

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Thursday, May 23, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 60 students of Grade 6 standing of the Green Acres School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Taylor, Mr. Hay and Mrs. Hammond. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions; Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ADJOURNED DEBATES

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources & Environmental Management) (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you proceed to Bill No. 55 and 60. I wonder if honourable members opposite are aware as to whether the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney wishes to speak on Bill No. 55 or whether he had probably - he does? All right. Yes, well then we'll just hold it. Bill No. 60 then, Mr. Speaker.

BILL 60

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion to the Honourable Minister of Health. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BOB BANMAN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first portion of Bill No. 60 is more or less a changeover from the old Welfare Act calling it under the new name of the Social Services Administration Act. There is one thing in this bill though that I find a little puzzling; we have reference made to the Blind Person and Disabled Persons' Allowances Board. Now I am wondering is there a special pension or this Board, is it going to be the same Board as what is panelling all your welfare cases? I would like to have an explanation from the Minister on this if I could.

One thing that the bill does not do and that is that there is no improvement in the bill mentioned on the age group from the ages of 60-65. Now many of these are unemployable people and they seem to be the most forgotten group in our whole society. There is a special difficulty in the single unemployable person under the age of 65 and I understand that their allowance has been raised somewhere to around, I believe it is around \$145; but when you consider the cost of let's say \$90, and I know that this is what many of them are paying for rent, \$40 for food, this leaves them very little for clothing and other expenses, and indeed there is no way that they can have a well balanced diet on \$40 a month for food. This is an area I believe that we should try to do something for these people and I hope that the Minister is going to take this under consideration. I understand that cost sharing could possibly be available for this additional supplement from the Federal Government, and once more I would like the Minister to look into the situation.

Now much of the bill pertains to the experiment in the Guaranteed Annual Income and I do not want to go into any details of the Guaranteed Annual Income at the present time, but there are still some questions that do arise, and one of these is the secrecy with which this bill seems to be enshrouded. Anybody giving information about the experiment is subject to a \$5,000 fine; and Mr. Minister, I'm quite certain that this could take all the fun out of leaking any information on this experiment.

We have quite a few clauses that relate to this, from 22 to clause 26, and I do not know exactly what is meant by this secrecy, whether it is just pertaining to individual cases or whether it is we're supposed to have secrecy on the total experiment. I believe that it is imperative that this House receive reports on the progress of the experiment so that we know

BILL 60

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) what is going on.

There are many things that we would be interested in for instance; let's say would the government put in the special activity programs in the experimental areas or will the experiments stem from the normal activities from within the communities. Will special pressures be applied to participants in the experiments to obtain work. And I believe that we would like to know what percentage of the administration costs would go toward - of the experiment would be administration. We would like to know what this cost would be. I believe that the Minister should furnish this House with a full report every year so that we can follow the pros and cons of the experiment. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that once again we are to have government by regulation and all power and authority within the Cabinet, with no further reference to the Legislature. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I too would like to make some remarks concerning this bill. Again it's one of those, I think as the Member from Rhineland said, a little of enigma wrapped in a mystery that we have presented to us as we have with the Child Welfare Act, a bill of major proportion and significance which is treated in a somewhat casual and almost offhand manner, and yet we find contained in this particular bill as we did in the other Child Welfare Act, a series of steps that are going to have very serious repercussions upon the total field of social service and the whole issue of income redistribution in the province. And I'd like first to basically say that we agree in principle with the direction of the bill as it sets out both the administrative arrangements for the application of the supplement to senior citizens.

I would expect that members of this House would grant me the indulgence if I remind them that of course this was a proposal that first appeared from our ranks in the last election when we indicated that it was absolutely necessary to increase the supplement of senior citizens to \$200 in the June election. I also would expect the members of the House to give me some indulgence if I reminded them that at that time the Premier of the province and the Minister of Finance were most aghast and upset at the notion that we would be going into this rampant kind of excessive expenditure only to change their mind, which I suppose is one good thing what the elections do, they are able to provide for a certain exchange of ideas, and we can only thank the Minister of Health and Social Development for his prescience in understanding our particular proposal and being able to pass on the good word to his cabinet colleagues who was convinced, so we can only be in agreement with the basic objective of this bill, but again I think it does demonstrate that there is a certain difficulty in simply copying someone else's proposal, and in this case the translation was almost too exact. We would have preferred if the Minister in presenting the administrative arrangements under the Social Services Act had been prepared to go just a little bit further. Certainly when the Liberal Party made its proposal last year for an income supplement at \$200, we did not fully anticipate the level of inflation that would occur, so we feel that the \$200 level that we're now talking about may not just be enough, and certainly if you just took the simple inflation factor that we feel the allowance might be of \$210 or so on, and certainly the Act should be made retroactive. So I suggest that while I am in full agreement and would thank the Minister for his faithful translation of our proposal, that he might have been prepared to go a step or two beyond and provide a float for some retroactivity forcing the citizens under this program, so that the loss of income that would have been granted to them had the fates been kinder to Manitoba and the Liberals had been elected as the government, we would have in fact introduced that proposal right away and called a special session so that the people over 65 would not have had to wait so long as they now have had to - and therefore we think that that correction should have been made and I would think the Minister still has an opportunity to correct what is an obvious oversight on his part. And certainly one should look very seriously at the basic formula that should be applied in instances where we are providing income supplements of the indexing concept, so that the supplement itself would maintain some pace with the rise in costs, certainly in the serious rise in the burdens that are being carried by older people because of their lack of any other form of income. So our first proposal would be that in the implementation of this proposal for which the legal sanction is given under this Bill that some amendment can be made to improve and correct upon what was the original proposal that was made by the now Member of Wolseley.

BILL 60

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

I'd also like to comment, Mr. Speaker, in taking note that this proposal again receives the majority of its financing from the Government in Ottawa, and I would think that considering their present state of generosity they would be only more than happy to consider a further amendment to this particular clause and to insure that some form of index formula could be applied. They have applied it to their own income position and it would only seem right that if we are applying the supplement in the Manitoba case that a similar kind of agreement could be arranged with Federal authorities who in fact are paying for about 75 percent of this supplement in its own right.

I would certainly want to add my agreement with the remarks made by the Member for Rhineland concerning the need to take a much more serious look at the financial difficulties being encountered by individuals, particularly single individuals in the range of age 55, 60 or so who don't have this particular kind of pension supplement available to them, and yet because of the change in the job market where many of them are less able to make a full livelihood and also because of the change in the cost structure that they must face are finding themselves again into increasing difficulty. And I can only say that a number of people in my own riding have brought this to my attention, again because the riding I represent is in the downtown area and has a number of apartment blocks and rooming houses in it. It has a very large proportion of single people, older people, and they are finding it extremely difficult now to keep up with housing costs, and because we lack any kind of housing program in the province right now for individuals such as this, they are forced to try to command some accommodation in the private market, and the rent increases again are going up 15 or 20 percent. I can recall a telephone call I had from a woman just last night in my office who indicated that her rent was going up from 95 to \$115 which was a very substantial increase and she simply just does not have the money to pay for it, and she simply wants to know if there is some way of finding her other accommodation. And investigating the matter further, we found that there is no other accommodation available. The serious decline in senior citizen housing production for the subsidy housing means that there is a two to three-year waiting list of the private market itself because the demand factor is raising its prices and there simply is no alternative, there is just no place to go.

And I think that is another problem that we in this House can in any way be indifferent to because I can't raise for you, Sir, the number of people that it would involve, I don't have the statistics at my command, but I would indicate that probably it might affect several thousands of people, certainly those living in the City of Winnipeg. And I suspect it might be true in other centres throughout the province who do not have any form of supplement other than if they are to revert back to a total welfare scheme which many of them don't like to do because they do hold jobs of some kind, but they're usually low paying jobs, maybe just something above the minimum wage; or they are living off private incomes and they are simply now being forced to continually cut back on the quality of their accommodation to the point where it's sub quality, it's below quality, that minimum standards are not being met. And it is causing a great deal of anxiety and concern, and I feel frustrated because when they call and ask you about these issues, there's no answers. You can say, I would like to find you another place that you could pay \$90 a month, but frankly I don't know where they are; and that's a horrible situation to be in to say that again in a time and an age when we are supposed to be, if nothing else, sensitive to supplying minimum standards - that we are neglecting very sorely a very major component in our population who are not able as much as they would like to be to fend for themselves and to maintain themselves in a situation of some independence and some security. And I think it's a sad commentary really on the creakiness of our machinery that we're not able to adapt and to keep up with the outside external events, particularly in terms of rising costs, to ensure that we don't have to impose particular burdens on people like this.

So I would simply like to add my concern to that of the Member of Rhineland for people in that situation and say that I would hope that the Minister and his very large staff would be able to provide us with some proposals very soon to meet that problem, whether it be in a strict income supplement or whether it is in some form of say special housing allowance that would enable them to make up the difference between the economic rent in apartment blocks or rooming houses and what they can afford. Again I would only emphasize that when we speak about forms of supplement and allowance, one doesn't have to look at it as a sort of general

BILL 60

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . allowance, they can look at specific allowances, particularly in the areas of housing which I think at this stage provides the most serious burden for individuals caught in this particular cost trap that we're now being faced with.

The other major intention of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to again provide the framework within which the income experiment can be conducted. And I've been, I suppose as most citizens of Manitoba, somewhat intrigued by what this experiment was all about - and again I have to endorse the concern of the Member from Rhineland saying it has been shrouded to some degree in an aura of mystery. Having conducted some social science experiments of my own in the past, I can say that that of course is one of the tricks of the trade, is to provide for experiments in a language and a jargon and a technique that the layman can't understand and therefore that's the way. You know, it's the same thing that lawyers do and accountants do that usually you try to take simple things and sort of over-professionalize them to the point where then you can create a mystique about it. Now I'm not saying that that is the case in this respect because I agree with the purpose of the experiment, and that is that before we undertake social policies of major dimensions we should certainly be very sure of what the possible impact can be; that we should invest substantial resources in pilot projects or demonstrations to test out new ideas and to test out, particularly in this case what would be the result of a guaranteed annual income.

But I'll tell you where my concern is, Mr. Speaker, and that is that I don't think we have been fully honest with the people of Manitoba in saying what the implications of this experiment are, because when we talk about the mini-income experiment, we're talking relatively small dollars in comparison to our provincial budget. We say, look it's only \$17 million and 75 per cent of that is being paid by the Federal Government so boy, you know, that's where we're getting a major experiment and it's not going to cost us that much. But what isn't being stated - and I looked very carefully through the press releases and so on announcing the experiment - is what happens if the experiment is carried forward into a major program. We are probably talking at a minimum another 100 to 150 million dollars of social welfare expenditures if in fact this is to be applied to those families and individuals in the province who are now living below the poverty level. And those figures by the way, Mr. Speaker, are some projections I took off the Barber Report that was issued I believe about a year and a half or two years ago and I just simply did the proper multiplication to keep up with today's prices and income levels. So I would say at a minimum we are probably looking at another 100 to 150 million dollars, and that would suggest to me, Mr. Speaker, a couple of major questions.

First, are we going to take that additional amount of money from existing services? In other words, are we now going to apply what can be called an "income strategy" towards the solution of poverty in the province at the expense of what is generally called a service strategy meaning providing a number of services to disadvantaged people or are we going to add it on top of the service strategy. In other words, what is the priority that is going to arrive from the results of this experiment? Because one of the important things to recognize - and I think that this is something that if I can supply any suggestion to this House based on some of my own experience in social science research - this is not going to provide you with the real answers. Let's not kid ourselves that somehow after this experiment is over there is going to be an abracadabra and a magic wand and all of a sudden the full package is going to be there, all the answers are going to be supplied. That's just not true. That's basically what a good social science experiment can tell you is the limits of your knowledge. It can tell you about the things you don't know because there are many areas of investigation that are simply beyond the ken or beyond the capacity of researchers today to determine. I would refer this House to the comments of Daniel Monahan who was the assistant to the American President when they brought in their family assistance plan. He has written a fairly interesting series of essays on the consequences of that plan and the one thing he points out is that after very large investigation and examination where they brought in the best experts and professionals to examine the possibilities that once they got into the politics of the situation, once they got into really looking at the implementation of a form of negative income tax family assistance program all of a sudden the whole thing changed. One of the interesting paradoxes I should point out to the House, and it might be of some interest to the members on the other side, that the major sort of opponents and opposition did not come from the classic free enterprise right-wing business groups, it came from the social workers who all of a sudden found themselves being threatened in some respects by a program that could have the possibility of replacing many of their services.

BILL 60

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

So what I think is important to spell out - and I'm not saying that there's a bad or a good attached to this - is that while we're conducting a major experiment that's being heralded and I had all the press releases from across the country as to what an important experiment this is, we should be kind of levelling with our own people in this province and saying, these are the implications of what we're doing, this is the outcome of it. And we should also be in a sense preparing ourselves for the kind of political discussion that will have to ensue in 1975, when the experiment is concluded, to determine whether in fact this is a direction that we're prepared to go ahead both in terms of cost, because we're talking very big dollars, at a time by the way when the Economic Council of Canada says we should not be talking more dollars in the social welfare field, we should be looking at redistribution through other means, and their recommendation which is one that I personally endorse in large part is that we should be going towards an economic development strategy as opposed to a social development strategy where in fact the whole point is to provide sort of economic means through jobs created for the structural. . . employees opposed to providing further assistance. I think we should be spelling those things out.

I can assume, it's not been detailed in any large respect, that one of the advantages presumably of a guaranteed income system in this province would be through the application of a work incentive scheme to enable those, particularly those who are now working or working in a part-time way but who are underpaid for their employment, to provide them with incentives to work and to presumably provide incentive to have those people who want to move off social assistance rolls to do so. And I would assume that's one of the intentions of the program. But the question is: there has been serious reservations raised by American study in a guaranteed income whether the concept of a negative income tax really works that way or not. And that again becomes an issue that I guess concerns me in part as to what degree are we going to be captured by our own experts. To what degree are we going to sort of have presented to us sort of a package which has already been precooked to get the kind of results that one determines. And I know that one can do random sample surveys and selector controlled groups but you're still not sure that the results are going to be fully indicative and fully exhaustive on the kind of problem you're looking at. Because certainly the experiment that was conducted by the American officials in New Jersey, very similar in scope to the one that we're conducting in Manitoba although I would grant this is somewhat more sophisticated, came up with a number of inconclusive results. They simply were not able to say to what degree there was an impact or not an impact because when you're dealing with a wide variety of family life and the motivations the people use to determine whether they're going to work or go on welfare or to what degree they are going to expend their income, sort of on better housing or whether they're going to spend it on better recreation, that there are so many variables to try to control that the social scientists who conducted the New Jersey experiment weren't sure they really had answers for that kind of issue.

So again I would simply raise the caution in this House about what we might expect; and the issue what we might expect is simply that we might get some indication, some suggestion but it will not in any way come down to give us a complete answer. And in fact what is going to occur is that this House in particular, and certainly a number of private organizations throughout the province, are going to have to engage in a very serious debate and discussions about the direction of social welfare programs in the Province of Manitoba and throughout the country, because it is on the basis of values that this issue will be discussed, on the basis of sense of power politics almost not the basis of some sort of precooked research package that will provide the magic answer. So all we can expect in this case is some partial answers, some suggestions of answers and what concerns me is that in a sense we're not preparing ourselves for that kind of debate, that we're still kind of rolling on as if there was going to be no change in direction, that the Estimates of Health and Social Development will continue to increment year by year the way they are, without really saying, lookit, we're going to be meeting a very major crossroads in a year or two and we're going to have to decide some very major issues and this is the kind of preparation we should be getting into.

And that comes back to the issue that was raised by the Member from Rhineland about in a sense the shrouding of this thing, that it's being kind of almost too precious and too kind of closed up. This should be the kind of experiment and the kind of discussion that involves most of the social agencies and people involved in that area throughout the province and in a

BILL 60

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) quick survey that I did talking to a number of them, people who are boards of social agencies involved in programs, they virtually know nothing about it. They have not been involved. They are in the dark as much as probably we in this House are. In fact they were saying, what can you tell us about it. And all I can tell them is the press release that was given out which says there is going to be an experiment, the Federal Government's paying for most of it, the results will be available in a couple of years and there's going to be some sampling done in Dauphin and some sampling in Winnipeg, we're going to be paying these rates of income and that's it. But no more in terms of what is going to be the policy implications of this particular proposal.

So the value, Mr. Speaker, of the debate at this point I think is that it does give us the opportunity to raise with the Minister the issue of comprehension of this program and to what degree is it simply a precious little experiment; or to what degree does it inform what could be a major direction of the government; and to what degree is it going to encompass changes in the social assistance income redistribution policies of this province and perhaps of the country.

I would also just like to raise the other issue, Mr. Speaker, about the role of the Federal Government in this because again, if the program is to work it has to be paid for as the present experiment is being paid for, probably 50 percent, 75 percent by federal sources. And I read over very carefully Mr. Lalonde's orange paper on income security that he issued last spring, as well as a speech that he made I believe it was in Edmonton - I could get the correct source for you on that - where he tended at that time to raise very serious reservations about whether the guaranteed income, the negative income tax formula for that guaranteed income is really the way to proceed. And in fact, it appears to me that the Federal Government over the past year is proceeding in a different direction, certainly by its emphasis on the Family Allowance program and on its proposal for the supplement for underpaid workers or for unemployed workers. It seems already to be not experimenting any more but in fact to be introducing a form of guaranteed income that's in being. And I just wonder whether in fact we again are engaging in an exercise of irrelevance, if in fact the Federal Government which has to be and is the major funding body for social assistance in large parts of the Canada Assistance Plan and other programs, has in fact already launched itself into commitments in another direction and is preparing to provide a form of income guarantee which is jumping over the experiment stage and is already becoming in fact a form of guaranteed income. It is certainly true for senior citizens; at this point they're moving in that direction; the Family Allowance is a form of guaranteed income for families and the proposal for the Workmen's Supplement, which is Stage 2 in Mr. Lalonde's proposals. So again it's a question of, you know, is the \$17 million being spent to provide for a lot of good grist for Ph. D theses that can be produced at the universities; or in fact is it part of an overall combined co-operative program with the Federal Government, and in fact is not simply something that we kind of laboured for, got, and now simply has been passed by in the movement of events, because I think that is probably the danger that we engage in.

There's one further danger, Mr. Speaker, that I raise that is sometimes not always considered when governments engage in social experiments, because one thing that you are doing is you are trifling to some degree with peoples' lives; that one of the great dangers, one of the real risks -- (Interjection) -- Well no, I go further than the member, I think it's not simply their pocketbooks, but in fact you are sort of using human beings as your experimental models. It's easier I guess if you're a physical scientist, if you want to play around with atoms and bugs and plants and so on, but in a social science field you're dealing with human beings and their families.

And so I read through the experiment where you've got a control group that's getting no money, and another control group that's getting a certain amount of money, another one that's getting a higher proportion and so on. You know, you're doing things to those people, you're kind of changing their lives in some ways and it strikes me at times that it's a little kind of cool and calculating and over-scientific to be doing that and I can recognize the requirements to provide for those - if we want to get the information, I suppose we have to investigate. But I am also concerned about what happens to those 2,500 families if the income experiment doesn't continue - what happens if in 1975 we say, well it was a great experiment but it didn't work, or we're going to do something else - what happens to those 2,500 families who had their expectations altered, their incomes altered, their position - are they going to be continued, are they

BILL 60

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) going to be left alone? And those are the kinds of issues that I'd like to see spelled out a little bit more. What protection are we providing for those who in fact are our guinea pigs in this respect - and I don't like to use the word to them, but maybe you have to use that kind of blunt term, because in fact we are using them in that respect. And I know that it's voluntary, no-one's being forced to do it, but the fact is that they're still being used for an experimental purpose and that would seem to require some commitment to them further on, so that for those who have their family life changed, they are simply not going to be left sort of holding the bag or all of a sudden having their expectations raised and then being dropped - kind of like an old girlfriend after the experiment's over; and if it is simply an experiment and not part of a larger scale program, there is that risk involved.

So here again that would be another question that has not been fully articulated, and I suppose that if there was some form of greater explanation that could be given, at least to members of this House so that it can be translated, that there was a briefing that was provided and some papers given out - but I'm not sure that that was really good enough. I would hope perhaps at the next session of this Legislature in one of the Committees, perhaps a special committee or one of the standing committees, that the authors of the experiment would be asked to appear and report on what they're doing, the detail what they're about. And so many of these questions can be talked about, not in a combative or antagonistic way, but just to get better information to raise some of both of the questions on the methodology of the research and the ethical questions about the research; and also the programmatic results of the research so that we can have a much better kind of understanding as to where we're going and be satisfied; that in fact their experiment which is unquestionably probably the most significant social experiment this province has ever undertaken. We can have the assurance that it is being conducted with the full knowledge of elected representatives, so that when people do ask questions, we're able to answer them; and that we can also satisfy ourselves to the maximum degree possible that it is simply not an experiment being conducted in the abstract or in the artificial but in fact is going to be a real one that has real results and is going to lead itself into kind of real programs. And if that's the case, then certainly it should be one that has a much wider dissemination and a much wider sort of involvement even at this stage of the social service community, so that we can now begin to discuss the issues as to where do we go from here: Are we prepared to go into the guaranteed income system in the Province of Manitoba? Can we do without the Federal Government - or if so, what kind of commitments are being made, so that when the time comes we're not kind of left with simply a big heavy document full of very extensive social science jargon and tables and formulas, but in fact we have prepared ourselves properly so that that kind of result can be considered in terms of a climate of opinion that is already fairly knowledgeable and fairly understanding of the problems that this experiment is going to pose.

So those would be the issues, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise with the Minister concerning this bill. And to reiterate, we say that we support the principle of first trying to improve the income position of senior citizens, and we also certainly approve the concept of trying to reform the welfare system. Again this is something that we try to talk about in the campaign in some way the connotation became the wrong one, but what we're simply saying is that the welfare system that we have in the Province of Manitoba right now is unsatisfactory, both for those who receive social assistance and those who pay for it. No one is happy with the system right now, it is a creaky kind of an anachronistic system. And so we can certainly endorse and agree some efforts to provide for a revision and an overhaul and perhaps a total change of that system; but if you're going to engage in social engineering, then it's got to be done very carefully, and at this stage in this experiment, Mr. Speaker, we don't know how carefully it's being done because, frankly, we don't know much about the main income experiment in the Province of Manitoba.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 20 students Grade 7 and 8 standing of the Fairdale School from North Dakota. They are under the direction of Mr. Brian Buck. We also have 30 students of Grade 9 standing of the LaBroquerie School. They are under the direction of Mr. Roland Quimet and Armand Bedard. This school is located in the constituency of the

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.
On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to enter into the debate, but I do wish to announce - and I think it's better to announce it earlier, so that there is the longest period of time, that Law Amendments Committee would sit again tomorrow evening at 8:00 p.m., that's Law Amendments Committee. I believe that there are still representations with regard to certain bills before the Committee and of course when the representations are completed we'd be able to deal clause by clause with those bills that are ready to be dealt with in that way.

BILL NO. 60

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions to raise to the Honourable Minister regarding this Bill No. 60, an Act to amend the Social Services. The one point that comes to mind is, the creation of the Welfare Advisory Committee will be dissolved and the new Social Services Advisory Committee will be established and I understand that there will be some 15 members on this Board; and the Executive Council will appoint the Chairman and the Vice Chairman and that a quorum would be three, considered as three. I'm wondering why the Honourable Minister needs such a large board when he's appointing the Chairman and the Vice Chairman and three will form a quorum. Would it not be better maybe for eight to be established as a quorum or reduce the board from 15 down to possibly seven or eight? Maybe the Honourable Minister can give me some information regarding that.

The other concern in the Board that comes to my mind, Mr. Speaker, of course, is again the invasion of privacy of citizens of this Province. And of course our caucus, and my personal interest in government, as legislators that we must at all times do everything we possibly can to safeguard the rights of the individual citizens of our province. This legislation we're involving the lives of people and the Minister has wide ranging powers that he can - in fact, every institution or agencies, medical officers of health staff, secretaries of municipalities, secretaries or trustees of school boards, and every other person that's so directed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council of course can come under investigation under this legislation at the wish of the Minister as the Minister may require. So I would wonder, like what safeguards that the Honourable Minister and the government has in mind with this legislation, so that we don't infringe upon the privacy of the people of this province; and I'm wondering what safeguards he's got at his disposal to make sure that the rights of the individuals are not trampled into the earth by the bureaucracy that's required to implement this experiment.

The other section, Mr. Speaker, of course again is the new plan. And of course I raised the question some years ago, or a year ago I guess about this plan, what's going to take place. I suggested to the Minister at that time, would the plan at Dauphin be considered as an experimental area, because information was leaked to me that no doubt would be - and I still haven't got a definition of why Dauphin was selected or the other areas that the Minister had selected in the province for the experiment. How did he arrive at the decision that these were the most suitable areas for the experiment? And of course in support of the remarks that were presented by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, once we involve these people in this experiment, then what is their future? I'm quite familiar with certain remarks that were raised at the time the federal people got involved in the debates and the negotiations, where the Honourable Marc Lalonde in public stated that he was opposed to the experiment. I'm quite familiar too with the Economic Council of Canada's comments regarding the experiment, and they thought that it would be very difficult for them to support it, but nevertheless some 75 percent of the experiment is being borne by the Federal Government.

So I wonder if the Honourable Minister would give us some idea and try and fill the Members of the Legislature in so we can hopefully answer some of the many questions that have been directed my way; those families that's going to be involved in the experiment, how long will they be involved, what is their future; and is this going to be just for four or five years and then are they going to be dropped, and would they again become wards of the province - or where do they stand, the ones that are asked to enter into the . . . ? I wonder also if it would be also possible for the members of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, to have the Minister

BILL 60

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) bring the key people on the staff of this experiment so that some committee of the Legislature, I don't know what one, could question them in some depth as to what they're doing and how they're getting along and where the weak points in the experiment are, if there are any, and if there's some way that we as legislators should be involved in the scheme to help in our various constituencies where the plan is going to be implemented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

HON. SAUL MILLER (Minister of Health) (Seven Oaks): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the members for participating in the debate. I want to say to the Member for Roblin with regard to the details on the income experiment, he may recall that a few weeks ago, a couple of months ago I guess by now, I had indicated that those members of the Legislature who were interested in hearing more of the experiment itself, were invited to attend a meeting with the staff and some members did avail themselves of it, if they were interested they appeared. As a matter of fact, I wasn't there myself, so I'm not being critical of anyone who didn't come. It is a social experiment, it's the largest social experiment of its kind ever carried out in Canada; it's not the be-all and the end-all. We hope and Canada hopes and the other provinces hope to learn from our experiment here not just what different types of income support will do to people how it will motivate them or unmotivate them. It will be able to test out a method of administering a program. What is the effect on the family where a child perhaps may stay at school one year extra instead of dropping out because of the financial ability to do so? Is that a plus, is that a minus, what effect does it have in a long run? These are all unanswered questions. Is there anything to the argument that if people get income paid to them through some means or another that they won't work? This too will be tested out. But this is a social experiment like all social experiments, developed by experts, by scientists. It will run three years, a question of what happens at the end of three years; it will be evaluated by the Federal Government, by the Provincial Government. Other provinces have indicated an interest to become involved and learn with us at the same time. The question of what happens to people when the program is over. Well it's done with, it's finished. There is a phasing out period and they'll have to adjust during that phasing out period.

As I said, it's not the be-all and end-all, it's a straight social experiment. The member quotes the Honourable Marc Lalonde as saying - from a speech where he was reported to have said that he has no confidence in a guaranteed annual income. I subsequently spoke to Mr. Lalonde and he claims that this isn't what he said. He is committed to the Manitoba experiment, the Federal Government is very anxious that it go ahead; it was chosen over two or three other possible experiments in Canada because of the great deal of work that had gone into it.

Which brings me to the whole question of secrecy. There's a need for secrecy, and it's true there is secrecy. The secrecy is to protect the information that people give, because part of this whole experiment is to follow people through over a three-year period as to what happens to them, what is the impact on their lives in a program which has a negative income tax feature to it. What are the ramifications of it of a 35 percent tax back, a 50 percent, 75. So they're constantly interviews going on and people are volunteered in this program, are registered in it with the understanding that all the information they give about themselves, about the family, about how they live, about how they spend their money, all of it is secret. People who work in this have to take the Oath of Confidentiality, they cannot divulge the information, they must not divulge it, and the reason for secrecy is not for the program itself but to protect the people who participate in the program within Manitoba.

Certainly there will be - the information will be made known, the information once digested, once the computers have evaluated it and people have evaluated it, the net results, the findings will be made known but those of course are not breaching of any confidentiality. It will be made known by the Federal Government, by the Manitoba Government. All through the program this will be worked on jointly by federal and provincial people working together as a team, and we are satisfied that it is an important first step in a social security program in Manitoba. Because everyone agrees that the present system is a patchwork, framework instrument which has been added to over the years, patch on patch. Now we don't know that this is going to be the final solution, that it is indeed the best solution, but we know that we'll learn enough about how to handle programs generally, whether it be an income experiment or a

BILL 60

(MR. MILLER cont'd) variation of it, that even administratively we will learn an awful lot from the experiment that takes place.

The Federal Government and the Provincial Government are very busy at the last two years on the Orange Paper, that was referred to by the Member for Fort Rouge, to look into the whole income security field. They have set up task forces; they're still working on that. The Federal Government has not made any conclusive steps in any direction, sometimes we wish they did but they aren't, and they are taking the position that until they have all the facts in, until everything is tested out, whether it be GAI or other income support programs, they're not willing to commit themselves, and perhaps they're right. Perhaps the answer is demonstration projects rather than go all out into a program which may end up to be worse than what you're trying to correct. So the approach taken was to try different programs in different parts of the country, and I think that's what they're doing, and they're certainly doing it in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I think this pretty well covers generally the broad aspects of the questions that were asked of me.

The specific question with regard to the disabled, the blind and disabled program, I'll get the information for the Minister; I don't have it at hand and I don't know the reference he's made. I'll certainly look into that.

With regard to the question of pensions or incomes for people between 60 and 65, I do endorse that. I think we're moving in that direction. I think that the time is coming when the Federal Government will move in that direction and when it does, we'll be able to move into it as well. It is a very costly matter to just go into it unilaterally, as members know, and I'm hoping that whereas not too many years ago 70 years was considered the magical age, today it's 65, and in the not too distant future that 60 will be recognized as the age when pensions can be started.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I've covered the major points brought out. I'm pleased that the bill will now go into committee where it can get clause by clause study.

QUESTION put and MOTION carried.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I'd like to introduce another 20 students of Grades four and five standing of the Montcalm School. These students are under the direction of Mr. John Zubatiuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

BILL NO. 58

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 58. The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk) presented Bill No. 58, an Act to amend the Municipal Act (2) for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this bill incorporates a number of additional amendments to The Municipal Act which arises out of resolutions at the Union of Manitoba Municipalities or the Urban Association and as a result of the department's own experience during the course of the past year. In almost all cases the proposed amendments are of a minor nature meant to facilitate better administration.

Firstly the amendments deal with an attempt to relate the population of a village or town to a minimum area. The amendments will bring about the definition of a village being limited to 400 -- the present provisions of the Act restrict of a village to 480 acres unless population exceeds 750. A town is limited to 640 acres unless the population exceeds 1,500. If towns and villages expanded in a uniform manner, the acreage would be sufficient to accommodate a larger population. Experience has shown however that the growth pattern of a town or village may be in a certain direction, and the logical extension of residential areas on industrial area dictates that the boundaries of the village or town should be enlarged in that particular direction.

The present legislation is unduly restrictive, is not conducive to proper planning. The proposed amendments to the alteration of status, boundaries, or area, in order to bring about

BILL 58

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) more flexibility in respect to the definitions required for town and village status.

Also under the proposed amendments is a section which deals with council approving a contract between a municipality and a member council under certain conditions where the value of the contract does not exceed \$100.00 and a copy of the resolution has been posted for seven days. The present section contemplates a council member always being in the position of seller and the council as the buyer. The new provision will permit the situation in which the council is the seller and the - rather than the seller in every case. The proposed amendment also clarifies the position of both council and the councillor whether the parties are in the position of buyer or seller.

Another provision authorizes council to spend money to provide information to electors on any by-law that is required to be submitted to a vote. For example borrowing by-laws.

The Union of Manitoba Municipalities have requested that council should have the authority to call referendum if it is deemed advisable and further that the referendum should not be binding on the council. The amendment as set forth gives effect to the request of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities.

The Municipal Act now authorizes council to make appointments by by-law to various boards and commission on which council is represented. The authority of council to remunerate a councillor or citizen member it appoints to a board and commissions is not clear. The amendment proposed makes it clear that council may pay to a councillor or a citizen member appointed to boards and commissions a remuneration fixed by by-law and travelling expenses incurred in performing his duties.

The Municipal Act now limits the right of suspension to the mayor or reeve. This practice, no doubt, dates back to the time when the mayor or reeve was the chief administration officer in the municipality. It is desirable, especially in our larger urban units, to permit delegation of this authority to any officer of the municipality.

Officer as defined in The Municipal Act is the mayor or reeve, the deputy mayor or reeve, the manager, if any, a clerk, treasurer, acting treasurer, and any full-time employee who is designated as an officer by by-law. The proposed amendment extends the power to suspend an employee to any other officer or of a municipally designated by-law.

Another provision provides safeguards for the suspended employee by requiring the suspension to be reported immediately to council and for review of the matter by council not later than two weeks after the suspension of the employee.

A further provision relates to that in The Municipal Act which now provides in general terms the authority of a council to make provision for the regulation of any matter or thing for the protection of persons or property, or both. The proposed amendment would give to council general authority to make provision for the protection of not only persons or property but also of the environment generally.

The Municipal Act gives to council power to pass by-laws respecting building standards in buildings and other structures. Presently however The Municipal Act exempts dwellings that are owner occupied. In order to take advantage of the Federal Government's neighbourhood improvement program, municipalities will be required to adopt minimum standards of maintenance of buildings including residential dwellings which are owner occupied. The proposed amendments bring this legislation in line with the City of Winnipeg Act.

Also there is proposed an amendment which deals with the problem which has been raised by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities in respect to grain being stored in open fields left unfenced within municipalities.

A proposed amendment would preclude the use of grants through a community development corporation for the purposes of assisting industry being established within the municipality.

A further proposed amendment removes the three mill limit on municipal grants to a home for the aged and infirm, a community centre, and a skating or curling rink, and provides that the grant for those purposes may be raised by a levy against the taxable lands in all the municipalities or in the part thereof to be benefited. I just emphasize there that I'm sure the Member for Swan River will be interested in that. That amendment is directed at a problem which occurred in Swan River.

It is also the practice of some municipalities to undertake with industries that are being

BILL 58

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) established within their boundaries to make grants through a community development corporation, or regional development corporation, of amounts sufficient to defray the municipal and school taxes on the properties of those industries for a period of usually three years. This arrangement conflicts with the principle that municipalities should not offer tax incentives to encourage industry to establish. You will recall that in 1970 legislation was passed by this House which prevented the giving of tax incentives by municipalities to permit industry to establish in a few cases. This has happened in practice since 1970 through the vehicle of the Community Development Corporation, and the problem here is it tends sometimes to place the larger or wealthier municipality in a stronger position than a smaller or poorer municipality if we get into that area of competing through our Community Development Corporations in that manner. A proposed new subsection makes it clear that moneys paid by way of a grant to a development corporation thus should not be used for the purpose of reducing municipal or school taxes.

The Municipal Act also deals with the municipal method of financing the municipality's contribution for park purposes and provides that the moneys payable in respect to the tax levied should be paid over to the parks board as they are collected. It is not the usual practice to pay over special levies except as and when collected, and the amendment therefore makes the payment permissive rather than mandatory. I wish the Member for Minnedosa was present because this amendment is being offered to the House as a result of a request from the - or as a result of this matter being brought to the attention of the department by the Town of Minnedosa.

The Municipal Act now provides that a municipality may pass by-laws requiring the owner or occupant of a mobile home to obtain a licence. The only exemption provided is to bonafide tourists. There is no general power given to a municipality under the provisions of this section to exempt any other classes of mobile homes. For example, mobile homes occupied by bonafide farmers cannot be granted an exemption through The Municipal Assessment Act, which exempts certain farm buildings from taxation. So there is a contradiction there that we're attempting to remove. The proposed amendment would permit a municipality to establish classes of mobile homes for which a different class of licence is required and would permit the municipality to classify as farm buildings, mobile homes used by bonafide farmers. The Municipal Act deals with the municipality's power to provide housing and further provides that the municipality may require land and construct dwellings on land acquired by it. It is considered that the word "construct" in the present Municipal Act is not sufficiently broad to empower a municipality to purchase mobile homes for the purpose of supplying housing, and the proposed amendment will make it clear that a municipality may provide preconstructed dwellings such as mobile homes and rebuilt houses on land required by it.

The Municipal Act presently deals with the procedure of borrowing by-laws, and the proposed addition makes it mandatory for persons making representations to council in respect to a proposed borrowing by-law to file with the council an address to which any notice required may be sent. Where petitions have been filed in respect to a proposed by-law, it is questionable whether correspondence and notices should be forwarded to all persons who signed the petition or whether the notices should be forwarded to the person who presented the petition. It is hoped that the proposed amendment would clarify this problem by making it mandatory for every person making a representation to file with the council an address to which notices may be sent.

The Municipal Act restricts the area of an incorporated village district to 340 acres, unless its population exceeds 50 persons. The proposed repeal of this provision complements the earlier proposed amendment dealing with the subject of area and population of villages and towns. The safeguard is retained where the Minister is required to certify that the residences are sufficiently close together in order to form an unincorporated village district. This leaves some flexibility in determining area, but retains a safeguard against a sprawling community which is unlikely to be able to handle services.

Further sections deal with the election and term of office of a committee in an unincorporated village district.

A further section in The Municipal Act presently provides that after the effective date of the formation of an incorporated village district, a meeting shall be called and the notice of the meeting shall explain the object of the meeting, and the electors present at the meeting shall select from among the electors by open vote or by ballot three persons to act as a

BILL 58

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . committee. The proposed amendment requires that the electors at such a meeting should nominate not less than three persons to be members of a committee; and the addition in the proposed amendment further provides that if more than three persons are nominated, the election of members of the committee shall be conducted in accordance with the Local Authorities Election Act.

The Municipal Act also presently provides that on the first Tuesday in February of each year, a meeting of the electors shall be called for the purpose of electing a person to act on the committee in the place of the committee member whose term of office is expired three years' rotation. The proposed new section provides that where more than one person is nominated to fill a vacancy, an election shall be held in accordance with the Local Authorities Election Act.

The Municipal Act also presently provides that a municipality will pay over to a non-incorporated village district the funds to carry on the operation of the district as and when the levies of the district are collected. Again it is suggested that this should be permissive on the part of the municipality. It is not administratively practical to pro rate taxes as they are collected and pay them to unincorporated village districts, parks boards, etc. Municipalities in fact usually pay these levies at the beginning of the fiscal year even if it means short term borrowing by the municipalities themselves.

Another section deals with grants in lieu of taxes which are presently paid by the province on university lands. The proposed change would make it the responsibility of the university to pay the grants in lieu of taxes. This enables a university to include taxes as part of the operational costs of the university and thus recover part of the costs of the taxes under the federal-provincial cost sharing arrangements.

A further section deals with the cancellation of taxes, and the proposed addition of subsection (3) to Section 885 of The Municipal Act is self-explanatory, in order to clarify the non-cancellation of taxes for purposes of incentives to industry.

Now these are - I read from speaking notes, and I would get these notes photocopied and the critics could deal with the notes from there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this and not in particular on any item that's in the bill, but on a matter that I would hope might be yet given consideration to be brought in perhaps at the Law Amendments stage. And it's a matter that has been talked about before in the Legislature over the years, but one which I think could come up to be a major item in the fairly near future. It deals with the case of a property owner who at the time of a local improvement going in, that is a street or sewer, other municipal services; finds himself with an option at the time of installation of either paying off the entire amount, which on a normal home nowadays may run say, \$3,000, \$4,000 for the costs of service, sewer, street, storm sewer and water and other municipal services and because of his financial situation finds that he can't pay it off so he amortizes it. And the regular period of amortization for municipal services is ten years, and once the party agrees to the amortization period, then he is locked in for that ten years and he has no option to pay it off sooner.

On previous occasions, Mr. Speaker, when this has been raised, the answer has come back from the government that once the borrowing schedule is set up for the municipal services that it's impossible to accept prepayment before the end of the amortization period. And as a result of that if the party, the homeowner, finds himself two or three years or at any period up to ten years following the installation of the services that he has the money and can pay off the services, it is impossible for him to do it because of that regulation. So I bring it up, Mr. Speaker, at this time because I have mentioned it before to the Minister a couple of years ago, and in fact I'll tell him quite frankly I raised it prior to his coming in to office and the answer seems to be consistently the same, that the administration sets out reasons why this can't be done. But I would counter this by saying that these same reasons were advanced at one time with regards to mortgages on homes, where a person once having taken out a 25-year mortgage was in many cases locked in for the entire 25 year period. But under the CMHC rules that were brought in a few years ago the mortgage by law is open after five years, so that if a person after five years, although he has taken out a 25-year mortgage - after five years finds himself in a financial position to better his position in terms of his

BILL 58

(MR. CRAIK cont'd). . . mortgage, the mortgage is open to him, so he can with any CMHC approved lender find himself in the position of going to the lender and saying, I have some money, I can now better my position either in terms of interest rate or amount of principle involved and I want to do that. And of course the lender has to do that.

Now what I am asking for, is that the same openness be granted to the person who has to amortize his services for ten years, but finds himself after two of being able to pay them off. And I think it's going to be a bigger problem we're facing, because municipalities are going to have to pay 10 percent for their money right now in order to put in services - or perhaps 11 - and we may find that the interest rates on municipal services drop significantly two years from now. We don't know that. You can't predict it. But if they do drop, it means that people who put in services in 1974 and amortized them over ten years are locked at say 10 or 11 percent, whereas the interest rate has gone down but they can't pay it off. So what I am asking the Minister for specifically, is whether or not in this bill it is too late for us to go back to the administration and ask them if we can't introduce a provision into financing municipal services that does the same thing in principle as CMHC has done with their mortgages, that is a person has the option. He's not locked in for 25 years, but I think at three years he can pay off a little - a chunk; at four years he can pay off a chunk and at five years it's completely open, he can pay it all off if he finds himself in that happy position. So it's more of a question, Mr. Speaker, and I wonder if the Minister could go back and perhaps badger his administration people again to have another look at this, because I think we're headed into a very difficult period where people are going to find it very difficult to agree to a 10-year amortization which will make their property improvements, their sewers, streets, water improvements cost them over two and a half times as much as the initial cost if they have to lock themselves in to a 10 or 11 percent interest rate over the next ten years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 65

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 65. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 65, an Act to amend The Law of Property Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: This proposed bill would authorize foreign countries to hold land in Manitoba for the purposes of a consulate or residence for a member of its diplomatic or consular staff. As governments of foreign countries are not always persons they cannot be dealt with in the normal way in the Land Titles Office. The Registrar-General recommended the proposed amendment to myself as being responsible for the Land Titles Office, and it was recommended arising out of negotiations which had occurred between the Registrar-General and the Government of Japan in the purchase of a residence for a consulate.

The proposed bill merely acknowledges the practice within the legal profession in Manitoba for a number of - Section 2 of the bill relates to the practice within the legal profession in Manitoba for a number of years. The intent of the new section is to bring the state of the law into conformity with the practice of the profession. The basis of the draft section is the English Law Property Act which was enacted in 1881, and has settled the law there for that long. The practice within the legal profession exchanging documents is generally that any consideration money is paid to the solicitor who produces or delivers a document. The understanding is that such a solicitor receives the money in trust for his client. This section makes it clear that the mere production or delivery of the document by a solicitor would authorize the payment to him of any consideration money. The most common example of this of course is in the sale and purchase of property through solicitors. I think the Honourable Member for Assiniboia has some interest in that section because of an experience by a constituent in Assiniboia.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I suppose the Attorney-General

BILL 65

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd). . . would be expecting me to be the last person to rise to speak on the particular bill that is now before the House. I rise only because of a statement or a sentence contained in his explanation, and that sentence read that this section now makes it clear, and then he went on from there. Sir, I know that it's not within the rules to deal with sections of a particular bill, and I don't intend to do that except for the purpose of explaining the points that I want to make. I don't want to comment on the thrust of the government insofar as this bill is concerned, I'll leave that to my colleague, the Member for Birtle-Russell, on a later occasion.

I do want to draw to the attention of the House that which the Minister said is now very clear - and if I may, Sir, I'll just read the clearness of this particular section into the record. One would have thought by looking at it that it was drawn up and drafted by Casey Stengel and/or the Leader of the Opposition. Its clarity is so obvious that, Sir, members of the House will recognize it. It goes on - and I ask the Minister when he closes debate on this, to give a further explanation as to how clearly this - it may be clear to him - but how clearly that this particular section strikes those of us who are not learned in the legal profession and who are not capable of understanding the Stengelese language that is contained in this particular amendment.

It goes on to say this - and I want the members of the House to pay particular attention, Sir, to the wording of this particular section:

"Where a solicitor produces or delivers a document that contains in the body thereof, or that has endorsed thereon or attached thereto, a receipt for consideration money or other consideration and the document has been executed or the endorsed or attached receipt has been signed by the person entitled to give the receipt for the consideration, the document is sufficient authority to the person liable or to give consideration for his paying or giving the consideration to the solicitor without the solicitor producing any separate or other direction or authority in respect of the consideration from the person who executed or signed the document receipt." That, Sir, is what the Attorney-General said, and now clear. I wonder, Sir, when the Minister closes debate on this important bill whether he will undertake to give an explanation to the House as to what the hell that is all about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to put the Liberal Party's position clearly. We have no difficulty with the language of Section 46 (1) of Bill 65. It's clear as most legislation that comes from the government these days. If there's any help that the House Leader of the Conservative Party requires, I'm sure the Attorney-General will be glad to instruct him in what I find to be deathless clarity prose. We support the bill and I hope we can get expeditious clearance to go to committee so that we can give it third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 66

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 66. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Limitation of Actions Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, by commencing my remarks I just say that I always find myself in a position of having to protest about the rules of this House that - I have to live with them I know - that prohibit a person introducing a bill from referring to his bill by way of sections because to me it makes it much more difficult to relate to the House the provisions of the bill and I just have absolutely no understanding. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. On the point of order. The honourable gentlemen is learned in the law. He can change rules; it's his privilege. All he's got to do is get the consent of the House.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the dean of the House and the Honourable Member from Morris I have a good inclination at this point to attempt to get that rule changed.

BILL 66

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd).

This bill deals with the Limitation of Actions Act which now provides for a one year limitation period on highway traffic accident cases. In effect this leaves the limitation period as it is set out in the Limitation of Actions Act, two years for actions founded on tort, and six years for actions for trespasser injury to real property. It might be noted that with regard to third party liability, the Insurance Act was amended to increase from one to two years the time within which actions must be commenced. Autopac varied its limitation in line with this.

The other section in this bill repeals Schedule A to the Act and substitutes a new schedule in merely bringing the schedule up-to-date as new Acts have been enacted. The schedule relates to Section 6 of the Limitation of Actions Act and indicates that a special limitation provision is set out in the Acts listed in the schedule.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I've examined Bill 66 and concur in the description of it given by the Attorney-General. The bill is worthy of support and is a progressive measure to bring the law into a much more readable state, and also I think a little more liberalized to the person who has to avail himself of remedies of the courts. So we have no hesitation in giving the bill our full support.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FREGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

. . . . Continued on next page.

CONCURRENCE - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Concurrence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. We were on Agriculture as well as the Attorney-General. What's the preference of the House? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may, ask the House Leader, or the Acting House Leader, if he would care to go on with the Attorney-General since he's here and since the Minister of Agriculture is not here. I understand that he has another engagement elsewhere, a very entertaining one, and also the Member for Lakeside, who I think will probably be in this afternoon.

Also, Sir, while I'm on my feet, I wonder if the House Leader would attempt to accommodate the Opposition in that there are a number of the items on the Concurrence that we do not intend to debate but one of them is Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Member for Pembina, who has been primed for a long time waiting to deliver that speech, if that could be deferred until he returns this afternoon. He had a meeting this morning. But if the Minister wants to just go on from the Attorney-General we will deal with them as they come up, with the exception of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. We'd appreciate very much if the House Leader would accommodate us in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that's quite satisfactory to us. I said we would finish off the Attorney-General. I'm not sure whether the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture has left the debating halls on Portage Avenue and a few picketers that were supposed to be there, but he will be here shortly so I would suggest that we carry on with the Attorney-General and then the other resolutions. If the Minister's not here we'll go through the formality as indicated by the Member for Morris, with the exception of Consumer Affairs in order to accommodate the Member for Pembina.

MR. SPEAKER: We are on Resolution 20 to 27, the Attorney-General's. The Attorney-General has 20 minutes of his time left.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, just prior to commencing my remarks, I'd like to mention that I have a considerable portion of my remarks which are directed towards questions that were asked by the Member for Swan River and if he is about he probably would like to hear some answers which I'll place on record to the various questions that were raised by him the other day.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface raised a number of points, the one dealt with Legal Aid Clinics. And I want to reaffirm my view that the development of Legal Aid Clinics in Manitoba has been a progressive step. I think that there are areas that can be handled better through the Legal Aid Clinic method than through the private bar. The examples that I would like to offer to the House in this respect are, right off the bat of course, Family and Juvenile Court matters. Unfortunately the matters pertain to the Family and Juvenile Court although I think among the most important matters that can face an individual when he's faced with proceedings in a court often do not receive the attention, for remuneration or other reasons, as they ought to from the private bar. So that the Legal Aid Clinics can perform a very useful element here.

Of course also dealing with the entire question of the rights and proceedings that may be commenced by various groups, whether it's tenants groups or neighbourhood groups, or a group in a neighbourhood which is objecting to a particular development, a Legal Aid Clinic can perform a very effective progressive role in this type of thing. Or for instance, and here I mention the Legal Aid Clinic having been involved, although I disagree profoundly with some of the reasoning behind the court decision that dealt with the matter that was heard just recently dealing with Autopac and the surcharges, but the Legal Aid Clinic was involved in that type of matter. A Legal Aid Clinic I think at all times must be prepared to take up the case irregardless of unpopularity, or irregardless of any fear or concern that there might be inherent within that particular case because of the bigness of the particular opponent that they are facing, but I think they have to be prepared to perform in that type of role within our community to ensure that there's always a base of legal service provided for those that are in need and require the services of a lawyer, or lawyers that are prepared to campaign even though at times it may be an issue that may be of some sensitivity either to the big corporation or the big government. Here I think the Legal Aid Clinic performs a very very effective role.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)

I'd like to also mention to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that when we were at the Attorney-Generals Conference last week a number of provinces have moved completely, pretty well completely, to the Legal Aid Clinic system. In the Province of Quebec, Saskatchewan, I think intended in British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, the Legal Aid Clinic is the dominant form of legal aid assistance. Some concerns were expressed at that conference which are being checked into, and which a meeting has been requested with the Minister of Justice in Ottawa in respect to the present cost-sharing arrangement between the Federal Government and the provinces, by which the Federal Government now provides funding towards legal aid programs based on 50 cents per head of population or 90 percent of the cost, whichever is the lesser. Those provinces which are very heavily involved in the providing of legal aid through the clinics, they have found that they are jeopardized by this formula because the providing of legal services through the Legal Aid Clinic does amount in a lesser charge per case load on the average than through the private bar. So that representations are being made to the Federal Government to revise that share-of-cost-formula.

The member also raised the question of the Public Safety Building. I simply say this to him: one, that the principle is uncomprising, that the judiciary, the judges, the courts, the remand facilities, should all be kept separate as recommended by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission. That principle is paramount. And insofar as the practicalities of the suggestion that was made in an informal way by Councillor Steen, the Minister of Public Works is looking into that matter very thoroughly - he's had some discussion with myself and I believe with the Member for St. Boniface, and I'll be awaiting further reports from him in that connection, although at the present time there is some indication that it would not be the wisest move to proceed in that direction but that we would better to proceed with new facilities completely. But the principle, the earlier principle is one that is uncomprising and we should proceed with at the earliest possible time.

The Member for Swan River had raised a number of very important points in the House dealing with the provision of police services in northern reserves. We are presently in the process of negotiating with the Federal Government, and in fact sister provinces are also in similar process, in respect to the providing of RCMP and auxiliary police services to northern communities. A real effort is under way to attempt to develop and devise a plan by which natives can be involved in the policing of reserves but not only reserves, and this is where the provinces have had some concern that it should not be restricted only to the reserves the providing of these auxiliary police services through the RCMP, but they should also include the remote community or the non-treaty community in the same vicinity as the reserve. The providing of cabinet quarters has been of some assistance but we still are faced with the problem that the police in northern communities are not part of that community, they're not involved in any intimate way with the problems of the community; they visit the community usually only when they are responding to the issuing of a summons or appearing in a court case. A couple of months ago a member of the northern bar portrayed to me I thought very very vividly, very imagewise, the problem that's faced by a small northern community in the administration of justice. He mentioned that here we have this great plane descending upon the community, usually a mile or so away from the remote community, out of the plane usually jumps the Crown Attorney and the RCMP officers and the Defence Attorney with their personnel, the court reporters, and what not, and they're led into the community, all often generally southern people, or certainly people that don't relate to the community. They stay all day during court proceedings which are often . . .--(Interjection)-- Right. Which there's often difficulty in understanding insofar as the local inhabitants are concerned; they have difficulty understanding really what all this is about. There's some uneasiness to get away usually about 5:00 o'clock so that court proceedings are wrapped up. The officials leave, and often with a citizen or two of that particular community, to the plane and off they go in this great bird that's descended from the heavens.

So that we admittedly must do much to improve the administration of justice in northern areas. I am hopeful that the program that is being advanced by the Federal Government in consultation with the provinces, it's commonly known as the 3-B Program, that will provide this type of auxiliary native policing to the communities of northern Manitoba will assist in bringing northerners into the police force into closer intimate knowledge of the communities in which

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) they're attempting to serve, and may assist in communicating a clearer understanding of the law and its provisions to some of the communities which do need help in this respect. We will know, I would say to the Honourable Member from Swan River, possibly within three to six months exactly what is going to take place with these negotiations. The other provinces are also involved. This cost-sharing - arguments of course always take place, and argument as to the terms and the specifics of the various contracts that are being proposed, but there will be some important moves in that direction within the next few months.

The Pas Jail is of great concern and the jail facilities really come under the auspices of the Minister of Health and Social Development, with the court facilities under the Department of the Attorney-General. They're housed all in the same quarters.

About a month ago I visited these facilities, Mr. Speaker, and they're not the facilities that one would be proud of in a modern civilized democratic society to see in existence. They are not the type of facilities that would be conducive to a proper administration of justice. They're antiquated; they would create I think an anti-social atmosphere, and I know that the department is involved now with our department in the planning of new facilities, new court facilities, new jail facilities, and I hope that we soon get it by the point of planning to actual start on some construction of facilities that we could be --(Interjection)-- Yes, and I believe that planning has been in progress for some time, and all that I want to say to the Honourable Member from Swan River that I think that that development should be hastened because I'm not intending to justify those present facilities in The Pas. I think that they're beyond justification.

The Honourable Member for Swan River also dealt with patrols by RCMP officers and he was particularly dealing at Swan River with a situation in Swan River, I believe, in similar areas to Swan River. I think the problem in Swan River so I'm informed is that the detachment there has five men and this permits only one man on duty during the daytime and two men at night, making it very difficult for them to cover their patrol responsibilities on foot, particularly bearing in mind that men on patrol duty must quickly react to other emergencies that might arise at any time in the future.

Well I can see, Mr. Speaker, that there is a problem if you're dealing with a fairly large community such as Swan River, and if the patrol men are on foot I don't know how they could be expected to cover the entire town as effectively as they can by car. But I want to say to the Honourable Member for Swan River that in my own area, in Selkirk, the RCMP have commenced foot patrol, as of about a year ago, and the reports have been very very encouraging as a result of these foot patrols. But there is the practical problem as to how effective foot patrols can be insofar as they certainly restrict a person's movements in covering a large area, how much concentration would he be restricted to if he was working on the basis of foot patrol rather than cruiser car.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. PAWLEY: The honourable member also dealt with the crime rate. The statistics that I have available to me is that insofar as the City of Winnipeg statistics are concerned, the crime rate in 1973 as compared to 1972 shows a fractional increase generally, but a decrease, interestingly, a decrease in major crimes. By that I'm referring to of course, murder, rape, the serious crimes, actually a decrease within the City of Winnipeg in that area - pleased to receive this information because it may in fact be counter to the trends elsewhere within our continent, but within the City of Winnipeg a decrease in the major type of crimes, slight, very slight, and I don't think we should read too much into it. Next year at this time we may be reporting an increase in major crime, but this past year the statistics that are made available indicate a minor decrease in major crimes, over-all a slight increase in the City of Winnipeg.

Outside however, the City of Winnipeg RCMP statistics indicate the increase of approximately 19 percent in 1973 as compared to 1972. Included within their statistics are offences under the criminal code, federal statutes, provincial statutes, municipal by-laws, but not such offences of course as parking and other minor by-law figures. Major crimes outside of the City of Winnipeg did show an increase last year, and from RCMP statistics an increase of nine percent, so we have a slight decrease in the City of Winnipeg, nine percent increase in major crime outside the City of Winnipeg. I don't know whether it's the influence of Swan River in those statistics outside the --(Interjection)--

I hope I've answered most of the questions that were asked. If not, I certainly would be prepared to meet with anybody individually on any of the points that were raised.

CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 20 to 27 pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,383,300 for Civil Service. Resolutions 28 to 32 separately and collectively pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$86,231,700 for Colleges and Universities Affairs, Resolutions 33 to 36 pass.

Consumer and Corporate Affairs you don't want, very well.

A MEMBER: Skip by that please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$907,600 for Co-operative Development. Resolutions 44 to 46 collectively, pass.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty \$145,392,800 for education. Resolutions 47 to 51 pass.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,542,300 for Finance. Resolutions 52 to 56 pass. . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the Honourable the House Leader of the Opposition that one of his colleagues, if he was within calling distance, one of his colleagues did want to make a contribution here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . have the same problem that House Leaders have all the time and that is keeping members in the House. Perhaps we can skip Finance for the moment and go on to Health and Social Development, since the Member for Rhineland is in here.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$271,991,700 for Health and Social Development. Resolutions 57 to 63. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you will allow me a minute I just came back from another meeting that I had. I have my material in with my suitcase . . . Here we are. Thank you for your indulgence in waiting. I suppose that we can be thankful to get this opportunity to speak on Health and Social Development since it did not come up in the Estimates where we could do a clause by clause study of the department. It's such a huge department that I think that it really should have deserved a little more effort than what we will be able to put into it in this short time. It certainly is the largest department and it's probably the most important, and it has certainly been besieged by very serious problems within the last year, and indeed prior to that. I feel that very many of these problems, very definitely, can be related directly to a lack of direction by the government, and mismanagement, contradicting directives which have come from various departments, and this has been causing a lot of confusion and inefficiency with the department. It's this mismanagement that I think that the Minister must devote full time to, to make certain that he gets all the departments under his control, because at the present time there certainly is absolutely no evidence of this whatsoever.

This was so evident by the letter that I tabled in the House earlier when the Manitoba Hospitals Organization, when they pointed this out in so many areas where you had health, education, and social planning, directly conflicting with the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission, and this is one problem area that definitely has to be settled so that whatever directives go down to the various departments that they have been thoroughly examined first.

Now with this mismanagement that has been going on it's small wonder that we did not get to see the estimates so that we could examine them in detail. We seem to have a lack of trust between heads of departments and government and providers of health care. There certainly is a lack of consultation with providers of health care, especially when any new programs are implemented, and this again creates confusion and inefficiency. This was so very evident in a nursing home program where nobody really knew in which direction they were going to head. The program was announced four months previous to the time that it was implemented; nobody had any time whatsoever to go out and see just exactly how we could implement this program, therefore we have come into a lot of difficulties.

Now whenever serious situations have developed the Minister of Health and Social Development has turned his back on them and assured this House that there really was no serious situation, and this was so evident in the situation in the hospitals when the emergency cases had to be turned away. He refused to take the responsibility for the situation and blamed it on Manitoba Health - on the Commission. So I believe that the Minister, even if the Commission

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BROWN cont'd) makes policy, and so on, that the Minister still has to take the responsibility of the policies that are implemented. The Minister should at all times be aware of what is going on and be in a position where he can either defend or take the responsibility for the actions that are taken by the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission.

Here again one of the contributing factors to the shortage of active beds that the hospitals were experiencing was through the Nursing Home Care Program. Now a lot of these beds in the hospitals are occupied by people who have been panelled, should be in nursing homes, and yet because there is no space available for them they are occupying acute beds, which are costing this province and the taxpayer of this province a lot of money. Your hospital beds at the present time are running anywhere I believe in the City between 90 and 115 dollars a day and these people are occupying beds which in the nursing home would cost them possibly between 15 and 20 dollars a day. Now at one time we had within the City of Winnipeg alone, we had 300 people occupying acute beds. Now if you just take this figure by about \$85.00 a month, or \$85.00 a day, which it is costing us more to have these people occupying these acute beds, that you come up with a fantastic figure. Surely we should be able to find proper accommodation for them which is less expensive.

One cannot help but wonder if the government is trying to control health costs by controlling the demand. We wonder is the Minister trying to control the costs of health care by creating huge backlogs of elective surgery and denying Manitobans the health care that in many instances it is urgently needed. We are led to believe that these elective surgery cases are not all that important that they can afford to wait, but they are pretty important to these people that are waiting for them. In many instances people can no longer do their work until such a time as they have received this surgery. Now this means that they will probably be waiting three or four months, they'll be laid off from their work for three or four months before they can get their surgery done and that they can get back to work. Now it certainly is inconveniencing the person who is waiting for this elective surgery, and we will have to see that this backlog does not get out of hand.

Now we have heard no reports from the Minister on existing community clinics. Now we wonder is research done on community clinics, and was research done before these were built so that a valid comparison can be made? Now the concept of community clinics was to provide better health facilities for everyone, but we are wondering, how will the Minister control the costs on community clinics? Will the demand be controlled as it was in the hospitals? This is completely contrary to the concept of community clinics where everybody is supposed to have access and receive the best health care that you can possibly get, and yet when we see all the backlogs that are in the hospitals we wonder. Is the Minister going to try to control health care in the community clinics the same way as what he is doing in the hospitals? Maybe we should take another good look at private clinics if community clinics is not going to be the over-all answer, and I myself am far from convinced that this is going to be the answer. We can certainly see a need for them in the northern areas of the province, or in any area that has had difficulty providing health care for their people, but surely in southern Manitoba, in the cities, and so on, I really see very little need for community clinics when we have private clinics that are giving us good health care. Now I would much rather see a doctor building his own clinic and looking after his patients than for the taxpayer to go out and build a clinic for him. I believe that the doctor will have more interest if it's a private clinic, and he is going to look after his patients better.

I see that we have gone into the Home Care Program which is a good program. I have absolutely nothing to criticize that program at the present time. I am just wondering how we are going to control the costs in this. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we will have to have a lot of local input in this program. Nobody knows better how much assistance is needed by people receiving home care than your local councillor. I have discussed this with many a councillor, and having been on council myself within my own community I know very well how much assistance is needed, whether somebody needs somebody to come in there and help them for two hours, or whether he needs somebody for half an hour a day, or whether he needs somebody for half a day, or whether they need full-time care. I believe that every councillor in a rural community knows what is needed of the people who would be qualified for home care.

I have also been discussing this with some of the city councillors, and they say there would be absolutely no problem here either because if they don't know the person they always

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BROWN cont'd) know somebody who does, and I believe that this is one way in which we would be able to come up with a good program and keep it within reasonable bounds. I very definitely believe that we should try to keep our old people in their homes as long as we possibly can because this keeps them in the community which they've lived in all their lives and where their friends are, and they certainly are going to be much happier staying in their own homes as long as possible, and we should help to keep them there.

I believe that there is going to be another area of trouble that we will be facing shortly, and that is we're going to be faced with a shortage of nurses. There is no doubt about it. I happened to be on the West Coast about six weeks ago. The first thing that struck me when I opened the paper over there was that they were predicting a large shortage of nurses in Vancouver and in British Columbia in general. Now if they're going to be faced with a shortage over there where nurses do receive quite a bit more remuneration than what they do over here, and it always has been a tendency for nurses to go down to the West Coast where your climate is possibly better, there is going to be a drain over here and we already will be facing a shortage. I hope that the Minister is going to look into the situation and see how this can be alleviated. The only thing that I'm sure that can be done is getting part-time, part-time nursing staff, and if we are going to move to that area then the time is now because these people want to know if they're going to be working part time or not. They have to make their arrangements too.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, for instance how many patients have been admitted to non-emergency medical care in the past four months. Let's say in the Health Sciences Centre, for instance. I'm sure that this would be very little, very few people, and the waiting list must be growing by leaps and bounds. I haven't had opportunity to check into this but I am certain that your waiting list is growing because the information that I have received there have been very very few people have received non-emergency medical care.

I would like to discuss ambulance services. I asked the question in the House the other day whether we were going to receive a bill on ambulance services and the Minister at that time indicated that it would just be, the program had just been implemented, that it had been funded for, and I would like to know just exactly what is this program going to be? I believe that every community in the province is anxiously awaiting some announcement of the ambulance program that the government will be coming up with.

I would like to see that ambulance technicians receive just a little more training than what they have been receiving so far. I think it would be very wise if ambulance technicians could administer intravenous.

The ambulances should also have a two-way communication system. I know that we have this in the Town of Winkler where I come from; we have telephones in our ambulance over there and whenever any difficulty arises the ambulance operator can always telephone the doctor, or when they're taking a patient into the city if anything develops they're always in contact with either the hospital authorities or with doctors. This is a very central service, and I hope that the Minister will see to it that we will get ambulances that are properly equipped and that our technicians who are operating the ambulances that they do receive a little more training. I think that there -- well I know that there are some cities that provide special training for ambulance operators, and Calgary is one of them.

Now the Minister made a study on the availability of hospital beds quite some time ago, at least we were given to understand that he would, and we have received absolutely no report of this, and I wonder if he would be able to give us a report on the availability of hospital beds. At one time or other he made the statement that we absolutely hadn't had any crisis as far as hospital beds were concerned, that we had plenty of beds to go around, and yet at the same time we are going to construct another hospital within the City limits, Seven Oaks to be exact, and I'm wondering if we do have adequate space then why are we constructing more facilities? It's I think another area that the Minister possibly should clear up.

We're also wondering how much more of an estimated increase will there be in the budget of the Health Sciences Centre due to the labour settlement? We have received really no details on what the settlement was over there. We are wondering will other hospitals be treated in a like manner of the settlement that was awarded there, or will they still have to operate within the eight percent guideline that was set by the government at the beginning of the year?

Another area which we should possibly be discussing is our doctor situation. I'm wondering if we are making the best use of the doctors that we have within the province. They are

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BROWN cont'd) allocated only so many hospital beds, and they have restrictions as far as the use of operating rooms are concerned. Now I'm sure that with proper consultation and planning we could have better distribution of doctors throughout the province. The way doctors are restricted within the City of Winnipeg it would lead you to believe that we have a surplus of doctors within the city, and this however is not a case in the rural area. Now if we do have a surplus over there, then surely we should be getting together consulting with the doctors and trying to get a more equitable distribution throughout the province.

This brings me to another question at the present time, and that is the question of the clinical clerks. I'm wondering, are we still advertising for more doctors in magazines in foreign countries? I wonder if the Minister is aware of the way these doctors are treated when they come to Manitoba. Very many of them are very highly qualified surgeons and they are forced to work at exceptionally low salaries. If we invite them into Manitoba then I believe that we do have an obligation to fulfill. These people at the present time have absolutely no recourse, either to the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission or the College of Physicians and Surgeons. We have different standards of medical doctors over here. Many of these have been trained in one specialty only, and they're doing an excellent job in that field, but our laws over here say that first of all before you become highly qualified surgeon that you have to take your practitioner's course. Therefore these people do not qualify when they come over here and they are not allowed to practice. Yet this is not explained to them when they come over. They're under the impression that they will be fully qualified medical practitioners when they come over, and this is one of the reasons why we are having a lot of unhappy people.

I would just like to go into the welfare problem briefly. It seems to me that so many of our problems that we are experiencing within the Department of Welfare is caused by alcohol and drug. We certainly have to come up with a better educational program as far as alcohol is concerned. Almost all our welfare cases can be related directly to the problem of alcohol or drugs.

We are receiving roughly \$40 million on the sales of liquor, and I believe that the estimates show that we are spending some \$739,000 on education of alcohol. We certainly have to come up with a much better program than that, and I believe that if we would spend every penny of what we get on the sales of alcohol and really do a very thorough alcohol education, we could greatly cut down on our cost of welfare, and this is about the only area in which we will be able to cut down on this expenditure, that is through proper education. It's something that will have to start at a very early age, and we will have to get a lot of social workers out into the field to really be in close contact with these people that have problems.

A lot of our problems that we have in the Children's Aid Society are also directly related to alcohol where you have a breaking up of marriages and homes, and again I must call for a lot more money to be spent on the education of alcohol to the people of the province and I hope that the government is going to take a very close look at this because this is our number one problem within the province. Thank you.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well inasmuch as the budget in Health and Social Development is taking up the larger part of the expenses made by this government, it would seem appropriate that we make a contribution in the concurrence motion in this department.

I think that I would like to go back to the time when the House first started sitting, and at which time we were faced in this province for the very first time with a confrontation that took proportions that were rather alarming and distressing to every Manitoban I am sure. I'm referring to the confrontation that was taking place between the government and the Manitoba Medical Association, or the members of the Manitoba Medical Association. This was a confrontation, Sir, that many Manitobans have felt all along could have readily been avoided had the government not been obstinate in its stand with respect to the handling of that particular situation. Luckily cooler heads prevailed and the confrontation became - I don't know what the appropriate term is, but there was an agreement reached whereby the doctors did not pull the plug as they had threatened they would towards the latter part of that set-to with the government.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the honourable member will allow me to just introduce another group of students Grade 5 standing, 26 in number, from Birtle-Russell. They are under the direction of Mrs. Lang. On behalf of all the Honourable Members I welcome you here today.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

CONCURRENCE, Cont'd.

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, the confrontation that took place was quieted - and I suppose that that's the only term that one can use - towards the end but it was one that has left some very very deep scars. I don't want to reopen the wounds that were caused but I would like to say that it should be for all Manitobans, and the government particularly, a lesson on what not to do when you are dealing with people who are experts in their field. I think that the First Minister on a number of occasions has said that co-operation with the medical profession was a goal which he fully subscribed to, and I think that during the altercations that took place, and they were vocal altercations, I think that that co-operation was wanting all the way along, Mr. Speaker. I would think that the lesson that we have learned is that if we want to, with all the goodwill in the world, sit down and talk to the group, any group concerned, and evaluate the reasons for their not wishing to accept the kinds of options that the government is offering, then I think, Mr. Speaker, we are able to solve the differences without having these deep scars that I talked about that will take a very long time to heal.

Now there will be, and I hope that the present Minister will see to it that there will be many opportunities whereby the government when it is planning on introducing new schemes will sit down with the medical profession and talk to them about the schemes that they intend on introducing. There was a catch phrase during the dispute that I cannot help but recall, and that catch phrase by the government was, it is the responsibility of the government to decide on how the services will be dispensed, and what is best for the medical health of the province. We will not let the medical profession veto government plans.

I felt all along, Mr. Speaker, that that was a very callous and uncalled for kind of remark because I followed the dispute very closely. I had a number of talks with members of the medical profession, in fact, Dr. Wylie, the President of the Association at that time, and there was never any veto power sought by the medical profession. There was never at any time, I repeat, any veto power desired by the medical profession. If the Honourable Ministers, who are now uttering from their seats, say that my statement is false, I say to them, will they please during the Concurrence debate take part and prove beyond any doubt, not on hearsay, but prove beyond any doubt that the medical profession wanted the veto power on government plans. If they will do that, I will not be obstinate and I will accept, but in all of the dealings I have had with members of the medical profession, it has become absolutely clear to me that there were not at any time veto powers requested. As a matter of fact, the medical profession was willing to work along hand in hand with the government to make sure that the health facilities of this province and the . . .

A MEMBER: Would the Honourable Member permit a question?

MR. MARION: When I'm through . . . and the health services rendered to Manitobans were at least on a par with all of the other services rendered to Canadians throughout this great country of ours.

I would hope that there will be, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, I hope that there will be a great deal of dialogue between the government and the medical profession, as there should be between the government and any other profession that deals with the public at large, because when you introduce legislation, at any time that you introduce legislation affecting a profession, you should at least have the courtesy of listening to members of that profession who will voice how the legislation that is to be introduced will affect their dispensing of services to the Manitoba population, and surely I think that we have now learned a lesson and we should be more ready to work hand in hand with the profession, with the medical profession in this case, to make sure that Manitobans are properly protected.

I think that before I leave this specific subject, I can't help but refer to the appointment that was made with respect to a Deputy Minister. Now this appointment is not of long-standing and I think that when the appointment was made there was no doubt that the Minister realized that there were possibilities of encouraging further conflict. I trust, as I know my honourable

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MARION cont'd) friend the Minister of Health, I trust that he will use his good offices to eliminate in all possible form any re-occurrence of a conflict between the government of Manitoba and the medical profession.

Mr. Speaker, we have on a number of occasions, members on this side, talked about the shortage of hospital beds, and I'm afraid that we have certainly not been able to make our point and I don't know why we haven't been able to make this point with the honourable minister, but it is a known fact, Sir, that there are waiting lists that now stretch to well beyond the middle of August. Now, in some of the inquiries that were made - and you'll recall, Mr. Speaker, that members of this side during the question period asked the minister to table in this House the actual situation with respect to hospital beds. Right up until this time, my honourable friend the Minister has not tabled this information and on one occasion stated that it was information that he was keeping unto himself. I hope that perhaps when he is responding to what he might feel is unjust criticism on our part, that he will advise us exactly what the hospital bed situation is like in the City of Winnipeg and in the province generally, and he will tell us what measures he hopes to take to alleviate the situation, because in all of the studies which were made, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that it was found by all of the experts that a hospital bed shortage did exist, and that mostly the professional groups who made the surveys said that the reason for the bed shortage was because of the fledgling plan for nursing homes; this plan had not gotten off the ground yet and far too many geriatric patients were being housed in beds that could accommodate those who were suffering and had to be wait-listed for unreasonable periods, Mr. Speaker. I trust that the Minister will tell us exactly how he feels with respect to the hospital bed shortage and what plan he intends on developing to make sure that this is a non-recurring thing.

Now I think the Minister, during some of the answers that he gave, mentioned that this is not a first; that in previous years we have had a hospital bed shortage; and I concur that there is no doubt that there have been in the history of Manitoba situations where we have had hospital bed shortages and there will be in ensuing years. But I wonder if the Minister could really address himself to the severity, basically, of the hospital bed shortage as we see it today, and this wait-listing which I said a moment ago was one that I found intolerable when you say that people are being wait-listed for 2 1/2 and 3 or more months.

Mr. Speaker, in dialoguing with a member of the medical profession, I was told that the general criteria that is acceptable throughout Canada is five beds per thousand of population, and I am told that certainly in the urban area of Winnipeg we are well below that. As a matter of fact, if we discount, because of the geriatric patients and because of services that are offered in the Metropolitan area that cannot be offered in any other area of the province, we are in the area of 3.7, which makes us well below the kinds of levels that are accepted by the medical profession throughout our country.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help also, while we're talking about the shortage of hospital beds, I can't help but talk about two other areas that have already been touched but should be talked about at greater length. We have all heard the term "elective surgery" being used at one time or another while talking about health services in this province. Well, I wonder, Sir, just how elective that list, that surgery list is. I think that you have people that are in essence seriously suffering and are not able to get into the hospital to have the surgery done that would eliminate this suffering. I wonder if really this is a kind of a situation that Manitobans and the government are willing to accept, Mr. Speaker. I think that there perhaps are some problems that make this elective list grow by leaps and bounds and extend to again a six, eight and twelve-week duration, and I think that the Minister has in his own mind certain steps that could be taken to alleviate the situation. I would be more than happy to listen to any suggestions that the Minister has and, as a matter of fact, I would encourage him to take any of the options that he feels can be taken so that this waiting list for surgery, Mr. Speaker, be brought down to what should be a reasonable waiting list, and I don't think that twelve weeks is at all a reasonable kind of option to offer to Manitobans in their health care. I think that there are situations right now, Mr. Speaker, that have come to light, where Manitobans are leaving the province to have what is referred to as elective surgery done in other provinces because they can be taken care of more rapidly and their pain can be eased more rapidly. Surely we don't want to live with that kind of a situation, Mr. Speaker.

I've been advised, and I know that the Minister probably is aware of the fact that we

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MARION cont'd) have other areas now that are causing great concern to Manitobans who are suffering, and I allude to the physiotherapy services that are being offered in this province throughout the hospitals. We have situations now where people who are really under duress and are actually suffering to quite a degree, Mr. Speaker, have to wait for a longer period than is reasonable.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.