

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 6 May, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING
AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVANTS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report same and ask leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Oral Questions, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right where we have 10 students of Grade 11 and 12 standing from Berens River under the direction of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Fiss. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

We also have 34 students from the Gimli High School under the direction of Mr. Michael Onyschuk. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance confirm a report that he did in Flin Flon at a meeting indicate that it was the intention of the provincial government to sell their interests back, insofar as the potash development was concerned in St. Lazare once the development was complete.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, it's the first I've heard of it.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll be forwarding to the Minister the press report that I made reference to. To the First Minister, in view of the fact that

Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario Legislatures have had a day set aside for debate pertaining to constitutional change, has the First Minister reconsidered his earlier position that there would be no days set aside within the Manitoba Chamber for a similar type of debate as has taken place in our sister provinces?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in order that I can answer my honourable friend accurately, is he talking about changes to the British North American Act or is he talking about the Referendum Debate in Quebec.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding the debates have included not only the Referendum in Quebec, but areas of debate pertaining to changes in The British North American Act and possible proposals that would be undertaken at the behest of Manitoba in that Act.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the clarification. My comment that has been made I think a number of times in the House is to the effect that there will be ample opportunity for discussions on changes to the Constitution as and when the Constitutional Debate resumes in Canada after the Prime Minister calls a meeting of the Premiers and the Attorneys-General and the other Ministers responsible. I look forward to that debate as much as my honourable friend and I can assure him that there will be ample opportunity for that kind of debate. With respect to the Quebec Referendum, which trenches upon that matter to some extent, I would reiterate what was said earlier, that we will be engaging upon the Budget Debate some time next week and there will be ample opportunity for my honourable friend and for any of us for that matter to make comment on that debate before it takes place and undoubtedly after the Referendum takes place.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that discussion pertaining to this important and vital area of concern during the Budget Debate would intrude upon the opportunity that opposition enjoys to deal with the Budget proposals. Would the First Minister not consider some separate time set aside for strictly discussion within this Chamber as to whether or not there is a consensus pertaining to constitutional changes and most relevant discussion prior to the vote in Quebec?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, without in any way wanting to be antagonistic about it, I would suggest with respect to my honourable friend that this is not the time, if he will ponder what I am about to say, this is not the time for provinces, with the greatest of respect, to be dealing in a detailed way with whether or not they would first of all accept, for instance, a

Bill of Rights with language entrenched in it, or matters of that sort, which could be taken and read, I would suggest, in perhaps an unfavourable way in the province of Quebec, largely because such a debate at this stage, Sir, would be premature.

Along with my honourable friend, I look forward to the Legislature having the fullest opportunity to debate that matter, and as I have indicated before, Mr. Speaker, to have a Committee of the House that would hear representations from the people of Manitoba as and when the constitutional discussions in Canada are resumed. They are in a state of suspension at the present time awaiting the outcome of the Referendum on the 20th of May. Thereafter, presuming that the Referendum goes the way all of us in this Chamber would hope it would go, there will be a resumption of Constitutional Conferences. I would think it would then be not only right, it would be more than appropriate to have the Legislature debate the question and have a Committee of the Legislature hear representations from the people of Manitoba. That has always been the intention of the government, as and when constitutional discussions resume in Canada.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, just by a further supplementary to the First Minister, is the First Minister then by inference suggesting that it was premature for the national leaders, Trudeau, Clark, Broadbent, provincial premiers, to have become involved in the discussions and in the debate pertaining to the Quebec Referendum, that it would have been better for them to have left unsaid statements that they had made to this point pertaining to their relationship to Quebec in the event of a Yes or a No vote?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was afraid that my honourable friend didn't understand me and that's why I asked him at the beginning of his question to clarify which of the two topics he was questioning us about. It's indeed true that one trenches upon the other, but the Quebec Referendum question is going to be decided on the 20th of May. The constitutional question that we are discussing is the one of the continuing constitutional discussions between the federal and the provincial governments in this country. They have been going on, as my honourable friend knows, for many many years. It would be right and appropriate for those, when they are resumed, to be discussed in the fullest way in this Legislature, and by a committee, and that's what we intend to do.

I was making no comment about other provincial premiers or national leaders who may have gone into the province of Quebec and talked about the referendum, the Oui or the Non question. What I was talking about was the inadvisability at this stage for Manitobans of whatever partisan stripe, that makes no difference, to be taking and setting firm positions with respect to constitutional negotiations which are in a state of abeyance. That is my only comment; it was not meant to cast aspersions on anyone, including my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to complete an undertaking that I took from certain members opposite last week to announce the by-election dates for the L.G.D. of Alexander. Upon my instructions, the nomination day will be Wednesday, May 21, and elections will follow on Wednesday, June 11, for the three vacancies.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask a supplementary to the Honourable Minister about his by-election. Does he then reinstate the other two members, whom he has suspended, concurrently with that announcement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: As soon as there is a quorum, they would be reinstated, which would be election day, June 11, I would expect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable First Minister, following up on the questions that were asked by the Leader of the Opposition who asked whether the First Minister thinks that the Prime Minister and other people should have left certain remarks unsaid. May I ask the First Minister whether he would agree that it would have been better had the Prime Minister of this country left certain remarks unsaid, namely that Rene Levesque has not got the courage, because he has not behaved in a similar way to the Algerian uprising and to the Irish uprising in the 19th Century, and make it clear that although we don't respect Mr. Levesque's ideas, or at least we don't agree with them, that we don't disparage his courage, having left a party which was the alternative and gone to a party with no seats and brought them to be the government of the province of Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, it has not been my habit or custom to make comments upon all statements of all Prime Ministers of Canada, and indeed I must say, for the benefit of my friend from Inkster, that I was not aware of that particular comment. Perhaps it was carried in the papers when I was visiting in the pristine temperatures of Thompson, Manitoba yesterday, but I am not familiar with that statement. I take my honourable friend at his word, however, when he quotes that statement, and I would say that if, indeed that kind of statement, which would be by implication and encouragement to civil disruption, if that statement were made, then indeed by anyone, that would be extremely regrettable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct another question to the Honourable First Minister. Due to the fact that the MP in Manitoba in the federal Cabinet

has indicated that rail line relocation would depend on allocation of other moneys which the provincial government receives to relocation, can the First Minister tell me whether he's going to take the federal moneys now advanced to health care, the post-secondary education to economic development, and re-allocate them to rail line relocation in order to preserve the sensitivities of the Member of Parliament for Fort Rouge?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that there's a fair amount of hypothesis in what the Member for Inkster asks. There is an equal amount of idiosyncrasy and foolishness, not in the question, but in the suggestion, if indeed that suggestion is being made by anyone who should be as responsible as a federal Cabinet Minister, and I can assure my friend from Inkster, and indeed the people of Manitoba, that there would be no disposition whatsoever on the part of the government of Manitoba to participate in that kind of an idiotic saga in order to resurrect promises and expectations that obviously cannot be fulfilled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a final supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the First Minister as a supplementary. Can the First Minister make it plain to our Ottawa representatives, including the Member for Fort Rouge, that the people of Manitoba have no argument against rail line relocation, provided it does not further delay an access route to north Winnipeg such as the Sherbrook-McGregor overpass?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought, and I'm confident in my own mind, that the Minister of Urban Affairs, speaking on behalf of the government, has made that position crystal clear on a number of occasions, both to the Mayor of the city of Winnipeg and to the different federal delegations he has dealt with on this matter. Of course, no one is opposed to rail relocation, if the federal government, which has primary responsibility for such matters, can pony up the money to make that come about; and if the province and the municipality could then sit down and negotiate in a reasonable way, that, too, would be carried on. It appearing to be the case, now, however, that the federal government does not, and will not have sufficient moneys to carry out their responsibilities in this field, then I'm sure that this government, along with the citizens of Winnipeg, would hope that the city of Winnipeg can proceed with the best alternative approach in order to give service to the people living upon that corridor, something that they have been waiting for for a good, long time, and which they deserve. It's overdue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Fort Rouge has correctly pointed out that I should have been referring to the previous Member for Fort Rouge, the now Member of Parliament for Fort Garry. I would not want to attribute to her the kinds of things that have happened with the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of privilege.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: On the same point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the member being referred to is the Member of Parliament for Winnipeg Fort Garry. He is not the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, I didn't have my nasty pills today, so perhaps we can get this back on the track a little bit, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed — I think, Mr. Speaker, the remarks are very interesting, and my question has to do with this. My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs, and I wondered why a Cabinet Minister was not able to represent this government at the citizens' meeting on railway relocation on Sunday afternoon, instead of a very amiable and very articulate backbencher who was not able to speak for the Cabinet at all?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I had a very important personal engagement that afternoon, of which some members are aware, and I would be pleased to inform the Member for Fort Rouge later.

MRS. WESTBURY: A further question to the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Does the Cabinet have a position, do they have a policy as regards to railway relocation, or as to the desirability for an overpass in lieu of a relocation? This House has not yet been told the government's position, and I think the citizens of Winnipeg would be most anxious to know what their preference is.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have had a consistent policy on rail relocation. What we are trying to determine is what degree, if any, of consistency do members of the Liberal Party have on this subject?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

MRS. WESTBURY: The Liberal Party is united in its recommendations, Mr. Speaker. I mean all members of the Liberal Party. Mr. Speaker, I do think I may be permitted to say that when I say members of the Liberal Party, I was not saying members of the Liberal Party who are elected to the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker. I realize that they're all very jealous of the position that Mr. Axworthy finds himself in at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, my further question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps we could allow the honourable member the courtesy of the House.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you for your courtesy, Mr. Speaker. My final supplementary is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Will the Minister of Urban Affairs be meeting with the Mayor and other representatives of the city of Winnipeg to develop a formal plan to be presented to the Transport Commission in accordance with requirements of The Relocation Act? This has not yet been done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, when Mayor Norrie and I met with Mr. Pepin, Mr. Pepin indicated, on behalf of himself and on behalf of Mr. Axworthy, that he would respond to us within a matter of days as to whether or not there was any possibility of any funding for rail relocation from any other source than the UTAP funds. To date we have not heard from him and I think it is incumbent on him and I am sure that he will follow through with that undertaking and advise us very shortly as to whether or not there are any additional moneys available through the federal government for rail relocation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a fourth question.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Minister not aware that The Relocation Act provides that the Transport Commission can order a relocation subject to the federal government's willingness to participate in requiring financial participation by the railways as well?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly aware of the requirements of The Rail Relocation Act, as our the city, requirements that, if they were followed through in fact to prepare a transportation plan, financial plan and development plan under that Act, would take some minimum of at least two years. That is why, Mr. Speaker, the city and the province sought assurances from the federal government as to whether or not they were prepared to make a specific financial commitment to rail relocation over and above UTAP funds. We have an answer from Mr. Pepin that from his department there is no more money available other than UTAP funds. We do not have a final answer; we expect to get that answer, that Mr. Pepin undertook, within a matter of days.

Mr. Speaker, the position of myself and the Mayor simply is that that commitment must be obtained before the whole transportation problem of the northern section of this city is further delayed.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the Honourable Attorney-General if he is now ready to report on his position regarding the banning of books for sale in retail counters without prosecution?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Not yet, Mr. Speaker, but I will be prepared to report to the member on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. In respect to some confusion that has been created as a result of recent statements by the Minister in regard to the use of 2,4,5-T in the province, can the Minister indicate a specific date as to when he will make a final and a firm decision as to whether his government is going to follow the lead of other governments in other enlightened jurisdictions and impose a ban on this hazardous substance for use in the province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

MR. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot indicate a specific date at this time.

MR. COWAN: Can the Minister indicate then if there is any spraying of 2,4,5-T ongoing currently in the province and can the Minister further clarify statements attributed to him to the effect that the danger posed by the chemical is reduced because it is being used in remote areas? In specific, are we to interpret that persons living in remote areas are more immune to the effects of this chemical, or are we to interpret that to mean that the chemical loses its hazardous properties when it leaves the urban environment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Churchill that the debate he is attempting to carry out here can better be carried out in Committee of Supply. If the honourable member wishes to modify his question, that's fine.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the question is on the record and I would hope the Minister would answer it, but I will ask a third supplementary: In light of some confusion that has arisen as a result of the Minister being quoted as downplaying the health hazards associated with the use of 2,4,5-T, and in recognition of the fact that the Minister does not intend to impose any immediate ban and cannot tell us as to when that ban would be imposed, if it would be imposed, can the Minister now categorically state in this House that he does not recommend the use of 2,4,5-T in this province and suggest to those persons that are using it that they immediately stop using it and do not import or purchase further supplies.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again, I suggest to the honourable member — apparently he cannot hear what I was suggesting to him — that that type of debate is better carried out in Committee of Supply rather than in the Question Period.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your advice, and would only point out to you that we have finished the Environment estimates in the Committee

of Supply and would hope that the Minister would take this opportunity to inform the public as to what he intends to do, and his government's opinions as to the health hazards associated with the use of 2,4,5-T in the province, that being, to my way of thinking, a very important issue that confronts all of us presently. I would hope that the Minister would answer and I would hope that you would give him the opportunity to do so, as he seems willing to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything further to what I have already told my honourable friend in the Committee of Supply yesterday.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of Highways whether he has received a communication from the Minister of the Environment requesting whether his department has in stock 2,4,5-T, or are they continuing with tenders for stocks of 2,4,5-T to be sprayed on roadways in the province of Manitoba, or is he prepared to take the lead before his colleague and listen to his colleague's earlier remarks that we will not use this product since there was a controversy, and the Minister agreed that there was a controversy about the product and initially stated that he was going to ban it and now he has changed his mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): I don't quite know which question to answer. Yes, I have received a communique from the Minister of the department.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What did the communication say, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate, and what does he intend to do in terms of the specifics of the communication?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the letter that was sent to my department was an internal document requesting certain information as to my department's use of 2,4,5-T. I have to indicate to the Member for St. George that I received that document.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether his department has ordered a new supply of 2,4,5-T and is it his intention to continue the use of that product this year?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that we have purchased a certain quantity some time ago of 2,4,5-T.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. In view of the remarks of the Minister of Immigration that certain provincial politicians are engaging in cheap politics, I wonder whether the Minister of Urban Affairs could confirm that at 60,000 per week for delay on the construction of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, that it's the Minister of Immigration who is engaging in expensive politics.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, perhaps I can answer two questions placed by the Member for Wellington on Tuesday, April 15 with respect to a letter which appeared in the Letters to the Editor of the Winnipeg Free Press relative to sterilization procedures. Mr. Speaker, the answer to both questions is no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary, I want to ask the Minister of Community Services whether he will be attending the day care rally tonight, and I would also ask him whether he shares the view expressed by Norma McCormick, who is a well-known advocate and supporter of day care services, that animals in the public pound have better rules and regulations that children in day care centres.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the last question is no. The answer to the first question, Mr. Speaker, is that I will be in the building at 7:30 this evening and I presume that I will have a chance to speak to the gathering that will be here.

I would also like to draw to the attention of the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that an invitation did go out to the executive of the coalition for day care to meet in my office at any time that was convenient to them, and to this date they have not accepted that invitation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Minister whether he has any intention of tightening up the regulations for unlicensed day care centres or so-called family day care centres?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, at the present time, I feel that the licensing method and the guaranteeing of equality, etc., in the day care facilities are adequate. I will be giving consideration later on in the year when we deal with the guest home and group home licensing at that time, because the same regulations can and may apply to day care centres.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Minister of Finance. We have asked him on several occasions to table the memorandums of agreement with respect to the mining developments at St. Lazare and Flin Flon. I am wondering whether he can do so today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think at the time I was questioned on it, I did reply to the member that in the case of Flin Flon, that the best avenue for him to pursue this is when the Manitoba Mineral Resources is before the Legislative Committee, when he can ask for all the information he may desire. I am sure that they will provide as much as they feel that they can at this particular time.

With regard to the potash development, I indicated there that essentially, again, what has taken place is that the assignment of the Crown-held leases in the area in question have been, for the period of exploration, made available to the IMC, and that the agreement that would be undertaken following that would be the agreement which, of course, he would be interested in being apprised of. Since that hasn't taken place, there is really very little more that can be made to the member or to the House at this particular time.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, to the Minister of Finance: This preliminary agreement does apparently give this company the right to do the exploration. I am just wondering exactly what is contained in that agreement. For instance, has the government and the company agreed on any specific royalties, any specific amounts for any specific amounts of time? Has the government agreed to that type of clause in this memorandum of agreement in order to induce the company to do the exploration work? Have you set any prices?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question on that just in the last couple of days, and I indicated no, that those kinds of details have not been settled and are subject to the further negotiations that will take place as we develop the final feasibility study during 1980.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, again to the Minister of Finance, I'm not sure I understand exactly why it is that that potash agreement cannot be tabled at this particular point in time. Is there something about that agreement which would be in the public interest for the public not to know about?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it might help the member to know that there never have been regulations ever formally promulgated with regard to potash, and those regulations, which would be the normal procedure that the government would go through in the issuing of an Order-in-Council covering them, would eventually come forth. Those will be public when they are finally dealt with by

Order-in-Council through the Cabinet, so they will be public information. But as I say, it may be helpful for him to know that there have not been formal regulations applied to potash as it has applied to oil and hard rock minerals, metallic minerals and so on. And that is still to come.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a fourth question.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister of Finance for informing us that public documents, Orders-in-Council and regulations will be made public. What I'm asking about is whether the agreement will be made public.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the agreement referred to by the member, the formal agreement, is still to come. The only thing that has been done in any formal way at all is to indicate by Letter of Intent so the company could proceed with its exploration work, that the government would be issuing the regulations in the regular manner, and that they could feel secure in proceeding, on the basis of 2 million of investment and so on, whatever required to complete the studies, so that they could get started by May 15th, and I trust that they are busy getting into the field at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Finance, I wonder if the Minister then would indicate, since he hasn't clearly said to the House, is the Minister willing to table the Letter of Intent that he has in regard to the potash development?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the entire contents of the Letter of Intent have already been indicated by way of public statement by the government. There is nothing more to be issued.

MR. McBRYDE: Then my question to the Minister is, could he explain to the House then, why he will not table that Letter of Intent?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, having now answered this three or four times, if it will ease the member's pain, I think we should probably table the Letter of Intent.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the Minister of Finance thinks that he should now table the Letter of Intent. My question to the Minister is, will the Minister table the Letter of Intent?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take it under consideration.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable First Minister. In view of the fact that Autopac paid a private auditing company 70,000 for auditing its books, is the First Minister satisfied that Manitoba drivers are receiving

economic and efficient service, in view of the fact that the provincial auditor did the same job for 38,000.00?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied, in this administration, as I think all other premiers across Canada are satisfied that having private audits by private auditing companies of public corporations is in the public interest. It was only when the bizarre took place, Mr. Speaker, when the NDP, under my honourable friends, from 1969 to 1977, abolished such audits, that Manitoba became odd man out. Manitoba again is following what all other jurisdictions have done in the public interest, and yes, it is in the public interest.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the First Minister should explain to the House what he considers bizarre about the provincial auditor's work. I will ask him as a supplementary question whether he intends to reverse the government's policy by turning back the auditing to the provincial auditor and save the Manitoba drivers 30,000 a year. Is he prepared to do that?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my use of the adjective bizarre was not attached to the provincial auditor. It was attached to my honourable friends opposite. Their tactics with respect to auditing practices were indeed bizarre, and no reflection whatsoever upon the provincial auditor, and he knows that.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying, my honourable friend from St. Vital is now concerned about saving the taxpayers of Manitoba 30,000.00. Would that he might have been more concerned about saving the taxpayers of Manitoba 40 million when he embarked upon the fiasco of Saunders Aircraft.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I had a question from the Member for St. Johns which he reminded me of yesterday, and perhaps I can indicate the answer to it. It was with regard to a particular tax discounter, and I want to indicate to the member, and he was good enough to supply the name to me, for the investigation, that the RCMP was called into this matter approximately a year ago to investigate. Charges were laid in March of 1980, and the matter is presently in the courts.

The party in question had received their 1980 licence to operate and that still stands, and of course is subject to the outcome of the court case, and that's about as much as I can tell the member at this time, except it is in the courts.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Minister. I would assume then, and I ask him, shall one assume then, that refunds have not been made by this person and will not be made unless there is a conviction of this? But meanwhile,

that person, tax discounter, is permitted to continue to operate his business as at the present time.

MR. CRAIK: That's the information I'm provided with, Mr. Speaker, that that is the case. Until such time as the court gives its decision, his licence stands.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the Honourable First Minister, relating to the questions he answered regarding the use of private auditors, whether he is now considering replacing the provincial auditor in his present function with private accounting auditors to carry out that job, which he thinks is better done by private auditors?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker. As in most things this government has had to do since assuming office in 1977, we are returning the administration of public affairs to a normal state. They were abnormal before.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just finish off a reply to questions. There was a question also from the Member for The Pas regarding the employment picture in The Pas with regards to the temporary close-down of the sawmill portion of the ManFor operations. There were two questions. One was with regards to whether there is any evidence of tradesmen leaving The Pas. As far as ManFor can determine there is not any problem that has arisen in that regard; and secondly whether any management were laid off during the shut down period, and I understand that the answer is no.

There was a third question earlier from the Member for St. Vital with regards to iron ore deposits in western Manitoba as to whether or not the government had an involvement in the development of these or potential development of these deposits and the answer to that question is no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, a question evolving from the Minister's answer. There was another part to my question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could report to us whether there has been any improvement in lumber sales from the ManFor sawmill. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform us what functions the management people that have been kept on, since all other employees have been laid off, what function the middle and junior management people would be carrying on at this time since there is no one there for them to supervise now.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, with regards to the latter questions of the Member for The Pas, I think those are the kinds that should be directed to the management when they are before the committee. As to whether or not the lumber market has improved, as of a week ago or so there weren't any very positive signs of improvement and it is a fairly slow-moving scene because most of the sales are in

the United States and the market is pretty slow as a result of the housing slow down there. So the picture is not a particularly good one with regards to lumber although it remains good with regards to the pulp operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas with a final question.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask more than one final question, but I'll put it into one final question. I wonder if the Minister could tell us what, in his role as the Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro, could tell us what stock of 2,4,5-T Manitoba Hydro has at this time, whether they've ordered and received any new supply of this dangerous chemical and, Mr. Speaker, what they intend to use it for this year and how extensive their use will be this year of this chemical.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that question was taken as notice yesterday from the Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the time for question period having expired. The Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, by agreement there's been a change in the order of estimates. The Department of Agriculture will begin outside the House this afternoon, as well the Department of Health will continue inside the House this afternoon. This evening only the Department of Health's estimates will be under consideration, and Agriculture will recontinue tomorrow or the next day.

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

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to enter this debate on grievances by some of the remarks that were made by the First Minister in answer to a question directed to him by my leader just a few short minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to make my remarks in French because I hope that these remarks will be — I want them to be heard by everyone and I hope understood. I believe, Sir, that we are facing one of the most important issues in this question of what's going to happen to Canada. Is Canada going to stay united or is it going to be divided? Sir, there seems to be very little interest in this and especially in English Canada and there is certainly much confusion. That could be rectified Sir, I believe by leadership — leadership that is not forthcoming, and I'm not only referring to Manitoba, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that there is a very real danger. I'd say that the odds are that the Oui vote will win on the 20th of this month, and then there will

be a lot of soul searching but it might be a little too late.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe you can divorce the question of the referendum with a question of possible changes in the confederation in the make-up of this country. It is unfortunately that so many Canadians feel that what happened a 100 years ago on the Plains of Abraham, the 45-minute battle, or so, between to foreign countries, between France and England, should regulate what's going to happen in this beautiful country of ours — 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that this is the issue. I don't think the French people will conquer it. The French showed that it had very little interest in their possession here in Canada. There were two groups who equally decided to join and form a country. The French people I think are responsible if there still is a Canada today because they defended it against the invaders from the South. Mr. Speaker, this was ratified by England and we were supposed to embark and prosper as a country, as partners.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose the following analogy that I hope will make you understand, make us understand a little better the situation as we know it today. I am thinking of a marriage that took place in the days when maybe the female partner was some kind of a second-class citizen maybe and had to stay married because of the children and because of security. And this was the situation for many years, Mr. Speaker, where the bride, in this case the province of Quebec and the Canadians of French origin had to, certainly the agreement that they made when they joined together was not fulfilled in so many instances, but like the bride, whenever a bride finds difficulties or has started to cry, well in the old days you would buy her a hat or give her a present and tell her that things would go well and then you'd forget again until the next time.

I don't know if what the Honourable Member for Inkster said about — but made the statement of Mr. Trudeau said, was exactly the way it was made. I didn't hear it, but if this is the case I certainly cannot share the opinion that many people have of Mr. Levesque. My position on separatism is well known. I don't have to apologize for making a statement, nor do I have to explain, but I consider Mr. Levesque a great man, a man of courage, certainly not a coward. We needed a Mr. Levesque. It's been going on for more than 100 years and finally somebody is standing up. And the times have changed, Mr. Speaker. Marriages are not exactly the same. The bride now wants to stand on her own two feet, wants equality. She is facing the bridegroom and she is saying, no, there is no point, and this is what Mr. Levesque is saying, let's separate as friends, but let's separate, we have nothing to gain.

Mr. Levesque is saying exactly what so many people, especially in western Canada, want to hear. You don't want, you don't need French in Regina, Fort Qu'Appelle or Winnipeg, there is no point in it. There is no point at all, why should you be embarrassed about that, why should you be forced to give the service. Let's separate and let's negotiate together to see if we can be friends.

Mr. Speaker, the strategy has been by everybody to say we will not negotiate sovereignty association, I've said the same thing myself. But if the Referendum is won by the Oui force, I think that we

will have to negotiate, I think it would be ridiculous not to at least to talk and see what they want. You are not going to create an island in Canada, an enemy group and go to war.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is so important that people speak up, because all that we have heard has been negative, we will not negotiate with you. The only confusing statement has been, yes, we might try to change the Constitution. Promises, promises, promises, this is the hat that you are giving the bride to stop her tears, and there is no leadership, no suggestions, no alternative. Many of people that will vote for the Oui do not want separation, but are indeed voting against the status quo because there is no other alternative. That is why it would have been useful. There are 15 days today, Sir, and then it might be too late, days to show that we want these people, we want to keep Canada united, but we understand the aspiration and the desire of other people also, that we do not become so parochial that we can't see the danger to this most beautiful country of ours.

It has often been said that we should do away with the hyphenated Canadian, that we should be Canadians. No one could support that more than I, Mr. Speaker, providing, of course, we have the proper definition of what a Canadian is. Fortunately you had many of the groups that came into this country, came in to settle in western Canada, ignoring what this country was all about; they still do, feeling that they were coming to some country like the United States. It was all right when Quebec was quiet, when they weren't even controlling their destiny in their own province, everything was all right, but when somebody gets up and speaks for his rights, when the bride said, I think I have had enough, well then we patted her on the head and said get back, go and do your dishes, keep quiet, don't rock the boat. Don't rock the boat. What are you? Are you an enemy of Canada? By rocking the boat, we have got such a good country, it has been a great country. When that group has had it exactly their way, when it has been 100 percent receiving and no giving at all, and unfortunately this is the situation here, Mr. Speaker. It needs leadership, it was brought to a head by Mr. Levesque. I hope that he loses the Referendum, but I think that we needed a Mr. Levesque. I think we needed somebody who finally stood up and said, hey, those times are past forever, they are gone, they are behind us. We want to live as equal partners or we dissolve the marriage, it is practically an annulment, because you haven't fulfilled your obligations.

Look at what happened in Manitoba 90 years ago. Look at what happened in Manitoba, practically all the Franco-Manitobans are assimilated now. Oh you can say that you feel sorry and it is no use blaming the people that are living today with the governments of today, but you would think that these governments would bend over backwards to rectify a wrong that was done, that was perpetuated for so long. It didn't take very long when Quebec tried to do exactly the same thing that English Canada had done for years. Well the accusation went against Quebec and it didn't take very long for a Federal Court of this country to say you are wrong. They had to couple Manitoba with this to say that you are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we really have to look and see what we want. We know and we should know that the status quo can not go, they will be no status quo, there will be a separation of Canada if a real effort isn't done. After weighing this, looking at everything and being faced with the situation of a divorce or a separation or a reconciliation that will satisfy both partners, many of the people in the West figured, well maybe we should leave. I submit that there are more separatists outside of Quebec than there are in Quebec. If we want to look, not only on the language issue, Mr. Speaker, but on all issues, Sir, it might be too late in fifteen days, we might destroy the most beautiful country in the world. We are not living in the United States. I like the United States as a neighbour, but I am so proud of living in Canada where we can have our own culture, where we are retaining something from the British and the French, and adopt something from the progress that you talk about that is happening south of us. But we have a better understanding of values now, I would say, as a country, than the Americans have. Without knocking the Americans at all, I can say that I am so proud of living in the best country in the world, a country that could be made so much better, that could be a paradise, if there is such a thing.

We are complaining all the time like everybody, but who can live the way we do here in Canada. This can go by the board, Sir, because Canada cannot exist without Quebec, and I don't think that Quebec can exist without Canada. That would be the No. 1 step, and then you will see Alberta and other provinces probably become annexed to the 51st, 52nd, 53rd, 54th state, and that will break up this country and it will be too late, Mr. Speaker.

There is fifteen days for people to get serious, for the leaders to take matters in their own hands and show leadership, to come with some hard facts. We are faced now with an ultimatum by a partner who is saying, you don't want me, you don't love me, you hardly tolerate me, and I will not keep in a union where there is no love, no acceptance, where we are not going to try to eradicate prejudice in this society of ours, Sir. That is what is missing, and you hear so little about that. You hear about these awful people in Quebec that want to vote Oui, that want to separate. These people want exactly what so many people in the west want.

I said a while ago that I would be pleased to be a Canadian, short — just Canadian, not a hyphenated Canadian, if we understood the situation. But this is not the case. We talk about the cost now, and it is something worth fighting for, worth paying for, but it doesn't have to be that costly. There are certain things that can be done. For instance, we pass legislation here that people can use French as a teaching language, but every time they want a school they have to fight. The politicians look at the votes, and there is not too many constituencies, if any, that are controlled by Franco-Manitobans, and they are afraid of the backlash because there is no leadership. It has always been the same. How many people were well-intentioned in this House, talking either on the question of private schools, aid to private schools, and on the question of a French education. And there was hesitation on the part of some of the leaders to act because they felt it was political suicide. But lo and behold, when these

things became law, when a recorded vote was asked in this legislature, every one stood to a man, to a member, to a woman. A few of them ducked the votes, but look, looking at the question of recognizing French as a teaching language in the first step taken by the Roblin government. That passed unanimously and you can search the documents and find it, Mr. Speaker. And what happened when the Schreyer government then expanded that and passed Bill 113. That also was unanimous, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Levesque is not an enemy of ours, but Levesque is saying, this is enough, you've pushed us far enough. I don't want to fight with you, I don't want to necessarily get a lawyer and try and get everything that you have. I just want to annul, to divorce, the two partners. Let us go back and be master in our old place, where we won't bother you, because we are not at home in the rest of Canada. You take a Winnipegger, Sir, that will go to Quebec City, and he'll come back and say, that damn policeman, I know he could understand English, but he spoke to me only in French, and they're insulted. How many Quebecers come around here and they're pleased if somebody tried to make an effort to understand them. This is equality? This is sharing the responsibility and the love of two people united together in marriage?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot impress on you enough the importance of this referendum. It might only be step number 1, it could be a change of government. But it had to be brought forward because right now you have only two alternatives, the status quo which is not acceptable to anybody, and even those that fought for it are now saying, very quietly, they are saying, no, we're ready to change that. But what are they ready to do? What leadership had we seen? We have some strong Premier in Manitoba, they're united only in the west, I should say. Why don't they show their leadership ability, stand up and be counted and be considered by history as real strong Canadians. Not just necessarily working for the short term for re-election and so on because of the fear of a backlash, because it is popular to kick somebody when they are down.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot impress on you and the members of this House enough where time is running out, there are 15 days. We have been united in one thing. The Prime Minister of Canada, the Premier of Ontario, and the Premier of the Western Provinces have said, we will not negotiate with you, which is ridiculous, because they will have to negotiate. Why couldn't there be something positive, why couldn't there be something to rectify the wrong that is being done for so many years? When the Premier of Manitoba will not allow a discussion on this until after the referendum, when he's saying that it's something else, it'll be too late. There won't be any need then for a renewed constitution or a confederation, and so on, because a large portion might say that they want to leave.

There is nothing, the Minister said we can't give too many concrete actions. Of course, we can't formulate policies in 15 days when we haven't been able to do it in 100 years. But at least if this was a forum to indicate the people, the normal, ordinary people of Quebec, who want to keep this country together, but do not accept the status quo that they

are some-well meaning people who will do their every effort to rectify what has gone wrong and to try to keep the marriage together in order to protect all the children and to keep on living in this country of ours, which is undoubtedly the Number 1 country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize if my remarks were distorted some. I certainly had not intended to speak today but I was shocked when the First Minister refused a fair request that a discussion, one day, in the life of this parliament, one day in the life of this session, to discuss, to express our views, to show that we're ready to try to fight prejudice, not only to tolerate, to suffer fellow Canadians, but to accept them with love, understanding and acceptance. Yes, the word acceptance means that you want a little more than tolerate.

I'm probably a voice in the wilderness today, Mr. Speaker. I don't imagine that too much will be done, and we practically need a miracle, and maybe that's what we need to keep this country together. They say that when there's life, there's hope, and in 15 days from there now, we might be very sorry because of our lack of action, our lack of leadership, and Sir, I hope, I pray that it won't be too late, that it won't destroy this great country of ours as we know it now.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to deal with the general question, which I think we'll have a chance to talk about during the debate on the budget as has been indicated by the First Minister, but I think there are a few things that have been said here that perhaps should be clarified. The Member for St. Boniface has made a number of comments, I think 90 percent of which I would have no trouble endorsing and seconding him and supporting him on, but he is leaving the impression, which I think has to be dealt with immediately upon that impression having been now established, at least from his point of view, about the position of the First Minister here. And I want to remind the House that I think it was four years ago, perhaps 1977, spring of 1977, three years ago, when the western premiers met in Manitoba at Brandon, that a joint position was stated at that time by the four western premiers, and of course it was not the Premier who now sits as the head of the government in Manitoba at this time, and the position taken was that the western premiers, having reviewed the White Paper that had been put out by the Quebec government, would not and could not support the principle of sovereignty association.

Now, the comments by the Member for St. Boniface are the type of comments that cause the problem, because they go back and do not define what is meant by that name, and it's an innocuous sounding name when you hear it. But I think that the position that was taken by the western premiers was based on the fact that they had read the White Paper that had been produced in Quebec, and that sovereignty referred to political sovereignty, and association referred to economic association, and that is what was said.

And if the province of Quebec, of course, votes yes, for sovereignty association, are we to not

believe that that was the intent of the name, political sovereignty? And that is the part that causes the problem, because if the rest of Canada says, we will negotiate sovereignty association, Mr. Speaker, then they are saying what they don't intend to do. They do not intend to negotiate the political sovereignty of any province.

Now, furthermore, the comments that have been made with regard to the case, the event of a No vote, have been spelled out very clearly by the First Minister of Manitoba; they were spelled out two weeks. He was the one voice that said, in the event of a No vote in Quebec, that it was incumbent on the rest of the country to no longer delay constitutional reform, to get on with it; and went on further to say that he felt that it could be resolved, although it had been under way since the late 1960s, it has been under way that many years, perhaps 15 years, that it probably could be brought to a head within a period of time. He went so far as to state that that period of time was perhaps 18 months to two years.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface says from his chair that that position was refused by the other Premiers. I don't think it was addressed by the other Premiers. I don't think there were any thoughts in their minds in any way, shape or form that there should be a longer time period required. It is simply that the Premier of Manitoba went out so far as to try and give some indication as to what he thought was the time frame required. All of the four western Premiers stated pretty clearly in their public interviews that they desired constitutional reform as well. Some of them felt they wanted constitutional reform worse than Quebec wanted it.

The position that has been placed by the Premiers, and by the Premier of Manitoba, is more than clear. It is these kind of fudging comments that have been made by the types of contributions by the Member for St. Boniface that draws the confusion into the picture. What the Premier of Manitoba has said is that he's not negotiating political sovereignty of one of the provinces in Canada. What is really happening is that those who are intending to vote Yes, and this has been stated very clearly by all the participants in the public debate in Quebec on the No side, is the fact that they don't think that the people who are wanting to vote Yes are in fact cognizant of the fact that it refers to political sovereignty. That is what is being attempted to be done, to point out that it is political sovereignty that is being referred to.

Mr. Speaker, just to underline what the First Minister here, I thought, made relatively clear as recently as the Question Period today, as to what Yes meant and what No meant, and the obligations that were involved in either of those votes, has already, within half an hour, been turned around, twisted around by the Member for St. Boniface. I think it is important to recognize that Manitoba has not changed its position over the period of two governments on this issue. The Premier of Manitoba now has said beyond that, that it is high time and a time frame has been given for the renegotiation of constitutional affairs in Canada and in the event of a No vote, it is clear that that can be done. In the event of a Yes vote, what is evidently clear is that that type of negotiation is not going to happen. I think it has to be relatively clear that it would not be

in the best interests of the people of Canada or of any given province, in that type of a vote.

The Member for St. Boniface says that there are some people looking at politics coming out of it, and their own re-election. I think he is referring to the western Canadian Premiers. I would think that in this particular situation, there is certainly more of a political overtone with what is happening in the province of Quebec than there is any place else in Canada and I trust that his comments were referring to the province of Quebec. But that is not the context in which I understood him to say it here in his comments today, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say finally, in conclusion, that I have watched the western Premiers, who have been commented on today, watched them publicly in their comments, and I don't think there are four stronger federalists in Canada than there are in the four western Premiers at the present time. I think what they are attempting to do is to try and lay out as clearly and as starkly as possible the implications of a Yes vote and a No vote. They are simply trying to lay out the ground rules so everybody understands. That is all they are mainly attempting to do.

If you want to get into the debate of what should go into a revised constitution, that applies in the event of a No vote, and the Premier said as late as today that he welcomes that type of input. But if you want to get into the debate as to what goes into a new political sovereignty for one province, then that is a different matter. They have said that the official position is that that's not negotiable and the case is well made. Why talk about it now if it is non-negotiable. You have already destroyed your position of being a non-negotiable position.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be clear, and obviously isn't, that the intents, I think, of all of those who are in positions of leadership in western Canada, and as far as I can see, the other provinces, are the strong federal position. I am sure that they would all be active in the referendum in Quebec, perhaps again judging from their public comments, if in fact they thought it would do any good. I think they are attempting in general to lay out the reality of the two positions as they see them. If they can do more, they would be willing to, but in fact I think there is concern that there is may be more harm to be done than good, in some cases.

That, Mr. Speaker, I hope clarifies at least a little bit the position with regard to the Yes and the No position. As I say, I agree with the majority of what the Member for St. Boniface has said in his speech, and the vast majority of it, I wanted to clarify what I perceived to be the positions in Manitoba and in western Canada that have been taken by the political leaders.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a substitution on the Public Utilities Committee. It would be the Honourable Member for Rossmere replacing the Honourable Member for The Pas on the Public Utilities Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those changes agreeable? (Agreed)

Are you ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion to go into Supply?

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order. We're on the estimates of the Agriculture Department, Resolution No. 6. The Honourable Minister.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank members of the committee for allowing us to have the evening to allow me to meet with the Canadian Wheat Board and the Chinese Ambassador who's in town. This engagement had been laid on somewhat before I knew committee would be sitting today and I want to thank them for allowing this to happen. I have copies of my opening statement if the members opposite would like them and members of the media, that I will be referring to.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present to members of the assembly the proposed expenditure estimates of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1981.

My department's proposed expenditures, including both Operating Expenses and Acquisition/Construction of physical assets, amount to 33.9 million. This represents a 3.7 million increase over the adjusted vote of the 1979-80 fiscal year. The estimates for the upcoming year reflect my department's ongoing commitment to strengthening our support and assistance for a strong family farm and a strong agriculture sector in the province.

Prior to discussing the expenditures of estimates in detail, I would like to make several comments regarding the performance of Manitoba's agriculture sector over the past year. In 1979, as in 1978, our province's agricultural economy experienced strong growth and development. It is estimated that Manitoba's Farm Cash Receipts will reach a record level of 1.3 billion in 1979. The increase over 1978 is just over 16 percent, continuing the strong upward trend of last year. The gross receipts of producers of such commodities as flaxseed, rapeseed, cattle and calves and poultry are expected to increase significantly. Total net farm income was up a modest 5.7 since there was almost no change in 1979 in the value of the inventories which is included in the total, following substantial increases in the previous two years.

The progressive Manitoba agriculture has always depended on many factors such as the climatic conditions, available markets and transportation. Throughout 1979, producers were faced with obstacles including late seeding, early frost and

marketing and transportation problems. Despite this, the agricultural economy strengthened, a reflection of the resiliency of farmers in Manitoba. Looking ahead, I am optimistic that Manitoba's agricultural sector will remain buoyant, continuing to develop and grow in the decade ahead even though we are now experiencing an extended period of hot dry weather which, if it continues for another three or four weeks could seriously affect the performance of the agricultural sector this year.

Over the past year I have continued to examine and evaluate the programs within my department. I believe that the reorganization initiated last fiscal year has been successful in effecting delivery of programs in a manner which is a reflection of the needs of the producers. In conjunction with this, I would like to stress the increasing involvement of municipalities, local government districts and producers on program development and overall spirit of co-operation which has occurred.

An appropriate example of producer involvement would be the Rapeseed 80 Home Study Course which has recently been delivered through printed material and television. This unique extension tool met with such outstanding success because it reflected producer needs and represented their involvement.

As members of the Assembly will note, our expenditure estimates continue to relate to the structure initiated last year, with the underlying firm commitment to the objective of sustaining and enhancing agricultural growth in Manitoba. Before dealing with the specifics of the department's expenditure estimates, I would like to table a chart outlining the reorganization of the department for the members of the committee. I have those copies here for distribution.

I would like at this particular time to also say that I am pleased that we have still with us, in the position of Associate Deputy, Ed Hudek, who was the Acting Deputy last year during estimates, who is now with us in Associate Deputy capacity and is also responsible for the Land and Water Division; Rod Bailey, who comes to us from the federal Department of Agriculture, being the Deputy Minister; Morris Kraut, who is with us in the ADM position responsible for marketing; Greg Lacombe still is in charge of management; and also the ADM responsible for extension, who is known to most of the members of the committee, Tom Pringle, who is also an ADM.

As stated earlier, the proposed expenditures for the 1980-81 fiscal year are 33.9 million, up approximately 3.7 million relative to the adjusted vote of the past fiscal year. In calculating the adjusted vote for the past year, approximately 334,000 has been deleted from our budget and transferred to the Department of Natural Resources for the purposes of administering the total Dutch Elm Disease Program under one department. Approximately 1.3 million has been transferred into the department from the Department of Highways and Transportation respecting the administration of the Northern Sewer and Water Program under the Manitoba Water Services Board. In addition, about 123,000 has been transferred in from the Department of Natural Resources regarding

Conservation Districts, which will be administered by the Land Utilization Section of our department.

In the area of staffing, we are proposing a level of 731.35 staff man years, up from the adjusted level of 722.11 staff man years in the 1979-80 year. This net increase of 9.24 SMYs, or staff man years, is comprised of an increase of 14.24 new positions and a deletion of five positions.

In my ongoing review of programs, I have concluded that there were several areas within the agriculture sector which deserve immediate attention. In the next two or three weeks, we will be devoting our attention to the possibility of the present drought conditions continuing. I have already encouraged farmers to take full advantage of our Crop Insurance Program and encouraged them to register before the closing date of April 30. Departmental staff are now preparing our pumping equipment, should it be required soon for the dugout pumping, the filling of dugouts or on farm water supplies. Contact has been made with the PFRA to integrate their contingency plans for water supply with ours and to make sure full use is made of our community pastures. Staff will also be involved in finding other emergency pastures and identifying hay supplies for the province's livestock producers should these become necessary.

Farmers are experiencing other difficult conditions, as I know members of the Committee are well aware, besides the drought this year, problems such as high interest rates and other high input prices. We are carefully monitoring this situation and would hope that the financial institutions will continue to support farmers, particularly young producers, during these difficult economic times.

Over the longer term, the principal areas we propose to strengthen and expand are in the areas of Livestock Management and Production; Market Development, an extension of that type of work; Agri-Water and Land Resource Management; 4-H Programs and strong extension services that can provide management counselling as well as good technical advice to develop our human resources in the agricultural and rural communities.

All of these thrusts are designed to encourage and strengthen the family farm — a continuing commitment of this government.

In the first area, initiatives will be undertaken to stimulate the development and growth of the livestock sector. This includes the development of a new stabilization program in co-operation with the federal government for our livestock industry in Manitoba. A livestock identification system for producers will be developed. The thrust of these efforts is aimed at improving the stability and the returns of livestock producers and the expansion of value-added activities, particularly in meat processing in the province.

In the second area, Market Development, the department proposes to develop and intensify market analysis and information necessary to expand and develop export markets and to assist in the improvement of the agricultural products transportation system.

If I may digress momentarily, I would like to state that we have negotiated the lease of sufficient hopper cars to meet the commitments I had made last fall to lease 400 hopper cars for one year to help alleviate the problems currently being encountered

across the western provinces with respect to the movement of grain. In co-operation with the other western provinces we will continue to work towards improving the grain handling and transportation system, recognizing the lead responsibility of the federal government.

The third area, Water and Land Resource Management, represents a continued intensification of our efforts to assist farmers in upgrading their productivity and returns through effective water and land resource management and the expansion of use of water for irrigation purposes.

To complement the above areas, the department will sustain the strong extension services which have been developed to continue being responsive to the needs of farmers. We also intend to expand efforts and increase expenditures in the development and upgrading of water and sewer infrastructure for rural communities in both southern and northern Manitoba.

Finally, I wish to make reference to the Canada-Manitoba Subsidiary Agreement, better known to most in the agricultural community as the Agro-Man Agreement, on Value-Added Crops Production. Throughout the 1979-80 fiscal year, a large number of projects have been implemented in a wide variety of areas. I have been extremely pleased with the progress on these projects and look forward to an expanded program over the 1980-81 fiscal year. I am particularly happy to view the working bond which has been developing among farmers, associations, producer groups, the University of Manitoba, along with Agriculture Canada and my department in carrying out the various projects and demonstrations. It is our firm belief that this agreement will provide substantial stimulus to the development and growth of Manitoba's agricultural sector by assisting producers to expand production of value-added crops, increase their efficiency in forage production and enhance the quality of land and water resources available to them.

To conclude, I am confident that through the continued active co-operation with farmers, farm organizations, Agri-Business and others, and the provision of a high quality of service, our department will continue to assist farmers and other rural residents to progress toward achievement of their development objectives.

I look forward to an objective review of the estimates of the Department of Agriculture and welcome the opposition, as well as members from my own government, the input that they have in the next few days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A few brief comments in terms of responding to the Minister of Agriculture's statement with respect to the operations of his department, and his government's thrust into agriculture.

It is certainly evident from his statement that agriculture in Manitoba is in a depressed state, Mr. Chairman. The problems that the hog industry is facing, the problems that the cattle industry is facing, the problems that most farmers, if not all farmers, are facing with respect to credit availability, high

interest rates, are putting a squeeze on farmers of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, this government is attempting to pride itself in being a friend and supporting a strong family farm and a strong agricultural sector in this province. Mr. Chairman, nothing could be farther from the facts of the matter and the truth of the matter. What we have seen in the last several years has been a decline in farm numbers, the likes that we have not seen for many years, with many farmers being forced off the land, farms being purchased and consolidated, farmers going bankrupt with respect to high interest rates, and what do we have as the policy from the provincial government? We have a policy to discontinue operating loans to farmers. We have a shift in policy from the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to the private banks, and the Minister in his statement today says he hopes that the banking institutions and financial institutions will continue to support farmers, particularly young producers, during these difficult economic times.

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister was seriously concerned about the plight of young farmers he certainly would not put them in the position that he has by his government's policy, by putting them at the mercy of someone else in the financial world with nowhere to go, if they are in trouble, but to go bankrupt, Mr. Chairman. That has been the move that this government has made in terms of assisting farmers in providing them with financial resources to continue their operations, as a result of high interest rates, and more than that, Mr. Chairman, problems that farmers are facing now in terms of cash shortage in terms of putting their crops in. Many farmers are faced with an acute shortage of capital, operating capital, to be able to purchase their required fertilizers and seeds, to be able to start their seeding operations. What do we have coming from the Minister of Agriculture? We have a statement saying, well, we are going to monitor the situation and hope that the financial institutions will look after them.

Mr. Chairman, that is not good enough. In the Minister of Agriculture's home community, I think there is ample evidence to tell us, to show us how this government's agricultural policies have affected not only farmers but affected rural Manitoba in general. Mr. Chairman, there have been at least three businesses in the community of Melita, that I have been advised have gone bankrupt within the last year, and there are two others that are virtually on the rocks, virtually going bankrupt. Mr. Chairman, what does that tell you? That tells you that the farming community is in a pretty sad state of affairs. The income position of farmers is so tight that their purchasing power has been limited and the impact on small business in rural communities has been to such a degree that many small businesses are either on the verge of going bankrupt or have already gone bankrupt. As a result, we have a total economic depression in rural Manitoba.

The Minister admits in his own statement that the total net farm income was up by a modest 5.7 percent. Mr. Chairman, what was the inflation rate in the province of Manitoba in the last year, which really shows that the net income of farmers has gone backwards; they are in a losing position within Manitoba. What has this government done as one

of its policies? Removed the financial ability of farmers to operate by changing their program through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, as well, what we find here now is the Minister of Agriculture indicating to us that we are now going to stimulate the development and growth of our livestock sector. Mr. Chairman, which group of men and women in the Legislature here, over the last number of years, stood on their heels and criticized the former administration to no end that one of the greatest handicaps that producers faced in the beef industry, was the depression of low prices; was as a result of the expansion of the livestock market in the province of Manitoba. It was the Conservative Opposition at the time that said that the low prices in the livestock industry were caused by the over-production of beef in Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the prices, again in beef, declining almost, I believe, to the point where, when we question the Minister further, that he may come to the point where he will be in a position to make a pay-out under the Beef Income Assurance Plan, which he has now put the final touches in his sabotage move to kill the entire Beef Income Assurance Plan; that he will, if the proper analysis is done in terms of the cost of production, be put in the position of making a pay-out. Rather than that, he has tried continually to sabotage, I believe, one of the most successful income stabilization programs that this country has ever had in terms of defining the cost of production and the returns on investment. So we have now the Minister of Agriculture telling us that he is going to increase livestock production.

What do we have in the situation of hogs, Mr. Chairman? We have now the hog industry going into virtually almost depression prices in terms of the sale of hogs. It has gone to the point where the Federal Stabilization Program has come into play, but the Federal Stabilization Program, which the Minister says he enjoys and tries to take credit for and he indicates his support for such a program, if the market trends continue in terms of the income of hog producers, it can only keep producers in a net loss position because the Stabilization Program, while it is designed to take into account cost of production, it is designed to assist producers to only 90 percent of the previous five-year average of the market situation. So that a Stabilization Program of that nature can only put farmers in a long-term, should the prices continue low, in a long-term net loss position. But we have this Minister indicating that he is supporting that kind of a stabilization program; while we have the Minister of Agriculture from Ottawa saying, look farmers, while we have a Stabilization Program in Canada, unless you clean up your house in terms of organization yourself into an orderly marketing system, don't expect the Government of Canada to put much more money into a stabilization program.

I would like to know what the Minister of Agriculture's position will be when the federal government will indicate its no longer support to producers who are not prepared to settle their own affairs and organize themselves like the majority of the agricultural sector, and other industries, who are organized in the marketplace. This Minister will say

that I don't support any orderly marketing systems in the province of Manitoba or nationally, I want national income stabilization plans.

Mr. Chairman, the province of Quebec, in the hog industry, is now going full tilt in terms of expanding its hog production. It is subsidizing the hog industry, which is almost totally vertically integrated by the corporate sector in that province. What we will see in Manitoba, we will see within the next year or two, I predict, that the province of Quebec and other provinces will be pushing Ottawa to clean up their own house, and to clean up their own house how, Mr. Chairman? By organizing a national marketing system in hogs, in effect, supply management. We will have a decline, as we are seeing now in the production of hogs in Manitoba, and you will end up, Mr. Chairman, I foresee, with a net loss position with respect to Manitoba's share in the marketing of hogs in this country.

If the Minister does not get off his rear and look and project himself into some forward thinking with respect to the agricultural sector in this province it can only hurt farmers in Manitoba. We have seen it in the turkey industry, Mr. Chairman, and that was the first move where the Minister did not want to involve himself, or at least he said he wasn't prepared to get himself involved in, and that is the change in the market share agreement in the National Turkey Marketing Agency. That agreement, Mr. Chairman, can only put Manitoba in a very awkward position and that, I believe, could be the first step to wrecking marketing schemes across this country and, of course, hurting the producers in the long term, the producers of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that he has negotiated the lease of sufficient hopper cars to meet the commitments he made last fall of 400 hopper cars. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Minister that while it was a commendable move to indicate that we were short of hopper cars, the Minister better realize that right now the hopper cars at the Lakehead are waiting at least three days to be loaded, that there are at least three terminals at the lakehead that are plugged with grains of the off-board that the Canadian Wheat Board cannot unload the grains that it requires at the lakehead, Mr. Chairman. It has caused the grain transport co-ordinator now to indicate that there will be no more direct deliveries of off-board grains to the lakehead until this problem is cleared up. So the Minister can now have all the cars he wants, but since the market system that he so eloquently defended and supported, the open market system, and he was not prepared to do anything with respect to grain that was being trucked to the lakehead and plugging up the terminals in terms of the trucking operation, now the Canadian Wheat Board, which utilizes 85 percent of the space in terms of its export commitments of the lakehead, has only in stock, I believe less than half, less than 50 percent of the grains are Wheat Board grains.

So that Mr. Chairman, the blockages that were predicted, that I asked the Minister several weeks ago to raise those concerns, he said that he supported farmers; he supported farmers in terms of the trucking of their grain, and that they could continue and he could see no problems. The problem has now occurred. The ports are being

blocked and unless there is pressure put on by this Minister on the transport co-ordinator and on the Wheat Board to continue their pressure on the federal Ministers, the 400 cars that he has on lease will be of no benefit to the producers of Manitoba, because of his continued reluctance to interfere, to at least state his position with respect to the open market system.

Mr. Chairman, while the Minister's estimates show a slight growth, the objective, or at least his objective of assisting the family farm, has really gone by the wayside. It's gone by the wayside in that he has allowed, through changes in the Farmlands Protection Act to allow corporations to purchase unlimited amounts of land, and he has now seen what has happened in terms of foreign-owned corporations coming into this province and purchasing land, and the consolidation of farm units will take place. He has moved through the Land-Lease Program to terminate leases and put land up for auction after a five-year period.

Mr. Chairman, talk about a regressive move in terms of assisting the family farm. Those young farmers who were assisted by that program to get on, now virtually have no option. By the way, I have read the Minister's releases. They have no option to continue leasing if they so desire, because after a five-year term the Minister and the government is terminating those leases and putting that land up for sale.

Mr. Chairman, talk about an option to producers. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, you read the Minister's announcements with respect to his statement on land leases, and the members will see that he said that the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: One speaker at a time, committee.

The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: They will see, the honourable members will see that those leases are being terminated. There is no statement in those press releases that the leases will continue if those farmers desire. You read the statement —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Minister said, Oh, Billie. The Minister knows full well that he has conned the producers and the farmers of Manitoba long enough and the day of reckoning has come for this Minister, and that he will have to either indicate his position or not continue the sham that he has perpetrated on producers in the last several years, that he is the friend of the family farm.

He's allowing the land that young producers have been allowed to begin farming to be taken out of their grasp; he has allowed the corporate sector to move in to the farming areas; he has allowed the pressures that farmers have faced in terms of high interest rates to continue to go bankrupt. We have seen that in terms of the net reduction of farms in the province of Manitoba over the last three years has declined by some, almost in excess of 2,000 farms. Mr. Chairman, this government's policy, or actually one could say lack of policy, has only led and will continue to lead to the decline of the family farm in Manitoba. The young farmer, the smaller and medium-sized farmers who are in the half to one section sized farming community are being squeezed,

and they are being squeezed by the policies or the lack of policies by this Conservative administration, and this Minister of Agriculture certainly has to bear the full brunt of that criticism, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister gave us a very sketchy overview of agriculture in Manitoba, as he perceives it, and I suppose as he wishes it to be. I'm not certain that that is the case. The Minister has astutely avoided, though, to deal with the question of current financial hardship that most producers are facing in Manitoba this year. It has to do with the high cost of interest rates, and I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister might have been in a position to indicate what discussions, if any, he has had with the federal government with respect to alleviation of the tight money situation, and what he, through his department, might be contemplating in that area.

There's no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that farmers, especially the young ones who started their careers four or five years ago, will find themselves in an extremely difficult position, and there's no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that there will be many well established farmers who may feel the credit pinch this year. I don't believe there is any business that isn't severely handicapped, whether it's a newly established business, Mr. Chairman, or whether it's been one that's been there for some period of years. Credit has become a very major problem and a major concern for all entrepreneurs, whether they be agriculturalists or other business types.

So certainly that is the area of crisis, as I would perceive it, Mr. Chairman, and that crisis of course can be compounded many times by other things, other developments throughout the year, namely the kind of season they are facing; whether or not they are going to have a successful production year or not is quite an open question, given the current climatic conditions. Certainly they won't know that till after they have invested huge sums of money in input costs per acre. But that's at a point where one cannot change one's mind, Mr. Chairman. Obviously the Minister can appreciate the point I'm making. They may very well be caught with a huge investment of new capital that is costing them an awful lot of money with perhaps a crop failure facing them at the end of it. I think is really the area of concern that everyone should pay some attention to.

The Minister somehow skipped over that very lightly, making only mention of the fact that he hoped that the financial institutions will do their thing to help keep these people afloat. It maybe necessary to do more than that, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what the remedies might be but I would have hoped that the Minister would have at least given us some indication that he is prepared with contingency plans for any eventuality, should we find ourselves in a position of many people facing bankruptcy because of high interest and poor growing conditions. A combination of the two can spell real disaster in a short period of time. I hope that the current drought is something that is not going to continue for any period of time. Certainly if it does, we're going to have some serious problems.

The other aspect that I think the Minister has skipped over very quickly, in fact not even dealt with, Mr. Chairman, is the continuing and accelerating decline of our farm numbers and whether or not he is of the view that those declines are really reflecting his government's policy and, if they are, that's of course a policy position that he may want to elaborate on and defend, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me the appropriate question to ask the Minister is whether or not he has fixed in his mind just at what population level in agriculture does he feel that we should level off at over the next several years or the next decade, or whatever. It seems that the decline of farmers in the last census period has increased by 100 percent, approximately, over the previous census period and that has to tell us something. I don't know whether it tells us that the Minister's policies are not working to the advantage of new beginners in agriculture, or is it merely a question of the old retiring and their units not being viable enough in today's economics to provide for new entries on those same units and therefore the Minister is promoting consolidation processes which, in effect, will reduce farm numbers.

There are all sorts of combinations of things at work here that could give us the answer but, Mr. Chairman, I put the question to the Minister. He has a research department. He has a tremendous amount of capacity for analytical work and I would hope that before the estimates are complete that he can illuminate somewhat his views on where farm numbers should be for optimum agriculture in Manitoba and by what period of time; or whether he is going to view with a degree of alarm the fact that that is taking place, notwithstanding his philosophy or his programs or his wishes, but that he should be other than silent on the question because it is there, plain to see, and with the increased pressure in the marketing area and in the area of cost of production, I can see the acceleration of an exodus taking place very very quickly. In the next five years I could imagine tens of — well not tens of thousands but thousands of additional farm people leaving the countryside.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's important that we maintain policies which do provide a reasonable opportunity for young people to enter the industry. When I say policies, I'm not talking about simply a credit link with the government or with the department; I'm talking about credit as being one component; I'm talking about access to land as being a component; I'm talking about pricing of products as being a component. All of these things are, in my opinion, stabilizing influences on farm populations and any one of them alone obviously will not do the job and therefore it has to be approached on the basis of a fairly broad program involving a number of components.

In Canada there is obviously a major shift of production taking place and accelerating away from the prairies, Mr. Chairman, and that should be a concern to this Minister and to this government. Regardless of their ideology on marketing or financing or tenure or whatever, I don't think that they can afford to ignore the fact that there is a huge thrust underway in eastern Canada for provincial self-sufficiency in all agricultural commodities to the

extent that they can be grown or produced in those regions of Canada.

It seems to me that our traditional intra-Canadian export market is being eroded very quickly in a number of commodities. I think that probably they could have been avoided years ago had there been a willingness on the part of governments to move in the direction of a stability in prices and, indeed, some control of the marketing process, to make sure that we don't continue on with the boom and bust cycle, whether it be in the livestock field or . . . Well, that's the remaining one, Mr. Chairman, because most other commodities are covered by some form of marketing agency operated by either government or producers in most provinces.

But there is a thrust in eastern Canada. I don't know what the Quebec thrust is going to result in because that particular thrust is also overshadowed by a referendum that they are going to have in a couple of weeks and I just don't know what all of that is going to mean, Mr. Chairman. But assuming the referendum result is that Quebec chooses to remain the same part of Canada as it is today, then there will be a push. There will be a push for a supply management system at a time when those provinces in eastern Canada have achieved their self-sufficiency. It probably would have been to the advantage of Western Canadian farmers to have had a national marketing scheme under way ten years ago, Mr. Chairman; it probably would have been to their advantage. To the extent that it wasn't possible and didn't happen will probably, in the historical context some day, be looked upon with some degree of regret, because that is probably the only mechanism that could have maintained Western Canada as an exporting portion of Canada to markets in other parts of Canada.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, discussions in Ottawa before the first national agency was set up and I know the arguments that were being put forward then by the central provinces, in particular — well, I don't know central, I guess Manitoba is central — but by Ontario and Quebec, the two major provinces who were pushing very much for supply management arrangements with respect to agricultural products, based on allocations of production related to human populations in their respective provinces. Mr. Chairman, I believe I drew this to the attention of this Minister on more than one occasion. In fact, suggested and pleaded with him that he not fall into the trap of supporting the Alberta people who had some feelings towards the same formula for market growth as did the two large provinces in central Canada; and that is that market growth in each province should reflect population growth and so on.

I pleaded with this Minister, Mr. Chairman, and suggested to him, on more than one occasion, that we object very strenuously to that concept, because that concept is going to transfer production rights away from this province, because we are not a province that has, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, due in good measure to other government policies of this government, we have had a negative population situation developing very quickly over the last two years. Where if you are going to use the population, human population index, as a basis for allocating production rights in national supply management programs, then Manitoba is losing by virtue of the

fact that they are losing people. To have supported Alberta's position, with respect to allocation of market for turkey producers a couple of years ago, we have put ourselves in a bit of box, Mr. Chairman. We have put ourselves in a position where we now are not able to, with credibility, take the original position which we took when the first marketing boards were established on a national basis, and that is that human populations have nothing to do with where production occurs, but rather historical production patterns and economy of scale were criteria that were more logical in our viewpoint. That is what we insisted on for a number of years, and that has only been upset by the intrusions of this Minister in that debate in his support of the position of the province of Alberta, who, because of their recent surge in population felt that they were entitled to a larger share of the Canadian market for turkeys. They will push the same argument for other commodities and so will Ontario and Quebec, because that argument is music to their ears, Mr. Chairman, it is an argument that they lost originally because there would have been no signing of any agreements on the basis that we would use human populations as a criteria.

So we are in a dilemma, Mr. Chairman. I think we have only Saskatchewan and Manitoba left, caught in this population squeeze, but in particular Manitoba because of the declining human population. All of this comes to what, Mr. Chairman? It comes to the realization that because of this government's policies, not only in agriculture but in their overall economic policies, we are in fact reducing opportunities for Manitobans, and that, of course, tends to feed on itself and multiply itself, Mr. Chairman, to the point where we have to admit that we have no room for new producers; that we have no job opportunities because of the declining scale of our productive unit, and so on. It is an interrelated thing having to do with the whole of Manitoba's economy.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say to this Minister that I am disappointed that I haven't heard him utter once in the last twelve months that we should, if we are going to have national supply management programs, that they should not be based on provincial and human populations, but that the market allocation should be based on some advantages and efficiencies in production, as well as on historical patterns of production.

Prior to the establishment of the Egg Board, because the two major provinces in Eastern Canada thought that they would be successful in securing an agreement on eggs based on human population, there was a massive surge of production just prior and during the initial years of that agency's operation, which resulted in a chaotic situation for the first couple of years, Mr. Chairman. But notwithstanding that, I think we were able to hold that idea off, Mr. Chairman, and I regret that this Minister has not been able to do so and has capitulated to the other side of that question, which only means that there will be fewer opportunities for Manitobans to participate in agriculture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1. — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I presume that we will be moving away from the Minister's Compensation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on 1.(b), the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister prepared to table the latest correspondence that he sent to producers who are participating in the Beef Income Assurance Plan, the new contract, and letters — I believe there is a new letter that the Minister sent to producers. Does he have that on file and would he supply copies for members of the Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there is no new contract, it is a matter of correspondence that has gone out from the Administration of the Department. I am sure he has a copy of it from the Livestock Producer.

MR. URUSKI: No, I don't.

MR. DOWNEY: I could provide the letter that went from the Director of the Program to the producers, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: I would appreciate a copy of that letter, Mr. Chairman. I don't have a copy on file. All I have is his press release that he made to the Legislature. In that press release, Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that a contributing factor to the decline in the province's cattle herds was the Beef Income Assurance Program. Could the Minister indicate how he arrived at the figures of cattle numbers within the province of Manitoba and how he arrived at that statement?

MR. DOWNEY: First of all, the figures that were used were, I believe, Stats Canada figures that were the source of information, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister says he used Stats. Can. information. Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I have also looked at Stats. Can., and I have gone five years back, up until 1975 in terms of cattle numbers in the province of Manitoba, and I have used the period, I believe it was January of every year, of 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, and 1980. Mr. Chairman, in 1975, Manitoba's cattle population was roughly 1,194,000. In 1976, it went down to 1,156; in 1977, it went up to 1,259; in 1978, 1,201; in 1979 —(Interjection)— Yes, 1.2 million. I am talking about 1,201 thousands, which is 1.2 million. In 1979, 1,110,000; and in 1980, 1,067,000. For an average reduction from 1975 to 1980 of roughly 10 percent in terms of cattle numbers for the province of Manitoba, of total numbers.

Mr. Chairman, when you look at the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Ontario, and I have done those other three provinces, our neighbouring provinces to the west and to the east, I took the same figures for the comparative same times of the year and it showed that Saskatchewan had a net decline in cattle of 19 percent, Mr. Chairman. It showed Alberta with a net decline of 9 percent. It

showed Ontario with a roughly net decline of 11 percent in those years. Although they have fluctuated, but they have fluctuated almost steadily from year to year in terms of reductions or increases; the only time that there was a difference was in 1977 where Ontario dropped and Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta gained, and in 1980 where Alberta and Ontario had a slight gain and Manitoba and Saskatchewan had a further decline in cattle numbers.

Mr. Chairman, it points out to me that the four provinces, over the five-year period, had relatively, with the exception of Saskatchewan which took a larger decline in cattle numbers — their numbers declined to a greater degree, almost double the other provinces — and yet this Minister of Agriculture is prepared to get up and make statements that are not only misleading but are totally inaccurate. They are inaccurate because they do not show the picture whatever. I have the statistics available; I have done the additions and subtractions and tried to arrive at a figure where the cattle numbers of Manitoba have disappeared and how the impact of the Beef Income Assurance Plan somehow made cattle numbers in Manitoba decline far greater than the rest of the country, and that hasn't happened. That hasn't happened, Mr. Chairman. The cattle numbers in the province of Manitoba have declined some 10 percent, which are virtually the same with the provinces of Alberta and Ontario. The province of Saskatchewan declined to a greater degree, Mr. Chairman, than the province of Manitoba.

In fact, if anything, the Income Assurance Plan had the reverse effect on cattle numbers, a complete reverse effect in terms of cattle numbers in the province of Manitoba. We would have seen cattle numbers reduced to such an extent that the cattle numbers today in Manitoba would have virtually, I would say, gone beyond what Saskatchewan has gone in terms of reductions.

The impact occurred greatest, Mr. Speaker, in 1977. That's when the program really proved itself, Mr. Chairman, and I want to show you. In 1976, the province of Manitoba, from 1975 to 1976, there was a 38,000 drop in cattle numbers in the province of Manitoba; a drop of 55,000 in Saskatchewan; a drop of 27,000 in Alberta; and a drop of 57,000 in Ontario. That's two peaks years when the program started going in. In 1977, the real low in terms of cattle prices, what we saw was that Manitoba's cattle population at that time not only stabilized, it increased by 103,000, while Saskatchewan increased by a relatively small margin, in terms of cattle numbers, of 45,000. That shows that Manitoba increased 9 percent over 1976; Saskatchewan increased 1 1/2 percent; Alberta had a 2 1/2 percent increase; and Ontario had a net decrease of roughly 1 percent.

So while the eastern provinces and two western provinces had marginal increases, if any, in 1977, Manitoba's cattle population was maintained in 1977 to the tune of stability of at least 9 percent, almost, Mr. Chairman, to the point of maintaining the cattle herds in terms of increases 10 to 1 in terms of maintaining and retaining the herds on the farms of Manitoba.

Contrary to what the Minister has been saying, the program, if anything, has had a stabilizing effect on producers and retaining the cattle numbers. I wish the Minister would either come up with the figures that he spoke about, or withdraw and apologize to the producers that he has misled the farmers of Manitoba and has gone ahead and made his misinformed and ill-advised statements that he has made before in terms of not only the cattle industry, but in other sectors of agriculture in terms of orderly marketing and the like, that he should withdraw his statements that he has made and apologize to the producers that he has misled them down the line and misled not only the producers but members of this House, in terms of the statements that he has given.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, when it comes to misleading members of the House, I think that we should talk back to the Member for St. George and make sure that he is not allowed to mislead the public.

First of all, the figures that we referred to were a reduction in beef cow numbers and for the Member for St. George, who maybe doesn't understand that it takes a beef cow to have a beef calf, and I think that if you lose that base that is your production base, then in fact you run into a lot of problems. We saw the numbers of beef cows being reduced in the province of Manitoba, where in fact producers were having to pay back the results of their efforts because of a program which —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Chairman — we're being interjected here — the fact is that we are trying to administer a program which was a disaster from the beginning. I will say to the members opposite that there was a certain amount of funds required by the beef industry. That money that was paid out went to people who were in need. When we came to a particular time when they were enjoying some profits in the industry, that in fact those particular producers who were relying most heavily on the cattle industry found themselves in a distressed situation where, in fact, if they didn't have incomes from grains or oil seeds or other types of livestock production, they in fact found it a severe hardship in having to either pay back the province some money or, in fact, give the numbers of cattle back that the members opposite think they should have done in the program.

Mr. Chairman, we have the member for St. George suggesting that . . . We have tried to work and have been fairly successful, I would say, working along with the producers to work our way through this particular program. I would think that if the Member for St. George wants to go into any agricultural community where there are a large number of livestock producers and suggest that they should be carrying on with the program as they were administering it, putting themselves in the position of having to collect the money back or having cattle put back into the hands of the province, that I would welcome to a debate in any forum that they would in fact, I think, give him somewhat of a hard time. I have met with many groups of farmers, the producers, the people representing producers, who in fact pleaded to me to allow them to get out of the

program. We have taken the steps that I feel are responsible, Mr. Chairman.

I could make further comments, and I don't want to be in a position of being overly critical of the program. I think that we have all tried to make the best out of a situation that we found ourselves in, that the producers found themselves in, and something that was put in place with good intent by the last government. I don't think that the money went anywhere that it wasn't needed, and I feel that was the case.

But we were faced, Mr. Chairman, with the situation, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet has pointed out and I pointed it out in my opening statement, the problem of cash shortage in the community, of people facing high interest rates and either having to give cattle back to the province or paying funds back, as in fact are interpreted by people in the legal department of the Attorney-General's office. The administration of the program has been as consistent as possible. The fact is, we raised the cost of production so that it eased some of the pressure from the producers, that in fact the last administration — and I don't want to be taken as totally critical — reduced the cost of production to the producers. Mr. Chairman, they reduced the cost of production on beef cattle from 51 cents to 49, based on a formula, Mr. Chairman. The formula happened to be . . . And we all know that they talk about inflation and the cost to producers; we all know that the costs of production have been consistently going higher for the last 10 years, that in fact that didn't change in October of 1977, that we have seen a continual increase in the cost of producing of agricultural goods, particularly where — (Interjection)— Well, no, Mr. Chairman, we are using the same formula consistent with what it was at the time of the last government. That formula, Mr. Chairman, something happened that when they were administering, they reduced the cost of production to the producers from 51 to 49 cents on the slaughtered cattle. It's all on record; they know that's what happened. No, they didn't reduce the formula, Mr. Chairman, but in fact, however they worked the formula, it provided less returns to the farmer under the program that they had introduced.

They can't sit here and accuse me of not trying to make the program work within the farm community. The cost of production was raised from 51; I believe it is at 61 cents at this particular time, Mr. Chairman. The cost of production on the stock calves has moved from 59 cents to 76 a pound on the stock calves.

Everything we have done has been to help those producers that are in the contract to assure the province of Manitoba, the taxpayers, that there is a commitment to the province, that there should be some money paid back to the province, and as has been indicated by the way in which we have administered and moved with our policy in this program, that it in fact has been acceptable.

What are the longer terms, and I think that is what we have to look at. I am a strong believer in this country that when it comes to nationally-produced commodities that the federal government should have the responsibility of administering a national program on stabilization. I think if we, as provinces, come to understand that and support it fully, then we

won't run into the problems of us having our natural advantage taken away from us by other provincial treasuries getting involved in the production of agricultural goods, distorting the natural use of our energies that we have in this total nation.

I am a firm believer in that. I think that we have to work towards — and that's why I don't want to get overly involved in the debate in the Beef Income Assurance Program. Well, I would debate it, but it is the future of the Stabilization Program that we have to look at. In fact, we do want to get involved and work with the federal government on one that is in fact going to work. Let's remember what the objective of the process should be; it is to work with the interests of the producers in mind, that we in fact —(Interjection)— There's a snort comes from the Member for St. George. I am really amazed at him because when you have 3,000-and-some producers — and those figures are available — 3,000-and-some producers who are still in a program, wanting to get out, and we can't work on a new program, or I feel that we should have the last one at least resolved or know where we are going with it before we start introducing new programs from the federal government, that in fact we are clearing the way to give security to the farmers who are producing beef cattle, at the national level, with participation or with input from the provincial government and the producers of this province. I can see that kind of a process now taking place.

We met with the federal Minister several weeks ago and the number one item, and the Member for Lac du Bonnet suggests what has taken place, the number one item was the cost of moneys to the producers of agricultural goods. Another item that is high on the agenda, as far as I am concerned, is to get direction from him and to work with him on direction, to look at a new federal stabilization program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, I am leaving the Chair for Private Members' Hour. No committee tonight. Committee rise.

SUPPLY — HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 61 of the Main Estimates, Department of Health, Resolution No. 79, Clause 5, Manitoba Health Services Commission, Item (d) Medical Program—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, there are some major issues, I think, facing the province with respect to this particular program and I think one of the major issues is the attitude of the doctors towards Medicare. This came out very directly, very graphically, when the Hall Commission was in Manitoba in the month of March. The Manitoba Medical Association presented a brief to the Hall Commission which, in my estimation, did not serve their purposes well, if they have any purposes to serve whatsoever.

The Minister talks about the doctors somehow losing status and in addition to loosing relative

incomes; I dispute whether in fact they've lost any relative income over the last 20 years, but if they have lost any status, I think maybe a number of professional groups have lost status including professors, lawyers and other people. But I think that if the doctors are complaining about losing any status, they deserve to lose some status if one judges them on the basis of their submission to the Hall Commission. It was one that was self-serving, narrow and, frankly, did not take the public interest into account. It made a case for flexible billing and it said that since the public is putting too little money into Medicare that somehow private patients through surcharges, which is really what they talk about when they're talking about flexible billing, should put extra money in. That is a position that certainly is opposed completely by people on this side of the House. We do not believe in two standards of health care, although the doctors really are promoting two standards of health care, one for rich and one for the poor, because I can assure you that those people who would pay the surcharges would receive a different quality care from those people who wouldn't pay the surcharges.

The Minister has said, at the same time, that the government isn't in favor of flexible billing but, while saying that, he says that the doctors have a number of objections which have to be listened to. I am wondering about how serious the Minister's commitment is when he says that this government will not promote flexible billing, indeed extra billing, on the part of the doctors. We have a fairly low percentage of opted out doctors but my feeling is that if in fact that percentage increases and that we get much more extra billing that we should start following the practice or we should consider following the practice in Quebec, where opted out doctors are opted out of Medicare entirely and they receive no public moneys for Medicare at all. I don't think we're at that particular critical situation but, given the approach that the doctors are taking, I hope that they do not carry things to that particular conclusion because I think that is the conclusion that the public would be forced to take.

I would like to get a clearer statement from the Minister with respect to flexible billing on the part of the doctors, taking into account the fact that right now doctors are practising a form of flexible billing. Secondly, the Manitoba Medical Association in its brief made a case for deterrent fees, said we should have user charges. This would make the system more accountable to patients and physicians and, in a sense, was arguing that somehow there was abuse in the system, that the patients are the cause of it and that deterrent fees or user charges would be a way of controlling that. We on this side of the House reject that position. We feel that there is really no abuse in the system and that, if there is any abuse, the onus or responsibility lies with the doctors because it's the doctors who set all the appointments; it's the doctors who really book people into hospitals. People cannot get into hospitals without doctors approval. Indeed, if there is any hypochondria in Manitoba, it's induced. Again, I think we need a clear statement from the government on that position. It's not clear, and I think it's important for government, I think it's important for this Legislature to take a clear position

vis-a-vis the doctor community within the health care field with respect to these particular issues.

I think doctors are a very important component in our health care delivery system, obviously. I think they have to be adequately compensated. They do shoulder a tremendous responsibility. They are very necessary ingredients within our health care delivery system. At the same time, the Manitoba Medical Association has not accepted a public system of Medicare. They were opposed to it in the first place. They make a case that it's over-controlled; that they would somehow like to break that down; that there are faults and that the faults can be remedied if the system is privatized. We think that's the wrong approach. We think that we have a public system which operates in a much better fashion than the system operating in the country to the south of us, which is primarily a private system of medical care. We feel that ours provides universal accessibility. We believe it's portable. We believe that it's a system that has to be improved but not mutated, and the doctor's approach seems to be one of chipping away at the notion of a public health care system.

The Conservative government's position on this is, in my estimation, quite unclear. It's as unclear with respect to health care as it is with respect to a number of other areas of Manitoba activity where they say we shouldn't be involved in mining but they will be involved in mining, but they will get out of mining if the thing proves successful. We are not clear as to what the government's position is with respect to the public health care system on flexible billing, on deterrent fees.

When it comes to the whole matter of physicians salaries, I note that the government made a fairly generous settlement with the doctors; a two-year settlement somewhat more generous than settlements reached between health care institutions and other vital people working in the health care field: nurses, orderlies, other people like that. I really can't comment on the settlement, that's part of the collective bargaining process. At the same time, I think it's important to recognize that there are other groups in the health care delivery system who are important, as well, and I would hate to see generous settlements only with respect to doctors and settlements which are very tough, which in fact don't take into account inflation with respect to other groups, because possibly they don't have the same type of power that the medical profession has.

I think that a major concern of Manitobans over the last year especially, and it's been focused recently with a couple of cases, has been concern on the part of the public with the power that physicians have within Manitoba's society. This was brought to focus by the issue of Dr. Owen Schwartz, a practitioner of holistic medicine, who was tried under some suspicious circumstances by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and had levied against him a very serious penalty that I haven't heard levied against other physicians. Maybe these aren't made public, maybe this was a particular public case but there have been past instances where I'm sure complaints such as this have been filed. It appears on the surface as if the College of Physicians and Surgeons took a very very hard approach in this particular case. There are suspicions that it might have been a kangaroo court in that certain doctors

were not allowed to testify before the College of Physicians and Surgeons Inquiry even though they wanted to, the most prominent one being Dr. Charles Green who was the personal physician to the late Right Honourable John G. Diefenbaker, the former Prime Minister of Canada. One then says well if a practitioner of holistic medicine is all right for a former Prime Minister, surely a practitioner of holistic medicine is all right for the average Joe in Manitoba. That doesn't seem to be the case.

The Minister indicated in the House some months ago that he would look into the matter; that he would investigate it; that he would look at; that he has someone monitoring the situation, which again is a normal type of response by the Minister. But he said someone was monitoring the situation from his department; he would look into it when the reports became available. These are not public reports. The inquiry wasn't a public inquiry. The Minister now is in a position, surely, to indicate to the House what his investigation of that inquiry has revealed and whether indeed the government is going to do anything with respect to this particular matter.

I raised an issue earlier in the review of estimates in this department regarding mental health. I raised the case of the inability of a constituent of mine to receive megavitamin therapy for schizophrenia. I indicated that this individual had a number of instances of electric shock therapy being administered to him and that this has left the person in almost a semi-comatose state. The parents indicate that the young man, who a few short years ago was a fairly dynamic individual who was president of his high school, is now unemployable. It would appear that his IQ might have dropped. He is on social assistance right now. He seems to have no hope for the future and we cannot in Manitoba somehow get a psychiatrist to prescribe megavitamin therapy to this individual, even though megavitamin therapy is prescribed in other provinces, even though the Canadian Schizophrenic Society in its own pamphlets makes the claim that up to an 80 percent cure if one can in fact utilize megavitamin therapy. You have a national foundation which is supported publicly making these types of claims, and you have this family which I'm sure is only one case of many, not being able to provide this alternative of care and treatment for their son. They watch him deteriorate and they watched him, as recently as two weeks ago having electric shock treatments administered to him without any alternatives available at all.

We then have to wonder what is the power of the College of Physicians and Surgeons; what is the power of the medical establishment. To what extent is it a hindrance to change, or to what extent is it a responsible, reasonable organization that will look seriously at new alternatives? When you look at something like megavitamin therapy, you wonder what's the harm and what are the bad side effects. I really don't know of any but again I'm a layman in this particular area. But when I see megavitamin therapy being rejected as an alternative of treatment and I know of definite cases of electric shock therapy being administered where the side effects are horrendous; where the effects are lasting, despite what the Minister said a few weeks ago in this Legislature; where there is concrete evidence that this is really a disaster for this particular patient and

I gather that other schizophrenics have had electric shock therapy administered to them. I wonder what is happening within our health care system. Why is it that we cannot look at alternative approaches that don't rely on drugs as much, that don't rely on something as horrendous, in my estimation, as electric shock therapy?

Again, we come back to the whole question of Owen Schwartz. Why was the penalty so severe? Why was he suspended for things which I am quite certain other doctors have in fact done, improper diagnosis in a couple of instances. I know, from my own personal experience, that from what I gather took place with respect to those diagnoses, doctors weren't that thorough in examining me before prescribing something and usually the prescription was a straight drug prescription.

I can't understand why we have that type of double standard. I can't understand why we have the College of Physicians and Surgeons taking such a hard line in that respect, and I am wondering whether indeed it is that healthy for our health care system to have a self-governing entity have as much power and independence as does the College of Physicians and Surgeons. I am wondering whether indeed the Minister shouldn't be playing more of a monitor role which is actually a real monitor role, rather than a rhetorical one.

Another major issue facing us in Manitoba with respect to the medical services program is that we have a shortage of doctors in particular areas of Manitoba. This is a problem that I don't think is endemic to the Conservative Government; it is one that has been faced by all governments and it is a difficult problem. Unfortunately, if one looks at Hansard in relation to questions that I asked the Minister a few days ago with respect to the lack of a doctor in Benito, a situation which arose over a year ago and which, to this date, hasn't been solved; and a problem which is developing at Notre Dame des Lourdes, and I am quite certain the Minister must have a list of other communities and medical institutions which don't have doctors, more because of their geography than because of anything else. I am wondering whether indeed the Minister does have a list of those areas and communities which right now are short of a doctor. I gather that the Minister has tried to deal with this problem by providing a 40,000 grant to the MMA as a means of somehow launching some type of a recruitment program to see if we can recruit doctors, I would assume from other provinces or other countries, who would undertake to serve in these more remote areas — some of them aren't that remote, Benito isn't that remote, Notre Dame des Lourdes isn't that remote — but who are prepared to serve in rural and northern communities. This is a very very serious problem and I am wondering whether in fact it is not serious enough to warrant some measures that possibly are a bit more stringent.

Right now the public does finance the great bulk of a doctor's education. Doctors often complain that they have to pay high tuition fees, that they have to spend some time studying. That may be true, but I would think people who go through for a Ph.D in microbiology or biochemistry, fields that are quite related, spend as much time at university, take courses which are every bit as difficult, do research

which in many respects is possibly more difficult, ultimately aren't paid as much, and have to contribute as much to tuition fees. These people aren't rewarded as well as doctors. Doctors are quite well rewarded, but at the same time, I would think that at least 80 percent of the costs of a doctor's education is borne by the public.

I am wondering whether in fact we are not at the stage of sitting down with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, or I don't know whether it might be the Manitoba Medical Association, and determining if there aren't ways in which we might provide some bursaries on condition that these doctors undertake to spend two or three years in a rural or northern community. I think this would be a step forward. I think it would provide very good experience. I think that if it was possible to organize a couple of small clinics where you could get some blend of experience plus apprenticeship, or apprentices, that we may be able to move a step towards solving the problem of shortages of doctors in particular geographical regions. I think we have to admit that to date, apart from community clinics, we have not been particularly successful in solving that particular problem, but we do have community health centres operating in places like Churchill, in places like Leaf Rapids, and for some reason, it is the health clinic concept that I think has attracted some more progressive doctors into these clinics and we have been able to meet a need in a new and dynamic way.

That's one reason why we on this side of the House promote community health centres in other parts of Manitoba. That's why we think the government is turning back a particular approach which may be useful in solving a problem which has existed in Manitoba for some time. We don't think that's the only solution. We think that there are some other solutions as well and some type of quid pro quo between the public and the medical students in terms of service in selected communities afterwards certainly isn't too Draconian a step to consider, given the magnitude and longevity of the problem that we have been facing with respect to a shortage of doctors.

I think that physicians themselves possibly are concentrating far too much on the whole issue of salaries. I know, I have material which I will bring up later in the debate which indicates that physicians' salaries, relative to other incomes, have not fared that badly if one considers the period prior to the introduction of Medicare to the present time. What happened was that in 1968, 1969, and 1970, doctors' salaries went up tremendously relative to other incomes and since 1972 they have decreased relative to other people's salaries, but they certainly have not reached the position relative to other people's incomes that they occupied, say, in 1955, 1965.

I think that Robert Evans, who is a doctor doing some research for the Hall Commission in this matter, will be able to conclusively demonstrate, I would hope within two or three months, that this indeed is the case. His preliminary evidence, of which I have some, indicates that doctors have not fared badly relative to other groups and societies in terms of their income over the last 20 years. I think that's some statistical fact that has to be provided the doctors so that possibly they aren't misled by their

own people who may be doing more research into this matter and have given them the impression that somehow they are horribly hard done by, by a public medicare system.

I think we have had instances of a few doctors returning to Manitoba, having gone to the United States because they were lured by 300,000, 400,000 and 500,000 yearly salaries, which frankly we couldn't meet and which I wouldn't want us to meet. These people went there, they saw the conditions there, and they came back saying that the overall system just wasn't good. It wasn't a fair system; it wasn't an equitable system, and they had some conscience and they came back to Manitoba and I commend them for that. They put some notion of public interest ahead of private interest and they turned their backs on those salaries which admittedly exist in the United States, exist primarily in private hospitals. I wasn't here for the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Five minutes.

MR. PARASIUK: . . . debate yesterday. I don't know whether in fact the Minister did get into the matter of private hospitals. He has made a very strong case for private nursing homes. If he makes that type of a case for private nursing homes he also de facto makes the case for private hospitals. We have heard doctors talk about the bad implications for the general health care delivery system of having private hospitals, of having a double standard of health care in the United States. I think the Minister is trying to duck that particular issue and I think he has ducked it with respect to the matter of doctors proposing a private clinic because public facilities aren't good enough; with respect to the provision of a private gynecology clinic because the public facilities aren't good enough.

The Minister has tried to bring in questions of morality when in fact the question really is one of accessibility for legally prescribed health care. If the Minister isn't satisfied with the legislation he should change it; but surely if the legislation exists, as it does, then I think we in Canada are obliged to provide a health care system which acknowledges it and which, indeed, does not force people to have to leave Manitoba or leave the country in order to get legally prescribed health care.

If the solution to that particular problem is to have doctors establish private clinics or private hospitals which would receive medicare funding, then again we are seriously undermining the public Medicare system.

I think that our Medicare system indeed is under attack; it is under attack because we aren't flushing out some of our facilities; it is under attack by doctors who don't believe in the system, the public health care system, and want to introduce flexible billing, want to introduce deterrent fees, want to indeed preserve and even magnify their private governing powers.

There are a number of other areas in which the health care system in Manitoba and Canada is under attack, but I think these are ones that are facing us when we deal with this particular program and I am hoping that the Minister will address himself to some of these issues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I expected someone else to rise and I was waiting for that to happen.

I have a number of points that I would like to offer for the Minister's consideration, please, Mr. Chairperson. First of all, I am informed that The Health Services Act has not been overhauled since 1948, that there is a need for that to be done. I wonder if in fact any consideration of overhauling of this bill is planned by the Minister.

I am told that there are 80 to 85 birth centres in Manitoba and that experts agree that this is far too many, as some are poorly equipped, and in order to provide good child care with proper staff and facilities the number should be reduced to between 20 and 25. I don't know if this would be a popular move in many centres but I am told that this would provide for more efficient care for newborns. In order to be economical and to provide the best infant care, I am told a birth centre must handle at least 500 births for a rural centre, and 1,000 births for an urban centre. I wonder what the Minister's intention is with regard to the Seven Oaks Hospital and whether that is to include an obstetrical unit. I know there has been some discussion of this particular problem and there is some disagreement among the professional people in the city. I understand Misericordia handles about 700 births a year and Concordia handles about 500 births a year, and some of the professionals in the city are saying that one or both of these should be closed if an obstetrical unit is to be opened at the Seven Oaks Hospital, and I'd be interested in hearing what the Minister has to say on that, please, Mr. Chairperson.

I wanted to speak for a moment on the matter of medical research. It is generally felt that 1 percent, or 2 percent of the Health budget should be for approved medical research, and I wonder if the Minister has undertaken or plans to undertake any sort of a review to see what research programs would not be duplications of other programs that are occurring elsewhere in the city and should be considered by this government in view of the very fine reputation that Manitoba had in the area of health research, and the fear and the feeling in the community that we are falling behind in that particular area at the present time and under this government.

Major priority for capital investment is felt to be in extending facilities for medical research. Winnipeg has always been considered a major research centre, but if we're going to keep it that way then we have to invest in appropriate facilities that will allow for expansion of research programs. At the present time, I understand the per capita expenditure on medical research in Manitoba is over 4.00 per capita, which is about 44 percent above the national average, if that has been continued; most of these funds coming from either the federal government or from private research foundations. I'd like to suggest that it should be recognized that emphasis on research improves the quality of medical services from the specialist to the general practitioner, and the Liberal Party would like to see us attempting to maintain the enviable reputation that Manitoba has built up over

the years in the area of medical research. Also from strictly a business standpoint, it's considered to be to the advantage of Manitoba that we continue to improve our status in this important area.

I also want to bring up the matter of mental health. It's felt that there's a serious deficiency in health care in Manitoba in the area of mental health. There are only about 50 trained psychiatrists in our province, most of them located in Winnipeg or Brandon, and others in the health care field capable of providing therapeutic services, such as psychologists, are also in short supply, Mr. Chairperson. There was an Internal Manitoba Association report of 1975, which I understand has never been made public, which pointed out that the result of this extreme shortage of mental health professionals, well, it makes the following observations, and I'm quoting: What does this shortage mean? In human terms, it means that many thousands of mentally ill and psychologically handicapped citizens will not receive the help that they require and to which they are entitled; it means that many Manitobans will suffer needlessly various illnesses ranging from painful anxiety attacks to incapacitating depressions and psychoses; it means a vast wastage of human resources, with much of the human potential of this province not being realized or utilized; it means a retreat into the barren emptiness of the withdrawn world of the schizophrenic; it means the suicide of a depressed parent; it means the premature deterioration into senselessness of an aging grandparent; it means the helpless drift of a child with learning disabilities and the empty void of the school dropout; it means the angry lashing out of a juvenile delinquent, the impulsive brutality of a rapist, the slow deterioration of an alcoholic and his family. To the families, relatives and friends, it means years of hardship, frustration and sorrow. If we are to avoid this inhuman treatment and uneconomic wastage of our fellow citizens, it is necessary that the manpower resources of this province be increased immediately and extensively.

The situation is believed to be aggravated by the policy of encouraging release of patients from institutions such as the mental hospital and encouraging them to live in the community. This releasing is commendable so long as there are the professionals in the area of mental health and other services available to assist the individual in the new setting, but unfortunately there are not, and too often the patient becomes a transient patient at a psychiatric hospital that is already overtaxed to provide proper care.

So the answer is not to reverse the concept of dealing with a person in his own environment, but to provide the community resources to enable him to receive appropriate treatment, and it has been pointed out to me that this requires a massive initiative to train and retain more psychiatrists and clinical psychologists and to improve the mental health care training of social workers and nurses, with better delivery services in the rural areas.

There has been a brief presented to the Hall Commission by the Psychological Association of Manitoba pointing out that the strange situation exists in which the skills of Manitoba-trained clinical Ph.D.s are mainly available to the few who can pay

for them, resulting in a serious form of discrimination towards both psychologists and towards the clients that would be otherwise using their services.

Mr. Chairperson, the psychologists are trained right here in Manitoba, in one of Canada's top three clinical psychology doctoral programs and in a clinical internship that is ranked among the top ten in the entire North American continent. Psychologists are staying here, they're not among the professionals that are leaving, that are migrating to lucrative areas, and they are willing to operate within Medicare, but the point is that they are not covered under the Medicare program. The medical psychologists are involved in training medical practitioners in the practice of psychotherapy, and then the medical practitioners are covered by Medicare but the psychologists who have helped to train them are not. It's suggested that initial start-up costs would be low and would largely be offset by reduced utilization of unnecessary and ineffective medical procedures. I wonder if the Minister would advise the House, please, or this committee, what, if any, response his department would make to this brief that was presented, and I know that other approaches have been made to the department in this area of coverage for psychological treatment. The general public is not able to avail itself of, very often, the most needed psychological help. They are restricted in their choice to medical specialists and practitioners and to psychiatrists, but they do not have the availability, generally speaking, to psychologists. There was a recent study conducted by the Texas Research Institute in Houston on 100 consecutive patients about to be committed to a mental hospital. This study found that 80 percent of the patients had a physical illness and 46 percent had illnesses which either caused or worsened the psychiatric condition, and I bring that forward to merely underline my concern and the concern of my party with the lack of mental health care, or the inadequacy of mental health care, in our province at the present time, Mr. Chairperson.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to just deal with a couple of small issues in the Health debate. The one that I would like to draw to the Minister's attention at this point is this question of chiropractors taking X-rays and medical doctors refusing to read them or transfer them, one to the other. The Minister is familiar, I think, with some specific examples, in which Doctor Brian Lecker, who is a chiropractor in the Elmwood area, has corresponded with him about, and I think the ultimate question that has to be asked is why is it that it is acceptable for chiropractors to take X-rays of people and yet when they would, say, be willing to forward them to medical doctors, or to hospitals, in handling of the same case, that it is refused.

On the other hand, a medical doctor or hospital will not transmit X-rays that they have in their possession to a qualified chiropractor. This would appear to be a clear instance of duplication. It would appear to be an unnecessary exposure of a patient to X-rays, and it would also appear to be an

unnecessary charge on the health system. I would like to, as an example, Mr. Chairman, back this up by reading some remarks from Dr. Lecker to the Minister and others in which he raises this particular problem, and I would simply take his latest letter, which was March 12th, to the Minister, a copy to the Premier, myself and others, which said as follows: Dear Mr. Sherman: I want to thank you for your letter of March 3, 1980, and the concern which you have expressed regarding the problem between chiropractic and the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Your hope that our association and the college will be able to work things out is a positive thought towards a solution, but it's very unrealistic when the latter refuses to associate with us in any way. I maintain that the College of Physicians and Surgeons' policy of forbidding medical doctors from associating with chiropractors in any way, shape, or form is detrimental to the health and welfare of Manitobans. I would appreciate if you could answer these questions since no one else seems to be able to. And he raises three questions:

(1) Should a patient who already has had X-rays taken which are of diagnostic quality, by either a physician or a chiropractor, be subjected to further films for the same problem? I believe that this pertains not only to the question of safety, but also of economics. (2) If a patient consults me as a chiropractor and I suspect that they require medical attention, do I make the referral to the appropriate medical specialty, or do I do nothing? It is my understanding that if I refer a patient the MD accepting my patient is breaking the rules of the College and may face disciplinary action by the College for associating with a chiropractor. (3) Are medical doctors, chiropractors, and medical X-rays paid through the same funding allocated to MHSC? Final paragraph, I believe that these questions are appropriate and that answers to, especially questions 1 and 2, are essential if I am to give quality care to my patients. I look forward to hearing from you in the near future. Sincerely, Brian E. Lecker, DC.

I simply say to the Minister if he doesn't do anything concerning this matter then you will have duplication and cost and, I guess, continued friction between medical doctors and chiropractors. I guess he can also go one way or the other and he can, I suppose, take away from the chiropractors their right to x-ray. He could deprive them of their, I suppose, long standing right or he could require or encourage medical doctors to accept x-rays from chiropractors.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of common sense, that if it is felt that x-rays used by chiropractors are worthy of a charge on the public purse, they must be of a certain quality and standard, and they appear to be regarded as such. Yet, on the other hand, they are rejected by one segment — perhaps the most important, perhaps the most sizeable segment — of the health care system, rejected by them. So I say to the Minister this appears to be a dilemma. It appears to be an inconsistency, and I ask him whether he has a reasonable and workable solution to this problem.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Arnold Brown (Rhineland): The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank those members of the committee who have just participated in the debate on this item and acknowledge their suggestions, questions, and concerns. I also want to welcome back the Honourable Member for Transcona, who has been away on a sad family mission to Edmonton, and to extend my personal condolences to him.

Mr. Chairman, I'll try to deal with the questions that have been put to me in order, and as quickly as possible, although there is certainly a range of medical issues that have been raised by the Member for Transcona, the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for Elmwood.

In the first period of the debate, the Honourable Member for Transcona raised the questions of the government's position with respect to Medicare and particularly pertaining to items like flexible billing and deterrent fees, and our position vis-a-vis the medical fee schedule and the remuneration system for doctors.

I think I can say, Mr. Chairman, that although the Member for Transcona may not have heard my statements on this subject on all the occasions that I've made them in the past, I think I can say that I have stated the government's position very clearly on Medicare, on our commitment to the reinforcement of Medicare and on our belief that the most reasonable system of payment and operation for participation by the medical profession and the health delivery system of this province lies in our present opt-in, opt-out model, where Medicare is concerned.

We feel that both government and the medical profession, on the one hand, and the public of Manitoba, on the other hand, are fairly and reasonably served by that system and that the widest possible accessibility and access to choice on the part of the patient is available through that system and there is reasonable flexibility for the medical profession itself, as there is for the government. I've made that statement at the federal/provincial Conference of Health Ministers in 1979 and I have made it before the Hall Commission on Medicare in 1980. I know that I have made in this House and in a number of other public forums and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that our position with respect to Medicare and the system of fee payment for doctors is quite clear. We do not accept the pressure or the arguments for flexible billing. We repudiate the concept of deterrent fees except insofar as those that fall under the category of utilization fees and that are in effect at the present time. And there are some utilization fees in our system obviously, such as the personal care per diem and the co-insurance feature on Pharmacare, and co-insurance on some other programs.

But the concept of utilization or deterrent fees, as the Honourable Member for Transcona means it with respect to hospital care and occupancy of hospital beds and visits to doctors offices, in that general context our position is one of repudiation and rejection of that method of operation. We don't believe that there is any evidence that we've been able to adduce or discover that supports, with validity, endorsement of that approach to financing health care. The argument has been raised that it can help to act as a protection against or a defense

against abuse of the system by the consumer. We've seen no evidence of that in any of the studies that we have asked to see, in any of the studies that have been undertaken on the subject with which we are familiar. We don't believe it does operate with that effect. On the contrary, we believe it would inevitably lead to a two-tier system of medicine and health care, and that is something devoutly to be avoided, Mr. Chairman.

I would hope that the Honourable Member for Transcona would concede that this Minister of Health and this government has taken a clear stand and made a clear position known on that subject.

The member asked about the issue of holistic medicine, although he may not have put it in precisely those terms, but he referred to the Owen Schwartz case and the manner in which it was dealt with by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the concept of holistic medicine was not on trial in the Owen Schwartz case. The only reason there was an investigation of Dr. Owen Schwartz was because it had been requested by some eight of his patients, who laid complaints with the College of Physicians and Surgeons against certain aspects of his practice. The College, as the responsible authority for the conduct of medical practice and the maintenance of medical ethics and the protection of the public in medical terms in Manitoba, had no alternative but to investigate those charges, investigate Dr. Schwartz's methods of practice. I am satisfied, Sir, that investigation was carried out justly and responsibly. I am satisfied that the issue of holistic medicine was not the issue. It was a matter of medical examination and medical diagnosis and it had produced some complaints which, as I say, the College was duty bound to investigate.

The member said certain doctors were not allowed to testify and he named Dr. Charles Green, in particular. Dr. Schwartz, himself, has denied that in letters to the newspaper. Dr. Schwartz himself has said that the college refused him participation by no witnesses and that they had been unfairly accused in that case.

The member asked me about my investigation of the case. My investigation was not a clinical investigation, Mr. Chairman. It was a monitoring investigation, naturally, because of the concern that had been expressed by members of this House and by the public and some members of the media and, because of my position as Minister of Health, I obviously have a keen interest in and commitment to seeing that justice and responsibility apply, as well as good health practices, in matters of health care. I asked to be kept advised, through communications between the College and my office, of the nature of the inquiry and of the opportunities provided to Dr. Schwartz to make his case and I'm satisfied, as I say, that the inquiry was carried out justly and that Dr. Schwartz was given every opportunity to make his case and to call upon whatever witnesses he wanted to help support him in that case.

The Member for Transcona makes reference to the fact that it was not a public inquiry. Precisely, and no inquiry of that kind ever is and one of the main reasons why it is not a public inquiry, Mr. Chairman, is to be found in one of the principle ethics in our society and that is the privacy of the individual, the

individual's right to that privacy, particularly insofar as the confidentiality of medical records are concerned. I've been asked by the press, as a matter of fact . . . Well, I shouldn't generalize; I've been asked by one member of the press why the media is not allowed to cover inquiries of that kind. The answer is that confidential medical information relative to specific individuals, identifiable individuals, in most cases individuals who were there, either testifying or listening and watching, is at the heart of inquiries of this kind. We believe that medical information of that kind is a confidence and must be respected as a confidence. I think that is part and parcel of our general ethic with respect to the individuals where health care and medicine is concerned. I don't think the arguments for breaking that ethic or departing from that ethic are strong enough to outweigh the value of the ethic and that protection of confidentiality itself.

The issue of megavitamin therapy versus electric shock treatment, I think we dealt with earlier, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Transcona seems to have some particular grievance with and dislike for electric shock treatment and some particular preference for megavitamin therapy. As I told him at the time, there is no law in this province which prevents psychiatrists or medical doctors from prescribing megavitamin therapy. There is, however, proven demonstrable value and worth to electric shock treatment. We don't have all the answers to mental illness and to psychosis and psychotic disturbances obviously, and electric shock no more works every time than an appendectomy or gallbladder surgery works every time, but it has a proven track record as being an effective method of therapeutic treatment and clinical treatment for certain psychoses; megavitamin therapy does not, Mr. Chairman. It may be favored by many, and those who favor it are entitled to pursue it, but it has not established the track record or passed the test which makes it an accepted conventional form of therapy among medical practitioners in this field of medicine, psychiatric medicine, and mental health, either in Manitoba or in any province in Canada that I know of.

The honourable member refers to a specific case which I suggest is . . . I was going to say I suggest is exaggerated. I do not have sufficient knowledge of the case to make that suggestion, but let me put it this way, I question the facts as he portrays them. Certainly, whether it is electric shock treatment or whatever other kind of treatment, the individual patient is not subjected to treatment arbitrarily, it must be approved by his physician, by the medical officer, and if he is a ward of the public trustee, by the public trustee. If he is not a ward of the public trustee, there certainly must be some communication and some, at least concurrence, if not wildly enthusiastic agreement, between his relatives and his physician; or if he is capable of making the decision himself, his own person and his physician. So I would question very seriously that he was given electric shock treatment against, either his will or his relatives will, or if he was a ward of the province, the will of the public trustee.

The honourable member asks why does a self-governing body like the College of Physicians and Surgeons have as much power, as much authority as they do, are they not able to make decisions and

determinations in areas such as this one that he raised respecting megavitamin therapy? The answer is, Mr. Chairman, because it is a self-governing body; because the government does not run the health profession, and I don't know of any Health Minister in Canada, in governments past or present, who do want to run the health profession. The health professionals, who are trained for it, run the health profession. The government is here to ensure that it is maintained at a peak level of efficiency and responsibility and that the necessary revenues are raised to finance those services, but the profession, through The Medical Act, through the College of Physicians and Surgeons is a self-governing body. They make determinations that I suggest, in the area of specific medical decision-making and specific medical knowledge, neither the Member for Transcona nor I, is or are competent to make. We rely on the profession to do that and they are empowered to do that, and their primary mandate is to protect the public of Manitoba to ensure that, at all times, proven, tested, quality methods of medical practice are applied in serving the people of the province.

I want to reappraise the Member for Transcona of the fact that the neurosurgery case that he has raised two or three times in the House with respect to a 56-year-old patient in the Concordia Hospital is a case that, once again, in terms of his presentation of it, represents exaggeration and inaccuracy. That particular patient has undergone two neurosurgical operations, neurosurgical procedures. He is still in Concordia Hospital, notwithstanding my honourable friend's claims, which crop up every three or four days, to the effect that he was sent home and that he has not been granted admission to the Health Sciences Centre. He is still in Concordia Hospital. The reason he is not at the Health Sciences Centre undergoing neurosurgery is because his doctor, one of the leading neurosurgeons in this province, in this country, has not decided that it is either safe, responsible, reasonable, or viable to undertake a third operation. That medical decision hasn't been made yet. It has nothing to do with conditions at either Concordia Hospital or the Health Sciences Centre, it has to do with the medical condition and the strength of that individual and the measurable effectiveness of a third operation, whether it is worthwhile or not.

On the Benito situation, Mr. Chairman, we have — when I say, we, I mean we, the government and the people of Manitoba — I believe, considerable reason to hope that a doctor has been secured for Benito. The board and the community, through concerted and combined efforts involving the MMA and discussion with the Commission in my office, have been on a long and difficult search to try to find a doctor for Benito. Recently a qualified practitioner was brought over from the United Kingdom and examined the situation, looked over the potential and the attractions of practice there, and we are hopeful that his decision will be favourable. He is not in Benito at the present time, but we are hopeful, as I say, that his return to the United Kingdom is a return that is intended to enable him to wrap up his affairs there, and that he will be deciding to come to Benito.

I can only say to the Honourable Member for Transcona that the individual hospital boards are

those who are primarily responsible for finding doctors. We do what we can through my office to help them, to assist them, but the boards and the communities go out and look for their doctors, and try to put together the kinds of packages that will attract them in terms of retention. Through the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower and the Placement Bureau being set up by the MMA, we hope to come up with a range of suggestions that will produce better ideas and initiatives in the area of incentives for attracting and retaining doctors in rural communities. That is not, Sir, although it is a worry and a concern of mine, and obviously a worry and concern of anybody who is Minister of Health, that is not the job of the Minister of Health or his office to go out and find doctors for communities. What we do is try to help them and in each case I do give them my assurance that we will give them every help we can and we talk to MMA about it, we talked to the Commission about it, we talk to other individual doctors about it, to try to identify individuals who could be attracted to coming to this or that locality to fill a vacancy. But in the final analysis, the board of the hospital and the community concerned must do the necessary fundamental spade work to get that physician. Now we hope that through some recommendations coming from the Standing Committee and through that Placement Bureau that there will be some tangible assists available in the future.

The honourable member has referred to the developing problem in Notre Dame. That is not a developing problem, Mr. Chairman, that is a chronic problem. We have long had, and the previous government long had, difficulties in maintaining a physician in Notre Dame. It seems to be a continuing recurring problem. We thought we had it solved, and Notre Dame thought they had it solved with Dr. MacKay, but there was a sharp cleavage of opinion in the community and in the hospital and among Dr. MacKay and his friends. You know the current situation, he is apparently leaving and so Notre Dame finds itself in the position again, that it has found itself in on many occasions in the past, having to look for a doctor once again. The honourable member says that I promised to help find them one, that is true, I promised to help find them one. Surely, I wouldn't be foolish enough to promise to find them, but I certainly promised to help find them one, and we are working with the MMA and the local board and community in that search at the present time.

The member has asked me about other communities in the province who are short of doctors. There are some seven or eight in total that are short of doctors at the present time. Once again I can only refer to the efforts that we are making and the new approaches and initiatives that we hope to be developing through the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower, which has been at work since January and which is charged primarily with that responsibility first on its agenda, Mr. Chairman, to try to produce some answers to that doctor supply problem.

Mr. Chairman, there were a number of other questions raised by the Member for Transcona, and a number by the Member for Fort Rouge, and the Member for Elmwood, but obviously I am not going

to have a chance to deal with them until the Committee reconvenes at 8 o'clock, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are 30 seconds before 4:30. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I will just use that time to ask the Minister how many of the eight complaints against Dr. Owen Schwartz were from patients and how many were from other doctors?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I can check that, Mr. Chairman, but I believe that all eight were from patients.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the majority of those came from doctors and not from patients and the Minister over the time can check his facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The time is now 4:30, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return to Committee at 8 o'clock this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. On Tuesdays the first item of business is Private Members' Bills. We have one Bill, Bill No. 44.

SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 44 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MEDICAL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN presented Bill No. 44, An Act to Amend the Medical Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this bill is an attempt to provide additional protection and additional public safeguards to what presently exists under The Medical Act relative to enquiries held by the Council of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and there are three main areas which the bill intends to deal with, Mr. Speaker, two of which are matters which have been the subject of my attention for some period of time; but I have to confess to the House that my presentation of them is rather a delayed reaction. The third one, Mr. Speaker, will quite admittedly stem from the recent publicity that was given to enquiries of the College of Physicians and Surgeons relative to proceedings which were taken this year.

I do wish to underline to the House, however, Mr. Speaker, that I have no knowledge of Dr. Schwartz, I have no knowledge of the Dr. Schwartz case, I don't make any criticism of the College in its conduct of the case; but the controversy surrounding the case

and the potentialities of difficulties relative to the practice of what may be considered orthodox medicine or medicine which does not comply with what may be termed to be standard patterns, has indeed raised a question, both in this House and outside of the House, and the third portion of the bill that I am presenting, Mr. Speaker, is intended to cause the House to apply itself to that Section.

With respect to the first portion, the first area which the bill deals with, Mr. Speaker, relates to when the College of Physicians and Surgeons is conducting an enquiry relative to a member, where the allegations with respect to that member are not directly related to either the delivery or provision of medical services — and it may surprise members of the House that the College would be involved in conducting such an enquiry. In this area, Mr. Speaker, my facts are well-founded and come from direct personal knowledge, because I have been involved in such an enquiry and know, in fact, that such enquiries are conducted.

The difficulty is, Mr. Speaker, that the College of Physicians and Surgeons are not trained in the conduct of such inquiries nor, Mr. Speaker, does their medical knowledge and does the conduct of the member form the subject matter that would normally be dealt with by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. I don't think that originally inquiries by the council were intended to deal with that type of conduct.

I will present to Mr. Speaker some examples. The Law Society will conduct an inquiry into one of its members who may be convicted of income tax avoidance, and they will suspend — income tax evasion, excuse me, a breach of the provisions of The Income Tax Act — and they will, in the course of that inquiry, Mr. Speaker, or they won't really conduct it until there has been a conviction of a member and then on the conviction of that member — and I'm not saying that this is right or wrong, I question it, Mr. Speaker; I question it myself, if it is not related to the provision of legal services to their clients — but they will suspend or discipline a member who has broken the provisions of The Income Tax Act. The reason that they do it is that they are of the opinion that the honesty of a member relates to his ability to present himself in court and to the practice of law.

Whatever the reasoning there is in that, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to deal with it at this point. I merely wish to indicate that the College of Physicians and Surgeons has, to my knowledge, in the past dealt with analogous type of inquiries, and I will be specific, Mr. Speaker. I can well recall the College of Physicians and Surgeons enquiring into a complaint which they received from the Manitoba Medical Association. The Manitoba Medical association said that the practitioner charged the Medical Association, the MMA as it was, the plan that was then in existence, which was prior to the introduction of Manitoba Medical Services; the doctor charged the Medical Services Insurance Program — that was a private plan at that time — and the Workmen's Compensation Board for the same service, that they received payment on two occasions. Over a period of six months, I believe it was — and in this I am relying on memory and it really doesn't matter very much — there was an alleged double charge of

some 270, Mr. Speaker. The medical practitioner's evidence was to the effect that he expected the insurance program to debit and credit these charges when and if they occurred, and gave, in fact, bills to the College to show that that had happened in the past, at least one bill is my recollection.

Really, Mr. Speaker, whether he did this or not is beside the point. The point that I am making is that the College of Physicians and Surgeons does not have, as a panel, the kind of knowledge, the kind of legal orientation to make them judges as to what evidence satisfies that kind of finding. Because in effect, Mr. Speaker, it is a charge of obtaining money by false pretences, obtaining money from two sources. I am certain, and this is to my everlasting regret, that if that doctor had been prosecuted that he would have been acquitted and therefore the College of Physicians and Surgeons took it upon themselves to try a criminal offence. It had nothing to do with the supplying of services. There was no complaint, nor was it adjudicated that he had given extra services, that he had given services which were not necessary. It was suggested that he double charged. The College found him guilty. He was suspended from the practice of medicine. I don't remember the period of suspension; I suspect it was a short suspension, a month. But his name was blasted across the headlines of the newspapers of the province of Manitoba on the basis that he had been found by the College of Physicians and Surgeons to have been guilty of malpractice in that he double charged.

How the College can make that type of decision, Mr. Speaker, would seem to you to be rather trite that anybody can make that decision. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is not true, that the kind of protections that are afforded to a person accused of that kind of activity were not available to him by the College and the College was not trained in the kind of evidence to accept.

Therefore, the first branch of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to make it quite plain that if the College does suspend, for reasons which are not directly related to the supply of medical services, that that suspension can only come or that discipline can only come after an appropriate finding has been made to that effect, such as the Law Society does. The Law Society will not discipline a lawyer where there is a criminal offence charged unless there has been that conviction.

In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, just to indicate to you that one cannot say, well, the College is doing it and then it must be right; they are protecting the public interests. I can well remember arguing the case, Mr. Speaker. By the way, the doctor involved was drummed out of practice in the province of Manitoba, did leave the province, became a specialist in radiology and is practising in Canada, I believe in another city, and is doing very well and is continuing to practice good medicine, and there was never any allegation of bad medicine practised by that doctor, and the College suspended him.

Mr. Speaker, the proceedings before the College were very interesting. The MMA had a complaint. That complaint was presented by the College's lawyer, who presented it as if it was a case against the member. A defence was then put in by the member, and I conducted the defence. Then there

was argument, Mr. Speaker. The argument was presented by counsel for the College; argument was presented by the doctor. The argument was concluded. The College then, the panel, went to consider its decision. And who went with the panel to consider the decision? The prosecuting lawyer went in with the panel and considered the decision and advised the panel. The person whom I had been arguing with, as the lawyer, went in with the panel and advised them with regard to the kind of decision that should be made and deliberated with the panel of doctors.

Mr. Speaker, that last part is merely with reference to how such decisions can be made when they are made by a lay group of this kind, because one can sympathize with the panel. They heard two legal arguments. They probably both sounded good, so they needed legal advice. Who did they get the legal advice from? The person who presented the argument against the doctor for the College. It went to the Court of Appeal and, Mr. Speaker, call it sour grapes, call it what you like — it's 10 years ago that it happened — it was wrong. In my view, it was wrong.

This particular section would merely safeguard that kind of thing occurring again, that the College should not be able to suspend for conduct that is not directly related to the practice of medicine.

What examples can one bring up, Mr. Speaker? I suppose that one could bring up the example of seduction, or a sexual assault. The College should not be able to discipline a member for that kind of assault unless the member was convicted of the assault, because of the kind of protection that is afforded, Mr. Speaker, is much different, and I submit that a panel of doctors is not the proper forum where that kind of charge can be properly considered.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the first element of the bill. I really don't think that there is anything in it which should disturb the College of Physicians and Surgeons from the point of view of being able to carry on their activities. It should help them, Mr. Speaker, because then there can be no argument as to their position with regard to the particular matter, because it will have been determined by a Court and they will not be the ones who have had to make that adjudication, which does not relate to the practice of medicine.

The second portion of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I think should be equally non-controversial. Under the present Act, the College is entitled to suspend, pending an investigation. That is an enormous power, because now a person is suspended before he has been found guilty. I am not suggesting that it shouldn't exist because, just as an interim injunction is necessary to prevent damage from occurring while waiting for the adjudication, there are cases where I would concede, and everybody would concede, that the College has a right to suspend. By the way, I don't know whether they have ever exercised this power. I have no criticism; all I am indicating is that it is a dangerous power and there should be a safeguard, Mr. Speaker. The safeguard that I am suggesting is that if a person is suspended before a determination, that he have a right to go to a court and if the court is satisfied that there would be no injury to the lives or health of any person if the

suspension did not continue until the determination, then it seems to me that the person who is charged is as innocent as every other doctor until he is found to be disciplined.

If, however, the College is able to show that their suspension is based on the fact that there would be a danger to the public, in the definition of the terms that I have given it, then the suspension would be continued. No such provision now exists in the Act, Mr. Speaker. I repeat, I do not know whether the College has ever used this power. It seems to me that they would not. I don't recall them having used it. That doesn't, of course, mean that they haven't used it. It seems to me that the safeguard that is being suggested is one that should not find objection within the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

The third area, Mr. Speaker, I will concede, relates to the inquiry that was held recently, which has been the subject of some publicity. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I do not know this doctor. I have never spoken to him. I have never spoken to any members of the committee who were pursuing this problem. I heard the problem and I have tried to consider what if the allegations that are being made against the College are true, or what if the charges that are being made, or what if the grievances that are felt are true, is there a way of protecting.

I will concede, Mr. Speaker, that in the section that I have proposed, I am making a concession to orthodoxy, and I cannot help but do this. If we are going to rely on some standard by which medicine must be practised, then we have to yield to orthodoxy, and the orthodoxy is the establishment of the profession. But within the profession there is room for disagreement. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I have been over-conservative, if you will excuse the expression. I have said that a doctor who practises in a certain way need be corroborated in terms of the acceptability of this practice by three people who teach in schools which the College itself recognizes. Maybe it should be two, Mr. Speaker, maybe it should be one, but surely the doctor should, if it is a question of the nature of the medicine that is being practised, surely if what he has done is recognized by someone in the orthodoxy, and I would assume that somebody in the orthodoxy would be somebody in whatever medical schools we recognize, who say that you may disagree with this, who make the statement, You, the panel, may disagree with this type of diagnosis but I believe that it is a sound diagnosis; I believe that it is a diagnosis which is as intelligent as the diagnosis that you are making.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have a minute on this. One of the most electrifying experiences that anybody in our Legislative Assembly ever had — and I hope some of the members here will have remembered it — was a lawyer by the name of Howe, who represented the Jehovah's Witnesses in talking about the blood transfusions and the compulsory blood transfusion.

I had always assumed, Mr. Speaker, that blood transfusions save lives, and I suppose maybe down under I still think so, but the lawyer for the Jehovah's Witnesses came here and not on religious grounds, Mr. Speaker, but on scientific grounds made a very very interesting and persuasive address as to the danger of blood transfusions. Mr. Speaker, he spoke for no less than four hours steady. The Member for

Roblin will remember it. Believe me, this was not, Mr. Speaker, a subject of amusement. He made one of the finest presentations that I have ever heard as a legislator, and he convinced me that there was some question as to whether blood transfusions save lives or cause deaths. He is now suing in Ontario for death caused to a child of a Jehovah's Witness who died as a result of a blood transfusion. I don't know whether he will be successful or whether he will not be successful, but I do know that there are arguments within the medical profession. I have read books, Mr. Speaker, on some of the kinds of treatment that doctors will resort to by being a little less diligent in terms of what they are doing. I am not going to adjudicate on that and I don't think that I can. What I am suggesting is that I do not want to see a medical practitioner drummed out of the profession because his practice is not right down the line of orthodoxy. If that happened, Mr. Speaker, I would be worried about being drummed out of the legal profession, because each of us is unorthodox in our own way.

I have said three medical practitioners who are professional medical teachers in medical schools, Mr. Speaker, maybe that is a little bit too tough, maybe it should be two, but the principle of the Bill in the three areas that I have discussed; namely, where it does not relate to the practice of medicine; secondly, of suspension pending an inquiry; and thirdly, a doctor being suspended on the basis of a form of medicine which may not be generally accepted but which has corroborative support by orthodox medicine, I believe, Mr. Speaker, should permit the House to send this bill to Committee, where we could, of course, hear views from other people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to the Bill that is before us and the principle of that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the case that the member referred, although he said he didn't have much knowledge of it, the case of Dr. Owen Schwartz, I think demonstrates clearly the need for some type of action, some type of legislative authority, because basically what we have seen, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the College of Physicians and Surgeons, not being a court and not being a jury and not having the legal jurisprudence background that the Member for Inkster has talked about, have in fact sentenced a doctor in the province of Manitoba. They have sentenced that doctor, Mr. Speaker, to a 14,000 payment to cover legal fees of that hearing. They have sentenced that doctor to a suspension, a three-month-suspension from his medical practice. They have ordered that doctor to attend or take courses which that particular doctor is probably more qualified to teach than many of the people that are teaching that particular subject at this time.

Mr. Speaker, somehow — maybe the Member for Inkster wasn't aware of this and maybe he could explain it to me — after they have made their disposition, then they have interpreted their disposition. Mr. Speaker, they have interpreted what they said in their disposition in the case of Dr. Owen Schwartz. They have changed it to the extent that

now instead of only taking some courses, it appears that they are interpreting their . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might raise a point of order. My understanding is that this matter is presently being appealed and is therefore sub judice and before the courts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am not familiar with the case of whether or not it is before the court, I have to accept the advice of the Attorney-General. If that is the case, I suggest the honourable member choose wisely what he is about to say.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. It is my understanding that the case is not being appealed and I think the Attorney-General has misunderstood in that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights on the same point of order.

MR. GARY FILMON: Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding from a newscast the other day that the matter has been appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I am at somewhat of a loss, not being a lawyer, and therefore of not being entirely sure of how to tread the ground between the bill before us and a case that clearly demonstrates the need for action on the part of us, as legislators, in terms of the power and authority of the matter before us.

Mr. Speaker, without referring specifically to the case, I think that we have enough of an example in terms of the authority and the kind of power given to the College of Physicians and Surgeons. As the Member for Inkster has referred to, the case where a person does not follow the orthodox practice of medicine right down to a specific way that is accepted by all other physicians in the province of Manitoba, then the tendency of the fact for other physicians to actually be the ones that file complaints, as opposed to patients who have been treated, but the possibility of other physicians filing complaints and of their basic attack being against the orthodoxy of the methods that are before us, the College does have the authority, does have the power, to basically put somebody out of the business they have trained to practice, out of the profession they have been trained to practice. They have the authority to punish persons from what they practice.

Mr. Chairperson, it is on the public record and I assume therefore permissible for me to mention the sentence that they issued in a very recent case: the sentence being a three-month suspension; the sentence being the payment of the entire legal costs of the hearing; the sentence being the person, of course, having to pay their own legal costs.

Now as I understand the procedure that the bill before us deals with or the option is to apply legal

practice at the first stage of this, so that you don't have a non-legal practice. The member described, for example, a case that he is familiar with, that the case would not be proceeded with had it been in a court of law, that the method of the conducting of the hearing was not anything that would be acceptable within the court of law. My understanding is that an appeal from a ruling of the Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba is basically on the legal technicalities of that appeal or of that hearing, and not on the basis of the opinion of the orthodoxy of that particular practice.

Mr. Chairperson, the Member for Inkster talked about the scientific grounds, and he mentioned the case of a person that had been before a Committee talking about blood transfusions and questioning the orthodoxy. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that orthodoxy questioning could back a long way. I mean if the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba were in existence a number of years ago and a physician or a barber didn't use the practice of bleeding, then they could find that particular physician or that particular doctor guilty of not following the standard medical procedures, because, Mr. Chairperson, that has been the scientific approach of the medical practice a number of years ago. And if the person didn't recover from being bled a little bit, then you bled them a lot. Hopefully then that would be the kind of cure necessary.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of scientific investigations, not only has the area of blood transfusion been looked at, but, Mr. Speaker, within the present practice of the College of Physicians and Surgeons each aspect of diagnosis and each aspect of procedure can be used. In the most recent case, there were eight complaints against a physician. The majority of those complaints came from physicians, not from patients themselves. The majority of those cases came from physicians. The charge that the College of Physicians and Surgeons had was a charge of not complete diagnosis or not full diagnosis.

Mr. Chairperson, I think that members of this Assembly and anyone in the public who has been to a doctor before knows that any doctor practising within the province of Manitoba could be charged with incomplete diagnosis. When you do into the doctor's office, the doctor says, well, what is happening? Oh yes, let's try this drug and see if it works; let's try this one and see if it solves the problem. Mr. Chairperson, anyone, I think, if the College set their mind on bringing that person before them and punishing that person for not being orthodox, could be found guilty of incomplete diagnosis. But, Mr. Chairperson, the College didn't consider the scientific validity of the unorthodox procedures.

A MEMBER: How do you know?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I am not allowed to mention the case which I have before me.

Mr. Chairperson, the College itself did not test the validity of the holistic approaches that were being practised. The finding was basically that the orthodox or normal procedures were not the ones in fact followed, that there were different alternative or alternate procedures that were used to test patients.

Mr. Chairperson, none, not one of the persons that were treated were in fact negatively affected, not one of them were negatively affected. So we have the power of the College of Physicians and Surgeons being able to sentence someone and no one being harmfully affected by what they have done, not one person, Mr. Speaker.

The other, Mr. Speaker, is the questioning that the Member for Inkster raised in terms of the whole scientific process in terms of the practice of medicine. Mr. Chairperson, what we have is not a thorough look and we have a problem in our society, in my point of view. We have a system, an institution within our society, the practice of medicine, which has become extremely powerful, which has become almost a religion to many people. Anyone who questions the orthodox, the existing practices, the existing procedures, is attacking the sacred cow, is attacking a religious institution almost in the form of people who are licensed to practice medicine. And Mr. Chairperson, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'd like to draw to the honourable members' attention the section of our rules, and I'll refer to Beauchesne Citation 118. The Speaker should be addressed as Mr. Speaker, or Sir. However, he has been addressed in this House as Your Honour, although there is no written authority for such a title.

I realize that the honourable member has spent many hours in committee and it may just be an oversight on his part, but I thought I should bring it to his attention. The honourable member may proceed.

The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, can you tell me, Sir, according to Beauchesne, how Madam Speaker is now addressed in the House of Commons? Is she addressed as Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I have to tell the honourable member that it is highly improper for any member to direct a question to the Speaker.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour, Sir, I apologize. I guess I have been spending more time in committee, Sir, than I have speaking in the House, and try, Mr. Speaker, to teach myself to use non-sexist language in committee and Chairperson. I've over-succeeded, Sir, Mr. Speaker, in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe that I was talking about, before you brought this important matter to my attention, I believe that I was talking about the scientific nature or the scientific validity. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that members of this House who have looked at the progress of science in our society, will be well aware of the fact that change does not come fast, change does not come overnight, and often the people who bring about change in science, in scientific methodology, in scientific method, which, Mr. Speaker, is what the Member for Inkster is referring to specifically in part of his bill, that is, how do you determine what is scientific in the practice of medicine. And the Member for Inkster says, you determine that by

asking some orthodox people who are now teaching the practice of medicine.

If that criteria had been applied to just about every scientific breakthrough in our society, then that scientific breakthrough would not have occurred, because most of the time, the person with a new insight, a new method, a new system, have been persecuted, punished, prosecuted by his colleagues, who are practising in the orthodox way. I mean, I don't think that they went up and thanked Copernicus, they didn't thank him for saying that in fact, the earth goes around the sun; he didn't get any thanks for that particular effort. I think that you can go through the history of science and find hundreds of examples that, in fact, progress has been made in scientific and technological advance has been made when somebody is willing to try something that is not orthodox, or comes upon something that is not orthodox and is not accepted.

And because, Mr. Speaker, we give licence, as legislators, to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba to enforce only that which is orthodox, to be able to sentence people who are unorthodox, then we have given that kind of authority to say that; (1) only they know the truth, only they have that God-like power in terms of being able to determine what is working and what does not work, and we have given them the power to persecute the unorthodox.

Mr. Speaker, we have given them the power to persecute the unorthodox without, in fact, checking the validity of the methods used that are not considered orthodox at this particular time. Mr. Speaker, two or three years down the line these methods may well be considered orthodox, as new discoveries, as new techniques are tried and in fact, found to be successful.

Now, the orthodoxy in today's medicine, Mr. Speaker, is to (1) be able to perform surgery effectively, and if I wanted to have surgery done, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly go to an orthodox practitioner and not to someone else. The other basic orthodox technique is to prescribe drugs, to prescribe pills, to prescribe drugs. Mr. Speaker, that is one area in which I would question the orthodox practice, because the effects of those drugs, the effects of those pills, even with short term usage, but especially with long term usage, is not really known; they do not really know the effect, in fact, of many of those. As I said earlier, often those drugs are prescribed in terms of a limited diagnosis; try this out and see if it works, see if it helps to solve your problem.

So Mr. Speaker, what we have then is a very powerful organization that is able to prevent, is able to require orthodoxy, the orthodoxy which is, in my mind, sometimes questionable as the most effective and most practical procedure. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we should give that kind of authority to any group of people, to any type of union or any group of people in our society, so that they can sentence, persecute and punish one of their members who has done nothing to harm a member of our society, but who is willing to try new approaches, and which his parents are able to verify were effective in helping them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I don't really wish to add a great deal to the contents, or make a great number of remarks as to the specific contents of this bill, but I do have a problem with the basis for acceptance of this bill, and it comes from the often stated rule, I think the Honourable Member for Inkster may be able to help me out with it, but the exception to the rule doesn't necessarily provide the basis for fundamental changes to law. I have difficulty, with such relatively short notice, in accepting some fairly fundamental changes to the Medical Act on the basis of a single case. The phrase escapes me, one hard case doesn't make good — you know, you don't base law on the subject matter of one case. Well, something like that, I'm trying to remember.

But there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that we are referring here, and the genesis of this bill is here because of one particular problem that has arisen in the city of Winnipeg, a case that has achieved a certain amount of publicity and, Mr. Speaker, I pass no judgement on the merits of the case as to how it was handled by the Medical Society, either pro or against the decision of the Medical Association. But I simply point out that in our every day living we do not, as a rule, promote substantive changes to legislation because of one case. I think that, by and large, there is a necessity to approach changes, particularly when we're dealing with self-governing bodies, with a degree of caution, and to enable us to satisfy ourselves that, in fact, a practice is being exercised by a self-governing group that is wrong and that is preventing the kind of development of the profession that the Honourable Member for The Pas alludes to, to allow the innovator, to allow the person with new ideas, with fresh ideas, with unorthodox ideas, from time to time, to allow him his due place within the society.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not satisfied, and I know that the particular doctor in question will no doubt not agree with me, but I'm not satisfied that is the case in Manitoba. I haven't been besieged, nor has this Legislature been besieged, nor if I asked any one of my colleagues, have we been besieged with any number of cases similar to the case in question, namely the problems that one Dr. Schwartz has had with the Manitoba Medical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not minimizing the problems that this particular doctor had with the medical society, nor am I passing any judgement on the manner and way in which he practised medicine in the province. I am simply saying that there is the appearance here, or the tendency here, of very immediate and very perhaps understandable reaction on the part of the Honourable Member for Inkster in the introduction of this bill, that I suggest is not in keeping with his otherwise cautious approach to putting legislation and adding to the statutes of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster prides himself, from time to time in this Chamber, of not rushing into this Chamber with reams and reams of legislation. He believes, Mr. Speaker, as I believe, that legislation very often adds to the complications of our life, rather than solves or brings solutions to

the problems that we have. So, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that the case in question that has brought forward this bill has not demonstrated to me the necessity for making the kind of changes that are being proposed in this bill. I have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the honourable member permit a question?

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the first two changes to existing legislation, not legislation which is being introduced at the beginning, but the first two changes, have nothing to do with the Schwartz case and are a matter of long-time cautious consideration. Would he say that the entire bill is brought in on the basis of the Schwartz case? The first two-thirds of it have nothing to do with that case.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster is correct. I acknowledge that I am posing my questions and my concerns about the bill that are centred around the Schwartz case, and I would suggest then that the Honourable Member for Inkster has muddied the waters, if I may use that phrase, by slipping in that third of the bill that I am taking some objection to. Now, that's fair game, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable Member for Inkster to cloak the amendment that he really wants to be included in The Medical Act with two or three other amendments that have perhaps had some long-standing review and consideration by other members, and indeed, perhaps the Medical Society itself.

I'm only suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that I have difficulty in responding in such an immediate way, without having the knowledge that the association that we're dealing with, namely, the medical society, has had an opportunity to discuss this with the appropriate authorities in government. I appreciate the fact that they will undoubtedly be there at the Law Amendments to make their positions or their views known on the bill as it affects the affairs of their association, but Mr. Speaker, I do concentrate my remarks — I'm called upon, of course, at second reading not to deal with the deal clause-by-clause and so haven't attempted to do that — simply to take issue with some of the principles raised in the bill. The principle that I take issue with is what I consider to be a fairly substantive change to The Medical Society Act on the basis of one case. Legislation built on one case is seldom sound legislation, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that there has been sufficient research undertaken, sufficient discussion with the group of people involved, in this case the medical community in Manitoba, and for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I, for one, would have some difficulty in supporting this bill for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone that debate be adjourned on this bill.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is disposition of the House to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there some indication that you wish to call it 5:30? The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that the House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock. I understand there will only be the one committee sitting here in this Chamber.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow. (Wednesday)