But the control of the practice of their profession being in danger, that would be serious — and that's why it was clearly established that the dentist, the highly-skilled dentist, would make the preliminary examination and would decide what had to be done, would order that to be done which could be done by a lesser skill, and would see to it by referral that dentists with greater skills would do the more complicated work. And dentists had every freedom of choice. They had the right to be the initial examiners. They had the right to do that on a sessional basis and there is

nothing really bad about paying somebody so much an hour or so much a half-day; that's how lawyers often get paid; that's not bad. That's how Ministers get paid, inadequately, they think no doubt. And that's how most people in society get paid, on an hourly basis, on an annual basis. It's not a terrible thing.

But even then they went on to say that on referrals, they would do it on a fee-for-service. The more skilled, the quicker operator of a dentist would earn more money because he could do the same job more quickly. So there was no danger there but the dental profession was afraid, as the medical profession is afraid, as the legal profession would be afraid, and we have heard that in relation to legal, oh, horrendous. There are students who are being permitted to do certain work — I mean law students — being permitted to do certain work. Horrendous. The fact is that it has been going on in the medical profession for so many years that interns have been doing medical work has been accepted, but the lawyers were a little behind, and that will happen in every case. And it happens in the skilled trades; it happens in the machinists who worry about apprentices; it happens with the boilermakers, I'm sure, who are worried about the apprentices they have. They are all afraid and one of the reasons they are afraid is that this dog eat dog world means that you have got to watch yourself, protect your own, look after your own interests. And that's what is going on here.

Now, having tried to describe, Mr. Chairman, the difference between our ideological approach for universality and the difference in opinion as to how to deliver the service, I recognize that this government has deliberately changed the method of delivery of the service and we think to the detriment of the future. I think the Member for St. Boniface is right. I think that this system will damage the whole program because of the great costs that will be involved, as I think it is now involved in the medical health field. But I recognize the difference and now we have an opportunity, if the Minister of Health sincerely means and will actually carry out a proper comparison and control. All right, the Member for St. Boniface said they wouldn't give that program a chance and now they are saying, give our program a chance. The Minister didn't really say that. The Minister said, we will not destroy one program until we have proven the other program, although he has admitted that he has a bias towards his program, the MDA Program. I am in great fear but I still want to call him because he is going to be in government for another couple of years and therefore I want to make sure that his integrity will carry him through to a fair comparison without the bias which he and others have attributed to the NDP. All right, let's test him and we will, Mr. Chairman, but only if he gives us an honest accounting.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask him some specific questions. The first is, has he already or is he prepared to table a copy of the agreement between the government and the Manitoba Dental Association?

MR. SHERMAN: What agreement is the honourable member referring to, Mr. Chairman, the agreement with respect to the Review Committee?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister cannot ask me to tell him what he has in his hand when I can't see what is in his hand. Mr. Chairman, he said we have an agreement with the Manitoba Dental Association that they will deliver a service at a certain rate, at a certain pay per capita, whatever, so they have an agreement. Now if they have two agreements, I'd like to see both. If they have three, I'd like to see all three. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I want to see all the agreements between the government and the Manitoba Dental Association relating to the delivery of this service. Is he prepared to let us have copies?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that one of the agreements to which the Member for St. Johns refers would fall in the classification what he legalistically would call an agreement. There certainly is an understanding between the Department and the Manitoba Dental Association as to how this service is to be delivered in this current school year.

There is also a letter of understanding between the Manitoba Dental Association in my office as to the Review Committee and how it will be constituted and it will be as I described it in this Committee a few minutes ago.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister prepared to let us have a copy of any written understanding letter agreement or any other document that evidences the arrangement which has been made between the government and the MDA?

MR. SHERMAN: I don't see any surface problems with that, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure until I check whether there is anything that the MDA or either party would regard as confidential information between the two parties. I would have to check. I don't have that information in that file of material

in front of me but on the surface, I don't see any particular difficulty with doing that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with the Honourable Minister. I don't think he should give an undertaking without first reviewing what it is undertaking but I can't conceive of what there possibly could be that would be confidential as between government and a professional body acting on behalf of its members. So on that basis, I'm wondering if the Minister will undertake at tomorrow's session of this Committee to let us have his answer, either give us the documents or explain to us why he's not doing so. I wonder if he would give us that undertaking.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can certainly give my Honourable friend that undertaking, and I repeat, my recollection is that there is certainly no reason why that material shouldn't be tabled but I would appreciate the opportunity to just check and see whether there was any other understanding between the parties.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I certainly accept that. As I say, I can't conceive that there could be anything like that kind of an understanding but if there is, the Minister will no doubt tell us, he's given us the undertaking. Now I'm wondering if the Minister has in print for us to look at or if not, if he is prepared to explain to us either now or tomorrow, the difference in the program as between the Turtle Mountain School Division and the other eight and two-thirds divisions that are operating under the MDA program.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the basic difference between Turtle Mountain and the other divisions in which the MDA is operating is that Turtle Mountain is dealing with children who were coming in for initial care. They haven't had any prior care. The difference in the way the programs are operated is negligible. I'm not sure there is any difference but there is a difference in the billing mechanism. The eight and two-thirds divisions that are operated by the MDA in the existing program call for a different form of billing than is in effect in the pilot project in Turtle Mountain School Division. Not necessarily a different financial agreement although it is somewhat different as I pointed out earlier. It is \$125.00 per eligible child there compared to \$105.00 per eligible new child in the other divisions but it is simply a difference in the manner in which the billings are submitted.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, if it is only a difference in the per patient payment, then it's not a difference in method of billing, it's actually a difference in amount, I assume. I wonder if the Minister could make clear just how the billing differs or why there is that difference unless — I don't think he's explained it up to now. I've been listening very carefully, I don't know.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, in Turtle Mountain the billing in Turtle Mountain is to Turtle Mountain School Division. In other words, the pilot project existing in Turtle Mountain exists directly between the government and the Turtle Mountain School Division. There is a certain amount of funding provided; I think it's \$32,500 from the government to the Turtle Mountain School Division. They made the agreement with the MDA for coverage in Turtle Mountain and the billing there is direct to the School Division. In the other School Divisions, it's a matter of billing the MDA.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would undertake in due course to let us have a copy of the agreement that exists between Turtle Mountain and whatever dentists are delivering the service so that we can see any differences between the Turtle Mountain's special deal of their School Board run program and that of this government.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, once again I, off the top of my head, see no difficulty in that whatsoever, but subject to the same caveat we previously discussed and I'll have that checked but before the Committee next meets.

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, and I would assume that if there is a contact between the government and the state operation of the Turtle Mountain School Division, that too would be available along with the other. The Minister nods his head. Well now, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know what is the difference between the program offered by the eight and two-thirds School Divisions under the MDA and the government program. How do they differ?

MR. SHERMAN: There is not very much difference, Mr. Chairman. The evaluation for the reporting process and the evaluation process and the criteria are exactly the same. The Honourable Member

will recall that a year ago we had virtually committed ourselves to a pilot project in Turtle Mountain. Now that was an agreement that whether it takes formal shape or not, and that is what I'm going to check for him, had been at least reached verbally at this time last year between the government and Turtle Mountain School Division and the per capita cost for the year of the pilot project was established in discussion at that time at \$125.00. Subsequent to that, during the months of May, June and July, in fact, extending I think into August, we worked with the Dental Association to integrate them into the other eight and two-thirds divisions that I've referred to for this school year or as early this school year as possible and at that point in time, partly because the Turtle Mountain pilot project was still a hypothetical project, was not under way, we had no particular guidelines to go by and we wanted to achieve the lowest per capita cost that we could within reason. There was a different per capita cost struck with respect to those divisions but there is no difference in effect in the operation and the programs.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister told us last year that the \$32,500 was the amount to be paid to the dentists — I believe it's to the Dental Association — and in the event that it works out to more than \$32,500, then the dentists will have to make up the difference. Now, I don't know whether he meant the dentists would accept less money or whether the Dental Association would pay the difference to the dentists to make up any excess over \$32,500.00. At that time I asked him if he could provide us with a fee schedule that would be payable to the dentists for the work they do and he undertook to do so. I don't recall that he did it but if he did, I would appreciate a reference to it and if he didn't, then I would like him to honour his undertaking.

Going on from that, Mr. Chairman, you realize what I'm doing is trying to prepare a framework within which we will be able to judge which of the two programs is delivering the best service at the least cost and to the greatest number of children, and I want to do that and I will have to rely, as I said earlier, on the integrity of the Minister, to give us a qualitative objective evaluation. So, on that basis I would like the Minister to prepare to tell us any geographical differences between the MDA served School Divisions and the government served School Divisions. The obvious geographical one would be that it should be much more costly to serve children on — what line was referred to? — on what was referred to as the Bay line where there are very few children and a lot of travel and a well populated district. Since there should be a geographical difference then I think we should know whether there is any, what we used to refer to in the insurance debates as creaming that might take place, that is the choices financially beneficial areas as compared to those that are more costly. I'd like to know what are the socioeconomic differences between the MDA served School Divisions as compared with government served School Divisions because these are factors that must be considered. If you go into a school where the largest number of children have bad diets from babyhood on and will therefore have more caries and greater dental difficulties as in a more affluent area, then that has to be taken into consideration. Has the Minister made that kind of study? Will it be part of the study? Does he agree that it should be part of the study?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have identified for Members opposite the nine divisions that the MDA is in exclusive of the Turtle Mountain School Division. I can identify them again and the Honourable Member can draw his own conclusions as to socioeconomic parameters and geographic conditions. With respect to the expansion requested for 1979-80 in the north, I identified those communities too and I can do it again. They are all fairly remote communities. They all require a different kind of consideration in terms of servicing than would, for example an area that was either urban in context or that was perhaps as populated as the Turtle Mountain School Division but all these considerations would be considered in the review as the Review Committee dealt with its process of evaluation. We haven't attempted to separate them out at this juncture.

As I say, I think that the Member can draw his own conclusions in looking at the divisions that we've gone into and in looking at some of those communities in the North, some of which will be served under the government plan and some of which will be served under the MDA plan. I would think that there would be a relatively convenient line of comparison available where those northern communities are concerned, but that again, is subject to some 3 months or 6 months of activity. It's pretty hard to project conclusions at this point.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, no matter how much the minister may think my conceit gives me confidence in judging many things, I want to assure him that I would not be prepared to rely on my conclusions of the geographical and the socioeconomic differences in those various school divisions. I think that needs a great deal more expertise than I have and I believe also more expertise than the minister has, and I would therefore expect that in the evaluation, it will be done by people who are trained and competent to do that kind of work.

Now, the important thing is he said it will be taken into account. Well, that's good because the people charged with that evaluation are now bound by the very words of the minister to take all that into account and I would think that it will be incumbent on them to report to the minister and to us and to the people of Manitoba the extent to which they've taken all that into account in a way that is believable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, not quite last year, but some eleven and a half or twelve months ago, the minister said, "I can assure the honourable member," that is if the minister is Mr. Shean, which I think he was in those days, he says, "I can assure the honourable member that the Manitoba Dental Association, as such, as a body of professionals will be examining and evaluating exhaustively the results of the pilot project and it will certainly take into account the quality of professional work and the satisfaction of the children being served and their parents. That will be done through the Manitoba Dental Association." That's what he told us last year.

I now assume that there's been a change of mind. That the government is now not going to rely on the Dental Association for its evaluating work, that it is doing a separate evaluation made up of MDA and of the Dental College and of members of his department. Now, I didn't know who he meant, Mr. Chairman, you know I've heard so much now about studies that are going on, there's some committee of the minister's department and the Attorney-General's Department looking at certain aspects and corrections. There is somebody in his department, I have yet to find out who, that's evaluating that program of the Alcoholics Foundation, that free-standing, independent body that the minister ordered to stop promoting a certain program. And now, we've got a little hint, he said they will be related to the electorate, they are in my office, he said. Now I really would like to ask the minister, who will be doing it, what are their qualifications? If they are going to be meeting with the Dental Association and the Dental School, each of whom have a different approach, many of whom are interlocking, who is there who is able to assess it on the other side, on the non-professional but financial, statistical economic sociological side to balance that study? Is the minister prepared to tell us who is doing it, and are they doing it now, have they already started or are they going to wait for some future date to do it? Can he give us that information?

MR. SHERMAN: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that they're not doing it now. The first, as I've said earlier, the first reports on utilization and enrollment are only now available. The Association has only been operative in those divisions for approximately three months, but they will be doing it and they will be reporting to me. And if the Member for St. Johns is questioning where the link with the electorate comes, it comes through persons in this Legislature, those who are elected to government and those who are elected to opposition. Presumably, I have a responsibility to answer the honourable member's questions as best I can, and to disclose the information that comes to me as fairly and responsibly and ably as I can and I give him an undertaking to do that. The work is not under way yet because there's nothing very tangible to work on except the first utilization reports from the first quarter. But certainly, it would be an extensive exercise that we would expect the Review Committee to be working on through this late spring and through the summer, preparatory to the start of the 1979-80 school year.

Now, when he asks me about mathematical and statistical expertise, I'm prepared to accept suggestions with respect to that kind of personnel, but I would suggest to him that we have that kind of personnel available in the Administrative Services Division of the Department of Health and Community Services.

Presumably, there would be expertise of that kind available, if it is felt that it's necessary to draw upon it, at one of the universities or at the Dental College, too.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the minister said there's nothing tangible yet, it's only three months and I think there's a great deal of tangible teeth all over the place, thousands of them which should be looked at.

Now the Member for St. Boniface read to us a report from a committee in Saskatchewan. Now I understand it was not a Saskatchewan committee, I understand it was a committee of qualified dentists who came to certain conclusions. Mr. Chairman, I do recall that a few years ago, I think it was the Dean of the Dental School or the Medical School at McGill was involved in that kind of a study, and I want to know whether the minister is doing that kind of work and doing it now, or planning to do it during the year as the work goes on because one has to see, actually look at the work being produced. So he said there's nothing tangible. If all they're going to do is to look at numbers, the dentists report so many examinations, the government service group report so many examinations, if they're going to look at numbers, then that's begging the question, Mr. Chairman, because we have a letter here which seems to indicate that numbers can be forced, you know like goose livers in France can be made to grow large by forcing the feeding, so can

numbers be forced.

So before I step to my next question, I want to point out to the minister that he's not yet indicated who in his department will be charged with making an objective report. I think he's already indicated, I think he's already undertaken that whatever report he receives, he will let us see. So now I have to ask him who is going to look at it from his department, the non-professional, non-dental group, who are they going to be so that we can measure their qualifications?

MR. SHERMAN: I can't answer that question, Mr. Chairman. I'll be prepared to answer it when that decision is made. That decision is not made. I have told the honourable member that there will be a Review committee, I've told him that there'll be representation from the department and from the Manitoba Dental Association. We're also looking at the university and/or the Dental College, but I'm not going to tell him who the people are on that committee because we're in consultation at the present time as to who those people should be and what the complement of that committee should be. There is no need to rush into this thing on the 2nd of April. The Member for St. Johns says well, there's thousands of teeth around, there has only been three months that the MDA integration into the program has been in effect. The school year is still on. We don't know what the utilization or what the effect or impact is going to be, and we won't know till the end of June and I would suspect that the most intensive months for that review will be July and August, but I can't answer that question tonight.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, this government decided a year and more ago to change the system of delivery of this program and to monitor it, that's the minister's words, and he has not yet decided who is going to do the work and I think he should have decided. I think an objective view of what is going on and the minister protests that it's going to be objective, I think that committee should be in place, should be drawing up its terms of reference, should be looking at what is being done in Saskatchewan by that committee, should be prepared to start its job and in its time, not when the minister gets around to appointing them, so that they can with all objectivity review and prepare this report and I think they ought to do it. So I will ask the minister, is he prepared to have the same committee, that outside extra provincial committee that did Saskatchewan, do Manitoba in the same kind of review? Is he prepared to do that?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, I have told the honourable member what we are going to do. We will do it and he will be apprised as soon as we are able to apprise him. He talks about a year, the fact of the matter is that it took considerable and intensive work over a period of many months to get the program recast and reshaped to where it is now and to get the MDA involved and integrated and delivering. That took a great deal of work, you don't do those things overnight. Now the next step will be to work on establishing a review committee and the next step will be for that review committee to do its evaluation after we have some facts to work with, but I'm not going to be bulldozed into making commitments to the Member for St. Johns tonight when we're only one quarter of the way through the first year that the MDA has ever been involved.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't have too much experience or too much knowledge about how one judges a pilot study, but I am really very certain that when one embarks on a pilot study, when one embarks on a system of controlled review, which is what the government did a year ago, one concurrently sets out the terms of reference for the study committee. One concurrently knows how one is going to start measuring. One concurrently brings in the people involved in doing the work in order to start knowing in advance what questions they would be required to answer. Here we have reports coming in from a computer telling the minister what the program has been doing in the first three months, and there is no committee that was established to decide what that computer should be telling them. And I'm critical of that, Mr. Chairman, because that I think will damage the objectivity of the review.

And I'm critical also of the minister for out-of-hand saying no, he will not use the committee which was used in Saskatchewan. —(Interjection)— Oh, he says he didn't say it, good, then I misunderstood him. I want to challenge the minister, —(Interjection)— Oh, the minister will not give a commitment that he will, well, that's fine. I want to challenge him to do it, I want to challenge him to assess the qualifications of the people who did that Saskatchewan study. I want him to, I would like him, I don't have the right to tell him what to do, I can only advise him on what to do. I'd like him to judge their qualifications, tell us whether they are people whose expertise and whose integrity are to be accepted and then to tell us why he doesn't use them if he doesn't. Because, I think it would be, if they are qualified and if they're objective, then I think it would be most useful to have them do the study in Manitoba, then we'd have a real comparison between what they know is going on in Saskatchewan and what they would learn is going on in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude with reference to this letter that the Member for St. Boniface read to us. I'm wondering how long ago the minister first saw this letter. Apparently from his reaction, he never did see it before.

MR. SHERMAN: I have not seen that letter, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that that letter, which must have been sent shortly after February 9th, they state that the MDA met with the government to try and determine what their objectives and priorities were, I'm surprised that it didn't find its way into the hands of the Minister, because they are now dealing with a program given to the MDA to carry out, and they are propagandizing and planning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader, on a point of order.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, my point of order relates to what I believe is a letter that my honourable friend, or a purported letter that my honourable friend is quoting from, which was introduced or tabled earlier by the Member for St. Boniface. I have a copy of that document in front of me. It contains no signature. There is no address and, according to our rules, Sir, the letter cannot be referred to, nor can it be tabled. —(Interjection)— My honourable friend, then, better acquaint himself with the rules of this Chamber. In Beauchesne's latest edition, the Fifth Edition, "An unsigned letter should not be read in the House." And that's Citation 329 on Page 116 of Beauchesne. I think, Mr. Chairman, that unless my honourable friend can table a letter that has a signature on it, it cannot be tabled, and neither can it be read in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns, on the same point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it has been tabled. It was tabled an hour or so ago and the Honourable the House Leader I guess wasn't present or didn't realize, but it has been tabled. However, you know, I don't want to make a big issue of it. There is no address; there is a phone number. I wish somebody would go and phone that number and find out whose phone number it is. Then, of course, it might be a forgery, I don't know.

MR. JORGENSON: That's just the point.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, if it were signed, it could be a forgery, too, Mr. Chairman. But you know I don't have to make a big issue of it. The letter, or draft or memo, whatever it is, is here. And I want to tell the Minister that it suggests a method whereby the documentation, which will be supplied by government, could be forced. I compared it to the way goose livers are enlarged by forced feeding. And I want to tell the Minister that it should be his responsibility to review very carefully information and statistics which may be provided by people who would have a vested interest in the nature.

Now, you know, this is a year ago we had this kind of a debate and I said then that the logical assumption would be that the people who are trying to prove a program to be free would be to have those people charged minimal costs. Did you hear, today, Mr. Chairman? I heard on radio and I suppose I can report that to this House, that there is a Commission that is hearing price fixing and that big manufacturers of foodstuffs have been paying chain stores sums of money, lump sums of money, in order to get their product on the shelf. And the banker from Minnedosa, who has suddenly awoken, is talking about something that I'm not clear on. If he wants to elaborate, then by all means he can have the floor. Do you want to speak about something, the Member for Minnedosa? I will sit if you want to stand up and make a speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I don't really want to make a speech. I was really asking the Member for St. Johns . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. .

A MEMBER: You have to speak from your own seat, at any time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, now that I'm in my own seat, if that's required; it's not required in the other committees. The Member for St. Johns is making suggestions that everything has to be in its place and I wanted to suggest to him about the rates on second mortgages. He was suggesting prices and rates. I wondered if he wanted all the rates regulated on second mortgages or third mortgages that people might be engaged in in the real estate business or the business that he has been engaged in for most of his life.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. To the Honourable Members, I must apologize for allowing some reference from the Honourable Member for St. Johns and the answer from the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. I can't see where the discussion has any bearing on dental services, which is the department which is now under discussion. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I was drawing an analogy relating to people who have a vested stake, a vested interest, in proving certain things and I think it is fair comment, just like the Member for Minnedosa, who earned his living out of lending money all the time until he stopped earning a living by coming into this Legislature, so do others have an interest, a vested interest, in what they are reporting. I'm saying to the Minister that either he has to ensure an objective evaluation or he is bound to accept the figures that are given to him. And this unmentionable letter, which was tabled, which is unsigned, suggests clearly . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would have to rule the reference to the unmentionable letter to be out of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have heard . . . I'm not quoting from any letter, Mr. Chairman. Let's get that clear. The Honourable the House Leader stated that it was not a letter which could be tabled, although it was tabled. I am not referring to it. But let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that it has been indicated that there is a special effort being made to show increased utilization in this period of proof just before the Minister's Estimates were brought in, and I have every right to do so, I believe. I believe I have every right to do so. I am not quoting from a letter because you and the Honourable the House Leader said I can't, so I'm not.

Mr. Chairman, I have a right to deal with an allegation that has been made, that you heard and I heard, that certain people with vested interests should show a higher utilization. Now, I'm not quoting anybody; I never did intend to quote anybody because I don't even know, having only seen what appears to be something that is not to be tabled and knowing that there is no name there, I can't even quote anybody on this. So I am not doing that.

Mr. Chairman, let's get the rules clear. Let's not rule me out of order when I am stating that there has been an allegation made that people who have some control over the delivery of this program, which is Item (j)(1), which is before us, should increase the utilization in order to show that the government is right in this program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a right to do so, and I have done so and I don't intend to belabour the point. I am trying to tell the Minister that he has to prove to us, without shadow of a doubt, that he is not going to have a biased approach in measuring the program, because, as I said, I don't believe that we are ideologically committed to the method of delivery of the program as developed by the NDP government, nor will I accept the fact that he has a right to be ideologically committed to this principle of leaving to the profession the traditional way of delivering a service which is new and different, and that's the point I am making. He gave the impression and he wanted to give the impression that he is going to look at the two programs side by side. I want to make sure that there's the proper evaluation of that program, and I have a right to say so. And the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, who is again talking from his seat where he makes his best speeches, I will now yield the floor to him again to make his great contributions that he often makes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Johns can carry on like a schoolmaster here as long as he wants to, I can ride out these Estimates just as long as he can, Mr. Chairman. I work for the people of Manitoba, through my colleagues in government, duly elected, and through my Leader. I will respond up to the point of responsibility to the Opposition, but I am not going to be brow-beaten into making commitments that dovetail with the philosophy and the approach of the Member for St. Johns, just because he wants me to. He had his chance. He had eight years to do it, and he fouled it up. We now have our chance. We will do it, consistent with the best interests of the people of Manitoba, who demonstrated what their interests were on

October 11th, 1977. He will get his answers. He will get them when I've got them.

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate the fact that the Minister spoke as he did and showed exactly where he stands on this issue. On that basis, I really have no further interest in debating this item with him, because I now have him clearly on record as to what his attitude is. It is only one step before that of the House Leader, who says "It's none of your business." Just one step away from that.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister stood up and again he accused us of being doctrinaire and he made it quite clear what kind of a program he wanted. Now, he told us that in opposition that he had vowed to change this program. He never told us in the House. I'd like it if he did. I missed it and I think I read what he said quite closely. I'd like him to, if possible, if he can find it or tell me when, in Hansard, refer to Hansard; I'd like to see it. It seems quite obvious, Mr. Chairman, that we're going to hear that forever — the word "doctrinaire". Now, I made it quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that we did say to the Dental Association that we didn't care who did it, providing it was done in certain areas that we wanted, in certain givens that we wanted. And they had all the chances in the world to bring it, but with certain commitments, certain things that we wanted. And that is certainly the responsibility of a government. If you bring in a program to do a certain thing to cover certain people, this is your right. This is our right and we're going to called doctrinaire for that. If we're going to be called "doctrinaire" we're going to know why, because the difference between the Dental Association and the government of the day of those days was this: That we recognized the dental nurses in that we felt that the service should be brought to the children in schools, because we had seen that it wasn't working in other areas, and that's all. And they were told that if they could do this, and the third one, that for the initial visit it wouldn't be fee for service for the second time, fine, it would be on a liberal sessional indemnity. Those were the three givens that we discussed and that's what we arrived at. And there were reasons for that.

I move that the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to have these people, and I'm not going to make any accusations, I'm going to be charitable, but I mean there are some people that shouldn't be in Committee here tonight. And we don't have to stand for that, Mr. Chairman. I move that the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that I have to stand for that in the middle of a discussion, a serious discussion. I move the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MOTION presented and defeated.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Then I ask that the Committee conduct itself as a committee, all the members. If not, they're free to leave this Chamber, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry; I wasn't paying close enough attention and I'll . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. I don't think that we have to stand for that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think maybe we could take the opportunity of changing the tape now, if the Honourable Member for St. Boniface will allow. The tape is in place. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the —(Interjection)— is that a parliamentary word, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is the word from my honourable friend in the back there a parliamentary word? —(Interjection)— Yes, but the other word that came after grandstanding, Mr. Chairman? —(Interjection)— If I want a headline and I'm just about ready to get one, and I'm going to make a certain statement that will bring headlines. You know, if this is what the — we have the House and a review of the Estimates — to conduct ourselves in this kind of a Committee the way it is now, if some people are not interested, if they want to do something else they're free to do it, but they're not free to disturb members of this Committee. I would hope that the House Leader

takes this into consideration, Mr. Chairman. I know this has happened before and usually people are fairly charitable, but there's a damn limit to where we're going to be pushed, Mr. Chairman. There's a limit to where we're going to be pushed. I ask the House Leader to see if he can control a few of his members so we can go ahead with this and have some kind of a cooperation, Mr. Chairman. There's a limit to this.

Mr. , Chairman, for the third time, I was talking about this question of doctrinaire, and I say that the only thing that we wanted, made no apologies for it, we had the right to do it. We said, "We're going to have a service that's going to be universal." Now, my honourable friend, again, he's pretty good at it. We're talking about two different deliveries. We're talking about taking a service, a delivery, or a program from the government and giving it to somebody else, then he talks about different aims that he wants in this.

Now, I want to know, and I think the people of Manitoba are entitled to know, if this is going to be a universal program or if it isn't. My honourable friend said that he's redirecting that. When this program was started it was the intention to have a dental care program for the school children, covering certain ages, and that was supposed to be all Manitoba, and if there's a question of restraint, if they want to change that it should be said very clearly. It is their right. They can cancel the program or they can say it's not universal. If it's not universal, we want to know why Boissevain was brought in. I said a while ago that it was a question of political. It is paying off for delivery during the campaign, Mr. Chairman. This is what we said and I'm repeating that.

You know the Minister is so careful in this period of restraint to not bring any new program, and if there's programs that aren't fit, you cancel them. But this was done pretty fast. This is one of the only programs that they decide — and he's talking about us being doctrinaire — and he's not ready with this program.

I don't say, like my honourable friend for St. Johns, would you please give us the contract? I say you have to give us the contract. You have to give the people of Manitoba — if you're using this tax money, you've got to tell us what they're delivering, what their contract delivered for what amount of money. That has to be told to the people of Manitoba. There has to be a contract, or at least an exchange of letters. You don't ask us to pass this amount of money and say, "I've got an arrangement and I'll tell you if they say it's all right." The people of Manitoba — we want to know what is going to be delivered. We want to know if there has been any change, if it's no longer a universal program. We want to know if the children of the Greater Winnipeg area are not going to have it because many of them feel that this is coming some time. We want to know what the score will be, Mr. Chairman. I think we're entitled to that. You don't start a program without knowing, and we want to know what kind of evaluation there will be and who will be conducting the evaluation, Mr. Chairman.

Now, I asked the Minister, "What will the utilization rate involve? What will it be?" Surely the Minister must have discussed that with the Dental Association. What does utilization involve? I think that we're entitled to know that, Mr. Chairman. Now we find out that the Minister had made up his mind before when he was still sitting here before he had a mandate. He didn't tell the public of Manitoba that. Nobody told the public of Manitoba during the election. That wasn't mentioned during the election that this program would nolonger be a universal program' and I —(Interjection)— Yes? That's all right, Mr. Chairman, we can go ahead with these disturbances. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, if the people are going to go on a liquid diet and then come here and disturb it, I'm leaving this Committee and the government can accept the responsibility. I am not going to be subjected to this, Mr. Chairman. I wasn't elected for that, and if people want to celebrate, that's their business, but they have no bloody business coming here and disturbing this Committee. Goodbye, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the government's members have succeeded in doing something which I haven't witnessed in this House in the many years that I've been here, and frankly I'm embarrassed as an elected public representative. I'm sorry it happened, and I hope that members opposite will remember this night and not allow it to happen again for their own sake. I don't think it reflects on people on this side; I don't think it reflects on people on that side. I think it demeans everything that we're supposed to stand for. I think it demeans us in the eyes of the public that we're supposed to be here to represent.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has been quite outspoken and he's made known his views. That's fine. I prefer that to many times that he gets up and talks around the subjects and tries to put forward many positions that he seems to represent at one time. But this is not just a small little program. This is an important basic program of a service to Manitobans, not just the children, although it started with the children, because what you start in one decade for children will eventually

accrue to the benefit of those same children as they become adults. It changes the entire dental care from cradle to grave because for the first 16, 18 years of a child's life they have proper dental care. If they're examined regularly, their mouths are dentally clean, then the likelihood is that the dental problems they might encounter in later years will never be as severe, and if a child's teeth are looked after to the extent that they require specialties of an orthodontist, for example, and it's caught early, then the downstream costs that the Minister likes to refer to, are saved. There's great savings in downstream costs to the individual, and therefore to society.

I know the Minister makes a distinction between a cost to government, to society through government, and the cost to the individual. He makes that distinction. If the individual pays for it, he doesn't care — doesn't count. I don't keep book that way. There's a total cost whether it's paid by people individually or paid by using the resources of tax money to pay for it in common by all taxpayers.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is important to fully understand what the Minister is saying to us. He started off earlier, or somewhere during the course of his remarks he indicated that the NDP Program was going to be very costly and he could visualize a few years down the road costing something like \$10 million — I think that was the figure he used, \$10 million. Saskatchewan's been at it now for a little longer, they've got the entire province covered, and I think they've now hit something like \$7 million, so that I think his extrapolation of figures is a little wrong. But what interests me is this. He says his plan, on the other hand, is going to cost less. Now, the only reason his plan can cost less is because he's obviously not planning and hoping that there isn't as great a utilization as with the government plan.

The government plan inevitably did mean as close to 100 percent utilization as it is possible to get. No child was going to be grabbed and treated by the dental nurse or by the dentist, but to the extent possible by having the child in the school, by having the service provided in the school, by having it become part of the school life and activity, that a very high utilization rate would be achieved. It's obvious that the Minister is hoping on a low utilization rate, otherwise he could never project the low costs that he seems to be projecting for his program because the differences in cost, even — I don't believe it — but even if the MDA plan was cheaper by a few dollars per child, then there couldn't be the difference between \$2 million and \$10 million. No way. The only way that differential could occur is if there are less children got to be seen and treated under the plan. That's the only way that those figures make any sense. So therefore I think I'm right in saying that this Minister is hoping that there isn't a high utilization, that in fact, province-wide, including the City of Winnipeg, Brandon, major cities, that, in fact, it is a low utilization so that the government costs, whether they be paid through a government plan — dentists operating within a government plan, or through the MDA, that the cost in total shouldn't exceed more than a couple of million dollars. That's what he's hoping for, and maybe a year later maybe \$3 million, but less than the former plan, and the only way that can be achieved is because less children would be looked after.

Now, we know, statistics are readily available anywhere in Canada, we know that there are some people with means, with the education, with the kind of understanding of dental health that will take their children to dentists. They start at very young ages and they make sure that their children go to dentists from childhood on, and they're looked after, but that is a very small percentage of the population. As I recall, it was about 25 percent. I'm just going by memory. And that is not good enough because in the final analysis, these things come back to haunt you.

If the child in the first 16, 18 years of that child's life can have proper, adequate dental care, preventative care, treatment when the child needs it, then the likelihood is he or she will not end up having to pull those teeth, sometimes as a very early age, comparatively, as an adult, and have a healthy mouth. That is where the savings come in, downstream. It is real prevention. It is investing now for the payoff in the future. But this Minister obviously doesn't want it and if he doesn't want it, then okay, we have to live with that. While they are in office, this is what we have to live with.

But I want to tell the Minister that if in fact he is talking in terms of truly evaluating the program through the MDA, that he is never going to succeed in having anyone in Manitoba, never mind me — I'm very skeptical as the Minister knows, never mind me — but he is not going to be able to convince the average Manitobans that a program is judged to be fair, equitable and correct if the people sitting in judgement are the people who are delivering the program. No way. In any inquiry, in any evaluation of any substance that is made, you do not ask the people who themselves are directly involved, who have an interest, a vested interest, an economic interest, in proving their case, you don't ask them to evaluate a program. You don't go by their utilization rates. The fact that a dentist can see 30 children in a school, in a classroom, just an oral visual examination and you can see probably 30 children in an hour because you open your mouth, you look in there, no X-rays are taken, nothing is done, you just look, that will certainly beef up the utilization rate

if that's included in the utilization rate. But that doesn't mean a darn thing.

So if the Minister really wants to be believed, and I really think that the Minister for his own satisfaction would want to be able to get up in this House and say, "I have proved my point; we were right; they were wrong." It's not a matter of ideology or anything else. He should want to be able to get up and say, I was right; we are proven right and we have not our word, not his word, not the MDA's word, certainly not, but the word of people outside the province or from inside who have no vested interest, not the Dental College because they have a vested interest. They work very closely with the MDA; their product goes to the MDA. People from outside the province, others from within the province in another field — that's who should evaluate the program; that's who should tell us what utilization rates are and how they're arrived at and are they valid.

Someone should look at the treatments that these children get and tell us whether it is at an acceptable level or not an acceptable level, and not the dentist who does the work, certainly not. He's the last man and if he was honest he wouldn't even want to have to be his own evaluator. But apparently the Minister seems to be quite content to prefer that kind of evaluation. That's not an evaluation, it's a farce because that isn't an evaluation, that's really an accounting, a numerical accounting of mouths seen by somebody. What was done is apparently of no consequence to the Minister and yet that is what is important in all of this.

So the Minister now tells us — my interpretation is that the universality we can forget about — he prefers the private dental scheme. Mr. Chairman, it doesn't take a genius, it doesn't take anyone to really have to rack his brains too much to realize that if you give any program, I don't care what it is, any service, I don't care what it is, to one group and you have, with the powers that the Dental Association has, licensing, policing their own professional group, if you give them the kind of control that they have on this program, that program becomes the captive of the Dental Association.

You know, many years ago when Medicare was still an issue in this country — should there be, shouldn't there be, and so on — there were people who said, you know, you can't launch the program of Medicare until such time as the paramedical people are in place, and then when you launch it, you make sure that you are using the doctor, the most highly-trained individual, to do the work that he is best qualified to do and use the paramedical to do other work. Well, that wasn't done in the case of Medicare and frankly I think one of the reasons why the cost has gone the way it has is because it wasn't done. But surely we don't want to repeat the mistakes that occurred in Medicare in the field of dentistry. I know when we were looking at the dental plan and there were many people in our own caucus and I know in the public generally, who were talking in terms of a denticare plan similar to the Medicare plan, in other words, cover everybody. We did some calculations and I recall that we looked at it and said, this is impossible, because a denticare plan is even more expensive than a Medicare plan. It would cost even more. So we decided, no way. We've got to start with children and work up to age 16 or 18 because what has proven in the Saskatchewan plan already is that after three or four years in the dental plan, the fifth, sixth and seventh years, they're just coming back for an examination. Their teeth are perfect; they're in good shape. There is very little treatment required because the preventative action has already worked.

So, Mr. Chairman, the idea that somehow you are going to have a plan and be able to get a handle on it and keep a handle on it, once the public, the government plan is kaput — and it will be kaput, there's no question — I say to you, you're kidding yourself. Because once the dentists have the plan entirely in their hands, once that control is there and they are the only show in town, then you will pay them the fees they want. You may kick and you may wiggle and you may complain, but you will end up paying their fee, because you just can't pull dental nurses out of a hat. We had to send people to Saskatchewan for training, 20 months of doing a specific kind of work. You know, the whole concept, as my colleague for St. Johns pointed out, the whole concept of using paraprofessionals is not so unique. It is done in the private sector very successfully. I remember the day when no architect would consider it proper to hire other than architects in his office. Not today. They learnt. They learnt that you take the product out of the community college who went into drafting and took a 20-month course in drafting, two 10-month years, Mr. Chairman, those draftsmen graduating were snapped up and they were taken into the architect's offices. They were welcomed because the fact is they can draft up a storm. Sure an architect can do it, but you can't match these younger draftsmen in speed and reliability because the training suits them for that particular job, and as a result, I recall that the graduates of the community colleges were snapped up in the field of drafting.

The same would be occurring, and could occur, in dentistry, in the Dental Health Plan. The dental nurses could become an important, valuable and unparalleled resource and you wouldn't be at the mercy of the dentists.

I know there are dentists — there are dentists who told me one of the reasons they disliked

the plan, one of them said to me, frankly, and it's a very interesting argument, he says, because we are looking down the line and we know that the best kind of dentistry is the kind of dentistry that you want to introduce through your health plan, and therefore, we can see down the line where you are not going to need as many dentists in Manitoba as you need now and the shortage may disappear. I didn't think that this government or any government, really, was in the business of keeping a situation going where we needed X number of dentists every year and have to either fight with other provinces to make sure our graduates stay here or try to woo dentists to come in and so on. If we can come up with a plan whereby dental health is secure in children, then the problem when they are adults won't be there and the demand for dentists may indeed be less. But is that so terrible? Is that so awful to conceive? That's what this dentist's concern was, because down the line he could foresee 10, 15 years, and he was a fairly young man, and he said he might be in difficulty. But I don't think that is the government's concern. The government's concern is to provide a dental health program which would benefit this generation of young people and that same generation when they become adults and on through their lifetime.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me — I have gotten the message — that what this government and this Minister wants to do is, if possible, move the whole thing into the MDA. Sure, there are some areas where they may have troubles, if you go to the very isolated areas on the Bay line where you have 30 children here and 10 somewhere else and you have to go and take the train, that's the only way you can get up to the Bay line, to Cormorant and further up north, they may need the government plan. It will be a very expensive plan and it has to be because it is so isolated and sparse and so leave it to the government . because the private sector won't go in there. They will, however, be able to go into places like Leaf Rapids which have at least a concentrated population and they will arrange with one of the dental clinics to fly in periodically and do the work they have to. And that's not new because the Assiniboine Clinic, the one stationed in St. James, has been doing this for the government for a number of years, going into isolated communities. They fly in, spend a day, fly out.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have gotten the message from the Minister as to what he is trying to achieve and that's fine. If that's what he wants, they are in government, they were elected, this is the Conservative way of doing things, I am prepared to accept he has the authority, is in a position to do that now. I'm also prepared to tell the public why I think their plan is bad, why I think that in catering to the dentists they are making captives of the people of Manitoba to the Manitoba Dental Association. —(Interjection)— Well, if you don't like it, go home. and that therefore, this will become, the plan will become captive to the Dental Association, with the control them. a monopoly always gives They will certainly try to show a high utilization rate now and they may even show a low cost now. But if they are smart businessmen, and I think they are, they will show a low cost now because they know the payoff is going to come two, three, four, five years down the line when there are no dental nurses and the only way you can work on a patient is if the dentist is there, under his orders, his direction. He'll pay their salary, whatever it happens to be, the hand maiden to the dentist.

That's the kind of dentistry that is going to be practised in this plan; that's the kind of dentistry that the minister obviously wants to have practised in this plan, and I predict that once they are in that position, those costs are going to go up. And they'll negotiate with the minister for an increase, if he says that's too high, they'll say well in that case we're going to withdraw from the plan. And he's going to stand there , he is going to say I have no alternative. I have to give them what they want or if I can't give them all they want maybe we can sort of saw it off with them this year, and they'll come along next year and say, okay let's raise it again, and they'll give him all the reasons why they should raise it because their rent costs have gone up and their overhead costs have gone up and all the other arguments that you hear from the doctors. You know the arguments as well as I. You've already heard them I'm sure.

And you're going to get it in spades from the dentists. And instead of having a universal plan at a long term reasonable cost you're going to have a plan which is: a) not going to be universal and b) if it's going to be universal, it's going to cost far more, far more than a plan that recognizes and utilizes the para-professional, para-dental people, who do specific kind of work under the supervision of, not the presence of a dentist but under the supervision of a dentist in the sense that they do only the work which the dentist marks on the chart. That's the only work that's done by the dental nurse. The dental nurse does nothing that the dentist does not initially tell the dental nurses to do, marks it on the chart after x-rays are taken, to determine the nature of the work.

You're foregoing it, and you think it's going to be less costly. It's going to be far more costly in the long run. It's going to be so costly that in fact you'll try to put a brake on it, and it'll be a drain on your resources that you'll try to stop. And the universality therefore, will go out the window. It will go out the window because the government will say, well this is really costing far

more, far more than we anticipated and we just can't afford that, because, as I said earlier, there is no doubt a universal denticare program would cost — by universal I mean all ages, across the — would cost more than a universal medicare program. That is known; that is a fact because of the very high costs of certain procedures. But you know, I'm remembering this whole question with regard to the dentists and their antipathy and their fight against recognition of the dental nurses, and I remember the dentists in Manitoba fighting equally as vigorously and vocally certainly, against denturists. Do you remember that Mr. Minister? And if denturists or dental mechanics were allowed to practise in Manitoba, it would be the end of dentistry in Manitoba to hear them say it. Every dentist was going to leave the province. No dentist would want to come here on the one side. On the other side, that the dental health of people would be absolutely ruined if denturists were allowed to make false teeth. Well, I don't know how many years they've now been allowed to practise, what, four years, five years?

It's not the end of the world, the dentists are still here, they're doing very well, thank you. I think they've achieved a higher level of average income than the doctors have. They haven't left the province. As a matter of fact, the graduates of dental school are remaining in the province. And not only was it not the end of the world, I think that more people were able to avail themselves of the services of denturists than before because they now can afford the lower cost of false teeth, where they couldn't before. They just couldn't so they did without.

So that the idea that the dental nurse is a threat to the dentist, I don't accept. They react like any self-interest group trying to protect themselves. If the Law Society was threatened by some proposal, by some group that Notary Publics be given certain powers in Manitoba, let's say equivalent to what they have in Quebec, I think the Law Society would be up here in law amendments.

MR. CHERNIACK: They're prosecuting every notary who tries.

MR. MILLER: Oh, they're prosecuting every notary who tries. Okay. But if somebody brought in a bill into this House suggesting that they'd be here in droves. You wouldn't be able to get an appointment with a lawyer, they'd all be here. And what would they be protecting? The public? I don't think so, I think they'd be protecting their income. That's what they'd be protecting. I don't think they'd be protecting the public at all. You know, too often we've done this in the past — I don't know what the answer is. But it's very common for professional groups to come in and seek professional accreditation, an Act for that particular profession.

We haven't got a Banker's Act in Manitoba, have we? I think I'm going to introduce one. I'm going to introduce a Banker's Act. How bankers should act and have the Bankers Association police their own members, that's the important thing. And always these professional associations, when they come before government, always it's they are doing it for the good and welfare of the public, to protect the public. It's in the public interest. So they can police their own members and make sure that they do right by the public. That's always the reason. And inevitably, within a very few years it then moves from that to the good and welfare of their own membership. Inevitably. And they become a self-interest group. Far more sometimes concerned with their own good and welfare than the welfare of the public which they supposedly were so concerned about and that's why they got the accreditation. That's why they got the recognition.

So, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the fear, that the minister has been influenced by this fear that somehow the dentists are going to leave Manitoba, if they don't get their way. He has knuckled down to it, he has yielded to it. He is prepared to give them the program, and I think he was very honest in admitting that if it went well, according to his likes, that he would like to see more and more of the program transferred over to the MDA, with the recognition that certain areas of Manitoba they probably couldn't handle and so therefore could continue as a government program. You could never compare those two because obviously the areas that the MDA would want to take over or could take over, or the ones they wouldn't take over, are those that are so difficult to service, so costly to service, that they wouldn't even want to bother. And what you'd be left with is the really tough geographic areas, isolated areas, which the dentists wouldn't want.

Mr. Chairman, I'm satisfied the minister has given his message. I've got it. I think the Manitoba people have got that message now, and the minister may feel that this is what Manitobans want. I think the Manitobans do want a dental health program for all children in Manitoba, a universal one, accessible to all, available easily in their school, so that people don't have to take the child to the dentist's office at the convenience of the dentist, when it suits the dentist, to meet his hours — because not everybody can take an afternoon off or a morning off to take their child to the dentist.

So, Mr. Chairman, the minister may feel very proud of what he is doing here with the dental program, but let him not for one moment try to kid anyone that the path he is now pursuing is

the path towards a dental comprehensive universal dental health program for children that the former government was pursuing. He hasn't got that objective, and of course he's not going to achieve that objective because his objective is different. Keep that cost down. Spend less public money and perhaps hoping that people who can afford it, will go to their dentist on their own, will use the private dentist, pay him on their own and others will simply be, well discouraged — I'll use that word, discouraged from going to the dentist because there won't be the follow up. A note may be sent home, as they have in the past, to a child's mother saying, "Johnny should see the dentist" and the note stays home and nothing is ever done about it. And the same is done with . . . I remember years ago in school, the public health nurse used to come in and send notes home to children's mothers to have Johnny go to the eye doctor and maybe go to the dentist. And what percentage ever followed up on it? Very little, very little. And that's why the problems develop in later years.

So the minister certainly hasn't got the same goals in mind as we did, and of course he's not going to achieve what we hoped — when we launched the program we truly hoped would occur in Manitoba, and what I think the people in Manitoba really want for their children.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the members on this side of the House had wanted to walk out with the honourable, the Member for St. Boniface, our colleague, and we felt on the other hand that we were obligated to stay in Committee. The Member for St. Boniface is our chief critic in health. The Minister undertook to answer certain questions tomorrow, and I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether this might not be a proper opportunity for us to rise, bearing in mind that the House Leader and his support could force the passing of this item after which I presume he would adjourn anyway, but I would think that it would make better sense if we left the item for completion tomorrow — the minister has some answers to give. On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I have moved the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, may I just say that I appreciate the contributions that members of the Committee on both sides have made to the debate. I certainly appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. I don't agree with them but I respect them. I respect the sincerity with which they were made. He and I have different concepts of government obviously, and I think this comes down to a concept of government. We believe that it's in the best interests of a responsible and a free society to reduce government involvement, government intrusion, government activity, to the lowest, reasonable minimum. I don't believe that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and his colleagues sincerely believe that. That's a sincerely held difference of opinion. We could be here until the middle of July debating that philosophy and I don't think that we are going to change them or they are going to change us. Therefore, let me just suggest through you, Sir, to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, that I think that I have attempted to answer the questions that have been put to me to the best of my knowledge, the best of my ability. There are some questions to which I promise to bring answers tomorrow. I would be reluctant because I think that in the interests of the business of the House we're all concerned with getting through the examination of the government spending Estimates in as reasonable time as possible. I think I would be reluctant to perhaps lay all of ourselves open to a reopening of this entire debate tomorrow.

We have covered the ground. I'm not going to be able to convince the Member for Seven Oaks. He's not going to be able to convince me. It's an honest difference of opinion. I can bring those answers tomorrow and if the Honourable Member for St. Johns is unhappy with those answers, or still unhappy with the children's dental health program, he certainly will have full opportunity to re-engage me in debate on the subject on the item having to do with my salary.

So, I would like to propose, with respect for the opposition's position, and I was in opposition for 11 years, that's as long as almost anybody in this House, not all in this House, but in total in politics, I understand the role of the opposition, but I would like to suggest to him with respect, that I can bring him those answers without delaying passage of this item, and he can engage me in further debate on this subject on my salary.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister, of course, was out of order but I didn't want to interrupt him. There is a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before the House is Committee rise.

MOTION presented and defeated.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, as I said, on this side of the House, we wanted to walk out with our colleague for St. Boniface. We are still rather depressed about what happened this evening. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, we are not interested in prolonging the debate today and since it is the obvious intention of government to insist that this item pass today, then you will not have any further debate or discussion on this item today from this side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (j)—pass. .

MR. JORGENSON: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that Report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. DOUG GOURLAY: I have a name change, Mr. Speaker. That the name of Mr. McGill be substituted for that of Mr. Ransom on the list of members to comprise the Standing Committee on Public Utilities.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Telephones, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).