

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 12, 1979

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne) introduced Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Trustee Act.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris) introduced Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland) on behalf of the Member for St. James, introduced Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The Museum of Man and Nature Act.

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Before the Question Period, I wonder if I can make a very brief statement. —(Interjection)— Non-political in a sense, and I have to assure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface it will be brief.

I will shortly, Mr. Speaker, today after the Question Period, tender my resignation as a Member of the Legislature and a member of the Provincial Cabinet. I do so, Sir, but before I do, I would like to express through you to the members my sorrow in one sense that I am leaving this Chamber. I know that there is still business before the Mouse that I would like to participate in, but I think most of you recognize that all of us possess in this House a disease called politics and one way or the other it affects us at different times and I have rightly or wrongly made the decision to offer my name in nomination and to seek a candidacy for our Federal Chamber.

But before I do, I want to express my gratitude for the friendships that have developed over the years and for the association that I have had with all the members on both sides, a very fine association, over this past period of time.

Well, I have been in the Chamber approximately 13 years. I have had the opportunity of serving both in government and opposition and therefore have had the opportunity of viewing government from the perspective of both sides of the House.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, through you to all the members, that if anything the period of time that I've had has simply increased my respect and admiration for those who participate in public life and a further strengthening of my belief in our system and our institutions.

We operate in an adversary system and there are many occasions, Mr. Speaker, when the debate is heated but, nevertheless, the way in which we operate is the way in which we are able to provide the legislative responsibilities for the people within this province and to administer the public trust that has been placed on us by those who have supported us.

Mr. Speaker, it has been often said in the House, and I have said it, and the Member for Inkster has said this on more than one occasion, that politics is really the highest vocation that one could aspire to. And while there is a tendency, Mr. Speaker, for some to demean those who enter political life at whatever level and to, in many respects, discourage the process, I may say to you that I believe that those who are prepared to offer themselves to be elected on behalf of the people, to carry out whatever function they have been chosen for, are exercising what I consider really truly is the highest vocation, in serving the people of the area you represent and in attempting to try, through our system, to develop the policies and procedures on which we would

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also express through you to the Clerk, to the members and officials who are responsible for the day to day operation of the Legislative Chamber and to the media and the press my thanks for their assistance and co-operation. I think that in various times in my career I have possibly been not the easiest person to have dealt with. I hope that they will forgive me. Certainly I appreciated the co-operation and assistance and the very kind way in which they have treated me.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, may I simply say this: I leave this Chamber with a good feeling. I leave this Chamber with recognition that I have made a number of friends. In fact, I have made friends on both sides. I do not consider anyone an enemy of mine, even though we have had serious debates and even though there are differences of emphasis as we deal with legislative programs.

But in leaving, I want, through you, Mr. Speaker, say to all of those who are here today, I leave this Chamber; I do not believe that this ends my friendship — and I hope it will not end — and I look forward on the occasion to be able to be with the members on both sides on other occasions as they carry out their functions and in the normal course of events when there will be occasion for us to be together.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, twice in less than a week we have had two members of our Chamber rise to tell us that they are taking leave of this Chamber and in each case seeking to enter that other place in Ottawa where, from time to time, important business in the national interest is carried on.

My colleague, the Minister of Government Services, and I have been friends for a long, long time, preceding the time that he entered this House. He is one of those rare political people who can say that he has worked at practically every job in the vineyard of politics. He's been an organizer, he's been a door knocker, he's been a poster putter upper, he's managed campaigns, he's been an elected member of this Assembly and served with great distinction in this Assembly, he has been the leader of our Party, he has been the leader of the opposition, and twice he has been called to serve in the Executive Council of the Government of Manitoba. Few other men, I think Mr. Speaker, in that period of 13 years could have accomplished all of the different offices, and could have held them with the distinction and with the vigour and with the dedication and with the intelligence that has always been displayed by our colleague.

This is not an occasion for partisan comment at all, but last week when we were bidding farewell to the Member for Fort Rouge, we had to allow that the rhythms of politics being what they were — sometimes people win, sometimes people lose — and he was one who was accustomed to both sides of the fence.

The colleague to whom we bid farewell, adieu, today is not used to losing. He's never lost an electoral contest with the public that he has been engaged in, and I've got a very strong suspicion, Mr. Speaker, that that record is going to continue undiminished on the 22nd of May' and at the risk again of separating the House, but in a friendly way, I would say that those of us on this side of the House at least are going to do our best to ensure that that happy circumstance comes about.

But more seriously, Mr. Speaker, we do wish to pay tribute to Sidney Spivak for the dedication and service that he has given to the people of River Heights whom he has consistently represented for the 13 years, but more broadly to the people of Manitoba whose interests he has always had closest at heart. I think all of us would subscribe to his words about the amount of sacrifice that is made by all members of this House when they agree to put their names forward for public office. But in his case I think it can be justly said that the kind of sacrifice that he and his family have had to make over the last 13 years, while he's enjoyed some of the elations of politics and some of the sadnesses of politics, is very well typified, and so we bid him adieu this morning. His departure from the government will be a loss to the government. There is no question of that at all. His counsel around the Cabinet table and in the Caucus room will be missed. We can take some consolation from the fact, however, that his counsel and his advice is going to be used and needed in that other Chamber in which he aspires to become a member.

So in bidding a few words of adieu to our colleague this morning, we wish him the very very best, first of all, of health and of personal satisfaction and of happiness and then, further down the line as we have said before, comes such other mundane things as political success and all of the satisfactions that come from that. We wish him bon voyage in the election and we'll be looking forward very, very hopefully for that kind of satisfactory result on the 22nd of May, which I think most in this House privately wish for our honourable friend and our colleague.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join as well in offering some words on this occasion. Mr. Speaker, when one recalls last week that the Member for Fort Rouge made a similar announcement and this morning we have the announcement from the Member for River Heights, I'm certain we must all breathe a sigh of relief that federal elections don't occur more frequently. We might not have very few members left in this House. I want to indicate also though not a time for partisan comment, when the Member for River Heights had indicated, Minister of Government Services, that in fact he had been in this House from both sides as Leader of the Opposition and as a Member of the Executive Council, had seen it from both sides; in some ways I want to say to the Member for Government Services that I hope that he looks at the Legislature from outside and from Parliament as outside and as a result of the success we trust of Vivian Rachlis in his constituency.

Saying a few words with respect to the Minister for Government Services, it's going to be difficult to imagine this Legislature without the Minister for Government Services. He seems to have been a real part of the House as though he himself had become an institution within the Legislature itself during the past 13 years. He has been one that has been, certainly fully committed, fully committed to the legislative process and to his political party and to the provincial community. He has been an individualist and certainly this has been spelled out well within his own party. He's been prepared to take stands even though they might be a departure from time to time from the mainstream of thought within his party. Certainly he has been an individualist within the Legislature, and within the provincial community. As well he has been a worker, he's been a worker and I can so well recall the many, many instances in which we would spend hours and hours, Mr. Speaker, and you must recall dealing with those alleged snooper clauses in the old Consumer Bills that we used to introduce as a government, and we would all express some distress when in would come the Leader of the Opposition who would deal at great, great lengths in committee.

When he would get his teeth into something it would be very, very difficult . . . The Minister of Agriculture feels he has problems these days, . . . I wish he had been here during the periods when the Leader of the Opposition would struggle so hard and yet so well in his contributions in the Legislature dealing with various bills that we bring in, and particular items of concern to him.

Mr. Speaker, Aristotle once said that man is a political animal and I believe that probably that description best fits the Minister of Government Services, the former Leader of the Opposition in the Legislature. He has been indeed, a political animal. He's contributed well. He has been fully committed, and though I cannot like my friend, wish him bon voyage, I do wish him happiness in the years that lie ahead, from outside looking in.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the First Minister a question — whether or not the Minister of Northern Affairs was indeed expressing government policy, when this morning he announced that, as a result of his observations in Thompson, a meeting involving the Manitoba Federation of Labour Representatives and the Manitoba Metis at Le Pas, and the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, that indeed, indeed the policies in respect to his government in regard to northern affairs must be reconsidered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm in the circumstance of not having had an opportunity to be any closer to my honourable friend, the Minister of Northern Affairs, than I am as you see us in the House. He having been busily engaged yesterday at The Pas at the meeting. I will be happy to consult with the minister to apprise myself of the statements he made, but without even doing that I can be assured that any comments that the minister made, not necessarily those that are attributed to him, but any comments the minister made would be in the public interest, and would reflect the feeling of the government. I could say that generally, without having heard the comments but I would much prefer to hear them from his own lips, and find out what is in the very agile mind of the Leader of the Opposition on this pre-Good Friday morning.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe we would also be very pleased if the First Minister could indicate the results of his meeting with representatives of the Metis Federation, as to the promises

which I understand he made to the representatives of the Metis Federation, arising from the meeting which apparently took place yesterday.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I use the words wisely, I suppose, in answer to the first question as to remarks being attributed to people, and so on. I can say to my honourable friend very frankly, that we had a meeting yesterday with Mr. Morrisseau, the President of the Manitoba Metis Federation, accompanied by Mr. Angus Spence. It was a friendly and informal meeting. No commitments or promises or undertakings of any sort whatsoever were made other than that we would consult with the Minister of Northern Affairs on his return from the meeting at The Pas, and that if possible today a further meeting would be arranged between Mr. Morrisseau and the Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Acting Minister responsible for Housing. I am not quite sure who? Is the Acting Minister of Health and Social Development? In view of the fact that there is an intention expressed by the Minister of Northern Affairs that relocation must be area of principle concern pertaining to Metis families in northern Manitoba, in order to ensure that those Metis families are able to move, to move to centres where the employment in fact exists, can the Acting Minister advise whether or not his Government intends to reverse, to reverse its do-nothing policy which it has followed over the past 18 months, pertaining to the provision of housing through Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation in the various centres in Northern Manitoba where in fact, where in fact there are employment opportunities but no housing, no initiative by his Government in order to provide such housing and failing that, any commitments or any promises by the Minister of Northern Affairs to assist in relocation, indeed very very hollow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the fact there's been any reversal of any policy. I think it is a misinterpretation of and a misunderstanding of what has been taking place and the initiatives that are being formulated. At the same time though, Mr. Speaker, although I dislike very much taking questions as notice, in this case I would suggest that it would be more helpful to the Chamber if my colleague the honourable, the Minister responsible for Housing were able to respond in detail and I will take the question as notice for him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct now a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. In view of the fact that during the past 2-3 months some 330 workers have been brought into our mining centres principally in Leaf Rapids in order to assist in mining, and at the same period of time the unemployment rates in the Metis communities in Northern Manitoba are in excess of 60-70 percent, and desire has been expressed by the Metis Federation and by others within the Metis communities that they would desire the opportunity of providing work within the mines upon proper retraining, can the Minister advise whether or not any effort, any effort or any policy or any program has been commenced of a meaningful nature by he through his department, in sitting down with industry, the mining industry, in order to ensure that this trend is reversed and that in fact more northerners are involved within the mining activity in centres such as Leaf Rapids?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Well, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering when the question would get to me, it run down the front benches and eventually ended up with me. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are very active with the relocation programs. In the last two to three months I signed an enlarged program for the town of Flin Flon. I am guessing at the figures but I believe it's an additional 24 or 36 families over and above what's already in place in that particular community that will be coming in during the year 1979.

We have been working and dealing with the Manitoba Metis Federation and the Sherritt Gordon Mines in Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids, and we hope in the new future to be able to expand on Tawow Project that's in place there to the extent of 40 to 50 families, in the year 1979.

And if I may take the liberty of partially answering your previous question on the housing situation, I am very aware of the housing situation in Leaf Rapids and I am very aware of the shortage. We have a geographic problem where we do have some excess housing in Lynn Lake but that isn't where the real activity in that particular area; the activity is in Leaf Rapids, so we have a situation where in Lynn Lake there is an excess — excess, if you will, and I use the word lightly — but

there is housing accommodation in Lynn Lake but there isn't at Leaf Rapids. And I am dealing with the Minister responsible for Housing, and we are dealing with the company and we are dealing with Leaf Rapids Corporation in an effort to come up with some type of housing program. And I think the Leader of the Opposition will appreciate that that has to be finalized and worked on, but I want to emphasize to him that I am certainly aware of the program. I am aware of the problem. It's the program that, as the Minister, I am responsible for and I know that housing is part of the overall situation.

But I think the Leader of the Opposition will also be aware — and I don't want to dig out all the facts and figures — that there has been a massive government commitment to the Town of Flin Flon or to the Town of Leaf Rapids. I think what you have to do, Mr. Speaker, is try and strike a balance between total public housing, on and on and on. You have to get a balance between the other type of housing, and I understand there is going to be a variety of housing and an expansion, possibly, to the trailer court. So there are some good things going to be happening in Leaf Rapids this year.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the answer provided by the Minister of Northern Affairs. Is the Minister of Northern Affairs in fact indicating to the Legislature that his principal thrust insofar as housing will be concerned in Leaf Rapids, where certainly there is need of further employees in the mining industry, will be to emphasize housing in Lynn Lake, some 50 miles distant, and that would be the main thrust of providing housing accommodation for those that he is wishing to bring into the mining activity in Leaf Rapids from the Metis communities in northern Manitoba, whereby those families would be living in Lynn Lake and the father or the son of the family would be participating in mining activity during the week in Leaf Rapids?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't know how the Leader of the Opposition could have even attempted to understand. I don't know; he just couldn't have been listening, Sir, really. I said that there is excess housing accommodation to some degree in Lynn Lake but we're short in Leaf Rapids and I am hoping — and it's not finalized — I am hoping that there will be a variety of housing taking place in Leaf Rapids. The excess, to some degree, is in Lynn Lake not in Leaf Rapids and of course Leaf Rapids is where there has to be some attention paid.

MR. PAWLEY: Could the Minister of Northern Affairs indicate whether or not there are any plans for the commencement of the construction of any housing, any housing of any nature, in Leaf Rapids through the auspices of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation within the next six months?

MR. MacMASTER: Again, I guess my English isn't very good this morning, Mr. Speaker. I have said that we're in the midst now of discussing housing programs for Leaf Rapids. We are in the midst now of discussing it.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must persist in my questioning, in case the Minister of Northern Affairs did not hear. I was attempting to place a time space upon the discussions and the considerations. Can he advise whether or not any housing will be commenced through the provincial government agency, MHRC, in Leaf Rapids in order to deal with this problem, within six months, within the spring and summer period of construction?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I am quite well aware of what the building season is in northern Manitoba and I have said to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that we are discussing the possibilities of housing projects in the Leaf Rapids area, and that's all I can say at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Premier of the province and ask him a question with regard to reports this morning of continued inflation in Canada and Manitoba, and in particular the reports from Statistics Canada of excessive rises in food prices. Would the Government of Manitoba consider establishing a food prices review commission to analyse the situation with particular reference to Manitoba, and determine the causes and, in particular, whether any abuses are occurring in the food handling system, such as unjustified markups in some food items?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend would appreciate that we have a whole department of government, namely the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, whose daily operations are to assist and to protect consumers of Manitoba against just such allegations as my honourable friend makes. I'm sure if he has any particular allegations to make with respect to food products of any sort whatsoever that the appropriate investigations could be undertaken by that department on a seriatim basis, and I would invite him or any member of the House, or any member of the public, for that matter, if they have reasonable cause to believe that food prices are being manipulated or that Acts are being contravened that they make their complaint to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I gather the answer is "no, the government will not set up a food prices review commission."

In view of the fact that there is a Department of Consumer Affairs, as the Premier refers to, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier then request the Minister and the Department of Consumer Affairs to conduct a special study with regard to food price rises in the Province of Manitoba. I refer him, in particular, to allegations and statements made in this morning's news reports that there are unjustified markups in meat prices in the Province of Ontario by meatpackers and others in this food handling area. And in view of that would the Premier of this province be at least prepared to have staff examine that and prepare reports which might then be distributed to the Legislature and made public, so that we can have some knowledge of the situation as it exists in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend has any substantive evidence that he would like to lay before the department, I invite him to do so.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I, like the rest of the people of Manitoba, have a lot of evidence to the fact that the cost of living is skyrocketing and that, alone, is causing many Manitobans to be extremely concerned about the inflationary situation in this province. And I would therefore ask the Premier again that, in view of this serious situation, would they have the various economists that are available to the government, whether they be in Consumer Affairs Department or other departments, whether he would have those economists do a detailed analysis of the causes of food inflation in this province, without requesting individual members of the public to come up with specific pieces of evidence which they have great difficulty, perhaps, in doing, not having access to the books of the various companies?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend failed to hear what I said before, I will say it again. If he, or any member of the public have any substantive complaints with respect to food pricing or anything that falls within the purview of the Legislature of Manitoba as administered by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I invite them to make that complaint and that evidence known to the Minister and the appropriate follow-up action will be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the Acting Minister of Highways, or indeed the House Leader, or the First Minister. It is regarding a notice on our desk yesterday regarding road restrictions and the question would be, will the notice on highways be in this terminology, this being the last working day of the Highways Department and the terminology that I read, 60 kilograms per 100 millimetre width of tire, gross weight per axle. Now, if those signs go out that way, rural members will not have an Easter weekend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Highways who probably is more adept at interpreting those, may I say to the honourable member that I appreciate the point that he has made and it just goes out to point out again some of the absolute foolishness that has gone on in the metric system in this country where we could use metric conversion for overseas and other sales, the business of having domestic conversion of the kind that the honourable member has brought to our attention is a piece of silliness.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I am following the advice of the First Minister and referring questions about price increases to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, as the Premier indicated we should.

Over four months ago, I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate the matter of bread prices which were increased in Manitoba to the tune of seven to ten cents a loaf. I felt they were unjustified. The Minister undertook then to look into the matter and report back to the House. Is the Minister now in a position to keep his word with that undertaking which he has made over and over again in this House.

MR. JORGENSON: I'll simply repeat what I have told my honourable friend on several occasions and that is that an investigation into that subject, which covers a broader area than just the Province of Manitoba, is more appropriately dealt with by co-operation between federal and provincial bodies. I doubt very much if an investigation conducted on a provincial basis would produce the kind of results, or would achieve anything, in the way of a rollback in prices without detriment to other aspects of the economy. I think my honourable friend is aware of that and he will be receiving very shortly a formal letter outlining the reasons why we believe that that kind of an investigation would be more properly carried on by a federal body.

MR. PARASIUUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs what he has done in the last four months to bring together that enquiry? Has he contacted other provinces; has he contacted the Federal Government; has he at least given the Federal Government the facts pertaining to bread price increases in Manitoba?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, we have been conducting, as provided for under the Act, we have been conducting a preliminary enquiry and the information that we have gathered has led us to believe that an enquiry conducted on the provincial level would not serve the purposes that my honourable friend would want to have. So we are discussing with the Federal Government the possibility of their conducting an enquiry in co-operation with the provinces across this country.

MR. PARASIUUK: Mr. Speaker, over a month ago, my colleague asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate gasoline price increases. The Minister undertook to do that. Is the Minister now in a position to keep his word on that undertaking?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of my keeping my word on that. An investigation is being conducted and until I have the results of that investigation, I'm afraid I cannot report anything to my honourable friend.

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

MR. PARASIUUK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. Over a month ago, the Minister of Consumer Affairs undertook to look into the matter of whether in fact the reduction in tariffs would lead to a decrease in imported food prices, primarily fruit and vegetables. Is the Minister now in a position to keep his word on that undertaking?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, a reduction in tariffs on fresh fruit and vegetables has indeed taken place on the federal level. The impact of those reductions, however, I am sorry to say, or to disappoint my honourable friend, are minimal and I doubt very much if they would hardly be even noticeable on the shelves of the grocery stores.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from the Member for Transcona, I wish to advise him that a decision has now been made with respect to an enquiry into the death of an 86 year old woman who died as a result of a fall in a private guest home on March 22 of this year. A fatality enquiry will be conducted and a date will be set very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs who is responsible for looking into prices. Some time ago the Federal Government reduced the Federal Sales Tax from 12 percent to 9 percent. Has his department been able to look into what

impact that has had on prices in Manitoba? Is he in a position to report on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, that again is a Federal matter that I understand is being monitored by the federal review agency that is set up for that purpose.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, last year the Minister of Consumer Affairs undertook to look into the whole question of cement pricing. Has the department undertaken that investigation to look at cement prices that were tendered to the Government of Manitoba last year and this year, and is he in a position to indicate to us what that report is?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, that investigation into cement prices, in all of the provinces across Canada, it seems to be an ongoing investigation. It seems that every year when prices are tendered, that question comes up. I don't think that there is anything new that has been revealed on that subject than there has been in the last eight or ten years.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier. In light of the fact that the Minister of Consumer Affairs has not answered six questions pertaining to price increases, would the Premier now reconsider his advice to us that we should refer questions on prices to the Minister of Consumer Affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that my honourable friend from Transcona make an application to the Hearing Aid Board to improve his hearing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the questions that were asked by the Leader of the Opposition and hopefully we would get a more reasonable answer than we get from the First Minister. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister of Northern Affairs, since his government is now putting their emphasis on the relocation programs, which is only one part of an overall program of employment and economic development in the north, I would like to ask the Minister of Northern Affairs what has been the reduction in the Tawow Project which is a project negotiated between the province and the mining company? What has been the reduction in that program since the Minister took office?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask the Member for The Pas if he was talking about people or clients or dollars, or just what part of the program he is talking about? I don't know of any particular decrease in that particular program. In fact, we hope to expand it this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about all aspects of the program, and I would also ask the Minister of Northern Affairs if he could indicate what have been the changes in the relocation program at Thompson where the Manitoba Metis Federation, Thompson Region, was contracted to assist placing people from remote communities in employment at Inco, or whether in fact there are enough employment opportunities at Inco since Inco has exported a number of jobs overseas, whether that program with the Metis Federation is still continuing at the same level and whether he intends to expand that program now as well?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, the Tawow Program in Leaf Rapids is well, and working well, and healthy and we hope to possibly do some expansion on the program that is in place in Thompson with the Manitoba Metis Federation and ourselves working jointly on that particular program.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I read the Minister's Estimates, of the three relocation programs, the one at Flin Flon seems to be being maintained, all three programs being started by the previous government, Mr. Speaker. I wonder in the two programs I asked about whether the Minister will be coming forward in Supplemental Estimates or Supplementary Supply in order to increase these programs, whether he'll be asking for more funds to expand those programs now.

MR. MacMASTER: I'll be glad to discuss those programs, the contents of them, the worth of them, during my Estimates, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if the Minister would be able to advise us as to the circumstances under which the joint venture interest that the public of Manitoba had in the uranium exploration in the Kasmere Lake region in Northern Manitoba was given up to Getty Minerals Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and the Environment.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the details of that transaction. As I've pointed out a number of times the interest that the government held in the compulsory participation agreements undertaken by the previous administration were turned over to Manitoba Mineral Resources for their handling, and some they have simply dropped as not being worthy of any further involvement at all. Some have been sold. I suspect that the term "given up" perhaps leaves an incorrect connotation, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure that we can discuss the details of those when Manitoba Mineral appears before Committee which I expect will happen shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I direct the Minister to a publication issued by the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy in which it's indicated that Getty Minerals Limited took over the joint venture interest from the Manitoba Government, and I concede that the words, "given up", may not be accurate and I hope they are not. Can the Minister assure us that Getty Minerals Limited paid the Province of Manitoba for the interest that the public of this province had in that program in which it's indicated that published results indicates mixed degrees of encouragement with the discovery of several mineralized border terrains in several narrow, mineralized, bedrock intersections, whether that property belonging to the public was just given away, as is indicated by the Minister of Highways that he'd like to give it away for nothing, property belonging to the people, or whether we received payment for the amount of our interest?

MR. RANSOM: As usual, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster is implying statements that have been allegedly made by members on this side to the effect that we want to give away all this, and when the Committee appears, Mr. Speaker, before the Committee, then the honourable members opposite can ask details about any particular agreement. Now I'm certain that no interests have been given away, Mr. Speaker, but we have been certainly attempting to get the private sector back into mineral exploration in this province. We've been attempting to make some changes in our regulations that will encourage the private sector to take risks and undertake exploration and development in the province, and if a company that was not previously operating in the province has now seen fit to make investments in Manitoba and to undertake exploration then we're happy to see that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, what the Minister confirmed, that United Siscoe Mines, a very responsible private enterprise company, found no difficulty in having as its partners the people of the Province of Manitoba and was not discouraged from uranium exploration in this province by the fact that the public were its partners, and would he also confirm that, as a result of his policy, the people of this province will lose the benefits that are obtainable in the Province of Alberta under a Conservative Government and in the Province of Saskatchewan where private firms do not find the public as being partners that are undesirable.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, United Siscoe found no difficulty in cooperating with the government

because they were compelled to do so by law. If they wished —(Interjection)—That's right. They don't have to come here, Mr. Speaker, and with some of the statements that the members opposite have been making with respect to the private . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland on a point of order.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister of Mines has stated something which is absolutely untrue because the United Siscoe Mines Limited have stated that the reason they started their exploration in the Province of Manitoba is because the Province of Manitoba was their partner. They would not have started. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The point raised by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland is not a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Mines. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland wish to ask a question?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Mines whether he would consider withdrawing his previous statement since it's absolutely untrue in view of the fact that United Siscoe Mines Limited have stated that the reason that they came into the Province of Manitoba to explore in Northern Manitoba is because the Province of Manitoba was prepared to enter into an agreement with them to explore. It was because the Province of Manitoba was prepared to provide money to assist them in this exploration that they started this exploration, and the exploration, in fact, is now becoming successful in Northern Manitoba. I ask the Honourable Minister if he will confirm that and withdraw his previously incorrect and untrue statement?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Regulation 328/74 that was in effect in this province prior to the Conservative Government taking office required that any mining company wishing to undertake an exploration program of more than \$10,000 had to submit that program to the government and they on a compulsory basis had the option of participating.

If anyone found or knew of a prospect in Manitoba which they wished to explore for, then they had to provide the government with that opportunity and, Mr. Speaker, some companies, some companies, —(Interjection)— That's right. My colleague says it's an offer they couldn't refuse and, in fact, if he'll review the comments made at the Mining Prospectors and Developers Association, the comments made by Mr. Muzykowski of Granges Exploration he attributes the fact that they came to Manitoba —(Interjection)—.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I point out to the honourable minister that answers which promote argument are perhaps not in the best interests in the Question Period. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland with a supplementary question.

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in this particular case in the case of United Siscoe Mines Limited, Mr. Speaker, can the minister confirm.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member a question? The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, can the minister confirm that the reason that this company came to Manitoba to explore northern Manitoba for potential uranium deposits, an exploration by the way which is now proving out to be successful?

The reason that they came into the Province of Manitoba is because the Province of Manitoba was prepared to put up at least 50 percent of the money, Mr. Speaker, and is the minister prepared to confirm that this company has admitted that they would not have come without that financial assistance, they would not have come without that financial assistance. It was not a compulsory item, Mr. Speaker, it was their freedom to come into Manitoba and it is because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I simply stated what is a fact that under Regulation 328/74 it was compulsory on part of any company to submit their plans for development and the government could undertake to take a 50 percent interest in that. That was compulsory, Mr. Speaker, if the company wished to come to Manitoba, they had no choice. Now it also happens to be very interesting that the honourable member now says that a company was coming to Manitoba because of the government that was in power. That is an argument that the Honourable Member for Inkster has

been attempting to refute ever since we took office.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that the Minister of Mines that Dave Thomas of Sherritt Gordon Mines said that the exploration program by his company in Manitoba would be reduced as a result of the minister removing the financial participation and share holding, by the way, not assistance, not subsidy, but the financial participation on the part of the people of the Province of Manitoba? That Mr. Thomas has indicated that as a result of the withdrawal of that participation, his exploration is reducing in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. RANSOM: The situation that the honourable member refers to, Mr. Speaker, was an article I believe that appeared in the Free Press approximately a year ago and related to a specific circumstance whereby the company, Sherritt Gordon had made their plans for exploration some time in advance, of course, and that when the government found that we, as a matter of both of principle and a matter of the huge, inherited deficit, were unable to provide the government's share that had been undertaken or some sense of commitment made by the previous government, then naturally the company found that they in that particular season, were unable to undertake the same amount of exploration that they had anticipated before. However, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, they were spending several million dollars in furthering the development of their Ruttan operation and also now that the companies know that there is a government back in Manitoba that is prepared to encourage and welcome private investment, I'm happy to say that the amount of private investment in 1979 in exploration is expected now to exceed the total of government and private sector expenditure of 1977.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the honourable member has confirmed that Sherritt Gordon reduced its exploration program because of the Conservative government. Will the minister now confirm that there was no subsidy to private investors under the previous system, that the public of Manitoba, which permitted private companies to explore on property belonging to us, put up 50 percent of the money or 50 percent of the shareholding, that they did not ask for any compulsory participation which we're not prepared to pay for, and did pay for?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I point out to all honourable members that it seems as though we're getting into a debate. We have used up the time of the Question Period and only 7 members have had the opportunity of asking questions. The hour for questions having expired the Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: 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.

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 Community Services and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY—AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. To the members of the committee before we go into the estimates I would like to suggest that possibly by having allowed the wide range in latitude in the discussion of some of these specific items that we have been spending a lot of time on it. I would suggest and humbly request all members of the committee that if we could possibly go on the specifics of these items that we could give fair consideration for all items of the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. I ask your cooperation in using the narrower interpretation of the items before us instead of the wider approach so that like I suggested all items could be given fair consideration. We will now proceed to Page 8 — 4.(a)(1) The Member from Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Surely you're not reflecting on the Chair of last week when you make those comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The interpretation could be there. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the item before us that we are discussing is the Administration of the Agriculture Production Division which is the Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Tom Pringle and his support staff. The increase is due to salary increases, the only reason for the increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated — I presume that this is an ADM position in charge of this division. Could the Minister indicate what portion, what is the number of staff in this division?

MR. DOWNEY: In the total division?

MR. URUSKI: In the total division.

MR. DOWNEY: In this particular part in the Agriculture Production Division, Mr. Chairman, the number of positions in vote 4 are 186 positions plus 21.42 contingency positions. That is per diem, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Is that term positions?

MR. DOWNEY: That's right. Contingency term positions.

MR. URUSKI: In what areas would those 21.42 staff man years be involved?

MR. DOWNEY: In areas of testing, blood testing and that type of thing.

A MEMBER: Poultry Division.

MR. DOWNEY: That's correct.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate, in terms of the numbers of staff of this division, could he indicate what the total number of staff within the department is? Again, I think he gave us that figure. Is that 700?

MR. DOWNEY: 705, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister indicated in a recent press release that the department was restructured into four areas, in terms of components of staff this Branch has the bulk of the staff or more than a third of the staff of the department in the area. Can the Minister indicate whether this area is considered by himself the thrust area of the department?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate who the other Assistant Deputy Ministers are in charge of the other divisions? Have they all been appointed for the other divisions?

MR. DOWNEY: No, they haven't, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: How many have been appointed at this time?

MR. DOWNEY: We have just had the Production Division ADM appointed at this time. —(Interjection)— That's right, and the other one under Management continues the same as it has been.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: I didn't understand the Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: The two divisions that have ADMs appointed, one of them being in the Production

Division and the other one remaining the same in the Management Division of the department.

MR. URUSKI: In the Management Division.

MR. DOWNEY: That's right.

MR. URUSKI: Then the positions in the other two divisions have not been approved, or they have been approved but they have not been appointed.

MR. DOWNEY: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Yes, I wonder if the Minister could indicate if there is an increase in staff in this division or a reduction from last year, and how many vacancies there are at the present time.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ste. Rose asked the question, the reduction in positions would be from 231 to 207. —(Interjection)— That's right, on that 207, I said earlier, there are 207.42 from 231.16, if you want to calculate the fractions.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister advise why there is such a drastic reduction of staff in this area? What is the reason for the reduction? This seems to be a very very important area. The entire section is, in my opinion, extremely important and I'm wondering why the government at this time would see fit to reduce staffing. Agriculture forms probably the second highest contributor to our economy and in view of this, I am wondering why? Is the Minister unable to convince his colleagues in Cabinet that agriculture does have that importance in the province? Is he being outflanked and outmanoeuvred in Cabinet? We are just wondering now because there has been a tremendous reduction in the last few years in the Department of Agriculture.

Now, we understand very well the need for restraint, but we are starting to be concerned about the amount of cutbacks in the Department of Agriculture because, as I said, it is the second largest industry in Manitoba. It is the second largest contributor to the economy and I'm sure all members opposite will agree with that. I'm just wondering, what is the reason that the Minister cannot maintain his staff in his department and the Estimates? Is he unable to convince his colleagues and his Premier on the importance of agriculture in this province?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member is asking in a broad range. We could deal with that as we go item by item through it, or if he would like to deal with it in this manner in a bulk. I can answer him in the general term that quite a few of these positions have been vacant, they have been vacant throughout the past year. In preparing the Estimates and looking at programs, we felt that the staff complement that we are retaining is quite adequate to carry on the programs and the responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture. I feel, as the Minister, and we feel as a government that we have not removed people or positions that would in any way enhance the development in the production area and through the types of programs that we are working with we feel we would be able to use somewhat of a smaller staff. But in particular I think it refers mainly to some of the vacant positions that were being carried forward.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is indicating that he doesn't feel it is necessary to maintain the amount of staffing that was available last year to this section. We're dealing under Administration so I presume that we can have some latitude because we're dealing on the first item of Administration. So I would ask the Minister again, when he brought his Estimates to Cabinet, was he requesting more money and more staffing than he was able to obtain?

MR. DOWNEY: I'm sure the Member for Ste. Rose is quite aware of what happens when — well maybe he isn't quite aware of what happens when it goes to Cabinet. What I take to Cabinet is workings within the department and consideration is given to them and a government decision is made, and that is what I am presenting here to the members of the Committee.

MR. ADAM: Did the Minister indicate how many vacancies there were in the reduction of 25 staff here, approximately? How many vacancies are there?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as of April 1st, there were 12 vacancies.

MR. ADAM: Does the Minister intend to fill these vacancies, or are they going to be left vacant?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, some of them are in the process of being filled at this particular time.

MR. ADAM: I see, could the Minister indicate in which areas are the vacancies, which sections?

MR. DOWNEY: There are two in Animal Industry, one in Vet. Services, one in Soils and Crops, three in Technical and the Economics Branch, four in Communications and one in Northern Gardening at this time.

MR. ADAM: Did I miss (f), or there are no vacancies in Section (f)?

MR. DOWNEY: No.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would provide us with a copy of the lists that he is reading from on staffing, so that we wouldn't have to go through the whole thing. I think we'd save a lot of time. I think the Department of Highways provided us with that kind of a list, and it would save a lot of time. We'd have that information at our tips, instead of having to ask it every time we go into a different department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the Minister, could the Member for Ste. Rose speak into the mike a little bit more; it's pretty hard to hear. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: I think, Mr. Chairman, we are able to deal with it in the manner in which we are going now, at this time.

MR. ADAM: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for not speaking any louder. I was admonished yesterday for speaking too loudly, so I kind of lowered my voice a little because the members opposite were criticizing that I was speaking too loudly.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister indicate in what areas are there reductions of staff, if he has not mentioned it, going to be made? The reduction of 24 staff man years in this division. Where are the reductions to take place?

MR. DOWNEY: Those reductions have already taken place, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Where did they take place from?

MR. DOWNEY: The reductions took place, Mr. Chairman — in the Animal Industry Branch there were four — two technologists, an egg and poultry specialist, and an administrative secretary, which were vacant, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, those are four staff man years in the Animal Industry Branch. As I understand, there were two lab technologists, one egg and poultry specialist, and one administrative secretary. The Minister, if I got him correctly, said that those positions were vacant at the time that the cuts were made. Had they been vacant for a long period of time?

MR. DOEY: It has been indicated to me that the egg and poultry specialist has been vacant since 1976. I would have to check on the other ones in detail, Mr. Chairman. Some of them have been for quite some period of time.

MR. URUSKI: There were in all, as I understand, 24 staff man years that were a reduction. We have four of those now, the other 20 were where?

MR. DOWNEY: We can go through them item by item, Mr. Chairman, if the member would like to do that.

MR. URUSKI: In a general way, then we won't be asking that question as we come to every item,

if that's convenient, deal with them now and then we won't get into it after.

MR. DOWNEY: In the Vet Services, there was a reduction of a pathologist and one in the A. I. section.

MR. URUSKI: Were those positions vacant?

MR. DOWNEY: One of those was vacant, Mr. Chairman, the other one was not.

MR. URUSKI: Which one.

MR. DOWNEY: The pathologist position was vacant.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate the reason for the position in A. I. that was not vacant? What type of classification was that?

MR. DOWNEY: That position was a genetic supervisor, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: And his role, or her role, would have been?

MR. DOWNEY: That, Mr. Chairman, was a technician supervisor.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate how many staff are within that branch in Vet Services, in the A. I. Branch, that that reduction could have taken place?

MR. DOWNEY: Four, Mr. Chairman. There are four now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: I would like an explanation. There were four then and there are four now, and yet we have . . .

MR. DOWNEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, after discussions taking place, there are four now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: So there were five then?

MR. DOWNEY: There are four now, Mr. Chairman. In the Veterinary Services Branch, we have deleted two and there were six.

MR. URUSKI: The position of the genetic supervisor, was an administrative role, or was that a field man role?

MR. DOWNEY: A combination, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: In the A. I. Branch there were four positions? Am I given to understand that?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there were three positions and three contracts, which totals six. Now there are four.

MR. URUSKI: So then the contract positions were terminated, changed to permanent?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it has been indicated to me by the Director that there had been one vacant contract also and it has been dropped too. So we are now looking at three, after the conversion of contracts to permanent, we are looking at four positions left in the A. I. as opposed to three permanent before and three contract.

MR. URUSKI: There are now four permanent positions. Were all those six positions filled at the time of the restructuring?

MR. DOWNEY: No, they weren't. I believe I indicated that one contract was vacant.

MR. URUSKI: Were those contracts on a full-year basis or were they a part-time, part-year basis.

MR. DOWNEY: Full-year, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Two contracts were terminated. Could the Minister indicate, were those technicians in the field that were on contract?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, one of each were reduced; one contract and one permanent position.

MR. URUSKI: What role or what classification was the contract position in?

MR. DOWNEY: Management, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: A contract position in management. Could he explain that a bit more?

MR. DOWNEY: Primarily with running the semen distribution centre and the running of A. I. activity in the centre.

MR. URUSKI: And the position of the genetic supervisor, was that position also with the A. I. Centre?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Now the management, I gather there was a management decision in terms of who was to run the program. Now, how is that being handled?

MR. DOWNEY: That will be handled by the Director, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Of the Veterinary Services Branch?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Let me understand that — we have now gone from four in the Animal Industry and three in the Vets Services positions?

MR. DOWNEY: I apologize for information here, Mr. Chairman. There has been some misinterpretation of what's been put down here. I think we'd better recalculate what we've got here. Okay, Mr. Chairman, I'll have to fully clarify that if I may, there was no intent in misleading. It was just that I didn't have the total information pointed out to me. There are two permanent positions have been deleted.

MR. URUSKI: In Vets Services?

MR. DOWNEY: That's right. There also were two contract positions deleted in the Veterinary Services Branch.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, now, to understand that, of the two permanent positions one of those positions had been vacant.

MR. DOWNEY: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: For how long had it been vacant?

MR. DOWNEY: Something less than a year, Mr. Chairman. Seven or eight months.

MR. URUSKI: The two contract positions, as I understand it, were both filled and the contracts were terminated.

MR. DOWNEY: One contract was vacant, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: So now we're up to 8 positions, if I understood the Minister correctly, in the 2 Branches where the reductions took place in the last year.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister go on and give us whichever Branch he wishes next in terms of where the reductions took place?

MR. DOWNEY: The next one which we can move to as far as staffing is concerned would be Soils and Crops. Mr. Chairman, last year we had 33.29 permanent positions, plus 6 contracts. This year we've reduced to 35.05 permanent positions without any contracts.

MR. URUSKI: 35.05 permanent positions?

MR. DOWNEY: That's correct.

URUSKI: Yes, from 39.29. So roughly 4 positions were eliminated.

MR. DOWNEY: That's correct.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate what types of positions were eliminated and whether they were vacant or whether they were filled at the time that the positions were eliminated?

MR. DOWNEY: 3.2, four smy vacant positions have been deleted from the Estimates.

MR. URUSKI: And they were in what category?

MR. DOWNEY: 2.24 of them were term assistants in the area of the Dutch Elm disease program and will be replaced by Provisions Under STEP Program, and one reduction of a secretary in the area of Horticulture and Grassland Section. Also one Contract Technologist which was a term assistant.

MR. URUSKI: In what area was the Contract Technologist?

MR. DOWNEY: A Lab Technologist in the Soils and Crops Branch.

MR. URUSKI: To understand that, all these were vacant positions at the time of their reduction?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman. I believe I indicated the 2.24 were term assistants which were students, and that will be replaced, or picked up by the STEP Program. That's in the Dutch Elm Disease Program.

MR. URUSKI: And the other two positions were positions that were filled? They were vacant?

MR. DOWNEY: They were vacant, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Those term assistants that the Minister indicates were students in the Dutch Elm Disease Program, are they going to be refilled, and how many students does the department plan to hire this summer in that area?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, they will be filled, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Well, how will those staff man years then be calculated or accounted for if these positions have been terminated from the present system?

MR. DOWNEY: They will be provided under the STEP Program, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: As an additional employment within the government for the summer employment program?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes.

MR. URUSKI: As additional numbers but not put in as smys in the Departmental Payroll.

MR. DOWNEY: Not in the Department of Agriculture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister' the student program, will there be a program for assistance to the farming community, assistance to provide help to farmers who need additional help or seasonable help in the summer, such as is available for the business community, which we have no disagreement with, to assist students to find summer employment?

MR. DOWNEY: It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the Youth Employment Program also covers students who want to be employed on farms.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister give us an indication of how many will be able to find employment in the agriculture sector and what is the situation insofar as subsidizing the wages paid or any training allowances and so on to farmers who hire people and what would be the length of the term that they would be hired?

MR. DOWNEY: In answer to the first question, Mr. Chairman, what are the job opportunities, the indications that I am getting from rural Manitoba, that there are lots of job opportunities on the farms, good employment opportunities. As far as the Youth Employment Program, that is being handled by the Department of Education. I don't have the exact period of time in which that program would be applied to the farm people, although we also have a program where there is an exchange program in which students or individuals from other international countries come to Canada to participate in the Farm Employment Program. We are carrying on with that.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move in another area there, if I may. I will defer to my colleague. He wants to continue in this so I will come back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: I would just like to finish, if I could, Mr. Chairman, all the reductions then we can leave that once and for all, that area of discussion. We have now gone to 8 and 4.24, which is 12, so there are still 12 more positions to account for, approximately 12 positions to account for in the reductions.

MR. DOWNEY: The next, Mr. Chairman, is the Technical and Economics Branch where we have 34.10 plus 3 contracts from last year, and this year it is reduced to 31.36.

MR. URUSKI: A reduction of 5.8.

MR. DOWNEY: Approximately six, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Six positions. Could the Minister outline the category of the positions and whether they were vacant at the time of reduction or what their status was?

MR. DOWNEY: Three, Mr. Chairman, were in the area of — one was an assistant supervisor, another one was a CanFarm technician, and another one a CanFarm clerk. I think the members opposite are aware of the fact that the CanFarm Program has been dropped by the Federal Government and is not continuing on.

MR. URUSKI: Were those two positions of the CanFarm staff, were they transferred to the organization that took over the program, or what happened to the staff, or were they vacant positions?

MR. DOWNEY: They were vacant, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Both positions?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That is three positions.

MR. URUSKI: The assistant supervisor and the two CanFarm were all vacant. Now, there are roughly three more positions in that branch.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, one technician, a secretary, and an assistant resource analyst.

MR. URUSKI: Were those positions vacant?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: So we are down to about six more, according to the Minister's figures.

MR. DOWNEY: In the Agricultural Training, Mr. Chairman, we show a — these, by the way, are net changes. There have been some conversions of contract to term, or to permanent positions within these changes. We are looking at 20.3 plus 4 contracts last year —(Interjection)— Agricultural Training. We are now looking at a requested SMY this year of 21.04.

MR. URUSKI: That is roughly a reduction of 3 staff man years.

MR. DOWNEY: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: So, since there were conversions, the 21.04 are permanent positions and those three reductions were where, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: These, Mr. Chairman, have been reduced by nine SMYs due to the termination of the Rural Development Corps Program. Five SMYs in Administration have been deleted, and four SMYs, term assistants, in the Selkirk Furniture Plant.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister repeat that. He was going a bit fast for me and I'm not sure that I'm understanding him, those positions starting with the nine SMYs that were terminated in the Rural Development Program.

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, the Rural Development Corps were five.

MR. URUSKI: That's the Manpower Corps of the Manpower Program in rural areas.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there were five SMYs in Administration of that Rural Development Corps and four positions of term assistants in the Selkirk Furniture Plant.

MR. URUSKI: Now, that nine figure, I gather that's how the nine figure is made up, with the five and the four; am I accurate?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Okay. Were those positions filled, of those nine? Where they all positions that have been filled?

MR. DOWNEY: There was only one of those positions filled, Mr. Chairman, and he was transferred.

MR. URUSKI: He was transferred to where? — the Department of Labour.

MR. DOWNEY: To the Department of Labour.

MR. URUSKI: So, Mr. Chairman, the actual staff reductions within the department — correct me if I'm wrong — is roughly four people in the actual staff of persons who left the employ of the Branch, not including those that have been transferred; am I out on that? — about four people out of the entire 27 positions.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have two more parts to go on that: Communications and . . .

MR. URUSKI: Oh, so there is actually more than the 24 that you indicated to me, that were on

paper.

MR. DOWNEY: We will go through them and then go back and check them through to make sure we have covered it all properly, Mr. Chairman.

3 Mr. Chairman, I will continue these out and then I have to go back and make a little further explanation, because there were some permanent staff positions added back in. So I will finish this out and then I will go back and I have a further explanation to make of the staffing because there were some of the positions added back in on a permanent basis.

MR. URUSKI: Fine.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Communications Branch, we're looking at — and these are net figures from last year. There was a reduction of one from 19.20 to 18.20 this year.

MR. URUSKI: And the deletions . . . ?

MR. DOWNEY: The deletion is a librarian, which was vacant.

MR. URUSKI: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I must apologize; I didn't get the Minister there. Could he please repeat that? I'm sorry.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, in the Communications Branch I have indicated that there were 19.20 last year, positions, 18.20 this year. The deletion is made up of a librarian, and the position was vacant.

MR. URUSKI: Was that the entire amount?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes. We move into the Northlands, Mr. Chairman, where last year we had four plus 2-½ contracts and this year we have 5.26 permanent positions.

MR. URUSKI: That's roughly a little bit more than one staff man year.

MR. DOWNEY: A deletion of about 1-½.

MR. URUSKI: 1-½. Were those positions vacant?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Can the Minister now, as he indicated, if that's it, recapitulate those figures for us, as he indicated he would?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. On these figures, I didn't start out in this format. We changed a little bit and I would like to go back and give him the same figures as I've used there, last year's compared to this year's. Last year in the Animal Industry we had 56.42, reduced to 52.40, which was a reduction of 4, and I believe I gave him the details on that one being two lab. technologists, an egg-poultry specialist and an administrative secretary.

MR. URUSKI: Of those, if I understood him, they were all vacant?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Before we get on with the discussion of this item, I would like to ask the Minister when it will be that we will receive those pieces of information that were sought by this committee in the course of consideration of his Estimates, which we have not yet received.

MR. DOWNEY: What information is that that the member referred to?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has a staff. I would have hoped that as we were asking questions staff were making notes. There were a number of questions that were asked that

the Minister took under advisement or promised to furnish the information on. We haven't had one shred of information since that time. So that I would hope before the Minister's Salary is debated that we will have answers to all of the questions that were put, either that the Minister is unwilling to provide them or, that if he is willing, that we should have them before we get to the Minister's Salary. If we can have that assurance, then we can proceed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the member that I think that I provided all the information that I was prepared to or gave consideration to provide.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I merely ask him to review — Hansard is available — to review Hansard and to bring forward those items that were asked for that he agreed to, and to deal with those items that he took under advisement but hasn't advised us whether he is going to reveal the information or not. It's all documented. We have Hansard now. It's now two or three days. So that it isn't difficult for his staff to peruse that particular debate and to furnish for the committee those things that were agreed to.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, to facilitate the member, I will further go over the Hansards and if there is some information that I feel has not been provided which I feel has been, then I will discuss it with him at that time, before the Minister's Salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I now want to raise another very important issue with the Minister, having to do with the recent election of officers to the Cattle Producers' Association under Bill 25, Mr. Chairman. I raise that as an issue because certain events have taken place, Mr. Chairman, pursuant to that Act being passed, and empowering certain people to do certain things and because those things that have been done to date have been done by and through the appointed board appointed by this Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to ask this Minister whether there has been any subsidy so far given to that board, if I may have that information?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I could at this particular point, I guess, refuse to give the information to the member because I feel we are in the Production Division of the department's Estimates. I can indicate to the member, to this particular point, there has been no money go to that — direct money. There has been, Mr. Chairman, some work done with the association in the provision of some staff time.

MR. USKIW: The Minister is confirming then that no grants were made to that particular board to date, is that correct?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Can the Minister tell me whether or not there is any intention on the part of his department or the government of providing the association with grant moneys from this department?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there was consideration given to either a grant or a loan but it has not been proceeded with.

MR. USKIW: Could the Minister elaborate? Does he mean that it will not be given under any circumstances whatever, or that the decision has not yet been made?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the decision has not yet been made but I do not feel that at this particular point there will be any made to the association.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have a problem with the operations of that association. First of all, I think we have to review what took place with respect to the question of whether or not the Department of Agriculture should have passed legislation empowering a group of people to do certain things regardless of the wishes of the cattle producers of this province. That is certainly open to question, but the scenario that has followed after the Act has passed, is something that doesn't satisfy me, Sir, and shouldn't satisfy the majority of Manitobans.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister will recall that certain people took certain positions on the very

issue for which the Minister passed legislation. One of those persons was an editor of the Brandon Sun who subsequently became the owner of a newspaper in Souris, the Souris Plaindealer, Mr. Chairman, it's called the farm paper. That particular person who owns that particular paper, was appointed as a returning officer for the recent election just concluded a week or two ago. There are many questions as to the method of conducting the election and the method of distributing the ballots and the registering of producers that have yet to be answered, Mr. Chairman. But what bothers me, Sir, is that it appears to me that there is a very direct conflict of interest and that is very serious and that is something that should not be permitted pursuant to the legislation of this Minister.

I want to read into the record, Mr. Chairman, a letter that was sent to — I have a copy of it — the appointed board, the interim board that the Minister appointed. It read as follows, Mr. Chairman: This was dated on September 30, 1978. The letterhead is Stouffers of Souris, Publishers, Box 488, Souris, Manitoba. "Congratulations on your appointment to the interim board of the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association. As you realize, I am sure the task facing the 14 of you charged with setting up the association . . ."

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

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

MR. DOWNEY: I believe we are discussing the Estimates of the Agricultural Production Division . . .

MR. USKIW: That's correct.

MR. DOWNEY: The member is reading into the record a letter which, I have no problem but I don't really see the relevance to the Estimates of this coming year. It is the performance of an association and they had the power to go ahead and do this and I really don't know what relevance it has to the Agricultural Production Division for this coming year and I would ask you to rule on that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George on the same point of order.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the point that the Minister raises, he just admitted to this committee that there have been staff man years provided under the Animal Industry Branch for this division. Now, if he wishes us to pass the Administration portion of his branch, we have no difficulty, we will go into that item. But, Mr. Chairman, certainly funds in an indirect way, whether they be by way of bodies or by way of direct moneys, have flowed from the government to that association that the government has set up, and it is a government appointed body. The Minister appointed the interim board; it was his department and the department is directly related to the Animal Industry Branch, the same branch that helped draft the legislation, that legislation that was voted on several months before it was brought even into the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on the same point of order.

MR. DOWNEY: On that same point, Mr. Chairman, I again go back to the fact that we are debating next year's Estimates and I brought to the attention of the committee what has taken place and there is no intent at this particular time, other than through normal extension which takes place, to work with certain agricultural organizations to provide staff man years in these Estimates, for that organization.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I suggest to the members of the committee that when going into this department, that by common agreement on both sides, we went through the SMY figures all the way. Could I suggest that instead of allowing the wide-ranging debate on the whole item, that we take it item by item. I'm not trying to curtail the discussion. Can we pass it and then take these items up as they come, otherwise we will be repeating and leaving it wide open.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: If the Minister can advise me that we can discuss this under the next item, Animal Industry Branch, that's fine. To me, I think it is relevant either under Administration, because he is administering this particular program. As long as he has an appointed board, he is administering that program. So it falls under Administration, it falls under policy, yes, or it can be debated under

Animal Industry Branch, it doesn't matter to me. It can be debated in one place or the other, but the Minister can't say that it is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not my intention to curtail any discussion on this area and I'm at the desires of the committee under which item we want to discuss this and I ask for guidance in that direction.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated that I will discuss it under any item that the Minister feels more comfortable in.

MR. DOWNEY: If he wants to read his letter now, that's fine. Proceed and read the letter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest then that we maybe cover Administration and then . . . The Member for Ste. Rose on a point of order.

MR. ADAM: Yes, on the same point of order, because the heading . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has indicated that he is prepared to proceed. The Member for Lac du Bonnet, continue to read the letter.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should start again, having had the interruptions. The letter which I attempted to read into the record and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, and I don't mean to interfere, the question arises of whether the letter is signed?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. USKIW: It goes on to say, and I'm going to start at the beginning again: "Congratulations on your appointment to the interim board of the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association. As you realize, I am sure the task facing the 14 of you charged with setting up the association is important to the health of the entire livestock industry of Manitoba and our best wishes go with you as you make the plans and create the machinery of a successful association. As you begin your work and as the association grows and begins to serve the livestock people of Manitoba, one of the most vital ingredients of a recipe for success is going to be adequate communications. If the livestock people of Manitoba are to be properly served, they must be a part of the planning and startup decisions that you will make. You can be only as successful as you are seen to be successful and that means you must be open and diligent in the task of keeping the thousands of Manitobans raising cattle and otherwise involved in the livestock industry, aware of what is happening. Communications can be difficult and expensive proposition. You might choose to go to the newsletter route but history has proven that newsletters tend to be somewhat inefficient over the long haul and not really even good short-term answer.

"May I suggest that we have for the past year carried on with a publication that might be of value to the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association. Last October, recognizing what we saw as a need for a free and non-affiliated agricultural voice in the province, we created the Farm Paper. We started by mailing to 15,000 farmers, the majority of them engaged in livestock production. After a fairly long test period, however, we found that the people who would respond favorably to what we were doing were less eager to make a financial commitment. In other words, we were producing a paper twice a month, mailing it to some 15,000 people, each edition at a cost in excess of \$6.00 per edition for postage alone, and managed to attract only a handful, perhaps 3 percent who were willing to forward the cost of a subscription.

"Our only alternatives were to bury the idea of a paper to serve Manitoba agriculture, or to do what we did, to turn the Farm Paper into a supplement presently circulated as part of the Souris Plaindealer, the Glenboro Gazette, and Shoal Lake Star. We have used this simmering system to keep the Farm Paper alive in recent months and we are satisfied that we are producing something of value. We are enclosing the latest edition for your perusal.

"Now, however, with the appointment of the interim board of the Manitoba Cattle Producers, may we make a suggestion that could be of benefit not only to that association and to ourselves as publishers of the Farm Paper, but also to the people who will be members of the association,

or who will be affected by its formation and operations. In short, we would consider favorably an arrangement that would make news space in the Farm Paper available to the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association on a once every two-week basis. News space naturally would not be sold, but we would assure sufficient space to carry the plans, the ideas, the decisions of the interim board as it created the framework for a worthwhile organization. We would also provide a certain space, to be negotiated, in the ad columns for association use each edition, as much as a page per edition as you require. There would be no additional charge for such space.

"In return, we would propose to provide each member, potential member or person who would be marketing cattle and thus eligible for inclusion in the plan, with each edition of the Farm Paper. We wouldn't guarantee that the Farm Paper would be totally in agreement with every plan of your board because we would propose to make news space available, but would not suggest that we would become a house organ as such. We would, however, promise the same sort of honest interest in agriculture that I think we have proven. Our columns would also continue to be open to the views of the people who make up the agricultural industry in Manitoba, even those who might be of other opinions in the association of the publisher of the paper. Subscriptions to the farm paper would cost \$8 per member for the year. We know that the association has no funding available until such time as the checkoff begins — I must make a note of that, Mr. Chairman — but we would suggest that the Manitoba Department of Agriculture should, as it is in the best interests of agriculture, provide funding that would enable the association to get off the ground. Therefore, we would suggest that the subscription fee for each member and/or potential member could be payable to us on a quarterly basis and we would then undertake to set up a mailing system that would be both permanent and flexible, as long as we could be guaranteed a minimum of three-quarters of the first year. As such, if there are 14,000 producers in the province, a payment of \$2 each per quarter would put us in business."

"Out of that initial quarterly payment, little would remain, when the cost of setting up the mailing list from names and addresses you would supply, was deducted. We would subsequently show some profit in later periods and would have a publication that could continue to serve not only the cattle industry but all of Manitoba agriculture."

"As for timing, we would suggest that if this offer were to be considered at your first meeting — and we can think of no other subject as worthy of first consideration as setting up good communications for your Board and the people it must serve — and if the agreement were to be positive, a good mailing list could be made up from the list of producers who voted on the last referendum in early 1977. If we were provided with copies of the voter's lists for each of the various districts, we would undertake to prepare a mailing list using an Addressograph system with a metal mailing plate for each subscriber and could have the whole operation ready to provide a service commencing by the first of December."

"Preparing of the mailing plates, of course, would be the biggest time consumer and the biggest cost for us. Initial work, preparing the list according to post office mailing divisions, etc., and having the plates made would probably eat up most of the first quarterly subscription fee. Once prepared, however, the mailing list would be a permanent thing that would serve the purpose designed and could also, should such ever be necessary, provide the association with a means of quickly and correctly addressing direct communication to all members. This, for instance, could be used if the association were to find it valuable or necessary to send individual statements to every member at any time. The mailing procedure could also be so designed as to permit certain selective mailing with addressing done by machine. For instance, if 30 percent or any other number were strictly in dairying, it would be possible for the association to use the mailing set-up at cost of handling alone to address direct mail information to those members."

"The mailing list can also be kept up to date, as needed, by changing addresses, adding or deleting names, etc."

"As indicated, the initial set-up cost of preparing such a mailing system will be expensive. We would therefore like to be assured of an agreement that would give us a guarantee of at least three quarters — that is nine months — of this arrangement."

"We don't believe that a captive publication or a newsletter as such would serve the livestock industry in Manitoba as well as it could be served by a professionally produced newspaper that is interested in the industry. Naturally, with a paid in advance circulation of the size we would gain from the association's participation, we would be in a position to increase our advertising and to thus increase the size of the publication."

"We would not, in the beginning, at least, discontinue inclusion of the farm paper in the three community papers now distributing it, and there could even be a possibility that such distribution as a supplement in community papers would grow, thus getting the paper into the hands of thousands of Manitobans who, while not directly involved in livestock production, should know what is happening in the basis industry of the province."

"The cost, based on \$8 per subscription per year, might seem high, but look at the alternatives. Mailing newsletters once a month to 14,000 people would cost, by my estimate, anywhere from \$3,000 to \$5,000 per month. If you choose to use a cheaply-printed mimeograph type one-page sheet, that would be from \$36,000 to \$60,000 for a year or from \$2.57 to \$4.25 per member each year for one newsletter per month. To be honest, I don't think something as important as the Cattle Producers' Association can afford to get by with that sort of an operation."

"I would welcome the opportunity to discuss the situation more fully with your Board at your convenience, subject to a suggestion that Thursday or Friday of any week would be more convenient to a weekly newspaper publisher, wherever you prefer, or if you would like more information prior to such a meeting feel free to contact me at Souris, Post Office Box 488, Telephone 483-2108 day or night, and I will attempt to supply what is needed."

"Yours truly, Garth Stouffer, publisher of the Farm Paper."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the point of introducing this is obvious, I am sure, to the Committee. We have legislation passe by this Minister that provided for the appointment of a Board, a Board that is to service the association and the membership of the association throughout the province. We have government financial input that has already been made towards this organization. We are unsure yet, according to the Minister's statement this morning, whether or not there will be further financial assistance.

But here we have a situation where, whether or not there is or will not be government financial assistance to this agency, the probability that if the Board of Directors enters into this kind of an agreement that by law this Minister is requiring the people, through their check-off on every animal sold, to subsidize the Souris Plaindealers. That's really what we have had passed in this Legislature, if this proposal happens to be acceptable to the Board of Directors of the Cattle Producers' Association of Manitoba under Bill 25.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is one reason why we fought so hard against the provisions of that legislation, because governments should never legislate a blank cheque to any group of people, a blank cheque giving them powers that rightfully belong only in the Legislative Assembly or the Parliament of Canada. This is a good example of what happens when that principle is violated and when governments delegate their responsibilities to some people who have a particular interest, a particular axe to grind.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it should be remembered that Mr. Stouffer was not a neutral person with respect to the question of setting up a livestock producers' association and Bill 25. He was not a neutral. His editorials, his commentary, his pencil was writing favourable to that, Mr. Chairman. We know that. What did he have in mind then, when he was trying to influence the farm community of Manitoba through his writings? Did he have in mind then that some way he, himself, was going to be the most significant beneficiary of Bill 25? That's an open question, given this kind of information, Mr. Chairman; that's an open question.

Because, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the first page, he talks about a trial run where he mailed out 15,000 papers to 15,000 farms but couldn't convince them that his paper was worth enough to warrant a subscription, other than 3 percent who participated. Three percent of the people were interested.

So, Mr. Chairman, the only way he can now make this paper succeed, obviously, is if he had a prepaid subscription by the Cattle Producers' Association or by the Department of Agriculture, as he suggested in this letter, Mr. Chairman. But in either case, it's wrong, whether the department does it or whether the moneys come out of a check-off; it is wrong to use \$112,000 — yes, \$8 times 14,000 producers, according to his figures, come to \$112,000 — that should be income to the Souris Plaindealer, the Stouffers of Souris, who really are neutral people in the question of Bill 25, so the Minister would like us to believe, I'm sure.

Now, what kind of nonsense is this, Mr. Chairman? When is the Minister going to assume his responsibility to make sure that the people of Manitoba don't have their pockets picked? Yes, because that's what this is. Bill 25 picks their pockets and puts money into the hands of people like this, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, we have allowed the member to go all over the waterfront, again, on Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, the Agricultural Production Division, which has nothing to do with the information he has read into the thing. I guess what bothers him most of all is that individuals in Manitoba are allowed to send letters to anybody they want. I have no control over letters that are sent by anybody to anyone, and, Mr. Chairman, I do not want that controlled. That is something I do not want to control is the press.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please, order please. Could we have one speaker at a time. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister have a point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister did not have a point of order.

MR. USKIW: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I would like to caution the Member for Lac du Bonnet that he try and get within the context that we're dealing with.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, would you tell me where I was out of context in my contributions so far? Please tell me; I want to know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my humble opinion that we are dealing with Bill 25 in the member's presentation and I'd like to bring it back to the area that we are covering here. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that you might be diverted by the antics of members around this table and perhaps I shouldn't expect that you should have heard every word that I have presented in this committee this morning; I appreciate that. But let me remind you, Sir, that my comments have to do with legislation passed by this government under this appropriation. Yes, the operations . . . Well, the Minister shakes his head.

Mr. Chairman, we now have a problem, because the Minister now doesn't agree, but he agreed that this is where we should debate the issue, when we introduced the matter. So that is his problem, not mine. I know that he doesn't want to debate this issue under any heading in his department. That is obvious, Mr. Chairman.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to warn him that should the Department of Agriculture fund this association to the tune of \$1 that finds its way into the subsidy of a rural newspaper, in particular this one, or should check-off moneys be used in this direction, there is going to be a lot more said in due course, Mr. Chairman. Yes. —(Interjection)— Now, the Member for Pembina says, well, it's a duly elected Board. Mr. Chairman, they're only elected under the authority of the Crown. Yes, an abdication of government responsibility, Mr. Chairman, an abdication of government responsibility where they have delegated power that should only belong to the people of Manitoba to a private organization to have powers over other people in society. That's what we're talking about. And no matter what that Board decides, Mr. Chairman, the Minister will have to answer for every decision. He will never escape that as long as Bill 25 is on the books of this province, and he should have known that when he passed the bill; he should know it today, and we will remind him every time there is need for reminder, Mr. Chairman.

Now, what is most intriguing to me, Mr. Chairman, is the character of this letter, because he goes on to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that he is going to be awfully nice to this association if he could only have a contract worth \$112,000 of people's money. That's right, he is saying, we will even provide space for news. Mr. Chairman, I always thought the purpose of a newspaper was to provide space for news, that that was not a contractual thing, that that happens automatically when news is created. But in this paper he has the audacity to say, if you give me \$112,000 of other people's money, I will give you news space. Now, Mr. Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Gentlemen, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 52 in the Main Estimates, Health and Community Services. 6. Manitoba Health Services Commission, Item 3 Hospital Program—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Apparently you didn't notice that the Member for St. Boniface was standing.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Could you tell me what item we're on, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Honourable Member for St. Johns. I couldn't help but notice that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was standing.

MR. DESJARDINS: With the minister, you will notice, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Item is 3, Hospital Program in Item 6, Manitoba Health Services Commission.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know. Before my friend leaves . . . was there an information to deal with medical . . . I leave that to the minister. It doesn't matter to us at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I think, Mr. Chairman, yes — that we had discussed among ourselves. I don't know how much further it had gone, but between the official opposition critic, the Member for St. Boniface and myself that we would deal with the medical appropriation before going to the hospital. If that's all right with the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Item under discussion is 4 Medical Program—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd be interested in hearing the minister state current policy in relation to the revenue for pment of the Medicare portion of the Health Services Program. In other words, is there any contemplation by the government, by the minister, to bring in any form of user fees, be it called deterrent, participation or any other form of fee, in addition to what is now the responsibility of all taxpayers to contribute to the Health Services Commission through their tax dollars?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman. There is no contemplation by the government of that kind of action whatever.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I am assuming that in order to bring in any other form of charge, it would be necessary for legislation to be passed and if I'm wrong about that and if the power rests with the minister, or with Executive Council, I would appreciate the minister pointing that out to me.

I'd like to ask the minister also whether the recent agreement with the Medical Association rules out any possibility of balance payments being chargeable by doctors, who are opted into the program?

MR. SHERMAN: It certainly rules it out for the term of the present agreement between the MMA and the government, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't rule it out for all time. As the honourable member for St. Johns will appreciate, we were dealing with the 1979-80 Fee Schedule arrangements, and it certainly rules it out for the period of time.

MR. CHERNIACK: That answer satisfies me. Of course, it's for the current year and next year will be another go around. Is the minister in a position to inform us as to the agreement, the nature of the . . . well, a copy of the agreement, which apparently exists between the Health Services Commission and the Medical Association, dealing with, well, with whatever?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that memorandum has been agreed to by the Manitoba Medical Association. The agreement hasn't been signed yet, but they have indicated to us that their membership has voted to accept it, and it is therefore officially accepted, but we have not received a signed copy of the agreement yet so I don't have that available either for myself or for the honourable member.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the memorandum spells out the terms, and if so, could the minister please inform us as to that?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the agreement is basically the same as the one that was in existence in 1975 between the MMA and the province. The terms and conditions of the agreement are not significantly different from those existing in that agreement at that time, the primary difference being the actual Fee Schedule itself, which of course is related to the current year. But, if the Honourable Member for St. Johns is asking if he can have a copy of that agreement, I don't see any difficulty. I'm not sure that my officials have one with us, perhaps we might have, but I don't see any difficulty with that, Mr. Chairman, if you'll give me one minute. Thank you for your patience. The Executive Director of the Manitoba Health Services Commission does have a copy of the agreement with him, but I would repeat that it hasn't been signed yet. We can certainly have copies made, or a copy made for the Member for St. Johns, but I would just remind him that, I have pointed out that although we've been notified by the MMA that they have accepted it, it hasn't been signed yet. So there are no signatures on it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the minister's offer, and I certainly accept the offer to receive a copy of that unsigned agreement. I'm assuming that although it's not signed by the Medical Association, that since it is not signed by the Medical Association, the government also not having signed it, is not bound by the terms of it, and therefore I'd be more than anxious to see it before it's signed rather than after. I now harken back to my early legal training, which makes me always anxious to see something before a commitment is made. So, I would appreciate that. And the reason that, for one thing I don't know that I've ever seen the agreement that is now in existence or that had been signed previously, and I am interested particularly in relation to the setting up of a mechanism for continuing consultation between the Health Services Commission and the Manitoba Medical Association. The attempt to promote co-operation between the two bodies is something that I am, of course, interested in. The fee schedule is not a matter of interest in this regard, and therefore to the extent that may take up time and space I'm not concerned about the fee schedule itself. But if I could get a copy of that agreement I would appreciate it and that would give me an opportunity to look further into it.

I have before me, Mr. Chairman, a newspaper clipping wherein there is a report that the Health Minister pledged peace with doctors and received a standing ovation as a result of stating that he has established a special consultation mechanism to ensure the continuing contribution of the expert knowledge and experience of doctors in the province.

Now, I find that this clipping is almost a year old, May 4th, 1978, and I don't recall that we ever did see a statement setting out this special consultation mechanism, although I believe we have discussed it last year. I am wondering whether that is available for our perusal.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I stand to be corrected by my honourable friend but it's my recollection that I did, during my Estimates last year — at least I believe it was during my Estimates — when the question came up from the Honourable Member for St. Johns as to what sort of framework of consultation it was that I was referring to in the consultative committee that I described; that I did at that time supply him with the terms of reference establishing that committee between the office of the Minister of Health and Community Services and the Manitoba Medical Association, pointing out that there would be four members; two from the Minister of Health's office — those two were Dr. George Johnson and Mr. Reg Edwards — and two from the MMA, those two at the time, I think, included a Dr. Bob Myers of Brandon and Dr. Henry Krahn of Winnipeg. That has changed since then. I mean, the membership has changed since then but I believe that was the original membership. I also advised him that rotating, office, and I the Chairmanship would be a changeable, thought I did supply him with that. If not, I can certainly do it.

But just on that point, let me just say to the Member for St. Johns that that committee is now really being superseded by a consultation committee that is being developed as a result of the agreement, to which the member and I have been addressing ourselves these past few minutes, between the MMA and the government. The agreement between the MMA and the government calls for a consultation committee and Article 4 reads as follows, Mr. Chairman: "Article 4, subsection 01. The parties agree to establish a committee to be known as the Consultative Committee, consisting of four members, two to be appointed by the Commission from among its members and two to be appointed by the Association from among its members. Each party shall appoint alternate members to serve in the absence of committee members."

"Point 02. Each party may bring such advisors to committee meetings as it deems necessary for its purpose."

"Subsection 03. The Chairmanship shall rotate semi-annually between the parties and the Chairman will have full right of participation."

"04. The Consultative Committee shall meet at such time and place as any two members will

decide, but at least once per month, unless waived unanimously. Notice of meetings shall be mailed by the Chairman to the address of the Commission and Association, respectively, at least 48 hours in advance of the proposed time."

"05. The Consultative Committee may consult about any matter."

"06. The parties shall aim to develop an ongoing dialogue and process of consultation in order to achieve the objectives of Article 3."

There are two other subsections relating to the making of new regulations or changing any existing regulations, requirement of written reports and minutes required to be taken from meetings and copies thereof to be forwarded to the Commission and the Association.

That requirement on consultation now is built into the agreement, Mr. Chairman, so that committee will really supersede and replace the Consultative Committee that has existed between my office and the MMA. In fact, the membership, from our point of view, may not change, because both Dr. Johnson and Mr. Edwards, who were my office representatives on the existing Committee, are both, of course, representatives of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. So the new committee which exists between the Commission and the MMA may well see our membership consist of those two.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the indulgence of the Committee for a five-minute break, Sir. I'm sorry, I have to tape an item downstairs and I will be right back. —(Interjection)— Yes, it's not relative to this Committee's work, it's relative to a religious service, Mr. Chairman.

Thanks very much. I will be right back.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I thought we were going to just wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I was. I that you wanted to make a remark.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, I just wanted to make sure that in the five minutes that I can get a copy of that agreement. I thought I could. Am I getting it? —(Interjection)— Now where are we? He has got it. All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee will come to order. The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank members of the committee for their indulgence and forbearance. While I'm on my feet I might say that during that break period I had, my officials had an opportunity to check with the MMA on the agreement that's been under discussion and they have reservations, Mr. Chairman, about tabling or making public an agreement before it has been signed. They are meeting with me and officials of my office on the 23rd of this month at which time I expect the agreement will be co-signed but at this point in time it hasn't been. They have reservations as I say about propelling into the public arena an agreement that has not yet been signed.

I can assure the Honourable Member for St. Johns that once it is signed it will appear in all the fee schedules anyway, so I can certainly make it available to him but at this point in time I would ask his indulgence in my decision to refrain from making it public out of courtesy to one of the two major parties involved, that being the Manitoba Medical Association.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I would not press for it. I think if the Government is prepared to commit itself on a certain policy it should be prepared to expose that policy to the public and say this is what we are about to do, but I'm not going to quarrel if the Minister wants to wait until the Manitoba Medical Association is ready to agree to its release. I am not too concerned about that.

I was listening carefully to what the Minister said just before our recess and he did confuse the parties insofar as Government is concerned, on some occasions he used the term association and on others he used the term Government. I want to tell him my impression not of what he said but what I believe is correct and I want him to correct me, Mr. Chairman, that the Government has not had any agreement with the doctors or the association up to now and the agreement that we were discussing whose production is not yet been agreed to, is the first agreement between the Government and the Medical Association. That any agreement that has been signed, be it a memorandum or an agreement itself, it has been with the Manitoba Health Services Commission and that when he read to us various sub-headings under Clause 4 or Article 4 that that was with

the Manitoba Health Services Commission not the Government.

I'd like to make sure about that because he read something relating to carrying out the policies or principles expressed in Article 3 and I don't know what they are, and he also talked about passing regulations. I want to make sure that we are not now talking about regulations under any Legislation which would be passed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I'd like to make sure about that so that I'm not confused about what the Minister has told us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Johns is correct when he says that what we should be referring to in precise terms here is a agreement between the Manitoba Medical Association and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and that the consultative committee referred to is a committee which is comprised of four members equally representative of the Manitoba Medical Association and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and that obviously there would be no power to change or effect or refine any Legislation in existence, where medicine and the practise of medicine is concerned, that did not have the concurrence of the Government of this province and it was not acted upon out of a climate of responsibility undertaken by the Government of this province as separate and distinct from the Health Services Commission.

With respect to the agreement itself though, I must say again that it is, I am advised, almost a precise duplicate in every detail of the agreement that did exist in 1975 between the MMA and the commission.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am aware that there was an agreement between the Health Services Commission and the Medical Association and I'm not too concerned about that. I was really concerned about any agreement between the Government and the Medical Association dealing with consultation and I am sure we referred to this last year during the estimates. But I want to tell the Health Minister again that we had a very, almost bitter set of negotiations with the Medical Association when they wanted an agreement to consult and we refused to give it to them, and especially we did give them a statement of policy of what the Government believed should be done and the Government's statement that it intended to consult, but it was at a closed meeting with the Medical Association that we brought out the fact that we would not in any way reduce the power of Government to establish policy unilaterally and would not agree to let any special interest group have any veto power or any right to be consulted in a legal way. We made the point that what they were asking for, although they said they would never use that kind of power, their lawyer admitted under pressure that the only purpose of having an agreement rather than a policy statement was the opportunity to go to court to obtain an injunction to prevent the Government from carrying forward any change in policy or development of policy without consultation which would be a matter for interpretation by the court. I am telling the Minister that so that I would like his assurance that he has not in any way jeopardized the position of Government, of any Government, in that regard, of its right to establish policy and since he is not showing us the agreement yet, until it is signed, that there is nothing in that agreement that will jeopardize the right of Government unilaterally to establish policy in relation to health matters. That kind of an assurance I think we ought to have because that is basic to any Government which is elected democratically and governs on behalf of the people who elected it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can give the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that assurance. This is a consultative committee to deal with matters of concern, whether conflicting concern or mutual concern, as between the Health Services Commission and the Medical Association with a view to improving —(Interjection)— no, between the Health Services Commission and the Association with a view to establishing and expanding as practicably as possible a favourable and healthy system of delivery of medical practise and a favourable and a healthy climate for the practise of medicine itself. But there is nothing in the agreement that in any way compromises, precludes or invades the prerogative of Government to fulfill its fundamental prerogative and mandate and that is to make the decisions.

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

MR. CHERNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Minister made the mistake that he did and now I would like to pursue it a little further since he made it his objective to establish such a good rapport with the medical profession and to have consultative meetings with them, representatives, to deal with ongoing problems of health care insofar as the medical profession is concerned, can he report to us the extent to which there have been discussions with the medical profession regarding the use of facilities owned and supplied by the people of Manitoba in the hospitals, in schools, in clinics, wherever, by the patients and by the doctors? Has he developed a better understanding that would assure that there would not be abuse or excessive abuse by patients? There will always be abuse by patients. I would say that there will always be abuse by all users of any service be it the use of busses or the use of taxis, I'm using anything at all, in any respect and I want to make sure that it is clear that I expect that there will always be abuses, but the cost of health care rising so greatly and being such a concern all over this continent and in the western world, I would like the Minister to tell us what progress has been made in the last 18 months, 17 months, since he has been Minister, in clarifying and arriving at a better understanding of the use of facilities, of prevention of abuse by patients, prevention of abuse by the dispensers of the services, by the health personnel, people in the health delivery services, that would aim to provide a more efficient delivery of service at a lower cost and fully to use the facilities to provide better health for the people of Manitoba. Could we have a report along those lines?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, a great deal of time and energy, mental and physical, has been expended in the past 17-½ months by spokesmen for the Manitoba Medical Association and the profession of medicine and officials of my office and the Health Services Commission, including the executive director of the Health Services Commission, the new chairman of the Commission, the Associate Deputy-Minister of the Department, Dr. George Johnson, and myself on addressing the very areas to which the Honourable Member for St. Johns refers among others. There have been a great many meetings. I can't tell the honourable member exactly how many because some have been official meetings and some have really been quasi-official or unofficial meetings between the representatives of the MMA and their executive, oftentimes including their president and the Associate Deputy-Minister of the Department and myself on the whole range of challenges that we face in the health care system, the health care delivery field, as Manitobans and as Canadians, in a time when I think it is generally acknowledged, we want to maintain the best medical service we can while getting the most complete value out of the limited dollars that we have available.

There have been meetings of the consultative committee to which I referred that have taken place on a regular basis, sometimes 2 or 3 weeks apart, but certainly as frequently as ever 2 or 3 weeks or every month in the absolute extreme, generally for a half day's duration, dealing with the problems of overuse or expanded use of emergency facilities and out-patient departments of hospitals; dealing with the so-called block-bed problem; dealing with the challenge of Extended Care beds and Extended Treatment facilities; dealing with the bed spectrum in Winnipeg and the ultimate mathematics that should be achieved there taking into account new hospitals coming onstream and existing facilities such as the municipal hospitals and Deer Lodge, both of which present individual questions in themselves.

Dealing with the size and dimension and desirable dimension of the Health Sciences Centre; dealing with manpower requirements and the challenges of attracting practitioners into rural, remote and northern communities; dealing, of course, with the fee schedule and its relevance to the climate for medical practice here in Manitoba.

Dealing with the morale of the profession and the relative position that Manitoba practitioners hold in terms of income earning opportunities in the cross Canada scale; and dealing with the desirability of thrusts in the preventive medicine field to keep people in the communities and in their homes and out of institutions; and dealing with the often suggested subject of possible over-usage of certain materials and certain facilities in hospitals themselves and what steps can be taken to rationalize and reorganize the use of our available resources so as to ensure that we're eliminating unnecessary duplication and waste.

It would take some considerable time, Mr. Chairman, to go into detail on those individual subjects, but if I may with respect suggest to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that those capsule headings represent the subject areas, some of the subject areas, and I may have omitted some, that have been at the root of ongoing discussions of the kind that I refer to.

Many discussions have been unofficial discussions in my office or in my Associate Deputy Minister's office, or in the Board Room at the Health Services Commission between medical practitioners —(Interjection)— Yes, medical practitioners and myself. The Honourable Member for

St. Boniface asks whether there is any value to those, I think I can say, sir, that there has been considerable value to those. I think that one of the primary things that we face in Manitoba, and indeed in Canada, I don't think this, in fact I know there's considerable evidence that these problems are not unique to Manitoba, nor are they unique to Canada. One of the major challenges we face as Canadians is a shift in attitude with respect to public funding; with respect to public resources; with respect to health care; and with respect to individual responsibility, and I think that ever since the end of World War 2 in this country, there has been a particular attitude that prevailed through successive and different stripes of government, federal, provincial and municipal that ignored the finite aspects of our resources not only applied in the health field, it's obviously applied in the energy field and in the resource field, and we have had to work to try to start effecting an attitudinal change.

We believe that the professionals in the health field, the doctors, the nurses, and other related professionals and paraprofessionals must be the leaders in the forefront of that campaign to change attitudes, and as a consequence a good deal of our energy and time has been expended on making that case, and having that case accepted and understood so that we could develop a mutually cooperative attack on the problem. And I think in answer to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, there has been progress made. The medical profession has responded with concepts, ideas, initiatives and suggestions that have been most useful and helpful and that have been, to some degree, implemented and will be, to a further degree, implemented as it is practical to implement them that will help us do what the Honourable Member for St. Johns suggested needs to be done and that is, to ensure that we're getting full value for our health care dollar.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the minister wants to keep it a secret or not as to what has been done, because we've heard a full elaboration — not complete as he says — of an agenda which anybody with the interest that the minister has shown in health care could prepare.

He's told us of all the discussions, the subject matter of all the discussions, but my question voiced quite a while ago was what progress can he tell us has been made in dealing with these problems? He said they're not only in Manitoba but in Canada, not only in Canada on this continent, I said just before he did that it's in all of the western world; I suppose I should have elaborated and said in the whole world these problems exist. But I'm not aware of what has been accomplished as a result of the consultations, other than talk.

Now he says that there have been accomplishments. Well, I don't know what has happened. What happened in the last 17 or 18 months that indicate improvement? And how do we measure that? I'm sure it can't be a secret because I think the people ought to know what has been done. He mentioned all the problems, described them in some detail, but he ended up on a basis of a shift in attitude. We know there's been a shift in attitude. For a long time, people could not afford doctors, people could not get to doctors; people could not get into hospitals except by standing in line and going through an Out-Patients, and now it's been changed because of social progress, because of the fact that governments finally decided to play a role in the delivery of health care, which along with education, is probably basically the most important services that can be provided to people. governments have become interested, involved and to varying degrees, concerned to be part of the change in attitude.

However, this minister was quoted in a newspaper, and I don't have the quotation just at hand, of saying that he's really a believer in the traditional services of the use of the doctor, and I think he said on a fee-for-service basis, and maybe the change in attitude is something that we ought to see on the government side.

But really, what I'd like to know is the answer to my question. This consultative committee has apparently had a very great number of meetings. I don't suppose it came minutes and if it did, I don't suppose the minister would be prepared to show us the minutes. But, you know, he's reporting to us on a year's program, on a year's stewardship, and wished to renew for another year the rights to continue to monitor, and I use that word in his sense, and then to deliver health services. That's the task he has taken upon himself and it may be considered unkind for me to tell him that I don't think that he told us what has been done except that he assured us that things have been done. I'd really like to know, what is the shift in attitude that is evidenced amongst patients? To what extent are they more conscious than ever that they must not demand services just in a casual way? Because the doctors complain to me that the patients make demands on them and they cannot really fend off these demands without a real battle and, in doing so, they may overlook the small percentage of times when they think that their services are not needed when it turns but that they may be needed.

And I'd like to know to what extent has the medical profession in the last 18 months agreed to have a greater control over their own delivery of service so as to be able to do a better job

in making themselves available. Because, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is good for doctors to be working as hard as I think they do. I know that they take Wednesdays off and they take holidays, and I don't begrudge it to them at all. They have one of the most demanding professions, skilled work that exists in society, and I don't want them to be overworked.

Just last week, I had a little debate with this minister wherein he said that his staff and his office is working morning, afternoon and evening. Well, he said he backed away from 24 hours a day, he eliminated the night, but he said 7 days a week, morning, afternoon and evening. I don't agree with that. I don't think that people should have to work that hard and I believe the doctors work very hard, and I don't begrudge them the returns they make. You know, when they say give us a 40 hour week like plumbers have, give us the overtime pay and all that, I don't see anything wrong with discussing that with them and recognizing that they should be paid well for the services they offer. But at the same time, the doctors have to become more and more responsible for the costs of the services, and responsible for seeing to it that they are able to deliver the service at a level commensurate with the ability to pay of the community.

And that is the kind of consultations that I would think should have led the minister to be able to report that yes, we've achieved certain goals, we have come to certain agreements. For example, and I can mention it now rather than wait for the next item, there's a very recent report, March 27th, 1979 of a statement by a highly responsible person, Dr. Paul Henteleff, Assistant Professor of Social and Preventative Medicine who suggests that 90 percent of tonsillectomies are unnecessary and regards it as 25 hospital beds in continuous operation year round in Manitoba, and says in his opinion, it's unnecessary and the interesting thing is, a quote which I'll find soon by a doctor, oh he says, and I'm quoting from the newspaper report: "Figures suggested families often urge their doctors to remove tonsils of children who have had no bouts of tonsillitis, he said. The attitude is, while you're at it, do Johnny. It is clear that the doctors aren't making a big rip-off through unnecessary surgery. Families have a tremendous impact on the operation while the doctor's role is only passive." Now, I've just quoted a responsible, concerned, salaried doctor who expresses this opinion that 90 percent of the tonsillectomies are unnecessary, and I respect that statement and then I read a quotation which would appear to be so silly, to say, and it appears to be his quotation so when I give him credit for what he said, I should also indicate that I can't understand the justification for his saying "The doctors aren't making a big rip-off through unnecessary surgery" by suggesting that families decide whether or not there'll be an operation.

Well, that's patent nonsense. Only a doctor can operate on tonsils, and only a doctor can say I will or I won't do it, and the fact that daddy or mommy say we want our child done while you're at it, I think is the expression used, is unacceptable. I remember now how my mother used to recollect that when she was about 4 or 5 years old, her older sister had measles in some village in Russia and her mother's solution to the problem of the fact that most children had measles was to put my mother in bed with her older sister to make sure that they both had it at the same time so they could both be dealt with. Well, that was about 85 years ago, 90 years ago and I don't quite think that that is the kind of practice that one should handle now.

I was just looking for some other quotable quote and I think there is one, but there's no need to do that because I mentioned to the minister that this is a matter that doctors have to deal with more than hospitals. A hospital administrator can't go to a doctor or to the operating group and say, "90 percent of tonsillectomies are unnecessary, therefore I'm cutting you down to 10 percent, or 15 percent." It's the doctors who have to do as the teachers do. Then the teachers in our public schools now say, "I cannot give to this or the other student 90 percent of my time, because I have a responsibility to another group of students." And when a child in education reveals an important need, then a progressive and aware administration sees to it that that child is referred to a specialist, who decides whether or not that child can get the special attention. And I hope gets it, depending again on how progressive the administration is, that provides for these services.

The same with the use of the facilities. Hospitals, we know how expensive they are. We know that the hospital cost is much greater in total than the cost of the fee for service paid to doctors. But there has to be some lessening of demand of use of hospitals by doctors, and I say by doctors, not by patients. And I say that the doctors have to be encouraged and have to assume the responsibility of saying no to patients. And I believe that few doctors do that.

What they have learned to say no to, and I think they're right in doing that, was to cut out all the home calls that used to be just the telephone away from the parent, who would say, "I want my son looked at at his home by the doctor, or I want myself to be looked at." And the medical profession made a very deliberate decision. They will not be available for house calls to the extent that they used to be. And I think they proved that very, very many people, who in the past thought that they could summon a doctor for any complaint, now find that it is possible for them to get to the doctor's office, and cut down on the unnecessary travel time by the doctor.

I have another clipping here, which is not dated, but I know that it is since this government came into office because there's an advertisement in the clipping by one of the people who were fired by this government, and is announcing his private practice in the professional field. So, I know it is more recent than the appointment of this minister. Where this doctor says . . . I'm sorry, where a health care consultant, named Friesen, of Washington and London, Ontario, who came to speak to the Canadian Hospital Association, apparently an Extension Course at the University of Manitoba . . . and I quote from what he has quoted as having said, "A doctor recently told me he spends 35 percent of his time going from hospital to hospital to office to home — what a waste! Why can't the doctors' offices be contiguous to the hospitals and use the same examination rooms, the same x-rays and the same labs?" You know why, Mr. Chairman, because administrations that are still operating in the traditional way don't see the necessity to bring the doctors and the hospitals and the labs much closer together. I think we've had evidence of that, that this government has made some changes or prevented the development of the practice, which can't operate out of a hospital. I think it's been said that Seven Oaks Hospital had been designed to provide a much greater primary family care service out of the hospitals, so that the people will have one centre, and I think that that was cut out by this . . . the minister was critical of that apparently.

So that I come back to my original question and point out to the minister that he described the agenda, that he described the problems that I am sure have been discussed by this consultative group, but he has not told us what they have actually done. Give us some examples, what changes can be noted for which the government can be . . . the achievement of which, by government and the profession can be recognized — that we can say yes, now there has been a change.

I'll tell you a little example, Mr. Chairman. I have a brother-in-law, who is considered by many to be an expert in the delivery of health services and public health. He was once consulted by a hospital, which felt that it needed to cut costs. He looked at various procedures within the hospital, and he saw that there was a Medical Review Committee, which made it its business to review the status of all patients that had been in the hospital for a continuous 21-day period. And by the 22nd day, they'd look in at the patient to see whether it was proper or justified medically for that patient to have been there 21 days. And he inquired and got the statistics of the many patients who were being discharged on the 20th day of stay, and suggested to this hospital that they have the Review Committee start looking at patients' stay beyond 14 days. And that quick 20-day cycle was reduced to 13 days in a large number of cases — large enough to justify his advice to look at it that way. And that's what I would think would be necessary for this consultative committee, and that is why I'm inclined to ask the minister why the consultative committee doesn't include hospital administrators, and why it doesn't include para-medical people. Because I am sure, Mr. Chairman, as sure as I am standing here, and nobody I think will challenge that statement, that the nursing profession would have a great deal to offer, to suggest, on the use of the hospitals, by the medical profession. They're there all the time, they're seeing what's happening. And I think they ought to be on the consultative committee. And for all I know, there ought to be other para-medical people involved in this consultative committee for it to be real meaningful and accomplishing a great deal.

And I would like to urge on this minister that he tell us in a realistic way, what has been accomplished, and tell us whether he doesn't feel that much more could be accomplished by an ongoing enlarged committee charged with doing that kind of a job. I will be referring later, Mr. Chairman, to the Law Reform Commission and its most recent report on dealing with the legal rights of mentally ill, and point out to the minister the great value that takes place when you get people who are experts, such as there are, in the Law Reform Commission. And when I say experts I don't mean only lawyers, because I think about half of those people are lay people, and not lawyers. But the accomplishment that they can do by having an agenda and meeting to discuss practical aspects. I'd like to think that this consultative committee, that the minister has, is doing that kind of a thing, and I look forward to hearing from him on what they are doing and what they've accomplished in that regard.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that . . . I'm bringing up my family again because I do remember now that a cousin of mine, who was one of the senior practitioners in this province, Dr. Louis Cherniack, was once reported in a newspaper of having said that he thinks that too much money is being spent on annual check-ups, pointing out that there is really a tradition of annual check-ups. Have you seen your doctor in the last year? Like, have you seen your dentist in the last year? I understand more about the need for annual check-ups of dentistry than I do for a complete medical check-up. What was pointed out — I had occasion to ask other doctors about it, and there was general agreement amongst the small group of doctors that I discussed it with, that your annual check-up will sometimes reveal a problem, but that the percentage is very, very low — that usually the annual check-up is just a routine thing, which takes time, costs money, there's certain lab reports involved. And I received enough of an impression from the doctors I spoke to, that it was not an

essential thing, to make me wonder whether that might not have been something that the consultative committee may have cut down and advised doctors that the annual check-up could be a bi-annual check-up, and in that way could save a pretty substantial sum of money for the people who provide the ability with which to pay doctors and health care, all the money which, I think, they are entitled to have because I do think they're providing a big service.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, as one who's had some experience with the type of committee that we're discussing today, I'd like to participate in this debate, Mr. Chairman. I kind of resent the fact that the minister is saying, now things are changing, we should make an effort to close the gap, to have better relationships between the medical profession and government, any government — not that statement but the statement that, now we're moving, that this was another thought, as if he had invented this thought, and that he was going ahead, and nothing was done in the past.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that of course the fact that we're here . . . many of the things we do, most of the things, or all of the things we do, are quite political. But I continue to be naive enough to think that there are certain things, that for the good of the population in general, that should be the first priority, and there shouldn't be that much, not necessarily debate, but that much taking of political position between the different parties.

And what I'm referring to, Mr. Chairman, something that did bother me an awful lot, one of the things that bothered me the worst when I was the Minister of Health was that all I was interested in was confrontation with the medical profession. And, Mr. Chairman, I think that this was probably the most unfair statement that was ever made about me. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the present Minister of Health certainly did his share to see that every Mr. Chairman, the minister will remember that he repeatedly stated that we needed consultation, not confrontation. And he repeatedly stated that the then-Minister of Health was only interested in one thing, and it was confrontation with the medical profession. And I think that this is most unfair. We also have a responsibility, Mr. Chairman, and it doesn't matter who we deal with.

I might say that I had many strikes going against me. First of all, as the Member for St. Johns said, there have been some quite difficult periods between the Cabinet and that was during the space that I didn't sit in the House for about a year and a half after the 1973 election. I wasn't part of that discussion, but then I became the Chairman of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. I signed the agreement for the Commission, between the medical profession and the Commission, and I can say to my honourable friend that I did everything — I bent over backwards, starting from that day, which was my first day of any responsibility in this field of health, as the Chairman of the Commission, not as a politician to try to have meaningful discussions.

I wasn't party in the contract, the contract had been arranged with the Cabinet of the day, and the medical profession, but I might say that we had a committee. It was a consultative committee and in fact I was the first chairman. It was pretty well the same as my honourable friend mentioned. The chairmanship was going to rotate, you'd have to have a meeting at least once a month. And I remember the first meeting; I even tried to suggest that we would have just the members of the committee so we could really let our hair down and talk about the problems, and the intention was to try to defuse the problems before they became problems, or before they became serious enough that nothing could be done about them. Well, Mr. Chairman, that didn't work, it was felt that the Secretary of the medical profession, and therefore, the Secretary of the Commission, should attend. And I remember that we said, well, we'll meet in different places, we'll even meet at the homes, to be very informal and not afraid to really trust each other and to see if anything could be done to improve the situation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it wasn't that difficult. First of all, it doesn't matter. It might not be popular to say this, but the MMA is some sort of a union, that negotiates for its members and even, which is more of a union, it negotiates for the doctors, . the medical doctors that are hired by the government, and that made it quite difficult. Mr. Chairman, I might say — I'm not criticizing that — but I might say that those that are on the executive most of the time are the most militant of the medical profession, and I don't have to name names. I'm not saying all of them and I'm not saying that's bad, and many of them have recognized the MMA as some sort of a union for the medical profession.

But here are some of the problems that we had with this committee. First of all, the then president sent letters to all the members of the Association, and I remember a certain time when there was an accusation at the Commission, something that was never brought to this Committee, and that came out the very day that we were going to hold a meeting and this was brought to his attention, and he said, "Well, after all, you know, my job is political, and you people are politicians. You know

what it's all about. I had to do it." Well, Mr. Chairman, with this kind of a relationship and with this kind of attitude I don't think that any committee will work.

Then there was another time where we had invited a certain group of doctors at a hospital, and I don't remember what specialty they were in right now, to discuss their problem, and it was the way they should be paid. So we invited them, and the day that they were to come in two of them were contacted by the medical profession, by the MMA I should say, and told not to attend. The secretary had not been at this meeting where we had made these arrangements but the two representatives of the MMA were there and another doctor was left cooling his heels all morning. He was never called because it was felt that that's something that had to be negotiated later on and it shouldn't be included in any discussions. So that meant that wages or anything like that that might have to be discussed at another meeting for a contract should not be discussed at the time.

Then there were other times that finally we pointed at the minutes, and then by the request of the MMA it was felt that there shouldn't be any more minutes so we would have nothing to go on because that seemed to be damaging to their cause. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that it became quite difficult.

You know, I think I'm reversing stands with my honourable friend. I really think this is more important than Parties, and I would like to very, very seriously, and very honestly, sincerely discuss and try to help my honourable friend because he says that this contract isn't signed, and I don't think I would be doing my duty of trying to get him off base, of trying to play games with him like he did when I was the Minister of Health, and God knows that he did use that confrontation many, many times.

And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that then we brought in — it was in Gynecology I think, that we had something — there was a discussion between the rural members of the medical profession and the urban members, and they had made studies and so on, and we were ready to act and nothing could be done because politically the MMA were in problems because of internal politics, Mr. Chairman. And that exists. I'm not saying any of this to criticize. I'm saying how difficult it is for anybody, even if your intentions are very good, to progress in a state like that.

So Mr. Chairman, there was another problem. The MMA wanted us that we couldn't move in this field in anything at all — and I would imagine that that will be part of the agreement, or at least they will request that, and I would like the Minister to listen because that might cause him a problem later on — that he could not move on anything unless he got in touch, or the Commission got in touch with the MMA and asked them to send on any committees or anything, of sending somebody on that committee, a member requesting. And we did that in many cases, in most cases, especially the last little while. But that is also very difficult, Mr. Chairman, because we found that the members of the MMA were afraid to let their hair down, to really discuss what they felt, because they felt that they were not sent there as an individual but they always represented the MMA, and nothing could be done. They were even afraid to give us advice in case that later on — to take part in the full discussion — because later on it might have been felt by the membership that the membership didn't go along with that. So that caused very many problems. And if anything was done, if you were going to bring legislation, or if you were thinking of something and this was done, you would have to wait forever. There would be very little participation from this member, but he would carry the problems, or he would go back to the Association and tell them what the government had intended to do and it would take a long time before you could get advice. I don't know if my honourable friend realizes or understands what I'm saying, but it made it fairly, fairly difficult.

So there were many times, and I know that they didn't always like that, that we selected a doctor, the government or the Commission, because I pursued that when I became the Minister, and we selected some members of the MMA, but as individuals' and we asked them to sit on this committee where they could give us their advice and we could profit from their knowledge, but they didn't have to report to the MMA and get the okay from the MMA before they could say anything. So, Mr. Chairman, mark my words, the Minister will have the same difficulty.

Now there's only one difference between the time that I was a Minister and the Minister now, that he is very fortunate, very fortunate that they can keep their battles private, and this wasn't done in the days that I was the Minister. It wasn't done — mind you, I attended many meetings of the Ministers of Health all across the country, and they had the same problem — but here in Manitoba, it's just like if there had been a wall around Manitoba and all the problems were the fault of the Socialists, of the NDP Government. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that this was most unfair. Then I became the Minister of Health after the By-election in 1974, and during that period of time or just previously to that the MMA had been accepted, been declared — the courts had ruled that the MMA would, in fact, represent the members of the medical profession that were hired by the government — and before we could even start negotiating it was all over the Press and so on

that the MMA were considering this a dress rehearsal, I might say, and they were going to get ready for hard bargaining for the big battle when we were going to deal with the Fee-for-Service that was so important for all the members of the profession, but for approximately 70 or 80 or 90, whatever, of the members of the profession that we had working for us, they did the negotiating.

And, Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to listen to this because this is where it really started that we had a confrontation. I asked to meet with the MMA. I finally went right in the lion's den because it was considered that. My name was mud by then. Right at the meeting, at the Fort Garry, I also offered to answer questions and I wasn't allowed, and they were not allowed to ask questions.

Now Mr. Chairman, we finally put an ad in the paper because our story wasn't coming across where we stated exactly what the increase would be, and I don't dare take a guess but it was a very, very high increase, and my honourable friend has his staff sitting in front of him that can give him this information, and I think it was very, very high. In some cases, if I remember right, it might have been around 30 or something, or even higher in some cases. And you know, when this appeared in the newspaper, well then it wasn't that anymore, it was something else. And you know what it was, Mr. Chairman, it was the hiring out and a lot of members of the medical profession didn't even understand that. A lot of members of the association did not understand that because they came to me, "What are you people trying to do? You don't want us to opt in or opt out," and it had nothing to do with that. Hiring out meant that the government could not hire any members of the medical profession, any doctors, without the permission and without the chance of veto of the MMA, which I am sure my honourable friend would agree with me, it doesn't make sense. And I don't know of any other government that has that. I don't mind anybody trying to have that, but was that confrontation in being firm and saying, no, this will never happen. And my honourable friends remember that it was so generous that there was a bit of a rift in Cabinet in those days because it was felt that I had been too generous and I think my honourable friends remember, the Minister of Labour wasn't too pleased with me. I'm not talking out of turn because I think that came out with some of the words that we had here in the House.

So, Mr. Chairman, we had a very very liberal, very generous settlement but the first confrontation was because they wanted to get ready, they were going to put this government — and I inherited that, Mr. Chairman — they were going to put this government in its place and they were going to start getting ready to really take a firm stand in the next negotiations.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I made another mistake. I tried too hard and I hope that the Minister will listen and not make the same mistake. Oh, and I might say this, that when I was the Minister, I had to deal with the chairman of the association who was there for only one year and in every instance, I had to try to discuss with him, I had meetings with him, and then when he finally realized that I was a human being the same as anybody else and maybe I wasn't all bad and I didn't want to hurt every doctor, he was replaced by another militant and I had to start all over again and it made it quite difficult.

Mr. Chairman, the next one, it was another mistake, there was a Dr. Abbott who was the chairman, who was the president of the MMA. He came over to see me, and I might say that any request that I had from the chairman of the time, I don't remember any time that he didn't walk right into the office or that he wasn't told to come right in if he wanted to see me. Now, we both made a mistake. The good doctor was being criticized for not being militant enough, he wasn't the type really, with the government, of fighting with the government, of embarrassing this government, and trying to have a settlement. He came directly and he said, you know, I took a chance, I still think that maybe we could work out something, why don't you and I straighten this thing out? It was quite difficult because the negotiating should have been done by the Commission and the Commission was doing some of that but the doctor, the president, wanted to settle this thing right at the top between the two of us. And we tried, Mr. Chairman. I remember that their request at the time was — and correct me if I am wrong, and ask your staff — but it was for 40.2 percent increase in one year. My honourable friend will remember — I won't repeat his words — when I told him that, he told me what he would have told them. Well, all right, Mr. Chairman, this was the request. Then I told the president that I felt that if we could push it fairly fast, I felt that I could probably get out of Cabinet, which probably I wasn't acting like a responsible Minister, I should have discussed that before, but I wanted to settle it too and I thought that I could convince the Cabinet to give . . . and that's after discussion with the Commission, mind you, that we could go up to 13 percent. If we had set on that, they would have had 13 percent across the board.

But unfortunately the AIB came in. They didn't get the 42 percent that they wanted; they didn't even get the 13 percent that I had said in all confidence to the President of the MMA, that I felt we could get for them. And 13 percent isn't bad; the Minister should know that now because of the increase that he himself had given.

So then the battle then because of AIB; there wasn't too much that they could do. If you remember, my leader at the time wasn't very popular with the labour group because he agreed to go along with the Federal Government's AIB, and you remember that the labour wasn't too pleased with it. And he said, well, we're going to go all across the board though and the statement had been by the AIB, the decision had been that there should be a maximum of \$2,400.00. We felt this would be it.

Now, the medical profession felt, well, that should be done collectively, they could average themselves. In other words, one doctor might get \$4,000 or \$5,000 and another one less, but the average would be \$2,400.00. Well, because of the example that we wanted to go, because it was dealing with the public where the individual wasn't allowed more because of that, I would imagine, one of the reasons, and because it was felt by Cabinet that it was a good decision, that it was fair, we didn't budge from that. We said, all right, it is going to be the individual, we'll have to go to \$2,400.00. And we said that we would review that the next year.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the contract expired on December 31 and if I remember right, on January 7, seven days after the expiration of the contract, there was a big meeting of the MMA, they closed their shop and then they went on record at that time, because they didn't have a contract — seven days — and we weren't fighting with the increase because that was taken out of our hands. It was that that we were discussing and there was a threat — the threat didn't come from the government — the threat came from the MMA originally, that said, we were going to withdraw, if we don't get this, we are going to withdraw our service from the patients.

All right, I guess you could call it confrontation; you can call it leadership; you can call it responsibility, but a few days after we called a meeting and we made the statement, in fact we had to do something, there was a threat that they would close the offices and there was a chance of really wrecking this program and having a profession saying, well, you are elected, you have the responsibility, but we are going to decide. A statement was made that no, you, in conscience, you haven't the right to withdraw from your patients. You fought for fee-for-service, you didn't want to be on salary and nothing had been changed under the NDP government, nothing at all. There was no change in the legislation at all. It was felt that fine, if you are going to withdraw service, you will withdraw from the government program, but then you will opt out. Of course it came out in the news and the members of the opposition pushed the fact that I was inviting people to opt out and that wasn't the case at all. I was explaining to them that we were doing the best that we could and this what we were ready to pay for those who wanted to work within the plan and if they didn't, well, it was unfortunate but their next choice was to opt out and deal directly with their patients. They wouldn't be worse than before. And that was the big battle, Mr. Chairman. And that was that we heard confrontation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it was that group, I think at the top of the ladder — it is natural, it is their right — but there is a much bigger percentage, I am sure that nobody will question that, that would support the party of my honourable friend than the party that I belong to. And this is exactly what happened. They went all out and I think they were probably one of the groups that was instrumental in having the change of government that we hear of so often, Mr. Chairman.

They didn't do any better under the next government, but what could they do? What could they criticize? You know, this is what I am saying. The Minister then doesn't get this. He keeps on saying, you know, there is consultation, not confrontation, and he has had exactly the same problem and now he sees what it is all about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 12:30, I am now leaving the Chair and will return at 2:30 this afternoon.