

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 4, 1973

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this afternoon, I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 37 students of the Senior Grade of the Grant-Deuel Hi-School South Dakota, under the direction of Mr. Clow and Mrs. Nelson. This school is guest of the Honourable Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, I bid you welcome.

The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie.

STATEMENT

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I know it's unusual to interrupt the proceedings in this manner but I would ask the House for leave to make a statement. (Agreed)

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the question period in the questioning of the government, I used the name of Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Moats in connection with a trip on a government plane to Norway House. My informant still stands by his statement, but however, Mr. Moats said he did not make the trip so therefore I withdraw the use of his name and apologize for using his name. This is not to say that I condone the use of government planes for political trips.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the withdrawal that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has made with respect to Harvey Moats seems to be a grudging one, leaving the implication that only because Mr. Moats says he wasn't there the statement is being withdrawn. That, Sir, is a grudging withdrawal and perhaps is useless in the circumstances. We are advised that Mr. Moats has not been to Norway House under any means of locomotion, whether it be aircraft or by automobile or by rowboat. Whether or not the honourable member condones the use of aircraft for what he calls a political purpose, may well have to do with public purpose, and that of course is another question which was entered into yesterday.

SUPPLY - HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. I believe you had ten minutes left. Oh. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I haven't got too many remarks but I have remarks of a different nature to the opinions that have been expressed so far. They are somewhat of my own but I feel nevertheless they're my feelings and I think they represent the feelings of the people in my constituency, and I think I should express them for that reason. And the budget in Manitoba we're spending in this department has been going up continually ever since this government took power. And I'm referring in particular to the Barber Commission's Report where it says, "Welfare programs cost has doubled in the last five years. Our increase has been going up faster than other provinces' and yet we still seem to have . . ." It says here in the same headline that one in four Manitobans are what you classified as 'poor' under this report.

Now I know Professor Barber is the man who is responsible for this report -- (Interjection) -- He's a professor at the University. I understand he's a very highly paid man. By my information he's getting \$29,500 for his work at the University and he isn't putting in too awful much time there, although I won't try to tie this down. I'm wondering what he's getting for writing this report and what the report has also cost in other ways with his assistants and what other help he had, because I feel he's brought out a very poor report. It's a report, in my opinion, to make you think that Manitoba, that everybody around here is suffering, and I think regardless of how much howling people are doing, that they're having it pretty darn good. And even the people that are on welfare, even though they aren't classified in the same wage bracket as others, they haven't the same type of expense and I think possibly if there was a little bit more management in some of their homes, which I realize is very difficult to make and force on them, but I don't really think they're what you call poor. And I wonder what you call "poor" because what might be poor to somebody in Winnipeg that's raising a family, even though he may have a fair job he may be really suffering more hardship than somebody, we'll say, in the

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) northern community where they shoot deer and have a lot of fish and can live off the fruit and berries and things like this that they do. So really they don't suffer. They probably get their fuel from right around where they are by cutting down trees. They don't pay rent, and there's so many other things to classify. And I think to get the idea that you can equalize things right across the board -- Mr. Chairman, I wonder could you stop these fellows here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. HENDERSON: It's just if they want to speak I wish they'd take their turn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw to the honourable members' attention our House Rule.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. HENDERSON: Oh I'm sorry. Oh, I thought the last order was for me to stop, that you wanted to make more remarks, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rule 44 of our own House Rules. No member, and that means members as well, shall engage in private conversation in such a manner as to interrupt the business of the House. Now I caution members. Show a bit of courtesy when an honourable member is on the floor and is making a contribution to this House. -- (Interjections) -- And if they wish to have private conversations that are going to be of such a nature as to disturb the business of the House, I am going to ask them to leave the Chamber and go elsewhere. -- (Interjection) --

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that and I also agree with you that I think it's something we should do when all members are speaking.

I also want to comment on what the Minister of Health and Social Development seems to think he can do by taking from one and giving to the other in a Robin Hood style, but he seems to think that this is just what we need to make a country function perfectly. In fact, he was so interested in that during his first years he made a trip over to Sweden and had quite an extensive study over there, we hope, because it cost the taxpayers enough money. And some of the things that I read about the way things are going in Sweden, and I have some of them here, I'd just like to read a few of the remarks into the record here. And it says that -- they're talking about their word for the pure socialism that has succeeded in sending 83,000 people a year to the Mental Hospitals and this is -- they're talking about Sweden. And responsible for the world's largest per capita consumption of alcohol. And then it goes on to say that the society is harsh and their citizens are required to work even harder to pay for the heavy taxed consumer goods and prices such as government housing.

So in other words they've got so many handouts there that it isn't doing any of them any good and that the people that are working have just been overtaxed to support the people that are gone. Just like the program that you seem to be working towards here. Now I don't think, in all sincerity, that -- (Interjection) -- yes I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): The honourable member is mentioning Sweden. I was just wondering if he would acknowledge that Sweden has the highest per capita income in Europe by about at least \$1,500 per annum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the statement of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, but it isn't really what the payroll is, it's what it will get you and what's taken off it and your expenses you have. And if you have a big payroll and your lifestyle has to be such that it's not worthwhile and there's so many people going mental and there's so much, well there's all sorts of things about Sweden here. -- (Interjection) -- But that's no better for society.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order. Now I think we've had our funny half hour. Let's get on with the business of the House. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that I was trying to make is that you can't just equalize things across the board. Sweden has tried it and it failed. Russia has tried it and it hasn't been successful, and we've had a -- we're trying it here and this here very fact of what the Barber Commission states, although I don't agree with him completely, it says that it has doubled and it says one in four is poor. And we're giving away a lot more in the way of things in social welfare and social development than we ever were. And I don't -- you see, when you bring them up the other class moves up, so you always have the poor with you. And

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) I'm not one of these that says that because somebody is out on a farm and their net income isn't \$4,000 that they're actually poor. They may be having a quality of life that's equal to the Premier's, or anybody else's. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm quite sure that you people are aware that the salary that you get doesn't really reflect the quality of life that you have, and I think that a lot of these people that are poor they aren't even concerned. They don't really seem to think they're poor and in fact maybe --

A MEMBER: They live better than we do.

MR. HENDERSON: They're living better than we do. That's just the way I put it. And I think whenever you get a professor, and I'm not knocking Professor Barber in particular, although I guess probably it sounds that way . . .

A MEMBER: How about Cy Gonick over there?

MR. HENDERSON: When you get professors to write a report, they may be all right in their own academic field but whenever you get them to look into anything they'll always come up with spending more money. And the main reason I think they come up with spending more money is because of some set of circumstances that I don't approve of; an awful lot of them draw such big salaries for doing so little, and I think that when they think that everybody else is suffering and are poverty-stricken it's just because they're comparing it to their own salary, you know.

A MEMBER: How about the Independents?

MR. HENDERSON: I don't know about the Independents. I'm pretty sure that you should be aware of just what I'm saying, coming from the area where you are, that there's many people that haven't such a big income but which still have a good quality of life. So I'm concerned that the department's headed in the direction it is. Manitoba is leading, almost leading the field in expenses per capita spent on welfare and that, and yet our increase -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the Member for Churchill is forever . . . Flin Flon, I'm sorry. Is forever interrupting and he can get up and have his say whenever he wants to. I don't know what he's trying to prove. At any rate I know that it's a very difficult department to handle. I realize that the Minister is trying to get people off the welfare roll and trying to get them employed and I appreciate that, and even though when you do surveys maybe you'll find 3.5 percent that's abusing it but then there's another 3.5 that you never caught up with, we're sure of that, so that amounts to a lot of money. And as you say, I don't suppose they're the only ones abusing privileges or spoiling a good program.

But I feel that this Minister is so devoted and carried away with his own ideas of being able to be Santa Claus to everybody and that he's going to be able to fix them all up, he has really got the wrong idea and that he's going to turn us into a place where we're just going to have more and more socialism and more and more of a welfare state, you could call it. And I'm very concerned about this because I'm of the opinion that a society that grows up, where people work and have to accomplish the things that they want in life, that it's a better type of society. And I think if a country later on destroys itself, it's destroyed from within rather than from without, and when you get that everybody's depending on the government payroll and for handouts and you have groups sitting around thinking about what we can get from the government and not what we can do for ourselves, I think your country's headed in the wrong direction and I feel this is the direction the present Minister is taking.

A MEMBER: The comes the one gallon of Premier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin, Point of privilege has been raised. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, the Member for Charleswood had made some reference to myself and perhaps it is one that requires some answer. I didn't quite understand my honourable friend. Did he have a question?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of privilege, I think that it is one that you would agree . . . that no one is recognized unless he is recognized initially by you as of making any statements in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Roblin. There is no point of order or point of privilege before the House at this time. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I thank you and I'd like to put a few comments into the record as we review the estimates of the Minister of Health and Social Development, whereby

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) he's asked for approval of an expenditure of some \$196 or 197 million. And I would like to first of all associate myself with the remarks of the Honourable Minister today where he praised his Deputy Minister.

I think that this government and some of these Ministers have finally found out that some of the civil servants who have been around in this place for a long time through various governments, have many skills and talents and abilities and they don't have to drag in these red-eyed supporters from other jurisdictions to run the business of this province. The civil service of this jurisdiction has been a good one for many many years and it was still a good civil service until this government came along and thought that some of our senior civil servants couldn't carry the ball, and they start dumping them just like flies and bringing in some of their own philosophers and believers and those that are dedicated to that party. But I'm glad that the Minister today finally recognized that there are people in this province that have been here for many years in his department, that have the ability to stand up and be a Deputy Minister, and in fact he said he thought he had the best Deputy Minister of all the departments of government. I congratulate the Minister for making that statement. -- (Interjection) -- Certainly, certainly. That's what I said, if the Honourable First Minister will give me a chance to say it, that we have one of the top civil service of all Canada right here in this province and I ask this government to make use of them, make full use of their talents and their skills and their ability, and not start dragging in your philosophers and your dreamers and your economists from other jurisdictions who are not going to add anything to the people of this province nor direct us properly as we should be directed.

Mr. Speaker, my next comment would like to deal with the matter of free Medicare and I think that it's something that has to be discussed in the Minister's Estimates at this time when we're moving into this field, and I don't think there's any quarrel with it at the present time, but what are the rights of the individual when he's not paying any premium? Has he got the right to go and see his own doctor? Have you got to go right to any hospital? Because as long as he's not contributing his dollars and cents out of his own pocket into a certain plan such as this is, what is the rights of the individual with this plan? -- (Interjection) -- I'm just asking this Minister and this government to reply to me, or if the First Minister will give me a chance, to get my comments into the record, and I think there's many people of this province today because I've had many inquiries made of me. When the average citizen is not contributing even five cents towards his health care, what rights has he got?

Now secondly, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask of the honourable Minister what rights now have the local hospital boards got in this plan for health care. Have they got the rights that they had before? Are some of their rights being denied? Have they any jurisdiction over their local communities, their local hospitals, their local nursing homes, under those rights now that it's all been transferred to the department. And these are questions that's been asked of me day after day and I'm sure the Honourable the Minister will give us some answers in his reply.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most talked about diseases in our province, of course, is cancer, and it's a problem, I think, of all the jurisdictions of Canada and, I daresay, the world today. I'm wondering what type of support that the Minister provides for the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation and what kind of dollars are being expended to help those people that are doing this most important research of this terrible disease which seems to hit every home on many occasions, and while research is continually bringing up new ideas and new thoughts, I hope that the day will come, I'm sure everybody will associate himself with me, that we will finally find a cure for this dreadful disease of cancer.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask of the Honourable Minister, is the Red Cross and the blood transfusion service, and I see from time to time that the blood banks are running at - well, I think last winter at one time there it reached a critical stage, the blood banks were down low, and I wonder if the Minister can explain to the House like how his department works with the Red Cross and are they adding more incentives and more dollars to help this most worthwhile facet of our medical care?

One other point, Mr. Speaker, and I see in the Minister's Estimates here in mental health, the care and treatment of the mentally ill, there's some \$12 million; in the care and the treatment of the mentally retarded there's some \$7 million; but I have had occasion to have it drawn to my attention that we haven't got enough people, where people have problems of mental health

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) and they want to phone up at 10 or 12 o'clock at night and get somebody to help them with their problem, which is a matter that has come up very quickly on them and it's a matter that needs almost immediate attention, but I'm told that people today can't phone up to the mental health centre and get that kind of expertise or knowledge to help them meet the challenge that they need at, say, 12 o'clock or 1:00 o'clock in the morning. In fact some days, sometimes I'm told it's referred to the next day which is in some cases too late for those people that experience those types of problems.

Mr. Speaker, while the First Minister is in his Chair I'd like to take serious concern with his speech in Grandview of some two weeks ago where he made certain allegations and certain charges against me personally, and went on and used certain language that was I don't think fair to the people of the constituency, and in fact if the press reports are accurate, and I've checked it out in several sources and I guess those speeches, the speech that the Minister made is well documented in the record. He went so far as to say that I was a b,s'er, and now in this campaign, Mr. Chairman, some of the allegations that's been laid in the House that this dirt is coming from the Minister of Agriculture, but I submit to you very carefully this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that the First Minister set the pattern in Grandview in that speech that night. And I'd like to read into the record some of the remarks of the Honourable the First Minister in Grandview that night, Mr. Chairman, if you'll permit me. And I'll try and read it. "Manitoba" - and I'm quoting a certain speech that the Honourable the First Minister made in Grandview wherein he said: "Manitoba politicians died and went to hell and they were given the choice of spending eternity in flames or in manure. All chose manure." Mr. Speaker, it turned out that there were . . .

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. A point of privilege has been raised. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, those are not my words. That has no relation whatsoever to what I said at the meeting. If my honourable friend is quoting, he must be quoting someone else, not me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. McKENZIE: I'll read it into the record what was said. -- (Interjection) -- Well, there's the Premier's picture. "Schreyer Campaigning".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister on a point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That, Sir, just will not wash. My picture may be on that particular page of newspaper but my honourable friend, if he's going to quote someone he'd better indicate who he's quoting. It certainly is not me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, may I for clarification explain to the First Minister the comments are by Mr. Richard Purser and it's his comments on who was there and I'm reading.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister. Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that will not wash either. Mr. Purser, I do not believe, ever indicated anywhere in that article that I was the author or the speaker of that particular quotation. That is someone else. And the Honourable Member for Grandview had better make it clear, I've had no relationship whatsoever to that particular quotation.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I will quote. I will quote certain things that are in italics in the First Minister's speech, and I'll move up two clauses from the one that I was quoting from, and here's a remark of the First Minister and it's in quotations. "Like hell it does, Mr. Schreyer said, after reading the letter aloud." Then in quotation marks again, "At the risk of offending the ladies, it's all a bunch of b.s." That was the charge and the allegation that was made by the First Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege I certainly claim, I claim authorship for that, and it should be put in the full context. I'm quite prepared to table every

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) letter that the Member for Roblin has written to the Minister of Health and his interventions with the Department of Welfare asking for welfare payments to individuals. All that, Sir, is the total context, and it should be put on the record instead of talking one place against welfare and other places asking for welfare.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, is that a point of privilege or a point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to get to the letter because I found the letter and I've got it and I'm prepared to table it today in all good faith, and I hope the Honourable the First Minister will let me read into the record my side of the story which he didn't give me a chance in Grandview. He attacked me at a level that I didn't think any politician would attack another politician. And let me read the story that the Honourable the First Minister told at Grandview.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I'm calling for order so that the honourable member can proceed. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Roblin is the only person that has been recognized at this time. Order.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, it went on, the story, and I'll try and paraphrase it back where they all chose the manure, and it turned out that they were into varying depths according to their sins. Mr. Schreyer was up to his ankles; he looked down . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think the point is well taken. The Honourable First Minister has stated and stood in his place and I think it's well documented in Beauschêne, that when an honourable member stands in his place in this House and says that he is, what he is stating, is not the author of the remarks, it has to be accepted by all members of this House. Now the honourable member . . . The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Just so it is clear to you, Sir. I have stated and I repeat that I do claim and acknowledge authorship of the references to my honourable friend's letters he has written to the Minister of Health, and those letters can be tabled and his other interventions with the Department of Welfare. There is no question about that part of what my honourable friend is quoting. But, Sir, he is attempting to also quote and leave the impression, falsely, that I was the utterer of the other reference in that article with respect to some analogy or joke or whatever, and I, Sir, had nothing to do with that; that was another speaker. And he should indicate who that was. It was not I.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I'm just reading from an article out of a paper and it's a quotation whether the Minister said it or some other member.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order. The Member for Roblin has been here a few years. He knows or surely he knows that the rules require that if you are going to quote, you must indicate the source and the speaker who was being quoted, and he has so far in his last five minutes still failed to reveal who was being quoted in that particular reference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the same point of order.

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order, I believe the House and you yourself, Sir, recognize that the practice has been from time to time to utilize the reportage that we receive via our news media. The Honourable Member from Roblin has indicated the source of the article that he is reporting from, namely one Mr. Purser who reports for the Free Press, who I assume was attending the -- (Interjection) -- or the Tribune, pardon me, attending the meeting. That has been publicly acknowledged by the Honourable Member for Roblin and I think, Mr. Chairman, that he has every license, every license to continue in the vein of the speech that he is making having acknowledged that he is attributing these remarks that he is now reading into the record as having coming to him by virtue of this particular report in this particular newspaper. I think if there was a question of privilege it would resolve around the fact of whether or not he was prepared to acknowledge where his source of information came from and where his speech material came from. But the Honourable Member from Roblin is doing that, he is referring specifically to a meeting that was attended to by the press, and he is referring to a specific reportage by the press of that meeting. He made that statement initially, I concur, at the urging of the First Minister, but having made that he surely is quite within his rights to continue in referring back to that material to the extent that he chooses to.

MR. SCHREYER: Speaking further to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside is correct in much of the points that he makes but that is not what is at issue, Sir.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) What is at issue, it is not as though I am indicating or challenging the accuracy of the report as reported by Mr. Purser. That is not at issue. I'm not suggesting that that is an error, it is simply that the Member for Roblin is attempting to quote and put on the record something which he implies or leaves by innuendo as a quotation reported by Mr. Purser of my remarks, and that particular passage, Sir, does not come from my lips and the Honourable Member for Roblin should indicate as parliamentary practice and Beauchesne's citations require. If one is going to quote someone, one must indicate whom he is quoting. That's all I ask and the rules require that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken and I would refer the honourable member to Citation 157 -- Order, please. I would refer the honourable member to Citation 157 (3) - sub (3): "It is out of order to read extracts into a debate if they refer to other debate during the same session or to a question not under discussion," May 317, 318. Bourinot, page 336. "(b) to reflect upon the proceedings or any determination of the House, Standing Order 35, Contain unparliamentary expressions" and it goes on and on and on. "to make personal allegations derogatory to members." Now I think this is the point. You can't use writings or quotations to buttress an argument.

MR. GREEN: . . . differing opinions that are being advanced and we wouldn't want a ruling that doesn't reflect on what is being argued. All that the First Minister is saying is that sure he has a right to quote but if he is quoting something that was said by one person he shouldn't leave the inference that it was said by another person. The honourable member is reading a quote which the First Minister says he did not make, he acknowledged that somebody should make, and all he's asking the Member for Roblin to do is to say who made it, that's all.

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order. Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that that point has now indelibly impressed upon the member's mind and he will within short order make that correction that the First Minister has asked and quote properly and correctly from the sources that . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Before we proceed I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have five students of Grade 10 standing of the Garden Will School, Island Lake, Manitoba, under the direction of Mr. Mariash. This school is located in the Churchill constituency.

Also where we have 25 students of the In-Service Teacher Training under the direction of Mr. Melnyk. This group is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rossmere, the First Minister of the House.

On behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly, I bid you welcome.
The Honourable Member for Roblin.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE Cont'd

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will withdraw the allegation that the remarks were from the Honourable the First Minister, but I will not withdraw the remarks, the fact that it was a member of his government that made the statement and the First Minister was present when the allegation was made. And, Mr. Speaker, I'll either go farther and even read into the record the First Minister's comments regarding this story that was told at that meeting.

A MEMBER: He who travels in manure cannot help but be stuck with it.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, if I can go back to the story, and it's an interesting story and I think it should go in the record, and especially at this time with an election, when the allegations have been laid at the desk of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, who's going to start this dirty election campaign. It's quite evident that the First Minister and one of his other Ministers of government started a long time before the Minister of Agriculture started that type of campaigning. Mr. Chairman, I'll go back where they all chose the manure and I think that's about the fourth time I've been at that point. It turned out that they were in to varying depths according to their sins.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order please. Order please. I think I've made it quite clear to the honourable member and I think it's been made quite clear by the temper of this House that the honourable member should identify the source. Who made the statement? Now is the

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) honourable member going to do it or is he not? -- (Interjection) -- ORDER. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's quite likely - would the Minister. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Either the member is going to identify the source or I'm going to ask him to sit down.

MR. McKENZIE: It's the Minister of Municipal Affairs apparently that made the allegation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. McKENZIE: In the presence of the First Minister. And the First Minister commented on it later, which I'll read into the record for the benefit of the members. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, we'll go back to "they all chose the manure again" for about the fourth or fifth time. It turned out that they were in to varying depths according to their sins. Mr. Schreyer was up to his ankles. He looked around with satisfaction to see Mr. Warner Jorgenson was up to his neck and Harry Enns up to his chest.

MR. ENNS: Never. Never.

MR. McKENZIE: But he was astonished to see Izzy Asper was only up to his knees and demanded an explanation of Satan. He is standing on Sidney Spivak's shoulders, Satan replied. And, Mr. Speaker, then comes the interesting part of the story. And Mr. Schreyer complimented Mr. Pawley for his contribution. Mr. Schreyer complimented Mr. Pawley for his contribution.

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I know that sometimes it is difficult to tell whether the Honourable Member for -- and I'm speaking on privilege -- whether the Honourable Member for Roblin is saying something in serious vein or whether he is saying it in a bantering manner, but certainly if he is now saying that I complimented my colleague on that, I must tell him that that is not the sequence of the meeting and how it went. My honourable friend of course cannot read between the lines, but I don't want the impression to be left on the record that the reason I complimented my colleague -- and I have many reasons to compliment my colleague and colleagues -- but it wasn't in the context of that particular passage. Let that be clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): I appreciate the opinion of the First Minister on several occasions during the last few moments but I would remind you, Sir, that we are on the Health and Welfare Estimates and this is the first opportunity that the Honourable Member for Roblin has had to refute statements made by the -- at that meeting to do with Health and Welfare matters. He spoke of the -- in fact he has made the comment today that he's prepared to table the letters that the Honourable Member for Roblin has written. Sir, I suggest to you that it is the right and the privilege of the Honourable Member for Roblin to write those letters, and for the First Minister to make the suggestion in this House I think it's below his dignity to do so. That's his job, Sir, and he's written those letters on behalf of the constituents, the troubled constituents, and I don't see why the First Minister should be making that threat today. He can table mine too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . point of order, then I will reply to the point of order, speak further to the point of order. Of course, of course it is the right and function of the Honourable Member for Roblin, or any other constituency, to write to the Minister of Health, or any other Minister, with respect to any other, with respect to any matter of public policy or individual citizen distress, and if the honourable member has that right, which he has, then we have the right to defend ourselves against misleading accusations. In the context of that I will take opportunity to speak during the debate of the Estimates of this Department to indicate the extent to which it is necessary to defend against inconsistency of criticism and attack from honourable gentlemen opposite. That's all that's at issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Same point of order?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order there now emerges a much more serious aspect to the point of order. Because members of the Opposition from time to time choose in a general policy way to make critical comments about how a government department is functioning, or whether or not they feel that a direction taken by government policy is advisable or not, this government has now heard by the words coming from the First Minister's

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) own mouth, is prepared to violate in my judgment privileged confidential efforts on the part of every one of us, particularly those in opposition, when we write on behalf of our constituents for certain pieces of action, and use them politically against us and hold them up to political ridicule. Because the Conservative Party by and large has made a position and has stood for the fact that there is welfare abuse in our province, and I think it is acknowledged by all that there is, it's a question of degree, and we all attempt to try to resolve that abuse. But, Sir, it is, I suggest, the first time that the First Minister has delved into the private files or into the files of this Minister's office to pick out individual letters that members of the Opposition have written on behalf of worthy constituents, not the ones that we're concerned with, and held them up to ridicule and to abuse, and held them up to a challenge to the Party for saying how inconsistent we are. Sir, the Conservative Party has never said there are not people in this province not worthy of help. The Conservative Party has instituted the finest welfare system into this province, and the kind of tactics employed by the First Minister in the speeches and in the tactics that he employed in Grandview, unfortunately reveals a depth that he is prepared to go to politically at the expense of people most worthy of help is - Sir, that begs a great deal of question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, there is of course always a demand from the other side that we practice more disclosure, as though we aren't, and of course the fact remains we are practicing more disclosure than ever. I am quite prepared to table any letter that I have ever written since I have held office as an MLA. My honourable friend should not ask for more disclosure but then all of a sudden want privileged treatment of confidentiality for their letters, as though their ox is being gored. They don't want the same treatment given their letters as what they demand of other people's letters. That's point number one.

Point number two, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the nature of a threat. All that is involved is an attempt of self-defence to indicate the extreme inconsistency of those who make speeches about welfare abuse and then are among the most prolific in letter writing asking for consideration for constituents for welfare. That's what's at issue.

MR. ENNS: . . . order before us. The question of privilege and order before us is that surely every member of this House, every member of this constituency, every member that serves his constituency, would be expected to write letters on behalf of what they deem to be deserving constituents in need of help. We expect on the other hand that they would be treated within - they would be adjudicated upon fairly and accurately by a confident civil service. But what the First Minister is attempting to do, that the very act of writing a letter, the very act of putting forward a petition somehow is inconsistent with our position here in the House. And that, Sir, is dirty pool, and that, Sir, is dirty politics, practiced by none other than the First Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If there is dirty pool it's on the part of those who speak one thing and practice another.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: For the further definition of "dirty pool" then I would like the Honourable Minister to reveal which letters he deems as advisable as to being released. Those only from this side, or those from that side, or what? Or only when he walks into political meetings in Grandview or specific opposition constituencies, and then decides to release letters that were written in good faith to the departments of this government asking for services that surely that all members, and all constituents, have the right to expect their members to write on behalf of their constituents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course there is no easy answer to that, to the question as to who is deserving, who is not deserving, is not as easily answered as one person, one MLA deciding that because so and so lives in his riding he's deserving, and all other people are not deserving, or most of them, or whatever. We have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that in all cases where honourable members, where they feel a sense of responsibility, which I do not fault them for, for writing on behalf of a constituent in distress, that there is, there is, there is . . .

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . there is an equal -- Mr. Speaker, there is an equal and counter-vailling onus on them of all cases where they believe that there is abuse, and there may well be, that they should advise us if it comes to their attention. They are to advise the appropriate regional director or the Minister, so that it can be checked out in a systematic way rather than any continuous maundering about abuse without any specifics to back it up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, to get back to the fact that the First Minister complimented the Minister of Municipal Affairs on his speech, I can ask him, did he reprimand him for making that speech in Grandview if he didn't compliment him? No, it's quite evident he didn't reprimand him, so therefore he stood there and listened to it in good faith and actually did compliment the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs for making that speech.

But, Mr. Speaker, my quarrel, my quarrel has been drawn to the attention of the House by the House Leader, the Deputy Leader of -- the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that I think it's darned unfair for the First Minister to go into the Minister of Health's office and take one of my letters that I wrote in good faith asking for help for the people in my constituency, and some welfare help. If I don't have those rights in this Legislature or with this government, then I say let's get rid of this government.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. McKENZIE: My gosh if MLAs, if members of this Legislature haven't got the authority to write to the Minister of Health in confidence and yet on this night in Grandview see the First Minister running around and reading my letters into the record in Grandview, then I say, Mr. Chairman, us MLAs in opposition haven't got many rights. And I'm prepared to table that letter that the quarrel is about because I have it with me today, and I finally found it, where I made the allegation last year in the House about a certain letter that I'd got, and it's not signed, a brochure went out in the constituency, but a certain person wrote and told me that in fact there were people out there that were -- a farmer in Garland with a well-equipped farm and about \$15,000 worth of cattle is now on welfare. I've got the letter. -- (Interjection) -- No, there's no signature on it. Well it came and I sent my letters out to my constituents. It goes on and, Mr. Speaker, and he said, thanks to the kind hearted welfare worker at Dauphin. It goes on and says, "welfare people with cars driving other people welfare recipients to Dauphin and collecting eight cents per mile," and it goes on and on and I'm prepared to table the letter. But I think it's very very . . . fair, Mr. Chairman, for the First Minister of this province to go out in the constituencies and take letters from some department because we wrote in in good faith about people that have problems in our constituency, and make an allegation that I was not telling the truth because it was a bunch of B. S. That's not true, and I want the First Minister to go right out in Grandview and tell the people in my constituency that I didn't -- I'm not that kind of an MLA, and I think it's damn cheap. I think that's the -- if we're going to have that kind of leadership from this government, it's very unfair, and I think it's not the kind of a First Minister that I want to lead this province. Maybe the First Minister had made it in the heat of debate or something, but I think it's very unfair to attack me in my own constituency about something that I can document everything and say it's a bunch of B. S.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like maybe a few minutes to deal with the two last speakers, and I'll start with the last one.

Actually there was quite an exchange of views between the Member for Roblin and the members on this side pertaining to a meeting in Grandview of which I didn't have the honour of attending. But I can recall quite clearly at the last session exactly, the date was June 16th, when the Honourable Member for Roblin did indicate what is contained within the letter that he's tabled now. I wrote to the honourable member and asked him to document it, and I wrote to him on the eighth of August, 1972, and he answered me on the 15th of August giving me the broad line at least of the letter, the unsigned letter that he got and saying that he would investigate and again be in touch with me. Well I'm still waiting. I'm still waiting to check on this so-called farmer with a \$15,000 a year income, and having received social assistance. I feel very bad for, you know, allegations that are made without any proof. I don't really like receiving anonymous letters, or anonymous phone calls, and I do get quite a few of them. I don't even bother reading anonymous letters. I don't like to even talk to people on the phone if they don't want to identify their names. At least we should have that dignity to let the other party know who we are.

SUPPLY - HEALTH Cont'd

(MR. TOUPIN Cont'd)

The honourable member made reference at the beginning of his remarks insofar as the Red Cross and blood banks, and so on, and the co-operation that can be expected from the Department of Health and Social Development. The Red Cross advises subscribers when they are in need of a special type of blood they go on drives, and they've received co-operation from different groups in society, and wholehearted support from the Department of Health and Social Development. We've been in touch with the Red Cross pertaining to their needs, not only pertaining to the blood bank. They've been in touch with us when they've found out of the increased financial component in our department pertaining to home care services, and so on. They've offered their services to help us deliver this new emphasis in home care as of the 1st of July, and thereafter. They have expertise that we can use and vice versa. There is a very good co-operation between the Department of Health and Social Development and the Red Cross.

The honourable member was making reference to the lack of crisis centres in the Province of Manitoba where one who feels that he's in need of advice pertaining to mentally retardates or other persons that are under a depression and so on, would like to call. There is always the hospital that individuals can call; there's always people, say at Brandon, at Portage Homes for Retardates, at Selkirk Hospital; there's always staff within the general or municipal hospitals in the Province of Manitoba; there is always the over 1,500 doctors that we have in the Province, there's always someone available. I know that I have my own phone number listed in the book and I get calls late in the evening. My Deputy Minister receives calls, and the doctors that we have working within our department are always available to individuals that feel that they are in need of advice.

I'd like to maybe dwell a few moments on the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Pembina. But since he's not in the House I'll withhold my -- oh I'm sorry. The Honourable Member for Pembina made reference to the increases in welfare and I indicated this morning when I spoke that there was not an increase, there was a major decrease in the amounts that are to be payable in social assistance in 1973-74. There has been a hefty decrease in social allowance paid in 1972-73. There has been a reduction of the amount of social allowance recipients at the responsibility of the Department of Health and Social Development. In the last fiscal year a hefty decrease. And I said the reason why we felt it may not be totally the reasons why, but the measures taken by this government have surely helped. I indicated that this morning, and I gave figures, and I gave figures not only on last year's budget pertaining to what we anticipate to be a surplus in regards to social allowance, but what is reflected within these estimates. And I did indicate this morning that if we were to go to the same services as offered in 1972-73 for 73-74, that we'd be asking for close to \$20 million less within our budget. I said that this morning, and I meant it. If you take the additional services offered, that I don't believe any member of this House would vote against . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River. A question? Oh the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe my remarks referred to what had happened in the budget in this last number of years where it says that the Welfare Program cost has doubled in the last five years. I didn't refer to it as last year and this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Now again we're coming back to the very thing that I pointed out before, earlier this afternoon. Members are getting up on the pretext of asking questions and then making political statements. Now I know this is the place for politics but we have House rules and no members shall interrupt any member while he's on the floor except for a point of order or a point of privilege. And if an honourable member yields the floor to a member, then it is on the proviso that he asks a question not to make a statement. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I do believe that I had yielded the floor for a question. I just have a few more remarks to make in regards to the contribution made by the Member for Pembina. I accept a . . . by the Member for Pembina in regards to his comments. I just want to make it very clear that there is certainly a very healthy decrease in the amounts that were paid in 1972/73 for social assistance as there is reflected in the Estimates of 1973/74. There may be a misgiving in a sense in regards to the amounts that appear on the Estimates themselves, being 196 million, I believe. There is a supplementary estimate that will bring the total amount to about 219 million, so you can keep that in mind. I did make that

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) point when I made my opening remarks, if you can recall, and I did give the reason why, you know, this increase and so on. If you take the new nursing home policies, and if you take the increase in to social allowance rates, if you take the Home Care Program, and if you take the Pharmacare Program for senior citizens, and so on, this is the reason why there was an increase, say from 190 million to 219 million in 1972/73.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member I believe posed a question, and here I'm talking about the Honourable Member for Pembina, and he asked who is considered poor in the Province of Manitoba? Well I have to agree with him having been myself raised on a farm and representing a rural area, that one can live with less than others and still not be considered poor. I personally was not brought up with a lot of money around me. I had to work for my education; I had to quit my studies young, work for a while and then go back to my studies, and this is considered, you know, was considered as being acceptable, you know a few years ago. Today, is somewhat different. I think a person, an individual is considered poor when he hasn't got the financial ability to meet basic needs. And when you haven't got the financial capability to meet your personal basic needs, and those that are responsible to you, well I think that you're considered in need. But we should never forget that a person is considered poor only because of the lack of financial resources. Individuals are considered poor for other reasons: Ill health, for those who are say, mentally retarded, for those who happen to commit a crime against society and had to serve a term in a correctional institution, those people are poor, not in the same sense. They need help, and help has to be given to them as a right in a sense. And this is why we have the different modes of treatment within the Department of Health and Social Development. That is my humble opinion as far as what I consider to be an individual who is poor not only financially.

I will be, Mr. Chairman, bringing data later on pertaining to the per capita cost per family in Manitoba in regards to social assistance as compared to other provinces in Canada and I think that this information will be worthwhile for all members of the House to bring back that information to their own constituencies to see exactly what has been done in the last five, ten years pertaining to the economy, pertaining to the needs of the, not only social allowance recipients, the working poor, and what has been done in all the rural areas and the north in the Province of Manitoba. I hope to be able to have this, if not this afternoon by Monday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Is it in order to ask what Professor Barber got for his work and writing his — what he got paid for, for preparing his report?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know offhand what the, you know, what amount was paid to Professor Barber for the work that he, you know, that he's done for the Barber Commission Report. I'll endeavour to get that information for the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, there are several things I want to speak about on this department. Like the Attorney-General's Department I think it's one that's important, and there's a great many items to be talked about, but the one I want to speak about today again has to do with abortion. And before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I will not congratulate the Minister as is customary; I do not believe he deserves our congratulations. I do not believe that gross incompetence should be congratulated. I will on the other hand congratulate his Deputy, that he mentioned earlier, and some of his staff which are doing an excellent job, and perhaps if there was a different Minister they might even be doing a better job. However, that will probably be resolved after the next election. -- (Interjection) -- Well perhaps, I should — a member suggests whether we should bring in a resolution to cut his salary to a dollar. Perhaps we will do that before we get off the Minister's salary.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about ruthless and politically sanctioned child murder that is enthusiastically and financially supported by the NDP government contrary to the clearly stated position of the party at the last, the second last convention. And Mr. Speaker, I know that anything I say is not going to make any difference but I want to stand up here today and speak knowing, knowing full well that the speech will touch or remove those anti-life people sitting on that side. But I want it recorded, and I want it recorded in Hansard that I am protesting the outrage that is going on.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I was just looking for the section, 155 of — Citation 155 of Beauchesne, "Abusive and insulting languages" and if the honourable member would look, it includes "villains, impertinence, rude remarks, gross culuminy, impudence, ruffianism, hypocrites, Pharisees and murderers." Now I would ask the honourable member to withdraw the remarks that he made about honourable members of this House.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I don't . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. BOROWSKI: I am rising on a point of order and I wish you would listen to the point of order. Mr. Chairman, there has been language of all types used in this House. I have no objection living by any rules even though they may be bad rules, and I believe there are. We have heard all kinds of names called here, Mr. Chairman, when you were in that Chair and there was no objection, and I do not understand, and cannot see how you can start at this moment bringing up rules that have been bent -- I agree there were rules that have been bent by both sides. And if you are going to do that then I am going to insist, Sir, that you do it for everyone or else that you be removed from the Chair. -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I am asking the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

MR. BOROWSKI: What remark?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Child murderers. -- (Interjections) -- ORDER, please!

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I am asking the honourable member if he is going to withdraw the remark?

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, I rise, and I rise on a privilege. -- (Interjection) -- Well you do not know what the privilege is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. ORDER! Order, please! I'm asking the honourable member if he's going to withdraw the remark or not?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, before I withdraw I think you should give me an opportunity to explain what I said. In Ottawa they are — the Opposition parties, particularly the NDP, is calling the hanging of convicted murderers a state murder, and that is acceptable. The killing of children, whether you like it or not, is murder and is no different from them hanging killers, and that is what I said. Murder is going on. You don't have to like it, but it's no different from hanging a killer which is acceptable language in Ottawa, and has been accepted in this Legislature. And I suggest that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please. That is not the context of which the honourable member used. The honourable member accused members of that side of the House of being child murderers.

MR. BOROWSKI: Read the passage because I have it written down. And the passage once again I'm going to talk about ruthless politically sanctioned child murder, enthusiastically and financially supported by the NDP government. That is true. It may be the law but it is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. That is out of order. I'm asking the honourable member to withdraw that remark. -- (Interjections) -- Order, please. -- (Interjection) -- Order, please. There cannot be three members on the floor at all times. There can only be one member. The Honourable Member for Riel, would you state your point of order?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I must say that you allowed other statements to be made in this House which were never retracted, were withdrawn, and were not requested to be withdrawn. We had a government employee accused of accepting a pay-off and a rip-off, a mining inspector, that was never withdrawn in this House, it stands on the books. And this was a much more serious charge against an individual, whereas the Member for Thompson is simply making the statement here that child murder by way of government policy is being allowed to take place. He's not accusing an individual of being a child murderer. He's saying that government policy endorsed by the present government is condoning child murder. And if he wishes to say that I don't see that you can accuse him of calling an individual a murderer.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Public Works,

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): On a point of order, there has been language used in this House which is parliamentary but when it is drawn to the attention of the Chairman or the Speaker, or when the Chairman or the Speaker sees fit to rule on that kind of language and asks for a retraction, I think then at that particular point that statement should be withdrawn. It's not a case of whether certain things have slipped by. The Chairman has asked the member to withdraw a statement that is unacceptable and untrue, and I think the member should withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson. I'm asking the Honourable Member to withdraw that remark.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you want me to rephrase it, I'll withdraw it and rephrase it for you, and I withdraw the remark and suggest that this government through the Medicare premiums and through other taxation is paying for child murder in hospitals and that is a fact. And I am going to — and I am going to now stick -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: On a point of order. The honourable member in the context in which he uses the word "murder" is clearly offending the rules. And he must withdraw the — now he said he would withdraw and rephrase it. His rephrasing is no better than his first expression, and it is an offence to the rules. He's accusing this government of breaking the law, and that is absolutely unparliamentary. And if he wants to suggest that in his opinion abortion should not be allowed and the Federal Parliament has made a bad law -- (Interjection) -- -- (Interjections) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. ORDER, please!

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, there are members in this Legislature who break the laws consistently and they typify, they indicate what they think about law, because the rules of this Legislature are laws in this Legislature, and the Honourable Member from Lakeside is the worst offender in this House, and he is setting a bad example for the Honourable Member for Thompson who . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: Yeah. What is your point of privilege?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. ENNS: . . . rules that we set for ourselves as to our conduct in this House are the rules of a meeting as chaired by persons that we select from time to time to chair that meeting. They're hardly to be, hardly to be put in the same category as laws that are duly passed in this province, passed on to sister governing agents like the municipality that say that certain building permits have to be made, etc., etc., or laws governing the Federal code with respect to abortion, etc., that are broken by this government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: On the question of privilege. It's a question on the question of privilege. The honourable member indicates his complete ignorance of how an organized and democratic society conducts its affairs. We establish, we establish rules in this Legislature -- (Interjection) -- I haven't finished my question -- (Interjections) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. ORDER! ORDER! ORDER! ORDER! Now I'm asking the honourable member -- (Interjections) -- ORDER! ORDER! -- (Interjections) -- Order, please. -- (Interjection) -- ORDER! ORDER! Now I think we've all had a pretty good airing of our tempers. Now I ask you as honourable gentlemen to try and set an example for the people of Manitoba. There can not be, and there will not be, shouting and yelling across this floor while I'm on my feet. Now these are your rules. If you do not want to obey them then we have nothing but chaos in this Chamber. Now I think that you should let your tempers cool — go for a walk. Walk off some of your excess energy elsewhere. The Honourable Member for Thompson,

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I certainly, Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with you that there should be no shouting in this Chamber and I think that should apply to the Chairman as well.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! -- (Interjections) -- Order, please! It may also come to the attention of the Honourable Member for Thompson that it is also against the rules of this House, it's also is against rules of all parliament, to reflect upon the Chair. Now I would ask the honourable member to reconsider that and withdraw that remark, -- (Interjection) -- ORDER, PLEASE! ORDER, PLEASE! I've asked the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the remark and I would ask you to keep those jackasses quiet while I complete my speech. And I'm going to read.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. DOERN: . . . we unfortunately keep challenging the Honourable Member for Thompson, we'll have to be here about six weeks to listen to all his withdrawals. But I think that he -- I think he's made two or three objectionable comments, and he should attempt, if he hasn't been able to learn the rules in the past three or four years, to try to obey them now. I think he's made one statement which he still should withdraw and not compound it by adding additional objectionable and unparliamentary expressions, which he will then be called upon to withdraw. So if he wants to make his speech let him do within the rules, let him make his original withdrawal and then get on with his comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I raise another point of order. When you read out the particular clause of Beauchesne you were quoting, I believe you quoted the word "ignorant" as being an unparliamentary word and I want to call to your attention, Sir, that the Attorney-General just finished referring to the Member for Lakeside by that very word. So you have a breaking of the rules by no less than the Attorney-General in the application of unparliamentary language.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. ORDER, PLEASE! ORDER!! I will read out again for the honourable members the section that I read out and the word "ignorant" was not amongst them. Abusive and insulting language -- for example: "villains", "impertinent", "rude remarks", "gross calumny", "impudence", "ruffianism", "hypocrites", "Pharisees" and "murderers" and there are more.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the honourable member rose again on what he considered to be a point of order. Ignorance, or the imputation of ignorance on the part of a member as to a stated fact or situation is not unparliamentary. Obviously when I referred to the honourable member as being ignorant of the rules, it was a fact, because he was on his feet when the Chairman was trying to get another honourable member to come to order. The Chairman had made a specific request to an honourable member, it had nothing whatever to do with the Honourable Member from Lakeside who insisted on interrupting from his seat and then had the gall and the audacity to stand on his feet and shout across the floor pointing his finger when another honourable member had the floor, and this is complete irresponsible conduct indicating a complete breach of the rules, and rules are the laws that govern this House, and the Chairman is to be respected and not to be toyed with as the Honourable Member from Riel is attempting to do at this moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, there's no question about it that the word "ignorant" is much stronger than any of the words you quoted from the book, it fits right in with them; and when we get people like the Attorney-General of this province using that kind of language, then it's very little wonder we get standards falling the way they are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on a point of order also, -- (Interjections) -- Well, I'm making a point of order, a new point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Raising a new point of order?

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm rising on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine, thank you. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: I was called, Mr. Chairman, in this House a Fascist by a Minister of the front bench; no-one apologized from that side. The Member for Flin Flon suggested or

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) said we were pimping for the press. The Attorney-General sat there and smiled, never said anything. It didn't bother him that the rules were broken. I'm suggesting to the front bench, what little there's left of it, that if we're going to obey the rules then everybody must obey the rules. I have no intention of obeying rules that the front bench continuously breaks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A question of privilege has been raised. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, my question of privilege is this, that the honourable member says that I sat in my place and did nothing when there was a breach of the rules. The honourable member was in his seat, smiling and acknowledging, when those comments were made about him, that they did not offend him, and if they did not offend him, how could any other member be offended because he seemed to accept the description with relish, and I think it's incumbent on any honourable member who is affected by a word that is offensive, to bring it to the attention of the Chairman. What we're dealing with here, Mr. Chairman, is a request by the Chairman to bring an honourable member to order, and that's what's before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, can I continue with my speech, Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, I will stick to my text so there is no question of what is said from here on in. I stand here today to . . .

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): . . . Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The member was asked to withdraw his comments by the Chair, those comments are not acceptable to this House, and I think that he should withdraw them and then make his speech, but he cannot gloss over the question he has been asked to withdraw. If he can't withdraw then let him cease his speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there's been so many, I don't know which one the Honourable Minister is referring to.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, to refresh your memory, it is some comment in reference to child murderers, which is just not acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that the honourable member had withdrawn that remark. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

SUPPLY - HEALTH Cont'd

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, we can get along much better if we have one Chairman; the Chairman is satisfied that I had made the withdrawal, and if the Member for Public Works will allow me I will continue. I stand here today to speak, knowing that my speech will not touch or move those . . . Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you're going to use the rules to the Member from Flin Flon who's interrupting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. ORDER! Have you got a point of order? ORDER PLEASE! Unless you're rising on a point of order, I'm not going to recognize you — a point of order or a point of privilege, otherwise it is out of order to interrupt an honourable member when he's speaking. Do you have a point of order?

MR. BARROW: The Member for Thompson is obviously looking for publicity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER! That is not a point of order! ORDER! The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am going to wear this page out if I keep at it long enough. I stand here today to speak, knowing that my speech will not touch or move those morally retarded, anti-life dropouts. Rather it is to put on record my protest and the protest of many Manitobans against this outrageous atrocity, and I am referring, Mr. Speaker, of course, to legalized child murder. But the records show that some were not silent during this systematic slaughter; T.C. Douglas, we recall Mr. Chairman, when Trudeau called out the troops to quell the rioting or the kidnapping in Quebec back in 1970, I believe, with the FLQ kidnapping, we remember that T.C. Douglas, as Leader of the New Democratic Party, came on television and we, I think, all remember the speech that he made. He said he was rising to protest what was happening. He did not disagree that the Prime Minister did not have the right to call out the troops because of the kidnapping, but he wanted to protest so he would not be as guilty as the German people were when Hitler was systematically exterminating

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) and jailing the opposition; they started off with the political opposition and then they switched to the old, the helpless, and then they went after the trade unionists, and then they went after the Jews and the gypsies, and he was saying, and then by the time they got to this particular person there was nobody left to protest, so Mr. Douglas ended his speech on television at that time saying that "I am speaking here today, something that the German people should have done in the 30s and had they done so this thing would have not occurred." I feel, Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking here today so the record will show that we on this side and the people of Manitoba are not silent when this atrocity and this legalized child murder is occurring.

A recent U.S. Supreme Court decision is a storm warning to Canada, Mr. Chairman. It won't be long before the bootleg barnyard swirl of that decision washes over the border into Canada. We already have evidence of things happening in various states. In Oregon they introduced a bill two months ago to force all hospitals to perform abortions and sterilizations. In Florida they reintroduced a "Death with Dignity" bill, and I'd like to read a section of that bill into the record, Mr. Speaker. This bill was defeated three times but in view of the Supreme Court decision of January 23rd there was evidence that this bill was going to go through by an overwhelming vote. It's called, A bill to be entitled "An act relating the right to die with dignity," providing an effective date.

Section 2: Any person with the same formalities as required by law for the execution of a last Will and Testament may execute a document directing that he shall have the right to death with dignity, and that his life shall not be prolonged beyond a point of meaningless existence.

Section 3: In the event any person is unable to make such a decision because of mental or physical incapacity, his spouse — that is the husband or wife — or person of first degree kinship — shall be allowed to make such a decision provided written consent is obtained from one, the spouse or person of first degree kinship.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that bill speaks fairly eloquently just what is in it. They're not talking about euthanasia any more, they're not talking about killing useless old people as is happening in Manitoba; we have had one doctor on the hot line admit that he is doing it in a Manitoba hospital, but they're talking about children being able to dispose of their parents by that act of the Legislature, and I am suggesting that if we do not stop it that this thing will come into Canada and we will be faced with that type of proposition in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I was in Toronto about a month ago at the St. Lawrence Centre, debating the question of life, and at that time they showed a film made by the J. P. Kennedy Foundation entitled "Who Shall Survive?" And it deals with a case that happened at the John Hopkins Medical Centre on September 9, 1971. The film deals with a child, a normal nine months' old child being born, and it was Mongoloid; it also has some intestinal problems and the parents, this was their first child, when they found out that it was Mongoloid, they said to the doctor, "We don't want the child;" and the doctor said, "Look, I can do the operation in the stomach, connecting the intestines will be no problem, but there will be — Mongolism will return but in this case it's not that serious. The parents said, "No, we don't want the child." But not only that, they said, "We don't want anyone else to have that child." The result was, of course, and I don't know what kind of a law they have in that state, but the hospital would not kill the child, so they simply -- the doctor had to tack on a piece of paper on there, "nothing by mouth," and every day the husband used to phone in and ask well, you know, "Is it gone yet?" It took 15 days for that child to starve. They didn't have the courage to kill it; they weren't even as kind as Hitler, but they let it starve in a crib alongside all the other children.

It took 15 days for that child to starve. But that, Mr. Chairman, is the law, and if anybody in this House thinks that we're going to stop with the present law that we have here, abortion law, they're just plain crazy. If you look out throughout the world where abortion laws are in effect, it's just not a simple question of abortion. The euthanasia and then the unwanted after they are born is an inevitable result, and if it happened in one state it'll happen in other states. I would suggest to the Minister and our government front benchers to get in touch with the Ministers of Health in the 50 states and find out what kind of bills are being debated right now in their Legislatures -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, I just got started.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. ENNS: On a point of order, we in the Opposition would be prepared to consider granting some leave in lieu of the interruptions that the honourable member has had during the course of his . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the interruptions were of the honourable member's own making. The honourable member has five minutes.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the honourable member proceeds I'd like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 18 students of Medina High School -- (Interjection) -- This is not going on the member's time, I can assure the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery -- ORDER PLEASE -- draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 18 students of the senior class of Medina High School, North Dakota, under the direction of Mr. Schmeling and Mr. Mitzel. This school is the guest of Mr. Speaker of this House. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly, I bid you welcome. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

SUPPLY - HEALTH Cont'd

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will try to hurry as much as I can. It is because of this toboggan slide towards the Hitler type of treatment and a solution towards unwanted and unloved and the old and the weak, that I raise my voice in protest here today. There is one paper, Mr. Chairman, that I'd like to give credit for, that has been doing a tremendous job championing the cause of the unborn. That paper is called "The Wanderer"; it's put out in Minneapolis, St. Paul-Minneapolis, and the February 1, 1973 issue has some interesting headlines: "U.S. Supreme Court Approves Death Penalties for the Unborn," "The Court's Judgment must be Repulsed and Rejected," "An Unspeakable Tragedy for our Nation". It's an excellent paper, and I recommend it for the Minister and other members of this House to read of just what the implications of that court decision are, which will surely affect us here too. In that same paper, Mr. Speaker, there's another quotation: "In 1857 the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously decided that black slaves were property and therefore had no human rights. This decision did not mean eternal triumph for slavery. Eight years later the decision had been repudiated and there was no slavery in the United States. Let us pray that the American people in the same way repudiate this new denial of human rights and as soon as possible. There'll be no mass abortions in the United States. Let us pray that this may be done without the civil strife through which the . . . decision was repudiated." And this comment is made by Dr. Ken Mitchener, Director of Mobilization for the Unnamed, Los Angeles, California. I understand he's a Jewish author, he writes some type of books.

Further on in that same paper: "The decision favouring abortions is an open invitation to further agitations seeking gradually to remove all those who stand in the way of encumbered enjoyment of life, the aged, the chronically ill, the malformed, the handicapped, and all other dependent more or less on the help of others. Once you begin to ignore the right of life, there you begin the reign of death. Without morality to hold the line of control, the floodgates are open to rampant individualism. I wonder what young man of the future will be willing to give his life for the protection of a nation founded on such a spirit." I think we've had some of the evidence of that in South Vietnam. Because of corruption American boys refused to go and fight for that nation.

And there's another -- I'd like to read the perversion and values that we had in that society and in our society. In that same paper, it gives a case of a Supreme Court Justice who gave parenthood to a grove of trees because he wanted to preserve them; the only way he could stop the developers from knocking the trees down, through his decision -- this is Supreme Court Justice Douglas -- he conferred parenthood on these trees. In that way the ecologists won the day by saying that that's human, you can't destroy them.

Another interesting case, Mr. Speaker, and this is a quote from the Regina Leader Post: "Three thousand foals produced on those farms used to be killed at birth, but now the European market is buying them once they become 90 days old. The Pregnant Mares' Urine Act passed in June 1970 now protects the foals until they're 90 days old." Well, Mr. Chairman, isn't that a perversion, to be concerned about mares, and to be concerned about trees, and pigeons,

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) and killing of seals, and where humans are concerned we just shrug our shoulders and say it's nothing.

I would like to read one final quotation from the paper: "The court has said, . . . a child bearing woman just to satisfy her whim for freedom, just to unload a life burden, at most can without fear of penalty of law, kill, murder, or half-murder, the helpless, innocent human life within her. If this is permitted then almost anything else follows, or will soon follow. The caveman's style of life was more humane than this. Certain strong voices shout louder in defense of dogs, cats, eagles, and coyotes, than they do for human life. The court is so inconsistent as to make illegal capital punishment for ruthless, convicted, even self-confessed criminals, but declare it perfectly legal, almost praiseworthy, to murder defenceless innocent human babies. Where is the sense of it all? What is the society for protection of animals going to say? Most probably nothing at all. My God, how can supposedly educated, enlightened, women and men think, that they will laugh off questions like this as coming from stupid religionists who haven't yet learned to cope with modern problems. Yet it is not just a personal, religious and moral matter, it deals with basic human rights. It concerns and the clearly revealed law of God is the basis of civilized society, as Cardinal Croll said so well. All of us must call out loudly to protest, we must stand ready to support effort to correct this outrageous decision. We must be ready to go to jail rather than approve and co-operate in any way with the implementation of the court's evil decision."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. BOROWSKI: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I can have a couple of minutes to complete my speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, very much. "Those who decry the claims and gospel documented prerogatives" and I'm still quoting, "of the Pope in matters of faith and morals may now be in an awkward position of accepting the infallibility claimed by the seven justices of this court." Mr. Speaker, we have heard in the past years of the, particularly the Left Wing condemning the church and urging the church to condemn the war in Vietnam because it's unjust murder of innocent people. Well, Mr. Speaker, now the church — and the church has done that. All churches. Now the churches are condemning the slaughter of the most innocent in our society. The same people, the same people, Mr. Chairman, are now saying to the church, don't force your morality on us. Keep your religion to yourselves. Well I suggest to those you can't have it both ways. If you want the church involved in condemning a war in Vietnam where innocent people are killed, you must give that church the same right in respect to condemn innocent slaughter in the womb. And that I have not heard from the Left.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is going to be the end result in this country as a result of the American decision. What bill may be brought into the parliament in Canada and what our efforts of the alliance against the Abortion Committee and my efforts will have to change things. When I sponsored Bill 10 I had hoped that the people's government would support the bill, not because they have any ounce of human compassion for the unwanted and undesirable human life, but I felt that they would support it on a basis of civil rights and because they usually support conscientious objectors whether they're army deserters or draft dodgers. I hope I would not have to resort to civil disobedience as thousands of draft dodgers and deserters have done with the full support of both Federal and Provincial NDP.

On second reading of Bill 10 I stated that as the late Dr. Luther King had stated: "I will not and cannot obey an evil law, therefore civil disobedience is the only alternative left to me." The first step was to refuse to pay Medicare premiums; the second step was to refuse to pay or file income tax, just about half of which comes back into the Provincial Government which is used for Medicare and hospitalization. Accordingly, I'm serving notice on this spiritually dead and cowardly government that so long as one cent and one dollar of this money is used to pay, subsidize, finance child murder, legalized child murder, without due process of law, no matter what the price or the consequences I will refuse to pay one penny of income tax or any other tax even if it means going to jail. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. McGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, in a debate earlier today I became quite confused if my role in this Chamber has any real meaning. When the First Minister -- and I was rather

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) surprised at his approach -- in reply to the Honourable Member from Roblin because I do believe there's some of us of fair mind and honest judgment, and I think if we had a clear look at some of our welfare cases and certainly in co-operation with the Minister, we do know wrongness, and we do have some judgment, that I'm gladly fed -- would feed to the Minister as I think last year I replied to some things; he came right back at me that I hadn't run to him, and I believe I have a responsibility in my part of Manitoba to look at these cases and at least give the Brandon office my judgment on it, and in doing this they told me in a nice way that doors are closed, it's none of your darn business, and he said, I'll give it to you verbally, confidentially. I said, well that's better than nothing. We went into different individual cases; they agreed with my decision, however, they were hung up because they can not put that on record, therefore I can do nothing about the wrongnesses and I say that the members maybe should have more -- given more consideration of his judgment in these cases, I've always said, and I'm not getting much support, one field of health is the naturopath physician, and I must say I've 180 to 200 using this service, paying it out of their hip pocket. The other naturopath physicians in Winnipeg don't seem to give a darn. I have one in Brandon, Dr. Grube, would like this. We have corresponded but I must say I'm not getting much help from the Winnipeg naturopaths.

The other area I'd like to speak of, there's some in my constituency that have been on welfare for going on to 18 - 19 years. They've been raising children, and they're on welfare because of that. Their children are coming off welfare; they would like a program that would fit them into society, and they would desire, dearly like to get off of welfare but when they request this kind of upgrading, there does not seem to be anything available -- and again if the Minister has something, I'll gladly take it back to those people that are making these kind of requests.

Another field that I spoke to the Minister again personally and I probably will never be accused of writing letters for or against a constituent because I'll have a record out of here for writing the least letters. My duties is contacting the people, talking it over with them, finding both sides of it out, then delivering it to wherever, either the local office, the Minister, the First Minister, and I refer now to -- I had heard rumours, and making no reflection to either of the members in Brandon, but I believe it was on First Street, a chap that was completely -- he had phoned everybody here -- he's a handicapped person -- and again I've talked to the Minister personally about it, and all he would wish is to be on some kind of a pension, he's getting a good living but his dignity is ruined. He would like some kind of a handicap pension, and I know this is part federal; I know what the Minister is going to say, and all I say, I think we owe this to Manitobans who are in wheel chairs, proven handicapped, to give them back their dignity and allow them to be proud Manitobans. And I said to this Mr. Seens that the difference in your income will be no different regardless. I said I'll approach the Minister personally; I know it's a part federal hang-up, it's maybe an entire federal hang-up, but this I think we will do. We would not spend one cent more of the Treasury's money, and I think we owe, if we can add dignity, and not costing us money, and I think this could, would and should.

The third small point, and I'm raising the smaller areas is older people that are in their little homes. They may be 85, the wife or either partner is able to look after them. They're again too proud to go in the senior citizens home. They haven't quite reached the stage where they're going to be forced in a nursing home. They would like some way of a little assistance, Mr. Chairman, to have someone go in and maybe clean up their house just a little bit. It would be a very very small amount of money, and again you're making those people proud to be in that small community, be it Hartney, be it Lenore, or wherever it is. And probably those three, the three points but I would like to leave with you Mr. Chairman, I feel myself a bit of a responsible person for the constituency of Virden, and when I hear someone from anywhere saying that our duties are being kicked around well then I just think it's poor approach on the part of any politician, be he on the government or be he not on the government. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I did speak on an earlier occasion however I at that time gave the Minister some time so that he could put in some remarks as well, so that I didn't finish what I had to say.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

There were three or four points that I wished to raise under the Salary. One, I asked the Minister on, in connection with the unused capital authorizations. Then he replied to some extent that this money that is used for Capital is contained within the Health Services Budget. And I would like to know from him whether, how much because, and also if he does reply I would like to get a budget of the Manitoba Health Services Commission itself. We're allocating \$70 million, \$70-1/2 million to it, and I would like to know how this money is going to be spent. How much of this is actually going to go for capital? When I checked the report, the report mentioned something like 3.8 million and another 2.2 million for Winter Works Program, so that there is total roughly of \$6 million. But I am sure that that's not the total because if I understand correctly, that the Capital moneys are going on the Hospital Districts Budgets, and I would like to know from the Minister how much additional money is going for capital that the indebtedness falls on the Hospital Districts and that the moneys are provided by them. Or how, just how the matter is looked after, worked. Surely enough considerable moneys must be spent for Capital purposes in this province and I think we would like to know just what is the intention for the coming year. Surely he can outline a program of such type for us.

There is the matter of the increase in family allowance. I questioned — put a question to him one day, I think, earlier this week or last week, as to the effect that this will have on the social allowances to be paid by the province. Certainly this will provide for, should provide for a very substantial decrease in the amount that we will be spending through social allowances, and could he give us some idea as to what the effect will be in dollars.

When we take a look at the total amount spent, or allocated, under the Estimates for the Department, we find there's a total of 196 million, \$196.9 million. And for the previous year it was 190 million, 90.4 million. And if we take a look at the Commission's Annual Report, we find they had a surplus of roughly 7 million. So that indicates that there is quite a surplus from the previous year so that — and then if you apply the increase that is allocated for this year, plus the amount that they're going to ask for in the supplementary Estimates of another \$22-1/2 million, this comes out to roughly \$38.9 million increase over the previous year. This is a very substantial amount, and it amounts to roughly 21.65 percent over last year's budget. This is -- (Interjection) -- well I — if there are any special reasons for it I'd certainly like to hear from the Minister and explain it to us, because the additional amount in supplementary Estimates is 21 million for the Health Services Commission. Does that mean that we are going to allocate roughly 92 million dollars for the Health Services Commission, and I would like to hear from the Minister on the total amount, and also to give us a budget of the Health Services Commission so that we know where the moneys will be spent.

There is mention in the Estimates of the guaranteed annual income and the amount allocated for that is 150,000.00. This is not a very large amount and I certainly would like to hear from him also on this particular matter. Apparently pilot projects are to be conducted and whether he could give us a general resume of what type of program they envisage and intend to carry out.

The matter of social allowances, and especially to widows of an age of 50 or more. I think this is the area where we have a serious problem and — at least where I have had people contact me. And I feel this is an area where we should be prepared to come across and probably give some additional help because by the time that the children have grown up and have left home, and as a result they are no longer entitled to assistance. They are then supposed to go out and find a job, and we know how difficult it is for older people to find jobs in the first place. And many of these cannot do just any kind of a job that requires skill, and so on. So I think here is an area that we should take a closer look at and provide additional assistance.

I think these were the additional points that I wanted to raise under the Minister's Salary. The one final one is the Home Care Program. I think this is an area too that because of the high cost of services that we should take a much closer look at it as well. I think we have 590,000 allocated for this particular area, and it is increased over the previous year, but whether we couldn't do much more in this line and at considerable savings. I know a certain family in my area where the husband had a wife with cancer and she stayed at home and he looked after her. There was some assistance given. But certainly the savings that were effected by not having her go to the hospital must have run into the thousands. And yet the amount of assistance that was given was very minimal. And I think — and he was glad to do it,

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. FROESE cont'd) and the family in this way had their mother at home as well, so that I think in many cases I think it works out to the good. So that we should not, certainly not hold back in furthering this type of service. And I feel that the program that we are embarking on in this instance on that matter is a good one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I see I only have ten minutes left on this -- (Interjection) -- Thank you. I see I have only ten minutes left and I know I've been under a lot of criticism and I have used abusive language you say. I've been accused of not being an honourable gentleman by the Member from Riel. I'd like to say if I am not an honourable gentleman then he is -- I'd rather be the reverse of honourable gentleman which is a thug or a rogue. But Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the Estimates, and first of all this is a letter and I'll quote -- (Interjection) -- and I'll table the letter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it signed?

MR. BARROW: I'll quote the letter, and I'd just like to speak on the letter. It goes: "Dear Mr. Barrow:" -- (Interjection) -- I'm trying to be a gentleman, Mr. Enns -- "As you know, I lost my son nearly six years ago. He was at Selkirk for treatment and sent home with certain pills to take. As a result of this medication he was shaking and trembling continuously. I wrote to his doctor in Selkirk and he told me to cut the medication down until his trembling stopped, but by then it was too late, and he believed he would never get better and he took his own life. Perhaps if he had been kept in Selkirk until the proper amount of pills could have been given to him, then he wouldn't have become convinced that there was no hope for him. I am not blaming the doctor as I know with so many people to look after that very minimum attention can be given to individual patients. I believe that if all the money I see being spent on LIP, PEP, DREE, OFU, etc. and make believe work, that some of it could be diverted to mental health, and training of more psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, etc., and help for mental institutions. I also suggest more help be given to SAE which operates on a program very similar to AA which has proved highly successful with alcoholics. It's really pitiful to go into a mental hospital and see the many lost and often forgotten people, and think of what might be done if more money could be diverted to that cause. Mrs. Anne Moore."

She followed this up, Mr. Chairman, and she wrote at least 100 letters to MLAs, both provincially and federally. I'll quote: Mr. Chairman, I've just misplaced it so I will just speak on this letter and I'll find the letter later because I know I won't have the time. For what really happened, Mr. Chairman, these people are very close friends of mine and they were a very close family. This boy suffered from schizophrenia. He obtained a job in Thompson and became ill, landed up in Selkirk -- they were very concerned. They took turns in visiting him; he'd go down for a week, she'd go down for a week; they brought him home. He was in very bad state where he would sleep 14 to 16 hours per day, no energy, and in very bad condition. One morning he got up and he had breakfast, he went to the bathroom and blew his brains out.

Now I'm saying to my colleague, let's do something about this type of thing, and I know he will.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we've heard the Member from Fort Rouge for four years attacking welfare abuse. She's added very little to the legislation of the House except on one subject, and I must say I'm very much amazed at her feeble efforts to attack abuse; I thought she'd come on much stronger. But I'll deal with her later.

Now here's welfare abuse in the Flin Flon area or welfare fraud: "Dear Mr. Barrow: This is further to our telephone conversation of last weekend, and is meant as a simple answer relating to the situation of welfare abuse and fraud. Be advised that the Flin Flon district during the year 1972, we did not find it necessary to follow through legally on any cases of overt fraud, that during the present fiscal year we have completed investigation of one case which has now been forwarded to our central office for assessment, and it is expected that it will be followed up for legal action.

"In terms of general welfare abuse, it is impossible to give any figures as we are now talking about people's motivation, impossible facts that we do not have. I'm certain that there must be individuals who we are granting assistance to who have in fact given inaccurate data, or who have misrepresented the situation in such a way as to make themselves eligible for assistance. However, as you are aware through the Barber report, and other reports,

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. BARROW cont'd) the number of people who find it necessary to gain support in this way are very limited. As you are aware, our department has made many new efforts in closing the gaps, investigating situations of suspected fraud.

"I am sure you are aware that the problem does not lie so much in detecting and following up fraudulent situations, as such, as in the area of providing people with viable alternatives. In this respect, the focus on vocational services through our department and northern Manpower Corps is a move in the right direction. I am sorry that I cannot include more factual or detailed statistics.

"The information given above represents the total number of fraudulent cases that have been handled formally through this office, in the last fiscal year and in the current fiscal year. This is for your information. Yours truly, Don Nesbitt, Area Co-ordinator." I'll file it and let you see it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I hear of the people talk about welfare abuse, I went to this man's office. He is a friend of my son's and I asked him to tell me of any case and how it comes about, what happens. He tells me this. People will phone and tell, but never never give their names. They will write letters, but never never sign their names. Forget those people, Mr. Chairman. If they know this is going on, we will stop it in Flin Flon; it has never happened.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I see that the time is running out -- and I'm giving this speech from written texts, because it seems you can't speak and say what you want in this House because people are very sensitive and a little thin skinned, so I will be a gentleman, or at least I will try. -- (Interjection) --

Mr. Speaker, it's almost 4:30 and to start this would take some time. I would beg the indulgence of the House to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' hour. The first item is Resolution 19. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Oh sorry, the Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the day being Friday, and the hour being 4:30, I understand that there has been some discussion amongst various members, and there seems to be a common consensus that the House adjourn at this time. Unless I'm in error, then I will move that the House adjourn until Monday morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member puts his motion, would he indicate or give an outline of Monday.

MR. MACKLING: I'm sorry, Monday afternoon. Pardon me?

MR. SPEAKER: Before I accept the motion, would the Honourable Attorney-General give an outline of the procedure for next week as agreed?

MR. MACKLING: As I understand, Mr. Speaker, we will be continuing with the Estimates of the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development, and I assume the Honourable Member from Flin Flon has some minutes left.

After completing the Estimates of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, I assume we will proceed with further estimates. I'm not sure which department is next, but it could well be that we'll spend most of Monday in respect to Health and Social Development.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding, or at least I believe that there was

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd) some notice given that Capital Supply would be discussed on Monday, introduced into the House on Monday. Can the Attorney-General confirm that?

MR. MACKLING: I think that is a distinct possibility. I haven't studied Votes and Proceedings for today; I didn't see a copy today, but I believe that was the understanding.

MOTION presented and carried that the House adjourn and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.