

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 18, 1972

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this evening I would like to draw the attention of the members to the gallery on my right, where we have 24 members of the First Crestview Cubs under the direction of Mr. Shingleton and Mr. Pitzel. These cubs are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the honourable members I bid you welcome.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 8 (a). The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure, but I presume that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is finished. He was still on his feet at 5:30 but since he's not here, I presume he had not intended to rise again at 8:00.

I want to make some comments, Mr. Chairman, on some of the points raised by members opposite, but to start with, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the question of the comment raised by the Member for Morris. The statistical presentation --(Interjection)-- well I want to make my point quite clear. I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, and I'm happy that my honourable friend had interjected ...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: He said on Broadway Beat the other night, that this was an unimportant issue, and if it was so unimportant, why does he raise it now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: My honourable friend is so embarrassed over it that he'd rather I don't, but I want to make reference to the comment that the honourable member made during the budget debate which had something to do with the statistics given by myself in the introduction of my Estimates.

The tenor of his remarks, Mr. Chairman, was one which would suggest that the province, the Government of Manitoba, is deliberately trying to mislead the House and the public with respect to the conditions in agriculture throughout the province; and, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to take a moment to remind my friends opposite that probably if anyone is guilty of indicating that there is a serious problem in the countryside, and perhaps at some point, maybe, exaggerating the problem, I would suggest that that would be yours truly, because in all the presentations that the Government of Manitoba has undertaken with respect to problems in agriculture with other governments and indeed the Government of Canada, we always expounded the fact that there is a very serious economic situation within the prairie region, and always pointed out the need for massive government inputs to deal with it. So let not anyone here assume for a moment this government in introducing the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture was trying to imply anything to the contrary because that is not the case.

But just as a matter of fact I want to respond to the Member for Morris by suggesting to him that the gross value of farm production figures was reported in the budget speech for the years 1965 to 71 under the heading of "Value of Manitoba's Primary Resource Production" and it's a convenient point that my honourable friend has overlooked - at least convenient for him. This has been reported in that manner, Mr. Chairman, for many years, both under the previous administration and this one. So that really my honourable member shouldn't appear so indignant about the way in which statistical data is presented to this Chamber --(Interjection)-- Pretty lousy opposition in those days? Well I'm not so sure about that, because while the opposition may have appeared lousy to my honourable friend opposite, obviously the performance of the then government must have been worse in the eyes of the people of Manitoba or they wouldn't be there, and we wouldn't be here.

If my honourable friend from Morris would have bothered to look into the Manitoba Agricultural Yearbook, and the yearbook opens with the heading of "Value of Farm Production" on page 5, had he done that, Mr. Chairman, had he done his research he probably would have not made the speech that he did during the consideration of the Budget. On page 42 of the latest yearbook, the Honourable Member from Morris would find that figure for every year since 1936.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if I may ask the Minister a question? Has that Agricultural Yearbook been distributed to members of this Chamber?

April 18, 1972

MR. USKIW: Well as I recall it, I think it's done every year.

MR. JORGENSEN: Then I wonder if the Minister could answer the question, why has it not been distributed this year because I have not received a copy?

MR. USKIW: Well I'm not sure as to the timing of it, Mr. Chairman, but nevertheless that information is public information whenever it is made available each year, and my honourable friend would be wise to peruse it most carefully before he chooses to deal with the question of statistics and their meaning. My honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, says that it was attached to the Budget Speech, for the benefit of members opposite. But there's another point, Mr. Chairman, that I want to touch on, and that is the point that the member seems to indicate that gross figures are the important figures to establish the true income picture; and you know it seems to me that it should make a difference to everyone in the consideration of the economic situation, that there is quite a difference to a farmer on the fact of whether he has a full granary or an empty one, or whether indeed he has a 100 head of cattle or 500 head, and so on. So that the true picture that my honourable friend is trying to project, - I don't know that he's trying so hard - could not be reflected in gross figures, and the inventory changes that take place are not inventory changes that are an accumulation of unsold products from previous years, but the difference in the amount of unsold product at the end of a given year, which is contrary to the position that my honourable friend from Morris took a few days ago.

So much for statistics, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to spend a great deal of time on that particular subject matter. --(Interjection)-- Now my honourable friend the Member for Morris says it's not important and I agree that it isn't, but he seems to find it less important today than he thought it was two or three days ago.

The next point, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with is the charge that this government is very much involved in and promoting the idea of the Balkanization of trade within the agricultural sector in Canada, and I want to deal with that at some length, Mr. Chairman, because my honourable friends opposite, my honourable friends opposite have had a great deal to do with the way in which this country has shaped up over the years, not only with respect to agriculture but with respect to all other products produced at the manufacturing end, the service end, so on. Having been in government both provincially and federally in this country, I think that if there are flaws in the system, which my honourable friend seemed to indicate, that there would be if we got into some sort of national marketing arrangements with respect to agricultural products. If those arrangements are flaws then my honourable friends have been promoting them with respect to a number of other areas for many many years. It is only when it comes to the primary producer that my friends opposite get excited when it is suggested that there should be some sort of organized marketing effort, an effort that would determine a degree of bargaining power and muscle in the marketplace and in the economy of this country on behalf of those producers. I want to say that one of the areas of policy making happened to be the presentation of this government's position on Bill C-176 and I would like to recall to the members opposite that some of the suggestions of the Government of Manitoba were eventually brought into Bill C-176 by amendment and we are much happier with the final result than we were when the bill was first proposed. But our propositions, of course, did not suggest that we accepted the philosophy that we ought to get into provincial self sufficiency arrangements, or Balkanization as my friend for Morris would like to indicate.

There are a number of areas that I'd like to cite for the member's benefit, areas beyond agriculture wherein such marketing arrangements exist. I want to make reference to the way in which oil companies in Canada operate. The Canadian market has been shared for decades between foreign and Alberta oil and I don't know whether my friends opposite - I don't know whether my friends opposite understand how that is arrived at but if there were no market sharing, far less Alberta oil would have been sold in Canada if there was not some arrangement whereby the market would be shared with the various suppliers of that commodity in this country. As a matter of fact, the oil companies could easily capture the entire Canadian market by lowering the price of Alberta oil. Instead, Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting that we capped the wells in Alberta while at the same time we get the Government of Canada to bring in measures which would decide the market sharing for the various oil companies in the country. --(Interjection)-- That's right, just like they do with the feed grains. I'm not quarreling with the idea, all I'm saying is that my members opposite were party to those arrangements because they have had some responsibility in making decisions along these lines

(MR. USKIW cont'd) when they were in government both provincially and federally. All I'm pointing out, Mr. Chairman, is that they are very inconsistent when they argue that producers should not have the same kind of opportunity to try to arrange the marketing of their products for some protection to themselves.

I'm wondering whether the members opposite would indicate what the automotive dealership system is if it isn't a market sharing agreement. Everybody can't be an automobile dealer, somehow there is a system developed that decides that there shall be only so many dealerships servicing every community in this country. Now I don't know what one would call that but certainly I would call it a market sharing system even if it's imposed on to the Canadian public from the top.

The International Wheat Agreement which my honourable friends opposite have had a lot to do with, or at least the Member for Morris should be fully familiar with, having served under the former Minister of Agriculture for Canada, the Honourable Alvin Hamilton. I'm sure the Member for Morris would know what kind of market sharing arrangements were arrived at by that agreement.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the members opposite would recognize that when car sales are low, whether or not the companies that are in production of automobiles decide to curtail production or whether they decide to lay off the staff and shut down the plant for part of the year because the markets cannot absorb the full productivity. That again, Mr. Chairman, to me applies in the area of marketing in a rational way producing for a market that is predetermined. And again, I think that's very relevant to the producers of agricultural products who are just trying for the first time to bring about some sense into the marketing of their commodities.

I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, why there is a restriction on the number of medical students or dental students, or why there is a restriction on the number of law students? I don't know whether that is market sharing or whether that is preparing for a given market. It seems to me that we can build, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we can build more universities and crank out more law students and more medical practitioners and more dental practitioners, we can have one for every two citizens if we really think that that is the way to operate. But that is not the way we function in this country, Mr. Chairman, except in the area of agricultural production. And that is the way my honourable friends opposite would like us to continue because they still feel, they still feel that for some reason, for some reason there has to be an exploitable human resource, and one of them is going to be agriculture and the other one is going to be the fishermen and the other one is going to be the unorganized working man. There are still a few left in some parts of Canada which my friends opposite think should continue in that way.

One of the areas that my friends opposite really should be taking a good hard look at, and that is in the area of grain handling and transportation. One of the reasons we have such a mess insofar as grain handling and transportation, as far as grain handling and transportation is concerned is the fact that the Conservative Government of John Diefenbaker who set up the McPherson Royal Commission on Transportation and from that Commission derived a so-called national transportation policy which has haunted us ever since. That is one which suggests that those lines that don't pay have to be abandoned because we can't have unprofitable rail lines in this country. That is one that suggests that we don't have to any longer worry about building a nation, let's rip it apart by removing some of the components that go towards building a nation from coast to coast and continue to provide privileges to certain areas of the country. My honourable friends opposite don't like some of those comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order. The Chair is having difficulty in hearing the Minister of Agriculture. Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take a great deal of time at this point but I want to deal with one other issue that members opposite had taken some exception to, and that is the issue of the changes that took place in the marketing of hogs in Manitoba and the implications of those changes, the benefits or otherwise. My friends would like to argue that there is no monetary benefit to the producers for those changes that took place shortly after the new year, but I want to indicate to the Member for Lakeside who seems to make quite a joke of the fact that the introduction of that system was somewhat delayed. He seems to think that there are motives other than the genuine motives that do exist. I want to say to the members opposite that there were huge variations of price on hogs in Canada, and as

(MR. USKIW cont'd) between Winnipeg and Toronto and between Winnipeg and Minneapolis, as high as 5, 6, and 7 dollar spreads.

So when my honourable friend wants to talk about pork prices being determined on an international or continental basis, that it's a continental market and that really there is not much that can be accomplished by changing the marketing structure in Canada or in Manitoba. I simply want to indicate to my honourable friend that he's full of wind on that one. Simple as that. Because it didn't take very long after the changes in the --(Interjection)-- I'll deal with that in a moment. It didn't take very long, Mr. Chairman, before there was a reduction in the differential between Toronto and Winnipeg prices and Minneapolis and Winnipeg prices.

As a matter of fact, as a matter of fact, I want to give my friends opposite a bit of a lesson, a bit of a lesson. Some members opposite have complained that there isn't sufficient done in the marketing areas and I want to say to them that while they were in office they never even had the marketing capacity within the department or anywhere. There was no such agency. But a year and a half ago we set up the Manitoba Marketing Branch, fully staffed sometime in 1971 and that branch has achieved for us a number of significant developments, and I want to indicate, I want to indicate the relationship between the operation of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board, the Marketing Branch in this regard.

Because there was a large differential in pork prices between Minneapolis and Winnipeg, the Marketing Branch sent a man down to Minneapolis to see whether we can develop a market to move our hogs from Winnipeg to Minneapolis, and I can tell you in a very short period of time, that 8,000 hogs were sold in that way, 8,000 hogs were sold in that way; and our man in Minneapolis was pushing that teletype button at a higher price than was the packing industry in Winnipeg, from time to time. --(Interjection)-- Who started it? The co-ordination of the Manitoba Marketing Branch and the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission. --(Interjection)--

I want to say to my honourable friend that the effect that that had on the local situation was one which caused the packing trade here a bit of nervousness and some of them in fact, did get in touch with me to indicate that they were worried that we might be short of supplies in Manitoba, you know. And at that time when I received that call, hog prices were still pretty low, about 23 cents, and I said to them that really I wouldn't get awfully excited about shortages of hogs because when the market is 23 cents I don't feel very sorry for the argument or for the people that make the argument that there is a concern about a shortage that is going to come about very shortly; that I would feel some urgency if the hog prices were somewhere in the area of 39 or 40 cents, but at 23 cents it was an argument that could really not be considered seriously. But nevertheless, we have had a substantial improvement. We have got to the point now where the relationship between the prices in Minneapolis and Winnipeg are such that we cannot sell hogs into Minneapolis, the prices have come up locally, so there is no real advantage of moving in that direction. But we have the capacity to move quickly should that situation change.

I want to also suggest to members opposite that there was never a capacity, never a capacity to sell hogs outside of North America and for the first time in Manitoba history, the Manitoba Marketing branch was able to secure contracts for pork in Japan. We expect very substantial shipments of pork to Japan this year. I am not going to give you a figure, the original figure was something in the order of 70,000 hogs and now it's looking like quite a bit more. We don't know what it's going to be, but it does look very impressive; and every time we can find a market like that, it helps to stabilize the price for the product that is bought and consumed in Canada. So I want to indicate to members opposite that a great deal has been achieved in this area and it's something that I am rather proud of because it is something that has been long overdue and something that members opposite have never appreciated during the time when they had the responsibility in this area. --(Interjection)--

Of course you did, of course you did. There's no doubt about that. There's no doubt about that at all.

MR. WATT: Would the Minister permit a question right now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, is he suggesting that we can increase hog production in the Province of Manitoba in the next year, by what percentage?

MR. USKIW: I hadn't said anything about increases or decreases in hog production, Mr. Chairman. All I am indicating is that we have found some new opportunities and to the extent that we find more new opportunities and markets which were non-existent before, it helps to

(MR. USKIW cont'd) improve the financial picture for our producers in Manitoba and indeed in Canada.

And further to that, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this is really a small experiment, that what is going to be necessary in the future is a co-ordinated effort on the part of all provinces in Canada if we are going to deal with markets outside of Canada. And this is - I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I remind the Honourable Minister that he has five minutes.

MR. USKIW: Thank you. This is an area which is going to require a great deal of effort on the part of people with a lot of goodwill; because it won't make sense, Mr. Chairman, to have a number of provinces doing exactly what Manitoba is doing in this area, and that is setting up marketing branches, to then go out into the world to compete with each other. It will make a great deal of sense if we co-ordinate those efforts under some sort of either regional or national hook-up, and that is the direction which this government is going to promote.

There is one interesting thing that I want to mention to members opposite with respect to the changes in hog marketing. The Member for Rhineland dealt at some length with the representations at some of our Ag Committee hearings throughout the province and I want to indicate that there is one item that came out of those hearings that I was somewhat amused over but I think it's worth mentioning because it had to do with the changes that were then made in the marketing of hogs in Manitoba.

One of the people that presented a brief to the committee, as members on that committee will recall, indicated that they were no longer in a position to receive free meals at the packing plants in Winnipeg because of the changes in hog marketing. You know, I don't know when farmers are going to learn that it's not important to worry about "free things", but this is one of the things that was brought out at the Ag Committee hearing, that there were no more free meals at the packing plants in St. Boniface.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. USKIW: Only if I can have the additional time later on to finish my ...

MR. MCKELLAR: Did the honourable member ever get a free meal in his life?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well I think that every time my honourable friend would like to take me out for dinner I'll have a free meal. --(Interjection)-- I would think so, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I put the question to my honourable friend, or to the gentleman that presented this case and I asked him why or whether he had tried to get a free meal since January 1st. And he said no, it didn't occur to him that he should even attempt to get a free meal after January 1st. I said, "well why not?" "Well," he said, "why should the packers give me a free meal now when I don't have to deliver my hogs there?" I said to him well obviously if the packers were just doing it out of kindness that they are just as kind today as they were a month before today and that I'm sure if that gentleman would go back to the industry and ask for a free meal ticket that just out of goodwill and good spirit he would get one.

Well strangely enough, you know, some of our people don't know that this is an area of public relations and really it shouldn't matter whether we have compulsory hog marketing or what have you, that if the packing industry is that generous we're quite prepared to fulfil to the utmost. And I suggested that this gentleman do just that, to go back and ask for his free meal ticket. But I said unless you think that the price of that meal came out of the hog that you sold to the packer, then maybe you shouldn't go back ask for that free meal. But otherwise, all things being equal, I was sure that the packing industry is just as nice to its client today as it was three months ago. I would think that that is a matter of fact. I would like anyone to suggest otherwise, Mr. Chairman, because I would not impute any bad things or bad will on the packing industry.

The Member for Rock Lake suggested in his comments that Manitoba went to the Canadian Dairy Commission on bended knee. Well I don't know, after the mess that was made of the dairy industry in Canada for so long, after all the quotas that were lost from Manitoba over a period of years during which time the members opposite had control, I would think that one had to go there with bended knee. But I can tell my honourable friends that that was not the case. We had continuing negotiations going on for a couple of years which did result in a

April 18, 1972

(MR. USKIW cont'd) very large recovery of 1.5 million pounds of butterfat quota -- Mr. Chairman, I'm just about through if the members would wish me to finish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . The Minister have leave?

MR. USKIW: . . . and an additional three million pounds of market share quota. And for the member's benefit, for the benefit of the Member for Rock Lake, the three year period is not an absolute limitation, there will be a review undertaken at that time and I'm sure that if we can make a case for an extension of time to absorb that amount of production that we will get it. But in the meantime, the Milk Control Board is charged with the responsibility of allocating these new opportunities to Manitoba producers. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 8 (a) to 8 (c) (1) was read and passed.) The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: On the question of Administrative Services, can the Minister tell me why we should be spending as we did in '70/71 period a figure something like \$1,680,000, or roughly 12 percent of the total \$14 million in that year on the item of printing and stationary supplies? It seems as though this is a paper war that the Minister is waging on Agriculture rather than an active one.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I didn't quite catch the comment because I was just sitting down to open up my books. What resolution is that on?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, it's on the Administrative Services. I was wondering if the Minister could explain why we should be spending 12 percent, as we did in '70/71 according to Public Accounts, on the item of printing and stationary supplies. It seems as though it's a paper war he's fighting on Agriculture rather than an active one.

MR. USKIW: Is that Item (c) under Administrative Services? I can't see the item here, Sir.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . (c) 1.

MR. USKIW: There's no reference there to pay - or to advertise.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I'm just referring to an item that was in Public Accounts where this department is spending 1 2/3 million dollars on printing and stationary supplies. I assume that's administration and it does very little for the farmer of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well I think, Mr. Chairman, the total figure which my honourable friend refers to in Public Accounts dates back to last year's Estimates --(Interjection)-- that's right, and I would assume that the reference is to all the supplies in this connection which includes many thousands of things that are sent out to people all over Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Minister, it does not include publications.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well again, not having last year's Public Accounts here I can't compare the figure. I'm not sure what the honourable member is suggesting.

A MEMBER: He's referring to Public Accounts.

MR. GRAHAM: Yes and I would gladly give him my copy.

MR. USKIW: No, but he's bringing up Public Accounts . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (b) (1). The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: . . . Manitoba Marketing Board, I see there's \$23,300 here, what does it mean? --(Interjection)-- No, just a second, he called it.

MR. USKIW: What is the question, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, you called (d) (1) did you not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) (1).

MR. FERGUSON: Oh I'm sorry. I was waiting on (d).

MR. USKIW: Well (c) (1), Mr. Chairman, is salaries for the Administrative Services. That is the bulk of it and the other is Other Expenditures of \$31,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on the question of item number (c) Administrative Services, will the Minister of Agriculture endeavour to curtail the amount of paper work that is going on within his department and try and get some more active results for the farmers of Manitoba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well I think my honourable friend ought to be more specific if he thinks that there's an area that should be cutback, an area of services to the people of Manitoba emanating from this department, if he wants a cutback he should tell me where we should cut the Budget.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I am specifically trying to tell him that, and that is in the area of printing and stationary supplies where the Department of Agriculture is spending double, triple and four times as much as any other department of comparable size.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, in response to that, then I'm wondering whether he wants this document abandoned if it was produced by the department or whether he has any specific publications that are now going out that in his opinion should not be going out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, we have a weekly farm bulletin that is going out which strictly duplicates anything that is going out from the Department of Industry and Commerce. Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known fact in the Province of Manitoba that the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Department of Agriculture have been at loggerheads for years and we're getting duplication of service and it's no benefit to the farmers of this province at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Again, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that - unless the honourable member wants to give me a specific suggestion I can't respond to him.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, how more specific does he want it than that?

MR. USKIW: Well what do you want cancelled?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I think perhaps I can help out the situation somewhat by suggesting that the Minister desist from the temptation that his other colleagues have shown and attacked with such enthusiasm. Principally of course the Attorney-General who on numerous occasions likes to send to hundreds of thousands of people in Manitoba his fine photograph etc. Now the Minister of Agriculture has also done that by sending out a little if I recall nice two-colour little booklet explaining the grain situation to all Manitobans; it was a nice little document, we enjoyed reading it but perhaps that was part of the 12 percent of the costs that we're talking about, the paper war. Send us the fact, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, on the farming scenes and we will look for the pictures of yourself in the newspapers and use them for our scrap books but don't spend the taxpayers' money on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friends opposite are really on weak ground when they suggest that a publication that is so vitally important -- or the information contained in the publication which is so vitally important to so many thousands, 36,000 farmers in Manitoba, should not be provided.

MR. ENNS: What's so vitally important about your picture, man?

MR. USKIW: What is so vitally important, Mr. Chairman? The Member for Lakeside says to me that it's not important that the people of ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. USKIW: ... that the farmers of Manitoba who are going to be subject to legislation being promoted at the federal level and who are going to pay costs related to legislation should not be informed as to the implications of that legislation. And the Manitoba Government decided if it was going to have a fight with Ottawa on agricultural policy that it's going to fight with 36,000 farmers informed. And my honourable friends had never thought of that vehicle in terms of their dialogue with Ottawa some years ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 8 (c) (1) ... The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could provide us with the number of people employed under the various categories -- Planning, Administrative Services and Marketing Board where we have salaries listed, the number of people that are employed under each.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I will indicate to the Member for Rhineland in terms known as staff man years, not people, because we have people that serve for part of the year. These are staff man years. General Administration, we have eight staff man years; that is in the Planning and Management section, Mr. Chairman. General Administration: 44.5; Manitoba

April 18, 1972

(MR. USKIW cont'd) Marketing Board: 3/4 of . . . Oh I'm reading the wrong year. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I was reading from the wrong column. In terms of General Administration we have 13.5 and we have 47.5 in General Administration; 2.5 in Manitoba Marketing Board. Did you want me to go all the way down the line, right down to the bottom? Animal Industry has 2 in the administration end and 22 in the Livestock and Product Inspection and Consulting Services. Animal Industry Management, Livestock Management 26. Veterinary Services 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I'm becoming confused here because we're dealing with (c) (1) and we're now getting information on the other ones.

MR. USKIW: We're going past, that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that we should deal with the resolution 8 (c) (1) proceed item by item. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under (e) we're dealing research. In other years we did get special publication giving us an account of the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're under . . . Order, please. For the benefit of the Honourable Member for Rhineland we're on Resolution 8 (c) (1), not (e). (c) (1) -- passed, (c) (2) -- passed, (c) -- passed, (d) (1) . . . The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. FERGUSON: . . . explain if he would the fact that there's \$23,300 for the Manitoba Marketing Board, what's entailed in this expenditure.

MR. USKIW: Yes, we have 2.5 staff man years, Mr. Chairman, and it's the related expenses surrounding those people. Those are mainly salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) (1) . . .

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, just a second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: This doesn't explain too much. What kind of a board is it? What's it representing?

MR. USKIW: Well the Manitoba Marketing Board has a secretary which services the marketing boards in Manitoba. It's a secretary to the Manitoba Marketing Board which is the big salary figure. --(Interjection)-- Well we have a Natural Products Marketing Act for the benefit of my friends opposite which was on the books for many years and the administration of that act demands that we have a marketing board and a secretary to the marketing board. This figure represents the salary of that secretary plus an additional -- a clerk steno, okay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution (d) (1) . . . The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Manitoba Marketing Board I believe it's the appropriate place to discuss the questions and ask the Minister some specific questions relating to the operation of the marketing boards as such, namely in the first instance with respect to the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board. Shortly after coming into operation the government or the new board I should say correctly found it necessary to increase the levy, the check-off from what I believe was 35 cents per hog marketed to 50 cents per hog marketed. Now it's been my recollection that during the tenure of the board when it was operating under the 35 cent levy that within a relatively short . . .

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: The matter that the member raises, I'm not sure if I'm right but I don't think it's relevant to the estimates because we are not involved in that particular area other than the passing of an Order-in-Council authorizing a marketing board to set their own fees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't accept that narrow definition of the discussion of marketing boards. As I understand it, the Manitoba Marketing Board which is the specific item that we're now on at the estimates has the over-all supervisory you know responsibility of looking at all boards, commissions of a marketing nature as such. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it's quite in order to discuss certainly at this particular point any individual aspects of any one of these boards that we choose to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to -- I don't disagree

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the same point of order?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . with my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside despite the support he's receiving from Souris-Killarney. I wonder whether the more appropriate part of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the estimates for consideration of this would be when we get down to Resolution No. 14 dealing with marketing itself. There is a difference between the administration within the Minister's -- the administration and marketing itself which I believe is on No. 14. I can stand correcting -- corrected on this but I believe it would be more appropriate on 14.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe as I understand the Resolution 14 - Marketing deals with a considerably broader aspect of an approach by the department in terms of providing a marketing thrust for the department. I certainly accept, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's prerogative of not choosing to answer you know specific questions if he chooses not to but I believe that this is the particular point of the estimates to discuss. --(Interjection)-- Well then namely the question that I would ask the Minister to consider: why was it necessary to increase as one of the first acts of the new Hog Marketing Commission Board the levy from 35 cents to 50 cents per hog when that 35 cent levy to the best of my recollection within a relatively few short years accumulated pretty impressive surpluses? I believe the surpluses ran upwards to 70,000 or \$75,000 that the 35 cent levy amassed. Indeed it was this surplus that to a large extent made it possible for the government -- and I was part of the government at that time -- to consider the construction of the present facilities of the Hog Marketing Commission -- and I'd simply ask the Honourable Minister whether or not in his judgment the 50-cent levy is firstly justified. Secondly, and I appreciate the fact that you are now handling 100 percent of the hogs whereas you were only handling maybe 50 to 60 percent of the hogs or 65 percent of the hogs prior to this, but would it not have been a more prudent course to have allowed the 35-cent levy to remain and if indeed that levy proved to be insufficient then to raise it to that amount that was necessary rather than an arbitrary considerable rise to 50 cents before you even have given the 35-cent levy an opportunity. That's one particular question, Mr. Chairman. I've raised on other occasions a concern with the Minister about the Hog Marketing Commission that it will in fact proceed as outlined under the regulations to an elective producer board. I have some concerns in that particular area.

Secondly on another question of marketing I would ask the Minister why he has found it impossible to give serious consideration to the long-standing, long-standing request by the cattlemen in the Province of Manitoba to consider a beef check-off or a red meats check-off that would of course come under the consideration -- under the purview of the Manitoba Marketing Board with respect to any regulations adhering thereto. You know, Mr. Chairman, the Minister finds it not too difficult to impose or to have or to create a compulsory situation when it comes to the dealing with hogs because as I suggested earlier the political climate was right to do so. His answer to date to my knowledge has been to refuse the cattlemen their voluntary check-off because he's not so sure whether or not the politics of that are particularly correct. He does not, as I suggest, he may want to talk about the necessity of a plebiscite. He did not find a plebiscite necessary when he introduced compulsory marketing of hogs. It seems to me that the cattlemen's requests here which have been made repeatedly both to the Minister of this government, to the Minister of previous governments, they have gone to the Manitoba Marketing Board in the proper manner, have developed plans; they have indicated to the government what they intend to do with the money, how they intend to use it and certainly are open to the guidance and the suggestions of the Manitoba Marketing Board and it seems to me that this request is long overdue.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the third matter that I want to raise and this is all that I want to raise is if the Minister of Agriculture again wishes to repeat his firm belief that the matter of bringing a product under compulsory marketing has such tremendous benefits overnight as he claims for it, and as the Throne Speech and as the Budget Speech claims for it in the hog industry then I ask him, why, Sir, has he not rectified that glaring, damning error that I made in which he roundly criticized me and my government for when in 1966/67 I emasculated the Vegetable Marketing Commission and took seven-eighths of the compulsory features of the vegetable marketing industry out of compulsory marketing. I recall the Minister at that time spreading the doom and gloom about what -- how I was ruining the vegetable industry. I note, Sir, I have to note with some interest that in the intervening years the Minister has chosen to make no move to rectify what he then considered to be a most serious error in a marketing decision; that nothing has changed since the days that the trucks rolled up the legislative steps and we had a pretty hectic hearing. Of course those were the years where vegetables seemed to excite the people of Manitoba; we have since come on to I suppose

April 18, 1972

(MR. ENNS cont'd) more earth-shattering things such as hydro development or what have you. But I ask the Minister that particular question: Would he not consider -- or why he would deny the vegetable growers that instant panacea of success and prosperity by putting them under compulsory marketing that he claims he can do for the or has done for the hog producers?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the points that the member relates I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. USKIW: . . . are most interesting and indeed are worthy of a reply. The first one having to do with the increase in handling fees of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission. I simply want to indicate to the Member for Lakeside and members opposite that we have had a number of requests by the Pork Producers' Association of Manitoba for a check-off which would go towards the promotion and development of markets for hogs, for pork products. And that is one of the reasons why an increase was provided for since the beginning of the year.

The other has to do with numerous requests from producers for facilities to wash trucks at the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission and that is an area that has had some difficulty in that we don't have adequate facilities. We have some trouble in getting permission to build a wash rack facility at the Hog Marketing Commission plant and really the problem arises because of the inadequate way in which my honourable friends opposite when they were in government set up the commission. One of the provisions that they put into their agreement in building that facility was that they would not go into the business of washing farm vehicles even though the Health Department demands that all vehicles must be washed before they leave the premises. Now I would hazard a guess that the reason they made that requirement on the commission was because there were other people in the business of washing trucks and they didn't want to add to the competition. Now we find ourselves in a position --(Interjection)-- We find ourselves in a position, Mr. Chairman, where they are not being washed and people are driving away with dirty vehicles. And I am certain that both the health people and the clean environment people are one of these days going to pounce on a lot of these people unfairly and all because of the way in which this whole thing was structured in the first place. So we are negotiating with people at the national level and the railway people to try and get around the agreement that was first entered into to allow us to build a wash facility and for that reason we have agreed that there may be a need for increase in fees. When those things are accomplished, Mr. Chairman, there is always an ability to reduce the fees if funds are not required. But those are the two points: the promotional side of it in the marketing field and the need for some improvement in the wash facilities at the Hog Marketing Commission yards.

The second point the Member for Lakeside raised was the one having to do with when an elected board would be in operation. I want to say that the regulations that were passed demand that machinery be put in place which would bring about an elected board and that that had to be done within a three-month period and my information has it that work is underway in that direction at the present time and there will be election of board officials some time in the not too distant future. I can't be more precise than that at this time because I don't have at this point a developmental plan that would bring this about. But that is in the making at the present time.

The question of a red meat check-off I think that the Member for Lakeside would want to be fair in this regard. He suggested to me that it was probably politically expedient to move towards compulsory hog marketing, and when he used the words "political expediency" or whatever term it was it implied that -- he I think used it in the very political sense and I would suggest to the Member for Lakeside that there are politics beyond this arena, that there are politics within the producer group which have to be considered. And as far as I am aware, Mr. Chairman, the politics within the hog producers were such that there was a consensus towards compulsory hog marketing, at least there was sufficient numbers of them that appeared before me including the Hog Producers' Association of Manitoba that influenced my hand in that direction but I at this point can't say that I am still fully justified in moving towards a beef check-off as of today. We have not said "no" to the proposition. It may very well be that a month from today that my position could be different but we are looking at the question and we are trying to determine the consensus of beef producers on that question.

The next point that the Member for Lakeside dealt with had to do with why the

(MR. USKIW cont'd) Government of Manitoba didn't do something about the marketing of vegetables, why we didn't reverse the action that was taken by the Member for Lakeside when he was Minister in charge. I simply want to indicate again that my attack on him although warranted at that time had to be fully understood, and if the Member for Lakeside would go back to my comments at that time my attack was the fact that the Member for Lakeside as Minister of the day did not properly and fully consult with the industry, with the people involved, before he made that decision. At least in our opinion. And I think there was evidence to that effect. It was a sledge hammer approach. Now I'm not saying that had there been adequate discussions, --(Interjection)-- I'm not saying had there been adequate discussions that that wouldn't have taken place in any case. It's only the authoritarian way in which the Member for Lakeside as Minister approached the matter that was a concern of myself and my colleagues when we were in opposition. --(Interjection)-- At the present time there are people that are involved in the small vegetable industry that are working towards the establishment of marketing boards in that area. There have been surveys underway. The Manitoba Marketing Board has been involved. At this point I don't have a proposal before me but I expect that there likely will be one and I will consider it on its merit and on whether or not I feel that it's right to move in that direction in that the majority of people involved in that commodity will want me to move in that direction. If I'm satisfied that that is the consensus of producers of carrots or cabbage or turnip or what have you, if I'm satisfied that producers in those areas want some action...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 9:00 o'clock . . . prefer to give the gentlemen or strangers within the Chamber time to withdraw.

Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, at this time, Private Members' Hour, we could go into the private members' bills. Unfortunately the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre is not present which means that 7 and 9 would have to stand and I therefore suggest you might like to call Bill 18, if that's acceptable,

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon) presented Bill No. 18, an Act to amend the Flin Flon Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, in 1955 and 1956 by chapters 88 and 77, the Statutes of those years, the City of Flin Flon which was then a town of course was given authority to enter into agreement with any operator who was willing to provide a public transportation system. --(Interjection)-- Well that's not very important --(Interjection)-- who was given authority to enter into an agreement with any operator who was willing to provide a public transportation system in the town. Various agreements and various operators have carried on the bus service in Flin Flon since that time, not without some considerable controversy at various times. At present the city has an agreement with Flin Flon Bus Lines Limited operated by a Mr. Cassan who is a principal shareholder in the company and by and large the operation since it was taken over by Mr. Cassan has been a satisfactory operation to the city.

The problem arises however in that Section 36 (a) and 36 (b) require that for every change in the agreement approval of the ratepayers must be obtained and this is a costly and protracted procedure since especially in these days of rising costs the bus operator through his auditors has about every two years approached the city with a view to having the subsidy

(MR. BARROW cont'd) for fares changed. There's an application by the bus operator at the present time before the city asking for an increase in subsidy and this if changed which the city has agreed to would if its present sections in the Charter stands necessitate a vote of the ratepayers.

However the new Municipal Act by Section 267 allows all municipalities within the province and governed by the -- and governed by the Municipal Act which the city generally is to enter into agreement with bus operators or public transportation system operators to operate within the city without the necessity of a vote of the ratepayers approving the agreement or approving the payment of a subsidy. These sections generally govern as we've stated municipalities throughout the province and Flin Flon feels that it should be placed on the same footing as other cities and towns in the province and not be required to have a vote every time there is a slight or even major change in bus franchise agreement. However it will still be a requirement that the Public Utilities Board approve of any change in this agreement or payment of the subsidy or the terms of the agreement or the fares of course. And most certainly the city is not trying to avoid having to obtain the approval of the board in the event of changes or new agreement.

There was a further matter and that is the matter of the amount of the subsidy. Under the old sections in the Charter 36 (a) and 36 (b) the city was limited to payment of a subsidy of a maximum of two mills on the latest revised assessment and the city is now fast approaching this figure. Under Section 267 of The Municipal Act no ceiling is placed on the payment of subsidies and as you are probably well aware there are very few public transportation systems now which can operate without a subsidy. They are however a very important service for the general public in cities or towns where they operate. The bus system in Flin Flon is a very necessary service. For this reason the council over the years had seen fit to keep the system going and to pay the subsidy as a service to the general public in Flin Flon.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Number 9.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Charleswood, that

WHEREAS there are many elderly people who are afflicted with chronic and degenerative diseases of old age; and

WHEREAS these people may not be acutely ill enough to be eligible for admission to hospitals where costs are covered by the Manitoba Hospital Insurance Scheme yet are unable to be cared for at home; and

WHEREAS they have contributed to said insurance schemes for many years in the hope of protecting themselves against catastrophic costs of illness; and

WHEREAS they must resort to alternative care such as nursing homes where they do not benefit from this insurance; and

WHEREAS it is desirable to relieve the pressure on high cost acute care hospital beds as expeditiously as possible;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Government consider the advisability of including alternative facilities such as nursing homes as insured services under the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Plan.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is now thirteen years since hospitalization insurance was introduced in Manitoba and almost 30 years since the Manitoba Medical Service first began its non-profit insurance plan to -- which was designed to protect people against the catastrophic costs of prolonged illness. The two services are now functioning as one under a government agency. But a further rationalization of health care I feel is long overdue. Without the inclusion of alternative care such as nursing homes the system can't function as efficiently and cannot fulfil its purpose as it should. There are many people, elderly people, who are not acutely ill and aren't eligible for care under the insured services even though they have paid for many years in the eventuality that they would need some degree of health care. So they must watch their life savings drained away until they are destitute and at that point

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) they can become wards of the government.

I would like to relate to the House the case history of a man who phoned me when he saw the newspaper item concerning Ontario Government's plan to include nursing homes in the insured services there. This man was head messenger in a bank. He had brought up three sons and had managed to give them all a university education. In 1962 he was forced to retire because of a heart condition. His wife became unwell and he wasn't able to look after her so she had to be placed in a nursing home which cost \$14.50 a day. That amounts to \$375.00 a month or about \$4,500 a year. And in addition to that there were medicines and clothes which had to be provided. This man has sold his house, he sold his car and his insurance policies in order to cover the costs of his wife's requirements. I think that this man is -- his case is typical of many others who have found themselves in the same circumstances.

A couple of sessions ago, Mr. Speaker, I brought forward a similar resolution. At that time I asked the government to exempt people in nursing homes from having to pay their hospitalization premiums since they were unable to receive any benefits from it. At that time we were told that negotiations were underway with the Federal Government for cost sharing, that is of nursing home care. But if they can be persuaded to pay half, Mr. Speaker, I think that would be very fine but I don't think that discussions with the Federal Government provide an adequate excuse for the Provincial Government to have taken no action concerning their health. I wonder what the government's priorities are? Whether they feel they can't afford it? They seem to be expanding in many other directions.

Let's take a look at the present situation. About 62 percent of the people who are in nursing homes at the present time already have their expenses paid by the government through Care Services. So this leaves about 40 percent who are paying their own way. Now at the middle of February when I made an inquiry there were 39 patients waiting at the Winnipeg General Hospital for a chronic care bed. The average at any time in that hospital I understand is 20 to 30 patients. The beds they are occupying at the General Hospital cost \$72.50 a day. If sufficient beds were available in extended care facilities such as the municipal hospitals these same people who need less nursing and medical treatment could be cared for at a cost of about \$30.00 to \$34.00 a day. But in that complex at the moment, Mr. Speaker, there are between 60 and 100 people waiting for admission and at the other end there are 30 to 45 who are ready to be moved out into a nursing home type of facility if it would happen to be available. Those nursing home beds would cost, oh around 12.00 to \$14.50 a day or up to as much as \$25.00 depending on the type of accommodation and the extra services which the patient would wish to have.

However some families have discovered that if they remove their parent from the Princess Elizabeth Hospital -- which he is covered by insurance -- to a nursing home then the family has to pay. So in some instances they simply refuse to reassume responsibility for the parent and hospital administration acting under legal advice is not allowed to move the patient out. They are told that they would be in severe difficulties if the patient came to any harm. So for lack then of coverage of nursing home care within the Insured Services, there are patients backed up and waiting in much more expensive facilities. Before consideration could be given to covering nursing home care of course we would have to insure that there is an adequate supply of beds. There are about 100,000 or so elderly people in the province and it's estimated that 2.5 per thousand need some degree of nursing care. About 2,500 beds are supposed to be sufficient to do the job.

In 1970, the annual report of the Department of Health and Social Development stated that there were 1,022 new hostel and nursing home beds. In 1971, the report that has just come out, in a statistical report it is stated that there are now 1,875 personal care homes in operation. The statistical bulletin indicates that there are a further 790 under construction, for an expected total of 2,665 which is more than adequate for a beginning. Proposed projects which are apparently only in the planning stage, represent a further 501 beds. In order to determine eligibility, a team of perhaps three doctors could assess the patients' needs and prevent unloading of those who might still be cared for in their home.

On application to Care Services at the present time for financial assistance in nursing home cost, the government puts a financial officer to work assessing the patient and his assets. There can be a delay of several weeks while the patient continues to occupy a more costly bed in a general hospital waiting for the determination of his eligibility for assistance.

In Ontario, the criterion used to determine qualification is that the patient must be in

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) need of at least one and a half hours of nursing care per day. In Alberta, the nursing home plan is administered by nursing home district boards and the Alberta Health Services Commission. These district boards have the power to construct and operate nursing homes or they can delegate that power to another organization or to a person. The per diem amount paid in Alberta is set by regulations and at present I believe that's about \$6.50 per patient per day. Ontario is paying up to a maximum of \$12.50 a day.

Quite apart from the more efficient and economic use of health care resources there's another benefit to be considered which would just naturally follow. It would no longer be necessary to use up patient's resources before he became eligible for assistance. At the present time his own resources are used up until he has \$500 left; this is to provide \$300 for his funeral and the remainder for extraordinary costs such as Christmas gifts, this sort of thing. What an ignominious position he is in. He is physically unable to look after himself and then he's systematically pauperized by the Provincial Government. I really think that more of them should take to a practice such as occurred in some instances of simply having one last glorious fling, taking a trip to Europe or spending the winter in Florida, Caribbean Island, and simply using up your resources in that fashion -- which is done and why not? I mean why should anyone be in a hurry to become the victim of a big impersonal machine of government? This practice of forcing already helpless people into further helplessness from which they are unable to escape, no matter how unhappy or dissatisfied they are, is debasing and degrading to them.

I know that somebody over there in replying is going to say well the Conservatives did it. And I'm, really, Mr. Speaker, becoming very weary of hearing that constant reiteration "you did it when you were in office". To me, Mr. Speaker, this is a very childish attitude, we're living in the present not in the past. I settled this matter with my children in their very earliest years when they came in and said, "Johnny can stay out till 10:00 o'clock, why can't I?" We quickly established the fact that because somebody else did something there's no excuse for a similar asocial behaviour from someone else.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to refer to a newspaper clipping from the Tribune of September 16, 1971, an article by Val Werier concerning nursing care making paupers of the elderly. He mentions the fact that sometimes the parent may give his resources to his children then if five years haven't elapsed all sorts of complications can occur. He says, "this gives rise to unhappy situations. A parent may legitimately transfer property to children and then within less than five years may have to live in a nursing home. The province then may ask the children to transfer it back to the parent; this is so the province may place a lien on the property.

The five-year rule can rebound in another way. There have been cases of elderly persons signing their property over to their children to escape the five-year rule and then finding themselves kicked out by their children. The elderly have been advised by Mrs. Evelyn Shapiro, the Executive of the Age and Opportunity Bureau to be very careful and talk to their lawyers before they take such action. He notes further that nursing care bills can also drain the resources of children who want to pay for the cost of their parents even though they are not required to. Cases like this are brought to my attention quite frequently and I would think that the Minister would hear from them quite frequently himself.

Well, I did say that I feel that it is not an excuse to say that the Conservatives did it because the fact is that we over here if we had the decision to make now would not continue this practice of pauperizing people. It's difficult to understand why this government has not seen fit to do something about this situation. In 1970, I believe government expenditures went up by something like \$69 million and this year they're close to another \$60 million and surely in that amount of expansion of expenditures there might have been enough somewhere that you could have taken this humanitarian gesture to relieve the pressure on these people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has two minutes.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that as people are living to a greater age, almost every family in Manitoba is being touched by this problem. We had hoped that with the Member from Seven Oaks acting as chairman of a Cabinet committee which concerned itself with Youth and Education, Health and Social Development and so on, that he might be a stronger advocate in Cabinet and would be persuasive enough to convince the Cabinet that this type of reform should be taken. However, that apparently hasn't happened, we don't see anything in these Estimates to indicate that. But Mr. Speaker, I think that if

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) some of the waste and the extravagance which we have observed in the government's expenditures and about which we hear reports almost daily on this side, if just some of that was done away with I think that the costs of ensuring nursing home services could be carried very easily.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to support the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. I find myself somewhat in a dilemma though because I felt that I had covered this subject reasonably well in the Budget Debate. But having listened to her, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize to the best of my ability the situation as I see it with regard to some of our senior citizens. In Swan River we are fortunate that we have a senior citizens home and an extended care home is presently being constructed and we will be reasonably well off under those circumstances. But in the past, Mr. Speaker, I have been confronted with many problems by these old people, as I am sure every member of the House has at one time or another. The human cry of course has been when they have become bedridden that they would be admitted into the hospital and after a given length of time through force of circumstances and the requirements of the bed and them not needing entire medical attention, to have them moved on at the earliest possible moment.

On the other hand, as the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has point out, that thrifty people down through the years have provided for their old age and having fortunately reached that stage, if one of them should take seriously ill or be afflicted with a disease that requires that they receive some small attention, those savings are soon liquidated and the one that may be left after several years of illness of the other party could be left destitute.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the people that my colleague is pleading for and those that are reaching that stage, find themselves in a terrible position these days with inflation and all that goes along with it. They realize that - well they are - they're helpless to do anything about it and in many instances they've outlived many of their family and many of them are left destitute. This I think, Mr. Speaker, is grossly unfair and I feel that the government in all its sincerity and the ample funds it seems to be developing and spending in so many directions, surely something can be found for the 10,000 or what was it? -- (Interjection) -- 100,000 pensioners that are approaching the stage where they're going to require the assistance of the State. It has always been my philosophy, Mr. Speaker, that we should take care of the very young and certainly take care of the very old, and those in between that are crippled and blind that really need help, society should take care of them and the rest of us should take care of ourselves. Somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, this burden has to be taken from the shoulders of these people and after all, my colleague is simply asking for the government to give serious consideration and in her resolution she asks the government to "consider the advisability", and surely at this stage with everything that has been said and everything that has gone before, that they will take this recommendation seriously and give it the thought and consideration that it rightfully deserves. I appeal to the whole House to support the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on this very very important matter toward an important segment of our society.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up in this debate for a few moments, but to begin with I would like to welcome both honourable members who have spoken over to this side of the House. We have one empty seat that has recently been vacated, it is all nicely polished and dusted off, and it seems that that's where either one or the other belongs, because they are saying now exactly what we had been saying while we were in opposition over the years. The thoughts that they expressed do not come as a new revelation by any means as though it were something that had just recently been discovered. I can quote chapter and verse where the same thoughts, almost the same words, were used not so very long ago. What they were saying gives the appearance of being a rerun of what had already been run through the mill, and it is just the opposite now to what the same party was saying just three years ago. -- (Interjection) -- I don't think so, I might run out of time, but afterwards, if you wish, either in the House or privately.

I would like to refer the honourable members to Hansard of 1969, May 5th, pages 1926 to 1930 where the words that I spoke on this subject are printed -- (Interjection) -- And what did they do about it? The then Minister backed away from the idea that was being represented. He warned against pressures to overexpand services where they would mean only an increase in cost and then he said that such requests are a product of a characteristic of our economy of

April 18, 1972

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd) a steadily rising expectation on the part of our citizens for better and better services. He made this statement probably to warn people against making too many demands and this was directly with reference to including nursing homes under hospitalization. He used such expressions as "under review", "the subject is under review". "Studies are being made." "Task forces have been organized." "That there are long term plans and that there are certain first priorities and so on." -- (Interjection) -- The question is asked who was it? It was Dr. George Johnson, my very good friend. I don't impugn his character in any way but he was a member of that party that had its clutches on him. But -- (Interjection) -- He sat in that very seat.

I would like to read briefly, Mr. Speaker, just a word or two, a word of two from my own speech, although I've given you the pages and it's easy enough for anybody to turn to them, and it seemed to me, at least I had the impression that these words had been read by either one or the other of both speakers because they reflected so accurately what I had been saying. That's why I'm inviting them -- that's why I'm inviting them to come over and join us. We have room for one, we could make room for the other.

A MEMBER: By the Lord, Harry, she can come over.

MR. PETURSSON: But these are some of the words that I spoke at that time. 'It would seem to me somehow to be an anachronism for a patient to be admitted to the municipal hospitals and being on hospitalization to receive the full benefit of his membership in a hospital like the King George, the King Edward, Princess Elizabeth, and then on discharge to be directed to seek out a nursing home where the full weight of the cost would be his responsibility except where Care Services might step in. Not only that but nursing home accommodation is very limited among us with the result often that where the doctor is in charge, passes the judgment that a patient has no need of the hospital services as such, that is if he has progressed to a point where he does not require active medical help, that he should be discharged. A social worker on the staff is instructed to make arrangements either with the patient's family or with the nursing home, often to find a waiting list in the nursing homes with all the accompanying problems of having to wait. I have personally had experience with families who have felt harassed and frustrated where a patient could not be taken into the home, that is the residential home, residence, perhaps because he could not be given the necessary care in his own home. There was no one there to give that care.'

And then I cite an illustration just the same as the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge did: I give an illustration of a woman whose husband was to be sent home into her care. She was told that she would have to take him into the home but she herself was in poor health and nearing the age of 80, and finally ill health overcame her and she died while her old husband now nearing 90 continues to live on. "The whole area, this whole area," I said then, "is one in which almost helpless people are being dealt with." And then illustrating the kinds of pressures that are built up under situations of this kind I said, "The doctor is under pressure; the social worker is under pressure; the people involved are at a period of life when they are most helpless and most vulnerable, and feel most harassed, and most threatened because in many cases they don't know where to turn. And the question is how can we solve these problems?" -- (Interjection) -- What did you do in ten years? What did you do in ten years, Sir? You did nothing except make proposals that you were thinking of it, or you were going to organize task forces and have it under review and make long-term plans which were the first priority. There was no indication that at that time there was any effort to move, no.

Mr. Chairman, I am asked what do we propose to do. If I may read a statement: "The policy of this government regarding the objective of insuring nursing home services has been clearly stated. Since 1970 we have been negotiating with Ottawa to accept the principle and share the costs. In the meantime this government remains committed to its objective of providing insured nursing care services," and that's the very thing that is being asked for. "We see nursing home care as a part of a continuum of services that range from adequate housing and home care to acute and extended care hospital facilities. It is not our objective to solve financial and social problems by herding the aged and chronically ill indiscriminately into nursing homes. Accordingly we have given high priority to low cost housing for the elderly as both a preventive and an alternative to institutional living. By the end of this fiscal year we anticipate that the number of units of elderly persons' housing will almost double the total number made available during the period from 1958 to the end of the last fiscal year." -- (Interjection) -- That's right. Less than three years. Two and a half years.

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd)

"This fiscal year we are, in co-operation with Ottawa, budgeting \$10 million in social allowances to provide nursing homes and home care services for those who need them and cannot afford to pay for them. The programs for the aged and chronically ill must be carefully planned. The objective is to provide the fullest and most efficient range of services required to meet the needs of individuals in indifferent health, family, social and economic circumstances. As a basis for planning insured nursing home and other services for the aged this government has conducted a province-wide survey of institutions and aged persons to provide us with insight into the needs of the elderly and the resources and services available to them."

And I point out, Mr. Speaker, that while the former government was proposing to make studies and take matters under review and to set up task forces, we in two and a half years are taking some action, where for ten years they sat immobilized. Additional complementary studies of nursing home programs, facilities and costs are underway in addition to what I just mentioned. And despite the -- (Interjection) -- You can read it in Hansard if you can read. Despite the resolution from the honourable members this House knows that the Manitoba Government has considered the advisability of including alternative facilities such as nursing homes under the Federal-Provincial Health Services Insurance Plan. The House knows that the Manitoba Government has acted towards including alternative facilities such as nursing homes under insured services, and the House knows that the government continues to act towards achieving this object, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Radisson, that all the words following the word "resolved", in the operative section of the resolution be deleted and the following words substituted therefor: "That this Assembly approves the Manitoba Government's objective of including alternative facilities such as nursing homes, as insured services under the Federal-Provincial cost-shared Health Services Insurance Plan."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not honoured to be of the same clan as the two speakers and it seems to be a "me too" night and I was just thinking while the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge was introducing the resolution it took my mind back to around June 1st last year when I tried to present a resolution very similar, and it was just about two years prior to that my former colleague, the now Senator Molgat, introduced a resolution like that and I'm very glad to hear that the member that just spoke had his members' attention and his members' concern as far as this resolution is concerned.

Now I'm not just too sure why the amendment unless it's just a matter of stalling it for a little while, and I hope it isn't, only referring if and when the Federal Government will give the necessary monies. However I don't think that's good enough if that party over there has been serious the last three years, and this party over here is now also serious with the rest of us, I think something should be done immediately. And I must agree with the honourable member that presented the resolution, as she mentioned at the start, or I think I heard her say, that all Manitobans are required by law to belong to the Manitoba Hospital Services plan. She said it a little different but I think that's what she meant and of course have to pay the premiums that support that plan. And as we all know these premiums are levied regardless of ability to pay. They apply in equal measure to the rich and to the poor.

Now the Hospital Services plan offers protection for Manitobans for costs incurred during the sicknesses that require placement in certain or specified hospitals by licensed medical doctors. But there are many people, Mr. Speaker, who suffer illnesses that do not require the kind of intensive care available at hospitals and yet are still for all intents and purposes really incapacitated and incapable of either working for a living, or incapable of caring for themselves. Now these unfortunate citizens, as has been made mention in other cases tonight, are not covered by any aspect of the present plan and yet we suggest should be the responsibility of a concerned society. Now, Mr. Speaker, our society should not show concern only for those who are so critically ill that they require the kind of round-the-clock constant care provided in a hospital but I think they should also, we should consider those who suffer chronic illnesses that require less direct supervision but are still beyond the capabilities of the patient himself.

Under the present system, Mr. Speaker, when a person becomes ill but not so

April 18, 1972

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd). desperately ill, as I just tried to say, that he requires immediate hospitalization his choices or choice of actions are often limited. I couldn't help but think while the honourable member was speaking this is exactly what happened to a friend, the former Member for Carillon, also the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Prefontaine, that we were paying respect to the other day -- his was a condition of wanting perhaps not himself so much but the family wanting to have him at a place where he's more available, where he'd get the same fine service that he got in the hospital that he was in under more relaxed conditions. And I'm not just speaking like this because our nursing care home at Steinbach is just about finished, and I'm sure that we'll have no trouble filling it up. It's a beautiful place but it was much needed. I'm very happy to see this resolution in here tonight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a person has the option of course of remaining in his own home or in the home of relatives to convalesce; certainly he has the ability to seek competent medical assistance at no charge under the Manitoba Medical, but it is often difficult to find the doctors who can find time to make a continuing series of house calls to individual patients, and at the same time the day to day personal care and the constant vigilance requested, or required of a sick person becomes the responsibility of nursing a member of the family for an extended period of time. And we all know what an emotional drain this can be on the surrounding people and on the patient himself of course. And I agree that it would be much more practical for a person who found himself in such circumstances to place himself in the care of a nursing home, or an extended care home, where under the direction of, first of all, his physician and under the constant care of the staff of the home, I think his recuperation could proceed much faster, and I think we agree by now by what has been said and by previous resolutions, we agree that the costs of the modest professional care provided by the best of these nursing and extended care homes does not begin to compare, as the honourable member was pointing out, begin to compare with costs involved in operating a hospital bed, and of course there are many obvious reasons for that.

In 1970, Mr. Speaker, the average annual cost of maintaining a hospital bed was in excess of \$13,000.00. I should perhaps not go into figures at this time, I feel perhaps there are others that would like to say a few words but it struck me when you start comparing, that the money you could save by pleasing people, by having people convalesce as they wish to. Now many chronically ill people who cannot, Mr. Speaker, for one reason or another stay in their own home, and we have many cases that we could refer to, and who cannot afford a nursing or extended care home, simply make use of hospital facilities and of course this is where our costs keep escalating. They stay in an accredited hospital in order to qualify just simply to qualify for coverage under the Hospital Services Plan. The present law, I think, encourages the use of these costly facilities by those who could quite easily and safely be cared for in a nursing or extended care home. And the strain on existing hospital facilities has become quite acute in itself and can even result, we know, very often result in delay to critically ill patients who desire legitimate hospital services.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we will not support this resolution, I think that many other figures could be brought out -- I mean support -- and I feel that perhaps -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I want that abundantly clear -- we'll have no problem in supporting this amendment to the tune where it's a good start that eventually we'll get to the resolution, and I hope not too long a time from now.

We also know, Mr. Speaker, that out-patient services are already being provided in some cases under the Hospital Services Plan. I don't have to cite the rules and regulations on that. I understand that two years ago these grants were extended to the Winnipeg General Hospital, the Children's and the St. Boniface Hospitals, for patients who were admitted to these hospitals for diagnostic care and treatment but were not assigned a bed in the hospital. Only approximately \$300,000 and this is two years ago, only approximately \$300,000 was spent on out-patients during that year as opposed to over \$91 million for in-patients, or those assigned beds.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that we can have some more pleasant evenings like tonight where we all agree and I don't know -- it would be nice to know the exact cost, and I'm sure it's hard to pin this down because there are many being built now, but perhaps the Minister might know, I don't know if he does, I hope he takes this opportunity or an opportunity in the near future, to fill us in on some more direct cost. Perhaps it's not going to come to a vote tonight, regardless I guess. I thought I should leave a few words, a few minutes for the

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) honourable member that I feel also wishes to speak, so that is all at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Wellington obviously can read, he read some Hansard but he only reads what he wants to read, he didn't read that in 1970 the Minister was saying the same thing as his resolution is now -- we'll wait for the Federal Government to do something. And quite frankly that isn't good enough. If you were to take the people that doctors keep in medical hospitals, Mr. Speaker, who are only receiving services from nurses, they are not there for medical purposes, they are convalescing, the doctor will not release them because they have nowhere to go, or they're not in a position of stroke to go to the municipal hospitals or something of that nature, but they just have to have a month of convalescing and the family, or nobody, can take care of them. If the hospitals in this province were able to be relieved of that responsibility you would save over \$1 1/2 million right now in the Province of Manitoba and yet the Minister keeps sitting on his prat and not doing anything about it.

You keep saying, the government keeps saying, "let's wait for the Federal Government, consider the advisability of" -- thank you, cause I wanted to bring that up, and the Member from Inkster when he was a Minister just told us what to consider the advisability of, and that is with that government that they'll consider, but that's all. They go and they consider it when the whole House, as the Member from Steinbach says, all of us, all of us want it and we're considering the advisability of, when it's a known fact that over a million and a half dollars can be saved by just using common sense.

You know the business of the care services, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague from Fort Rouge brought up, would you really believe that a person on care services, if they have a stroke condition and needs therapy receives it for free, that happens. But you know a person with a stroke condition in this province paying their Manitoba Medical and they're in a nursing home, does not receive it for free. Under the rules and regulation, and Mr. Speaker, this guy's yelling his head off again, we started care services, we say it can be better, you say it can be better, but you do nothing about it. -- (Interjection) -- You know the person that's paying their medical has to pay for the doctor -- (Interjection) -- yet you bleed the people dry of their money, their holdings, everything they got -- (Interjection) -- sure, sure they can have it. But no, but no -- (Interjection) -- don't take me out of context again you got stung once by doing that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, \$1 1/2 million or over can be saved right now. It doesn't bother me because these fellows have said we don't give a damn about those people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.