

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o' clock, Tuesday, May 8, 1973

SUPPLY - HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned at 5:30 I was dealing with some of the questions posed to me by the Honourable Member for Thompson. We were in the process of discussing abortions and relative issues pertaining to abortions and how this actually comes to the responsibility of different bodies and the honourable member asked me a few questions that I feel I have an obligation to answer.

I was indicating to the honourable member that although I didn't necessarily agree with the present Federal policy on abortions that I felt more comfortable with myself to remain with a body, with a government that could do certain things to help change matters than to withdraw myself from what I consider to be a government that is positive in wanting to do things for the people of Manitoba in general. And that is the reason why I did not take the route that my honourable friend did when he decided to withdraw from Cabinet and caucus and now has decided to withdraw his taxes from the Federal and Provincial governments.

The honourable member asked me if I believed in the life of an infant yet unborn and I believe he mentioned 21 days. Well I believe in the life a child that's unborn from inception. That's my personal belief. I don't attach any days to the life within. I'm not given the responsibility to decide what life to terminate and this is really what happens when an application for an abortion is made to an abortion committee. I'm only asked by agreement, agreement arrived at by negotiation between this level of government and the Federal Government to pay for these procedures once they're accepted by a committee of three doctors. And let's get the record straight, Mr. Chairman. It is the policy of this government to pay for such procedures once they have been accepted by a committee of three doctors as prescribed under the Criminal Code, and this agreement was reached at by the former administration equally. I'm not saying that we haven't got a power, the power to negotiate changes but the same policy that we now have was the then policy of the previous administration.

When we say that someone according to legislation has to decide on terminating one or the other life, that is the life of the expecting mother or the life of yet the unborn child, that is determined under the Criminal Code as the honourable member stated. Now if there are cases where there's abuse I think information should be laid either before myself or before the College of Physicians and Surgeons to see that the medical practitioners on these abortion committees be disciplined. They are the body, like I stated in a statement that I made before the House the other day, the College of Physicians and Surgeons are the body to discipline all medical practitioners in our province and it is our collective responsibility if we do have examples to bring before them to do so for them to rectify what could be considered or could be determined as a breach of the Act.

The honourable member made a statement pertaining to the redress that Cabinet had to make in regards to a policy that he left to indicate was decided by myself in regards to abortions outside of the province. That is not the case. The abortions that were performed outside of the province including New York and elsewhere were paid for and are still paid for if they're accepted by a group of three doctors the same as they are in Canada. If they comply with the Criminal Code, with the conditions of the Criminal Code, these abortions are paid for by this government and paid for by any government in Canada. The honourable member is at least somewhat aware of this policy because this is actually the time that he decided to sever his direct relationship with Cabinet when that decision was taken.

When I mentioned that having a dual policy pertaining to abortions for the poor and the rich I did sincerely mean that. If you have say an individual that hasn't got the financial resources and presents himself to a committee of three doctors and the committee accepts that this individual do get an abortion and hasn't got the financial means to pay for it that means that something has to be done. If it's a person with the financial resources that abortion will be performed because it's legal, but if the individual hasn't got funds and yet if it's legal and accepted by the committee of three doctors according to the provisions of the Criminal Code, and if it's not paid for by Medicare as the agreement now stands, there is hardship and hardship could be either for the mother or for the expected child, whatever decision is taken pertaining to either life. And I agree with the honourable member that life

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) is there. That is my personal opinion based on studies and based on different discussions that I have had with medical practitioners and having seen aborted children yet alive. So I completely reject the fact that my position, the position of this government is based only on legal aspects; it's based on what we feel to be right in accordance with the provisions under the Criminal Code. And if we do intend as individuals to change the provisions of the Criminal Code as mentioned in the news this evening--as I was going home I heard that the provisions under the Criminal Code pertaining to abortions are being revised according to petitions that are being presented to the Federal Government--well if that is the intent of individuals of our province that's left up to them, It's equally at the option of any member of this House to make pressures before the Federal Government to make changes that individuals may feel should be made.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to maybe revert back a few minutes to the comments made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge in regards to the agreement reached by the Department of Health and Social Development and the Dental Association in regards to fees payable for procedures for social allowance recipients and other procedures under our dental program. I'd like to read into the record a letter that I sent to the Dental Association following the letter I got from them dated April 27th, 1973. And this is sent to the Association. "I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 27th concerning the social allowance dental benefit schedule which I mailed to you under date of March 5th, 1973. At the last meeting held with your executive it was my understanding that a three-year arrangement which would provide for annual increases of approximately five percent would be acceptable to your Association. Accordingly a benefit schedule was developed which would achieve this and also provide for somewhat higher increase in the first year to compensate for the year of discussions and negotiations." I indicated this afternoon that the increase for 1973-74 was 8-1/2 percent. "In addition to compensating for increased utilization the benefit schedule sent to you on March 5th increased the funds available for the social allowance dental program by 8-1/2 percent for '73-'74, an additional 5 percent for '74-'75 and a further 5 percent for 1975-76. This arrangement follows increases which were granted in each of the years 1969-70, '70-'71 and 1971-'72. These increases have contributed to rising the costs of this program from 315,000 in 1968-'69 to \$700,000 in 1972-'73. All things considered, I believe the recently revised benefits schedule and the prior increases granted had been a fair approach to the subject. Considering the above, I was therefore surprised to receive your letter of April 27th which stated the Association does not accept the existence of any contract or agreement to continue to provide emergency services to persons covered by social allowance benefits' lists.

"And further that your members are free to refer these persons, social allowance recipients elsewhere. It would now appear that the government has two options available: (1) to immediately revert back to the benefit levels paid during 1972-'73 and reopen negotiations with your Association; or (2) for those dentists in the province who will provide services to social allowance recipients to reimburse them on the basis of the recently approved three-year agreement. Because I feel the approved arrangement was fair and arrived at in good faith, our department will continue to reimburse benefits for their services on the basis of their recently approved schedule for 1973-'74. Benefits to be paid beyond 1973-'74 will be the subject of future consideration.

"In closing may I please ask that any communication to your members includes my sincere appreciation to them for past services to the underprivileged and my hope that such services will continue in the future."

MRS. TRUEMAN: Will the Minister please table that document?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, I will.

The honourable the -- not the honourable, but the Dental Association decided to take their negotiation after completion to the public. They're attempting to make a case out of their desire for increased benefits, and if that is their stand well then the people of Manitoba will decide what happens from here on in. The letter went out today and their reaction will prove the services that will be available to those in need in the months ahead. Mr. Chairman, I'll now sit and hear comments from other members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would briefly like to restate a couple of questions that I put to the Minister earlier and make some comments in addition to that.

I was quite interested yesterday when we dealt with the capital estimates and the First Minister indicated at that time there were some 30 million in uncommitted authorizations as far as capital for hospitals. Then I think he also indicated that there was some 4-1/2 million which was allocated and for which he gave the various areas for which money was being allocated. But I would like to know from the Minister where this 30 million is going to be spent and over what period of time. Certainly when we look at the annual report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, there is very little said in the report on the hospital construction, and I feel we should have better coverage as far as the construction of the hospital facilities in Manitoba in the report. I think the Minister when I asked him earlier, on an earlier occasion, indicated that this was included in the Manitoba Health Services Commission allocation and when I look at the report here certainly it doesn't appear to me that way. We have a statement of revenue and expenditures for the year ending December 31st, 72 and with 1971 figures for comparison, and certainly there is nothing mentioned in that statement in regard to construction. Apparently the moneys are being used for services and for 1971 there was something like 63,000 in the statement for land office building, an addition and so on. But for the year 1972 there's no figure, nothing mentioned.

Then too, in connection with that, when I look on Page 19 and 20 where the report deals with hospital finance and on Page 20 you have construction finance and I'd like to read one paragraph, there's only three paragraphs in that report dealing with construction finance, and it says --(Interjection)-- For the year 1972. It says: "Assistance" and I'm quoting now, "Assistance is provided to hospitals in arranging both in term and long term financing and the annual levy program relating to hospital share of borrowing is administered by this section." It appears according to that that a certain amount of financing is done by the hospitals themselves and is carried on in the name of the hospital district. Is it still the case that 20 percent has to be brought up by the local area. This used to be the case and I'm just wondering whether this is still applicable or not because on that basis and certainly if the 30 million is allocated that means that some six million would have to be brought up locally by the various areas that have hospital construction going on. And I would like to hear from the Minister whether this is the case.

Then too, to what extent are our hospital districts indebted at the present time. I know that our particular hospital has been trying to get just a few thousand dollars and has been unable to get it for an intensive care unit which is a very small one indeed. The application I think has been with the department for at least two years now, probably three, and they're very interested in getting this brought forward and bringing it to fruition. If I'm correct I think the department is considering this now and I hope it will be favorable. Because as indicated yesterday, we have a good medical group in Winkler, very able doctors and specialists at that and they certainly feel that we should provide more services for the specialists so that they will be able to remain in the locality.

We got statistics this afternoon from the Minister stating that of the specialists in Manitoba of whom there are some 444, that 28 of these are in rural Manitoba and we have some in our locality and are performing a very admirable job. I feel that in order to keep these specialists in rural Manitoba we will have to provide facilities to them similar to what you have in the greater Winnipeg area. I think they're just deserving and the people in the country are just deserving as those of the Greater Winnipeg area and I feel very strongly that something should be done in this respect so that we can keep these people in our rural areas to provide the service they are giving.

I asked the Minister on a previous occasion in connection with the \$70.5 billion that is allocated in the Estimates for the Manitoba Health Services Commission, I asked for a budget on this and he indicated at one time, I don't know maybe this was a slip of the tongue, but anyway, that he stated that there was a special budget for the Commission of this amount, and I would like to get that particular budget. --(Interjection)-- So I would ask that he provide that budget for the members of this Committee so that we know where these moneys will be spent, this 70 billion. Certainly this is a large item and we need a breakdown on this. I think if we get a budget it will certainly provide us with information so that we maybe need not ask questions unnecessarily; and I think if information came forth readily on points of this type we could

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. FROESE cont'd) shorten some of our speeches as a result.

As far as the Hospital Districts Budgets , just on what basis are they treated? Are they using the same yardstick for budgets from Rural Hospital Districts as from the Greater Winnipeg area? On what basis are these moneys granted? Certainly I would like to know because we find that the moneys very often allocated to hospital districts is not sufficient or they're overspending either one and then the additional amounts that are being spent are levied on real estate taxes and we have to bail them out time and again. This has happened in our local area I think just about every year, that they incur deficits and then these have to be made up by the various municipalities or towns or villages within that hospital district area. Certainly I think we should have some indication as to how, on what basis the budgets are approved or are they being cut down and as a result that we have these deficits, or are they overspending. I would like to hear from the Minister on this, whether it's a matter of overspending.

Then on the matter of Family Allowances, and I just looked at the Bill No. 3 which is an Act to Amend the Social Allowances Act and I see where there is provision that Family Allowance will be excluded from financial resources for the sake of social allowances. So that I take it then that the total amount will be excluded from any given family that is getting social allowances from the department, or from the government and I would like to have this confirmed by the Minister if I'm right. If not would he inform me as to where I'm wrong.

A MEMBER: . . . point on the Mennonites in question.

MR. FROESE: Well I think we'll find today that our birthrate is going down in practically all the areas of the province I would guess, so that probably increasing the family allowance is not such a bad idea after all.

A MEMBER: It's a good idea.

MR. FROESE: I feel when family allowances first came out it was because of Social Credit advancing the idea of national dividends. And as a result for them pushing about it this is why they were brought in in the first instance. Just like the NDP fought the pensioners. It was for these very reasons that some of the programs were brought in at the time. Certainly we can use all the purchasing power that it will bring into Manitoba, I feel it's something good, something that we need, because today an employee probably only getting the minimum wage or a little better, his income is small and if he has a family to look after it's causing a hardship on many of the people and certainly for them it will be welcome news and something they will appreciate. Certainly I would not in any way want to ridicule or sneer at the Federal Government's program that they're bringing in in connection with Family Allowance.

One other item that I wanted to ask the Minister about has to do with the per diem rates of the various hospitals in Manitoba. Some years ago I had an Order for Return where I got this information and except for the last two or three years I think I've not requested this, so that if you could give us the per diem rates I would really appreciate that. If he hasn't got them available now maybe he could do so later so that we would know just how our various hospitals are faring and how much more economically they are run in the various areas. Probably, and I'm sure that it's not in all cases a matter of economics only because you will have some hospitals that have a much larger occupancy than others and as a result their operations are different.

On the matter of abortion raised by the Member for Thompson, I rather feel that this government should come at least half way. I feel strongly about this issue myself because when he presented the bill to the House that abortion not be covered by medicare payments I supported this bill and I still feel that way about it. I'm not so sure that the program that is followed by this government by paying for those cases--and I would like to hear from the Minister how many we have been paying for in the last year and what the cost was. I think we should not just ignore what he says or what he's asking for. I feel his arguments are valid in most areas or in most cases and that we should certainly listen and see what can be done. Certainly we could have this matter referred to a committee of the House so that it could be studied and brought in a report. Why not have a committee sit on it and hear from the public as to what they're wanting and what --(Interjection)-- Well the Member for Morris said to me that you people would just sit on it. I don't necessarily think that if a committee was appointed to hear people on this matter and if the majority of the people wanted it or if we had a good cross-section of representation from the people of this province on this matter, certainly it

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. FROESE cont'd) should be heeded and they could give us guidance as to what should be done on this matter. I don't think we should just let it go by and sit there and not do anything. I think something should be done.

So with these few questions and comments I will hear from the Minister what he has to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I was awaiting possibly some announcement from the Minister about two matters that I have previously taken up with him. As the time allotted for Estimates is drawing to a close it seemed that as I had not heard these announcements or indeed had any communication from his staff with regard to either one of them, one of these programs, it seemed that I had to rise at this time to bring them to his attention publicly and of course to bring them to his attention once again.

The first issue revolves around the Manitoba Mental Health Research Foundation. This foundation, Mr. Chairman, was established by an act of the Legislature in 1971, by a bill that I had the pleasure of introducing and piloting through the House - Bill No. 65 of that year. Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Mental Health Research Foundation in December presented a brief to the Minister, a fairly substantial brief of 12 pages, indicating what kind of research the foundation might engage in if it could obtain adequate funding from the government and from sources outside of the government. I think that the government and the Minister in particular have to make a decision as to whether they wish the Provincial Government to undertake research and care in all sectors of the health and welfare spectrum or whether indeed they do wish voluntary agencies to participate in providing care and services to people in need of health treatment and welfare.

I would hope that this government would go out of its way to encourage voluntary associations and I would hope that it would encourage the Manitoba Mental Health Research Foundation in its attempts to conduct research into the problems relative to mental health. And it could do this, the government could do this by providing an adequate grant to the Research Foundation so that it could get its program under way.

The need for research into mental health is surely not requiring substantiation by me but because of the delay in communicating any information to me and to the members of the Manitoba Mental Health Research Foundation perhaps I could reiterate just a brief facts so that the Minister could perhaps deal with them too in his reply.

It's my understanding that some 30 percent of the persons consulting a family doctor do so because of symptoms of emotional origin. That's a very high number and surely research into the problems that besets those people, those 30 percent, could be undertaken in part by a voluntary association. There is good reason for provincial funding too because as usual the Federal Government seems not to have got involved in this particular problem of mental health. The information I have indicates that a very small percentage of the research dollar is spent on the mental health question, and the figure I have is that 3.5 percent of the budget of the Medical Research Council is allocated to mental health research.

The Research Foundation itself includes in its board men of considerable repute in the Province of Manitoba and indeed internationally. I think that their indication of the need for provincial moneys to provide research into these mental health problems could be well listened to by the Minister and by the Government. The Foundation has asked for \$300,000 and that figure I understand is based on the per capita grant that is provided for mental health research in the Province of Saskatchewan. That comes to something like 35 cents per capita, a figure which hardly seems unreasonable. Certainly the Foundation initially could do with the smaller grant of \$300,000 and if the Minister needs reminding about the need of this Research Foundation I remind him now and look forward to some brief statement as to just what the position of his department and his government will be on the provision of grants to the Mental Health Research Foundation.

I might point out to the Minister and to his staff who are in the gallery that I have written to the Deputy Minister of his department and to the Minister about the need for at least some resolution of the problem facing the Mental Health Research Foundation. To date I have not received a reply to that letter. I believe I sent it to them some four weeks ago.

The other problem, Mr. Speaker, that I have raised with the Minister of Health on previous occasions and with one of the assistants to the Deputy Minister is a problem that faces

SUPPLY-HEALTH

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) those individuals in Manitoba who are working and maintaining themselves in a job but need, in order to maintain themselves in that job, some assistance in the provision of day care for their children. I know that the regulation set out in the Regulations of the Social Policy Manual of the Provincial Government do indicate the following in Section 1(1)(d) "Take-home pay plus voluntary deductions less a reasonable amount for the expenses of working determined on a case-by-case basis should be considered as income." I draw to the attention of the Minister that take-home pay would be the amount of money that such a person would have after the premiums have been paid by the Provincial Government under the new scheme that his department is introducing. In other words, Mr. Chairman, most wage earners will benefit from the \$8.30 reduction per month for a family in medical care premium. Every wage earner in Manitoba will have his income increased by 30 if he has a family and is paying the medical care premium now. However, those people who are as I said working, maintaining themselves in a job but at the same time require some assistance from the government or from a voluntary social agency, as far as I can make out so far, may not benefit from the reduction in the medical care premium. And the reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is this, that if the regulations of the department are administered in such a way as to require the person receiving this assistance to pay out in fact an additional \$8.30 for the assistance that they are receiving for the day care service that they are receiving, then this person who isn't on welfare is going to be discriminated against. I think it is a point that the Minister understands and surely his department by now has had a chance to see in what way they will be able to indicate, be able to ensure that the working sole support parent will in fact benefit from the elimination of the medical care premium.

Now I might point out, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister that if his department is not willing to enable those who are receiving special dependent care to receive the benefit of the elimination of the medical care program—I'm sorry the medical care premium, —then those people who are now working may find it beneficial to become welfare cases. And if his department cannot see some way of passing on the benefit of the elimination of the medical care premium to those people who are working and who do have children and who are receiving day care of some kind for example, then I think that what he is doing in fact is increasing the tendency of such people to become dependent on government welfare programs, and I think that what he should be doing, and he seems anxious now to deal with the point, what his department should be doing is increasing the independence of such people. Surely --(Interjection)-- in a few minutes.

MR. TOUPIN: Just one question.

MR. TURNBULL: In a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, I'm just concluding. I'm glad, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is anxious to deal with the problem now because I haven't had a response out of his department in the past. If he can increase the independence of those people who are receiving special dependent care, and if in fact this has been done, I shall be very pleased. If it has not been done and if these people who are working but need assistance of some kind or another are in fact going to have to pay out an additional \$8.30 a month for the services that they receive, then I think that the department is increasing dependency rather than independency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I would only like to ask a question of the Honourable Member for Osborne. When the Honourable Member for Osborne mentions the possibility of reduction into special dependent care offered to those individuals, am I correct in assuming that the sole supporters now are paying for their — still are paying for their medical and hospital premiums?

MR. TURNBULL: Well it's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, and I had hoped that they are. And I had hoped—Mr. Chairman, rather—to have several case histories before me tonight but I regrettably don't have them. But everyone that I have managed to speak to about this problem indicates to me that those people are working and who are now paying their medical care premium of \$8.30 a month for their family, will be reassessed under the regulations of the Department of Health and Social Development. And that reassessment will mean that those that are now receiving special dependent care or now receiving some form of assistance, will in fact not gain the benefits of the elimination of the medical care premium. All that happens is that they get their medical care premium reduced and they in turn have to pay out more money for the service that they are receiving. That's the information that I have

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) from people who are working with such clients. I can't get much closer to the source of that kind of information than dealing with the workers in the field,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge,

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I really had difficulty in believing my ears when the Minister stood up to speak following the comments of the Member from Morris. He really failed to answer any of the concerns that were expressed by that member, and in fact made a rather vehement defence of his department and that they had not apparently established the rates as yet without going to talk to the boards of the various personal care institutions,

He failed to comment on the question of whether there was going to be a central registry which would require the reporting of a vacancy in any bed for 24 hours with the result that that bed would be filled,

We really are very disappointed to hear that the local boards are going to be replaced, I believe that this is what the Minister said that they would be replaced by a regional board which would have authority . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health,

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that the boards would be replaced, I said that we would leave this to the local boards to decide among themselves, and if they decided to joining forces, amalgamate, that that's up to them. If they decided to remain as complete separate identities with a local autonomy, that's fine. We're not forcing anyone to amalgamate,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge,

MRS. TRUEMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that what the Minister says, I hope is true. We get a rather different sort of feedback which would indicate that those people who have privately owned personal care homes are to be replaced, that their boards are to be replaced and that in effect they will receive something like about a 3-1/2 percent return on their investment in return for the control being handed over to the agent of the Provincial Government,

Now I wanted to bring up some other matters. One concerns the recent increases in the old age pension and the guaranteed annual supplement--I should say the guaranteed income supplement. Previously people in Care received something like \$150 a month and at the present time due to the increases in the Federal pensions and so on, they're supposed to be receiving something like \$170.14 I believe per month, which would mean a net increase to the recipient of \$20.14. Now the government while they look after the people allow -- there are two items that actually come into the hands of the person who is in receipt of assistance and is living in personal care home. One is the personal allowance which is something like \$14.21, I think per month it was, and it's now going to be \$18.00 per month. Previously the clothing allowance was \$11.50, now is going to be \$12.00. Now the recipients receiving the increase in these two items gains \$4.19 per month, whereas if you subtract that \$4.19 from the \$20.14 pension increase, the Provincial Government or the Department of Social Allowances is getting \$15.95 of that increase. So I think that they shouldn't try to pretend that the additional benefits are being passed on to the person who is supposed to be in receipt of this increased assistance.

I wanted to take exception to the Minister's boast that at the present time he has held down the social allowance group to the extent that only 5.5 percent of the population are receiving assistance. This seems to be a matter of which he is very proud, and he speaks of having underspent by over \$4 million. His own report, the report prepared for him, the Barber Report indicates that 25 percent of the people of Manitoba live in poverty depending on which figures you use. If you use the Economic Council of Canada's figures you get one answer and the Committee on Poverty another figure. This group could be anywhere from 25 to 31 percent of the people. The Minister indicates that 5.5 percent of the population is receiving assistance, and I just don't see why he feels that this is anything to boast about. I think that the department is dealing very harshly with applicants at the present time and this is one of the reasons that we on this side are having more people approach us asking us to intercede on their behalf. And of course the Premier feels that we shouldn't ever intercede for any person who needs social allowances. It's a rather ridiculous posture for him to take since every member of the Legislature has an Ombudsman's type of role to play for the people in

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) his constituency and--well this is their first line of defense against what they feel is unfair treatment by the government.

So I wanted to extend a little farther this matter of the \$15.95 of the pension increase actually being absorbed by the government. That sum over a period of twelve months means something like \$191.40 from the person receiving the care in the home. This \$191 is contributed to the Provincial Government and this of course is far more than the Medicare reduction that they have passed on of \$4.30 a month. I think it's just a silly pretense that people are going to benefit from the fact that this Medicare premium has been reduced; in fact they have now lost their right to have a say in the delivery of their health services, the policies concerning it, and the government is now increasingly laying down the terms and conditions and drawing in all the control that it can possibly do. And one of the examples of this is in the regional boards which will likely replace the various local boards. The regional boards of course will have a great deal of work to do and probably will not only be appointed by the government but will also be paid for their efforts in comparison to the voluntary sector and the fine voluntary service that has been contributed in the past.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one more matter that I wanted to mention under this matter of the Executive Function. I was really hoping that we would move off this item shortly, and to reduce the amount of time concerned I'm going to raise a question now concerning the increase of over two-thirds for the expenditures of the office of the Associate Deputy Minister. The request in the Estimates is up over \$80,000 and I think that the Minister must give us a good explanation of this. We would like to know that this is something more than simply Empire building.

With those remarks I think I have covered all the things that were on my mind at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I've only got two or three questions here and I'd like to direct them at the Minister and he will perhaps have time to handle them even before 9:00 o'clock.

First of all, the Minister has commented on the increased expenditures that are likely to come in the way of support for day care centres in the province and I wonder, in relation to that if he could give us any idea yet whether any decisions have been made for support of the various day care centres that have appealed to his department for support. As he is more than well aware, there have been quite a number have been looking to the government for financial support. This has come in some cases from groups that have been sustained by other means up to this point. Some have started under LIP Programs which are short term or terminal programs and therefore where they have achieved a degree of success they're looking to the Provincial Government for financial support. I don't know that he has a list yet that he could submit to us in the same manner that has been done by the Minister of Tourism in his support for recreational facilities in the Province, and the Minister of Highways on his Road's Program, but if this could be distributed it would be helpful at this time.

The second question in relation to that is whether or not his department intends to give support to programs that operate "meals after school" program.

There have been a number of these operating in the City and possibly in the rural areas as well, but I know in the at least four that have been operating in the urban area that were operating last year and there's only two of them operating now mainly because of lack of support. Now these have fallen under the difficulty that they're peripheral to the day care centre program and therefore haven't got any specific category for support except that they are similar to a day care centre except they appeal and cater to working mothers usually where there's only one parent in the family and they are working in many cases, sometimes they're on welfare.

If they're on welfare they don't usually have a reason to qualify for the meals after school program. But in most cases, it's a case where you have one parent on a limited income and looking for support by way of meals at a very reasonable cost to their children going to school while they're working. It's usually of course a noon-hour meal which is provided, as I said, by at least four groups in the city. This is now down to two and they're in the threat of folding up as well because of their dependence on

SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) some sort of support from government agencies. And of course the government agency that it falls under is the Minister of Health and Social Development. That's my second question, Mr. Speaker, I have a third one.

The third question that I wanted to ask him about was the groups that have sprung up in the city called the Group Guidance for Anxiety Relief. --(Interjection)-- No, it's not the Group for Good Government, and I don't suppose the group for good government is going to ask the Minister of Health and Social Development for his support. I was unaware of the existence of the Group for Group Guidance for Anxiety Relief but there has been representation made as this being a very worthwhile and effective program. The way it operates, Mr. Chairman, is that the people who have suffered from some sort of nervous disorder and have an affliction that shows up by way of an anxiety reaction, which are many in number of course in our society, have found that the traditional means of psychotherapy, or other means, haven't been complete and ongoing enough to provide them with the assistance they need over a long period of time, and this group has formed, and I assume there may perhaps be more than one group or perhaps there is only one-- the Minister might be able to advise us on this--and they also have been getting a form of support from the Provincial Government so that they can finance one RPN - registered practical nurse- which in this particular case is a male nurse who has guided this particular group. They of course now feel that this sort of thing is essential to society because of the very good track record they've achieved in the last year or two since they formed.

Now I assume that this is a development that has been brought about by the Minister, and perhaps he can comment on it. At any rate I bring it to attention because I suspect that it was an experimental program, and like other experimental programs that are successful they're looking for continued support from the government.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's my third question. If the Minister could comment on those two, or those three questions, it would be helpful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, to start off with the last speaker, the Member for Riel, I can assure the honourable member that I did not cause the group of anxiety, the Group for Guidance of those in Anxiety to form themselves.

I did receive a request from them and it is being considered. And the same as the request for day care financing is being considered, not only for day care centres in the Province of Manitoba but that could include the meals after school program. I did indicate in my opening remarks that the day care program itself and related aspects will be a program available to all based on the ability to pay. There will be incentive grants to help them start off and then the per diem and the financing will be based on a scale, a scale that still is to be determined and once that is determined this will be related to the different groups that have applied for grants. At last count there was approximately 80 individual groups that have applied for support. So there is interest in the Province of Manitoba pertaining to day care centres and related functions. I did indicate previously during my comments to questions in the House that there were approximately half a million dollars in the budget of my department for day care centres, and so on. And this will be - I will be giving details on this very shortly.

I'd like to deal with a question posed of me of other members including the Member for Fort Rouge, that really surprised me in her comments in regard to poverty but I'll do so at a later date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 9 o'clock, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, the committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and passed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private members' hour. First item is private bills. Bill No. 33. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

BILL NO. 33

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek) presented Bill No. 33, an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate The Winnipeg Real Estate Board, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the changes in the act are very simple and they're just housekeeping. The change in the paragraph to point 1, section 1, are designed to separate out the officers of the corporation elected annually. Those officers are our permanent members of the corporation and employed by it to conduct its affairs. As a result the officer of the honorary secretary treasurer is now created, and the secretary treasurer of the corporation are permanent staff members. The section is also intended to add to the board the immediate past president of the corporation, and to add to the board the chairmen of the subdivisions within the corporation which deal with special areas and real estate.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the sections respecting the first election are designed to ensure that only one-half of the board of directors is elected annually and that there are continuing directors in office providing a continuity of the affairs of the corporation. The existing section 3 of the act is amended by deleting the first sentence which would now cover by the section 2 (11) both sections deleted and the new section inserted. The purpose of which is to ensure that the annual meetings are held each year in November and that officers are elected at that time.

The amendments to the section 9 of the act are designed to provide a more satisfactory method for arbitration of disputes between members of the corporation and to ensure that there are such matters submitted to arbitration. The procedure practice will follow the principles of natural justice and will incorporate many of the practices now in effect in the Manitoba Arbitration Act.

There is also one other area of the act, Mr. Speaker, that will give the salesmen who are presently working for companies selling real estate, that they will have the provision to have an arbitration board to deal directly with the Real Estate Board and will also put them in a position to have more say on the activities of the Real Estate Board.

That's all Mr. Speaker. It's basically housekeeping.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg, seconded by the Member for St. Matthews, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and passed.

BILL NO. 21

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 21. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Minister of Education. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews has six minutes left. Oh, Portage la Prairie, I'm sorry.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the scattered applause but really I have said about all I wish to say on the matter. I had spoken last year at length as to why the Mayor of the great City of Winnipeg should be elected by the people and not be elected by the politicians in the back room after they have been elected. And I stand by that stand, and I agree with the Member for Rupertsland when he proposed his private or his public bill this year. I made the statement when I was speaking last week on the bill that I intended to propose an amendment, and I now move the amendment, that the amendment calling for a six-month hoist be further amended by striking out the words "months" and substituting the words "days".

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to inform the honourable member that the amendment is not acceptable; according to our rules of procedure Beauchesne's Citation 202, Section 7 does not allow for an amendment to a six-month hoist.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the proposal before the Legislature was a simple proposal, was a simple proposal, the legislation was --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting, the Honourable Minister of Public Works says that it isn't, or it wasn't but --(Interjection)--

BILL 21

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) now that has to be contrasted with the position of the First Minister who has publicly stated that he's prepared to support, and his government is prepared to support the election of a mayor to the City of Winnipeg. Now you know one of the problems we've always had is who speaks for the NDP? The First Minister, or his Cabinet, or the second or third Minister? You know, are we --(Interjection)-- Well I wonder if I really can take a guess because I will in fact accept what the Minister of Public Works has said, and take a guess. My guess, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no agreement among the Cabinet and caucus of the NDP as to whether the mayor should or should not be elected; and my guess, Mr. Speaker, is supported by the Minister of Public Works who stood up and said that he couldn't support such a proposition. Mr. Speaker, the policy is not set by the First Minister, it is set by his caucus and by his Cabinet; and the reason, Mr. Speaker, that we are faced with this, you know, ridiculous situation, is because the NDP cannot come to an agreement as to what the future course of action should be about the election of a mayor of the City of Winnipeg.

And so much, Mr. Speaker, so much of the hypocrisy of the NDP is reflected in the actions of the First Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A point of privilege has been raised. Would the Honourable Minister of Public Works state his matter of privilege. Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): The Leader of the Opposition is not correctly interpreting my remarks. I think that I made it clear that I believe that it is. The honourable member said that I stood for the other system. I think that I made myself clear that I believe the original system as proposed was a good one; however, since we have agreed on this side of the House that we are in fact going to change the election of the mayor . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The explanation is accepted. We take each member's word in this House. The matter of privilege now is passed. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege, I believe that, if I read Hansard correctly, that the Minister of Public Works has in fact expressed the opinion that I stated. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I am prepared to take a guess that the NDP and the other side are in no agreement as to whether the mayor should or should not be elected. Mr. Speaker, I believe this, it is my opinion, surely I am entitled . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The matter of a point of order has been raised. The Honourable First Minister state his point of order?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, my point of order is that the Minister of Public Works has risen on a point of privilege to explain that he has not contradicted his leader, he's made that clear. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition now persists in saying that which the Minister of Public Works has expressly repudiated and denied. Therefore, and under the rules and practices of the House if an honourable member explains his position, then one must proceed from there and not carry on as though there has been no clarification made.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of what the Minister of Public Works has said is in direct contradiction of the statements of the First Minister. And, Mr. Speaker, I guess and I believe, and I think I can state that without question. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition not to provoke. He has been given assurance that what was said and what was meant. I cut off the Honourable Minister of Public Works because he was getting into debating the issue but he did clarify his opinion, and I think we should accept the word of the honourable gentleman and not provoke further. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. --(Interjection)-- Order, please. I believe I have clarified the point that was raised. I think we should try to proceed from there. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Morris have a point of order?

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, yes I am rising on the point of order that was raised. And if it reaches the stage in this House, Sir, that debate from this side of the House must not provoke the delicate sensibilities of honourable gentleman opposite then there'll be no

BILL 21

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) more debate in this Chamber. Surely the Leader of the Opposition has the right to interpret remarks as he hears them from the other side of the House, and he made that very clear. He said the way I interpreted the honourable member's remarks. Surely that is permissible in this Chamber to interpret their remarks the way we see them. We don't have to put their interpretation on them. We can put our own interpretation on their remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, or on the point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege surely what is allowed on the other side should be allowed on this side. On more than one occasion the First Minister has stood up and interpreted what the members opposite have said. --(Interjection)-- Yes, yes. On more than one occasion the First Minister has taken . . . has basically stated his understanding of what the individuals have said, and has proceeded on that premise.

Mr. Speaker, I will now interpret what I believe the Honourable Minister of Public Works has said, that he's in disagreement with the announced policy of the First Minister, and that is the premise that I take and, Mr. Speaker, the logic of my argument, it comes, follows--the logic of my argument, Mr. Speaker, follows because of the fact that the government will not pass a very simple amendment, and the reason they will not pass the simple amendment is because there is disagreement among the caucus and Cabinet, and because the First Minister, like in so many other issues, is not able to deliver on behalf of the NDP the policies that he states, because he's surrounded by colleagues who are in fact in disagreement with him on policy matters. Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has announced publicly that he supports the election of the mayor and that so does the New Democratic Party. The Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, has stated that he supports the election of a mayor. We on this side, Mr. Speaker, have stated that we . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member raise his matter of privilege.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to--I think I have to make the point clear because it is not understood by the Leader of the Opposition. I am not, I do support, I am in support of the position of the government as enunciated by the First Minister and --(Interjection)-- I have the floor --(Interjection)-- and, Mr. Speaker, my position was clear. I am in support of the position of the government, and I believe there are other changes that will ensue from that change in policy. That is my position.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. It's intolerable that the Honourable Minister should be in a position to debate, and it should be allowed by the Chair. Mr. Speaker, he had an opportunity to enter the debate in a legitimate way. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I am on the point of privilege. --(Interjection)-- I am on the point of privilege. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I wonder if I may appeal to the better sense of all the honourable members to get on with the debate. We have a subject before us and I would appeal to all members to try to maintain their decorum, their equilibrium, so that we can all take turns at debating this particular question. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

BILL 21 (Cont'd)

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has stated that in his opinion it is a policy of the NDP Party to allow the mayor to be elected. The Leader of the Liberal Party has said that the mayor should be elected. The Progressive Conservative Party has stated that it believes and supports the position that the mayor of the City of Winnipeg should be elected. --(Interjection)-- As far as I know, the Social Credit Party accept that position. The Independents accept that position. So, Mr. Speaker, as one of those rare occasions we had unanimity in this House and yet we can't pass the bill. Why? Because it was introduced not by the government but by a member on the opposite side. That's the logic --(Interjection)-- well that's the only logic to be applied by the First Minister. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it. The real reason, Mr. Speaker, is because there is no agreement on the other side. Mr. Speaker, we are led to believe, we are led to believe that when the Unicity Bill was brought in that there were three votes in the New Democratic Party caucus as to whether the mayor should or should not be elected. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, we are led to believe,

BILL 21

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) we are led to believe that the votes were I believe 14-13 the first time, 14-13 the next time, and 14-13 the third time. 14-13 Mr. Speaker, on the basis that the Mayor should be elected, 14-13 that the mayor should not be elected, and 14-13 that the Mayor should not be elected.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting because in effect the people who were consultants to the government, who were responsible for drafting the bill, recommended strongly, and that I am quite strong of, recommended strongly to the government that the whole concept developed in the Unicity Bill proposed and developed by them was going to fail if in fact the mayor was not elected. Because in effect they were setting up and establishing the equivalent of a Provincial Government for the City of Winnipeg, and with realistically the concept of responsible government being brought to the City of Winnipeg, and the whole concept of the 50 man council had no rationale unless he was one, unless the mayor was one to be elected by them. But the government, for whatever reason, made a decision, and albeit it was a close one, and the members on the opposite side know how close that really was, to allow the Mayor to be elected. And, Mr. Speaker, once you have done that and given that privilege to the people in the City of Winnipeg you cannot and should not take that privilege away from them.

Now it's a very simple proposition. A bill has been introduced by an Independent, and basically stating that the Mayor should be elected. There has been some discussion, and there is an assumption that the government is for it. Well Mr. Speaker, I say to you that the NDP Party is not for that position; I say to you that the NDP Party does not want the mayor elected; I say to you that the First Minister is not in control of the NDP Party; and I say to you that the actions of the First Minister and the NDP Party in not being prepared to support this position, is only conclusive of the conflict, the disagreement that exists, and still exists among the members opposite, . . . the members opposite with respect to the basic issue that they had to decide some time ago. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that what the First Minister is really saying is that I indicate that at the next session of the Legislature, if I can form a government, if I am lucky enough to have colleagues who will support me, I will allow a bill to be brought in to allow the Mayor to be elected. But I cannot, and I am not in a position to guarantee it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have on a number of occasions indicated to the House that I have had the opportunity of being a member of this Assembly longer than any member in the House, and that includes the Leader of the Opposition --(Interjection) -- my honourable friend for Arthur says to me, how many more times am I going to indicate that? And I suggest to my honourable friend that after the next general election I will be able to stand up in this House and say that I am continuing, but I doubt very much whether the Honourable Member for Arthur will be able to say the same because I think he will be replaced by his brother, who has already announced, who has already announced that he will be - that is, his brother who has already announced that he will be a candidate for the New Democratic Party in the constituency of Arthur, and I ask my honourable friend from Arthur to judge whether his brother is more intellectual than he is. But I leave that. I leave that. --(Interjection)-- It's perfectly relevant, that is perfectly true, and my honourable friend from Lakeside, my honourable friend from Lakeside knows of what I speak.

But, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the idiosyncracies of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in his expounding tonight . . .

A MEMBER: Who almost got kicked out last fall. Almost.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . is beyond comprehension, for, Mr. Speaker, that individual who represents River Heights, damn near got kicked out of the Leadership of the Conservative Party at Brandon not so long ago. And one of the instigators as far as I am aware of that particular procedure--(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, was the Member for Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his matter privilege?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that we all individually as members of this House have a responsibility when we think that a House privilege arises. I now rise, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to you that perhaps a gentle reminder to the Honourable the Ex House Leader, Minister of Labour, might be reminded that we are discussing the bill that's before us

BILL 21

(MR. ENNS cont'd) which, has to do with the electing of the Mayor at large of the City of Winnipeg. My only contribution Sir, to you that might keep some form of decorum in the debate in the next few moments.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . admonition of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. But his leader, only by virtue of a couple of votes --(Interjections)--

A MEMBER: He's not running for Mayor.

MR. PAULLEY: No. No. He did run, he did run for the Leadership of the Conservative Party and damned near was defeated at Brandon and he, Mr. Speaker, in the debate that we've had here tonight had the audacity to reindicate --(Interjection)-- Okay, but I'll sit the way you want. I am not educated the way my Honourable Member for Morris is and my friend --(Interjection)-- no I wasn't in Brandon at all. And God forbid that I ever attend a Conservative Party convention. I have far more intelligence than to be connected with the Conservative Party in Manitoba who have been so deficient over the years that they have imposed upon Manitobans persecution and prosecution ever since they were a political party in the Province of Manitoba. And I reject completely. But, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Conservative Party complained --(Interjection)-- Oh keep quiet! The Honourable the Leader of the Conservative Party complained because it appeared --(Interjection)-- Yes you can go and the whole damn works of you can go! But Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Conservative Party complained because in his opinion--and who the heck ever considers his opinion--in his opinion, he wondered whether or not the honourable member, the Honourable Minister of Public Works had the support of the Premier of the Province, the leader of our party, in making his observations on this bill. --(Interjection)-- Which one is supporting? I say to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek we are a united party, we will go into the next election united. The people of Manitoba will unitedly reject that bunch on the other side of the House. --(Interjections)-- Over here. I predicted, Mr. Speaker, I predicted in 1969 when the then Premier of the Province of Manitoba decided to call an election that the Conservative Party would go on their way into oblivion. The net result was that they're on that side of the House and we are on this. I predicted, Mr. Speaker, in 1962 that the Liberal Party were on their way out--they had 11 members at that particular time and they are four. And I suggest today, as we apparently are on the throes of a provincial election, that there will be a changeover, that there may be four Conservatives as a result of an election, and only two or three Liberals.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris state his point of order?

MR. JORGENSEN: I rise on a point of order. We're always delighted to hear the Minister of Labour when he's in such good spirits. But I wonder if you could persuade him, Sir, to return to the subject matter of the bill that is before us. I'd be interested in hearing his comments on the matter of the bill that is before us because we're always eager to learn from him.

MR. PAULLEY: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have attempted ever since the Honourable Member for Morris came into this House to try and educate my honourable friend, and I haven't been successful. And I hope that one of these days that some of the wisdom that emanates from me will penetrate his skull so that he knows a little bit about parliamentary procedure. And I don't, I don't, Mr. Speaker, assume to stand up in my position in this House with my hands on my hips and try and duplicate some other conservative who once was a character of some recognition in the whole of the Dominion of Canada, as my honourable friend from Morris attempts to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: The Minister still has not dealt with the subject matter of the bill that is before us, and it is that kind of an education that I want. I want to learn what he has to say about the bill. He doesn't need to tell me about myself, I hear enough of that from my wife. (laughter)

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Minister--order please. I wonder if I may appeal to the Honourable Minister to deal with the subject before us. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, what is the subject matter before us? (laughter) I suggest to you, I suggest to you in all deference, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the subject matter before us is to whether or not any member of this House has the right to propose a motion for a six-months hoist in a bill dealing with the election of the mayor of the City of

BILL 21

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Winnipeg. The Leader of the Opposition attempted tonight in speaking to this resolution to chastise and to condemn this government for the introduction of the motion.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for River Heights is attempting to grasp at moonbeams in order to introduce into what may be an election issue in the forthcoming campaign.

And one of the things that he is trying to do in his ineffectiveness is to use this as the methodology, that is the six-months hoist of this bill, to go before the electorate and say, I didn't introduce it. --(Interjection)-- You didn't introduce the original bill, and this, Mr. Speaker, is what I am trying to say to the ineffective and ineffectual leader of the Conservative Party in this House. He is trying, he is trying to use this as an issue in the next provincial election. What we have said, my Premier has said, and other Cabinet Ministers on this side of the House, we have said that we are firmly committed to the election of the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg on a universal basis. But those--no, I almost said, idiots, Mr. Speaker, and if I said idiots I don't know whether I would be unparliamentary or not. But what we have said, and this cannot penetrate the mind, if indeed he has a mind, of the Leader of the Opposition, it can't penetrate his mind, that it is not a simple matter to take in isolation the question of the election of the mayor of the City of Winnipeg. That man, the Leader of the Conservative Party, --(Interjection)-- is hogwash, you're right! You said it, I didn't. You're party damn near said it at Brandon that you had no confidence in him, and I don't blame you for saying that at Brandon, but why the heck don't you say it here in Winnipeg in this Assembly. There is no difference. But, Mr. Speaker, what the Honourable the Leader of the Conservative Party in this House and his colleagues in the Conservative Parties cannot comprehend that when we deal with the matter of the City of Winnipeg Act there are more important considerations than simply that of the election of the Mayor. I say, Mr. Speaker, as one of those who have been involved in municipal affairs, in school board affairs . . .

A MEMBER: Here we go again.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, here we go again, and I say to my honourable friend for Arthur, boy wouldn't Manitoba have been better served if he had of had some participation in the affairs at the municipal school board and provincial levels than he has had. Because, Mr. Speaker, because, Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting at this time, that there are more important matters to be considered than mere political expediency as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for River Heights in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition is doing a disservice to half a million people in the Greater Winnipeg area. I suggest that he is attempting by his utterances tonight to divorce and to divide the people of Manitoba. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition is really scraping at the bottom of the rain barrel in order to raise issues for the next provincial election. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he is doing a disservice and at one stage in the history of the Province of Manitoba the Conservative Party of Manitoba did render some service for the well-being of Manitoba. But when I hear as I heard tonight the utterances of the Leader of the Conservative Party here in the Province of Manitoba trying to raise issues to try and better the political position of the Conservative Party in this province, it is unbecoming the historical background of the Conservative Party.

I say to the Honourable Member for River Heights, I say to his colleagues, if damn it all, all you're trying to do is to scrape into the gutter issues for a possible election then it's unbecoming a once responsible political party in the Province of Manitoba. I am a New Democrat, there's no question. No I'm not ashamed of it. And if the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is ashamed of the fact that she is announced as a Conservative, I let her wear her mantle. I am not. But I do say to the Leader of the Conservative Party he has rendered a disservice to the Conservative Party and to the people of Manitoba by his utter nonsense that he has enunciated here in this Assembly tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me in opening a few remarks that I have, right at the beginning correct the honourable member who has just spoken. He is not a New Democrat, he is an old broken-down Democrat, and that I say with some sadness, with some sadness because I do have a considerable amount of genuine appreciation and affection for the former

BILL 21

(MR. ENNS cont'd) Leader of the New Democratic Party, the New Democratic Party that of course under his stewardship and under his leadership stayed in oblivion and saw no hope and saw no chance of improving that situation during the years of his stewardship in office.

But, Mr. Speaker, what causes me to rise, because I do want to speak on the pertinent aspects of the bill before us, is this sudden fear that I all of a sudden feel coming across from the other side about my leader, about the Leader of the Opposition; and about the concern that we now feel on the eve of an election that obviously is being felt by the members of the government. Mr. Speaker, I know, I know where that fear has its roots. There was indeed, Mr. Speaker, a happening last Tuesday on May 1st and there were happenings in other parts of the world on May 1st no doubt, but I'm speaking about a particular happening here in the City of Winnipeg which demonstrated to an enthusiastic and a very large number of Manitobans and Conservatives that the Conservative Party is in no way fading into oblivion but indeed is prepared to accept the challenge and the responsibility of returning to Manitobans such things as freedom of choice and opportunity now. Such things that will ensure that the reins of government will be once again passed into the hands of a responsible group of men and women. And there will be women, there will be women, Mr. Speaker, on that side of the House when we form government, at least three or four of them. And that may be cause for the Minister of Labour to have even additional worries because of the difficulties that the capable Member for Fort Rouge so often inflicts upon him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable Minister of Labour to cast crocodile tears about the welfare of such friends of mine as the Honourable Member for Arthur. Let me assure him the only concern that he has, the only concern that he has is that the Member for Arthur does not do any damage to the chair that he's sitting in because it will be his if he is lucky to be returned to this House. It will be the Minister of Labour's chair if he is lucky to be returned, that is after the group for good guidance or the group for good or whatever—they might have something to say with that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it comes to no surprise because of late of course the news has been all dismal for the members opposite. From the north of this province, from the north of this province they are in severe difficulty, and that in itself—well the member who laughs, the member who laughs so loudly, the member who laughs so loudly is of course appreciating one of the last laughs that he will have in this Chamber, one of the last laughs that he will have in this Chamber, so I suppose that we should not be unduly unkind to him for granting him that privilege.

Mr. Speaker, the ranks of the Conservative Party will be strengthened by at least three or four seats, members of the government, after the next general election and they will be coming to us from the north. To suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the ranks of the rural countryside will in any way be depleted is utter nonsense. I can assure you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A point of order has been raised. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I do hesitate to interrupt the honourable member's election speech but I believe it's Bill 21 that's before the House at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have every intention of coming to it. I'm sure you've already detected my geographic approach to this bill. I do not like to slight other members of our greater community of Manitoba who so often feel slighted because we deal solely with the Metropolitan Winnipeg area, so I started in the far north where the Conservatives will sweep at least four out of five seats in the coming election. And I'm drawing closer to the matter at hand, Bill 10, which deals with the Greater Metropolitan area when I talk about the countryside, seats such as the Honourable Member for Swan River who will be returned on the side of the government; the Honourable Member for Arthur will be returned for the government; indeed all sitting members who are here will be returned, plus as I suspect the First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture have found out in their travels throughout the province, a few others; in particular such seats as the seat of Gimli. Unfortunately I have to say to my honourable friend from Gimli, that seat is already virtually sewn up for the soon to be formed government under the new Progressive Conservative administration. The fact that we possibly will have to take a seat or two away from our friends in the Liberal Party, that of course has also not escaped the notice of most intelligible analysts of the political scene here in Manitoba

BILL 21

(MR. ENNS cont'd) and that too will augment and indeed make only doubly sure of the fact that we will be asked to form . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the honourable member would analyze the bill before us.

MR. ENNS: Coming to the City of Winnipeg. And here, Mr. Chairman, the honourable members opposite of course show that particularly sensitive Achilles heel. Because here we have even the possibility of an independent thrust coming out to them from the dark reaches of who knows where. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, members opposite, all those insignificant members who so happily rode on the coattails of their Lochinvar in the last election, they who now have had a chance of exposing themselves for the last four years to the general public, now must surely have some deep concerns as to how they can possibly stave off the defeat that is about them, so they are playing games, they're playing games with the name of the popular Mayor; they're hoping that perhaps their First Minister can assuage any concern that the Mayor has about his legitimate concern about the fact that the people of Winnipeg should-indeed I think most any average man that you meet on the street would be aghast at the suggestion that the Mayor of this big and important city, the capital city of Manitoba, should not be voted for by the people at large. You call yourselves democrats; you call yourselves democrats? Autocrats is the words that should be applied to them. Autocrats, and the Minister of Public Works spelled it out for us. The Minister of Public Works spelled it out for us. Especially the privy councillor from Elmwood who may have some special concerns, some special concerns as to whether or not he can ride out the wave of new thinking that is going to sweep the province in the course of this election.

Mr. Chairman, the suggestion, the suggestion that this people's party, this people's party would deny the 500,000-odd citizens of Winnipeg the right, Mr. Chairman, the God-given right to vote for their chief magistrate, to vote for their chief magistrate, their Mayor, their Mayor, is simply beyond all realm of understanding Mr. Speaker, to watch the coy little political games that they're trying to play in this particular matter, and to watch the First Minister attempt, attempt, Mr. Speaker, to pour oil over the obvious troubled waters, the obvious troubled waters that exist on this question, as they exist in so many other questions within the caucus and within the Cabinet of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall, Mr. Speaker, where the First Minister has on several occasions laid his credibility on the line, has said that he was in favour of something; he was going to see something through; he was going to do it, only to be shafted, only to be stabbed in the back by his own colleagues. And that, Mr. Speaker, that, Mr. Chairman, is what the people of Manitoba have reason to be worried about in this coming election. They will not be electing a Schreyer administration, they'll be electing the people around him and that's what the people of Manitoba have reason to be concerned about. That, Mr. Speaker, will be the reason why the people of Manitoba will reject him, will reject him.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the comments made by the Member for Lakeside, can he explain how it was that when the metro administration was established the Conservative government first appointed the head man, the chairman of metro, and then, secondly, allowed him to be elected by the councillors for the rest of the terms.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this government, this government, particularly with the record they have of appointing boards, whether it's in agricultural fields or in municipal fields or in any other fields, shouldn't be asking that kind of a question.

Firstly, the establishment of the metro form of government was always recognized as being a transitional one. And the appointment of that transitional board in no way superseded or took away from the fact that you had a Mayor properly elected, you had a Mayor and councillors properly elected by all people within the various municipal jurisdictions that made up the city at that time. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we didn't have just one Mayor, we had ten or twelve under that particular system of government. The Metro form of government was a transitional form of government, level of government, that even, if the honourable member would not be so quick to rise, that his colleague, particularly the Minister of Finance at that time, the man most charged with the responsibility of bringing about the passage of Bill 36 recognized, acknowledged, served on that council as did some other members, and always

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd) recognized the necessity of that transitional period of bringing about the first steps towards amalgamating certain services, indeed to bringing about the possibility of a form of a unicity complex if that indeed was the bent that any future government was directed upon.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's not confuse any little issues with the issue at hand. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this government, this government is not prepared to let the people of Winnipeg vote for their mayor, but this government in a coldly, cynically calculated move is going to pull the wool over the people's eyes before the next election. They get their best man up - the First Minister - to tell all and sundry that oh, we've got nothing against letting the people vote for the mayor, we have nothing against that, except we won't do it now. Well, Mr. Speaker, as my leader has said, if he, and if he speaks with some authority on that side, if he speaks with some authority on that side, says that he wants to do it, of the Leader of the Liberal Party says that they're prepared to do it, and if the Leader of the Opposition Party and the entire Conservative Party says we want to do it, and if the Independents say they want to do it, then why can't we show the people of Manitoba that there is unanimity of feeling every once in a while in this Chamber, that we don't have to argue with each other all the time, that here we have a simple clear issue as my leader has already said that is understood and clearly understood by most people that hear or talk about it. I'm sure every person sitting in the Chamber in the public galleries understands the gist of my arguments today. The fact of the matter is, if we are all agreed sitting in his semicircle, Mr. Speaker, that the mayor of this city should be voted by everybody, should be voted at large, then why can't we do it. Why the six-months hoist? Why the six-months hoist? Why the politics? Who's playing the games, Mr. Speaker? The fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is that the First Minister does not on this issue, as on so many other issues, control his caucus, never mind his Cabinet and that the position on this issue is far from as clear as the First Minister maybe himself would like to see, and he Mr. Speaker, is prepared to allow himself to further stretch the credibility problems that the building up for himself by these kind of tactics, by these kind of tactics. That Mr. Speaker, is really too bad, because the First Minister--and of course this is the way, this is the way leaders, this is the way premiers do get into credibility problems.--(Interjection)-- My leader is sitting beside me and my leader is going to be the next premier of this province. And let's have that clearly understood and you understand that.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you, Sir, appreciate the fact that I'm now dealing directly and squarely with the bill; obviously a subject matter that the members opposite don't want to deal with. It was demonstrated by a twenty minute speech by the Minister of Labour who chose to speak about everything else but the bill. When he was reminded that he was speaking to a bill he wasn't quite sure what bill he was speaking on. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is --(Interjection)-- he has to ask for guidance as the Honourable Member for Riel said. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that on an issue that really, that really needn't cause any divisiveness in this House, on an issue that really needn't cause any problems in this House, where there is a joint agreement in this House, Mr. Speaker, in my few moments remaining to me let me appeal to you once more, that I think it's of note that on the occasions that do present themselves where we can act with a degree of unanimity in this House, that it tends to strengthen-- and sometimes this Chamber needs some strengthening insofar as its image-making problems about the acrimony of recent debates, something like that--then let us, Mr. Speaker, join hands across the sea--no, well not quite the sea or South Indian Lake--but join hands in some fashion or other, join hands in some fashion or other before we enter into the fray that we know is about to descend upon us. Before we get into that election fray which the government says is going to be the dirtiest in Manitoba's history. We're not saying it but the government says that that's going to be the cause, and we have reason to believe that very likely will be the cause.

Mr. Speaker, here is an opportunity, amass, as we go into the eve of an election fray to join hands with a show of unanimity, do something that I am sure will be supported by 99 percent of the people of this province, certainly by 100 percent of the people that reside in the City of Winnipeg who want the privilege, who in fact demand the right to have their opportunity to vote for their mayor. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the time affords me just about the exact amount of time that is needed to deal, and deal effectively and concisely with the issue that is before us.

The Honourable the Member for Lakeside who has indulged again in one of his diatribes and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition who before him engaged in one of his less than intellectually honest exercises, both of them of course failed to grasp one essential point. And that essential point is that we have given a clear indication of intent, completely unequivocal, without qualification, without condition as to the way in which we shall proceed if we have the responsibility of office within ensuing years, relative to the question and the statutory provision for the election of the mayor of the City of Winnipeg.

Just to show you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, how desperate the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was in trying to make some issue, he deliberately in the face of Beauchesne and Bourinot tried to misrepresent the statements made by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. By that I mean, Sir, that Bourinot Page 350, makes it very clear that it is a well established parliamentary practice that when an honourable member is being misrepresented and misinterpreted it is open to him, and practice and usage of parliament leave it open to him to rise in his place in order to explain and indicate just precisely what he meant. But do you recall, Sir, about 40 minutes ago that when the Minister of Public Works attempted to gain recognition of the floor in order to make his statement the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition protested that he was somehow acting in a way that is out of order. So I would invite honourable members first of all to look at Page 350 of Bourinot in order to see what is the civilized long-established parliamentary practice in that respect. But of course the Leader of the Opposition would have no interest whatsoever, in fact would be inimical to his interest to allow the Minister of Public Works to explain what his position really was, because the Leader of the Opposition would like to continue the false impression that the Minister of Public Works was stating something the other day that was contrary to the government policy as I expressed it approximately ten days to two weeks ago on behalf of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no question about it whatsoever. Let there be not a bit nor tittle of doubt or uncertainty as to where the government stands with respect to this issue. We have stated and I reiterate now, that at least six months before the election of municipal council and mayor comes about in 1974 that change will be made. Therefore if it's made six months in advance it is entirely and completely academic as to whether it's done 14 months in advance or 16.

Now if honourable members, and one of course must pay respect to democracy, if other honourable members are called upon to form Her Majesty's government, it will then be open to them without being handcuffed, as to whether or not they intend to proceed with amendment to statute law to provide for the election of mayor at large. So therefore what conceivable recrimination, what conceivable argumentation can there be, in good faith, that it has to be done now?

Furthermore, my honourable members, and especially the Honourable Member for Morris, he above all, knows what the fate is of bills that are presented before Legislatures or Parliament that are either--and some of them may be good in principle-- that are either premature or else academic in the immediate context in which they are viewed. But if my honourable friend--and perhaps here I use the term inadvisably--if the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition persists in arguing that we have no intention of doing that which I have said we will do, then of course he is once again in a second context deliberately ignoring parliamentary usage and parliamentary practice.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would permit a question?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, as one who accepts the Premier's word that he will bring in a bill, I'd like to pose the following question. In the event that they are re-elected with a few other backbenchers that are opposed to the election of the mayor and what position, what will the Premier be able to do then. In other words, if he is double-crossed as he was on the school aid, what can the Premier do even though he has given us his word which I accept . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my Honourable friend the Member for Thompson raises

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. SCHREYER contd') a point which is in a parliamentary sense valid, that is to say in the event of another caucus, another government, But Mr. Speaker, I thank my honourable friend for the preface to his question and I say to him simply this: that it has been made as a statement of government policy so clear, so unequivocal, so unconditional, that I frankly cannot conceive of an alternative course of action being followed by any government which I would lead,

If my honourable friends opposite lead a government, it is open to them. If there is a successor to me, then it is open to them again. But Sir, I say to my honourable friend, and I look him in the eye as I say so, that the --(Interjection)-- my honourable friend is one case, the Honourable Member for Lakeside is another--contempt Sir, is the best word I can use to describe my reaction to the Honourable Member for Lakeside when he said that I had --(Interjection)-- Yes, I admit Sir, that I failed in my endeavours relative to the public and private and denominational schools question, but I made it clear all along, Sir, that that was on a free vote. But insofar as any matter of public policy on which it was a matter of government decision, Sir, we have not yet failed to deliver, not in one sense. (Applause) So least of all, Sir, do I intend to take any lectures from a Leader of an Opposition who is himself in a most precarious situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 10:00 o'clock the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)