

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 8 April, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

TABLING OF REPORT

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: I'm pleased to table the First Report of the Legislative Assembly Management Commission.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Highways and Transportation, it is my pleasure to table the 1985-86 Highway Construction Program.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 16 students of Grade 5 standing from the King Edward School under the direction of Miss Rod; they are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Personal Health Identification Number - adoption of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not the Manitoba Health Services Commission has adopted a cradle-to-grave computerized identification number system known as the Personal Health Identification Number or PHIN?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any new change in policy. If it has happened, I'll take that as notice and will check with the staff and report to the House.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder, given that the Estimates for the Department of Health are coming up, whether or not the Minister could undertake to bring that information for perhaps later today so that we might discuss that.

Ft. Garry Women's Resource Centre - prov. grant

MR. G. FILMON: The next question is for the Minister of Community Services and Corrections. I wonder if, in view of the fact that the Secretary of State's Department has committed \$24,000 to the Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre by way of an operating grant, whether or not her department will be matching that grant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it's under review.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not she or her department officials committed to the Federal Government that they would, in fact, provide additional support to the Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: No, Mr. Speaker.

WAPA - status of negotiations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Energy. It's been some time since we've had tabled in this House the Memorandum of Understanding with the western area power energy group known as WAPA, can the Minister indicate where the negotiations are with this energy group at this moment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm hopeful that over the course of the next weeks and months, I'll be able to table in this House good indications of progress and discussions with all the groups that we're negotiating with in the United States. The discussions with the Western Area Power Administration are proceeding.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, to be more specific, can the Minister indicate when he or senior Hydro officials last met with senior persons of this group?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I believe there was a meeting of senior officials within the last month, but I'll certainly take that as notice and bring back the specific information for the member.

Education in Manitoba - Quality of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On many occasions, the Minister of Education has stated unequivocally that the public school system is providing an excellent level of quality of education to Manitoba students. Since the last time I've asked the Minister this question, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if she could indicate or provide provincewide factual data or results that quantify or qualify her statement and her claim.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure if I even attempted to answer that question in question period, the members opposite would be starting to complain within about 30 seconds, because if we started to list all of the things that are good indicators of quality of education, the list would be very long.

I suggest we will be covering these and very glad to talk about them in detail during our Estimates.

Education in Manitoba - departmental exams

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister on many occasions has stated her total opposition to the reinstitution of provincewide departmental exams. The Throne Speech Debate, however, made reference to enhancing assessment. Can the Minister indicate whether the government has changed their minds on this issue, whether they will be instituting departmental exams or, if not, what is meant by the word "assessment"?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, the word "assessment" means the assessment of students in the education system both at the local and the provincial level. We presently have a two-tier system that we share with the school boards where the school boards carry out the role they can best carry out. What we will be doing is talking about improving the system, making some improvements on the system that we have presently and talking a little bit more publicly about what it is that we are doing at both levels that will have the parents understand how their children are doing.

Education in Manitoba - "The Manitoba Education System" report

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph Masek prepared an independent report and the title is "The Manitoba Education System" and its current impact. All members of this House, I believe, were provided a copy of this report this morning. I would ask the Minister, was a meeting with her requested by Mr. Masek and has the Minister provided him with an opportunity to meet with her prior to the releasing of this report?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I did not meet with the gentleman named, but I believe he met with members of my department and uh . . .

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd be interested to know what the "and uh" led to, but maybe the Minister will provide us with some further details.

Mr. Speaker, the report reaches a number of strong conclusions, one of which is on Page 107 that Grade 6 Physics within Manitoba curriculum covers only 38 percent of the topics covered by a corresponding curriculum within the European schools, 11 percent for Grade 7, 21 percent for Grade 8 respectively. Does the Minister still intend to support blindly the Manitoba Science curriculum in its present form?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I've supported anything blindly in the curriculum, nor have I ever said that the curriculum and the programs that we've got, as good as they are, can't do with some improvement and some change and we're constantly making that improvement and change.

I would like to remind the member opposite that it was only last year, the Manitoba students going to science symposiums - the nationwide - cleaned up in the awards. I think we sent 24 students and 12 of them came home with the top awards across the country.

I also remind the member opposite that I believe I read into the record last year during Estimates, when we were talking about the science program that we have in Manitoba, that we were commended by the Science Council of Canada for being the only one that had brought in a program with teachers in the field and science teachers involved, and that other provinces should follow our lead.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, I, too, was impressed with the winnings of those three or four students. However, my greater concern is the 195,000 other students in Manitoba taking the science program.

Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary. Will the Minister undertake to have her department seriously review this report which was prepared by the parent of a student at his own cost and reproduced at his own cost? Will she have her department review this because it makes some very major serious conclusions - reaches some conclusions with respect to the curriculum in Manitoba Education - and will she report the department's finding to this House and to the people of Manitoba?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, I certainly can say that we'll look at the report with interest. We will review it very seriously and I'm sure that there are some very good ideas. If you look at the size of the report, it's about 400 pages long. I am sure that there is some very good information and some very good ideas in there and we're willing to look at them.

School of Psychiatric Nursing, Portage - Closure of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Community Services, Mr. Speaker. The people of Portage la Prairie appreciate the fact that the Minister took time to call a meeting in Portage on April 3rd, to discuss with the MDC nursing staff, the class of nursing students, the administration

and management staff, the Chamber of Commerce of Portage, the question of the closure of the Psychiatric School of Nursing in Portage.

My question is, Mr. Speaker, why would the Minister turn hundreds of concerned Portage citizens away and refuse them entry to her meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the meeting was called in the cafeteria at the Centre to meet with staff.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I question whether the Minister ever thought of including the people of Portage la Prairie.

My next question to the Minister is: is she planning a public meeting to discuss this important issue in Portage la Prairie regarding the closing of this school?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, last week I did meet with the staff and there were some representatives from the Chamber there. I was available afterwards to the press. I undertook to review the questions that they had raised and reviewed the plan. To date, the original plan holds up but there are some details within in terms of phasing and the curricular mix which we are looking at co-operatively with the psych nurses. When that examination is complete, I'll be available to discuss it and report to the House.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, from the answer that the Minister gave me, it appeared to me that she's not ready and willing to face the people of Portage la Prairie in regard to this important issue. My question, Mr. Speaker, is before she makes her final decision, will she meet in a public meeting with the people of Portage la Prairie?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we'll review whether that is the most effective way to deliver the decision we've arrived at. Meanwhile, I am accessible to people who wish to come and see me or who wish to submit their concerns in writing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Community Services. Could the Minister indicate whether on Wednesday, prior to her meeting with the staff of the school at Portage la Prairie that she met with members of the New Democratic Party Association from Portage la Prairie to discuss the closing of the school?

MR. SPEAKER: Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, perchance the Minister didn't hear my question. I'd repeat it for her if she didn't hear the question. Did the Minister, prior to meeting with staff at the School of Psychiatric Nursing at Portage la Prairie, meet with members of the New Democratic Party Association from Portage la Prairie?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'd be a funny politician if I wasn't able and willing to meet with members of the party all over the province.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, it is a very interesting scenario that the Minister will meet with New Democratic Party members, but refuse to meet with the public in Portage la Prairie.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister, in view of the fact that she would not meet with and take advice from Dr. Glen Lowther, her chief medical advisor for the Department of Community Services, can the Minister indicate whether, basis the meeting with the New Democratic Party Association in Portage la Prairie, that the advice they gave her caused her to rethink the closing of the Portage Psychiatric School of Nursing?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be so much innuendo in the question asked that what I would like to say to the member opposite is that the person he has named is a medical consultant on individual cases, that the consultation process on the issue was carried out with the Administrator and Director, School of Nursing from Brandon, the Chief Executive Officer, Director School of Nursing, Director of Nursing and Personnel Director from the Manitoba Development Centre, and the Chief Executive Officer, Medical Director, Director of Nursing Education, and Senior Nursing Administrative Officer from Selkirk Mental Health Centre, the people in the respective positions who, I think, are the ones to be consulted on such a program move.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I am fully aware of the names of the people who met and formulated the report which, I might say, Mr. Speaker, contained grave warnings to the Minister about the closing of the school.

Mr. Speaker, my question quite simply to the Minister is, did her meeting with members of the New Democratic Party organization from Portage influence her more than expert advice from her department on delaying and reviewing the closure at Portage? She did not answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when I met with the staff in Portage la Prairie, I reviewed the history of the issue, the fiscal pressures that are on the government and the very difficult choices we must make to manage the affairs of the department and the government as efficiently as we can to meet those needs, many of which are unmet as yet in the community, and to put every bit as much pressure on any government to fund them as the people in Portage are putting to retain something which, admittedly, they're very devoted to and whose devotion I certainly understood and appreciated the night I was there.

I engaged in dialogue with them; I listened to them extremely carefully to see if there were any elements in their presentation which I had not been fully cognizant of before and, as I said the next day in the House, although the substantial framework of our decision still stands, there are some subsidiary points having to do with phasing and some of the curricular questions which I have undertaken to work with jointly with the psych nurses in developing and I will do that.

In due course, when there is a final decision whether to speed up, maintain or slow down the pace of implementations we have determined, then I will report that to the House. If anything comes to light in the course of the discussions which calls into question any of the assumptions we were operating on before, as we've done before, Mr. Speaker, in the department when those situations have risen, we've raised that issue and been willing to reconsider; but I emphasize that to date the basic outline, the basic assumptions of the decision stand and what we are now working on is the implementation with the people that we feel are most vitally affected.

The people in Portage la Prairie, as I say, I would welcome input from them. I have received a great deal to date and I appreciate that and will be taking it into consideration as we develop the program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Community Services and Corrections is, in view of the fact that after her meeting she said there would be further consultation, in view of the fact that the head of the Psychiatric Nurses Association, Annette Osted, is quoted as saying that the decision to close the school was made "without any kind of proper consultation." Why wasn't the consultation done before the decision was made, not after?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there was some consultation which I gather the Psychiatric Nurses Association thought of as not official consultation, prior to the announcement.

However, their understanding of their role, because of their act that supports their association, is that they had control over the whole delivery of training for psych nurses and to them that meant the determination as to location of schools, etc. Reading the act from our perspective, we believe that they have input on the components of the curriculum that have to do with the training and the registration of psych nurses and consultation on those elements is proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, we also discovered, in the process of talking with them, that not all the psych nurses view the two-year training and the resulting certification in quite the same way and that is one of the things which we want to get down to and see whether the generic training of psych nursing is equally applicable in all the areas where it's currently operating.

Since the division of Health and Community Services, the mental retardation part of the psych nurse training has operated somewhat separately from the health components and those are the issues that we are working with. Community Services has not been generally in the area of direct training. There are other departments of government that do the training and we believe that the rationalization of the training of psych nurses is a move that should be reviewed very carefully.

At the moment the information we have would indicate that it is a feasible move.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. My question hasn't to do with the legalistic requirements

of consultation. It's evident that the Minister did not have answers to the question. It's evident that the people affected by the decision were not consulted. Why didn't this process of consultation take place before the decision, not after?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Can I remind members that the purpose of question period is to gain information and not to make arguments.

**Schwartz, Betty -
Settlement re wrongful dismissal**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community Services. The lawyer for Betty Schwartz, the former Executive Director of Children's Aid Society - who was fired by this government - has indicated publicly that a settlement has now been arrived at with his client.

I would ask the Minister to inform the House of the total amount of the settlement and the terms of the settlement and how much it will cost the taxpayers of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the person named was an employee of the CAS Winnipeg and I think they are the people who should be approached for any comment on the settlement.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister not confirm that the taxpayers of Manitoba, through her department, will be paying this settlement to Betty Schwartz?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, that the obligation for delivering services and handling the employee relationships lies with the CAS Winnipeg, and they are the appropriate body. They are incorporated with the responsibility for handling those arrangements and they're the people who should be asked the question.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister this. Does she know the total amount of the settlement and the terms of the settlement?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The knowledge of a Minister is not a suitable topic for question period.

Morgentaler Clinic - Additional charges

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General in regard to Dr. Morgentaler and the courts and his clinic. Will the laying of additional charges by the Crown deter or prevent Dr. Morgentaler from performing abortions in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable member knows that he should not ask for opinions, but information.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could rephrase that question and ask the Attorney-General whether he has, in fact, instructed his Crown Attorneys to lay additional charges against Dr. Morgentaler?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The honourable member usually seems to do very little with his time except read newspapers. I thought he would have read that charges were laid.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the Attorney-General in regard to Judge Kroft's remarks that conditions of bail should have been set that would have precluded Dr. Morgentaler from continuing to perform abortions, I'd like to ask him whether he has ruled out the possibility of appealing a two-year-old ruling that denied the Crown that possibility?

HON. R. PENNER: The appeal period for rulings of that kind expires in 30 days. So it expired, roughly speakingly, two years and some bit ago. Yes, on those grounds, I've ruled out the possibility of appealing that decision.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, holding aside the incompetence of the Attorney-General in not laying those charges, I'd like to ask the Attorney-General whether he can then anew or afresh lay out conditions that would preclude Dr. Morgentaler from performing abortions in Manitoba as a condition of bail?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I have no such power. That is a matter for the courts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, just following along the questions from the Member for Elmwood. Mr. Justice Kroft in his decision involving the application for an injunction against Dr. Morgentaler indicated that the conditions of bail are, however, always subject to review on the motion of the Crown. What is more, the Attorney-General may have an early occasion to consider the matter of interim judicial release in connection with newly-laid charges. He can, if he then chooses, request and according to his discretion, order stringent restrictions on Dr. Morgentaler's activities. Is the Attorney-General or his Crown Attorneys considering reviewing and requesting some stringent

restrictions on Dr. Morgentaler's activities when he next appears in court on the new charges?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, there's been a ruling by an experienced trial court judge setting out reasons why, in the view of that trial court judge, such a bail order would be inappropriate. I see no reason why I should go judge shopping and should the opportunity arise, go from judge to judge to judge until I find some judge with a contrary opinion. That is not the way I see the law operating fairly and evenly.

Secondly, it's all hypothetical. The fact of the matter is that there is now an injunction that will operate at least until the 17th of April or thereabouts, the 18th, pursuant to which the clinic is not open. I don't want to deal with hypotheticals in this matter. It's a sensitive matter. Members continue to try to exploit it. I won't.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the injunction that is in effect is with respect to practising medicine and, I understand, is subject to a further review in the courts. Would the Attorney-General or his department not consider the fact that at least two new charges have been laid as an opportunity to review the conditions of bail and seek some restriction on Dr. Morgentaler's future activities?

HON. R. PENNER: As I said a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, that matter is hypothetical at the moment.

Policing costs change - Town of Emerson

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding the Town of Emerson. In view of the statements made by the Minister over the weekend which border on blackmail that he will not approve the budget of the Town of Emerson if they do not include over \$20,000 for policing services in that community, can the Minister indicate whether he will dictate the figure that the Town of Emerson is going to have to include in their budget for policing services?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Emerson in his question suggests that a Minister of the Crown has engaged in activity which might be termed as criminal. The honourable member knows he should not do such a thing.

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

A MEMBER: Put that on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I categorically reject the assumption contained in the member's question with regard to his description of our request that the Town of Emerson obey the laws of the Province of Manitoba. To suggest that is in any way a reprehensible action, Mr. Speaker, is to suggest that the member wishes the Town of Emerson should not obey the law. I don't think the member would say

that. I don't think he would want to advise one of his constituent municipalities that they should disobey the laws of this province. If he is saying that, I wish he'd put that on the record.

Mr. Speaker, I think what the member forgets, and I think the House should be reminded, is that the Town of Emerson was told two years ago and one year ago the same thing they're being told this year. That is that they should provide for the costs of providing policing for the citizens of their town. Two years ago, that requirement was waived. Last year, because it had not been contemplated in their budget and because of the concern about the census figures, the Attorney-General waived the requirement that they pay for a policing contract for one additional year. That correspondence clearly indicated that obligation would ensue this year. They have been aware of that for a full year.

They're also aware, I trust, Mr. Speaker, that under the revised Police Grants Program provided by my department, the grant to offset that cost for the Town of Emerson will be rising this year. Every municipality has an obligation, for example, to levy for the equalized assessment for school division purposes, to provide for policing, if they choose not to get that policing from the RCMP under contract with the Attorney-General's Department, they may provide that on their own. I only insist that municipalities who are obliged to provide for policing make that provision. It's up to them to decide how to meet the policing requirements of their municipality. That is entirely within their jurisdiction, but the law says they must make provision. We intend to ask all municipalities to obey that law.

I think it would be unfair to let one of 201 municipalities break the laws of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister then, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister going to allow the Emerson Council to decide how much money they're going to be spending on policing services?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my answer to the member's first question, the municipal council is obliged under The Municipal Act to provide for police protection for their citizens. It is up to that municipal council to determine what form that police protection will take. Some municipalities constitute their own police forces to provide that service. Others contract with the RCMP. That's a decision the municipal council makes in accordance with certain general guidelines which they receive from the Attorney-General's Department with regard to the provision of that service. I don't know the details of those guidelines or how much latitude is provided but, certainly, that decision is the local council's within certain guidelines about how and what levels of police protection must be provided.

I can tell the honourable member that generally most municipalities find a contract with the RCMP to be a more cost-efficient way of providing that service than engaging their own force. That's not always the case, but that's generally the case.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my next question is to the Attorney-General regarding the same situation. Can the Attorney-General indicate whether the forms

related to the signing of an agreement with the RCMP, whether these forms have been sent to the Town of Emerson so that they can peruse what the agreement would be based on the time element that is involved with the budget approvals? I'm just wondering whether the Minister can indicate whether that has happened or the Attorney-General?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I'll take that as notice, Mr. Speaker, and provide the member and the House with that information tomorrow. I believe that the extension contracts are the same other than the amount which varies from year to year because each year in accordance with the 10-year contract that we have with the RCMP, the provincial share increases and accordingly the costs that would have to be paid as a proportion of the actual cost by the towns and villages which make use of the service increases by about a percent a year, but subject to that special additional information, the extension agreement is the same as the year before, but nevertheless I will check with the Director of Police Services to make sure that the town is in possession of the most current information.

Policing costs change - rural municipalities

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Municipal Services. I would like to ask the Minister if the program for policing costs to the various municipalities has been changed this coming year? — (Interjection) — I would like to ask the Minister if the program and the cost for police services has been changed for this coming year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the reason I hesitated was, I wasn't clear on whether the member was asking me whether or not the program for the provision of police services has changed for the coming year, or if he was referring to the grants program, because the provision of services under extension contracts is under the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General; he just answered a question for the Member for Emerson in that regard.

If the member is asking about the grants program, I would be pleased to advise him about that program.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, it's the grants program, and I also am interested in the levies that are being charged by his department.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I'm quite pleased to advise the member that after a period in excess of a year of consultation with the two municipal associations and after the establishment of a ministerial advisory committee consisting of representatives of those two associations, I received a unanimous report with

recommendations last November, which was circulated to all members of the Assembly and to all member organizations of the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities.

After some discussion, Mr. Speaker, of the contents of that report, and after receiving a high level of endorsement of the recommendations, I modified that proposal to reduce the recommended levy from one mill to one-half mill out of respect for the difficult circumstances in many of the predominantly rural Union of Manitoba Municipalities RM members and that program was announced to all municipalities outside the City of Winnipeg last week. The grant program now will consist of grants in excess of \$600,000 a year, up from \$180,000 last year. The bulk of the increase will come from the half mill levy, which will help offset the costs of policing, particularly for municipalities with over 1,500 population; and also for those with a population of between 750 and 1,500.

The cost of the half mill levy this year to the rural municipalities will be slightly more than offset by the increase in the provincial-municipal tax sharing grants, which were announced about two weeks ago, so overall the program that I've announced is a modification of a unanimous recommendation from the ministerial committee to reduce the actual amount of the levy, while at the same time offering a very dramatic increase to towns and cities of over 1,500 population in their grant support to help offset their policing costs.

I'm pleased the honourable member asked the question; if he wishes further details, I'd be pleased to provide them.

MR. H. GRAHAM: A final supplementary to the Honourable Attorney-General.

Will it then be the case that communities in Manitoba that have had police service provided to them by the province for over 100 years will now have to pay a portion of the costs of that police service?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I regret that the member, who has been a member of this House far longer than I, hasn't at least ascertained from the answer of the Ministerial Affairs the exact arrangement. The arrangement is that given the obligation under The Municipal Act for towns and villages - and that's all I'm dealing with at the moment - to provide police services where their population exceeds 750, - and that's town and village police services, we're not talking about rural services which are provided throughout the province by the RCMP by rural detachments - they have an option and they still have that option, they can either hire their own police person or hire the RCMP through what is called an extension contract.

That obligation remains, and the way of fulfilling that obligation remains. The question arises of payment for those services. They have always, in terms of populations of 750 or more, had to pay for those services, either directly or indirectly through the extension contracts, and have received a grant in aid.

The program announced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs is just intended to equalize the burden of those kinds of police costs and take them off as we always

intended with the program of grants in aid, take them off substantially, as substantially as we can, the backs of town and village ratepayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll try and make it brief, however, I think it's extremely important that on behalf of the farm community in our constituencies that we thank the Federal Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board for the large injection of cash out of the Western Grain Stabilization Payment which was announced today, Mr. Speaker, of some \$73 million to Manitoba farmers, and I think it's important to make recognition of . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur has been in this House long enough to know the usual form of non-political statements. He should not vary that.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a committee change on Rules of the House: the Member for Thompson substituting for Inkster; the Member for Wolseley substituting for the Member for Burrows; the Member for Fort Rouge substituting for the Member for St. James.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to move the motion for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply, but before I do, I wish to advise members that the committee in Room 255 will be considering the Estimates of the Department of Highways and Transportation, and the committee staying here in the Chamber will be dealing with the Estimates of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted by Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the

Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Health and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Highways.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The committee will come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply will be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Highways and Transportation. We shall begin with a statement from the Honourable Minister responsible for the department.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have copies of this statement that the members may wish to have.

Before I start with the statement, I want to extend my specific and particular appreciation to my staff in the Department of Highways and Transportation. I think that they have provided excellent support over the two years I have been in the department, and I want to especially mention the Deputy Minister who has done a great deal of work, specifically with the reorganization of the department that I will be mentioning later on; all the Assistant Deputy Ministers under the new organization. And particularly, I want to mention Jack Peacock, who is in charge of Engineering and Technical Services and who has been suffering from a serious illness over the last while. We want to send him all of our best wishes with regard to that illness and hope that he will be able to overcome it.

I also want to mention Clayton Jackson who is the construction engineer and who is retiring at the end of April this year, and extend special wishes to him for a long retirement; and John Duerksen, the senior maintenance engineer with the department, who is also retiring at the end of April of this year, and thank them for their many years of dedicated service to the department.

I want to welcome, on behalf of all members, our new Registrar of Motor Vehicles, Dan Coyle, who was formerly a Director of Administration with Government Services, who was with the department for less than six months, I believe, and who is doing an excellent job there.

The Department of Highways and Transportation Estimates reflect and are consistent with overall government initiatives and objectives.

We have over the past year, carefully examined our expenditures and service delivery, bearing in mind that we did not want to - if we were going to be reducing in any areas - lay off people or decrease service. We want to be frugal with our increases, to produce greater efficiency in our operations, and to effect the optimum utilization of staff.

This year our total Budget is up some \$4.5 million. This increase is largely accounted for by the \$1.7 million rise in our Maintenance Budget and a \$2 million increase in our Construction Budget.

It is important to note that the Department of Highways and Transportation has an internal

reorganization. There are now six divisions within the department, whose head now reports directly to the Deputy Minister.

This reorganization is in response to a need to provide greater opportunity for improving policy development and direction within the department, addressing department-wide issues, improving lines of communication and authority, and enhancing the opportunities for career development within the department.

This reorganization of reporting procedures is found in our Budget Estimates and I'm sure that you will notice a change there from previous years. The Budget which you will be receiving provides, for the first time, a direct relationship between the organization and function of the department and the related main and sub-appropriations and this wasn't always the case in previous years with regard to the function and the appropriation. I think it will make it more understandable when considering the Estimates this year.

I will subsequently be distributing a package of information which will provide you with some background information on the comparison of the former appropriation structure and the new appropriation structure, reflecting the reorganization that has taken place. I will be pleased to review this with you before we go into the individual appropriation if you would desire that at that particular time.

Some of the highlights in our Estimates that you will find, first of all, the Air-Ambulance Program, which we are very pleased to have included in our Estimates this year. The Department of Highways and Transportation is implementing this service in conjunction with the Health Services Commission and it will be providing a new air-ambulance service to Manitoba. The annual air service costs for this program which will begin this summer are estimated to be just over a million dollars and these costs will all be recoverable from the Manitoba Health Services Commission, as reflected in the Estimates package.

With regard to the transportation of the mobility disadvantaged in rural Manitoba, we are pleased that this program is continuing to expand under our government. It is, I believe, an excellent program and is servicing a vast number of rural citizens across Manitoba. It provides start-up and operating grants for rural communities that wish to operate a handi-van in those communities to service the elderly and the mobility disadvantaged.

Just recently, under a cost-sharing agreement with the Federal Government, we were able to supply \$20,000 to 12 Manitoba communities to purchase handi-vans. I am very pleased that we were able to reach this agreement with the Federal Government so quickly. It is an example, I think, of a co-operative approach. As members may be aware, our program provides for \$10,000 Capital grants for communities where they're wishing to purchase a handi-van to offer the service in their community. We were able to get the Federal Government to match that figure, so the \$20,000 now is much more realistic and made it possible for communities that would otherwise not have been able to afford to purchase the bus, that they are now able to do so and to begin offering the service much sooner than they would otherwise have been able to. So now there are presently 22 communities participating in the

program and three more are expected to join in the new fiscal year.

I want to mention as well the matter of parking for physically handicapped. As part of our government's continuing commitment to providing necessary services to the mobility disadvantaged, my department will be offering in the very near future parking decals to physically handicapped people who own and operate their own vehicles. This will supplement the placard that they've also had for the last number of years. The decals, which display the international symbol of access and the Manitoba Provincial logo, do not confer special benefits on physically handicapped people, but they identify those persons for any special facilities that may be offered in public and private parking places when they're operating their own vehicles.

Insofar as the task force to review motor carrier regulations, this was established in December, 1982, and published its final report and recommendations last September.

As indicated in the Throne Speech, a White Paper outlining the government's intentions will be tabled shortly. Subsequently, it will be my plan to bring forward amendments to the appropriate sections of The Highway Traffic Act, reflecting the contents of the White Paper. To a certain degree, we may phase in some of those recommendations and, of course, that will be reflected in the White Paper.

We have also just recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Canada and other provinces dealing with the reform of trucking regulation for extra-provincial trucking, covering a number of areas in which there was agreement at the federal-provincial level right across this country.

As I mentioned earlier, our Construction and Maintenance Programs were both increased by about \$2 million each this year. Of course, times are difficult, economically, in terms of finding additional dollars, but the Department of Highways and Transportation is taking every initiative to find ways to make the dollars go further. Of course, the Members of the Opposition would say that, whatever department they were dealing with, our priorities are not what they should be if they're not increasing. However, we have to find those dollars and we were able to in this particular case and I'm very pleased that we were able to expand our construction program this year.

It will be our plan to direct a greater effort toward the rehabilitation of our existing infrastructure instead of adding to it by new construction, wherever possible. In an effort to obtain the most advantageous bids in our construction program, we have, over the past two years, significantly increased the size of our pre-advertised program. Of course, this has given benefits to the contractors. It allows them to plan for the work they've been awarded through the winter months. They can undertake such activities as resource allocation within their company, equipment maintenance and preliminary activities, including mobilization. Last fall, we pre-advertised 24 major highway construction projects worth approximately \$29 million.

The Department of Highways and Transportation is in the process of classifying all the roadways in the province by function in order to provide uniform design standards to facilities of equal importance. I think this will be a major development, in terms of providing

standards for roads that survey an equal function, roads that are strategically important in areas of the province being upgraded to higher standards, than those that are not of the same importance. Of course, rationalization will enable us to prioritize the dollars in the proper way and make sure that dollars go further with regard to construction of those roads because they won't all be upgraded to the same standard as they are at the present time; although certain roads that are of strategic importance will receive greater attention and upgrading than under the present system. So there will be some balance there, but we believe that will assist in enabling us to have our dollars stretch further. Of course, a three-year plan for highway rehabilitation and construction purposes will serve as a guide for subsequent construction programs and that is being developed as well.

We've also maintained our efforts to have the Federal Government participate in the funding of major inter-provincial routes with the unanimous agreement of all provinces at the Council of Ministers Meeting in Montreal last fall. We received again a discussion with the Federal Minister, present in Ottawa in February, an endorsement of that request.

The Federal Minister is, of course, having to prioritize his dollars as well and we have sent a very clear message - I think from all provinces - that we feel the Federal Government has a responsibility with regard to interprovincial routes, as well as it applies to additional spending that municipalities and provinces have to undertake because of rail line abandonment. And as members may know, that responsibility has increased dramatically in the last number of years because of rail line abandonments and greater trucking distances and has cost the province and the municipalities a great deal of money. We'd like to see that the Federal Government recognizes their responsibility in this area.

Under the sub-agreements that we signed, we provided for a joint provincial-federal study. Members opposite may be aware that there was a study done by the department some time ago, which identified approximately \$52 million in additional costs for the province because of rail line abandonment, however we're going to update that study and have it done with both provincial and federal input, so that the results cannot be disputed. We feel that that is the first step to having the railways and the Federal Government exercise their responsibility with regard to the provision of alternative transportation where they are abandoning rail lines across this province.

Insofar as safety is concerned, the Government of Manitoba is continuing its emphasis in this area. Through the Highway Traffic Board we have made significant improvements in the physical layout of pedestrian corridors. In addition to this, a major effort will be made under the ALIVE Program to inform pedestrians and drivers of their responsibilities with regard to pedestrian corridors.

The new layout for pedestrian corridors is beginning to take effect in the City of Winnipeg and in those pedestrian corridors that are under the responsibility of the Department of Highways and Transportation. We feel with the dual-flashing, alternately-flashing amber lights, that there will be an improved visibility that will be activated by the pedestrian. There would be an

improvement with regard to safety - a significant improvement with regard to safety - at pedestrian corridors. We may also introduce some limited amendments that may be necessary to The Highway Traffic Act to provide further addressing of the safety concerns at pedestrian corridors.

As well, I might want to mention the Safe Rider Program that was introduced for novice motorcyclists to supplement other safety initiatives with regard to motorcyclists. As you know with regard to the introduction of helmets, there was a request by motorcyclists to have a safety course. A six-hour classroom course has been adopted and will be delivered by the Manitoba Safety Council, and is already being delivered. It teaches the basic elements of motorcycling, including the explanation of motorcycle controls, general traffic rules, insurance coverage and survival techniques on the highway. My department has supplied a start-up grant to the Safety Council of \$30,000 and in addition to that a \$15,000 operating grant to assist in the carrying out of that program.

As well, the mandate of the Traffic Safety Committee has been expanded to address a variety of safety issues, both as it concerns the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and the Highways Department. This committee is chaired by John Wylie of the MPIC, he's the safety manager.

We've also introduced the unique trial - and it is unique, it's the first in Canada - of the Videotex Program that will give faster and more accurate information on road conditions. It was introduced over part of this past winter and we believe it is successful in providing updated information to the public on road conditions. It is part of the Manitoba Telidon project and it is the first road information program of its kind in Canada.

We have installed a videotex terminal in the road information office in Winnipeg as well as in Carman, Portage la Prairie, Brandon and Dauphin offices.

The department's district offices supply road condition information by telephone to the Winnipeg office and this information is entered into a central videotex terminal. It is then possible to use the four pilot district terminals to answer public enquiries for any area of the province more efficiently and accurately. Instead of having to phone each of those areas of the province, all of the information is there and is contained in the terminal and can be provided immediately to the public when they enquire. We have enormous numbers of enquiries from the public as members will be aware. I think, during the heavy winter conditions, there are sometimes as many as 900 enquiries a day.

In co-operation with the MTS and several cable companies, this road information is being provided for a trial period, at no cost, to evaluate the market interest on cable channels in Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Thompson, and Winnipeg.

We've made a number of improvements to our signage program this past year. There are a number of additional thrusts in the signage area directed and improving and enhancing information to the travelling public and, in particular, the tourist using our highway system.

New programs such as one which supplies signage to mark the location of historical sites and museums, and another identifying the call letters/frequency of local radio stations have been introduced. We'll have lots

of time to get at the construction program in a few minutes, for the benefit of honourable members. I believe that signage is a very important area and we have made significant improvements there.

We are participating in a Community Identification Highway Signage Program aimed at improving the identification of traveller services and facilities in 65 Manitoba communities this year.

This program for \$135,000, is funded by the Federal and Provincial Governments under the Destination Manitoba Program, and also by the participating communities. It provides for the installation of community service signs on designated tourist routes by the Manitoba Highways Department.

We will be expanding, hopefully, that program in subsequent years to include all areas of the province, but we hope this initial program will stimulate the tourism industry by making motorists more aware of services available in communities throughout the province and thereby assist in stimulating rural economies.

In addition, in co-operation with the RCMP and rural crime watch associations, the Department of Highways and Transportation has developed a uniform rural crime watch sign to be used throughout the province. This was also done in consultation with the Department of Municipal Affairs. I think it shows the flexible approach that we're taking with regard to the improvement and introduction of our signage programs. These rural crime watch signs will be posted in conspicuous areas and will warn potential thieves that a rural crime watch is in operation in that particular area.

The department will produce and install these signs when requested by rural crime watch associations through the local municipality. The cost of the material for the sign production will be funded by the Department of Municipal Affairs. It involves the co-operation of two departments as well as the municipalities. I think it's an excellent initiative and one that I had been asked about in a number of areas of this province and one we responded to very quickly.

Manitobans should also be aware that the new highway route marker signs will be appearing as the present route markers wear out. This attractive new route marker bears Manitoba's new stylized buffalo symbol and the word "Manitoba" appears in tartan green on the signs.

This year our efforts will be focused on the policy area on developing further policies on grain transportation issues such as variable grain rates which we are very concerned about. Members may be aware that the recent applications in Northern Saskatchewan were withdrawn by CN, however, that is only the beginning and we will be making strong representation in that area to avoid the potential introduction of variable grain rates.

Also the review of The Western Grain Transportation Act is a matter of concern to us, and of course the whole area of rail line abandonment and, of course, they're all very much interconnected, as members will know.

We are also continuing our work on the two sub-agreements on transportation and Churchill signed in April of last year with the Federal Government. Members may be aware that there was some \$213 million allocated for these two sub-agreements and work is

continuing with the new Federal Government on many of the initiatives under these sub-agreements.

Some of the major studies and initiatives that are under way are the development of the lightweight rail car for manufacture in Transcona, which will service the Churchill line in the future and many other branch lines. It has tremendous market potential that we are exploring as well under the sub-agreements. Research has also taken place on the railway roadbed stabilization in permafrost areas, to follow up on initial research that was done. Improvements for the Port of Churchill in the area of dredging, a new tugboat and the dust control that was needed in that area as well. And of course we're looking at the extension of the season at the Port of Churchill as well, and to determine exactly what the economic impact of extending the season by approximately 40 days would have on the potential for other commodities and the viability, generally, of the Port of Churchill. One other one that is being worked on under the sub-agreements is the Transportation Institute at the University of Manitoba.

So we are actively following up on our initiatives on the Port of Churchill, meeting with other countries, customers. We've been informed by the Wheat Board that the customer countries that purchase our grain are the ones that determine what port it's shipped from, and we're actively pursuing markets on that basis. We think that this is somewhat of a breakthrough in that the countries can specify directly to the Wheat Board where they want to purchase their grain and that leaves us with some potential for expansion at the Port of Churchill. We will be following that up as well as the season extension as I mentioned earlier.

I think that is enough information in terms of my opening statement. I want to give the members an opportunity - the critic, the Member for Minnedosa - perhaps to respond in some way if he wishes, and then we will attempt to deal with the staffing changes, the reorganization of the department, if the members wish. I would hope that the construction program could perhaps be focused under the Planning and Design Area, which is traditional for a discussion of specific individual projects under the construction program, as it has been in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair now calls upon the main opposition leading critic to make his reply if he so wishes.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Firstly, we thank the Minister for the statement that he has given to us today. There is little in there to warm the hearts of those that were looking for some construction projects and some better maintenance programs this year, but we'll be getting into some more of that a little later. There is a great lot of rhetoric in there about signs and policies and various other programs that I don't want to label them as Mickey Mouse projects, Mr. Chairman, but they're projects that I think are worthwhile. They're ongoing and they aren't costing any dollars. Naturally that's helpful to the government.

But I would also pay my compliments and those of the other members of my party to the staff members, those that are retiring and those that are not in good

health and we wish them well, of course. Those that are retiring, Mr. Chairman, we hope that they're not bailing out from a sinking ship, that they're taking retirement for that much-deserved rest that they have earned so well over the years.

So, Mr. Chairman, we do thank the Minister for his opening statement, although it's like the program that we have received when we received the Estimates and the program today that there was so little in it this year that I don't know whether there's enough to prolong debate on the Estimates very long this year, other than to express our strong disappointment, of course, in the downward trend that's been evident the past three years in the Highways Budget.

The Department of Highways, I think, has again been ignored this year. Those on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, are disappointed and shocked that more attention hasn't been paid to this important department, because we do consider the Department of Highways - especially the rural members such as the rural area that I represent - to be an extremely important area to all Manitobans and this includes the ordinary Manitobans that this government claims is their special constituency and they love to clasp the ordinary Manitoban to their breasts. This program affects them as much as anyone, if not more than anyone. But we realize, Mr. Chairman, that the government considers the Highways and Transportation portfolio a junior one, but it's important to all of the people of Manitoba. I think it deserves better treatment, especially from a caring government - one of their boasts is - that they care for the ordinary working people and highways are extremely important to those people.

Mr. Chairman, the increases that we've seen in the Highways Budget this year, it's not even keeping up with inflation, let alone providing any funds to improve the system or to provide necessary and very badly needed construction work. It's self-evident that you can't band-aid a hemorrhage and that's what's happening in our highway system. It's deteriorating at a rapid pace and it has to be shored up and it has to be shored up quickly before we are faced with just an enormous, if not insurmountable task.

Mr. Chairman, this year in the statement of revenues that we received, in the Estimates of 1985, we were taking \$100,400,000 in gas tax. This year we're going to collect \$115.4 million which is up \$15 million. In the motive fuel tax last year, \$47.5 million; this year \$56.7 million, up \$9.2 million. That's an increase of \$24,000,200.00.

Now under the Budget that the Minister has brought down, Operating last year was \$94,905,600; this year it's \$96,930,000; it's up \$2,024,000.00. Capital of \$101,730,200 and this year \$104,125,000; it's up \$2,395 million.

So, we've got a total increase this year, Mr. Chairman, of \$4.4 million, so give or take some change. So, we have a 2 million increase for Operating and a 2.3 million increase in Capital spending.

Now, Mr. Chairman, of the road tax increases of \$24.2 million, almost \$20 million of that tax is being siphoned off. It's going into other uses. Mr. Minister, we don't know where it's going. We'd like to know. Is it going into the Jobs Fund? Are we going to see it crop up later with a big press release, "The government has spent another \$20 million on road construction." That'll

come with all the fanfare and the hoopla of a great press release, probably just about election time.

Mr. Chairman, I think the people of Manitoba are on to that one. They're not going to be fooled with that one anymore. I don't like quoting the First Minister, but it just won't wash anymore. That apparently is one of his new phrases.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think the people of Manitoba want to pay a bad road tax. I don't think they mind paying their fair share of the tax, but they don't want to pay a bad road tax. I think they're being shafted by this government by not getting their fair share of revenues that are coming out of the gas and the motive fuel tax plus the other taxes that go into the department. I don't want to bore the Committee with a bunch of statistical figures because I think it's self-evident what is happening in the Department of Highways.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's anything that creates jobs with more of a spin-off effect than a healthy and aggressive road program. That is evident in other provinces that you travel through that do have a substantial road program going on. I think the Minister is well aware of the problems in the heavy construction industry. They're operating at probably 50 percent of capacity. Many of them are out of business, have left business in the last few years for many reasons, the biggest one, I suppose, being out of work, having so little work to do that they've either gone out of business or they've gone bankrupt by not having enough work to do.

The Minister has received a number of briefs from the heavy construction industry and I'm sure that he's well aware of some of the problems there. I do see some benefit in the pretended work - that does assist the contractors. The Minister alluded to that in his remarks and I compliment him for that because it's a program that's very very functional, it's timely, and it's taken advantage of by the operators. There's no question about that.

But I think, under the system when we see our operators going out of business, the bid system suffers. The small operators are staying in but operators of any size, if they can't receive enough work and enough contracts to bid on in Manitoba are going to be looking for work elsewhere and a number of them, I know, are looking and have looked and are successful working elsewhere and not in the Province of Manitoba where we would love to have the jobs, and that all filters down as a great benefit to the economy.

With the dismal increase in construction, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister what is going to happen to our plans to four-lane Highway 75, to finish four-laning No. 1 West to the American border? Mr. Chairman, we have American tourists coming in here travelling on a four-lane highway till they hit the border and then travelling over potholes and a road that's just in terrible shape. I know the Minister of Tourism has been off to Minneapolis promoting our wonderful province and encouraging tourists to come here, and I know is being thwarted in his efforts to some degree by the road that we asked him to drive on. There has just been a federal-provincial cost-sharing agreement signed to improve tourism in the province.

I should quote, Mr. Chairman, just at this time from the remarks of the Minister of Highways on the second session we had. "The people of Manitoba and indeed

the tourists that travel through Manitoba, I am told, take good advantage of our highway system. In fact, it appears that they do about 2.8 billion vehicle miles annually in this province. It gives you some idea of the magnitude as to the use of our highway system. Of course, that is why it's important to continue with our repair, maintenance and reconstruction programming that is designed to keep improving the highway system in the province in order to provide the public with a better and more convenient means of commuting back and forth from their workplace to home and so on, as well as the touring public that wants to see as much of Manitoba as we have here."

It goes on and I quote, Mr. Chairman: "We must strengthen them to a standard that meets the requirements of today and indeed the future. A dollar invested in the highway system today is not invested only for the day or for the year but, indeed, is expected to service the public for many, many years to come. I'm told that about 36 percent of the construction program is essentially dealing with these aims. Highways that receive paved surfaces, of course, unfortunately are not able to last forever without a lot of maintenance. Many of our highways are approaching 20 years since they were last surfaced and they can only be brought back to an acceptable condition by reconstruction."

We understand now, Mr. Chairman, that some of the surfaces are only good for about 13 years. So, it's evident from that, Mr. Chairman, that there was at one time, a feeling in the Highways Department that we did have to concentrate on reconstruction and upgrading of our road system. There is nothing in this Budget or the remarks that the Minister has given us today that would confirm that or would indicate that that policy is still in force. That is disturbing to those of us on this side of the House, especially, as we've said earlier, there's some \$20 million being siphoned out of the tax that's being generated by motive fuel taxes and the like that should be into construction and into road maintenance programs.

I know the Minister's familiar with the TRIP Report that was sent to him by the heavy construction industry, so there's not much point in going into that. Our system is deteriorating at a faster pace than we're able to keep up with it, especially in the City of Winnipeg in their streets and sewer systems. They don't spend massive amounts of money. In the very near future, they're going to be faced with an insurmountable task and they're faced with the same problem that the government is faced with and it's going to cost a tremendous amount of money and where's the money going to come from?

The Minister touched in his remarks on the trucking regulations and we'll be going into that at some greater length as to what consultations have been held and just what the White Paper is going to suggest. We want to discuss some of the aspects of the Motor Vehicle Branch also, Mr. Chairman. I know many of the members on this side are concerned and want to ask questions pertaining to their particular constituencies. I must say, on my quick glance through the Highways Program, there is a bit of work there that we wanted done in my particular constituency and we're happy to see that. I haven't had the chance to go through the program and find out just where all of the work is being done, but I'm not going to be so bold as to make an unfounded - I guess I could call it a confounded - statement such

as the Member for Ste. Rose made a few years ago about all of the work being done in Conservative constituencies. I would relate back to those years to the Member for Ste. Rose and find out how much work was done in the Member for Ste. Rose's constituency during the Conservative years, Mr. Chairman, so I won't make that blanket statement such as he made when we were on the government side of the House.

The Minister mentioned rail line abandonments, federal funding and the road bed property and when we get to that particular section we do want to discuss that further because what's happening to the rail line abandoned road beds appears to be up in the air; and I know there's been a change in the federal House. It's hard to nail anybody down. Somebody said that was in the gifted agreement and the other wasn't in the gifted agreement and that property's been sold to the municipality and the other one hasn't and it's something that has to be nailed down, I think, Mr. Minister, fairly soon to find out just what we're going to do with it. Maybe that's going to take some long-range plans, I don't know.

Mr. Chairman, just to recap, we are extremely disappointed in the Highways program this year, to say the least. The Minister will be hearing from me and some of my colleagues as we go through the Estimates section-to-section. I do hope, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, that we may be allowed some small bit of latitude in going through the Estimates because as you know we're dealing with two committees in the House and I know some of the members who want to ask questions here are in the other committee and they may not just get in in time; so with your forbearance, if that should happen, if they can't get in to ask a particular question that's important to their constituency and to their constituents, we may find some way that we might be able to accommodate them should the time schedule get a bit off their timetables.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll conclude my remarks and we can start into the examination of the Estimates. I think it's customary to leave the Minister's Salary to the last item and get on to the examination of the Estimates. With that, I'll conclude my remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Following the reply of the opposition's main critic, the Chair now formally invites the members of the departmental staff to kindly take their respective places.

Mr. Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, while the staff is coming up, I just wanted to comment on a couple of things if I could.

The honourable member had mentioned . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we will discuss it under the aegis of 1.(b)(1), the Minister's Salary, that will be a general discussion of the issues.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to focus on his request to have the discussion on Highways construction projects being done somewhat with a flexible approach. I agree with that. However, I think it's important that we have the appropriate staff here and that's why I suggested the majority of that

discussion be done under the Planning and Design Section No. 3 of the Estimates or under Expenditures Related to Capital at the end on Page 97, No. 7 of the Estimates; and that would assist me in having the appropriate staff here at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1).

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I also wanted to just correct a couple of statements that were made for the record from the Member for Minnedosa with regard to the gasoline and fuel tax increases this past year and how they relate to highways. I believe the honourable member may have been referring to correspondence from Mr. Whitmore of the Heavy Construction Association when he refers to \$24 million increases in taxes related to highways. That is incorrect information. It's about \$21.6 million in increases, total, from the Department of Finance estimations and approximately \$7.6 million can be attributed to railways, heating fuel and off-highway vehicles and so on, of that 21, so we're talking about \$14 million that can be related to highway use, as opposed to \$24 million that the honourable member used. That of course is a somewhat different picture, although the budget of the department is not increased as much as the highway taxes. But the relative significance of it is less, on the basis of the information that I have, versus the information that the individual member has put forward and I want to mention user taxes have never been the way that highways have been financed in this province or in any other province, as a matter of fact. No tax has been designated for that specific purpose.

If you look at — (Interjection) — the overall . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: The rationale has been a lot higher though.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, if you look at the overall Highways budget, we're obviously collecting a lot less money than we are spending in the areas of Highways and Transportation and of course if we get into user tax, on the basis of who uses the roads and who doesn't, we have the difficulty of determining whether the users can actually afford to finance the highways and expansion of the Highways budget that the honourable member may have been referring to in his remarks that there should be a substantial expansion because users would, I think, not be able to afford a tremendous increase in that - we look at grain transportation as one example where farmers would have to perhaps pay a substantial amount more in registration and licences for the use of their roads; and if we get into that, I think it would be folly and it would be a backward step so I wouldn't like to see it work on the basis of those people who use the highways. There's benefits to people who do not use it as well, of having an efficient highway system and that's the basis for the tax system, for financing highways over the years, and I think we should continue to have that system, as opposed to strictly a user tax.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now considering Executive Support - Administration and Finance 1.(b)(1) Salaries, 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just on this item and to follow up the Minister's remarks, whether we call it a user tax or not, it was obvious they way the figures are, we can always get into a dispute over figures.

The obvious fact is that the user fees on gasoline taxes and other taxes have been increased and 80 percent of that increase was siphoned off and it wasn't going into roads. That was the aegis of our argument, that's been siphoned off and gone somewhere and we're waiting for it to show up. Whether it shows up at election time or more flags or more stakes on the highway, just before the election's called, we don't know, but we'll be watching for it.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: One joke goes that, a surveyor is looking through the scope, the other fellow asks him what he sees out there and he says he sees an election coming; but I don't think we could look at it from that respect this year, Mr. Chairman. There's a lot of construction activity going on and I would say not a disproportionate amount of survey work going on.

MR. D. BLAKE: As the fly said when he walked over the mirror, Mr. Chairman, that's one way of looking at it.

The increase in Executive Salaries is only up a small amount. The Minister might care to comment, if that just covers a new executive assistant or what that increase might cover.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: If I could, I'd like to distribute a staffing list of changes from last year if that might help the members. I have a number of sheets that might serve to facilitate the discussion. We'll pass this out and I'll make a comment on the difference in staffing.

1.(b) reflects the same number of staff. We're under 1.(b), Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: 1.(b) does not reflect an increase in staff, just . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: . . . general increase in salaries.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: . . . and reclassification.

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

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There's an increase, Mr. Chairman, in 1.(c).

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(1), Administrative Services, Salaries; 1.(c)(2), Other Expenditures - the Honourable Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in anticipation of the question, there's an increase of one staff that provides for the support for the internal audit function. That makes up the majority of the increase there.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, at the section that we'll be questioning the Minister on internal audit, there will be

some questions on that, Mr. Chairman, but I think the section will be somewhat later on. When did you want to - when we get under districts, I suppose?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well if they're specific questions relating to districts, Mr. Chairman, that would be the place, otherwise this is the section where the internal audit is located - internal auditor.

MR. D. BLAKE: We can maybe cover it right now, Mr. Chairman, and I'm referring to the situation in the Carman area. I wanted to ask the Minister what - he may not be able to comment too much on that one - I just wondered if there were any other areas, what his audits - his checks and balances, so to speak - if they'd shown up any other discrepancies or irregular practices in any other districts?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, both the Provincial Auditor and the internal auditor are working on this investigation and we expect a report on their findings within a week or so, so I can't comment on what their findings might be at this time.

MR. D. BLAKE: Would the Minister be able to make those findings available to members of the opposition or is that an internal . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well we would want to assess the report, Mr. Chairman, and I believe what would be reflected would be, if we felt there was suggestions or requirements to change procedures, we would obviously want to implement them, and after some consideration the members would be made aware of those. I think that would be the best way to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(1)—pass; 1.(c)(2)—pass.
1.(d)(1), 1.(d)(2), Financial Services, Salaries, Other Expenditures - the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: The increase there, I suppose, reflects, Mr. Chairman, the similar situation to (c).

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There's no increasing in staffing in that particular area. There may be some reclassifications for computer services and so on, upgrading of classifications, but no increases in the SYs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass.
1.(e)(1) Personnel Services, Salaries, 1.(e)(2) Other Expenditures. 1.(e)(1)—pass; 1.(e)(2)—pass.
1.(f)(1) Computer Services, Salaries, 1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Again no change in staffing there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f)(1)—pass; 1.(f)(2)—pass.
We shall defer this Item 1 because of the Minister's Salary. We now go to Item No. 2, Operations and Maintenance; 2.(a) which is Maintenance Program. Operation and Maintenance, 2.(a). — (Interjection) — We're on Item No. 2, on Page 93 at the bottom, Operations and Maintenance, (a) Maintenance Program - the Honourable Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, this area of 2.(a) includes a small increase in the staffing of 1.26 for additional casual employment to supervise maintenance activities. In addition to that, there's additional dollars, primarily in the maintenance activities, in expanding the service in some areas, particularly for dust control and dragging, grading for our roads.

We also have an increase in the number of miles in the provincial highway system that need to be accommodated under the Maintenance, about 135.8 miles in Southern Manitoba and 119.5 on the Split Lake to Gillam, Sundance Road.

As well there's the inflationary increase for materials, equipment and services allowed for about 2 percent, approximately \$948,000, so that we feel that materials overall for maintenance will be up around - for most of the major materials that are required - will be about 5 to 6 percent increase for those materials. It requires about a 2 percent increase in the overall Budget.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, it's up about \$1.7 million. Those increases are pretty well taken care of in the statements the Minister made.

Under tendering the department, the Minister can confirm, is it still following a tendering process, and probably he could assure us that all of the roads in Dauphin and Dauphin constituency were tendered under the usual prescribed manner?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well we're talking about maintenance activities here and major maintenance work is done by a tendering process, it is not done by Department of Highways forces. However, of course, the honourable member will be aware that there are certain works that are done on an hourly basis and the department publishes an hourly rate for each year that's usually updated with some inflationary allowance. I don't believe this last year it was increased — (Interjection) — a 3 percent increase and that was for the last couple of years. There hadn't been an increase, I believe, the year before. So it is done on that basis. We have to consider that - I would like to see of course that all equipment owners in an area have an opportunity to have access to this work on a rotation basis, and of course I think that is the fairest way to do it. We want to perhaps look at that over the next while to see if that is the case. Of course that's one of the areas that the internal auditor will be looking at, perhaps in his investigations, but it seems to me that's one of the fairest ways to proceed. Of course, District 8 in Dauphin is no different, in terms of my involvement, than it is in the other district.

MR. D. BLAKE: This particular section would cover the maintenance and design on existing bridges, not on new bridges. New bridges would come under Planning and Design, I suppose, would it, Mr. Chairman? Am I correct there?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We have a certain amount of maintenance work done on bridges, under this appropriation, but the Construction Program has the major replacement of bridges. Major bridges on our highway system are included under the Construction Program.

MR. D. BLAKE: That's right. I think that would be the best section to discuss, for example, the proposed bridge at Selkirk.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, that's under the Construction Program. I might mention that the department continues to follow the maintenance, management system that has been in place with all of the standards that were outlined there since about the early '70s, it was put in place, and the same standards that were applied at that time are being followed under the Maintenance Program today with a computerized system, standards that are applied and so on. I don't know whether the members would be interested in that but summer maintenance makes up most of the dollars, much more than the winter maintenance, about three times as much of the total dollars spent under what we call normal maintenance. There's also special maintenance activities such as resealing of pavement, heavy maintenance work that's done under this section as well and the remainder is winter maintenance.

MR. D. BLAKE: Largely winter roads, I take it.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, not winter roads. This would be the winter snow clearing and sand and so on that's done during the winter months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass. The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, some place along the line, I would like the Minister to give us an opportunity for a pretty open discussion on the planning and the design that we use in our Maintenance Program, dealing not only with surfaces of roads, but also with our bridges. Where would you suggest that we do this? Would it be in the next item? A lot of it comes under Maintenance too.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: If the member would like to have a discussion on bridge standards and so on, I think that would be best had under the Bridge Section that is included. However, a general discussion on the maintenance standards that are in place, General Maintenance, I think we should have it right now if the member has some comments he'd like to make.

If the member would like to talk about proposed new bridges or major structures that are being included, that would come under Planning and Design; but the standards for existing bridges would come under the Bridge Section and that is a Special Appropriation in 2.(d)(2), so the member could raise all the question on bridges at that point. However, if the member wants to discuss our standards for maintenance, this is the time to do it.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Standards for maintenance, the best time is right now.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: This is the best time to do it.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if the department has done any studies on the cost of maintenance of, say, a concrete roadway as compared to an asphalt roadway or if their studies

have indicated that perhaps it is better to put an asphalt treatment on top of a concrete road? Can we get some professional opinions on that at the present time?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: We haven't, I don't think, outside of the department, undertaken any extensive studies in this area recently, but the point is that in the Red River Valley area where aggregates are limited, the concrete is used most extensively and asphalt is used mostly in other parts of the province; so we don't do a lot of concrete paving in other parts of the province, just in the Red River Valley area. The life span is about 18-20 years on that concrete pavement and after it has received that kind of wear, then usually an overlay is put over the top of it, not just an AST but so that we get the proper adhering qualities, a regular mat or overlay is required of two to four inches over the top, and that's what you see on the Trans-Canada Highway and on other concrete roads that have seen their better years. So that's generally what's done and it's cheaper generally to lay bituminous pavement than it is to do concrete, even at this time.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, it hasn't been very long that No. 1 Highway has been in operation since it was rebuilt or built and yet we're finding that the concrete apparently is not standing up. They've had to put asphalt over top of most of it and, as you say, 18 years. Eighteen years in concrete, to me, doesn't seem to be a very long span and it causes even greater concern when you start to get into bridge construction, because I've been over bridges that have been in existence for hundreds of years. Yet here we're replacing bridges after 15-20 years and . . . yes, hundreds of years. In Europe, bridges are standing and still being used that are hundreds of years old.

I'm beginning to ask questions about whether we are using the best materials or is the material that we're using the wrong material, because if we're only getting 18 or 20 years out of a road, I know gravel roads in this province that have been standing for 30 and 35 years and we can only get 18 years out of a concrete surface. It doesn't seem right to me because it costs us ten times as much to put a concrete surface on and it's only standing up half the length of an ordinary gravel road. We'd better be getting some answers to those questions because there's hundreds of millions of dollars invested and it's not standing up.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: First of all, that's a gross exaggeration in terms of the cost of the concrete. It's not ten times as much; it's very close to the actual cost because there's more aggregate required for bituminous paving for base in the Red River Valley area. Concrete doesn't require as much base.

The other thing is that when you put an overlay on, you're extending the life of that road for another 12-15 years. So really, you have at least 30 years out of the total life of that road because you don't have to rebuild the base to put the bituminous overlay over as you would if you were starting from scratch and were having to rebuild the whole road to do the grading and then put the bituminous overlay. What you have then is the life extended to at least 30 years. You have not the kinds of costs differential that the member is referring to.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll ask the Minister another question.

How much money has he got in this Budget appropriated for research into new methods and new materials to be used in road construction?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I wouldn't have a figure but we're always looking at new ways of doing things. Recycling asphalt is one area that we're doing. We're also looking at new developments, new technology in terms of machines that are available to recap paved surfaces, so that an extensive two to four inch overlay is not required just to fill those areas that require the filling, in areas where you have, for example, rutting in existing pavement because of an extreme amount of traffic over a number of years. So, that is being looked at.

We're also looking at studies to find the most effective materials for dust control, that kind of thing is going on. I guess I can say the laboratory is constantly doing tests on existing materials to determine how they're standing up and to make suggestions for improvements on the kinds of aggregate and materials that are used.

In addition to the efforts that we're making individually as a department, we're also members of some large organizations; the Roads and Transportation Association of Canada, which is doing a \$3 million study in which we are participating over a period of years to determine the effects of increased weights on the pavements across the country. As the members will be aware, there has been a dramatic increase in weights that have been allowed over the years. Of course, it is also coming to the attention of authorities that this has decreased the life of pavements dramatically, so we have to look at that and that is being addressed.

As well, the Deputy Minister is on a committee of the American Association of Traffic and Highway Officials which is a huge American organization that is doing a great deal of research into various materials used for paving and methods of pavement and so on. So, through that organization and our direct participation which we're very pleased that we have a member, the Deputy Minister on, we have access to the latest information there as well. So, I think those two areas, those two major organizations will provide us with the kind of information that the honourable member is seeking through our participation in those organizations.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, once a year, the Estimates for each department are brought before a Committee of the Legislature and if we ask questions in the House, we're told wait till you get to Estimates, then the answers will provided. I asked the Minister how much money has been set aside for planning into new materials and new methods of construction of roads and bridges to get an increased lifespan and he says he hasn't got the figure. Can you give us the figure? Can you get it for us?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can give the honourable member the figures after we have a chance to put them together in various sections of the Budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If my memory serves me correctly, there was an announcement some time during last year about a program the Highways Department was doing on photographing all the highways and provincial roads in the province. Could you give us an update on that?

MR. H. GRAHAM: We'll try and get you another 10 miles for your constituency.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't recall a specific announcement on photographing of highways. What we usually do is if there's major developments being taken - I don't know if the honourable member is referring to aerial photography that's done for routing; that is done on a project-by-project basis. We also do traffic tests and so on on highways on an ongoing basis to determine traffic volumes and so on, but I'm not certain what the member is referring to here.

MRS. C. OLESON: I haven't got it in front of me either; I wish I had. It strikes me that this announcement said that all the highways and provincial roads in the province, there was a program being undertaken to photograph them all with a view of the condition they were in and so forth.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well again, I don't think that there was an announcement that came from the department as such. It may have been some departmental employee making reference to some new processes that might be available. There is a new laser machine that can measure the condition of pavement and we want to do some testing with that this spring.

There's also a test that's done every fall on pavements to determine the ratings of those pavements in terms of the ridability and that is done by the districts and the maintenance engineer every year to determine the ridability and it's graded and that number is allocated so that we know what the condition is in terms of the need to upgrade or resurface and so on. But that is done on an ongoing basis so there's no new program in that regard, but as I mentioned, there is a new machine involving use of lasers and we want, since it is available, to have it tested here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder can the Minister advise me how many miles the municipalities in the province maintain of the PRs and the highways and how much money the department pays to the municipalities.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would have to get that information. I don't know if we have the exact dollars. It's a very small percentage in certain districts. I believe District 7 is one where most of that is done. There's only one other district, I believe, where municipalities are doing the maintenance work to any extent at all for the Department of Highways and Transportation. It involves in District 7, about 20 percent to 25 percent of the maintenance work that is done and that's the highest district, so it's rather insignificant and each year it's less in areas where municipalities are deciding that they no longer want to provide that

service. In some municipalities they like that kind of system because then they can afford to buy equipment that they otherwise would not be able to, but largely that practice is not in place across the province.

If the member would like the exact dollars, we could get that for another sitting but I don't have it right with me at the present time.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Can I ask the Minister, are any private contractors doing maintenance in the province?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Not as a rule, for regular maintenance there isn't. We're looking at one situation in the province in District 11 where the highways maintainer has to travel long distances, dead-ending for the purpose of grading a road and we're letting a contract on that; and of course in that particular case, because the contractor does have some equipment available, it is much cheaper, and we're looking at that kind of approach, but not in any wide scale application.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Can I ask the Minister, regarding the bridge at Grandview on the provincial trunk highway which the community, the Chamber of Commerce, the town, the municipality have been asking the Minister for months now, if they would be kind enough to name it the Hume Bridge for their 85th anniversary this year? For some strange reason, the Minister is stalling and he has not been able to come up with a reply or agree with the local community. I wonder if the Minister can give those communities a decision today.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, traditionally the naming of bridges has taken place only on major structures. We have many, many bridges across the province and normally they are not named, except when they are major structures crossing the major waterways. The policy of the department has been, over the years, not to name bridges of the kind that the honourable member is referring to, so that is the major reason why there has been no positive decision in regard to that request. It is an anomaly; it's a special request that does not fit the policy and I'm concerned that we would get into these kinds of ceremonies.

I think the members opposite would think that we were window dressing and spending money on ceremonies and signage and things like that, that they don't feel should be high priority for the government. We could have opening ceremonies of bridges and naming and dedicating them right across this province if that's what the honourable member is suggesting, but I think that would be rather an extensive program. Right now, it just not exist and we're reviewing that and that's why we have not made any decision on it. It does not fit the current policy; it never has been the policy of the department.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I wonder would the Minister be kind enough to let the Community of Grandview, the municipality, the town, know what he's telling me today because they've been waiting months for an answer.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I did inform them that there was no commitment made to name that bridge and what our policy was. I gave them that

information some time ago. However, I said I was reviewing that policy to see whether there would be any advantage to getting into a widespread program of naming. I have not received the final report on that from the department. As soon as I do, I will be informing them.

I received the honourable member's letter just recently and I'm going to be replying to that as soon as possible. I know that they would like to know the final dispensation of that, but I did indicate to them what the policy was and I think they are aware. I also indicated that there was no commitment from the department anywhere that we could determine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's very obvious that the Minister's not running his department when he answered the Member for Roblin-Russell. Does the Minister himself not have a policy as to whether or not these bridges could be named? I would think he'd have enough experience by now where he could just step out on his own a little bit without putting the department ahead of him and blaming them for not being able to come forward with a policy. I would hope the Minister would start the department.

Does the Minister have a policy? Or what is the government's policy on the numbers of maintenance trips that are made over the PR roads in the province?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, before I get to the maintenance trips, I might respond just briefly to the preamble of the member.

The policy is in place and I generally am in agreement with it. The only difference in this particular case is that it was stated that there was a commitment to name that bridge. I want to determine if there was such a commitment and that's why it was taking time. I'm inclined to go with the policy that has been in place.

In terms of the standards, the dragging varies depending on the road classification and the road classification is established by traffic volumes. The Class 3 road - I'm just trying to get the traffic volumes on here - would be graded, dragged 33 times in a summer; Class 4 road, 20 times and a Class 5 road, 14 times, and that is the established practice that has been in place for, as I said earlier, about 15 years.

The traffic volumes are in another section here. I could find that, in terms of what constitutes a Class 3 or Class 4 or Class 5 road, but there's a lesser amount of traffic in each of those classes as you go up, from Class 3 to Class 4 to Class 5. There's less traffic on those.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the concern I have is that there are some roads, particularly in the constituency which I represent, that far too often I don't think come within any class at all, that the road traffic is far greater than what a lot of the engineers feel that the roads are in deplorable condition. Many municipal councillors have contacted me, many local people, and asked for an increase.

Do the engineers in the district, is it specifically laid out for them or do they have a cost saving that they can transfer the money from fuel and wages from that

road maintenance into other portions of their departments or how do they handle the funding for that? If they as engineers, feel that they can save some money in a particular road, do they have that flexibility or is it laid out in pretty strict policy to them?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: As a general rule, they are to drag to those classifications that I indicated, 33 times, and I wanted to just go over that. Class 3 road would have average daily traffic of between 250 and 600 vehicles per day; Class 4 would be 75 to 250 vehicles per day, average daily traffic; Class 5 would be less than 75 vehicles per day. I indicated that the dragging times were 33 times in the summer, 20 and 14 for each of those classifications. That can vary if unusual circumstances develop in a particular area where there are a lot of complaints or severe problems develop, they can put more emphasis on one particular road and then may put less to balance out on another particular road. So they have some discretion but as a general rule they follow the standards that are in place and it is our desire that they do that and that they would give special treatment to certain roads when problems develop of a severe nature.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I suppose if a person were to call the engineers in the different districts, they'd be able to repeat what you've just said, that that's what they'd be going by. Is that correct?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: They have the same standards and I believe that's what they would say. As I indicated, they may make some decisions regarding additional dragging on certain roads because of certain situations that develop.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister just what class of road does he describe PR 227 - what class? He referred to Class . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: 227 varies, depending what section the honourable member is talking about. North of Portage, it has about 230 vehicles per day.

MR. L. HYDE: I'm speaking on the part, Mr. Chairman to the Minister, from 240 west to highway No. 16.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, that would be, from what I can see on the map, 230 vehicles per day, so that would be a Class 4 road and would warrant 20 draggings a summer.

MR. L. HYDE: Twenty draggings per summer. Mr. Chairman, for some time now, I have been approaching the different Ministers of Highways on the condition of the section of road, as I said, east of 240 on 227. The answer that I've been getting for the last number of years is that once that heavy traffic of trucks hauling material is completed to the upgrading of highway 16, that there's a good chance that 227 will be brought up to where it is higher than the level of the land around. Today, Mr. Chairman, the old highway is below the level of the land. It's just been pounded out to the point that it is almost impossible to travel it in wet conditions.

Is it in the plans of the Minister in the near future to have that correction made there?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we're sliding into the construction program here.

MR. L. HYDE: I realize that, but I didn't want to miss the opportunity.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: As the honourable member knows, on this one question there is one grading contract on that road further east, but there are no specific plans in the program for the other sections of the road at this time. It could very well be programmed in future years, as the member knows, but it's not in the program at this time.

But I want to emphasize again, Mr. Chairman, that we're getting into a discussion that is somewhat apart from the Maintenance. If the member is asking about the maintenance of that road at this particular time then we should be discussing it now; if he is talking about upgrading it to a higher standard, then we can discuss it at that time. The standards or classifications of roads that I'm talking about in terms of the maintenance work is not the same as the standard in terms of upgrading of the road. It's a standard that's applied on the basis of average daily traffic and therefore gives us a guideline for the number of dragging trips on that road.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Minister is saying but until such time as there are funds enough available to the Department of Highways for more construction, I would suggest that we need more maintenance work on that particular stretch of road, because it is in a deplorable state right now. There is no gravel on it, to speak of; it's just been pounded out.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The standards that I referred to a few moments ago also refer to not only the number of dragging times that are warranted per year as a guideline, it also refers to the amount of dust treatment that's applied to a particular road and we intent to expand that in the coming year as well, the dust treatment on several of our roads to cut down on the hazardous conditions that exist on a number of our roads. We're expanding considerably our dust control treatment across the province and we want to put more emphasis on that when we cannot get into paving or upgrading those roads because there are demands from all over the province for upgrading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour now being 4:30, we are interrupting the proceedings of this committee for Private Members' Hour. The committee will return at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler: We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health.

Does the Minister have an opening statement?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would apologize to the committee - if we could take a minute or so -

it's a very short statement that I intend to make and I didn't have enough copies, and the critic of the opposition would like to have a copy, so that is being made and it shouldn't be very long.

I might say during that time, Mr. Chairman, that I don't intend to make a very long statement, rather short, but I chose instead of having during the course of the Estimates Review, because we deal with the Alcoholism Foundation, Sports and different groups, of maybe having a short statement or press release, or whatever you want to call it, at that time. I think it will be easier to follow. So with that understanding then, it should take a minute or so.

Maybe I could ask the - I see the Leader of the Opposition is not there, I was going to make sure that I understood the question that I was asked earlier to try and endeavour to have the information as soon as possible. It is a system of computers that keeps record of all Manitobans from . . .

A MEMBER: Cradle-to-grave.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Was that the question? I think they called it PHIN or something.

A MEMBER: PHIN.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, so the Minister can seek out the information, it is a nine-digit number called the Personal Health Insurance Number used in conjunction with your MHSC contract number, only this number has not been made public. It is a number which stays with an individual from cradle-to-grave and from which all information on medical records can be pulled on that individual, so that in my family I have a PHIN number, my wife has a PHIN number, and my three children each have a separate PHIN number, which will keep track of them until they are no longer on this planet.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I know that the department has been trying to get as much information of a medical nature for the planning that is necessary, but certainly I can assure the members of this committee that there has not been any policy change from the present government to try to spy on the people and get more information. As I said, the details of that I'm not familiar with, and I'll get an answer directly from the Commission and report back to the committee as soon as possible.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, in that regard, we'd be fully prepared to discuss that this evening in the Estimates process.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that would be quite proper. This is something in the Commission and we won't be in the Commission today. I think that through the question period we certainly would have time. I think it will be very difficult to go through these Estimates if once we pass the initial statement, we don't try to stay with line-by-line. It will be impossible to get the information properly.

That could be dealt with - well, I guess maybe in Planning if you want it early, if you want it tonight. If I get the information we could look at Research and Planning on (c), because we have that combined, the Research and Planning, both the Commission and the department is together. So if I have the information, to accommodate the members opposite, I'll be pleased to discuss it later on then.

The short statement that I have - the Health critic of the opposition now has a copy.

Mr. Chairman, I'm introducing today a budget for the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, Manitoba Health and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, that now exceeds the sum of \$1.1 billion. I have had the opportunity to present to members of health care professions and interested citizens some basic facts about health care services in Manitoba and the cost of supporting our program. I have stressed that it is necessary to consider the most efficient methods possible to care for those in need and to assure that services are provided to meet the needs of our citizens in the most cost-effective method possible.

With this acknowledgment that there's a need to consider prudent fiscal policies, I am pleased to be able to announce that the combined efforts of Manitoba Health and the Manitoba Health Services Commission will see increased programs for health services during the fiscal year 1985-86.

This year we have been able to budget for our immediate needs by close monitoring and increased efficiency. We have been able to start some new programs and maintain or expand those started in previous years.

We are intensifying our efforts to promote reproductive health by education in schools and communities by improving and expanding services to mothers and children.

We are supporting a cancer outreach program, where people will be treated in their rural communities.

We are expanding the neo-natal and pediatric intensive care units at Children's Hospital.

We have expanded the obstetrical unit at the St. Boniface General Hospital.

At the St. Boniface General Hospital and the Health Sciences Centre, we are continuing to support an obstetrical outreach program that takes portable ultrasound to women in northern and remote communities.

We are continuing to expand our provincewide ultrasound program in a way that will make this expensive but useful diagnostic tool available equally to all Manitobans.

We are expanding our services to northern and remote communities. We are increasing staff in northern nursing stations under our jurisdiction. We are offering training courses for community health workers. We are offering funding assistance to public health nurses who wish to take university education. We are enlisting local residents to take a greater share in health decisions that affect them by forming health committees in a number of communities.

We are inaugurating an air ambulance program using a Cessna Citation II, which will be so equipped and staffed that it will be capable of transporting any medical emergency patients.

As part of our policy of disease prevention, we are inaugurating a provincewide diabetic education

program. This will have the primary purpose of preventing the onset of diabetes in people at risk. Nutrition counselling, education and the monitoring of diabetics will reduce hospital use and delay some of the major complications of this common disease. Similar programs in other jurisdictions have produced encouraging results.

Our policy has always been to do everything possible to promote the health, personal dignity and independence of our elderly. This year, through a newly formed interdepartmental group, Support Services to Seniors, we will subsidize some 37 community projects to provide such supports as group meals, transportation, escort services and regular or occasional home help.

Our Home Care Program, which offers support services in the homes of Manitobans of all ages, is for the elderly an effective alternative to care in an institution. In 1984, 10,201 were in this program, compared to 9,933 in 1983. Without the Home Care Program, many of these people would have had no alternative but placement in a personal care home.

We have expanded adult day care, a social and recreational program for elderly home care clients. It has proved successful as an aid to maintaining independence.

Respite care, also being expanded, offers respite to families caring for an elderly member.

I would like to be able to report, Mr. Chairman, that we have reduced our waiting list for admissions to personal care homes, but I can't do this. The waiting list stands at about 1,700. I have asked for a review and when this is complete, I'll report to the Legislature.

In spite of our concern about institutional costs, we are increasing our support for traditional hospital services by increasing the supply of intensive care beds in Winnipeg.

We will reduce the waiting list for elective eye surgery by providing staff and equipment to perform 1,000 procedures a year in day surgery. We are expanding the capacity to treat outpatients and not-for-admission surgical cases at Concordia Hospital and Brandon General Hospital.

The expansion of Brandon General Hospital will enable this institution to meet increasing demands on it as a referral centre for rural patients.

In the area of mental health, Mr. Chairman, we have begun to reorganize and enhance our service delivery system which began with the report of the mental health working group. The position of the chief provincial psychiatrist has been filled with a person who holds a joint appointment with the department and the University of Manitoba as a professor of psychiatry.

We have established a mental health directorate to plan and develop mental health services. A Central Mental Health Advisory Committee has been approved to promote consultation about mental health issues.

We are building 200-bed personal care home units for elderly residents at Brandon and Selkirk to replace time-expired facilities at the mental health centres.

An audio-visual link between Brandon Mental Health Centre and the University Department of Psychiatry at the Health Sciences Centre has been established. This makes expert consultation available to the Mental Health Centre staff.

As I proceed into the detailed Estimates of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, I will provide

you with details of a multimillion dollar hospital and personal care home construction program.

Mr. Chairman, I have provided a brief introduction concerning the new and expanded programs which are being sponsored by Manitoba Health and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Throughout the course of our discussions and debate, I will be providing additional, more detailed information as it relates to ongoing programs and those that are scheduled for expansion or commencement in the fiscal year, 1985-86.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before I take my seat I want to take advantage of this opportunity to say to the members of this committee how pleased I am with the dedicated staff that we have, led with my Deputy Minister, who is also executive director of the Commission, and of course, his assistant deputy ministers in the department, as well as the associated directors at the Commission, and also the new director that we have at the Alcoholism Foundation.

I would challenge any department - I would think that we could rival any department with a staff of dedicated, concerned people who are loyal to their beliefs. I can't say too much good about them. I know that it is a difficult and a large department and I know that it would be impossible for me to accept any responsibility in the department if it wasn't for the help of the terrific staff that we have.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank the Minister for his opening statement and I want to assure the Minister that during the course of the consideration of his Estimates that we will attempt to deal with the issues that are before us, with his department and with some of the emerging problems that are facing Manitobans as they look at the future of the health care system.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, cannot comment on the Minister's last remarks regarding the staff and how well they work and how good they are, because I haven't been Minister responsible for that department and I haven't been critic for all that great a number of months, but I do have to tell the Minister that in posing questions to people that I meet with, in discussing issues relating to the Department of Health, the opinion on the staff and senior management of the department encompasses a whole range of opinion, from the excellent report the Minister has just given us, to a much less than excellent report from other individuals who are working with various branches of the department. The opinions range from the staff being very knowledgeable and very effective, to criticism that is levelled from some sectors that the senior management have formed an old boy's club, if you will, and that they're resisting needed change and indeed are, in no small means, stifling the system and preventing innovative change. I'm sure the opinion is to neither extreme and probably lies more likely somewhere in-between.

Mr. Chairman, in introducing the reply to the Minister's statement, I thought I might take us back on a small history trip and refer to the document that has often

been referred to by members on this side of the House, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans, Policies of the Manitoba New Democratic Party," and it's signed of course with the solemn promise of Howard Pawley that everything will be right and well in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I want to quickly go to the page which deals with health care in the middle of that document and it says specifically, "Health care and not cutbacks." That was a theme that was developed during the 1981 election campaign which harnessed an impression that was left by that master of guile and deception, the Member for Transcona, in attempting to paint the four-year administration of my colleague, the Honourable Bud Sherman, as Minister of Health, into a scenario where the health care system was falling apart at the seams during our four years of administration. I call the Member for Transcona a master of guile and deception because, Sir, some of the statements, some of the criticism he levelled was unfounded. It was very theatrical and I have to say effective, because it in no small way contributed to the outcome of the last election.

But when people elected this administration, this Pawley administration in 1981, I believe that they did not expect these people to be more competent in government; they did not expect these people to be better administrators; they did not expect these people to better look after the economic affairs of the province; but, Mr. Chairman, I think it's fair to say that Manitobans developed an expectation of the New Democratic Party in 1981 and gave them a mandate to do as they promised in terms of health care, in that in 1981 this government, this Minister, made the promise to the people of Manitoba that Manitoba New Democrats would restore the health care system. Not, Sir, maintain it in its condition that they inherited in 1981, but restore it to some level that the master of guile and deception, the Member for Transcona, had alleged the system had fallen into.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that left this Minister and this government with an interesting challenge. They inherited a system that I believe was effectively managed, was adequately funded in 1981, and over the last three years - I think we can and that we will do this as we go through the Estimates - we will find a system of health delivery in the Province of Manitoba today that has many more problems than it had in 1981, that has many more areas that need urgently planning, that need urgently additional funding. And, Sir, whilst we're on the topic of additional funding, I will acknowledge the criticism that will be levelled by the government to members of the opposition when they say you want both sides of the issue on money management and funding. On the one hand we will criticize the size of the deficit, and on the other hand we'll be demanding more money for the health care system.

Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out by members on this side of the House, time and time again, that money does not appear to be a problem for this government when it comes to such things as hiring of political staff, advertising to prop up the image of this government - money is no problem there. Money is no problem when it is stripped from the departments and put into this Jobs Fund which does and undertakes a myriad of projects, theoretically, to create employment

throughout the province, while at the same time the Minister of Health must daily face situations in the hospital system which are crisis in proportion because of lack of staffing, because of budgetary restraints. The government is trying to have both sides of the issue in the Jobs Fund. They have now \$250 million worth of financial maneuverability in the Jobs Fund to create jobs for Manitobans and, at the same, the health care system is suffering from a lack of nursing staff and personnel in certain areas of the hospital system, personal home care system, home care system, and many other programs of delivery.

As well, this government has no shortage of money when it comes to providing grants to the various ethno-cultural groups throughout the province to help them enhance and further their ethnic origins in the province and their unique ethnic backgrounds. Sir, money will come up constantly in these Estimates that we want both sides of the issue. We want to criticize them for size of deficit, on one hand, and criticize them for not spending enough on health care on the other.

Sir, we can have it both ways in the opposition because this government has the money; it's in political staff hiring, it's in image advertising, it's in grants to support various cultural groups which were not supported prior to 1981 and are supported today not as much to preserve the cultural identity of those people, but to secure their political support in the next provincial election. The money is there, Sir, but it is not being spent in a way which would allow this New Democratic Government to live up to their basic election commitment of 1981 to restore the health care system and to provide health care not cutbacks.

Mr. Chairman, what is the reality of the health care system in Manitoba today? I've mentioned cutbacks and we have seen cutbacks in the health care delivery system, and those cutbacks are stimulated because of a reduction in the level of funding to the health care system. The Minister, this year, is imposing a zero percent increase on salaries to the health care system and, I believe, a 2 percent increase in supplies and other services.

Now, those cutbacks may or may not be appropriate at this stage of the game. Sir, the health care system today is changing at a very rapid rate. The Minister knows that and his planners and his advisors are telling him that daily. Delivery of health care is very much on the forefront of technological change. There are new techniques which are able to be performed in a variety of surgical procedures. There's only one drawback though, Sir, in that they require some capital investment of new equipment funding. It has been said indeed that the impact of technology on the health care delivery system is so great today that it is almost impossible for any administration to keep up. I, quite frankly, don't find an argument with that. It has been said that 80 percent of the current technology available to the delivery of health care in North America, 80 percent of that technology has been developed since 1980. That's an amazing figure. I believe it's right. I believe the person that provided it to me is reasonably correct in that. That presents a challenge to this Minister to any government looking at where to spend very scarce capital funds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some of the realities also of the health care system today is that we have an increased

waiting list for personal care home placement. The Minister indicated some 1,700. The latest information I have for 1984 is a figure of 1,800.

Now, Sir, that represents a 30 percent increase since 1981 because statistics in 1981 indicated there were some 1,400 Manitobans panelled for personal care home placement in 1981 when this government took over. That figure has risen somewhere between 1,700 by the Minister's figures, 1,800 by the latest ones I have from the Department of Health Report in 1984, which indicate 1,800.

Mr. Chairman, that is another promise that the New Democrats made in 1981. The Minister of Energy and Mines, the master of guile and deception, in 1981 when he was opposition Health critic, created the image that we were not building enough personal care homes and a 1,400 panelled person waiting list for placement in personal care homes was terrible, it was a despicable situation, and they were going to change that. They, in fact, promised to do that. They promised that the desperately needed personal care homes would be built by an NDP Government. The reality of the situation is, Sir, that there are 400 more people panelled for placement in personal care homes today than in 1981. That, Sir, is hardly a restoration of the health care system; that is a deterioration of the health care system under this administration.

There are longer waits for elective surgery in 1985 than there was 1981. Diagnostic services such as CAT scanning, ultrasound, take much longer to undertake by a patient whose physician believes that he/she needs that kind of a service. That's hardly an improvement.

The number of acute care beds that are blocked in our hospitals by chronic care patients has increased. Now, you know, Mr. Chairman, there are two schools of thought on the blockage of beds in the hospitals by chronic care patients. Apparently there's a twenty-page directive - I haven't seen it - but there's alleged to be a twenty-page directive gone around by some hospital administrators telling their hospitals basically to make sure a certain number of beds are filled with chronic care patients, because they're cheaper to keep there than are acute treatment patients who would be in for elective surgery and other processes. If that's the case, Sir, then that school of thought says that the system is not being adequately funded, contrary to the push from opposition of the Member for Transcona, the master of guile and deception. If the system isn't being funded, then once again we have not seen the NDP restore the system.

The second school of thought is, of course, that this government has not built sufficient personal care homes. Either reason for the blockage of acute care beds by chronic care patients demonstrates that the government has not lived up to its election commitment to the people which helped to get it elected in 1981.

Now, Sir, let's deal with some specifics. These aren't, Sir, my specifics; these are specifics that were given to us in late 1983 by a series of newspaper articles, "Hospitals In Crisis." This series of articles appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press written by some three reporters, I believe, who investigated various problems in the health care system in the latter half of 1983. One of the circumstances was baby deaths at the Health Sciences Centre. The allegation being that those fatalities, unfortunately, were caused by overcrowding and understaffing.

Now, there are once again several schools of thought. The first school of thought says that the closing of the Seven Oaks and Concordia obstetric wards put pressure on Health Sciences Centre and St. Boniface before they were adequately prepared and before their planning was good enough to allow them to handle the extra load.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't answer what the reason was back in mid to late 1983. That was 20 months ago. This Minister in his Throne Speech Address chastized our government for not having adequate planning and that he had resolved all that by putting an elaborate planning system in place. Well, surely, one would say that with 20 months of notice on these baby deaths, that the system, due to the fact that he's got so many expert planners now on staff, would be vastly improved.

Well, what happened just this last fall, in the fall of 1984? We had babies in need of intensive care flown to Saskatoon. We still have the same problems. It is fortunate that we haven't had any fatalities amongst our new born, but the problems are still there. In late 1984, they were still identified as overcrowding and lack of facilities. There was a crisis once again in 1984. The situation has not been improved.

The Minister made reference to intensive care units in his opening remarks. In those same series of articles, "Hospitals In Crisis" in late 1983, there was identified a shortage of intensive care beds. This shortage of intensive care unit beds was cited as contributory to the death of four Manitobans. Part of the problem, according to the information gathered and presented, was that there was a bed blockage by chronic care patients and that beds weren't available.

The allegation was made that Manitoba is under the nationally accepted standard for the numbers of intensive care beds for thousand of active treatment beds. That allegation, Sir, despite the planning of the Minister and the funding that the Minister has put forward, still exists today. It was identified in late 1983 that staff was a problem and that more beds could be opened with the accompanying staff.

Well, Sir, what's the situation today? I'm sad to report that the situation is the same today as it was in mid to late 1983. We still have a shortage of intensive care beds; we're still below the national standard. And what is ironic is that the Minister indeed opened a number of intensive care unit beds in the province in the last eight to ten months, but they can't be filled, Sir, because there's no staff. Now, Mr. Chairman, does that give us a feeling of adequate planning, when the capital resources are put in place to open more intensive care unit beds and the staff aren't there to keep them open? Staffing is a problem and I understand the problem - I think I understand the problem. Nurses to go into intensive care unit work must take a nine-month, fairly intensive, training course. To do that they have to take a reduction in salary and then after they're in there, they earn some more.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how can we have proper planning that the Minister alleges to be there, in which he opens beds, and doesn't make sure the staffing is there to keep the beds open? He's put the capital in place but he hasn't put the manpower in place. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister, in his opening Estimates, has indicated on Page 3 that we are offering funding assistance to public health nurses who wish to take university education.

The Minister might also take a lesson from the Minister of Community Services and her department because in the report - the confidential departmental report - given to the Minister of Community Services which identified problems in her closing of the School of Psychiatric Nursing in Portage, it said that the department, in order to maintain staff levels at the Manitoba Development Centre, may have to introduce a bursary system to entice registered psychiatric nurses into the specific field of training, where enhanced capability is available in working with the mentally handicapped - develop mentally retarded.

Mr. Chairman, we've got this Minister in this department saying that he's going to have funding assistance to public health nurses, but meanwhile his problem is a shortage of intensive care unit staffing, and the problem is a nine-month training course at a pay cut. Surely it would make sense that if the Minister has got money to provide funding assistance for the training of public health nurses, that he would recognize the problem in intensive care and provide some funding to make sure that nurses will take that nine-month training course. That would make ultimate planning sense to me, but it hasn't happened, despite the indication to us in the Throne Speech Debate by this Minister, this Session, that his Planning Department is doing wonderful things. That doesn't sound like good planning to me, Sir. Maybe the Minister will justify it. It would appear as if, as my colleague says, the priorities are indeed out of whack in the Minister's department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let's deal with another area in ophthalmology. That was an area of concern that was also identified in the series of articles, "Hospitals in Crisis." It was indicated in late 1983 that since 1981 the waiting list for eye surgery for children had increased from two months in 1981, and in 1983, it was four months. It had doubled - 100 percent increase in the waiting time. What it is today, I can't answer. The Minister can probably answer that when we get to that section.

In that 1983 series of articles, it was also identified that there were problems with the School of Ophthalmology at the Health Sciences Centre. The problems were lack of space; the problems were lack of modern training equipment. Those problems were identified in 1983. The Minister has this planning section which is identifying problems and theoretically reacting to them before it's crisis management. But what is happening? Well in July, I believe, of this summer we're going to see the closing of the school which trains ophthalmologists at the Health Sciences Centre and with that closing, Sir, there are warnings which have been in the paper in the last 30 days, saying that the Department of Ophthalmology and the delivery of ophthalmologist - I'm going to get tied up in that word - but the services of ophthalmologists will in fact decline, despite the Minister's announcement in the Throne Speech Debate that they're going to be able to undertake some 1,000 out-patient operations.

Now once again what was the identification of the problem? In 1983 it was lack of space and lack of equipment. Now, in 1985, after having that warning and that advance warning, it's still lack of space and lack of equipment. The Minister has not addressed that problem and this flies in the face of health care, not cutbacks as promised in 1981.

Now what about emergency services as another area? It is indicated that the volume of emergency traffic at the Health Sciences Centre is the second-highest of any hospital in Canada. The waiting times for emergency patients' bed placement has increased - from 1981 till today - has increased by 333 percent. In 1981, 3 percent of the patients going to the Health Sciences Centre for emergency patient treatment waited more than four hours. In 1984, 10 percent of those patients at the emergency in Health Sciences Centre waited more than four hours. That's hardly a restoration of the health care system. That's hardly an improvement in the delivery of health care. That's hardly health care, not cutbacks.

And once again, Sir, the problem identified is the blockage of acute care beds by chronic care patients, but the Minister has made a move just last week to resolve that, in which now he is rolling in a brand new user fee for those chronic care patients, in which they now will be paying the \$15.25 per diem as of May 1st, when they block an acute care bed in any of our health facilities. That's hardly a solution that would meet the approval of the Member for Transcona, the member who practised guile and deception in opposition and decried even the slightest increase in the per diem rates to our personal care home patients and residents, let alone rolling in a whole new group of people for approximately \$3.5 million of additional revenue.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these allegations aren't my allegations. They aren't my personal allegations. These are allegations that were made in late 1983 by three reporters for the Winnipeg Free Press. The situation today is once again documented by news reports in the two daily newspapers in Winnipeg. And, Mr. Chairman, I was fairly careful in trying to search this out. I found no refuting by the Minister or departmental staff of any of those allegations. The Minister, in 1983, did not say no, those stories are false, they are wrong, nor has he said they're false and wrong today. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister can't say they're wrong because those situations exist, they're fact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the situation today in the health care system in Manitoba flies directly in the face of this document, election promises, policies of the New Democratic Party as given to the people of Manitoba in 1981, which promised health care and not cutbacks. There has been no - and I emphasize "no" - restoration of the system as promised in 1981.

Instead we have seen funding cutbacks, funding to the hospitals that is below the rate of inflation - a point that the member of guile and deception, the Member for Transcona constantly berated us for, as did many other New Democrats currently sitting in government when they were in opposition. There are now new levels of user fees. Personal care home per diems have gone up. A whole new class of people are now subject to those per diems that weren't subject to them during the Lyon administration or the Schreyer administration before that.

There is a raise in the Pharmacare deductible from \$75 to \$100. The Member for Transcona, that master of guile and deception, when he was in opposition said that is not right. If anything, he said in 1979 when we raised the exemption from \$50 to \$75, there should be no deduction up front, that it should be 100 percent

insured service. I wonder where the Member for Transcona, the minister of guile and deception was when the Cabinet decision was made to raise the Pharmacare deduction just this year.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the government has failed in another promise that they made to the senior citizens in that they would provide hearing aids and dentures under the Pharmacare Program. I don't believe that program exists, but yet there are no doubt senior citizens out there that elected this government on the hope of that promise.

This is the last theoretical set of Estimates we're going to have before an election and I don't believe it's part and parcel of this set of Estimates. Maybe the Minister will correct me.

Mr. Chairman, the current actions and the current state of the health care system flies directly in the face of all the election promises in 1981 and all of the criticisms levelled by the New Democratic Party from 1977 to 1981.

The Member for Transcona was indeed an opportunist of the first level when he was in opposition. He was against raising the Pharmacare deductible from \$50 to \$75 when we were government. I wonder how silent he was when this government raised it another \$25.00. The Member for Transcona, the master of guile and deception was against raising the per diems, chastised us, chastised the Minister of Health, the Honourable Bud Sherman. I wonder where he was when this Minister has raised the per diem rates in personal care homes by 37 percent since he's been Minister and the New Democratic Party has been in office.

I suggest the Minister of Transcona now has reversed completely his position. He has flip flopped on health care, and now as long as the New Democrats are doing it and charging those Manitobans, it's all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Is the member nearing the completion of his comments?

MR. D. ORCHARD: I'm very close to finishing, sir.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most incredible instances of the Member for Transcona and how opportunistic he was in opposition and how he indeed was, as I call him, the past master of guile and deception, comes with his stand in opposition of services to the disabled.

We all recall in this House, those of us who were members in 1981 the wheeling up of a physically handicapped Manitoban. Elizabeth Semkiw was her name. The Member for Transcona was aware of her problem for probably a month to six weeks, but it wasn't politically opportune in 1981 to bring that problem to the front and to the attention of the then Minister of Health, the Honourable Bud Sherman, so he waited, while that person suffered the alleged problem that he was bringing forward for an additional six to eight weeks.

Now, sir, he has one of his own constituents, one Theresa Ducharme, who has been cut back in her services in home care, in orderly care, by this government, and when she phones her MLA, the Minister of Energy and Mines, the past master of guile and deception, he, No. 1, doesn't answer her phone calls and when he does, he tells her to quit phoning him, to quit bothering him, she's getting more than she

deserves. What a difference three short years make to the Minister of guile and deception.

When it was an opposition issue that could be harnessed, he was there wheeling the person along, but when it is his own constituent who has been cut back in services, he says nothing. Now the Minister of Health may ask why I'm laying these on the records right now, because he obviously was not the person that was doing that, making those accusations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The member's time has expired.

Does the Minister wish to bring in his staff?
The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it is usual here to have the opening remarks from the government and the opposition and then go line-by-line before we start questioning, because if you remember, the Minister's Salary is kept to the very end also and that's the point of having line-by-line. A lot of these things will be answered and if there's something forgotten, that will be picked up at the end.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you. While we're waiting on the staff to come in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we should wait for the staff to get here.

MR. D. ORCHARD: While the Minister will be aware of the circumstances I'm going to raise over the next minute or two so the staff won't have to be here necessarily. Then if you wish to proceed, I'll wait till they come in if you want.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to make another couple of statements and then we'll get into line-by-line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that we follow the procedure. Usually the Minister responsible for the Estimates starts with opening remarks and then it is the understanding that the opposition would also have a chance to make these remarks and then we go directly to line-by-line. We don't . . .

MR. H. ENNS: This is not to be the usual way. It's no kissy face, huggy bear this time, Larry. We're out to get you.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh well, as long as I know, that's fine.

MR. H. ENNS: Despite the fact that it's Easter Monday, this is the way it's going.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It certainly would be unusual that when I have the floor, you would refrain from yelling. I hope so anyway, and then if you want to speak after that, you can. I'm trying to have a working agreement

and if it's your wish to try to disrupt the committee - it's happened before - be my guest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1.(b)(1) Executive Support: Salaries.

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Would it be all right for me to make a small statement?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1.(b)(1)—pass.

1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Under planning, this fits in rather well, sir, with the conclusion of my remarks, if I may.

The Minister of Health, in his Throne Speech Debate, decried the fact that there was no planning within the Department of Health under the Lyon administration. The Minister of Health has also said from time-to-time that he always tells the truth and I think in that one he maybe bent it a little, because there was planning under the Lyon administration. There were various committees struck. Maybe they didn't quite fit within the current mode of planning in which you have established a 16-group planning formally structured, etc., etc., but surely the Minister has to recognize that under the former Minister of Health, in the Lyon administration, there was indeed substantial amount of planning went into aging. I believe the Council of Aging was established then.

Nursing manpower was being looked at. The very areas that I identified today where there was shortage of intensive care unit nursing staff, that whole issue of nursing manpower was being addressed and studied and hopefully solutions were being pursued. I'm not certain that the Minister even carried on with the nursing manpower study, but these studies and this planning that was done by the former Minister of Health involved people in the community and it involved people in the direct line of fire, if you will, of the delivery of the health care system.

I don't want to prolong that argument, but I think it is grossly unfair for the Minister to leave the record showing that there was no planning done during the four years that the Honourable Bud Sherman was Minister of Health, because indeed there was a lot of planning; the proof that there was a lot of planning is in the condition of the health care system in 1981 that this Minister and this government inherited.

It was a system without nearly the problems that are there today. Problems that I've identified in my opening remarks have been worsened in the last three-and-a-half years of New Democratic Party administration - not bettered. Funding has been a problem to the institutions and the system has deteriorated. You don't get a series of articles in 1983, "Hospitals In Crisis" without having a system that has problems. There was no such series during our four years of government. Those problems still exist, as I say, because you can go to the newspapers as recently as three months ago and you will see the identical problems still surfacing.

Now, in terms of planning, the Minister says he has a good planning section that is working well. I guess

I would ask the Minister to give us a brief rundown on the activities of their Research and Planning group. I have his staffing chart here which would indicate some 11 people. I wonder if he might be able to identify some of the key players in the Research and Planning section here.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to be able to say something about the planning process because obviously the Member for Pembina doesn't really understand what planning is all about. I think the member stated that I said in the past that I was disappointed in the way the planning was done under the former Minister and I certainly will stand by those remarks.

It is true that the Minister, and I'm not blaming the Minister for that, he was responsible for the department with the freeze that was so common in those days, and the staff, I think they talked about commitments during an election, those commitments were made during the election of '77, how many staff they would get rid of; and that's exactly what they did and they start with the planning. Sure, the then Minister, of course, set up a council on aging which certainly was valuable and it's continuing, I would hope, with improvement. I don't say that to say that I can do things better than the former Minister, but as you go along, I think everything should be improved no matter who the Minister is or the party in power.

These were some things that were done. There was a review committee. Those aren't going on. We just had the O'Sullivan Committee that you're using people in the field. I think that should be encouraged and that's part of the planning and that is the research that we've done. The department should have certain staff to be able to co-ordinate that and that did not exist. That existed under the former government. That was the reply that the then Minister gave me directly. The situation was that they had the planners who were the directors of the program and they were doing the evaluation also. There is no proper planning without evaluation.

My honourable friend talked about different problems that exist and the challenge was if we were doing that good in planning, why weren't we correcting everything? Surely, he himself knows better than that, knows that it isn't done that fast or in that method. He knows that there's such a thing as emergency or short-term planning. I think that's what he's referring to. That is important, I would say more if there's an emergency, and also in the political sense to make sure that when you have stories such as you saw in the newspaper in 1983 that were referred to, that you can counteract these things.

Then there is the important long-range planning. Lately, I've been talking about long-range planning. I say long-range planning because it is scary. If it doesn't scare all the members of this committee then there's something wrong. It is scary what is facing the people of the world I would say and certainly the people of Canada and Manitoba in health services and health care.

I dare say that Canada is probably the country with the best health care, not in everything, but in general. I still think that Manitoba is right there at the top with

the top provinces. There is no hesitation in me saying that at all; it doesn't mean that there's perfection. There is no way that you'll ever find perfection when you're talking about illness, when you're talking about the people that are handicapped. I said before the Creator in His wisdom could not get any perfection, how in the hell do you expect a mere mortal to have perfection? That doesn't mean that we should not strive to give the proper care and we will strive and we are striving.

The member said awhile ago that I would come back, and he was right, as if to say, well, make up your mind. That is true. To say that there is no cost, that money is not an issue, I won't challenge his right to say that, but I'm not going to get involved in that. I'm here to look at the Department of Health with the money that we're spending. Is it spent wisely? Is there enough money? Now, you can make that point, I'm not even saying he's wrong or he's right when he's talking about the priorities of the government. All I'm saying is that this former government felt that it was spending a lot of money, that it wasn't a priority, and they were insulted and incensed when some members from this side would say, well, you're not doing this and you're not doing that. The case is we're spending an awful lot more money now than was spent in those days.

It is true that you're talking about it because you have a party in opposition that is saying that there should not be deficits. I remember the days when the then leader, Mr. Lyon, was saying that the ill-fated Crosbie budget did not go far enough and the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada would want to see a change in this. That was one thing.

Then when you're trying to bring ways to save money to set the priorities, because of different priorities, and if we're going to continually have politics and play politics and partisan politics - I'm not saying that there's any one party. There is no doubt that my honourable friend gave an example of what was done another year. That's true now. I would think that the best apprenticeship to really learn what this is all about is to serve as Minister of Health.

I know what kind of a crusader I was when I was a Health critic before having a chance to have this responsibility. I certainly didn't think I was unfair at the time, but I look back now and I realize that my statements weren't always fair, that it was easier to criticize, especially in a department such as that, the administration wasn't that simple.

Now, Mr. Sherman did exactly the same thing. I remember the first time in opposition when I was Minister in the Schreyer years, that with a little bit of search I could find all kinds of examples of him being very unfair. I don't think he realizes or he thought he was at the time, but he changed. He changed so much; he was so careful of being responsible that you called it the "Bud and Larry Show" last year. You decided this year that you would change that, and I was told by the House Leader, and I welcome that. There's no better way to keep people on their toes.

Now, I don't think for a minute that the former Minister of Health, the Member for Fort Garry, was not up to his responsibilities. I feel that he realized that it was a touchy issue. I think that he would have liked to have seen a kind of a planning where all the members of this House or at least the parties would get together.

That might be whistling in the dark. It might be very naive on my part, but I think it has to be done. I certainly

will invite the members of the opposition to sit in with the planning because you're talking about a department that has gone up. I haven't got all the figures. I presented that in speeches to the different groups and some of you have heard me. Most of you have heard these remarks and quickly maybe I can get a note on how much was spent per hospital, per citizen of Manitoba, how much was spent 10 years ago just for institution or acute care hospitals, and how much is spent today. I think it was mind-boggling, the percentage increase that there was. It scared the heck out of me.

When I'm talking about planning, and I can. I can take the rest of the day and tomorrow and the week to tell you about planning. I still say that there's been tremendous planning. The first year or so, even the members of my party, of the government, were getting impatient and saying, well, what are you doing? You've talked about this, and it takes a while before you can get the staff. We all know the red tape in government, unfortunately, or sometimes I guess fortunately, it makes us a little more careful.

But the situation when you recruit the type of people - and by the way the director is Mr. Dave Pascoe who is sitting in front of me on my right, and that's a co-ordinated and a united planning for the Commission and the department. The thing is that we also have talked to say that our staff - and I'm not quoting the Member for Pembina, he made a report. There is no doubt that when somebody is active, when you do nothing, if you're all protected by cotton batting or something, you're not going to be heard, because you're not doing anything, or if you're sitting on the fence you're not going to achieve a hell of a lot. There is no doubt when you're trying to do something that you're going to be criticized by some of them and I think that if some people have criticized the staff, I don't think they understand the role of the staff, or they're certainly exaggerating. The staff is not there to set the policies for the department. I would think that the staff I would like to see is to inherit staff from somebody that has been very loyal to them, a different party, and then they can be loyal to their ideas and so on. They're not political animals, we don't see that at times. You know if somebody works well with some people you figure, oh they can't be our friends - I'm not talking about obvious people, such as, Ted Tulchinsky and people like that who were definitely committed to this party. There's others that have been committed to the Conservative Party - of course I'm not referring to that. But I'm talking about many, most of our civil servants who are good people.

One of the fears that I have - and I think that's going to hurt Manitoba - let's say that there would be a change in government and, all of a sudden, in a year or so, all the work of this Research and Planning division, and all the work of the staff was set aside and, say, well they worked under the NDP, so that is not fair and I think that would be a bad mistake. I certainly will make an effort to discuss with the Member for Pembina, if there is a way, at least on certain things, that we can sit together with staff and different people to try to work for the betterment and to safeguard this service which is the best - this system that is the best, I would say, probably one of the best in the world.

Now you know to stand here and say that we're not spending enough money, when I'm saying that in 1971

or so there was \$98 spent for every man, woman and child for institutions, and in 1981 or 1982 which is much more than that now, it was \$474.00. You know there's something wrong if you say there's not enough, there's something wrong. I think that you have to realize that.

Now this planning group is looking at long-range planning. It's a thing that sometimes you've got to fly by the seat of your pants there are so many changes; every day there's a crisis and you do the best you can. In a crisis or something that appeared like a crisis, but you are not going to get anywhere if you don't start to plan.

Some of the things that the member said, of course, some of his criticism is valid. Much of it is the result of lack of planning in the Conservative years, and if we don't do something very soon, something that the next government - be it a Conservative or an NDP Government - after the election much of the things that will be done, and they'll be criticized for, will be the fault if there has not been adequate planning now. That is why I say there has to be and it is not government alone, I think that time has passed. I think, for instance, I cannot see a change in the system without kind of a partnership with the medical profession. I think that the medical profession has to work together, there has to be some incentive. We're not realistic if we think that we could just ram it through. There has to be the people of good will that will work for that and other delivery of services and you have to involve the hospitals and the institutions. There is a fear now when you talk about Community Services, well then people see kind of a competition between the services in the community and the institution and they are wanting to protect their turf. I think that's unfortunate.

Now there has been all kinds of work getting these people together and we are going in the right direction. Now you have to, I think, differentiate with the discussion where people are as equal, or different groups, not just once you've been able to impress on them that everybody has to work together and you're not just talking about them or trying to pick on them. The difference between somebody that feels that they must have the veto, that all the different groups - and there's enough pressure in government now - having all these groups that think they can have a veto in everything that you change. That's not planning, that is the way that it is done, unfortunately, in areas where it is the lobbying, the strong lobbyists, the people that may have the most, the better funds or the most funds, the people that could muster supporters and so on. That will scare the hell out of the politician and feel that if he doesn't go along, well then he's in trouble. That's democracy in a way, it's not the nicest thing about democracy as far as I'm concerned, it might be as well as the others, but you've got to take the good with the bad.

Now the situation is, as I said before, the climbing. For instance, there is no doubt that things were exaggerated in the election. I can say all kinds of things. I saw the report right this year from your present Leader, who's talked about health, who said we had no planning. That's the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard, and then that I made a statement - as a given - that we should charge for meals in the hospitals, and that was repeated. You know we can have a lot of fun with statements like that. We can go ahead and try to . . . In a letter to the editor on Saturday, it was repeated

again. You know what I said? And it was on a program, in fact Peter Warren, where I was asked if I believed in utilization fees and I said, no, that our party did not; that in general I did not. And then somebody insisted that we should at least charge for the meals - it wouldn't be the same because you'd have to pay for your meals. And the furthest that I lean in that direction, I said, well I guess maybe it should be looked at and I'll repeat what I've said again, and use it against me if you want.

But I would say, and I say this to my colleagues on this side of the House also who have certain commitments, who are saying we're not going to have premiums, who are saying we're not going to charge extra billing, allow extra billing, we're not going to have utilization fees, we're not going to have those things; we are not going to have too big a deficit; we are not going to raise taxes. And I said to them, then you'll have to make some real tough decision in this field, and I say the same thing to all members of this committee. I say that to save this thing we have to be together and we have to save in certain areas. We have to save, especially when the standards are not going to be run-down. Politically, it's dynamite and an opposition can have a lot of fun and capitalize on it by making statements like my friend is accusing us of having done. That's a possibility.

Then the situation is we work really to see us safeguard these services for the people of Manitoba and keep giving the service that we have. A while back in his remark the member mentioned the situation that, fine, that there was CAT scan and you had to wait and so on. Well that's something new. In the days of Sherman they didn't talk about CAT scan, or maybe in his last days, but it hasn't been that long. Just the cost at St. Boniface, to say we are not doing anything, we are not planning, just the cost to set this thing up and order one was about \$4.5 million.

We are now ordering one for the Health Sciences Centre because theirs is pretty well obsolete. St. Boniface and the Health Sciences Centre would like to have a second one. They probably should have one that is used only for the head because you would save, about 75 percent of those are used in these facilities. Brandon would want one, and Brandon should have one. But I mean let's realize that this is not that easy, these are things that you have never heard of before.

At one time - and I say this to my colleague on this side - that we'll have to make up our mind and we'll have to work together. Are we saying that we are giving you the best, or did we say we will give you a service that will not make some impossible demands on your family and on your pocket, but on yourself. In other words, will we give you transportation, maybe a bicycle, or are we giving you the cadillac - not the cadillac - the Rolls-Royce? The people who are giving these services are saying, the patient is the important thing, we want the best. So how in the hell can you argue with that?

But the point is that somebody will have to make a decision. What do we do? Another very unfair statement that was made, and one of the most telling statements that was ever made was against Pierre Trudeau, who said he would never sell your wheat. That was completely out of context; it was recognized at the time. I was there. — (Interjection) — Never mind defending Pierre Trudeau. Once in a while if we defend

a politician when somebody is misleading him, the lawyers close ranks, everybody closes ranks, but we take advantage of that. The best we can expect from a politician is be silent, and what do we get in return? Nobody respects us. Nobody respects the politician at all and that is one of the reasons.

I don't give a damn if it's for Pierre Trudeau or Diefenbaker or Timbuktu or whatever. I think that some of these statements have been completely unfair.

Another statement that was made that I advocated that they should not have open heart surgery on people 96 years old. What I did say, what the Federal Minister of Health is saying, what all the providers of services, where the planners, where the administrators are saying, we have now another problem that we didn't have before and that is the problems of the morality, and where do we go? What I did say, I said somebody - I haven't got the answer and I wish I did have the answer - but somebody will have to ask and answer these questions. I also make the point that there is no way that government should get between a doctor and his patient, but my question was, does the public still spend this kind of money for people of that age? I don't know. If we do all that, you can have all the best intentions in the world, but if we do all that then I say that we're going to lose the system. In other words, it's completely impossible.

You've heard me and I think it's important again to repeat it. If we go on with just the same percentage increase as we've had in the last 10 years, not any more, and we would have the same problems as we have now, then in 10 years the Budget, not even of the department, just the budget of the commission, would be \$3.44 billion. There's no way we can pay that. There's no way we can pay that and there is no way, especially when one of the partners, the Federal Government, said we should have a system across Canada, that's the name of the game. We should have. We're Canadians. We want equality, we want treatment, so therefore we will have cost-sharing programs and the two levels of government will pay. All of a sudden the government said, enough is enough. This cost-sharing has to stop.

The former government, exactly when Mr. Sherman took over, in fact there was a new system, and for the first years paid a heck of a lot more than even under the cost-sharing plan and that was changed four years ago and that's another factor that my honourable friend from Pembina should know when we talked about the cost and the spending and so on. We hit it again wrong in 1981. It was the change of system and you know the fight that we've had to reinstate some of the money that all the provinces, everybody will agree, that the Province of Manitoba and Quebec were penalized compared to the other provinces.

And you have a program, although the now Prime Minister of Canada stated in his by-election in Nova Scotia - and I was in Halifax at the time, on that day - and he said that he would go back to cost-sharing. They've changed their mind since then. I think it was obvious there is no doubt that that government didn't really believe everything they were saying, but politically they were wise and we're not naive. We know that there's politics. I'm not advocating that we do that but if you're going to accuse members on this side, let's look at the whole situation; and you have a situation

where Mr. Mulroney figured, well, they're not going to get away with that, the Liberals.

Also, and I question their motive, the Liberals brought in that act that there would be no extra billing because it wasn't costly to them. It was trying to place the blame and put more pressure on the provinces who were mostly Conservative Governments and then that would put Mr. Mulroney really on the spot. He would be alone with the medical association and he would have the public against him and Mr. Mulroney outsmarted him. He outsmarted him and he said no, we will go one further, and he could have borrowed the words of this party, the things I would have liked said, and I was asked how come you support what he said? Well, you know what he said. He said, we will have all the other provinces that the Ministers of Health meetings before had always said, no, we're not going to have cost-sharing. We don't want that.

He was going to reinstate cost-sharing; he was going to allow for regional disparity - great for us. He was also going to allow for an aging population and he was going to take care of prevention, mental health - which had never been covered before - and research. We haven't seen that yet. Again, as I've said in this House, before I have confidence in the present Federal Minister of Health, I think that he's sincere, I think he understands the situation. I certainly will hold back any other remarks until we've had some final discussion with him, except that honeymoon can't last forever; sometime we'll have to stop speaking and get some action. But we have in front of him different programs for different things.

We would offer to put our money where our mouth is. Manitoba is ready to pay their share; we're ready to look. The best example, I think, of the change that you'll have is because of the aging population here in Manitoba and we're ready to look at it. We would hope that we will have them as partners also because it is important for them that we will have some kind of a pilot project to go ahead.

Now one of the main things that was forgotten by the Member for Pembina when we talked about the waiting list and so on, when he talked about this document, and this document is probably exaggerated the same as when members on the opposite side say that nobody on this side could run a peanut stand and those kind of things. — (Interjection) — I think I could run a peanut stand just as well as you. I might not be able to back it as well as you but I think I could run it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We were talking about the beds and I was saying that the aging population, the increased population also, and there is no doubt that when the Conservative Government - and when I reproached them at the time it was that period of restraint after the task force they had where they froze every construction for two years. They froze construction of personal care homes and now the problems that you saw in that article of '83, a lot of it is because of that and we're paying for it now. We're behind. It is true.

My honourable friend from Rhineland in opposition, he queered himself and he never got the job of Minister of Health because he was yelling every day that he

wanted construction of more personal care homes in those days and all of a sudden, in that restraint, he died. He died completely. You never heard any more from him at all and now all of a sudden he found his voice and he's talking about new personal care — (Interjection) — and we will.

The situation is that in the planning we know some of the direction, but we don't know all of the direction we want to go. But we know something. We know that we want to keep people out of institutions as much as possible, and by doing that we will increase our home care program, respite care, meals on wheels, and we're doing all that, we've done all that. So this is the situation, that we do it, but we're certainly not doing it perfectly.

We have enriched services for the citizens. We've started this program. We've kept on with what was a pilot project in our time, and to be honest and to give credit where credit is due, which was to increase the day care for the elderly under the administration in 1977, that these are the programs we must work with. Then after that, there will be personal care homes. The acute bed hospitals, if you look at certain other countries and so on, you have too many. I know that this is a joke. Mind you they're not all used here, that's true. I'll recognize that. They're not all used for acute beds but there are too many if anything.

So you have a situation where you'll have to take care of the older people, keep them healthy as long as possible, keep them busy and that is being done. We have a gerontologist in Manitoba that we never had before and that person is very busy. As I said before, we've improved the Council on Aging. It is now an advisory committee working with the gerontologist. As you know - I would hope that this will be helpful - that this year we're having a conference - seniors - on aging and we've invited some members representing the opposition also and I hope that they will be able to participate. These are some of the situations that we've talked about in planning.

Now other things, we've talked about ophthalmology and that school was closed and all of a sudden, you know, from being told that we have a government that wants to run the whole show - that too big government - and when you leave the responsibility that's the difference between the former Minister who accepted all responsibility. That's why he was on the run, and that was one of the reasons that they got after him so much. I'm not going to get sucked in; I told you that. I'm going to work with people as long as we respect that there are boards and commissions at different hospitals that have their responsibilities; that they have a grants commission at the university, that is something at the university. Again you can't have it both ways. You delegate the medical profession to do their own teaching, the disciplining and the policing or whatever you call it, and they're doing it. I certainly won't accept all responsibility. I think that we have to work together. This was the thing that was coming. It wasn't just last year that they all of a sudden lost the accreditation. They had been warned, and now it's going to take a while and you will have to recruit the right type of people, good teachers, and that is not that easy.

There have been some people that have been able to provide a little more funds for research and so on - I don't mean research at their level - research at the medical profession and so on. These are some of the areas that have been very difficult.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The member's time has expired.

It is evident from the comments made by the Member for Pembina that he is addressing Item 1.(c). Can I take it as given that he's passed Item 1.(b)(2)?

MR. D. ORCHARD: I beg your pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your comments have been addressed to Item 1.(c). Can I take it that you have passed Item 1.(b)(2)?

MR. D. ORCHARD: If you wish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, you know the Minister takes exception to the fact that we make the accusation that members in the New Democratic Party couldn't run a peanut stand and basically, many people believe that. The possible exception over there is the Minister of Health and there is every possibility he could run a peanut stand, providing he sold Planters. — (Interjection) — Planters.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health has indicated that part of the problem . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes a pretty wild-eyed allegation and draws a pretty long bow where he says the problems that I identified in my opening remarks are a carryover and a result of the freeze that was imposed on construction of capital facilities after we took government. I think the Minister's memory needs a little refreshing back to the 1977 election campaign.

Once again, it's the old member of deception and guile, who at that time the Member for Transcona presently was head of the Planning and Priorities Committee. Mr. Chairman, I remember very well in the 1977 election committee that there were planning signs on the health care system going up in every community. They had promised hospitals. They had promised personal care homes. They were promising senior citizen's housing and, Mr. Chairman, I want to give the member, the present Minister of Health, some credit back in 1977 and he can correct me if I'm wrong.

But it would seem to me that in 1977 when the election was called, the Member for Transcona as head of the Planning and Priorities Committee and running for election in that year rolled out this grandiose plan of facilities that were going to be built, and made announcements out of Planning and Priorities Committee for construction of capital assets in the Health Department that the Minister of Health didn't even know about and we inherited those promises.

The town of Carman was told three weeks prior to the election that their hospital was right on top. It was going to be the first hospital in along with about 15 or 25 other communities; and a lot of the same communities were promised personal care homes, and there was not a lick of plan in place. It was an election

gimmick brought to us by the Member for Transcona, the master of guile and deception, as head of the Planning and Priorities Commission. We inherited a community out there that had been promised personal care homes, hospitals, helter-skelter across the width and breadth of this province.

No government, Mr. Chairman, could have brought them into government and instituted that kind of a building program because, Sir, it was fictional. It was designed to fool the people into re-electing the New Democrats for one more term. It was not factual. There was no substance to it in the majority of cases, and the Minister of Health had to take a very serious overview of the capital commitments in the Department of Health, because this Minister now talks about the \$3.4 billion expending, just exactly the same amount of fees for service as we're doing right now and in 10 years we're going to be at 3.4 billion.

Had we undertaken the planning program and the construction program announced by the Member for Transcona, the master of guile and deception, we would have had 3.4 billion a couple of years ago because he had that many hospitals, personal care homes and other facilities planned without any knowledge of the sitting Minister of Health in the New Democratic administration. And to his credit, Sir, he straightened out the Member for Transcona and said, no, we're not going to go along with this kind of deceptive promising to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the Minister of Health exactly what happened after we reviewed that building program and removed the freeze. It was not a New Democratic administration that ended up approving the plans and undertaking the construction of a hospital in Selkirk. Selkirk just happens to be the constituency the Premier's in. For eight years while he was a Minister in the Schreyer administration, the man fumbled and bumbled and flopped between this lobby group or that lobby group and couldn't come up with any kind of plan that they could carry out for construction at Selkirk. We solved that, Sir. A Progressive Conservative administration solved that.

I remember, Sir, during the election campaign, there were television cameras went into the hospital at Snow Lake, and the roof was falling in. There was water leaking in some of the rooms. It was in despicable shape. It was located in a New Democratic constituency and - bless his soul! - the then member was unable to convince his government and the Schreyer administration to do anything about it. Who resolved the Snow Lake Hospital problem, Sir? It was the Progressive Conservative administration under Sterling Lyon and the Minister of Health, Bud Sherman. That's who resolved it. And why did we resolve it? Because the need existed. The Snow Lake Hospital is a functional hospital serving that mining community today, because of a Progressive Conservative administration.

Mr. Chairman, let's talk about some more capital expenditure and planning. The Manitoba School, the Manitoba Developmental Centre underwent a disastrous fire. — (Interjection) — I forget the exact figure, but it was close to \$10 million that the Lyon Administration put into that facility to provide fire protection. It didn't end up with a monument like we have over on the corner of Broadway and Kennedy, a monument to the - oh, he isn't here right now - memory

of Woodsworth. It wasn't visible at all, but it was done to protect those citizens, those residents in Portage. So the Minister can take his argument, and he stretches a long bow when he tries to attribute the problems that he's got that have been part of the system since he has been re-elected as Minister of Health, and have worsened since he's been Minister of Health, and blame it on a capital facility freeze from 1977 to 1978. He can't do that, Sir. He can do it, but he isn't being quite honest with his perception because it's not the truth, Sir. You can't blame those kind of problems on the system now.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister made an interesting proposition, and he's made this one to me privately about getting involved in the planning process in the Department of Health, and he points out how the health care system - and I tend to agree with him - is probably too big and too important to the people of Manitoba to have politics being played with it loose and free, and I agree with him.

Mr. Chairman, I want to contrast the kind of criticism that has been levelled against this Minister of Health by this opposition, with the kind of criticism that was levelled - and the member unfortunately isn't here - but the big issue in 1978 was two strips of bacon. It was linen on the beds not being changed every day. Those were the big scams, the big issue, the big devastation of the health care system, and it was the most phony criticism of the health care system that this House has ever seen. There has never been more irresponsible criticism levelled with the Department of Health than was levelled by those who sat on this side of the House from 1977 to 1981 - and talked about two strips of bacon, talked about canvas, a bed sheet that was like canvas. It was sort of like a tarp when this particular member was in there for elective surgery.

And, Mr. Chairman, it's interesting that that member would criticize the hospital system for not changing his bed linen when he was in there for elective surgery, because if he tried to get in there today he'd have to wait six to eight months to get the elective surgery done. He got in and got it done during our administration, and there weren't the lineups and the waits for elective surgery during our administration that there is now, and the Minister knows that. That is a failure, and a failure to deliver the promised restoration of the health care system that they campaigned on and they won on.

I want to reiterate the facts, Sir, that Manitobans didn't elect the New Democrats to bring a better economy to the Province of Manitoba because, in general, Manitobans do not have faith in a New Democratic Party in terms of their business acumen and their ability to provide direction for economic growth in the province. New Democratic Party governments in this province have a history of abject failure in promoting economic development, but they have been able to harness, rightfully or wrongfully, a reasonable reputation in delivering social services, if you will, in the Province of Manitoba.

Now, having said that, Mr. Chairman, I want to once again reiterate that the Minister has said we should be co-operating in terms of health care planning. It's too big an issue for partisan politics. If we did a role reversal, Sir, and we had of been re-elected in 1981, and we had the same Minister of guile and deception, the

Member for Transcona sitting in opposition as Health critic, not necessarily the Member for St. Boniface, as Health critic but the Member for Transcona, can you imagine the hue and cry that would have been made over four deaths in 1983 at the Health Sciences Centre attributed to the lack of intensive care unit space? Can you imagine the hue and cry? Can you imagine the hue and cry that would have been mustered by the member of deception and guile, the Member for Transcona, on the closing of Seven Oaks and Concordia obstetric wards, and piling those expectant mothers into St. Boniface and HSC, prior to it appearing they were ready to take them because the system was identified by a judge as being overcrowded and understaffed at that time? Can you imagine the hue and cry of the member for deception and guile, and I might add sneeze, because that's what he was doing when he was in opposition, can you imagine the kind of hue and cry?

Mr. Chairman, we have not chosen to play on the misfortunes of Manitobans who have lost their lives at Health Sciences Centre and babies who have not survived because we don't want to be that kind of an alarmist opposition. That serves no particular purpose, and the Minister of Health will have to admit that nobody went after him personally in the House on that, because we're not out to try to prop up our political image on the gravestones of unfortunate Manitobans like the member for guile and deception, the Member for Transcona, would do if he were in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, we have been a responsible opposition in terms of our level of criticism at this Minister and this government in terms of health. If anything, Sir, we have been irresponsible as an opposition in not being alarmist enough, in not being fanatical enough, in not being harsh enough in our criticism of some of the bureaucratic messes that have surfaced in some of the deaths, the problems, the overcrowding, the understaffing, that has been and is part of our hospital system today.

But, Sir, reverse the role. Put us in government for the last three-and-a-half years that this New Democratic Party has been undertaking and overseeing the deterioration of the health care system. Reverse the role and see whether the same kind of knowledgeable criticism would have been levelled. It wouldn't have been, Sir. It wouldn't have been, because they would have got an alarmist wave of action going across the province. The Minister gets upset because the allegation has been made basis comments he made of charging for meals in hospitals. He says that's unfair, that's treating me badly, and I'm going to get very upset as the Minister of Health if people keep accusing me of that because I'm really a nice guy. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health - no, I'm repeating your musings, I'm repeating the Minister of Health's musings on his self-aggrandizement that he has in his mind about how good a job he's doing. But, if any Conservative Minister of Health had mused about charging for meals - two strips of bacon - and the arguments there would have appeared like but a tempest in the teapot, and we would have had a hurricane of protest. And, Mr. Chairman, because the Minister mentioned it today, he has mused about whether, and I'll correct him, it's not 96-year-old Manitobans, it's 95-year-old Manitobans that he said. — (Interjection) — No. Mr. Chairman, it's in the record. In your Throne Speech Debate, you've

mused about 95-year-old Manitobans, whether they need or whether they should receive open-heart surgery. The Minister left the question unanswered because it is a very very emotional and a very tough question to answer. But, as the Minister says from his seat, it has to be answered.

The question is, Sir, where do you draw the magical age? Is it 95 today, and is it 90 tomorrow, and next year is it 85, and then does it get down to 75, and then does it get down to 65, and then does it get down to 50? Where does it stop, Sir? And, maybe, it would stop just prior to 53 with this Minister of Health. — (Interjection) — You see, Mr. Chairman, that is not an issue that I have gone throughout the province as the Health critic for the official opposition saying that the Minister of Health is now musing whether people who are 95 years old should have open-heart surgery and causing a great deal of fear and alarm amongst the senior citizens because that would be irresponsible, Sir. But the Minister of deception and guile, the Member for Transcona, would have been on TV, radio, newspaper, every platform, he would have said the Tories are going to stop you from having surgery.

No, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health says I am doing the same thing and I am not doing the same thing. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, you see the problem the Minister of Health has is that he is surrounded by a group of . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Coyotes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . "vultures" is the proper word, and if we were to digress just slightly and choose a provincial emblem to signify the bird most appropriate for the province, we would choose the vulture right now because that's what we have in government, is a group of vultures that have preyed upon the seniors and the chronically ill in the Province of Manitoba.

The announcement the Minister made on Monday of last week establishes a new user fee by placing per diems on non-panelled chronic care patients in our hospitals and our mental health institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the member for deception and deceit is sitting in government right now allowing his Minister of Health to do that, and that, Sir, is what aggravates most Manitobans, is how these people can possibly get up in the morning and look themselves in the mirror. How can the Minister of Labour look in the mirror each morning to shave when he has that kind of a record of two-faced public policy pronouncements? One face when you are in opposition, the second face when you are in government.

There's no care for the senior citizens and the chronically ill in this government now, they've proven that because they have imposed a user fee on them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 4:30 in Private Members' Hour, proposed resolutions.

RES. NO. 4 - ABORIGINAL RIGHTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Concordia,

WHEREAS Section 35 of The Constitution Act, 1983 provides as follows:

35(1) The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed;

35(2) In this Act, "aboriginal people of Canada" includes the Indian, Inuit and Metis people of Canada;

AND WHEREAS Section 37 calls for the "identification and definition" of the rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada to be included in the Constitution;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House support ongoing multilateral discussions between the Government of Canada and the various provinces including Manitoba and the various aboriginal peoples of Manitoba to consider the nature, jurisdiction and powers to be recognized and affirmed for the said institutions of aboriginal self-government, without derogating from the trust and treaty obligations of the Federal Government with respect to the aboriginal peoples; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution as passed by this House be forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada, and the Premiers of the Provinces of Canada.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great pleasure to speak on this resolution and also it's been a great matter of privilege for me to place it before the House for the consideration of members on both sides of the House.

Self-government has various meanings and a lot of misunderstandings of what we mean by self-government. Self-government to the aboriginal people means taking care of our own affairs and also looking after ourselves.

I might quote from the conference that I returned from just shortly this past week in Ottawa and I would like to quote from the Honourable Prime Minister of Canada, Brian Mulroney, who again supports the Indian people. I would like to quote from his opening statement and I quote:

"The key to change is self-government for aboriginal peoples within the Canadian Federation. We are a cautious people and self-government is a term which is worrisome to some of us, but self-government is not something that I fear. It is not an end in itself but rather a means to reach common goals. It is the vehicle and not a destination. The challenge and satisfaction is in the journey itself."

That is the Prime Minister's statement in regard to self-government. I hope the members opposite would support the aboriginal people in trying to achieve self-government.

In the early part of history when the first white man arrived here in Canada, I read some of the debates that went on in the House in 1867 with respect to the Indian people in Canada and what the purpose and the intent of the legislation that they debated at that time which was that they consolidated a number of Indian acts at that time.

At that time the purpose and the intent of legislation was to eventually enfranchise all Indian people where they no longer would have special status and have treaties with the rest of the country and also the Government of Canada. It is very clear that was their intent.

Also in some of the debates that I read - I guess it would be in the House of Commons debates - the Indian people were not regarded as being civilized but rather being savages. Some of the quotations I could make from the specific debates that went on there, they felt that the Indian people didn't have the capability of being able to save or able to plan in the future. As a matter of fact it stated in one of the debates that the Indian people gave everything away that they had so they weren't capable of planning for themselves.

As a matter of fact we were considered heathens. The debates also mentioned about - there was a section in the Act which called heathen Indians and later on somebody in the debates was insulted so he changed the thing to non-Christian Indians. So you can tell in the whole course of debates where the Indians stood and where the Indian people were being left out in the democratic process.

As a matter of fact Canada prides itself on democracy and freedom and yet the ironic part of it is that the Indian people were denied in a democratic process by means of suppressing them by means of a democratic process. So it wasn't until 1960 that the Indian people were able to vote. I must say 1960 was the time when the Indian people were able to vote without giving their rights up as Treaty Indians. Prior to that, the Indian people were to vote but, if they voted, they were enfranchised, and they were no longer considered to be Indians, and also enjoyed the benefits from those Treaties that were signed with the Crown.

Many of the Indians at that time were also enfranchised arbitrarily, because they joined the army, or went to school, or became a priest. In order to join the Canadian society you had to abandon your culture, your traditions and become part of the majority of the Canadian society so that you could enjoy your privileges and your right to vote and other things that are associated with that.

I must say that Indian self-government is not necessarily, as other people have misrepresented the thing, to separate from Canada. As a matter of fact, it is not. I think it's a means to look after our own. It is, for long periods of time the government has looked after our interests. We have to start taking care of ourselves, we don't want to have governments looking after us. Even now, at the Constitutional Conferences, I hear some Premiers saying that well we have to look at what this means, I don't know whether it's in the best interests of the Indian people or not. But I say, let us make those decisions for ourselves, we don't want you to make those decisions for us.

After a period of 100 years, we can see the deprivation of the Indian people, we see high suicides. The poor

conditions that exist on these Reserves, and yet people question the ability for us to take over and look after our interests, whether it is in the best interests of us or not. But I say also, can we do any worse? Like somebody quoted Gandhi, I said, we'd rather have our bad government, rather than have your good government.

I think it's about time the Indian people got that recognition. The Indian people have existed here for many centuries before Europeans arrived here. It is that fundamental difference when we approach the Constitutional Conferences that the Premiers do not tend to recognize, that we have had self-government, as a matter of fact, self-government was recognized in the proclamation and also in the Two Wampum in 1950, and the Royal Proclamation of 1763 which speaks of, and I quote: "The several nations or tribes of Indians with whom we are connected and by subsequent Treaties . . . 'We say the purpose in that proclamation on the Treaties was not to give rights to the First Nations, but to give rights to European settlers.

The Indian people have an inherent right to govern themselves, and this still exists today. Yet, governments have failed to recognize that we have the ability and also had a prior inherent right to govern ourselves. Neither the Crown of the United Kingdom or Canada delegated the right to self-governing to the First Nations, it existed before Canada became a nation.

Parliament did not create the right to self-government, and that is the fundamental difference when we talk about negotiating about self-government at these Constitutional Conferences, because the approach of several provinces is that they want to delegate authority and jurisdiction to Indian people. It is not merely taking over programs and delivering services. In that sense, we would be just administering our own misery. I think we have that capability and have that right to govern ourselves.

As you know, The Indian Act that was passed in 1867, and has had some changes to it since then, has not really brought equality or standards of living to these communities, the Reserves that we live in today. As a matter of fact, it has caused grave economic and social chaos in these communities. It has brought self-dignity and the purpose of life to be meaningless.

I hope that members opposite will understand what we mean by self-government. We want the ability to be able to govern ourselves and our purpose in life, and also able to join you in living in Canada and able to co-exist with you. You would find that the Indian people are the most, not peaceful, but the most generous and understanding people. As a matter of fact, we gave up parcels of land, I guess, throughout this country; in return we've had very little. Yet, there are still unfulfilled Treaty promises that still have to be implemented by the governments.

Also the provinces have a key role to play in it because they are part of the Canadian Constitution. If we are to develop Indian self-government, or aboriginal self-government within the meaning of the Canadian Constitution, and if we are to amend any Constitution, or add to the Constitution, we require the support of the provinces.

However, I am concerned in respect to the Treaties that were made to the Crown which is being represented by the Federal Government. I am concerned that the

provinces would be able to have some say in the definition of those Treaties, because the Treaties are strictly between the Indian nations and also the Federal Government, and those have to be still identified. I am very cautious and also concerned for those provinces that are not sympathetic to the Indian people, they know that we require their understanding and their support.

As a matter of fact, in the last Constitutional Conference just passed a few days ago, we were able to achieve some considerable progress in which at least seven provinces supported the accord that was tabled at the Conference. But yet it wasn't totally supported by some provinces because some major organizations such as the Inuit Organization, also the Assembly of First Nations, did not support the accord because it reflected some of the things that they were concerned about which is the involvement of the provinces. The meeting has still to take place in May, at which time the provinces, and also the organizations, will make their decisions as to whether this accord will go through or not.

Indian self-government, I mentioned before, is very fundamental to our existence and also to our contribution to society, but we have to talk about the structure and the powers that we would like to have and the institutions that we would like to develop, and also what resources we require, and also the physical arrangements that would have to be transferred to the Indian self-government institutions. I think I would like to see total support of self-government by members here. I think that we owe something to the aboriginal people because I, myself, am an Indian person and would like to see something being done to alleviate some of the problems that exist in those communities.

I realize that by passing this resolution, and also by acquiring Indian self-government, that everything will vanish. I don't think that's the case at all, but I think what it'll do is it'll give the bands the ability to start planning for their future and also start taking over some of their institutions, like the schools, economic self-sufficiency that exists, and also work with the governments, with the Federal Government and also the provincial governments, even with the municipal governments.

There is a lot of misapprehension about Indian self-government, but I don't want the general public to fear that what we're talking about is creating a totally different government altogether. We want to be part of Canada, and we want to be part of the Canadian society and join in in the contributions of developing this great country of ours. I think you would find that the Indian people love this country and they fought overseas in the First and Second World War, and also in Korea. They didn't have to go and fight for the country because they were excluded from joining the forces but, yet, they went and fought for the country. In return, when they got back, the biggest battle they fought was here in Canada because, when they got here, they lost all their status and they no longer benefitted from their treaties, they were automatically, I guess, not registered and taken off the list of Indian people. I guess the one that I would mention is Sergeant Tommy Prince, a well-known Indian soldier.

A MEMBER: A fine soldier.

MR. E. HARPER: Yes, he's a fine soldier. He was from the Brokenhead Indian Reserve, but when he went to war and got back he was no longer a Treaty Indian, or a member of the band.

So, we've had a lot of input into protecting this country. I would hope that the honourable members opposite would stand up and also support me in the passing of this resolution so that this House would say to the people in Canada that we support the Indian people, the aboriginal people, in trying to gain their destiny and able to plan for their future.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I'll conclude, and I hope the members opposite would contribute to this resolution favourably.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the resolution which has just been introduced by the Member for Rupertsland, and I would like to, at the outset, commend the member for the sincerity in which he has presented some of the details with respect to this resolution.

I believe I speak for all members on this side of the House in effect that we don't really have any argument with respect to the resolution as it is presented, and I would just like to comment briefly and to requote what it says:

"**THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED** that this House support ongoing multi-lateral discussions between the Government of Canada and the various provinces, including Manitoba, and the various aboriginal peoples of Manitoba, to consider the nature, jurisdiction and powers to be recognized and affirmed for the said institutions of aboriginal self-government, without derogating from the trust and treaty obligations of the Federal Government with respect to the aboriginal peoples; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution as passed by this House be forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada, and the Premiers of the Provinces of Canada."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a lot of merit in what the member is proposing here, however, we have just witnessed last week two days of discussions by the Prime Minister, and the various Premiers and various leaders of the various Native organizations and groups, to try and resolve the question of self-government. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is any quarrel with respect to what the Constitution states, and that self-government is in the Constitution, self-government for Native peoples. I guess the question that hasn't been answered is what is really meant by self-government. Now, the Member for Rupertsland, today, has appealed to us to support him in getting on with the question of self-government, and I believe the member generalizes, to some degree, in the question of self-government.

Most of the reports that came out of Ottawa indicate that the provinces generally were sympathetic toward the question of Native self-government, but three or four of the provinces, I believe, stood firm on the fact that it was very difficult to support an entrenched

amendment to our Constitution which would provide for the self-government of Native peoples in this country without really defining what the issues are. Mr. Speaker, I know that there must be a lot of frustrations on the part of many Native leaders, as well as Native people throughout Canada, however, I know in my own constituency I have had many calls from Native individuals, in some cases leaders, but in many cases they are the rank and file people on the reservations or in Métis communities who are really concerned about what is meant by self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all very familiar with the situation that occurred in one Métis community, only about a year ago, where the community of Camperville had decided to enforce their own version of self-government in the community of Camperville. I know that what the leaders in the Métis government of Camperville were proposing did not meet with the approval of the majority of their own people in the Camperville community. I would venture to say that a majority would not support the Camperville version of self-government. I believe the Member for Rupertsland here today indicated that they want to work with Canadians and become assimilated into the Canadian government and the provincial governments. They're not asking for a third level of government, as I heard the member speak, but they would like to be able to look after themselves and to govern their own destiny. But, we have had the situation with the Camperville community where they have gone ahead on their own, and also we have had the members on this side meet with a group of urban Indians who are asking a question, really who is speaking for the urban Indian in the City of Winnipeg. That group probably numbers well into the several thousands, and they have many reservations with respect to what the entrenchment of self-government would mean to these people located here in the City of Winnipeg.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a very serious problem in that if the self-government is entrenched into the Constitution without it being well-defined, we may very well have a bigger monster to deal with than we have now. Granted we are all concerned with the situation that many Native and Indian people face today; it's certainly less than desirable, that's for sure. I believe all Canadians would like to see the situation resolved to the betterment of all people concerned, but this is easier said than done. I believe the resolution that the Member for Rupertsland is bringing forward today does provide for multilateral, ongoing discussions to try and resolve the question of Native self-government so that it can become entrenched.

As I understand the conference that just completed last week, there was provision for another meeting to be called in a couple of months to try and come up with an agreement that would be acceptable to all the provinces and the Federal Government and the various Native groups. As the member has indicated here today, there were at least two Native groups that were not prepared to go along with the accord that was presented last week.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very obvious that ongoing discussions are very necessary. I'm not sure that the discussions are set up to deal with this as quickly as we would like to see it happen and I believe this resolution supports the proposal to get on with this

gnawing problem that has been with us for many years, and not much progress has been made with respect to allowing Native people to be able to control their own destiny.

Certainly the member indicated that they don't want to administer their own misery and certainly many many people, I believe, are really concerned with respect to this very fact, that this could result in a detrimental position for the Native people if the self-government situation is not resolved and defined to accommodate all the possible situations that could arise.

Certainly I have quoted a couple of examples with the Camperville community and also the urban Indian population that the self-government situation proposes a problem for. The question or the resolution that the Member for Rupertsland has brought forward I think is very timely and that this problem is receiving considerable publicity in the media, but not many solutions have been coming forward.

Even last week, I believe, my leader asked the Premier with respect to his support of Native self-government which the Premier responded that he was strongly in support of, but when it comes to defining what he means by Native self-government then I think we all heard what the Premier said, that it's a question that is not easily defined and will require considerable discussion before a proper definition or an adequate definition can be resolved. Mr. Speaker, I believe and support those Premiers who have stood firm with respect to their argument that the definition of self-government has to be accomplished and well-defined before we can really move on the entrenchment of the self-government into the Constitution of Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, how can we entrench something that we are not really aware of what it entails? We all realize we have a commitment that was agreed to over 100 years ago enabling Native people to have their own self-government but I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to - and when I say "we" I think that includes all the people of Canada - regard the definition of self-government.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset I don't have any argument with the resolution as it is presented. As I said earlier I believe it's a timely one, and it's one that will obviously require considerably more discussion by the various provinces and leaders throughout Canada in order to arrive at the term self-government.

Now the Member for Rupertsland said that he hoped that we would agree with him and get on with allowing the Native people to govern themselves, but I had listened very carefully to the member speaking and I can't just recall where he actually defined exactly what is meant in his mind. I know that the member spoke with sincerity. I feel that he probably has many more things that he could tell us about this question of self-government because certainly all Canadians want to get on with the question of providing self-government to the Native people.

For over 100 years now we haven't been able to resolve the question of the land base for the Indian people and again questions were asked last week with respect to the present status of a formula to try and achieve the land base situation with respect to the various Indian bands in this country. It seems and appears that we are a long long way from resolving this issue that has been before us for over 100 years

and I'm not sure that we are about to get on with the land claims very quickly from the answers that we are getting.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't really have anything further to say on this resolution at this time, other than to say that I appreciate the member for bringing it in as a timely topic. I don't have any quarrel with what the member is asking us to do here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are two principal issues involved in this complex question. I think we all would agree that it is a complex question. One is the question of principle, which the Member for Rupertsland and the Member for Swan River have both addressed, and it's important that we do that. It's a matter of some gratification on this side of the House to see and to hear that on this question of principle, indeed there is, if not unanimity across this country, at least very substantial consensus, and that there appears on the question of principle to be that kind of consensus in this House. That indeed is a major achievement, and I say that in all sincerity.

I think it's important to understand the principles about which we speak, and I will speak very briefly about that since the Member for Swan River says that on that side of the House they support the principle. But it is important to understand that we are talking about the rights of an indigenous people, that Canada is a subscriber to international covenants which recognizes the rights of indigenous people to self-determination which includes certainly a substantial degree of self-government; that the indigenous people, Inuit, Indians and their immediate descendants, the Metis, were never a conquered people. In fact, they were treated with in the main, not in every part of Canada, as if they were sovereign nations because we entered into treaties with them, which is something that you do with sovereign nations, and those treaties dealt substantially with matters of land and title but not directly, perhaps indirectly, with questions of governments. So to the Royal Proclamation pursuant to which the land which was recognized that belonged collectively to the indigenous peoples, was recognized as being vested in the Crown, in the right of Canada, in trust for the indigenous peoples and to be used through history as and for their benefit. So those principles are there.

When the Government of Manitoba, at the beginning of these constitutional talks, stated through the First Minister our support for that principle, we did so with some qualifications because we recognize, as do the leaders of the aboriginal people, that we can't undo 400 years of history and start back as if we were in the 17th century at that stage of development and begin the work of creating forms of self-government and institutions of self-government for Canada's aboriginal people as if we were back there.

So we have said as a government, and we were the first Provincial Government to state a position, that we believed however it might be defined, however it might be framed, that aboriginal self-government would have to be within the Canadian Confederation and within the Canadian Constitution as it exists today.

We went further and we said that there would have to be an acceptance of federal fiscal responsibility where we were worried that this might be an instrument for what is called devolution; that is, that the Federal Government divested itself of its responsibility and left the self-governing communities as islands in provincial seas and then cut them off at some point where the provinces would then have to pick up the financial tag. So as a province we were quite careful in delineating how we saw this principle articulated in today's world.

As these constitutional talks developed it became clear that there was a monumental, perhaps an intractable difficulty from the point of view of definition, the second question to which the Member for Swan River adverted. You are dealing with three very different kinds of aboriginal peoples.

The Inuit who basically live in the Northwest Territories and are looking towards a public form of government; that is not an ethnically based form of government, which eventually will evolve towards something very similar to provinces. I see that, in fact, as a development in the not too distant future. It talked about Nuvivet (sic), is the name that they used, the Inuit name for this form of government. So that's one kind of government.

The Indian organizations, represented in the main but not exclusively by the Assembly of First Nations, are talking really about a land based ethnic form of government really confined to the reserves. The reserves might group themselves for the purpose of evolving the form of self-government but it's a much clearer sort of concept. It's ethnic based but it's confined to the lands reserved for Indians.

Indeed we should remember there that as things now are the Federal Government through the Constitution as it is, having the power under 91(24) of The Constitution Act to legislate with respect to Indians and lands reserved for Indians, could take the present very narrow, almost colonial form of self-government, the band council government, and could expand it greatly on their own in a bilateral way. Indeed there are some Indian leaders who, having felt frustrated by the process to this date, suggest that the Federal Government should do that.

There are some of the Indian nations, particularly the Prairie Treaty Alliance who are not represented by the Assembly of First Nations, who think, and probably with some backing, that the right of self-government, albeit not spelled out, is implicit in the treaties and that what really should happen is a series of treaty extensions by bilateral negotiations between the Indian nations and the Federal Government with the provinces not being represented at all.

Our view is quite different. Our view is that there are provincial interests that must be protected in every stage of development and we believe that the way to go is in multilateral discussions. So that's what's reflected in part in the resolution.

But then we come back still to this crunch question, enshrine and then define or define and then enshrine, that the Member for Swan River stated and I want to deal with the federal approach to that.

The member said that he stands, and presumably other members of his caucus, with the position that he said three or four of the provinces take, which he suggests is one where you should have a definition and then constitutional protection.

First of all there are only two provinces that take that view, that's Alberta and British Columbia. All of the other provinces recognize that it's virtually impossible to have a singular definition that is applicable to all these various aboriginal groups and the various differences, let's say, even within the Indians as an aboriginal group who come from a variety of different cultures and have different national groupings. You can't really equate the position, let's say, of the Haida Indians on the West Coast who are not covered by treaty and who still have a whole number of land claims questions to be resolved with the Iroquois in Quebec. Historically and culturally, linguistically, there are great differences.

So that being the problem, how do you approach it? The Federal Government has come up with an approach which eight of the 10 provinces in principle - because there are still many details to be considered support - Manitoba being one of them. Let me just take the Prime Minister's statement which he read to the conference, it's not the opening one referred to by the Member for Rupertsland but the one that he read to the conference later on in the first day of the conference.

"The first element of this approach . . ." - the federal approach - again let me emphasize, endorsed by eight of the 10 provinces as an approach - not six but eight - "The first element of this approach is the recognition of the rights of the aboriginal people to self-government within the Canadian Confederation which would be set out in negotiated agreements."

So there's the principle but "within the Canadian Confederation", so there's no question of sovereignty being talked about and "which would be set out in negotiated agreements."

The second element is the commitment of the Federal and Provincial Governments to enter into negotiations with representatives of aboriginal people aimed at concluding these agreements respecting self-government.

Third, the amendment provides - that's the federal amendment - that the rights of the aboriginal peoples contained in those agreements would receive constitutional protection if the parties agree. So even if there are negotiations resulting in some expanded form of band council government for the MKO Reserves in the North, that still might be the subject not of a constitutional entrenchment unless the parties, which would include the province, agreed that they were ready to have it constitutionally protected.

Fourthly, and these are the Prime Minister's words, "You will note in this latter regard that the draft provides that both Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures concerned must consent prior to any agreement being given constitutional protection."

So it's not the intention you'll see, to entrench an undefined form of self-government. It's the intention to entrench a principle and a process. Let me just deal with those two elements a little bit more.

As the Constitution now is, Mr. Speaker, it states in Section 35(1) "that the existing aboriginal and Treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed." That's there now. There is growing belief that the existing Treaty and aboriginal rights include the right of self-government. That has not yet been decided by any court of competent jurisdiction. There are one or two lower court decisions

which go one way, and one or two lower court decisions which go the other way.

It could be the case, one doesn't know although there is a strong inclination in the courts nowadays to stress Indian rights, aboriginal rights, that if that section were ultimately taken to court in the absence of a political resolution the court might say yes. Self-government is an existing right of the aboriginal people, because it is something that went with the collective ownership of their land that they never gave up. It was never extinguished. That is a not only conceivable but a probable outcome of a court case. I don't think the courts could define it.

But you would then be left, as a matter of the court development of the Constitution, with an undefined and undifferentiated right which would be the subject of ongoing litigation. That creates or could create a problem.

The approach of the Federal Government is that rather than taking that route, and since it doesn't appear possible to have this single definition of self-government, why don't we follow this process of saying let's just recognize the principle? It's what they call a non-justiciable affirmation; that is, it simply affirms the right but gives no legal powers that can be enforced. Then you begin the negotiations.

It would be very much different as between the Federal Government, and it would be there at the Federal Government, and the Inuit and the territorial governments. In fact, that is fairly well advanced towards a territorial form of government involving the Inuit people, dividing of the Arctic between the eastern and the western Arctic along a line not yet determined but soon to be determined and the granting of powers, both legislative and judicial powers, not too dissimilar from the powers that a province has. So that would take place off there.

Once those agreements in whatever form were arrived at by multilateral consensus and the parties agreed that this indeed was what they wanted to constitutionalize, then it would be the subject of a resolution through the House of Commons and the Senate.

Let's take the situation as it might develop in Manitoba, a group, let's say, of reserves up in the North. We have no Inuit and I'll talk about the Metis in a moment. A group of reserves up North might say, well, we certainly want more than the band council form of government that we have. So there would be a series of negotiations, multilateral because there are provincial interests - clearly there are provincial interests. I don't know how long such negotiations might take, two, three, four, five, six years. It's not something that can be resolved very quickly.

But even that, supposing that there is an agreement about some greater powers, perhaps the kind of powers that President Reagan spoke about recently when he stressed the importance of self-government for the Indian people of the United States where, in many of the instances that he used as a model, they have certain elementary parts of the justice system, their own justice system, their own delivery of family programs, their own delivery of some educational programs and health programs for their own people on their own land.

Even then, under the federal proposal, the province would have to agree; the feds would have to agree. It

would have to then, if it's to be constitutionalized, come back to the Legislature and be passed by the Legislature, be passed by the House of Commons, be passed by the Senate. It is a very careful way of articulating and defining the very question that the Member for Swan River was concerned about.

With respect to the Metis people, without a land base there is really no kind of self-government that one can talk about that one can envisage at the moment. The member raises the spectre of Camperville, but nothing really happened there other than a declaration which never amounted to, in fact, an actual self-government. The then leader of the Metis community of the Camperville area thought that they should in a sense make a political point, but Camperville remains today as it is now under the existing forms of municipal government and Northern Affairs government that we have.

Indeed we are moving with respect to Northern communities to greater degrees of local autonomy by the block funding program about which I am sure the Minister of Northern Affairs presently, the former Minister of Northern Affairs, will talk in due course. So we're talking really about different processes about which I think there needs to be information, there needs to be concern, but there need not be fear that somehow or other we are creating some unknown leap into the dark.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, do I have about two minutes? About two minutes. The matter did not reach a successful conclusion for two reasons. One is that while there was this consensus about the federal approach, one element of it did not appeal to Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia, namely, the commitment to negotiate would be constitutionalized along with the principle. They were a little bit worried about that, that they might be taken to court and compelled to negotiate.

Well, our feeling is that if you enter into a solemn agreement that you're going to negotiate without which the rest doesn't make sense, why should you be worried about being taken into court? You really can't, in my belief, take anybody to court and say you have to negotiate, because people can come to the bargaining table and put a hard position on the table, and they're negotiating.

The other problem was the one that the aboriginal groups felt that aspect of it, and the provincial involvement, some of them felt they were uncomfortable

with. But I want to say to this House, Sir, that the Manitoba position was, as I stressed at the beginning, that indeed the provinces must be involved, that we are not in favour of bilateral agreements, because if you're going to have constitutional change it must involve the province. It must, because we want to make sure that along this slow, careful process, our provincial interests are protected.

So in supporting the resolution of the Member for Rupertsland, as did the Member for Swan River, I come at it in a somewhat different way. I do want to assure him that the growing consensus which is taking place and has taken a number of years to develop is one in which, from our perspective, the fundamental interest not only of the aboriginal but of the province as a whole are matters of great concern to us.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to commence some remarks with respect to this resolution. On the other hand, in view of the hour, I might ask permission to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30, when this resolution next meets the House, the Honourable Member for Lakeside will have 20 minutes remaining.

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair. The House will resume in committee at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

ERRATUM

On Page 594 of Hansard the Report of the Committee should read as follows:

The Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

On Page 598 of Hansard the Report of the Committee should read as follows:

The Committee of Ways and Means has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.