

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, April 28, 1978

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I would like to draw the honourable member's attention to the gallery where we have Mr. Myron Just, Commissioner of Agriculture from the State of North Dakota. On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here today.
Presenting Petitions.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: The petition of Brandon General Hospital Praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Brandon General Hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 21 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone) on behalf of the Honourable Member for St. James, introduced Bill No. 16, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate St. Johns-Ravenscourt School.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Yes, to the First Minister, and flowing from a statement he made some one or two weeks ago with respect to Western Provincial Utility InterConnection, did the First Minister say, or can he say now, approximately when there may be expected a definitive report as to magnitude or quantity of Western Inter-Provincial Connection capacity increase or upgrading and technical feasibility and cost and so on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, no, the report or the communique that was issued by the western premiers did not deal with matters such as quantification, load, or anything of that nature. The time factor for the study is expected to be approximately six months and the preliminary steps to get it under way have already been taken.

MR. SCHREYER: A related question and that is to ask the First Minister, in the light of the Task Force report which devotes a section suggesting the very real need for revision of load growth forecast factor assumptions and suggesting that the 6 percent assumption was entirely too high, given that Manitoba Hydro's Planning and Forecasting Division has just completed its annual review and has made a revision, albeit only 1 percent downward in load forecast, does the First Minister have anything in mind to pursue this recommendation or to leave it lie given that there has been a review just completed?

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there will be fuller opportunity, as my honourable friend is well aware, when the Hydro Electric Board are before a committee to pursue the question of projections of load growth. The recommendation that is contained in the Task Force is, of course, as has been said on so many occasions merely a recommendation and it is a rather esoteric field for laymen to venture into so I will leave it, that is any further dialogue on it, until such time as we have Hydro before the committee where those questions can be asked.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, to the Minister responsible for reporting for the Task Force — responsible for the Task Force — if he will admit to it I'm not sure, and that is to ask the Minister, given that it is an

Friday, April 28, 1978

esoteric field for laymen to be involved in utility load growth forecasting — it's an assumption I share with the First Minister — can the Minister without Portfolio indicate on what basis the recommendations were made suggesting downward revision of significant magnitude?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, based on an assessment of the historical facts related to Hydro and the information that is provided I must say I think that the Honourable First Minister will, in fact, have that occasion to examine those who will come before the Public Utility Committee and in addition there is a particular commission or study that's now being undertaken and I think that there will be further information which will be of value.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: And that is to ask the Minister reporting for the Task Force whether he used the first person pronoun "I", meaning himself, or is he in a position to indicate who made those assumptions and those recommendations with respect to a downward revision from 6 percent to something much less than that?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the Task Force, there's a collective responsibility of all the members of the Task Force who were in fact commissioned by the government to bring forward recommendations, and when I use the word "I," I talk in terms of the Task Force itself, not in terms of myself. But I must say that the information that was supplied to the Task Force, the information upon which judgments were made, were made on the best evidence available, and the recommendations were brought forward on the basis of an assessment made by those who believe that that assessment in fact could be made.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting it wasn't made in full faith, the question is, was it made with the full facts? And I'd like to ask the Minister if he can indicate whether this collective Task Force — well, I'd like to ask the Minister, was it the totality of the Task Force or was it a sub-committee of the Task Force that delved into matters pertaining to utility rate load forecasts?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the methodology with respect to the Task Force is contained in Volume I One of the Task Force Report and there were several sources of information and several sources of review, one of which was a review of Crown corporations by a review team who in fact provided recommendations, but that was not the only source of information provided, nor did they conduct the only interviews that were taken with respect to appropriate officials.

MR. SCHREYER: Last supplement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, and that is to ask the Minister if he can indicate at least this much: were there any members or member of the Task Force that was, one could say, with electrical engineering background or utility senior management background?

MR. SPIVAK: Well Mr. Speaker, you know, it's very difficult for me to know the full backgrounds of all the individuals who participated. The particular positions that many of the officials hold are known and the academic background of many are known, but I can't in any way — but to suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I think this is the important question for the Leader of the Opposition, to suggest that the members had a particular expertise which was in fact necessary for a judgment and evaluation, I can't suggest that. But I think the Task Force approached this on the basis of facts and information that were presented to them, and if in fact there was information that was not presented, then, Mr. Speaker, it would fall on the shoulders of those who were responsible for producing that information. If there is a void at all. And I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that that is in fact the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Is it true that he intends to introduce legislation to eliminate variances on the driver's license due to sex and age?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, I don't know whether any legislation is required, whether it's not a matter of internal adjustments of rates by the Insurance Corporation but in any event if any change is contemplated, the members of this Chamber will be the first to know, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if what the Minister says is true, then how is it that we are the second to know since he has already announced it to the radio shows?

MR. ENNS: I don't wish to appear to be unduly unkind to the members of the news media, but I certainly can't be held responsible for anything that Mr. Warren at any time wishes to announce to his listening public.

MR. DOE: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Does the Minister have the support of his colleagues on this matter or is this another seat belt disaster, a case of, now you see it, now you don't?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: To the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Agriculture use his good office to request the producers and processors of fluid milk in the province delay a justifiable increase from their point of view, until such time as the government raises the minimum wage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY(Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I could have them consider that.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister of Agriculture, it is a matter of some urgency, because this affects over a quarter of a million people at a certain income level, minimum wage, fixed incomes, and incomes that are related to the minimum wage. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture, if he would use his good office, could perhaps delay this, so I would implore him to expedite it as quickly as possible because if he doesn't then people will be chewing Flintstones and drinking water.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, a question I believe rather important to the First Minister which presumably he will seize upon with alacrity, that is to ask the First Minister if he deems it advisable and in fact, would he proceed to register with the Government of Canada the strongest possible objections to the manner in which, according to reports, they have proceeded to make Dominion-Provincial fiscal arrangements with Quebec that apparently was not open to the other provinces because of the peculiar timing in which they proceeded relative to the sales tax arrangement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I too have only heard the reports. I have not seen any documentation on the particular arrangements that are alleged to be in the course of being made between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Province of Quebec. I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that these will be reviewed very carefully when the facts are known and we have further representations to make to the Government of Canada other than those that have already been made rather forcibly in the course of the Budget Speech itself, certainly the House will be so advised.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the supplementary would be in this fashion, to ask the First Minister, that upon ascertaining the facts that presumably are having Canada and the Province of Quebec agree to a sales tax reduction in that province of a selective kind with consequential transfer of funds from Ottawa, the Federal Treasury, to that province in a way, and under a formula which apparently was not available to any one of the other nine provinces. I realize there is a slight hypothesis here but if that be so, will the First Minister indicate whether, in that context, the Province of Manitoba would register the most grave of displeasure?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as previously indicated, we will look at all of the facts of that alleged arrangement between Canada and the Province of Quebec, and if the hypothesis expressed by the Leader of the Opposition is true, namely that they have received considerations above and beyond those that were accorded to other provinces, he can rest assured that the Province of Manitoba will register a full objection to that procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the Manitoba Medical Association having ratified the 6.8 percent agreement with the government, can the Minister of Labour inform the House whether she has offered any guidelines to the negotiating team of the government to offer the MGEA something in the same order?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the 6.88 only represents a part of the year; it's actually 5. something, so it's not that.

And as to whether I have given any guidelines, that is still confidentiality at the bargaining table.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question related to the current Manitoba Milk Control Board Hearings, which adjourned on Wednesday.

Is the Honourable Minister looking into the matter of whether, either the Legislation should be changed quickly, or perhaps a change in regulations, in order to allow consumer groups access to financial data of processors that are applying for an increase in milk. The consumer groups are being hamstrung in the presentation of their brief because of lack of data on financial operations of such companies, and my question is, is the Minister looking into the matter of changing his regulations, or if necessary the legislation, to enable such data to be made available to consumer groups?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: No I'm not, at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Well, in view of the importance of this particular item of milk being a very basic commodity, and as my colleague the Member for Winnipeg Centre has pointed out, affecting people particularly on lower incomes of which there are too many in this province, would the Honourable Minister agree to look into the matter, so that consumer groups can present an adequate case without having their hands tied behind their backs as it is now, in analysing the submissions made by processors in particular for an increase in prices?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wondered if the Honourable Minister was going to answer. I'm not sure. Is he not going to answer or is he going to answer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated there is no intention of our office doing that at this time, of looking into the changing of any legislations in regard to the Milk Control Board.

MR. EVANS: Well then a final supplementary question. Is the Minister not concerned that there are some major processors who are not requesting an increase because obviously they're making sufficient profits and is he not concerned that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Questions of concern are really not relevant in the Question Period at this time. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Due to the fact that he doesn't intend to do anything and leading from questions by my colleague, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, could the Minister of Agriculture prevail upon the Minister of Labour to allow the minimum wage to increase so that the consumers will not be obliged to ride on the backs of the producers; would the Minister of Agriculture undertake to convince his colleagues in Cabinet to allow the minimum wage to increase so that they won't have to ride on the backs of the producers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I direct my question to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Is it a fact that government is planning on laying off employees at the Thompson hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): It's certainly not a fact that the government is planning on doing so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARROW: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. How many are involved and do you plan on replacing them at another place of work?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Flin Flon would permit me to answer that question, I have been in touch with Thompson three times on a particular situation. There are 18 positions involved, either 9 or 10 presently are not being filled so they are vacant and the others are being transferred into the hospital. There will not be an individual laid off as such.

MR. BARROW: Does the Minister of Health not realize that Thompson is a Conservative constituency?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Meer for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health whether he could give to the House a report on the problems in the Lac du Bonnet Health Centre. Have they been resolved or where are we at with respect to the dispute as between the doctor and the board of that centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Minister in charge of the Environment. I wonder if he could give us an update on their findings at the East Selkirk situation, the water pollution problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, there is no definitive information available yet. I understand that some of the test wells are still contaminated; some of the dye studies have indicated that there is a connection between the abandoned quarry and the wells. Beyond that it is difficult at this stage to draw any conclusions.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I then ask the Minister whether it is his intention to require any contributing source to that abandoned quarry to alter the course of the flow of water discharged from whether it's septic fields or whether it's the large farm east of the 59 Highway. The Minister will recall that last year a test was taken on that particular flow from the farm where there was a 144,000 bacteria count showing up in the test.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of potential sources of contamination of the surface drainage that goes into those quarries and it is my understanding that there are presently discussions going on as to how that could be diverted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Would the Minister of Consumer Affairs use his position in Cabinet to protect the consumers of this province vis-a-vis an increase in milk prices? Would he use his position in Cabinet and talk to his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture? Very seriously, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister for

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If the honourable member, having asked his question, will allow the Minister to answer. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I was anxious to hear the question but somehow in the applause, I missed the question.

MR. EVANS: Well, I'm glad everybody is awake this early Friday morning after a late night. Would the Honourable Minister, in his capacity as Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs and I presume concerned with protecting consumer interests in this province, look into the matter of changing the regulations or perhaps legislation pertaining to the Milk Control Board so that consumer groups can have access to financial data in order to present a decent case or a well-prepared case to protect their interests before the Milk Control Board?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcome the specific suggestions made by the Member for Brandon East. The earlier questions relating to the terms under which the Milk Control Board was established were directed to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. I am given to understand that the Board is intended to represent various groups concerned in this hearing that not only are the producers represented but also consumer interests are indeed also represented on the makeup of the Board. But, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion of the Member for Brandon East is one that we will certainly consider and we will consider any other positive suggestions that he may have to make with respect to the hearings and the activities of the Board. We will await with interest any additional comments that he will have to make.

MR. EVANS: Well, I thank the Honourable Minister for his positive answer. There is a problem, Mr. Speaker, and part of my question related, previously at least, to the timing of it. Would the Honourable Minister, as the protector of consumer interests as it were of this province, look into this matter expeditiously and perhaps see that regulations are changed in this matter so that in these current hearings which are very vital, in these current hearings that the consumer groups can have access to financial data in order that they can properly present a case. It's a very serious matter; it's affecting hundreds of thousands of people in this province.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we'll examine the regulations to ensure that there are no impediments that prevent consumer groups from adequately representing their interests.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and is relating to the hearings presently before the Milk Control Board. When I asked him earlier in the session when the temporary increase, I believe of 2.73 cents per litre, was temporarily granted to the milk producers for metrification, is this now being taken into consideration before the present hearings of the Milk Board because I don't see how 2.73 is going to go on into perpetuity. Certainly the Minister must feel that at some time or another that metrification process will be finished, and is that being considered by the Milk Control Board at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say specifically that that particular problem or announcement is part of the present hearings as explained to the member at the time his question was put. My advice was that the 2.73 per litre was the cost of the conversion to the metric containers, and it was my further understanding that, after experience under the conversion, this would be re-examined to determine whether that was, in fact, completely necessary or whether some adjustment should be made.

MR. JENKINS: A supplementary question. Could the Minister inform the House when the Milk Board would be reviewing the changeover to metrification? Is it going to be this year some time, next year, or ten years from now? I mean how long is it going to take to pay for the change in metrification?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the Member for Logan realizes that I cannot speak for the Milk Control Board to tell the member in advance what their program and time table will be but it is a question that might very properly be put to the chairman of the Milk Control Board.

MR. JENKINS: A final supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister would undertake to table in this House the consistence of the present Milk Control Board and showing what groups they represent — which group represent consumers and which group represent producers and which group represent the final processors of milk — some time in the future.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Milk Control Board comes properly under the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. The terms of reference and the Annual Report of that Board are documents, I believe, that are available to the House.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just refer that question then to the Minister of Agriculture and ask if he would comply with that request.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should have a short seminar on the history and function of the Milk Control Board, and a good person to ask perhaps would be Mr. Monk who has been on it I think, since 1931 when it started. I wonder if the Minister of Health would take as notice a question. It appears as if the hospitals are automatically putting infants in their maternity wards on soy bean substitutes for milk. It's Friday morning, and the chirper from the corner whose tactics, Mr. Speaker, when somebody wants to be a little serious around here is to try to ham it up. I get a little bit tired of it once in a while. He has absolutely no interest in the people in the City of Winnipeg and their problems which are a critical nature at the moment relative to milk.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I would hope that the member would ask his question. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I would be only too glad to ask the question, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you will protect me from the inane comments of the . . . I will repeat it, and I ask the Minister to take it as notice that there is evidence that the hospitals automatically put infants in their maternity wards on milk substitutes, the brand names of which all end in "lac", without the consent, or even the awareness. I would suggest, of the parents of these children. Would he take it as notice and have his staff investigate it and report to this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the courtesy of permitting me to take the question as notice because I will certainly have to do that. I would say that I have no knowledge of that kind of practice. If it's in effect I would presume there's good reason for it but I have no knowledge of it. If he has any knowledge of it I would appreciate his communicating it to me. I will look into the matter and provide him with what information I can uncover. That's all I can do at this juncture, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health or the Minister of Northern Affairs, whichever succeeds in vying to answer, assuming they're vying to answer, and that is to ask with respect to the previous question relative to the Thompson General Hospital, if we are to understand the Minister of Northern Affairs answer it is that there is no direct layoff but there is some reduction in staffing patterns by way of attrition, or whatever, can the Minister indicate whether this is because of a reduction of patient in-take because of reduced activity and population at Thompson, and if not, then is it because of the only other alternative which is one of staff reductions being made necessary by virtue of budget support?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, first I would have to tell the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I have not had any official communication to me from the board of the Thompson Hospital outlining the situation to which he refers and the situation which has had some attention in the media — some reporting in the media — so I'm going from news reports and from the Leader of the Opposition's questions only.

Secondly, my conversations with the administration of the Thompson Hospital led me to conclude that the administration and the board felt there were some rational steps that could be taken to effect budgetary savings that would not have an impact of any significance in the service area. I'm operating on the assumption that if they find there is such difficulty they will be in touch with me. That's the only conclusion I can draw at this juncture.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, I thank the Minister for that answer, particularly the last sentence or two. May I ask the Minister of Mines and Resources responsible for environmental protection whether in his replies, which he gave to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, replies which I might say have an abundance of caution to them, may I ask the Minister whether he has received advice as to whether or not it is possible to apply sufficiently sophisticated biological analysis so as to determine for once and for all whether the pollution problem is being caused by human settlement, waste disposal, or by animal waste disposal problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: That question is being addressed, Mr. Speaker, but to this point they have been unable to differentiate on those two sources.

MR. SCHREYER: May I ask the Minister to perhaps take under advisement rather than reply today, whether this is because the nature of the problem does not lend itself to differentiation or whether in fact it does but requires more sophisticated analysis equipment and personnel.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to get the technical details on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOE: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Health in view of the apparent rejection of a demand on the part of nurses for a nine percent wage increase, apparent rejection by the hospitals. Prior to offering the hospitals and therefore staff of hospitals 2.9 percent with which they have to make adjustments in their programs and in their staff, did the Minister have any studies about alleged waste and mismanagement in the operation of hospitals or in the use or misuse of nursing staff, so that he could stand behind such a low offer?

MR. SPEAR: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I would say to my honourable friend in this respect is that I have had considerable expert advice provided me from professionals in the health field including representatives of the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses and other nursing organizations, and other health professionals, and the Manitoba Health organizations. The government's decision was made on the basis of that kind of advice, that kind of expertise, and that kind of experience. We also operate from the knowledge that our per capita health costs in Manitoba are the highest or very close to being the highest in the country. On that bases hospital administrations have been challenged to find ways to stay within an admittedly limited budgetary increase. They are making

every effort to do that.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, again, can the Minister then explain how he was able to find 6.8 percent for the medical profession and 2.9 percent for the nursing profession?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that question from my honourable friend because it gives me a chance again to try to explain the increase in the fee schedule, under which the MMA, or most of the MMA practices. The increase is 6.88 percent over what in effect is 15 months because we moved them from a calendar year to a fiscal year. Therefore the 12 month increase is 5.16 percent. That level was struck in close, intensive, and co-operative consultation with the medical profession, recognizing that that profession has a substantial operating cost attendant upon the practice of their professions, the maintenance of their offices. So a substantial portion of 5.16 percent is an operating cost pass through and there is some dispute as to whether the final income improvement figure for the physicians, for the professionals is 1.6 percent or 2.6 percent or 3 percent, but it's certainly in that range.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. I am referring to remarks by Mrs. Joyce Gleason, in which she expressed a concern in an intent to collect information and document apparent irrational moves in regard to cutbacks and the fact that there was some concern about providing safe nursing care and safeguarding patient welfare. This was her remark. I want to know whether the Minister has any information that is negative or that could be negative resulting from the government's policy of providing 2.9 percent, or whether he is just blithely proceeding on the assumption that there are no dangers, no problems, to patients and to health care in Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr' Speaker, I can assure my honourable friend I am not just blithely proceeding on assumptions. I respect Mrs. Gleason's argument. I not only respect it, I expect it, and I would think my honourable friend would expect it too. I would be operating in a fool's paradise if I didn't expect there would be that kind of approach that responsible professionals would take with respect to their own budgetary areas, but we are monitoring the whole situation very closely regularly; I have assured the Leader of the Opposition of that and I have no evidence of the kind that the Honourable Member for Elmwood has asked me about. None, as yet, Sir.

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

MR. D.JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. Does the Minister have an estimate of the total number of dollars needed for the present year to cover that 6.88 percent for the doctors?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister be prepared to share that information with the House?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, it will come up in my estimates of course, Mr. Speaker, but it's roughly 5.7 million.

MR. WALDING: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister inform the House in advance of his estimates whether that amount of 5.7 million is included in the printed estimates?

MR. SHERMAN: Absolutely, and underlined, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Education and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Highways.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: We have a quorum and we're on Page 46, Highways. Item 3. Planning and Design. 3.(a) Salaries—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could give us some information on this department and, in particular, the Winnipeg Rail Relocation Studies, Manitoba-Northlands FRED Program, Strengthening Agreement, Indian Reserve roads. I don't suppose he wants to talk about metric conversion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I make an apology. What was the original question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose, the Minister was still opening up his book and you listed a number of specific items. Could you repeat them?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that the listing of the items read by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose simply indicates that these, among the many other aspects of the department, are what provide for and create a great deal of work for our Planning and Design people. When we are informed, perhaps from a different department, the Department of Industry and Commerce or from the federal authorities, that rail relocation is being planned anywhere in the province, it generally affects the pattern of highway construction or rerouting of highways in that given area.

The FRED Program, as such, to be an in negotiating some cost-sharing arrangements with the Federal Government to help offset the contribution they have made in the past, perhaps through railways, in aid of transportation, that some of that should now be coming through the Provincial Department of Highways, either through a renegotiated highway strengthening program, an expansion or extension of that kind of a program, but this is what the planning and design people keep themselves busy with, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. What is the Red and Assiniboine Rivers study? What's happening in there?

MR. ENNS: My information, Mr. Chairman, is that this is again essentially initiated in this instance by the Parks people. It has to do with the development that they are involved in, again with the federal authorities, the ARC agreement here, the City of Winnipeg agreement, that is involved in the acquiring of riverbank land. Our input, or our association with it in this instance, comes because somewhere along the line transportation corridors are required, transportation facilities are required of one nature or another, and my information is that in this particular instance it's a matter of providing work and input that's been requested by the Department of Recreation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Yes, I'm just wondering, I wanted to ask through you, Mr. Chairman, to do with access roads. But probably I should maybe let that go until Number 6 or would now be a proper place and I'm thinking now of access roads off PRs.

MR. ENNS: I think, Mr. Chairman, now that we are moving along, perhaps the proper place would be on Resolution 6, Construction, when we're talking about construction if you don't mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that has always concerned me in this area, planning and design, has to do with whether we are doing enough with respect to planning and design of road intersection structures from the point of view of public safety, as opposed to the point of view of cost accounting. I'm thinking for an example, and I think it's a very good example, the intersection of Lagimodiere Boulevard and Regent Avenue. It's a very good illustration of a real safety problem having to do with pedestrians trying to cross that vast intersection, and with all the various signals directing vehicular traffic in different directions, whether there isn't some means of providing for a safety feature for pedestrian crossing in those kinds of busy intersections.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have to indicate to the honourable member, and I'm sure he's aware, that while the Department of Highways has a very good working relationship with the city, and the member is aware and the Committee should be aware that we contribute in a substantial way to the city's capital works project in their transportation improvement facilities, the particular facility referred to by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet does come, however, entirely within the jurisdiction of the city and the city public works department, and we do not as such have an initiative type of an impact in suggesting to the city the type of structure, the type of design that ought to be built. That's the information that the Deputy Minister furnishes me with, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't know the exact relationship. My understanding is that that is a highway that's paid for by the province. If I'm wrong there, I would appreciate being corrected.

MR. ENNS: The original highway was paid for by the province and then turned over to the city and is then treated like any other grant thing in terms of mile support for maintenance.

MR. USKIW: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, I don't think we should lose sight of that important aspect. Who should take the initiative is probably here nor there. I think what the important thing is that what we should do is attempt to set up systems which are life-saving systems. One tragedy is one too many if it can be avoided should be the philosophy in my opinion and that certainly planners and designers, I think, could work together with the City people to either act in an advisory capacity or whatever to bring about the sort of optimum in safety standards.

The other related question to safety still has to do with the increasing amounts of traffic other than vehicles, well unless you describe bicycles as vehicles, but I'm talking about bicycles, motorcycles and mopeds and so on, where either it's got to be more education for the general driving public or perhaps some extra facility built to accommodate that kind of traffic but it seems to be just too frequent an occurrence, the collisions that take place between motorcars and bicycles or motorcycles where the latter really have not much of a chance for survival. I don't know what the policy is of the department in this regard but I think that's an area that does require a great deal of attention and I think we're going to see more and more people travelling by way of the bicycle, the motorcycle and so on, because of the cost of energy, the cost of the vehicles and so on. I don't think it's going to be less.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet allows me to comment perhaps at a little greater length about one of the difficulties that the Department of Highways constantly faces and if I can expand it to the entire operation of the Department. The Department of Highways is often held up as the villain in the piece, for instance, when somebody wishes to locate either a commercial enterprise at what he deems to be a favourable intersection or wants direct access onto a highway with fast-moving traffic. The Department of Highways has to resist these encroachments for precisely the reasons the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet is bringing it to the attention of the committee. On the other hand, the Department of Highways is constantly — and is sensitive to the kind of areas where we do have safety problems and I would have to say that it probably ranks at the top of the list in terms of priority setting for the department. There are often other pressures on the department to provide X number of hundreds of thousands of dollars, or indeed millions of dollars, to provide for, let's say do away with a level crossing of a major intersection and put in the \$4 million or \$5 million interchange, cloverleaf if you like, that we all know is necessary to eventually solve a hazardous corner where two trunk highways meet or where density of traffic and rate of ascents tell us that that ought to be done. I think if you review the Estimates of the Department, we are trying to do that within the capabilities of the budget. We are in this year hopefully going to be addressing ourselves to at least two or three more major intersections. I refer to the four-laning of Highway 7 into and where it joins the Perimeter; the four-laning of Highway 12 where it joins Trans-Canada. These two areas have extremely dense traffic patterns and we recognize and certainly that is as much of the reason why they are on the program.

The overall question though of safety, I believe, has to be kept in perspective and I would ask the members to recall my opening comments. I think that we can take some satisfaction that the safety record, despite a 4 percent increase in registered drivers in the province this year, despite a 6 percent increase in registered vehicles this year, that we have recorded a 15 percent decrease in fatalities this year and I'm told by the Registrar of Vehicles that we, in fact, enjoy one of the best safety records on our highways of any jurisdiction in Canada. I think that that ought not to be forgotten and it says something that the department is cognizant of the matters raised by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet and that we do put into our design and into our planning of traffic arteries, the kind of safety features that, at the moment, technology says we can and dollars says we can. I think that's an ongoing process, one that will never really come to an end.

I think if you travel the highways, certainly over the past period, whether you take any special period of time, the last ten years, the last five years, that you will constantly see some improvements, whether it's in better reflectorized signing of highways, whether it's in better aggregates on the surface of highways where it has been brought to our attention that one type of surfacing provides a hazardous situation under certain weather conditions. The department is innovative in these things.

I can indicate to honourable members, just as a matter of a little side story of interest, the Department is this year purchasing some 20 tons, I believe, of material from a Swiss company in co-operation with the Federal Government, that consists of a chemical that is mixed right into the asphalt and that apparently will keep under reasonable temperature conditions the asphalt or the roadway free of ice, without the physical application of similar chemicals, salts, etc., that are used. Now, we have some doubts as to whether that can be applied in any great way for our conditions but we are certainly prepared to experiment in particular areas such as cloverleaf overpasses, where we have extremely hazardous conditions when motorists find themselves waking up to a morning of glare ice before highway crews can be out to sand and to make safe the approaches to these overpasses. We have a high rate of accidents. This is a program that we are experimenting with. The Federal Government is co-operating with other provinces, I believe, in a similar program. We are

having somebody from the University of Manitoba assist us just as an additional outside objective source to monitor the success or failure of this program. If it proves applicable and successful under our conditions, then we would perhaps expand that kind of a program.

I mention this only as being one of the many kinds of programs that the department is prepared to consider. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Highways in the technique and the technologies of providing either surfaces or better design is one that is constantly pressed on the department and certainly with the resources available. I'm satisfied we are addressing ourselves to that problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important area and I don't think we should regret any time spent on it. I would like to draw to the Minister's attention and perhaps the Deputy Minister might have some information for the Minister relative to past discussions on this particular example. It has to do with No. 9 highway north of Winnipeg, in other words, Main Street, as a good example relative to planning, safety, speed restriction, the whole gamut of things that go into trying to provide a safe highway system.

I have argued in the Highways Committee before, and the Deputy would remember that, that really, perhaps we should reclassify highways such as No. 9 north of Winnipeg here to the status of a street rather than try to deny people access to those highways because we want to maintain them as highways. I almost believe that I'm right and perhaps some studies should be done to confirm or otherwise, that that is no longer a highway and we can't hope to keep it as a highway with the density of population that we have there now and the rapidity at which it is increasing, the influx of new people every day, almost, into that area, into the new subdivisions has really rendered that highway to be a street. And therefore when we see people applying to the Highway Traffic Board — I believe it's the Highway Traffic Board — for access, they are often denied access, direct access, on the basis that it's a limited access highway. And I've argued perhaps it's time to reclassify that so that we don't deny people access and that we simply reduce speed limits as the population builds up and declare that a street.

In conjunction with that, and I think this is important, —(Interjection)— Well no, Mr. Chairman, I wanted the Minister to be briefed by the Deputy — in conjunction with that, it was my argument, along with a number of others on the Committee, and the Deputy would recall these discussions, that we thought it would be prudent to develop an alternate through highway from Selkirk to Winnipeg to take the main traffic load, the through traffic load, somewhere west of the CPR railway system, so that we can say, "Yes, No. 9 is now a street; we're not going to have limited access criteria any more. We'll give driveway access to that street, but the through traffic should really take another route." And I would hope that the department is still looking at that; I know we spend a lot of time on it, but I think that's a very crucial problem in that area relative to the amount of traffic that flows in and out of that area every day, both ways, both ways. A heavy commuter route.

The other question having to do with planning design and obviously policy, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that soon, or some day before too long — perhaps it's happened, maybe it has happened, I don't know. I was presently surprised to notice the lighting on the intersection of No. 6 and 101 the other day, which wasn't there. It was a very dark intersection. I would hope that perhaps we can move into a policy for no other reason than safety, a policy of lighting important and busy intersections so that we reduce the incidence of accidents and so on. Now, I know that costs money, because when you say a policy you must apply it province-wide, you can't pick and choose. And it may mean \$2 million or \$3 million of expenditures, it may be more, I really don't know, but I think that's an area that is or has been lacking — well, I'm sure it's still lacking and that we should be looking at it from the safety angle point of view.

I just make those comments for whatever they're worth, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think I expressed similar concerns about the particular stretch of highway that the member has spoken about, No. 9 north. It's undoubtedly going to happen, the transition of a highway to that of a street status, and the timing of that is probably what will determine that. To do that would call for greater restrictions on speed, and it's a question of when the department or when the public feels that that's the acceptable alternative. I'm the first one, and I'm sure the department is the first one to appreciate that if one were to move in that direction one would at least have to have alternate routes in mind at least, even if not in position.

The matter of lighting that the honourable member brings up again is one that I take no quarrel with. I can only indicate to him that inasmuch as in my caucus I have a great number of members who travel and come up to dark and unlit intersections during the night and I can personally indicate my satisfaction with the fact that that particular corner of No. 6 highway and 101, which I travel every night usually about the hour of 1:00 o'clock, has made a considerable improvement. I now don't bypass that great metropolitan area of Woodlands too often any more; I do get on to No. 6 highway a little more often.

So those are, I think, kind of general statements with which the Committee would take no objection. I know that there are many corners in Manitoba as major intersections develop, trunk highways meet, we experience funny phenomena. We can light up with flashing red lights and stop signs and well-marked corners, passing lanes, and yet, accidents continue to happen. And certainly, a better lit up intersection would be a continuing further factor from a safety point of view, but we are

talking more dollars, and I hope that the Committee will support the Highways Ministry when those dollars are necessary to be found.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre, unless he's prepared to waive to the Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BOYCE: Well, perhaps the Member for Flin Flon could go first, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I just have one question; I'll be very brief. Well, we are very concerned about No. 10 highway, of course. We've done a tremendous amount of work on it, and what we'd like to know is, will you continue the original plan to straighten that highway from Flin Flon to Bakers Narrows, will it continue?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to acknowledge that the Honourable Member for Flin Flon hadn't been at the Committee prior. We are now dealing with the Planning and Design, but we can answer it on this question too.

We are completing that portion of the work which considerably straightens out, I think reduces by some — what, six miles or something like that? —(Interjection)— from Flin Flon to Bakers Narrows. It's in the pink program, if you have not received it, Mr. Barrow, I would ask that you receive it. Substantial work is carrying on on that project.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I have a number of questions, Mr. Chairman, and when we're talking about planning and design, you have to understand the kind of priorities of the Minister, and perhaps I'll give him the areas of the questions and his staff can brief him, perhaps, and refresh his memory on some of them.

The first one is relative to the Perimeter Highway; the second is relative to the beltway system; the third is the Sherbrook-McGregor overpass; and the fourth is the upgrading of the municipal road system relative to strengthening the main highway system to 110,000. And the fifth one is specifically with the redesign of the road to Thompson.

So, on the first one, Mr. Chairman, this is under Planning and Design, and the original plans call for completion of the Perimeter Highway, roughly from the Birds Hill Road around 15. I wonder if the Minister could advise us what his plans are for this particular section of the Perimeter system.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Department of Highways in allocating X number of dollars in any given part of the province bears in mind the kind of money that is being spent in a particular area. One of the reasons why the completion of the Perimeter Highway in the particular area referred to by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, they have been spending in the last number of years, five, six years, pretty intensive inlay of dollars in the four laning of Lagimodiere and that has had the effect of putting back or down the ladder in priorities, the completion of the Perimeter in that area. The plans for that completion have not been abandoned, I should indicate to the honourable member, but as we are pressed for various reasons, traffic patterns, density of traffic patterns, accident problems in other areas, in that particular northeastern part of the city and exit of the city, the priorities of the department are dedicated to the continuation of four laning of 59, and have been in the past immediate number of years the four laning of Lagimodiere. There has been substantial investment in terms of the Department of Highways in that area and that kind of allocation of dollars have precluded the completion of the Perimeter at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, just by way of information, these are the kinds of questions the department has to consider. The estimated cost of completing that portion of the Perimeter is \$25 million and that is 1975 dollars. Now, those \$25 million, if I were to ask the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet or indeed even others, whether they would prefer to have that dedicated to continuation of four laning of 59 or to the Perimeter, that's how the priorities are being set up.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I understand the vastness of the project, but that doesn't change the situation. It's going to cost the City of Winnipeg about \$60 million in 1975 dollars to replace the aqueduct which is going to have to be replaced. But in the Boundary Commission Report which must be tabled in the House next year, I think that you will find that the influx of people into that Oak Bank-Hazel-ridge-Cooks Creek district is such that time is working against them. But can the Minister advise us at this time what his policy is relative to the beltway.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on the two second questions that were posed by the member to the Committee in reference to the beltway, in reference to Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, again the same reply that I gave to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet applies. We do not, the Department of Highways, initiate these programs, these are entirely within jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg. We certainly assist if and when the city is prepared to move forward on any of these

programs. We are there not only to provide technical assistance but also cost-sharing formulas are arrived at between the city and the province and hopefully in the case of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, Federal contributions will be required. The city has made its direct approaches through the offices of the mayor to Ottawa. We have indicated to the province that we are prepared to commit funds to the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, but I cannot respond to the honourable member in any more definite way inasmuch as that the Department of Highways of Manitoba does not initiate these projects.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I'll read the Minister's comments relative to the beltway, but nevertheless with the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, is the Minister telling us that they are going back to square one and they are not going to participate unless the Federal Government participates in the construction of this long delayed overpass.

MR. ENNS: No, there's no playing around with squares here. The Federal Government's position is reasonably clear; we're not particularly satisfied through the renegotiated contribution that we are receiving as a result of urban transportation assistance as with the old policy of railway crossings. What has now happened, the Federal Government has given us I believe a kind of a lump sum based on a per capita basis. We have indicated to the city that we are quite prepared to dedicate the major portion of that for that project, even though it may mean in some instances of putting off providing rail crossings, overhead rail crossings⁸ in other parts of the province. In other words, in the past, there used to be a particular fixed sum, that the Federal Government participated or contributed towards an overpass over railway lines. And that was not in total or an aggregated fixed sum. If we chose to put in two or three overpasses in different parts of the province over railways, we would get the appropriate and set federal contribution. That has been changed just recently in the last year to a fixed sum of some \$2 million over the next five years. Now we can dedicate all of that amount to the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass and have nothing for any rail crossings anywhere else in the province. But that's not hanging us up, I want to assure the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. We will, and I have indicated and the Minister of Municipal Affairs has indicated this directly to the city representatives, and I was present during those meetings, that the province is in no way impeding or holding up the decision to move forward the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister telling us that we can't expect that construction to start this year as was the plan prior to the change in government?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, again I would have to remind the honourable member of what I said just a little while ago. It is not the Department of Highways of Manitoba that decides whether the project will start this year, or October of this year, or September or May of this year, it is the City of Winnipeg that decides that, and I would ask him to direct that question to the City of Winnipeg for that confirmation. We have not been advised by the city that they intend to start this year, there has been of course considerable advance moneys already laid out in the acquisition of land, most of that I believe is in place. The city, in their priorities of capital projects in the city, have not indicated to us as yet a definitive starting date for that project.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I well realize it isn't the Department of Highways that is involved with the city, it's the Government of the Province of Manitoba that is involved with the city. And just on that point, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Highways in the Province of Manitoba is one of the best in the world, because anybody who disputes that fact, all he has to do is get off the interstate system down south and look at the States I'm sure that they will agree. It doesn't appear, Mr. Chairman, as if I'm going to get an answer to this. You know, the people in the City of Winnipeg, including those people who have been waiting and holding their breath till they're blue in the face for this particular overpass, and it appears that they're not going to get it this year, if ever.

But we'll go on to the next one, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that was drawn to my attention is that in going to 110,000 pounds the municipalities are still faced with the problem that many of the bridges in the province are 15 tons and that sort of thing. What has the Minister in mind as far as some plan of assistance to the municipalities to upgrade these bridges so these big trucks can get down the municipal road system?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the department's aware of that, and the department has regularly set aside a fixed sum of moneys for replacement of bridges relative to our capacity to design the bridges, our capacity to get them installed, we are every year replacing a number of the bridges. This dates back, by the way, right from the time the department took over, many of which were then called the main market roads and turned them into what we now call the provincial road system. These were the main municipal roads and with that, of course we inherited many weak structures and the bridges in many instances had been the weak links in the chain. As vehicle weights grew and trucks grew to expedite that kind of inter-connecting traffic that is necessary to take advantage of our trunk highway system these improvements have to be made. We are well-advanced in this program. The Deputy Minister may be able to provide me with how many bridges do we intend to build this year in that program? I've indicated we're building about 35 to 40 bridges this year, and that has been done regularly now for a goodly number of years and, in effect, slowly replacing the older and out-dated bridges that were in place when the provincial road system was actually formed as a provincial

highways department's responsibility, I believe, in the year 1964-65.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, by the way the Minister says that the department is aware of the situation. Having had the honour and privilege for a brief time to be a Minister of the Crown I found out that the department is usually aware of most things, but I'm more interested in the Minister's awareness than I am in the department's awareness. When he mentions 25 to 30 bridges being upgraded, to what capacity are these, you know, in general, because if we have a 110,000 lb. system at the end of the system . . .

MR. ENNS: Well, I'll try this one on the Member for Winnipeg South: HS 25, 35,000 lbs. per axle.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, that's a cute ploy of the . . . How about 302?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, seriously, certainly on the provincial road systems any structure that is being replaced is being replaced on the basis that it will have the capacity to handle 90 GVW, you know, 90,000 gross vehicle weights. The question may come to the Honourable Minister, why not 110? I would probably suspect that that it is the case in many instances, but you have to remember these are not your major trunk highway systems that we're talking about, these are your feeder lines that feed out into the smaller communities and into the rural parts of the province and have proven to be of sufficient design and strength to do the job.

Most of the kinds of road systems that we're talking about would have a gross vehicular weight restriction of some 70,000, 74,000 lbs. We're designing the bridges some 20,000 lbs. in excess of what would be the normal weight restriction capacity of these provincial road systems.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, it's an important matter but I should preface further questions by the fact that when I ask questions about rural road systems no way could people construe this as being a criticism of building an adequate system to handle the produce of the farm community because it is not. It's an interesting point, Mr. Chairman, that the media makes the case that I opposed the increase in the price of milk before the Milk Control Board which is not the case. I did not oppose it. I said that the farmers shouldn't subsidize, you know, the price of s. milk. The question is how do people pay for it? But in this regard, Mr. Chairman, what is happening is that effectively the cost of transportation of farm produce is being transferred from the taxpayers of Canada to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba; case of point is the building of Cargill's inland terminal in Elm Creek where it was that if a rail line was suffering a loss by the acute accounting systems of the railways then the taxpayers of the country, the whole country, paid for that particular line, but nevertheless what is effectively happening is that the railways are abandoning these lines and that the weight of the farm produce is being transferred to the road system, and while Canada is assisting the provinces to upgrade their main highway system to 110,000 lbs., nevertheless it eventually means that the provincial taxpayers will have to pay for the upgrading of the feeder system to almost that level because as the branch lines are abandoned the farmers are forced into the position where they have to go to bigger and bigger units to haul heavier and heavier loads which puts it all on the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba. So that's why I'm, as a city member, interested in just the progress of that particular program because I'm sure the Minister will agree that that is the case.

But one final question I have is relative to the road to Thompson. During the election campaign, Mr. Chairman, in that particular constituency we heard much about the potholes in that particular road. Now I would like to know what secret design the present government has to alleviate the problems on the highway up around Thompson because the road system in the City of Winnipeg has been here 100 years and is probably one of the best built, deepest bed systems that we have in the whole province but every spring we have potholes. So I wonder if the Minister at this time under his planning and design section could advise us how he's going to alleviate the problems on that particular road.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, there's no great secret as how you build a better road. You spend more dollars, and in this case it means a basic reconstruction of the road with using blast rock fill, with using perhaps, where it's advantageous, some of the material available to us from the slag heaps of INCO operation — that has been used with some success — but in essence it means embarking on a major reconstruction program over the course of the next three or four, or five years to reconstruct the provincial road No. 391.

I think the situation that we face there is such that we can no longer — we can continue with remedial work of fixing potholes, but we have basic deficiencies in the road bed which make travelling at any speed of over 50 mph hazardous and, as the member points out, the road every spring is in pretty rough condition. The program for the coming year has allocated and I believe that first contract was in our pre-advertising and has already been let — in excess of \$1 million to begin this process, starting with what we were lead to believe to be one of the poorer sections of the road from Wabowden to Ponton. But I hope to make a fuller statement directly to the council and the Mayor of Thompson and to indicate to them the plans of the department over the period of the next three or four years with respect to Provincial Road No. 391.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could advise us the technique which has been developed since October which will guarantee that sections of that road every spring won't sink regardless of how many dollars are put into it.

MR. ENNS: There's no trick at all. You see the technique that was developed since October is that we now are going to go back to building roads properly and forgetting about putting on too much election pavement. You see, that kind of road construction happens when you have a government that is, in fact, more interested in picking up the fast votes and we put on what we call a fast bit of election pavement over poorly prepared surfaces and then, of course, that doesn't hold up. I think we had that situation on the Narrows road interconnecting between the lakes and we are now having to come back to do that. The particular magic to the new technique is, of course, having elected 33 Conservatives on October 24th and having formed a Conservative administration. That magic will now be applied to the roads of Manitoba and will provide the people of Manitoba with better roads for years hence, including the people of Thompson.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was waiting for you to call the Minister to order. As you haven't, I assume that this is proper matter now for debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Winnipeg Centre, I thought that . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think it's quite in order, this is all what you call under Planning and Design. We planned mightily prior to October 11th how to do this and we have succeeded so the item before us, Planning and Design, devious design, otherwise, it's all part and parcel of the item under discussion I would think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just going to say to the members of the committee and to the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that I thought that the Minister of Highways was talking about Planning. Planning is a very very broad definition. The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, I don't take umbrage at the Minister. I will debate with him sex, sin, psychology, politics or anything else, on any forum. You know, the Minister has put on the record . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you could likely debate some of those things under this item if you wish. I'm a fairly lenient Chairman.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, you would like to debate with me on this issue? I don't want to debate with the Chair. But, nevertheless, the record will show this bunch of gobbledegook that the Minister has put on the record and every spring somebody will come along and I will take great pleasure in holding this up as, you know, next year, the year after, the year after, the year after, because, as I said earlier, they've had a road system in, by and large, under the control of the Conservative Party. They call themselves ICEC or something until they want to get into provincial politics, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And then what?

MR. BOYCE: The road system, the Conservative road system in the City of Winnipeg, every spring portions of it disappear. Now this will happen on 391, on every other road in the province unless, of course, the Minister is prepared to tell us at this time where he has come up with his secret formula or secret technicians because, by and large, it's the same staff that advised us well. Every once in a while this road system will disappear in Thompson but, of course, the Minister can't do that so he uses his usual ploy, as he does in the House when he can't answer a question, he gets that "Gee-hee-hee-hee" going as he did with me this morning. But, nevertheless, he . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think now I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman, because as the Member for Winnipeg Centre appropriately pointed out, what we say is in fact recorded for posterity and history and he's quite welcome to walk around the province over the next four years and draw attention, and focus attention, to the good job the government is doing in building roads but I'm worried about this "Gee-hee-hee-hee" and how that will be interpreted on the record. I just want to make it plain that I'd made no such statement and that I won't have to explain that to the good people of Manitoba when he's travelling around the Province of Manitoba.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, if Hansard has difficulty spelling "Gee-hee-hee-hee" I'll help them, but otherwise, it's my way of speaking and I apologize, not to the Minister, for my way of speaking.

But nevertheless, we might go on to some other speaker though because I really had those five questions and just in summation, the Perimeter Highway is in limbo, the beltway is in limbo, the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass is in limbo, the upgrading of roads . . . One out of five, one out of five, the Minister is doing something about. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just want to clarify for the Member for Winnipeg Centre when I said that under Planning and Design you could almost debate anything but I was hoping that he would debate it with the Minister and not the Chairman.

The Member for Rupertsland is next.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was listening with interest to the Minister's comments about election pavement. Since it is the same officials that are advising him, I assume as well as they advised the previous government and I hope and trust they will advise him as well as they have advised the previous government, I'm wondering if he can be more specific as to those particular areas where so-called election pavement was laid down which will fall apart, either is falling apart or will fall apart, because I don't believe that has ever taken place under the previous administration. I believe that the previous administration followed the advice of the Department of Highways in almost every case as to what kind of construction should be applied and to that end I believe that where there have been problems it has been problems that have been beyond the technical experience of the Department of Highways and not to downgrade any of their technical experience, I think that there are some cases such as the Thompson Highway and others where, in spite of all of the best techniques that were available at the time, there have been problems with the road construction and resulting deterioration of pavement quality or roadbed quality or whatever it may be. I take it that the Minister was joking when he said that there was election pavement laid down, I don't believe he was serious when he said that. But just in case he is serious I would like him to point out those areas that we may have been badly advised about, I don't believe that we were but just in case he is aware of some I would like him to advise us.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, let the record show that I am delighted that the same officials are advising me, and hopefully will be advising me over the next number of years, that advised the previous administration with respect to the construction programs of Highways. As to whether or not a particular kind of pavement exists in the province, I will leave that to the honourable member's fertile imagination to, as he roams through the province, to decide whether or not that kind of paving was in fact engaged in by any governments at any times, at different times.

It's a proven fact e that we have experienced — and I think that's an admonition to politicians in general and Minister's of Highways in general — that the true experience that has been garnered over the years by the professionals in the business of road building is that you cannot take too many shortcuts, that in some instances political pressure, public pressure, community pressure, has to be set aside, as uncomfortable as that may be from time to time to any individual member or individual Minister. And the prudent course of laying the proper base, using the full knowledge and full technological experience gained over the years by a department such as Highways, ought to be proceeded with. We're dealing with planning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't finished my comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I take it from the Minister's answer that he was providing, indeed providing us with a bit of sidelight humour there, and he really wasn't serious when he was accusing the previous government of laying election pavement. He may have been accusing all previous governments, including the previous Conservative government before the last New Democratic Party government.

Getting back to the planning and design, I must say I am very happy to know that the previous officials advised the previous government well. I mean, the same officials, I should say, advised the previous government well in their planning and design of a very difficult road to repair in my own particular constituency, PR 304, and I'm happy to see that pavement was laid down there. It can't be described as the kind of pavement that the Honourable Minister has just referred to, that is, so-called election pavement, since it is standing up very well. The type of construction has stood up very well, and I commend the department for their technical expertise in knowing what kind of construction technique applied well to the very difficult terrain that they had to deal with there.

For the future, however, I would like to know what planning and design is being contemplated with respect to that road; I note that there is certain funds allocated this year for a further construction of 7.6 miles of grade and gravel on that road, as well as completing the old portion that was uncompleted last year, approximately seven miles. Is the intention of the department in their planning and design to construct those two portions at a standard which will provide a base for asphalt surfacing similar to that which has already been completed? And are the plans being made to continue that paving process over that distance of new improved road that will be built this summer?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the upgrading or the continuation of the upgrading of 304 in the area that's of interest to the member is being continued on the same quality, the same standards, certainly with the hope that in due course will enable us to complete the work, including the asphalt overlay.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That completes my questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Minister opened up a new line of questioning when he mentions the political roads. I want him to know that in my area, my recommendations have been very closely identified with the priorities of the district engineers and from the department with very, very few exceptions. So I would take exception to those comments that he made. It's just perhaps by coincidence that the department felt and I felt, that there are certain roads that carried a great deal of traffic, tourism and farming, and that those are the roads that I would like to see updated in my area. And it's not my intention, and I know it is not the intention of the department, to start spending money on roads upon which no one travels. I would like to get that point clear.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, on a lovely spring morning like this morning, Christian charity and my desire to live at peace with my fellow man, forces me to withdraw those comments from the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass; 3.(b)—pass. 4. Highways Maintenance; 4.(a), Maintenance Programs. . The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes. I wonder if on this particular program, would the Minister give us the SMYs, the complete number?

MR. ENNS: We have on Item (a), Maintenance Programs, some 746 SMYs.

MR. ADAM: 740?

MR. ENNS: 746. And under traffic, in addition to that, a further 25.26 SMYs.

MR. ADAM: How many?

MR. ENNS: 25.26. That is the total SMY positions for the Highway Maintenance Programs under this appropriation. Gross Salaries in those same areas, if the member is interested, voted in 1977-78 was \$26,813,200; requested 1978-79 \$28,180,000, or an increase of \$1,366,800. And in the Traffic Division the vote in the previous year, 1977-78 was \$2,004,000; the request for this year in these Estimates is \$2,300,000 for an increase of \$296,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I could have the indulgence of the members of the Committee for a moment. Under Planning, I must pass the Resolution 68.

Resolved, that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,122,000 for Highways, Planning and Design—pass.? (Pass).

Carry on with Highways Maintenance. (a) Maintenance Program. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: The increase in Maintenance Programs appears to be about \$1.67 million, which is a very modest increase so I would expect that there will not be much increase over previous years of maintenance. Is that correct? The increase will barely cover the inflationary factors? In fact, there would probably be less maintenance; would that be a correct assumption?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, that's not a correct assumption. There is an actual increase of — as the member says — roughly 1.6 million and it's the advice of the department that they indicate to me that they believe they will be able to maintain the roads of Manitoba with those kinds of funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I did do some calculating here, and I guess I have to get into this debate because the Minister of Highways would have to recall the harangue of the last two sessions with respect to whether or not the previous government, the government at that time, was spending enough money on road maintenance, and indeed, Mr. Chairman, it was nothing but a harangue. For two whole sessions a number of Conservative MLAs participated — a good number of them did.

I would like to draw to your attention, Sir, that the increase between the 1976-77 spending on Maintenance and 1977-78 was \$3,546,000 and now this government comes in with an increase of \$1,662,000 on Maintenance. I would like the Minister to at least attempt to explain to me how the roads automatically improved over the winter that we now don't have to have a great deal of money allocated for road maintenance since they were so bad up to last fall. \$3.5 million increase last year was suggested to us as being no more than covering inflationary costs and that the road program was going to help, and now we have a Maintenance Program increase amounting to \$1.6 million. I don't fault this particular Minister but I want him to attempt to tell me what took place over the winter months that does not now require the kind of maintenance money that they thought that were required prior to last October?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm tempted to remind the honourable member that, of course, the greatest thing took place on October 24th and all things flowed from that. Mr. Chairman, I must indicate to the honourable members of the committee that we have looked at our operations and maintenance very carefully. We don't believe that certain practices and directions within the maintenance department of the Department of Highways, will enable us with these dollars to

markedly improve the maintenance on the roads of Manitoba. There have been some additional moneys and programs set aside to enable us to do this. We have set aside in the Capital division an additional half a million dollars for the stockpiling of gravel which is a major part and parcel of the maintenance program of our provincial roads, particularly our gravel roads.

I make it very clear to the honourable members opposite that in the event that we find ourselves not in a position to maintain the roads to the level and to the desired acceptability of then the travelling public it may well be in this area that additional funds may be requested but the department advises me that we hope to be able to maintain — pardon me, I'd like to correct that statement because I recognize how nervous honourable members are when we talk about having additional moneys put away in Capital division. The references that I made with respect to having additional moneys for the stockpiling of gravel are listed and are included in Resolution 73 entitled Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets where you have a total of some \$16 million plus on Resolution 15, contained in that appropriation are additional moneys that in effect are part and parcel of the Maintenance Program, principally for the stockpiling of gravel, principally for the stockpiling of gravel.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to make a major issue out of it other than to amuse myself with the past and the present and try to point out that we are moving from about a 13 percent increase in the last fiscal year on the Maintenance Program to about a 5.5 percent increase in the Maintenance Program in the proposed program in light of the fact that there was so much commentary about the lack of priority for road maintenance with the 13 percent increase that we had a year ago. I just put that so that the Minister of Highways and the members opposite would remember, would remember, for a little longer the impossible position they've put themselves into with those statements at that time during the debate on these departmental Estimates a year ago. Now we see that in fact the previous government was perhaps even too generous by comparison in spending that much money on road maintenance. I don't know what other conclusion one could come to unless we now find that this government is not at all interested in spending any amount of money on road maintenance which I just can't believe, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: That's correct, and you shouldn't believe it.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think what they have really found is that the road program was relatively in good shape and they don't have to worry about adding extra sums of money to road maintenance as they alleged had to be done a year ago.

With respect to the point that the Minister raises that we have to look for funds in other Resolutions, if you look at Resolution 73, Mr. Chairman, that is not where we find extra money for maintenance. We see there Winnipeg Streets Construction Assistance \$15 million — which is an increase of \$5 million over last year — and then Others are down from \$3.5 million to \$1 million so surely he is not going to convince us that there is some money hidden there. I can't see that at all, Mr. Chairman' I don't know what he is getting at.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, to suggest that I am trying to hide money anywhere is offensive to me and.

MR. USKIW: No, no, no, I didn't say that. I'm looking for it and it's not there. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Highways . . .

MR. ENNS: On moral and ethical grounds it's offensive to me that you're suggesting that I'm trying to hide money.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Highways indicated that there were some sums of money additional for the Road Maintenance Program to be found in Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, Resolution 73, and when I look at that, Mr. Chairman, I see an increase of \$5 million with respect to Winnipeg Street Construction Assistance — which is commendable — and then I notice Other Expenditures reduced from \$3.5 million to \$1,054,000.00. Where are those additional funds for our rural Road Maintenance Program that the Minister alludes to?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'll be more than happy to provide the breakdown of that particular appropriation, Resolution 73, to the member's satisfaction when we arrive at that point in the Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, there is no doubt that there's at least an 8 percent decrease in the Maintenance Program from the previous year and if you add to that the inflationary factor there are indications that we're going to have less maintenance in 1978-79 unless, there's an answer that technology, new technology, or costs of operation has decreased but I don't see it here. What is the snow plowing bill for 1977? What is the increase in the fiscal year for snow plowing, for instance? What is the

anticipated expenditure for snow plowing for 1978-79 and for 1976-77?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of interest, I can go back a few years. The snow plowing bill . . .

MR. ADAM: Let's go back to 1976-77. I have the rest.

MR. ENNS: I believe you have them there as well.

MR. USKIW: 1976-77 and 1978-79 is what I'd like.

MR. ENNS: The year 1976-77 was some \$5,142,000 and the year 1977-78 was some \$7 million, \$7 million in the past year for snow plowing. We are estimating the same amount for the coming year.

MR. ADAM: Seven million? No increase in that?

MR. ENNS: Yes, of which I can indicate to the honourable member only \$3 million will be spent because we do expect to have some influence with respect to how much snow is going to fall on our highways in this coming year.

MR. ADAM: Well, that's good news, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENNS: That is good news.

MR. ADAM: I want to ask the Minister, I asked him a while ago, what is the fleet number?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that does not come under these Estimates. You're referring to Highways or the government fleet cars. That would be in another Estimates, the Department of Public Works.

MR. ADAM: No, highway road maintenance fleet.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I could take that question as notice while staff finds that information for me.

MR. ADAM: We can move on to the next item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. 4. (a)—pass; 4. (b) Mechanical Division. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, on Salaries, there seems to be an increase of \$2.86 million on Salaries and Wages which seems to be about 8 percent. A good increase. Is there an additional staff? Well, Mr. Chairman, on the left hand column we're looking at \$3,314,900 and for 1978-79 we're looking at \$3,600,000 which is roughly about an 8 percent increase I would think.

MR. ENNS: That is the salary adjustment that has occurred during the course of the year.

MR. ADAM: You're not adding the agreement that will be signed in the future, so where does . . .

MR. ENNS: No, other than there is, as has always been a practice, just a figure and I believe it's \$8 million for the entire operations of government to be proportioned when a contract is concluded with the Civil Service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(b)(1) Salaries and Wages — pass; (b)(2) Other Expenditures \$5,800,000.00.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be quite an increase there as well. Could the Minister explain what this appropriation is for and if there is any carry-over or any Capital under this item. Is there any Capital?

MR. ENNS: No, this increase there is no Capital. The previous year the request was for \$4,942,000 under this item; we are requesting the year 1978-79 \$5,800,000 for an increase of \$858,000.00. This increase provides for the general rise in the cost of parts, fuels — and fuels is a major cost item in that area — and services and transfer of depreciation provisions from Capital Account to Current Account.

MR. ADAM: That's what I'm referring to. That's what I'm trying to get on the record. How much is the transfer to Capital Account?

MR. ENNS: No, it's just the depreciation provision from Capital Account to Current Account.

MR. ADAM: Depreciation provisions to Capital Account.

Friday, April 28, 1978

MR. ENNS: It's advised to me that within the Mechanical Division we have always had a revolving fund which is an internal fund not to be confused with the . . . I think part of the difficulty that the Member for Ste. Rose is having is that he is using last year's book. The depreciation amounts on equipment was placed into Capital Accounts last year. This year, not having a Capital Accounts, the depreciation amounts have to be shown as they are being shown here in the Current column.

MR. ADAM: \$5,800,000 that's where it is; that's where it is now.

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(2)—pass; (b)(3) Equipment and Tools—pass; (b)(4) Highway Buildings and Storage Yards—pass; (c)(1) Warehouse Stores, Salaries and Wages. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I think we can pass that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2) Other Expenditures.

MR. ADAM: Okay, there's an increase here of 100 percent. On (c)(2) there's an increase of 100 percent, what is the reason for that increase?

MR. ENNS: We have an increase of some note in the this particular item but this provides for (a) the normal rise in the cost of goods and services plus \$3,500 for design of a new inventory control system and the greatest number of dollars is \$27,000 related to added computer costs. It's a question of having our inventory and stores tie into the computerization program that's in effect in the Department of Highways or getting into the Department of Highways just as it is in so many other government services.

MR. ADAM: Do I understand that the stores now will all be under a computerized system, is that correct?

MR. ENNS: The inventory control system, the control of inventory will be computerized and to get them programmed, these are basically programming costs which the member would be aware of are expensive but once in place hopefully will provide for a more efficient control of our inventory stocks in this area.

MR. ADAM: And that is transferred to the computer division, that's where the charge goes. That's all done internally with the Highways computer system is it? Or do we farm that out to Cybershare?

MR. ENNS: These are costs that are associated and related back to the Warehouse Stores Division, that they have to incur to enable us to put our inventory control onto a computer system.

MR. ADAM: Who do they pay this money to? Who gets the \$32,000 extra that it's going to cost us?

MR. ENNS: It's the cost of likely providing a person, a computer programmer, a programmer to do the necessary work, punch the necessary keys, get the necessary cards indexed and set up so that the program can be computerized. It's an internal cost, an additional cost to the Warehouse Division of Highways.

MR. ADAM: Yes, it seems to me that any salaries should come under (1) if there's an increase in salaries there for the computerization. It should be under (1) and 64 is an additional cost.

MR. ENNS: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I'll backtrack a little bit, whatever moneys are directly attributable to salaries would be so listed under salaries. This cost reflects the cost of the system, the mechanical things that have to be purchased to set the system in motion.

MR. ADAMS: Well then, could we have a breakdown of that. It's not a big item, but just for the record, do you have a breakdown of those costs?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the breakdown would probably consist of boxes of cards, it probably consists of keypunch machines, it probably consists of items of this nature. Mr. Chairman, I'm not personally or totally aware of what it consists of, but I'm aware that when you change from a system of a manual inventory control system to a computer control system, you are bringing in a whole host of new office equipment, if you like, to make that possible. The reason why it's been specifically identified, and for that reason I would ask the member to remember that it is under the items of Supplies, Expenses, Equipments and Renewals, and it's under that heading that pretty well is self-explanatory as to what the item covers.

MR. ADAM: Yes. This will be done centrally, and that all the districts will be — or is that each district has its own, or it'll be a central . . . ?

MR. ENNS: This is the central warehouse stores in Winnipeg which is the main warehousing body for all our highway yards.

MR. ADAMS: Then, that will keep track of the inventory, is that what I understand? Does that keep track of the inventory, the culverts — how many culverts there are in Dauphin, how many culverts there are in Boissevain, or wherever they are, or whatever the materials?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, the particular item that the honourable member mentions does not come under Warehouse Stores. That would come under, I suppose, Construction, you know, physical assets. What this item deals with are those items that I would suspect are of a smaller nature, general equipment parts, parts for our own equipment that are purchased in bulk and stored at strategic locations so that we can effect reasonably fast, efficient maintenance. It means that our sources in Winnipeg, Brandon, Dauphin, Boissevain, Swan River, The Pas, Thompson, Roblin, Minnedosa, Beausejour, can tie into this central warehouse when they need a distributor cap for this particular machine that is operating on our highways.

MR. ADAM: Then there is no really computerized control of the next item. I think (c)(3) would be the Inventory, is that it, that we're buying, purchasing? Purchases, \$3,470,000.00. That's inventory?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that that will be or a good portion of that will be under the computerized system of inventory control.

MR. ADAMS: Oh. I see. Part of that . . .

MR. ENNS: In other words, in (c)(2) we are requesting the necessary moneys to mechanically put the system under computer control and (c)(3) gives you some indication of the annual resupply into the warehouse of the equipment parts and tools and what have you that will in fact come under this control.

MR. ADAM: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think this is the direction that we should be moving in then, is that our inventory, the same as any manufacturer or distributor, have computerized control of the stock, wherever it sits and wherever it is, and that's why I'm asking these questions. I think they are pertinent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(2)—pass; (c)(3)—pass; (d), Recoverable from others—pass.

Resolution 69: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$30,986,000—pass.

Item 5, Assistance Programs.
The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, in the left-hand column it shows \$16,790,000 which is about \$5 million more than anticipated. Does that have to do with transit assistance to the City of Winnipeg, or towns, or what? The Estimates were budgeted for a \$50,000 increase over 1976-77 and that would be \$1,150,000 and it shows up as \$16,790,000.00.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think what the honourable member is experiencing again is some difficulty with reading from the old book. That was the Estimate a year ago; this now, the figure in your left-hand column is the figure that was expended on this item, in Aids to Cities, Towns and Villages and Work in Unorganized Territories for a total of \$16,790,000.00. We anticipate that that same assistance extended and provided to the same areas of cities, towns, villages and unorganized territories will cost in the neighbourhood of \$17,420,000 this year.

MR. ADAM: There will be assistance for an additional 75 buses for Winnipeg? Does the Minister have the assistance figures for that?

MR. ENNS: Well Mr. Chairman, as you know, the previous administration advanced the order of buses for the City of Winnipeg to Flyer Industries, and the amount of dollars that the Provincial Government was obligated to was advanced in the fiscal year just foreclosed, the year 1977-78. There is no provision in these Estimates for further provision of bus purchases (a) because the City of Winnipeg has not requested them. They are now receiving delivery, I understand. And (b), it is questionable whether I would prefer to have them in the Estimates of the Department of Highways. Some question as to whether or not they could more appropriately be located in the Department of Municipal Affairs in the sense that the Department of Municipal Affairs deals more directly with the cities and municipalities. But the point in question really is that the bus expenditures, particularly the amounts that the honourable member is referring to, the 75 buses, were paid and spent in the years 1977-78, the year just concluded.

MR. ADAM: Yes. The figure I have for that 75 buses, \$2,771,400 for 1977-78, but it projected for another 75 buses. Is the Minister saying now that any future assistance for transit will now be transferred to the Department of Municipal Affairs?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm making that just as an observation. I wouldn't want the record to show that that in fact has or is going to take place; I'm just making that as an observation, that number one, there has been no request or no need for a provision for the purchases of buses by the City of Winnipeg in this fiscal year, partly for the reasons that I already indicated, that that had been advanced by the previous administration and paid for in the last fiscal year. And I just made the further observation that if indeed the City of Winnipeg makes a further request for additional busses, that it would be my preference that that be handled through the Department of Municipal Affairs.

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

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I will direct the honourable members to Page 25, Department of Education, where under Resolution No. 41, Section 1.(f) Inter-Provincial Training Agreements—pass — The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: I would like the Honourable Minister to explain what appears to be a significant reduction in the appropriation, namely from \$606,500 to \$488,700, a reduction of about \$118,000 or so, \$120,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, the difference between the two sums is explained by the fact that there will be no intake into the Dental Nursing Program this fall.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, that is rather interesting, Mr. Chairman, because I believe that the House was of the impression that there was no final decision made on the Dental Nursing Program, so, no final decision having been made, one would have thought that the program as it was established, and what it was designed to do, the trainees that it was to provide for in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, that that would continue. So it really does surprise me that in view of the fact that no decision having been made by the Health Department as to the future of the Dental Nurses Training Program, that the Department of Education saw fit to reduce the Estimates by that amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f) — The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I would hope we would get a response from the Minister on this rather important item of his Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f)—pass — The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Honourable Minister doesn't want to answer, after we have been assured by the Minister of Health that this program was still under consideration, and now we find, lo and behold, that the Dental Nursing Training Program which we share by using the facilities at the university in Regina, and we now find that the item has been, to all intents and purposes, liquidated. It has been struck from the Estimates, and the only conclusion that we as members of the opposition can come to, that either the Minister of Health doesn't know what he's talking about or the Minister of Education and he are not on the same wavelength, because the Minister of Health assured this House that he was still considering this program, and I think it is incumbent upon the Minister at this time to answer this House. And I can assure him that we're not going to pass this item until we do start getting some answers; we can stay here all day if we have to on this one item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I didn't answer the Member for Burrows; I missed the last part of his remarks. This of course does not represent the fact that the Child Dental Care Program is being suspended, what it does represent is the fact that it is not being expanded at this time. We have some 40 nurses in training at this particular time and they will continue in training; they are in the first year of their training at this time, of a two-year program. And so they will be continuing in this particular plan.

MR. JENKINS: I just want to get a bit of clarification. Now, the Minister says that they will continue in the plan. Is that till the end of this current term? They are now, these nurses, I understand, the ones that he is talking about, are in their first year of training and it's a two-year training program. What happens next year? Has the program been cut back, that these people are just going to sort of be left

in limbo with half their training completed?

Now, I think somewhere along the line, we have to start getting some straight answers, either from the Minister of Education or from the Minister of Health. Now you people have got to get together somewhere, and I think these people have already approached the Minister of Health and we've had communications from people who are in the process of training. They are naturally upset, they don't know exactly where they stand at the present time, and I think rightly so, I think it is incumbent upon the Minister to say one way or the other, so that these people can start making — unfortunately — other plans. But I think that the Minister should say, are these people who are in training now, is he going to take any new people into the program? I think these are answers that, before this item is passed, that the Minister should come up with some answers. If he can't answer them, well then I suggest that he and the Minister of Health get together and come up with some sort of an answer that we in this House can get some idea of where you are going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Logan is quite right and I am prepared to certainly do my best to try to answer the question. I didn't want to intrude on my colleague's Estimates, and I had assumed that the question would come up during the examination of my departmental Estimates which will be next. But I will do my very best to answer the question.

There are approximately 68 or 66 nurses in the course at Waskana College right now, nurse trainees. Between 35 and 38 of them just went in last fall so they would not be graduating until June of 1979. The other 28 went in a year earlier and they will be graduating this June, 1978. Normally, had the program been intended to continue in the fashion in which it was originally envisioned, there would have been an intake of a new group of student nurses next September. We have made the decision that that will not be the case; there will be no new ones taken in next September. So we're looking at approximately 66, 67, 68 nurses who are in the course right now.

The Childrens Dental Health Program is in existence in 29 school divisions in the province, all of them would be classified as rural type school divisions. The previous government had intended to expand it into six additional divisions in the fiscal year just ended and then move into Winnipeg, Brandon and the north in the fiscal year upon which we are now embarked. The government of the day froze the program at the level of the 29 divisions that it was in; we did not extend it into the six that had been on the schedule for 1977-78, and we are not extending it into those that were contemplated by the previous government for 1978-79. What we are attempting to do is work out with the private dental profession an opportunity for the profession to participate in the program, but the top priority must be the service of the children of this province, with particular emphasis on those in northern and remote and rural areas who do not have access to proper dental health.

And I want to assure my honourable friend for Logan that both the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health have been unswerving since we were privileged to become members of this government in our insistence that the top priority considerations must be, and will continue to be, the dental health of children with particular emphasis on those who come from areas of the province that aren't adequately served by the dental profession. We are planning to operate a pilot project in the Turtle Mountain School Division for a year which would involve the private profession and which will be evaluated at the end of that year. And we believe and hope that that year will commence with the new school year, this coming September, and run through the succeeding school year. The lessons we learn from that will help us determine whether we can apply the private profession in an active constructive role in extending the service into rural and remote areas, particularly into the north.

There's no problem in providing the program in major urban centres like Winnipeg and Brandon. And my honourable friend and I both recognize that probably neither of us would have too much difficulty, even with our limited knowledge of dentistry, in operating a program in urban areas. The problem is to get it into the remote areas, to serve them adequately. So we want to have a chance to evaluate what the private profession can do, while holding the state operated program in the 29 divisions in which it now operates.

Within the next year, we'll be able to come to conclusions as to whether the future of the program will rest entirely on a state-operated base, entirely on a private-operated base, or on a mix of the two. If I were to hazard a guess, and I'm only guessing, I would suggest that the ultimate program will be a mix of the two.

Now the nurses are obviously concerned about their future. I have attempted to reassure my honourable friends opposite in past weeks that I am equally concerned about their future. I have insisted, in my conversations with the dentists, that any program outside of the pilot project in Turtle Mountain, which is a separate program that will be funded to the extent of, I think, approximately \$32.5 thousand — between \$32,000 and \$40,000 — but outside of that, anywhere we go after we draw the conclusions that we draw from that program, must be a course of action in delivery of service that includes the dental nurse, that provides for the dental nurse in some form or another, that they must be accommodated in these discussions and deliberations that are being held. I am assured by my department officials, that there should be no difficulty in accommodating the 28 nurses coming out of Waskana this June, in the program as it exists right now, because though it's frozen in the 29 divisions, it expands in terms of age groups, as the honourable member knows. The difficulty is with the other 38 nurses in the first year of their course, and I want to be able to reassure them as quickly as I can. I can't reassure them any more fully at this juncture than I did a couple of weeks ago, when I met with some of their representatives, that they are part and parcel of the deliberations with the private

professions, and it is my intention that their future is to be accommodated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Honourable Minister for being as candid as he was, but from what the Honourable Minister has stated, that the 28 that are graduating this year will be fitted into the program, and the fact that there are going to be no new people going into the course this fall, it seems almost a *fait accompli* that the Minister has made up his mind that he's going to opt for a private plan. I agree with him that it's not in major cities like Winnipeg or Brandon, or major urban areas, that the problem exists. The problem of proper dental care is in the remote areas and in some of the rural areas, especially so in the remote areas.

The Honourable Minister will recall when we had hearings on the legislation that established the dental nurses, we found in northern areas that some of the dental care that was being taken up there was of a very rudimentary nature. Doctors, nurses and even lay people were pulling teeth and doing other things, and that is really unfortunate. You know, it is all well and good to say that you have a mix, which may or may not be the answer, but I have never seen any great rush of Doctors of Dentistry up into the remote areas, and I don't think that you are going to get that sort of thing. And that is unfortunate, because the Minister has said that that program for, say, the City of Winnipeg, and he also mentioned the remote areas, is now in limbo. And these are the people who are really the ones that need the dental prevention care; primarily, I think that was the whole idea of a good dental hygiene program with dental nurses to make sure that the children — because the teeth that you save today are teeth that you will use for many many years to come.

And it disappoints me that the Minister cannot even give an assurance to the 35 to 38 nurses. I understand the program is going to continue; I hope I heard the Minister correctly that they are going to be given the opportunity to finish their program. It would be tragic if they were cut off in midstream, but it is also tragic that some of these people are going to have to make some very serious decisions between now and next September, when the next semester at the Wascana College takes place, whether they should continue in the program. The Minister has said that there may not be any place for them in the program in Manitoba, and we are losing native Manitobans who have been educated at the cost of the taxpayers of Manitoba; they will have to probably go elsewhere, and I think that's unfortunate. I think the Minister should take a real hard look at this program.

And especially, I would say, maybe not so much for the City of Winnipeg — I don't think anyone can say here that they can't get proper dental care — in the centre core area it is just as bad as it is in some of the remote areas, these people simply haven't got that kind of money, but there is at least someplace here in the school program where they can get some care. But in some remote areas of the north there's nothing, there isn't "Painless Parker" around who used to pull teeth; he made \$2 million pulling teeth back in the 1880s, one on the east coast and one on the west coast — he used to hang them around his neck like grizzly teeth, it's unfortunate I/ that we have this mix-up. And we're going to have this same argument, I can assure the Minister, when we get into the Department of Health. But the unfortunate thing is that the money being provided for these people is mixed between your department and the Department of Education.

I would urge the Minister with all the verve that I can muster that he seriously look at the program, especially for the core area of Winnipeg and for the remote areas of Manitoba. Because I think these are the places which if we are going to have a preventative program, was one of the first things that the Minister of Health said when he took over as the Minister of Health and Social Development in the province, that he was interested in preventative medicine. Well, this is preventative medicine and as the old proverb says, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." So I urge the Minister to seriously look at this program and take a second look and a third look and a fourth look at it, because I think it is a program that is vital to the young people of the Province of Manitoba and I think that they should have healthy teeth for the decades to come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond to the Honourable Member for Logan, I want to say that I agree with him that there is a need for that kind of a program in Winnipeg and in Brandon. I never suggested that there wasn't. What I said was, even he and I with a limited knowledge of dentistry, at least mine is, would have no difficulty in operating a program in an urban centre like Winnipeg and Brandon. I agree with him that the need is there. Certainly the core area and other parts of the city and that is a part of the province that would certainly be included in any overall plan or program, but the question of operation is much more difficult, much more costly, and for many persons and professionals unfortunately much less attractive in remote areas than it is in urban areas. That was the only point that I was trying to make in that respect.

Secondly, I want to say to my honourable friend from St. Johns, who commented from his seat that it was easy to tell that the Minister had just been in Snow Lake, that I don't suppose the Member for St. Johns reads many of my public statements because I don't read many of his. But I want to remind him that I took a position a year ago and expounded it and articulated it during the election campaign in my constituency of Fort Garry in which I made it very clear that I was in favour of a universal children's dental health program, not necessarily state run, but a universal children's dental health

program, and I don't need to go to Snow Lake to convince myself of that or find that. It is a simple enough visit to go down to the children's clinic here in Winnipeg and look at the kids from the north who are being brought in with all kinds of medical problems that emanate from, result from, in many instances the fact that they have had no dental health, and no dental treatment, and no dental care. So I just want to remind the Member for St. Johns that my position has been consistent on this.

Thirdly, let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that I agree with the urgency that is suggested and emphasized by the Honourable Member for Logan, where the future of those particular nursing students is concerned. I feel that I am under a considerable deadline to come up with something to reassure them long before the next academic year would get under way next September. I know that they want to know and deserve to know as quickly as possible what sort of future is likely or possible for them in the dental field in Manitoba. I am hoping to work that through to a satisfactory conclusion just as quickly as possible. I will advise my honourable friend and other members of the House as soon as I have an answer. I don't have one yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I find some of the comments made by the Minister of Health interesting, and I thought perhaps that debate should take place under his Estimates, but because the moneys for training the dental nurses is in the Minister of Education's Budget, I guess we will have to come to it here.

I find it interesting that the Minister of Health says unequivocally that he favours a universal children's dental care program, and I am pleased to hear that. But I am wondering whether there is a play on words here. He says he favours 's universal children dental care, but not state controlled. What the devil does that mean? It means basically this, that we' as in the case of Medicare, where the arrangement was with the medical profession who determines the entire nature of the program, who will do what, how it will be done, with the medical profession as a pinnacle of the hierarchy, of the system. My fear has always been that we don't repeat that mistake in dealing with dentistry. Because if we go to a universal dental care program, Mr. Chairman, the costs of dental care for the entire population will make Medicare look like peanuts. It is far more expensive in the long run. —(Interjection)— So he is saying now, only for children. He is going to limit that, and I say to him you're going the most expensive route possible. —(Interjection)— That's right. Right. But you are going the most expensive route possible by tying yourself and putting yourself in the hands of the professional dentist.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it there is a drop here in funds being made available through the Department of Education for the training of dental nurses. It is a program and it made sense at the time, and I think that even the members opposite will agree, to utilize existing facilities in other provinces. Instead of every province building its own particular facility, whether it be optometry or for veterinary services, or dental services, it has been for many years an attempt to rationalize interprovincially and avoid the duplication that occurs in competition as between provinces. So it made sense. Coming back to the Education field, there has been for years an attempt made to rationalize facilities in one province by students being allowed to come in from other provinces, and that has been done in this particular instance.

The Dental Nurses Program was not going to be captive to the dentists, and that is key. You know, there is no question that a dentist can perform all of this work, but a dentist can perform by virtue of his or her training far more than a dental nurse. Just as a doctor having completed getting his M.D. is in a position to do work which no paramedical person can do. Our problem has been the poor way in which we utilize in all of these fields the health manpower. The way we have to go and it has been determined not just in this jurisdiction but elsewhere, the way we have to go is to use the abilities of people for those purposes which they are best suited.

Mr. Chairman, the dental nurses are trained specifically to do certain limited work under the guidance of a dentist and that is where the thing falls down. Because the dentist says, "Guidance means I have to be there, physically, I have to be there and I have to see what is done." Whether they see what is done or not, I don't know. I know that when you go to a dentist's office and you get the dental hygienist that cleans your teeth, you go in there, the dental hygienist does what she has to do; the dentist then walks in, takes a look, and says, "That's good," and walks out. That's supervision!

Mr. Chairman, this scheme was developed in order to be able to use people like dental hygienists, dental nurses, with specific training, and that training is intense, Mr. Chairman. It is 20 months where they do very restricted type of work. It is done after a dentist has seen the X-rays, has examined the child in the first instance, has marked on the sheet, on the chart, the nature of the work to be done, and he knows whether it is within the competence of a paraprofessional. It can be a simple filling. It can be a simple cleaning. It can be a simple teaching of the child how to use dental floss, how to brush properly, encourage them to do that and an annual check-up thereafter. To use dentists for that will lead you to be captive of the dentists, will lead you in a position where you are constantly negotiating as you have this year, or every year, with the medical profession, and paying the highest possible price. Because after all a dentist with his training says, "My time is worth money." I don't question that, but his time should be spent on those things which only he as a full professional can do, because no one else can do orthodonture, can do certain corrections, can deal with children with certain emotional problems, or disabilities which require the kind of care that only a dentist can give them.

Mr. Chairman, the program that exists in Saskatchewan and elsewhere is a good program. The records show, and I believe the Member for St. Boniface read it into the records last week, that a study

made by three dentists from outside the province, coming into the province and looking at something like a thousand children, came up with some very startling statistics. It indicated that the quality of the work done in the field by the dental nurses was in many cases superior to the dentists, and this is not to downgrade the dentists. I will take an analogy. A number of years ago any architectural office would automatically in hiring staff demand that their new people be architectural graduates, and then when the Community College developed the drafting course, lo and behold what happened was that they discovered that those students who had spent 20 solid months drafting were able to literally draft up a storm, and they could draft better than the graduate architect, because the graduate architect studied far more than just drafting. He took the entire spectrum of the architectural program. He had to know about the modulus of elasticity, he had to know all of these things, which, of course, the draftsman didn't. But the draftsman became so expert at this narrower field of endeavour that he really was able to do it faster and do it just as efficiently, but much faster than a graduate architect. The same applies here, Mr. Chairman.

For the Minister to say, "Well, it's easy in Winnipeg or in urban centres." It is not a matter of easier. It's a matter of what method are you going to use. What route are you going to follow? Are you going to lock yourself into the dentists, as we are locked in with the medical profession today, or are you going to try to develop, which as I say is becoming common all over, a recognition throughout the field of health, and I am sure the Minister has heard this, the better use, the more effective use of paraprofessionals. In this case the dental nurse is a paraprofessional. She doesn't work totally on her own. She works only after she is informed by written instructions the nature of the work that she has to do in this particular child's mouth. That's it, whether it is a cleaning of the teeth, whether it is a simple amalgam, whether it's — because you are dealing with baby teeth at that age — the odd case where it has to be pulled, all of these things can be done by paraprofessionals, providing they are adequately trained.

We know that they are adequately trained. We know the records from Saskatchewan show this, the evaluation has proved successful, and you are not locking yourself in to a really crazy situation, where you are saying that only a dentist can or should be doing the work or doing what is known as supervise the work by his presence. You are in the long run making yourself captive to a dental profession with all the cost concomitant that flow from that and they will flow from that inevitably. He says, "It is easy in Winnipeg." It isn't easy in Winnipeg. It is the same problem in Winnipeg as elsewhere, there are more children in Winnipeg, and sure, in the City of Winnipeg School Division No. 1 they have a form of dental program. In some of the suburbs of the outlying divisions they don't and in some where they do they simply have somebody look at the teeth and say, "Go see your dentist."

Well, as the Minister knows, if you have a child or children who require dental care it is a very costly business and there are thousands of parents who simply feel they can't afford it, and whose children don't see a dentist. The key to good dental health is to start young. The younger you can get at the child, the more you'll save in the long run. If you can get that child started right, if you can get the care initially, as early as possible — we're starting at five because that's the most effective way of doing it, the children are in kindergarten, they are there. If you do it on the basis of four or three-year olds, the parents may or may not bring them. So starting at five, you start with those children, you do the initial work, the annual maintenance, the dental nurse having the time — and this is part of the program — making that child very conscious of dental health, making it an accepted thing for that child to use dental floss, to brush their teeth regularly, to come in for flouridation. These are things that do not require a dentist and if you say, "Well, the dentist doesn't necessarily do them but the dentist will supervise by his physical presence, if not overlooking them in the same chair but being in the same room," then I say you're going to the most expensive way of doing it and in the final analysis, because of that, dollars will limit the number of children that you can look after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would like to direct the honourable members' attention to the loge on my right, the Deputy Premier of the Province of British Columbia, the Honourable Grace McCarthy. We welcome her on behalf of the members.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, my concern — and I think the tragedy — will simply be that yes, we'll have a Dental Program of some kind or another and those dental nurses that have graduated, something will be found for them. I'm sure the dentists in the city and elsewhere will be glad to have them in their office because instead of taking somebody in and training them to stand by and hand them his tools, he'll have somebody ready-made to do it and I'm sure they'll get a job. But the tragedy is that we're going the route which will cost the most, the most expensive, and inevitably the government will say — any government, I don't care what it's political stripe will say, "Hold it; whoa back. We just cannot pour that much money into one program. We just haven't got it."

So the answer lies in coming up with a system whereby the same dollars are going to give you more effective dental care for children, more widespread use of dental care for children within a budgetary figure which is manageable. If you don't, if you persist in following the route of Medicare and saying, "The doctor is the key man; he determines. The nurse is simply a right hand, if you want, a left hand to the doctor simply to jump at his command, not to do anything on their own," which is pretty well what they're limited to now, then you're not utilizing manpower properly. This has come

through all over the place; at the World Health Organization; it's come through in the United States, it's come through in Canada, it's come through in Europe; it's come through everywhere. Do not trap yourself by locking yourself in with the one select group of professionals who have, of course, a vested interest. The dentist says, "If I'm going to spend one hour, whether I'm doing some very sophisticated work in a patient's mouth or I'm simply standing by and watching somebody I've ordered to do something, then I'm going to be paid at X dollars per hour;" that is an expensive X dollars per hour and I don't blame them. They have attended a very difficult program of studies at universities for many years and certainly they're entitled to be paid accordingly. I don't expect them to work for \$10.00 or \$12.00 an hour and they don't. I forget what the going rate is now on an hourly, half-hourly basis, but it's fairly high and I don't begrudge them that.

I'm saying we're silly that we're simply still thinking in obsolete terms. We're thinking in obsolete terms. It simply makes no sense as I say. You know, just as LPNs, Licensed Practical Nurses, came into being because it was recognized that to use a registered nurse to do certain functions was a waste of resources, manpower and money, and under-utilizing the skill of the person, the same applies here. We have to move in the field of medical health towards the greater use of paraprofessionals and we must, at the beginning of a program, use the paraprofessional people because if we don't, as I say, it's going to be too late. It's very hard to reverse the process, very very hard to reverse the process once it's established. We're going to become captive to the dental profession.

Sure, I know that in rural Manitoba, northern Manitoba, the Minister will have this problem. There are no dentists there; they don't want to live there necessarily and so he'll be able to fit these people in somewhere. But the danger we're now facing is that the dental profession takes over the steering of this program; in the long run, they will command the method in which it is delivered and it will be the most expensive way of delivering it. It can only be the most expensive way because, as I say, we are using the most skilled person, the most highly trained, the person who is really entitled to a very good return on the time and the years that he spent within the profession to acquire his skill; a skill that goes far beyond the kind of work that the dental nurse does and a skill which, I say, a dental nurse can do adequately and can do well and has proven to do well in other jurisdictions.

Now I know that the Minister is going to try a pilot program and the pilot program will show that they can do more children per hour in what may first appear to be a lower unit cost. But the reason for that, and that's been now shown elsewhere in other jurisdictions, is that the dental nurse graduating after two years, after 20 months, of course is very cautious, very careful — and because there is a dentist that is going to determine what she does in the first place and then check the results later on, is very careful and takes a lot of time with children. Part of the process is to try to gain the confidence of the child, to try to overcome the fear that children — and adults, for that matter — have of dentists because people don't flock to dentists unless they have to. That's one difference between Medicare and Dentalcare. People may want to go to a doctor for assurances to make them feel better. I don't know too many people who run to dentists. It's still not the kind of profession that attracts people voluntarily. But the dental nurse does spend more time with children, that is part of the educational process because preventative dental health care is the key to it and it's known that if you get that child early enough and if you can work on that child annually to age, let's say 16, then the likelihood is that you have prevented future dental problems which may cost hundreds of thousands of dollars and allow that person to retain their natural teeth, perhaps throughout their lifetime instead of what was happening just a few years ago where people simply got to a point where they said, "Well, it's going to cost so much; let's forget about it. We'll pull our teeth, put in false teeth and that's the end of it."

So initially it may be that the dental scheme that the dental profession is coming up with, may indeed show a lesser unit cost but in the long run, over a period of five years, as the dental nurses improve their efficiency through confidence, through the fact that they're doing this day-in, day-out, eight hours a day or seven hours a day, whatever it is, that in the long run the unit cost will be less as was shown in Saskatchewan and certainly the savings to the community at large in the long run and to the individual is far less because of the dental health that will then flow, not for this immediate generation because you have to wait until they grow up — it's 12 years down the line — but the preventative aspect which as the Minister knows is something that he is hoping to achieve, bears fruit not today but 10, 15, 20 years down the line. That's when you see the benefits of preventative program. You won't see it immediately. As a matter of fact, immediately there may be more costs as the Minister probably knows.

I urge the Minister to give serious . . . I don't know what he's done with the dentists. I don't know what commitments he's made but I would urge him not to abort this program because that's what he's doing. He's doing it gradually. He's not saying, "Those who are on course and put in one year, forget it, you've lost." He can't really do that; that would be totally immoral because these students went into the program, it's a two-year program, and in all good faith they've undertaken their studies and are involved in those studies, so he will — according to these figures here — he will allow them to continue to complete their program. But now that's the end and I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, when we wanted to launch this program, we were faced with the dilemma: shall we start a program in Manitoba? — and some of us were very reluctant to do that. There's a great capital cost involved and we said, "No," since many years earlier I had been involved in inter-provincial university rationalization talks with other provinces. We said, "This is an ideal example of utilizing the facilities already available in one province and sending in students from other provinces. In the long run it costs less because you don't have the capital outlay that one province has already made" — and it makes sense as it is, I say, with veterinary colleges and with optometry.

So I would urge the Minister, if he wants to play around with some sort of pilot projects the

dentists have, there's a lot of places in Manitoba and he can do it, but don't abort this program because that's what you're doing. You're allowing students to continue, and they'll get jobs; they'll get jobs in dentists' offices because they are far ahead of anyone else that the dentist can normally handle. They have the knowledge, they know the jargon, and they have certain skills which a dentist may or may not use but at least they know what's happening in a dentist's office., so they'll get jobs.

But the program will suffer if the Minister persists in the direction he's going; that is to pretty well stop the training of new dental nurses, put a damper on the entire program, which means the death-knell of the program and simply lock himself into the dental profession and say to them, "We leave it to you. You're the dentist. You figure out a way to deliver a program." That way will lead to such an expensive program that neither this government, nor any government, can afford to sustain it and the net result will be that the Dental Health Program for children he's talking about will not develop in Manitoba. It will be spotty, at best; it will lead to a cost which the public at large will be shocked at and which no government will be able to carry through. It would be in a sense locking ourselves in as we did through Medicare but a more costly program because dental care and all its ramifications, if you go to the adult population, is an extremely expensive proposition, as I think the Minister knows and as any dentist will tell him.

So I'm concerned about this. I think it's a damned shame that something that was started and has such positive meaning, can have such positive meaning in Manitoba to finally tackle a very important aspect of health, is now being sort of skated off to the sides and the net result is going to be either an inferior program or in the long run, a sort of hit and miss program without too much effectiveness and a program which will become captive to the dental profession leading to costs far beyond what the province can afford, or any province can afford, and under utilizing the skills of a dentist who really should be used for those features of dentistry for which only he is trained. We are backing away from using people with skills in limited areas, but using them instead of using the highly-paid professional.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his remarks and for his advice, and I look for his advice in this area. He has considerable knowledge in the area of health, health services and programming, having been the Minister of Health of this province in the past, and I want to assure him that I'd take his counsel very conscientiously and with gratitude. The honourable member said that it isn't easy to put a program into Winnipeg, a program of this nature, and I want to just say to him that "easy" is a relative term, as he well knows, or is a term of relativity. It is easy in Winnipeg in relation to other parts of the province because more dentists, more dental nurses, want to be located in Winnipeg. That's all I'm saying about the operating of a program in Winnipeg. The really difficult part of the challenge is the rural, northern and remote constituency of the province.

But I don't think we should be side-tracked in discussing the relative ease of implementation of programs in different parts of the province; I don't want to labour that point. What's at issue here is the philosophy and the value and the direction of the program itself. I agree with the value of the program, I agree 100 percent with what my honourable friend says and with the position that members opposite who support this program have said in terms of its value and effectiveness as a preventive health measure. That is not in dispute, Sir.

What is in dispute is the manner in which it is implemented and the manner in which it utilizes the talents available from our society, professional and non-professional. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks says that we're going to do it the most expensive way that it could possibly be done. Mr. Chairman, precisely it's the question of expense that is at issue here for us to a large degree. It's precisely because we think it's being done in the most expensive way possible right now that we're looking at alternatives; we're looking at a mix. The honourable member can talk about unit costs and the reason why unit costs are high at the moment, and why they will come down in the future, and his points are well taken to a degree. But the fact remains that the unit cost has been a cause of concern. The cost of the program has been a cause of concern to many Manitobans, not necessarily within this Legislature, to many Manitoba citizens, for the past two years.

The unit cost of the program as it operates at the present time is, I believe — or certainly has been until very recently, in the neighbourhood of \$250 per child. That includes capital. The unit cost has been in the neighbourhood of \$250 per child. —(Interjection)— That is correct. The Member for St. Johns says, "Does that include capital?" and it does, but we're only in 29 divisions, so we're looking at capital again in the remaining 28 divisions in the province. We're looking at capital again.

Now, we're not convinced in the government that the unit cost, even including capital, has to be that high. I agree with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that it will come down as you build up the expertise of the nurses, as you get the equipment in place, and in fact as you get the routine refined and sophisticated. But the government is not at all convinced that a unit cost, even including capital, even including start-up, even at this juncture in what is a relatively new program, need be as high as \$250 per child. If it has to be that high, then that's the way it'll be in the future, but we're not convinced it has to be that high. We have had arguments, evidence, at least certainly partisan evidence and arguments placed in front of us to suggest that the unit cost need only be \$125 per child; that it is twice as high as it needs to be. I'm not satisfied that those who are presenting those arguments to me are any more correct than the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is.

I think I have a responsibility to explore and examine both arguments. Is the proper unit cost \$250 or is it \$125, or in fact, if we get the program to the point where we're covering every child in Manitoba from age five to age 12, is it not possible that that unit cost could be brought down to even less than \$125? The dentists, the private profession, tell me that it could, at that degree of intensity, and should, be brought down to something in the range of \$60.00 or \$70.00. Now a lot of this may be argument,

may be sort of normal persuasiveness that all members of a government are subjected to, and certainly my honourable friends from Seven Oaks and St. Johns are no strangers to that kind of persuasive pressure. But I have to check those things out. We came into office on a program of fiscal restraint, on a platform in which we said we were going to try to get public spending and costs to the public of programs under control, and I face a major responsibility to explore the possibilities open to us of getting that unit cost down.

So, we are not going into this in order to get into the most expensive way of doing it. The reason why we're stopping and taking a look and examining it is precisely because we think at the moment we, the citizens of Manitoba, are into the most expensive way of doing it, and we want to see if there isn't a more cost-effective way, a quality way at a lesser cost, at a lower cost.

Now, the Member for Seven Oaks suggests that we're locking ourselves into the private profession, and that the dentists are going to control this program. I want to assure him that as long as I am Minister of Health, that will not occur. We are holding discussions with the dental profession because, as I say to my honourable friend, his administration did not hold discussions with the private professions, certainly not satisfactory discussions. —(Interjection)— Not to them, and I might say to the Member for St. Johns, not to a great many other people who were privy to that kind of consideration.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise a point of order here. I'm getting somewhat disturbed that this item that we are supposed to be discussing is lost sight of. I've been — (Interjection)— well, yes, I know my honourable friend would like to get into it, but not on this item, and what I see developing is that we're going to be debating that item fully on this item and then when we come to the Department of Health, we're going to do it all over again. And the whole purpose of the items being structured the way they are is to be able to ensure that there isn't that kind of repetition. I know that there is an overlap, I know that there is a possibility — and my honourable friends can be ingenious enough to find a way of relating their remarks somewhat to the subject, but to launch into a full-fledged debate on the medical or the dental program, I think is out of order. What the item says is a training program, and I wish that my honourable friends could relate their remarks to the training of these people, rather than the program itself, its operation, its future, and things like that.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks on the same point of order.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, I point out to the Government House Leader that we're dealing with 1.(f) which is Inter-Provincial Training Agreements, which is an agreement to train, there's funds there to train dental nurses. And I say to him it doesn't take any ingenuity to discuss the training of dental nurses in those Estimates which deal with the training of dental nurses. They're not trained by the Department of Health and Social Development, they're trained through the Department of Education. And since they are doing the training . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Let's stick to the training part.

MR. MILLER: . . . they are doing the training, and therefore the graduates of that training will have to then come into the field. I say that by cutting down the training, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, by cutting down the training you are in fact curtailing a program. And it flows, as day follows night, that the drop in Estimates here will affect the results next year, the year after and the year after that. So by attacking this particular item, (f) in the Estimates, we are in fact dealing with a matter which is germane to this House in these Estimates, and that is, the Dental Nurses Program through which training is done by the Department of Education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows on the same point of order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, I want to remind you that in dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Education, and particularly in dealing with the funding of training programs, one cannot separate the training component from the need for the graduate in that particular field. And that happens in every appropriation where the matter of training comes up, when we deal with the Manpower training programs under community colleges, when we talk about universities, when we talk about training of teachers, we look at the need end of things and relate the training component to it.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out to you that if the reverse were true, if the government had shown an appropriation providing for a very significant increase in the number of trainees we would have to discuss and debate the same particular issue to get the government to justify the particular increase and to justify to us the need for that particular increase.

MR. JORGENSEN: If that's the case it should come under the Department of Health then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Minister of Health care to continue continue? I would rule that on that point of order in fact there is not a point of order. The discussion on the subject has been relevant and I will allow the Minister of Health to continue.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to pick up on the point that I was attempting to make a moment ago, that in our view and on the advice and information that I have received from within the dental profession and from without the dental profession, there were not fair, reasonable, conscionable discussions held between the former government and the private profession with respect to the role, the participation, the role, the contribution that that profession might make in this field in a program of this kind. Now, that being the case, I say to my honourable friends opposite that we are not the ones who were foreclosing auctions and locking ourselves in or locking ourselves out or locking anybody in or out in the current negotiations that we're going through; they are the ones who, in our view, locked the private profession out. Perhaps the private profession will prove in the end not to be deserving of, not to be worthy of, a role in a program of this kind, but our position is they deserve consideration. They have a professional expertise to offer, but that's not the more important thing. The more important thing is that they are Manitoba citizens who have a right to be heard, particularly in a profession and a field that they know something about and in which they want to make a contribution. They have a right to be heard. They feel very sincerely . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Will the Minister permit a question?

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I thank the Honourable Minister for permitting me to interrupt him to pose a question. I know full well that the position of the organized dental profession would be one that would be contrary to what has been done. I do not know what outside organization or outside body would have advised the Minister that there was inadequate consultation, and I challenge him to tell us who, from the outside, was involved in challenging the negotiations that had taken place.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Honourable Member for St. Johns that not only have members of the profession advised me that they felt they were shut out of participation in formulation of any such program or policy, but that many persons, patients of dentists, friends of dentists, friends of the Honourable Member for St. Johns, many persons I know in society who are not dentists, have told me that their information is similar, and I don't think that that question, I don't think that that fact can really in all conscience be challenged. I think the Honourable Member for St. Johns knows that the dental profession and the public generally has felt for some time that the former government moved rather arbitrarily in this field and did not offer proper opportunity for the profession to be involved or to provide any advice or counsel, or to be accommodated in meaningful consultation. There might have been some window dressing meetings. I'm not saying that the previous government did not sit down with one or two official representatives of the dental profession and go through the motions but that's all it amounted to was window dressing. There were no meaningful consultations in the view of the dental profession. There were no meaningful consultations.

What we have said is that we want to hear from the dental profession not only as dental professionals but as Manitobans. What do they think can be done? Why shouldn't they have a chance to participate in a program of this kind or at least to offer some suggestions and ideas. So far from locking ourselves into anything we're reversing a situation in which a professional component of our society was, in our view, locked out of a subject area — locked out of an opportunity to contribute and participate.

As far as putting ourselves in a position where the dentists are going to control the decision that's being made, or control the formulation of a program, I reiterate that I will not permit that to happen. I want a program that works for the children and for the people of Manitoba. If in the end after all the evidence is in and all the conclusions are available, on the basis of practice it proves that the most effective kind of program is a program that would be run and operated by the dental profession, if that's what the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks means by control — and I think we're getting into an area of semantics here — if that's what he means by control, well then yes, I suppose there's a possibility that we could have a program controlled by the dentists but there's also a possibility that we could have a program controlled entirely by the state, and there's also the possibility that we could have a program that involved the mixture of the two as I have suggested. But if he's saying that we're putting ourselves in a position now where the dentists are going to control the decision-making process and the future direction of our thinking and the government's thinking in this area then I want to reassure him that I reject that totally. I will not permit that. The dentists will control no such thing. The dentists will participate with us in trying to formulate the best kind of program and in the end we'll see whether they, whether the people of Manitoba, or whether they and the people of Manitoba in concert and in union should control the program that finally emerges.

I agree with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks wholeheartedly that this is a positive health program and I want to assure him that nothing is being pushed aside. No positive health program is being pushed aside whatever. We have a responsibility to look at all the programs, all the functions, all the services, to look at all those that we inherited when we assumed office. This is part and parcel of our ongoing conviction of the day that we have to examine public spending and determine the most cost-effective way, the best way to husband the taxpayers' dollar, the best way to get the

maximum return for an efficient and tightly controlled expenditure. A program of this nature necessarily has to be included in any responsible scrutiny or government review of that kind. That's all that's taken place up to this time. We have said the taxpayers of Manitoba do not have the means at the moment to expand the program into the school divisions and into the areas envisioned for this year. We have to stop and take a look, see what can be done to bring that unit cost down while maintaining quality, see what the private profession might be able to suggest as a contribution to the program and then develop our course for the future and move ahead from there.

My objective is to make proper dental care and treatment available to all the children of at least elementary school age — elementary and junior high school age, ages 5 to 12 — in Manitoba. My colleagues and I want to do it in the most effective and cost effective way possible. For us to blindly proceed on a course that we felt, although valuable in terms of the people it served, was arbitrary and authoritarian in its implementation, was discriminatory in its implementation with respect to a major profession in this province and was not as cost effective as this government believes public programs should be, would have been highly irresponsible, and I would think that my honourable friends opposite would expect this government, having said what we did during the campaign, having campaigned on a program of fiscal responsibility, to do just this with respect to all programs.

The jury is still out on the unit cost and the cost effectiveness of this program and the best way to deliver it. The jury is not out on the value of children's dental health. That decision is in and has my, and my colleagues, wholesale endorsement but we are not going to waste taxpayers' money if it doesn't have to be wasted.

If by developing a combination thrust that involves the private profession we can deliver that quality service to the children of Manitoba, in the remote parts of the province as well as the settled ones, and if we can do it for less money than is necessary under a state-operated program, such as in effect at the moment, then we are doing the two valuable and necessary services that we feel is government's responsibility to the citizens of the province. We're not locking ourselves in. We're not handing over control. We are working for a quality program that contains cost effectiveness.

As far as the use of para-professionals are concerned, again I have no argument with my honourable friend from Seven Oaks. He and I, I think, are agreed on many many aspects, many many components of this subject overall. I know we can't continue in the health field, whether it's dental health or health of any kind, relying on the expensive graduate of the professional school to do all the jobs and perform all the services that need to be done. It's unrealistic both from the personal point of view and the financial point of view.

I want to be part of a government that helps to develop and expand the para-professional concept in the health field and wants to emphasize very heavily the preventative aspect in the health field. I have no quarrel with the qualifications and the talents of the dental nurses coming out of Wescana College. I know that they are of high calibre and high quality. I know, and have been so advised by colleagues of mine in the government, that in many instances they feel they do a job superior to many other professionals working in the dental field. Those points are not in dispute, Mr. Chairman. Those points are not in dispute. The only thing that is in dispute is whether a Progressive Conservative Government, committed to fiscal responsibility, should inherit a state-oriented, state run program that has never demonstrated its cost effectiveness, and I think it is unreasonable of any honourable gentlemen opposite to expect us to accept that kind of program carte blanche without looking at it. Now you can't look at it without pulling back from the brink and taking a look' and that's all we have done. We have said no expansion this year. We're going to look and we're going to come up with the cost effective solution that enables that kind of service to be given to the children of Manitoba in the future without fear of going broke or bankrupt. Because if we're into programs that are going to drive us broke or bankrupt how much, what price do you pay, what future is there for the dental health of the children of Manitoba? It's all well and good to say this is a marvellous program that's delivering that kind of help. It is. But if we haven't got the money to do it five or six years from now, what good have we done those children? We want to ensure that there is a program that can be maintained and operated because it is built on a sound financial and fiscal and accounting base. That is all we're doing and I can assure honourable friends opposite that we will be able to provide the final and definitive answers and a proposed comprehensive program in the course of the next year so that there doesn't have to be a prolonged freeze or prolonged deferment or prolonged limitation on the expansion of the program as is the case at this moment.

This is a temporary measure in order for us to find the answers and to find the ultimate solution, but most of the things that my honourable friend from Seven Oaks raises in this debate are points on which we can agree without wasting a moment's time. We're agreed on everything except on the cost effectiveness and delivery, and that's what we're seeking our answers to. He and his colleagues had their particular answer. We're not sold on that answer. We will propose our answer. Honourable Gentlemen opposite may not be sold on it but I can assure them that whatever it is it will be built, based and embedded on the principle that children's dental health, available to all children from age 5 to age 12 in Manitoba, is an objective of this government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed I would just like to point out that we are in the Estimates for the Department of Education and I have ruled that the debate has been relevant and if we could just get some reference to Section (f), Inter-Provincial Training Agreements, I'll allow the debate to carry on.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be more relevant than was the Minister himself. I want to comment on my comment from the seat to the effect that one can tell he just came from Snow

Lake. There are two reasons for my comment: 1. The interesting thing that we've seen in the last six months of this government is that they came in on a glorious promise that they would cut the waste and mismanagement that they knew existed, and in six months they have not found massive waste or mismanagement, but having promised that they would be able to find waste and mismanagement they were therefore able to promise that they would not cut program — they would continue with program. I'm going to be addressing the Minister of Education too but I'm sure that he will learn what it is that I'm talking about if he's gone for any length of time. They said, and you, Mr. Chairman, were one of them, said, "Why, there's so much waste and mismanagement once we cut out the fat we will be able to continue to deliver all the good programs that have been done in the past and we will, and we will cut taxes." And they came in no doubt with a great support from the people of the high income groups who liked both thoughts: 1. Cut fat. 2. Reduce taxes. And they carried out their promise, and they said, "Here is back your inheritance taxes to you poor people who have been so adversely treated by having to pay taxation after you die and you can now rest easy because no longer will we be taking money from the poor." And they then cut personal income taxes and said, "Well, we're doing that so that you poor people who have been paying large sums of money will not have to pay much." So they saved \$13.00 for a \$10,000 a year person and saved \$500 for their friends, and I say their friends because I am saying that, with this dream of finding the money out of waste and mismanagement they would continue programs, and when they go to Snow Lake they discover that the programs are necessary and that the waste and mismanagement wasn't there to the extent that they could find the money.

So now they're trapped. We said, "You can't go on with that because we have no money." They said, "We will find money out of waste and mismanagement corrections." But they didn't find it, so now he is back to reinstating programs which he cut out. And I don't blame them for that. A new administration coming in should have a new look. That's fair game.

Now, the other side of the Snow Lake thing is the name snow, and the snow job that we have been getting as well. And I will refer specifically, aside from the protestations of good faith which I believe that this Minister has, and I am sorry for this Minister because he is bearing the brunt — really bearing the brunt — of this ridiculous restraint program that was exercised two days before he was sworn in. And in his department of all, the people department, he is the one who is the front spokesman for a government who has lost its real interest on behalf of the people who are in the need, who are the people who cannot speak for themselves. So, that's his problem, and I sympathize with him on it, and I understand he lost the weight because he wanted to lose the weight, but I wish him good health because he needs it.

Mr. Chairman, the reference to the snow job is that he comes in in his broad way, and this is part of his style of speaking and I think I often get into the same style, he starts talking about the great costs. And he almost hiccupped, I think, when he talked about \$225.00 per unit, because he knew there's a tremendous cost involved in the capital portion of instituting any program of this size, and to lay a per unit cost to include a capital outlay is a deceptive — or is there a kinder word I could say, where you are not revealing the whole story — misleading. And I believe the Honourable Minister was misled into thinking that one talks about unit cost, building into it the capital involvement, and that's a bit of snow job to talk in those large terms without realizing that a substantial part of that is a non-repeating, non-recurring cost.

The other snow job of which I accuse him is when he said, "We have consulted and we have found that there was inadequate consultation with dentists before this program was instituted, both from the vested interests of the dentists and outside." And really, Mr. Chairman, unless he's — I don't know why — he probably could have gotten his friends at the Winnipeg Chamber to tell him that they don't think there was adequate consultation, but when he says the patients of dentists told, and his friends and my friends told him that, that's a snow job, Mr. Chairman, because that's not conceivable that he should pay the slightest bit of attention to somebody who is not a participant of the discussions, who says I was told by somebody I believe, i.e. a dentist who participated in discussions, that it was not adequate, therefore, from outside as well. Let him tell us the truth, which is that the dental profession never accepted this program, fought the program, and didn't want the program because they were losing their control of the program. That's what it is.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I participated in negotiations with the dentists on the fee structure only. I was not involved in negotiating the entire program with the dentists, but I know that preceding my involvement there was some two or three years of very direct negotiations on the question of the role of the dentist in the program, and indeed in our campaign platform of 1973, we talked about a dental program. It didn't come in until 1977, 1976-77, and part of it was the many meetings that were held and discussions that took place in relation to investigating the program. The Honourable Minister doesn't have to accept it, but let him not pretend — or maybe he doesn't know the extent to which there were negotiations, and what they faltered on, because I learned when I was attempting to negotiate fees that the dentists had not finished negotiating program. And everytime we started to discuss fees — I think I had about half a dozen meetings most of which were attended not only by the top level people of the dental profession in Manitoba but also they had an economist from Toronto who was employed to negotiate on their behalf and I would guess that he may have already been in the Minister's office more than once — I found that they were still debating program and they were still debating their wish to control the delivery of service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that in reopening this planned program, the Minister is fair in saying it but let me caution him, you don't build a program without having the people with which to deliver a service. You can't build a chair without having the material that you need to use it, and you need the

skill with which to use it. I could not be given grates, wood, and leather, and all the nails and tools with which to do it, unless I knew how to build a chair. And if the Minister is going to continue to work along with the dental profession to deliver the program, then he will find that when he discovers the tremendous cost involved, and the insufficient number of trained hands skilled to do the work, that he will be in their . . . I think trapped or closed-in was the word that was used, in that he won't have the way, the manner in which to deliver it otherwise.

Now, Mr. Chairman, specifically on this item — and I'm glad the Minister of Education has come back because I want to address him more than the Minister of Health, because he has a responsibility that goes beyond the health scene — (Interjection) — Now, now, I don't think the House Leader should pout just because he didn't have his way. He'll have to accept the fact that we are talking about Item 1.(f) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please. I have been following the debate quite closely, and I am still waiting to hear some reference to the Inter-Provincial Training Agreement. If the Honourable Member would make some reference to the Inter-Provincial Training Agreement, I'll be happy to let him carry on.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do you not realize that I started to talk directly to the Minister of Education, because I wanted to talk about this Inter-Provincial Training Program as it relates to the nurses and as it relates to the broader responsibility that the Minister of Education has to make sure that we have in Manitoba people who are trained to do the jobs that Manitobans need to have done for them. And in this field, specifically, we find that after some two, three years of negotiations with dentists, after two, three and more years of planning a program which had to make use of the skills of trained dental nurses, that an arrangement was made for the training of those dental nurses in, I believe, the most economical way possible to this extent, by buying spaces for them at Wascana in Regina, and arranging that they be trained and also arranging that they come back and use those skills to benefit the dental health of the Manitoba children.

Now whether or not the Conservative government, I really find it difficult to say Progressive, but I should laugh and say Progressive Conservative Government, wants to turn over this delivery back to the people who have had control of it in the past, or not, if they decide that they were wrong in delaying it and go back to the scheme, in either event, it is incumbent on the Minister of Education to produce people who are skilled to do the job. And if they sell-out — that's a bad word — if they leave it to the dental profession to control the delivery of the program, that in no way suggests that the dental profession would not make good use of pararental people who are trained to do that job. And that's the important point to realize. It's not the nature of the program that should determine the responsibility of the Minister of Education to deliver skilled hands to whatever group that will be delivering the service.

But there's a maxim — I've a brother-in-law who's an international authority on public health and involved in health education, and he claims that it's his theory, he names it the Sheps' Principle, his name being Sheps, but I don't believe it's his alone, but it's a good principle — and that is that you never have a skilled person do a skilled job which a lesser-trained person can do as well. And that's exactly what we're talking about here. There is no sense in the world for a highly skilled dentist to be doing the work of a limited nature, which the dental nurses have been trained to do as well as, and some have stated — and I think it was the Dean of the McGill School of Dentistry has stated — that they do the job even better, because they do that and that alone. So there's no sense in our spending all the money we do, per unit or per capita or per year, in the dental school to produce a highly skilled dentist and leave it to him as the only person to deliver this lesser-required skill that the dental nurses could do. That's why we're training people in the Tech-Voc School, and that's why we were training people in the Community Colleges, and that's why we are realizing that the University is not the end-all of an academic career.

And it is important that we do this. It is important that we have that opportunity. The quarrel that the Minister of Health got involved in is one that he may recall, unfortunately the turnover in this House is so great that we have less and less people who have a memory long enough, like 10 or 12 years ago when we were deeply involved in a whole fuss and discussion about the role of the dentist in the dental profession, and I'm still talking about 1. (f) because I'm talking about pararental people. The outgrowth in Manitoba of a whole group of people, highly skilled they said, to fabricate artificial teeth, and they said — I think one of them was a candidate for the Conservatives in Transcona, as I recall it — they said, "We are skilled to do the job, why should people have to pay a highly-trained, expensive dentist to do what we can do very well. Give us the right." The big fight was with the dentists, and the dentists said here in the committee room, in Room 254, and in the lobbies of this hall, they claimed that this was a terrible thing that was going to happen, that they could use this kind of person provided he was in the back room working for them, and delivered to them the fabricated teeth that he could make, but he must not be allowed to put his fingers into the live mouth of a person in fitting fabricated teeth. And the First Minister and I travelled from Vancouver to Toronto, visiting various — well, not just he and I alone, ten members of the Legislature — did almost a cross-country investigation of what was going on in other provinces. In the end, with the dentists saying that the dental health of Manitoba would suffer tremendously, and they had pictures of cancer developed in the mouth from ill-fitting artificial teeth, they said that things would break down in Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Chairman, these denturists, the illegal denturists became legal dental mechanics, and if the Minister of Health who has the toughest portfolio there is in this province, if he has time to find

out, he may discover that there is an inadequate inspection, I believe, an inadequate inspection now by his department of the role of the dental mechanic and the extent to which they are only doing the limited job they are enabled to do. Yet I believe, unless he has friends different from friends I have, that there has not been any great objection to the intrusion into the dental health field of these lesser-trained dental mechanics. I haven't heard. Nobody has been coming knocking on my door or telephoning me or speaking to the media about the terrible things that the dentists claimed would happen back in the middle Sixties with the use of them.

And I want to tell, speaking again about training of individuals in the paramedical field, that I used to go to an ophthalmologist, who used to do the refractions for my optical needs, who admitted to me that that he could work in one office with seven optometrists and they would save him doing all the work that they could do as well as he could, but the medical profession fought the use of that paramedical person, the optometrist. And now the optometrist is practising on his own and he is called a doctor, much to the chagrin of many medical people, and I haven't heard that things have suffered that badly.

So I come back to reminding the Minister of Education that he has taken out of his budget a small amount of money which could — well, it's all relative, isn't it — he's taken out that money which he would need to continue to train dental nurses to do a job, which must be done, and whether it be done under the direct control of the dentist, or under the supervision of the dentist is something that the Minister of Health can play around with as long as it takes him to make a decision. But that is the difference, because the present program or the program that existed before under the previous government, was that these dental nurses would work under the guidance of dentists, that dentists would decide what they should do, and after they had done their job dentists would decide if they had done it adequately or not.

The big difference is that the dentists wanted that the job be done, maybe by these people but in his presence, where he is around, and the dentist also wanted that he should get the money for the work and he should pay the dental nurse. That is the big difference. The same dental nurse that we are talking about that the Minister of Education has cut out of his program was going to do the same work, but the way the program was set up — and unfortunately very few dentists were willing to get involved in that program and that I can certify to because I did negotiate with them at length and ad nauseum and repetitively — that they didn't want to be the dentist to come in, do the chart, instruct what should be done, what could be done by a dental nurse and indicate what should be done by the dentist himself, and then leave it to the dental nurse to do the job. They wanted to have control of the financial gross, the financial handling, of the moneys that the government was going to spend on this program. So they would be the ones to negotiate with the dental nurses, they would be the ones to hire the dental nurses, and they would be the ones to control the program. That basically is the difference.

So let us still come back to our plea to the Minister of Education, don't cut out the opportunity for Manitobans to make use of the skills of a parodontal person who could do the job as well as, and maybe better than a dentist, at a lesser cost to the community in training and in return.

Mr. Chairman, the important thing is that I don't begrudge a dentist — being a professional myself, I guess I have a vested interest. Somebody could say that I favour the professional. I don't really begrudge the doctor, the dentist, the other professionals from making a good living and from enjoying the position that they occupy as the most highly skilled persons. But I begrudge seeing any person in a highly skilled professional dedicated service, firstly, being involved in the economics of the delivery of his service because I think that is none of his business. I am talking about lawyers and everything else. They should not be involved in the economics of it. Nor should they be involved in restricting people of a lesser skill but in the same profession, the paraprofessionals, from offering their full services, nor should they be redundantly doing the work that a lesser skilled person can do as well as they. That is the accusation that I make, not that the Minister of Health still hasn't decided which is the right way to proceed in this program, but the fact that he in collusion or in conjunction with the Minister of Education are cutting off the opportunities for us going in either direction or any direction, but of our being able to train people to do that job that they have proven that they can do well.

So I would say to the Minister of Education, put back the money to train these dental nurses, see to it that they are available, and then challenge the dentists. Why, the Minister of Health has become the greatest challenger. He challenges each hospital to produce the same quality of service and cut down on staff, and cuts waste and mismanagement. He hasn't found it in his department so he is forcing them to find it. The First Minister is challenging private enterprise, "Now we are giving you the climate, it is up to you to produce."

So I am saying to the Minister of Education produce the people who can do the job and challenge the controllers of the delivery of service, whoever they be, to put them to good use for the benefit of Manitobans. And if the controllers, in the wisdom of the Minister of Health, have to be the most skilled, the most highly trained people in the profession, the dentists, and that they are entitled to have economic control, if he says that, that's fine. That is how we differ; that is why governments change because there is difference in philosophy. But at least let him be able to say to them, "You people should be using the parodontal people that we have trained." The Minister of Education has cut them out and I believe he has cut them out because the Minister of Health says, "I don't need them anymore," because otherwise he wouldn't have cut them out. So he is really following the direction of the Minister of Health and I think he is wrong in doing that, because I think he should know that this program takes 20 months to train a dental nurse. So 20 months down the line he has already the

Friday, April 28, 1978

equivalent of three years' university.

The point I am making is that the Minister of Education is not only in a staying period, but he is also falling back. Where the program that was developed by the previous government provided for the training of dental nurses, he is cutting them off, and when it is found that they are needed the program will have to start again.

Meanwhile, this government is committed to at least maintaining the same level of service. So they are going to be forced — and that's the point — willy-nilly they are going to be forced to turn over the delivery of the service to the dentists who have been fighting to keep it all along and who, no doubt, are amongst those who are so particularly thrilled to know that their support of the Progressive Conservatives has justified and made it possible for them to come back into the control picture. I would not expect the Conservative Government to continue with a socialized health scheme. If they would, then what did we change seats for? All we had to do was shuffle around. But we changed seats with them because they believe that they don't trust any government operated plan. That's fine, but don't Mr. Minister of Health and Mr. Minister of Education remove from the people of Manitoba the opportunity to be served by well-trained people who can do the job well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is now 12:30. I am now leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 o'clock.