

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 2 May, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Reports for Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., the Communities Economic Development Fund, and the Channel Area Loggers Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Financial Report for the year ended March 31, 1984, for Brandon University.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

I have a brief report for the House on the outcome of last evening's Ministers' meeting in Ottawa on the Canada-Manitoba Churchill and Transportation Development Sub-agreements.

The meeting was a follow-up to the annual Canada-Manitoba Economic and Regional Development Agreement Ministers' Meeting which was held in Gillam early in April. At that time, the lead Federal ERDA Minister, the Honourable Sinclair Stevens, agreed to convene a special meeting between Manitoba Ministers and the Federal Minister of Transport and some of his other colleagues to review in detail progress under the Churchill and Transportation Development Sub-agreements, and to deal with some important outstanding issues.

Last evening's meeting was attended, at various times, by seven Federal Ministers: Mr. Stevens, the Honourable Don Mazankowski, Senator Roblin, the Honourable Jake Epp, the Honourable Charlie Mayer, the Honourable Jack Murta, and the Honourable Bill McKnight. The Honourable Erik Nielsen and the Honourable Ray Hnatyshyn were also invited, but were unable to attend. Saskatchewan's Transportation Minister, the Honourable Jim Garner, was also present, as were the Chief Executive Officers of C.N. and Ports Canada.

The province was represented by myself, the Minister of Energy and Mines, the Chairperson of the Treasury Board, who also represents the Churchill constituency

in this House, and by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

My colleagues and I believe that, on the whole, the meeting was productive, and I think the federal representatives would agree.

Although the precise details remain to be worked out, we were able to secure federal agreement to move ahead as soon as possible with \$6 million in boxcar rehabilitation work for the Churchill line. Mr. Speaker, the costs are to be split 50-50 between Canada and Manitoba as specified in the sub-agreement.

When Manitoba undertook to share in rolling stock costs it was with three main understandings in mind:

that the cars would be required by C.N. to service the Port of Churchill;

that the rehabilitation work would be done in Manitoba at the C.N. Shops in Transcona; and finally,

that work would also proceed simultaneously here in Manitoba on development of a new light hopper car.

We are satisfied, after last night's meeting, that provincial investment in improved rolling stock remains justified.

We are also pleased that the prototype for the new light hopper car is virtually completed and ready for testing this summer.

The Minister of Highways and Transportation will be in a position soon, with the Federal Minister, to provide more specific details on the \$6 million boxcar rehabilitation effort.

Probably the most positive outcome, Mr. Speaker, of last night's meeting from our point of view was the joint decision by both governments to increase our efforts to extend the Churchill shipping season and to broaden the use of the port. In this connection, we discussed several key issues, including the availability of ice breakers, joint efforts to overcome insurance constraints, and co-operative efforts to pursue greater utilization of the port.

We will be following up these initiatives in the coming weeks, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the announcement that we've heard today is certainly one that we, on this side, welcome that there will be a lot of work being done in Manitoba for cars, rolling stock for the Port of Churchill. Also, the announcement that the prototype is nearly ready is something we also feel is going to be of benefit to Manitoba.

I can only add, Mr. Speaker, that I'm very pleased that this government has followed up on the tremendous work that was done by the government, when we were in government, regarding the Port of Churchill, the original meetings that were initiated in Dauphin, the meetings with the Federal Government to encourage

them to know that the Port of Churchill is important. Mr. Speaker, we're also very pleased that they listened to us and the members on this side about the importance of Churchill because there was a time when this side of the House was the only one that was interested in the Port of Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. R. PENNER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 35, The Young Offenders Act, Loi sur les jeunes contrevenants; and Bill No. 36, The Mortgage Dealers Act, Loi sur les courtiers d'hypothèques.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

We have 29 students from the Happy Thought School. They are under the direction of Ms. Podruchny. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Housing.

There are 15 students of Grade 9 standing from the Fort Alexander High School under the direction of Mr. Hogan. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Premier - availability

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Government House Leader.

In view of the fact that the Premier was unavailable for questions yesterday and is unavailable again today and, as I understand, will be unavailable tomorrow, I wonder if the Government House Leader would indicate either the whereabouts of the Premier or when he might be available for some questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, we on this side do not make reference to the absence of the Honourable Opposition House Leader, and I do not propose to begin doing that. I think it's entirely inappropriate, though, for the Honourable Opposition Leader to make those references.

I can advise him that the Premier is attending to the public interests of the Province of Manitoba. I believe today he is in the City of Brandon, which is a very important part of the Province of Manitoba. That, Sir, will go some distance to explaining the unavailability also of the Minister responsible for Employment Services and Economic Security, if that is the Opposition Leader's next question. The Minister for Brandon is with the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that those Ministers who are here, and the Deputy Premier, I believe are eminently capable of not only answering but dealing with any issues he wishes to raise for reports or details or facts from the government.

Subsidiary of CGE - facing possible closure

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question then for the — (Interjection) — Acting Premier . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Question?

MR. G. FILMON: . . . or the Deputy Premier, whichever title she prefers, is in view of the fact that there has been a news report in Ottawa to the effect that the U.S. parent firm of Canadian General Electric has told its subsidiary that it either shape up or face closing or sale, I wonder if the Acting Premier would indicate whether or not the agreement that we have entered into with respect to the purchase of turbines from this organization for the Limestone Generating Station has in it sufficient protection for the people of Manitoba to ensure the terms of that contract will be fulfilled by the Canadian subsidiary of the U.S. parent that has threatened closure on this company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice, but I would appreciate it if the member would table the article he's referring to.

Sugar beet industry - Assistance to

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

MR. A. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The question I raised previously in this House on a number of occasions, I raise it again this morning, directed to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if he has now received a response - a positive response hopefully - from the Federal Ministers involved — (Interjection) — in regard . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, has the Minister received a response in regard to if they accepted Manitoba's position . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The honourable member is entitled to ask a question and I'm trying to hear it.

The Honourable Member for St. Rose.

MR. A. ADA'4: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll begin again, Mr. Speaker, because I think there was

quite a bit of cackle coming from the opposition benches. The question is: has the Federal Government responded and have they accepted Manitoba's position in regard to support for the Manitoba beet producers in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, this morning we received a telex from the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board indicating that they have accepted our major concerns vis-a-vis the sugar beet industry. Mr. Speaker, they have accepted our proposition that there will be a national sugar policy beyond the 1985 crop year, and that no longer, other than this one time, will the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba be involved in the support of the sugar industry. That's very clear. Mr. Speaker, no thanks to members opposite including the Leader of the Opposition who said, "Put the money up and then negotiate." Mr. Speaker, if it was for the members opposite, Sir, we would not have this kind of commitment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on a point of order.

MR. G. MERCIER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the rules specifically provide for ministerial statements. In particular, in circumstances in which the Minister has held a press conference immediately before question period and puts a press embargo on the release of the information and then comes into the House and puts up questions from backbenchers when they know what has really happened and do not allow members on this side of the House to respond to what is in fact a ministerial statement, then he ignores the question and makes insulting remarks to members on this side of the House, this is a clear violation of the traditions of this House.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

It is a traditional courtesy that if members have information to give, they give it to the House prior to giving it to the press. It has previously been raised in this House as a point of order. It is not a point of order, but it may be a discourtesy.

I would also point out to the Honourable Minister that an answer to a question should not develop into a speech.

Sugar beet industry - assistance to

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert raised a point of order about the issue of sugar beets, and interrupted my answer to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

Mr. Speaker, this matter has been before the people of this country for over six months and questions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

A point of order was raised concerning a matter of privilege. That has been dealt with. If the Honourable Minister has an argument or an answer to a question, he may give it.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, last night there were some 400 sugar beet producers in the province meeting to put together a request to the Minister of Agriculture to give their industry support. Why was the Minister not at that meeting?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the reason in discussions with Mr. Siemens, the President of the sugar beet growers, that I was not at that meeting, and I spoke to him earlier in the day, was the fact that we did not have a response from the Federal Government to our position that we made to them. Not until this morning did we have a telex from the Federal Government agreeing to our conditions.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, had it not been for the involvement of the Province of Manitoba in this process, the sugar beet growers would have had a contract, or at least a proposed contract for \$21 a tonne, and not until we met with the company and the growers on Monday afternoon, were they prepared to increase their amount to \$25 a tonne.

It was this government's involvement in this industry that has helped the producers, no thanks to members opposite nor the Member for Arthur, who had screamed at former Federal Governments in terms of reneging their responsibility on stabilization, and now they want to take the Federal Government off the hook, Sir.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture show a little courtesy to the House and table the information which he provided for the press? Will he provide that information now to the Assembly?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to do so. I will get a copy of it and table it immediately for the honourable members.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Will the total amount of money that it will cost the Province of Manitoba now that they have finally been forced into it by the producers and the opposition, kicking and screaming, will the Minister confirm that the contribution of the Province of Manitoba will be \$3.7 million?

HON. B. URUSKI: Let it be very clear that the Province of Manitoba was not forced into anything, Mr. Speaker.

Had we had some co-operation for the interests of Manitobans, Sir, the Federal Government would have had to live up to their obligation to pay stabilization payments. They did not do so and members opposite can stand, can take the blame for this very position, Mr. Speaker.

Let it be very clear, Sir, that the commitment to this program was, we gave the Federal Government our commitment within two days, Sir, after they made the announcement of what our conditions were; it took the Federal Government the rest of the two weeks in order to respond to our conditions. The amount of money that will be forthcoming, or may be forthcoming, because there is no certain amount but, according to the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board in our meeting with him on Monday evening, he indicated that Manitoba's share of the \$8 million would be \$2.4 million, Sir.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I heard the Minister say maybe there would be money forthcoming. Can the Minister confirm, if there isn't \$10 a tonne coming from the Manitoba Government, that there won't be \$10 a tonne coming from the Federal Government, it is a matching grant that will be forwarded to the province? If the province puts up \$10, so will the feds, and that, Mr. Speaker, will that not equal \$3.7 million, because there were 370,000 tonnes produced last year, and approximately 3.7 million is required to let the sugar beet producers plant their crops tomorrow? Is that not the amount of money?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, let it be very clear that the Federal Government did not make a commitment of \$10 a tonne. They said it was the equivalent of \$10 a tonne on the \$8 million, a maximum. Mr. Speaker, our commitment is on a 50-50 basis to what the Federal Government pays. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the program, had it in fact been for members opposite, first of all, the Province of Manitoba would have been subjected to the possibility of having been involved on an ongoing basis financially — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want it to be very clear that on Monday evening we did receive a commitment from the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board that there will no longer be the requirement of ongoing provincial participation but, on the next day, Sir, in conversation with the Minister of Agriculture, he indicated that he didn't think he could agree to that because he didn't know what the committee dealing with the national sugar policy would, in fact, come up with. He said it might come up with a policy that would involve producers, provinces and the Federal Government, which clearly points to tripartite stabilization, Sir, and not a national sugar policy, as was envisaged or led to believe by a Federal Government spokesman in this House, the former Minister of Agriculture, who said, believe the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, that's why we hung on and if we didn't hang on, Mr. Speaker, there would have been no commitment to a national sugar policy, and the people of Manitoba would have been subjected to ongoing costs.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

If members wish to conduct a private debate, would they do so outside the Chamber?

Distribution of material to ND Party

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier. On Tuesday, after question period, the Premier apparently indicated to the media that he would pay for the preparation of material and the distribution of material by the government to the ND Party. Would the Deputy Premier advise the House as to what criteria the Premier will use in calculating the expenses to be reimbursed to the taxpayers of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the preparation of the material and the use of paper, the criteria will be who prepared, and whether they were party people or government people; and then, in terms of the stationery, if government paper was used, how much of it. In fact, the material was prepared by party people at no expense to government. The covering sheet that was government stationery and not party stationery is being a calculated cost, but it runs in the neighbourhood of \$1 to \$2.00.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, is the Deputy Premier indicating that the NDP Government and the Premier will not reimburse the taxpayers of Manitoba for the time spent by Mr. Cramer and other secretarial and clerical staff, and other staff time used in the preparation of this material?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the assumptions as to who prepared the material are incorrect as I've already said.

Acquisition of titles to expropriated land North of Portage

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. More than a few weeks ago he took as notice a question I asked him with respect to the acquisition of title to property owned by the Winnipeg Free Press with respect to core area negotiations. Could he now answer that question and advise whether all other titles have been acquired, and whether or not title to the Free Press property will be acquired?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, we have all the contracts except the one for the Free Press.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the Minister indicate why a title has not been acquired to the Winnipeg Free Press property? Is the province not intending to proceed with that acquisition?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it's ironic that that particular person should ask me why; I think he knows why. I think it was some of the action when he was the Minister responsible.

But let me answer that it is the intention of the Federal Minister of Health, the Mayor, and myself intend to go to Ottawa, I think, next week to try and have a meeting with the principal of the Free Press - there's not much action here - we want to discuss with them before taking final action.

PCBs - precautions in shipment of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health and it's with reference to the recent PCB spills in Ontario and Saskatchewan.

What precautions have the Provincial Government taken when there is a shipment of PCB material through the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the member might have read last week or the week before already, the Federal Minister introduced a regulation that was passed in the House of Commons to the effect that no PCBs can be transported anymore, unless they are in a sealed, secured container. With the Transportation of Dangerous Goods legislation coming into force recently, there will be additional safeguards implemented at that time.

MR. A. KOVNATS: A supplemental question to the Honourable Minister.

Is your department notified well in advance when these shipments are being made through the Province of Manitoba?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question under advisement.

MR. A. KOVNATS: To the same Minister, a final supplementary question.

Does Manitoba Hydro and Winnipeg Hydro advise the Minister's Department of Environment any time that there is a shipment of materials, particularly in Winnipeg and through the Province of Manitoba, does the Honourable Minister receive notification from these provincial corporations?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'll also take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. KOVNATS: To the same Minister, can the Minister advise what system is set up to keep the Minister apprised of the amounts of PCBs located and

stored in provincial storage facilities, particularly Manitoba Hydro?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated the other day that staff from Environment does monitor the amount and the various substances that are in storage with Manitoba Hydro and Winnipeg Hydro through annual inspections and ongoing reports that are supplied by both of these utilities.

Versatile Mfg. - employee layoffs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: A question to the Minister of Labour. Is he, his office or his department, or the government received any notice of employee layoffs at Versatile Manufacturing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker. I don't recall the specifics. I know that from time to time, and it could well be that Versatile has filed with us a letter confirming that there may be some reduction in work and they, therefore, let us have notice. I will confirm the details of that. I believe that they may well have filed such a notice with us.

Salary ceiling - Senior Officer 7

HON. A. MACKLING: While I have the floor I'd like to respond to a question from the Honourable Member for Lakeside who asked me the question on April 26th in respect to the new senior officer positions and I wish to give him and the House that information.

The Senior Officer 7 position has an upper level of \$75,652; there are currently five staff who have been categorized in that Senior Officer 7 classification. Five, at the present time, are receiving all currently, \$67,463, which is the third step of the new series. They will receive their annual increase over the next three years, and those people are Michael Decter, the Clerk of the Executive Council; Charles Curtis, the Deputy Minister of Finance; Ron Duhamel, the Deputy Minister of Education; Boris Hryhorczuk, the Deputy Minister of Highways; and Reg Edwards, the Deputy Minister of Health.

MR. C. BIRT: A supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. As he has taken the first part of my question as notice he may wish to take the following questions as notice as well.

If the notice has been given to the government of layoffs, I would like to know how many people had been laid off, how long the layoff is for, and what are the reasons given for the layoffs?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, I've . . .

St. Pierre parents - re additional English-speaking programs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education.

Yesterday she claimed that her studies on French Immersion showed that there is no adverse effects on the speaking and writing of English. She claimed that she had studies showing there was no adverse effects from English or any other heritage language program, and I want to ask her, in view of reports coming out of St. Pierre to the contrary, will the Minister be investigating these complaints and concerns?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, if the parents in a particular community have questions about the level of achievement of children in a school, they should raise those questions with the school, with the teachers and with the school divisions.

The reports that I referred to were reports and studies that we take responsibility for undertaking on the provincial level which assesses the accomplishments of children across the province, and assesses the curriculum and how good the curriculum is, and how well it's being handled in the schools. That information clearly shows, as recently as the studies on the Ukrainian Bilingual Program, is the children who are taking that program do as well in all of their other subjects as children who are not taking a bilingual program, and children who are taking that program do as well in English as children who are not taking the program. So I'm talking about provincial statistics and any specific questions related to how a child is doing, because some of the things that are being said to relate to an individual child - and you can't translate that into statistics and information about a general system - should be raised with the teacher and with the school.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that her response to complaints of 75 or 85 angry French-speaking Manitobans in St. Pierre, that she's going to send them a copy of a general study and some general statistics? Or is she going to seriously discuss their complaints and concerns and put them into that study and maybe reassess it as a result of some practical feedback?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is argumentative. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why the government members are so upset about this. The fact of the matter is that there has been some specific complaints and I'm simply asking the Minister whether she is going to react or respond to the fact that new information has been presented about problems on the French language side of the equation, or whether she is simply going to dismiss this as not fitting into her previous studies?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, to date I have received no complaints from any members in that community or any parents, and the issue that they are discussing is presently under discussion with the school

board. They have some concerns; they're raising those concerns with the school division; the school division is meeting with them and dealing with the issue. If they don't resolve it they may decide to go beyond that, or they may decide to present some information to me. To date, they have not done so and I have neither any complaint to deal with, nor any information.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister consider a review of the department's language policies and set up an independent inquiry to assess the trends and consequences of French Immersion over the past decade?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Member for Elmwood that we are always assessing our program. We're always assessing our curriculum. We're always assessing the results and we are always assessing our language policy. As a matter of fact there has been major review and changes over a number of years related to all those areas, related to the assessment and information that we got, so I'm not adverse to either receiving information that is useful and making changes. It's the process that we undertake all the time.

Inter-City Gas Manitoba Pipeline date tenders called

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

Previously the Minister of Energy and Mines had indicated to the House that Inter-City Gas and Manitoba Oil, our Crown corporation, had entered into an agreement to form a joint venture to bid on an oil transmission line from Waskada to Cromer. That company was Inter-City Gas Manitoba Pipelines Limited which became effective in July of 1983. Can the Minister indicate what date the province called tenders for the construction of that pipeline?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I should correct the statement by the Member for Virden. I said that the Inter-City Gas Corporation had received the licence to proceed with the pipeline development and had in fact indicated that they would be willing to take Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation into the company and those negotiations proceeded afterwards. I indicated in the House that I believe that the - and I'll have to check my memory on this - but I did indicate that those negotiations were I think concluded about September of 1984.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I'd like to repeat the question I asked the Minister. Could the Minister indicate the date that tenders were called for the construction of the pipeline?

HON. W. PARASIUK: With respect to that question, I'll take that as notice.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can the Minister indicate whether that was a public tender call or whether it was an invitational tender system?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I will check with Inter-City Gas to see how they proceeded with respect to that matter.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that Inter-City Gas has anything to do with it. I think it's what the province did in calling for the tender. Was it a public tendering system, or was it an invitational tendering system?

HON. W. PARASIUK: We in fact had asked companies to apply through a process that is established under legislation with respect to the awarding of pipelines and that was all conformed to, but I'll get the specifics and bring that back to the member.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can the Minister indicate if those submissions were made to the Minister?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, they were made to a board established under the legislation of this House.

National sugar-sweetener policy - advisability of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Agriculture for providing us with the press release which he apparently issued before the Session today and I want to ask him, in view of the fact that the press release states as its first point, with respect to the new agreement, that the Federal Government would endeavour to have in place prior to the 1986 sugar beet crop a national sugar-sweetener policy, what greater assurance is that to the former telex that was received on April 26th that said, "I would like to assure you of the Federal Government's commitment concerning the national sugar-sweetener policy"?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I'm just looking through my notes for the original press release which he makes reference to.

In the original press release that the telex refers to, the Minister of Agriculture announced the federal policy that the Federal Government would be looking at the advisability of a national sugar policy within the next year.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, the advisability, how does that give us a great commitment that there will be a national sugar policy? The main feature, as well, that they will have a national sugar policy and no longer be dependent on the Province of Manitoba, Sir, is that the Federal Government assures that further financial participation

by the Manitoba Government beyond the 1985 crop is not required, Sir, and that's the key issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ensure that the Minister understands what I'm speaking of. I wasn't referring to the earlier telex of Mr. Wise, I was referring to the telex of the Honourable Charles Mayer of April 26th in which he said, "In view of the concern you expressed regarding the establishment of a national sugar-sweetener policy, I would like to assure you of the Federal Government's commitment." And today's commitment is, as I understand, Mr. Speaker, that they would endeavour to have in place a sugar-sweetener policy, and I further ask the Minister, there appears to be no assurance of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: There appears to be no further assurance, Mr. Speaker, other than the assumption of the Provincial Government that accordingly producers and the Manitoba Government fully expect the Federal Government to make regular stabilization payments to growers for the 1983 and '84 crop. Does that mean that they were assured in the telex that they would receive those payments, or is this another assumption on the part of the Minister?

A MEMBER: Where's the telex?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the Leader of the Opposition was not negotiating with the Federal Government . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, now I know who can't negotiate his way out of a paper bag.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the original announcement made by the Federal Government on April 18th, and I quote the last paragraph dealing with the national sugar policy. Mr. Wise said: "Over the next year the Federal Government will look into the advisability of establishing a national sugar-sweetener policy."

The telegram makes reference to their commitment. What kind of a commitment does the federal announcement make to a national sugar-sweetener policy, ". . . advisability of establishing . . ."

Mr. Speaker, I believe, and I've said this before, I believe in motherhood as well, but that doesn't give the producers of this country a national sugar policy and doesn't give the taxpayers of this province no longer commitment to the sugar industry. This agreement does.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, the Federal Government by their announcement was abandoning its long-standing position about stabilization. The honourable member

doesn't mention that. Since 1958, when John Diefenbaker's Government passed The Agricultural Stabilization Act, this is the first time that a Federal Government has backed away from stabilization. It is another Conservative Government, his federal leader, who he and his colleagues have attempted to take off the hook, Mr. Speaker; and that's why I said, no thanks to them that we now have a national commitment to a policy, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Sugar beet industry - tabling of telex

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture table the telex that he received either this morning or last night from the Federal Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Will the Minister of Agriculture table a copy of the telex he received from the Minister of the Wheat Board either last night or this morning that he refers to, the actual telex that he received?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that the honourable member has received a copy since they received copies of previous telexes, but certainly I'll be pleased to table that telex.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was unavoidably late for the start of proceedings today. I was wondering if, by leave, I could revert to the tabling of reports and table an annual report.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you. I have the pleasure to table the 1983-84 Annual Report of the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if we're still on the same item, I would like to table the report on the

Standing Committee on Medical Manpower as promised to my honourable friend yesterday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I move the motion for Committee of Supply, I wish to advise the House that the next department in the committee room following the Attorney-General, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Business Development and Tourism will be the Department of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there may once again be a disposition to dispense with Private Members' Hour. If you could ask, Sir, if there is leave, I would then move the motion to that effect. If not, we would of course have it.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today? Leave has not been granted.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I was unclear, I did not hear a nay. Was there a nay to the request?

A MEMBER: Yes.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Oh, there was?

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has not been granted.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Health, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of the Attorney-General.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. We are considering Item No. 2(a)(1) Criminal Justice, Crown Prosecutors: Salaries; 2.(a)(2) - Mr. Minister.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Chairman, yesterday I was asked a number of questions which I took as notice. I believe I have the answer to perhaps all but one of the questions, and rather than lose continuity and time, I will give those answers now with your permission.

One of the questions asked - who were the members of the Charter of Rights Coalition? The members of

the Charter of Rights Coalition, Manitoba, are as follows: The Elizabeth Fry Society of Manitoba, the Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba, the Junior League of Manitoba, the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the Manitoba Association of Women and the Law, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Provincial Council of Women, the United Church of Canada and the Young Women's Christian Association.

I was asked some questions to which my answers were somewhat less than clear concerning my staff, and I regret for any confusion which may have originated in my own confusion. It sometimes happens when you run two departments.

With respect to the answers I gave yesterday, identifying Valerie Bingeman and Nancy Allen as my E.A. and S.A. respectively, and Nancy Allen in fact is my S.A. with the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who substantially looks after those elements of my involvement, but also does some of the Attorney-General's work when time permits; Valerie Bingeman is the E.A.

Virginia Devine was the S.A. with the Department of the Attorney-General until September 26th of 1984 when she was reappointed in the department but with an enlarged mandate as a planning and program analyst reporting directly to me. Shortly after her appointment to that position, because of a maternity leave position that was required to be filled in the office of Executive Council, she was seconded by me to fill in for the time of that maternity leave, which has now expired. Ms. Devine is presently on vacation and on her return her ongoing duties will be discussed with her but she will be a member of my staff. That's one of the things that will have to be discussed.

We are presently somewhat short of office space and, as the member knows, in a month or two - I hope not longer than that - some elements of the Office of Legislative Counsel will be moved over to the Woodsworth Building, freeing up some space that we need for my staff and for the Deputy's staff.

The salaries were asked as well, and with respect to Virginia Devine, when appointed she was earning \$25,611, when promoted to S.A., \$37,220, and on the reappointment, \$42,478.00. Valerie Bingeman is presently employed as an executive assistant at \$29,050.00; and Nancy Allen, of course, is in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs at an S.A.'s salary.

With respect to some statistics that were asked for, I turn first of all to spousal abuse statistics. I have a copy for the member, and I would be pleased to address any specific questions, but I'll note in summary rather than take up the time of the committee as a whole by reading column after column of the statistics.

You will note that the summary total at the beginning indicates the number of charges. I should point out that this is not necessarily the same as the number of persons charged. In fact, if you look at the top, you'll see that the number of persons charged is 640. The reason, of course, why there's a difference between the number of persons charged and the number of charges is that there are multiple charges in some instances.

Then, of course, you have a breakdown of the disposition of those charges and the number that were

in a continuing capacity, continuing status at the end of 1984. This is for the calendar year. There is also a month-by-month breakdown that is found at the top, and a cases per district. Do you want me to break here, if you want to ask questions about these?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the statistics show 640 persons charged. Then with respect to the number of charges, 963, and then stayed, 262. Is it possible to indicate how many persons against whom the charges were laid were stayed? We could relate it to the number, 640 persons charged.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I'll try to find that out. It's not broken out here. What you have, of course, are the number of charged stayed, and that is not broken out in terms of the number of persons, but we'll get that information.

Other statistics that were asked for related to, I believe, break and enter. I have just received from my staff the following figures. I will give the combined figures and then break them down for Winnipeg, Brandon and then RCMP and other municipal departments. Winnipeg's total for calendar 1984, 12,171, I believe that represents a fairly significant increase over calendar 1983 where there was a total of about 10,200 in Winnipeg of Business and Resident break-ins. The business-residence breakdown for Winnipeg: Business, 2,895; Residence, 7,2 . . .

MR. G. MERCIER: What were the - 2,100?

HON. R. PENNER: Business, 2,895; Residence, 7,268 - excuse me for a moment. I think there's a copy of this available. In fact, we'll get you one in a few moments, but there is a copy available of those stats.

MR. G. MERCIER: Those figures don't add up.

HON. R. PENNER: No, I haven't finished. Business, 2,895; Residence, 7,268; Other, 2,008. Now you may well ask, as I will in a moment, what the other represents. Garages, outbuildings, tents, trailers, schools, it would be a fairly high number of schools in that figure but, if you want a further breakdown, we can get that.

Brandon, the total is 566, and that is split between Business, 254, and Residence, 312. Apparently no Others are reported. That is a further reduction in the Brandon figure which, in 1983, already showed a reduction from '82. The Brandon total for '83 was 600 on the nose, and here we have 566.

In the RCMP constituency, that is for most of the rest of the province, other than those policed by municipal police departments, the total for '84, 4,402. The split there is almost even, that is, 1,390 Business, 1,531 Residences, and then 1,481 Other.

Other municipal departments have a total of 201.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have with me the statistics, I believe, that the Attorney-General tabled in the Legislature from last year which, for example, in the City of Winnipeg you showed 3,100 Business, 7,000 Residential. They didn't refer to Other last year.

HON. R. PENNER: I know that.

MR. G. MERCIER: In order to compare last year to this year, does the Minister have any information as to how the figure from last year would have broken down?

HON. R. PENNER: I'll take that as notice, and see whether or not there was an additional figure, or what is now broken out as Other is included in the 10,200-odd in 1983.

MR. G. MERCIER: Was there any other information the Minister had, because I would like to deal with the break and enter figures if there were any?

HON. R. PENNER: No, that's all the information on break and enters I have.

MR. G. MERCIER: On any other matter?

HON. R. PENNER: Well if you want any figures about obscenity prosecutions or drinking and driving, I have some figures there.

MR. G. MERCIER: We could deal with that later then.

Mr. Chairman, last year with respect to break and enters, I had raised that matter in the Legislature because it is certainly not only a concern of residents of my constituency - many of whom have expressed their concern to me - but it is obviously a concern of many many residents of this province.

The Attorney-General did not quite accept the concern I had last year about the serious aspects of break and enters, because they are indeed, particularly where the privacy of homes is violated, a very traumatic experience for homeowners, for people who come home, find the door broken into, the windows smashed. They are afraid to enter their home.

I have experienced this myself with neighbours, personally, afraid to enter to their home. They then enter the home, the privacy of their home is being violated, their dresser drawers have been opened. In many cases there is vandalism inside the home, although that's not usually the work of the professionals, more often of juveniles. But it's just a very traumatic experience because subsequent to that, certainly many many women, let alone men, are afraid to be home alone. They are afraid to go back into their home in the evenings. They are really frightened of this particular crime. I am not trying to overemphasize this crime relative to other serious crimes that the department is well aware of.

Now we see, as compared to last year, certainly in the total figures in the City of Winnipeg - and acknowledging that Brandon has dropped by roughly 34 situations - the RCMP in rural Manitoba, that is increased by 800 occurrences; and in the City of Winnipeg, in the gross figures, there has been a 20 percent increase over 1983 during 1984. That, I submit, and I am sure most members of the Legislature would well agree, is a very very serious matter.

I would like the Attorney-General to indicate what, if any, extraordinary steps are being taken by his department in the prosecution of these offences in order

at least to attempt to convey to the perpetrators that this is a very serious offence and anyone charged and convicted of this offence is at least going to be, in the opinion of the Crown, dealt with very very seriously.

HON. R. PENNER: First of all, let me make it clear for the record that, contrary to the statement which was made by the Member for St. Norbert at the beginning of his question that suggested, in any event, that I took this crime somehow not seriously or in a light-hearted way, that is not at all the case. I think it is a serious matter. Break and enters, I would agree, are very traumatic for the victims. In some ways, it is one of the most traumatic crimes, no doubt not as traumatic as offences of violence, but there is the sense of violation of one's purse and one's privacy when there is a break and enter.

There has been a considerable increase in Winnipeg, not nearly as much outside of Winnipeg, in the last two or three years. The member noted a figure of something like 23 percent. Nationally - this doesn't make it any better but to put it in context - the property offence rates have shown, over the 1977-81 period, a basic 29.9 percent increase. There has been a considerable increase, an unwelcome and unacceptable increase with respect to property offences generally; but certainly, honing in on break and enter, this is a cause of concern.

I think the point has to be made, however, one has to differentiate the role of the Crown Attorneys from that of the police and from that of the judges. In the first instance, of course, the rate at which persons are apprehended and brought to justice, as the phrase has it, depends entirely on the activities of the police forces who, in my view, are following up break and enters diligently. I don't think anyone would suggest, and I know the Member for St. Norbert is not suggesting that the police are anything less than diligent in following up on break, enters and thefts.

But, by the very nature of that crime, which is less public in a sense than many crimes of violence, by the very nature of that crime the resolution rate remains at a relatively low 30 percent to 35 percent figure, in that area, in terms of an investigation leading to apprehension and a charge. Even in the numbers that are shown as offences, one of the problems is that many of the people who have committed those offences are not caught and brought to justice.

But, thereafter, certainly where there is an apprehension and an investigation leads to a prima facie case against the accused, the Crown prosecutes diligently. Representations as to sentence are made to the judges based on all of the factors, not the least of which is the incident of the crime, but including, of course, whether or not it's a first offence or a second offence, and the nature of the break-in and things of that sort.

Ultimately, whether or not the persons caught, charged and convicted are sentenced appropriately is a matter for the trial judges. The Crown does take appeals from time to time where it feels that a sentence has been inappropriate. I must say we're primarily concerned but by no means exclusively concerned with crimes of violence, particularly where it is felt the sentence is inappropriate. Crimes involving drinking and driving where we feel that the offence is

inappropriate, we have not been loath to take appeals. But there have been some instances where the Crown has felt that sentences in break and enter cases have been inappropriate, and we take it to the Court of Appeal in order to allow the Court of Appeal from time to time to set the standard. That is done.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Code obviously still recognizes the seriousness of this offence by the possible maximum punishment, of course, which has never certainly not to my knowledge ever been imposed, and I'm not suggesting it be imposed, as the Attorney-General suggested last year.

But leaving aside for a moment the cases of young offenders who would have to be dealt with on a different basis, in a situation where someone who might more be regarded as almost a professional, and there are people obviously who are doing that, who telephone throughout neighbourhoods on a regular basis and finding no one at home, because you find out about how these things happen after they occur.

Now a neighbour noticed someone sitting in a car outside. They didn't realize nobody was at home. Somebody is watching the home to signal to the person who enters the home. Very quickly, the VCR and the valuables and the jewellery, etc. are stolen. In that type of a situation, that's the sort of type of person I am referring to as a professional in this area. Would it be the Crown's position, upon a conviction of such a person for break and enter, even though the person had not been convicted of a previous similar offence, to request a jail sentence?

HON. R. PENNER: I find a little difficulty with the question. I'm not sure how we know if somebody has never been convicted before that they're a professional. There's an assumption there which I find difficult to follow, and I don't know how the court would make the assumption that person is a professional. He might be a one-time loser.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, it's just a general term.

HON. R. PENNER: Rightly or wrongly - I happen to think rightly - the courts view a first offender much differently than a multiple offender. Take the view that someone who has been before the courts and may on a first offence, depending of course on the nature of the offence, be treated somewhat leniently, appears before the courts again in a relatively short period of time, I don't think they sort of in a sense approach it from the point of view of whether or not the person is a professional. They approach it from the point of view that the person has been given an opportunity to change direction and to get off the path of crime and, not having taken the opportunity to do so, must be punished more severely; and the courts do that. I think, basically, that is the right way to go.

The real professionals in break and enter are the ones hardest to catch. They can be in and out of a place with very little sign of entry in a matter of under two minutes. If they can't make it in under two minutes, they don't consider themselves to be professionals. But, by the very nature of the skill they employ, in a misdirected way, of course, in that profession, makes

it difficult to catch. There is a significant amount of time spent by the police forces in trying to get at the real problem, the area which perpetuates the crime, perhaps more than any other, those who deal with stolen goods. A great deal of attention is paid in law enforcement to try and get at the fences, if we can get rid of them, unfortunately that's not as easy as it sounds, you can take a lot of the profit out of this kind of crime.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the Attorney-General saying that the Crown never asks for a jail sentence in the case of a first offender for break and enter?

HON. R. PENNER: No, no, I didn't say that. There will be circumstances in which that will be asked for.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General referred to the fact that there is generally only 30 to 40 percent, I believe, of the actual occurrences where the perpetrator is found. Does the Minister have a summary of how those persons were dealt with, say, in the year 1984? Does he have access to those kinds of statistics?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, we have access to those kinds of statistics, and we will get for the member, if not for tomorrow, then Monday, the number of offences cleared by charge and then the dispositions of the charges.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, I wonder if the Attorney-General could elaborate on the statement that he made about efforts in place to track down offences. This is an area that I am quite concerned with for a number of reasons, particularly there seems to be a lot more break and enters in my constituency, although the police constantly assure me that it's no more than any other area of the city and that the suburbs are affected every bit as much, although, when I personally have had five break-ins in the last two years, I begin to wonder why they can't catch any of these people. Many other people in my neighbourhood have been experiencing the same kind of numbers of incidents and we don't seem to be able to catch anyone.

I think one of the ways to do it, of course, is to follow up on what happens to the stolen property. I am curious as to what programs are in place to try to track down the fences.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I will answer in a general way. The reason I am doing that is one doesn't want to give too many of the tricks of the trade away, not that I am involved in them, but I know from my own involvement as Attorney-General that both police forces, when they feel that they are dealing with a fairly well organized break, enter and dispose of the goods group, will lay back a little and try to follow up through normal methods of investigation to see if they can track down the method of disposal, where the goods are stored and, if all other methods fail, they will ask for and receive permission to go after a wiretap. It is quite often the case that those wiretaps are successful in giving the police enough information to locate sort of the warehouse and, from there, the chain down the line, and there have been a

couple of successful operations of that kind in recent months.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: I still haven't got my silverware back.

HON. R. PENNER: It may be that the Member for Wolseley spends too much time in this House and not enough time at home, you see.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Exactly, and they know that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister gave us a figure of, I believe, 2,008 break-ins that were classified as Other In the City of Winnipeg. Does that include automobile break-ins, or do you get that figure from Autopac?

HON. R. PENNER: No, it doesn't include auto break-ins.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, do the police then treat break-ins of automobiles different from other break-ins?

HON. R. PENNER: Only from the point of view of statistical compilation but, otherwise, they treat them as a crime.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, it's been brought to my attention by several who have had automobiles broken into that, when they report to the police, the very first question that is asked is: Is the vehicle licensed? Would that make a difference to the police in how they treat the crime?

HON. R. PENNER: Again, I must emphasize, I can't speak for the police, the police do not come under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Attorney-General or any other department of government, but I would certainly think not and I would certainly hope not.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, the only reason I raised it, I did have a vehicle broken into last year, and that was the first question that was asked. The police then advised me to take it to the Autopac Claims Centre.

I wonder if the police inspected the vehicle at that place, or whether they would actually come around and inspect it on your own premises.

HON. R. PENNER: Again, I simply don't know.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Could the Minister probably investigate and report back how they do conduct their investigations into break-ins in automobiles?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I will look into that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, what would be the policy of the Crown in a situation where a person committed a break and enter, was released on his own

recognizance pending trial, and prior to trial was charged with another break and enter offence?

HON. R. PENNER: In circumstances of the kind enunciated by the member in his question, the Crown will bring that to the attention of the trial judge and ask the trial judge to take that into consideration in the placing of conditions of bail, or the refusal of bail.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, on another matter. There has been some reports with respect to the possibility of legislation allowing for victim impact statements to be a part of the trial in judging procedure, a procedure that would allow the victims, particularly in various kinds of assault cases, to ensure that the results of the assault, for example, would be brought to the attention of the judge in regard to sentencing. I wonder if the Attorney-General has been involved in any discussions with respect to that type of procedure, and whether he would support such a procedure.

HON. R. PENNER: The Federal Minister of Justice indicated in a general survey of possible federal initiatives in the criminal justice field that this is one area that is being looked at federally. There may be, in the next round of amendments to the Criminal Code, legislation dealing with victim impact.

We tend to think that it's not really necessary, that is, there is nothing to prevent that kind of statement being made, or evidence led, at the sentencing time. It has been done here on a couple of occasions; it isn't frequently done, but it has been done.

Some of my colleagues in other provinces have expressed doubts about the large-scale use of victim impact statements. The doubts that some of my provincial colleagues have expressed, and I find them very interesting, are that there is a danger that has to be thought out very carefully about introducing into a very difficult area of sentencing a subjective element which may be helpful and may not. The eyebrows are sort of still raised on that, and there are some who believe that it is and ought to be an important feature of the criminal justice system.

I'm more inclined to the view that what should happen following sentencing, where sentencing is, to a very considerable extent, looked at in terms of the nature of the crime and the nature of the criminal, that disposition, particularly of course in the young offenders field, should include substantial evidence of attempted victim-criminal reconciliation, mediation. Programs of that kind are seemingly quite successful and can't be used, in many instances I don't think they mean much where you're dealing with a professional criminal, to use that term again, nor would they be particularly helpful where you're dealing with the very serious crimes of violence. But where the charge and disposition are more of, in terms of I could say, a fracas or a minor property theft, or where they involve a young offender, then that type of disposition is helpful.

I think it's rather more helpful than the victim impact type of thing, although I'm not by any means ruling that out as a device. There are questions, and I can understand those questions.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think there exists in society a genuine concern that victims of crime are

ignored in the whole criminal process and they're soon forgotten about. The violent assault takes place, and then all that we hear afterwards, and they hear afterwards, is the trial of the accused, and the traumatic experiences that perhaps his wife is undergoing, and applications under the Charter of Rights to protect all of his rights. There is, I think, in society a very genuine concern that the victim has been forgotten, although there have been some steps lately which I think we started, which I think this Attorney-General has continued that, hopefully, will serve to go some ways to helping that concern.

Would the Attorney-General give consideration to, in the instances of violent crimes, assault, sexual assaults upon women, to incorporate into the sentencing procedure a victim impact statement? As he said, it has been done in some cases, would he consider doing it in those situations of violent crimes, assaults, sexual assaults?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Criminal Justice who is with me, John Guy, advises me that, in fact, the Victim Witness Board on which he sits, together with the Chief Provincial Judge and the people involved in the program, are indeed considering the whole question of victim impact statements at the time of sentencing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, as someone who practises in criminal courts from time to time, I can assure my friend from St. Norbert that it is the practice of the Crown Attorney's Department, in summarizing their position prior to sentencing and making a disposition statement, to often include statements attributed to the complainant in their final submission to the court. This is a very common practice. As a matter of fact, it sometimes leads to sizable disagreements between Defence Counsel and Crown Attorneys, as a result of the accuracy and veracity being questioned.

I personally feel that there should be some sort of statement disclosing the impact of a particular crime against an accused submitted to the court, but I think one has to always remember that the statement has to be accurate and has to be reliable in its content. The effect of an inaccurate statement of that sort, made in conjunction with allegations of a serious offence, could have a very dramatic impact on the sentencing conferred upon an individual accused person.

So, although I agree with him, for what it's worth, that the courts should be made aware of all the facts and should be aware of the impact on the individual, I think he should remember that there is presently a system that has some effect and consequence in this regard, and there is some risk associated with going to the system he proposes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Not being a lawyer, Mr. Chairperson, I find this discussion very interesting between three lawyers about victim impact statements. You know, I'm wondering what exactly the definition of that is and

what is included. But I tend to agree with the Member for St. Norbert in his assessment of how victims are left out and how their experience is ongoing, and where they might never even know whether the person was arrested or brought to trial, or whether they were sentenced to jail or community service or whatever, or fined or sent merrily on their way.

But, from personal experience, I don't know, in terms of the Member for Ellice, what he means by veracity and whether it's a truthful statement. I would think that if it's a statement by the victim on how this impacted on them, I would tend to think that it wouldn't necessarily be a statement of fact, it would be a statement of emotion, of how this affected a person's life, whether they were physically assaulted or whether it was a property assault.

I don't know about the Charter business or what defence would say in terms of having a statement by the victim entered before sentencing was pronounced, but I know that to this day I never turn off Westminster to go up my back lane without wondering what I'm going to find when I get to 165 Lenore.

HON. R. PENNER: What was that address again?

MS. M. PHILLIPS: It is a very traumatic experience to come home and find all your personal belongings thrown all over, some of your precious, precious things either stolen or broken, eggs smashed all over your house. You have to spend a whole day cleaning it and while you're cleaning it you're fluctuating from being furious that someone would do this to being really scared about how did they get in here, and how did they do this, and how could they do this to me, and who are they? That kind of trauma goes on for ages.

You worry about leaving your teenagers at home. You worry about, you know, whether they've figured out some new way to break in through the bars you put in the basement window. You think you've got everything locked up, and you just never know. I don't know about the factual part of it, but I want to tell you that the emotional part of it is never addressed, even though you get a nice folder in the mail from the police saying, if you need someone to talk to about it. I've got five of them.

I recognize that the police have to catch the people first and that's the police's responsibility and that's very difficult, but I don't even know what's ever become of the first case, let alone the fifth one. I still, you know, wonder whether these people are running around, if they're going to come back, if they're going to break into my neighbour's. It's a very traumatic situation, and I don't think that the victims have any part of the process. If there are the massive numbers that have been listed today in terms of incidents, that means we've got at least that many victims if not four or five people in a household that have been victimized in the same way.

I don't know what the Attorney-General's Department can do about it, but if there is any way that the victim's statements even can be used to make the perpetrator of the crime understand that, yes, he might have run off with my silverware which I can't replace because a lot of it is old and irreplaceable, but they have left me as a victim with very serious ongoing worries every

time I hear a noise in the middle of the night. They should pay for that as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, an article on the subject that I had looked at indicated just for the information of the Member for Wolseley that: "Proponents of victim impact statements argue that victims of such crimes as assault and murder should have the opportunity to tell the court about the emotional, physical and financial distress that they have suffered."

It also goes on to point out, I think, I suppose as the Member for Ellice raised, that some defence lawyers, the main opponents of victim's impact statements, maintain that the comments of all victims should be given under oath and subject to cross-examination. The Member for Ellice's concern that the statements be accurate I think is a genuine one, but, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that the Assistant Deputy Minister has this matter under consideration at the present time. Hopefully, something will come of it.

On another subject matter, Mr. Chairman, with respect to seat-belt and helmet legislation as it's been introduced in other provinces, it was my understanding from - in fact in speaking to some of the various Attorneys-General that they would go through phases where they would request for a limited period of time the police departments to strongly enforce or at least to enforce seat-belt legislation. For example, they would go through a period of three or four weeks where it was enforced strongly and the statistics would go up, and then the enforcement would drop off and then they would go through another period where the Attorney-General once more asked the police departments to enforce the legislation once again.

I would ask the Attorney-General whether or not he or the Crown have given any direction to law enforcement authorities in Manitoba with respect to the enforcement of seat-belt or helmet legislation.

HON. R. PENNER: No, not specifically. I do know that the police forces, in fact, are enforcing without going on sort of a hunt and find mission specifically directed to seat-belt violators. That is, as far as I'm aware, when they find a violation, they will charge or sometimes caution, depending on the circumstances. But I haven't asked the police forces to do anything more than that, because I'm satisfied from what I hear but I'm certainly prepared to check into it, that indeed the police forces are still continuing to view this legislation as important legislation and are enforcing along the lines that I have suggested.

I do note incidentally, and I have just received a day or so ago by way of a note from the RCMP - I haven't received the statistics yet from the City of Winnipeg - with respect to reportable motor vehicle accidents involving a fatality, that 1984 is the lowest year for the past eight years. In fact, I have all the figures for eight years, and the number of fatalities on the highways in Manitoba were the lowest in eight years. So I think some of this - I could by no means say all of it - is attributable to the seat-belt legislation, because we do, in fact - the Minister responsible for MPIC has a sort

of informal seat-belt survivors club which has a fairly significant number of people who are members of it at this time.

I also think, at least I would like to think, but it's purely impressionistic, that part of the reduction there is attributable to the program that has been conducted by this government through several Ministers against drinking and driving.

MR. G. MERCIER: Does the Attorney-General have any statistics on the number of tickets that have been issued for contravening the seat-belt legislation?

HON. R. PENNER: No, but I'll get them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1) - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, on another matter, the Attorney-General earlier indicated that where a person who had been charged with a break and enter offence, released on his own personal recognizance, subsequently charged with another similar offence while out on bail would certainly have the Crown Attorney speak to that matter and possibly oppose bail for that person.

We have a situation in the City of Winnipeg where Dr. Morgentaler has been charged, reopened the clinic and charged with the same offence, then reopened the clinic and charged again. To my knowledge no attempt has been made through the Attorney-General to oppose bail or impose some kind of restrictions on his activities when he has appeared in court on the two subsequent charges. Now it would be normal in my view for that to take place as it would for the person who has been charged with a break and enter offence, as the Attorney-General has indicated, the Crown might even oppose that person's bail. I simply ask the Attorney-General why, through him or through his Crown attorneys, some sort of further restrictions have not been requested against Dr. Morgentaler when he's appeared in court on the two subsequent charges?

HON. R. PENNER: First of all, I would not make the analogy that the member makes between break and enter and the abortions. Whether or not the abortions that have been committed are legal has yet to be determined by a court of law because . . .

MR. G. MERCIER: The same for the break and enter.

HON. R. PENNER: No, there is a difference and that is that the particular individual having faced charges and trials on four separate occasions and advancing a particular defence which is open in these circumstances, and would not be with a break, enter and theft in almost all circumstances, has been found not guilty, but related to that when in fact bail conditions, of the kind suggested, were imposed by bail magistrate. At the time Dr. Morgentaler was first arrested, this issue was raised before an experienced trial judge by Dr. Morgentaler's lawyer who challenged the validity of those conditions in the circumstances.

The trial judge found that those bail conditions were not appropriate and gave written reasons, or at least gave a judgment which has been reduced to writing -

and which I have - on the 26th or 27th of June, 1983, and it seemed to me in those circumstances that issue has been canvassed in the courts and there was no particular point for having it canvassed again in the court.

There was no particular point because the police have made it quite clear that in their sense of what their duty is under the law, that when the clinic opens they will be there shortly after it opens and make an arrest. I'm not going to pass a value judgment on that, that's not the purpose of this discussion, but that's what they do.

So you have nothing like the situation the member refers to with someone who is engaged in break, enter and theft and the following circumstances are the differences: No. 1, the issue of whether or not bail is of that kind, imposing conditions, making an assumption that an offence has been committed has already been canvassed in the courts in Manitoba.

No. 2, the intentions of the doctor are announced and advanced. He makes it perfectly clear exactly when he'll be there at the clinic and exactly what he's going to do. He's not skulking around in the dark like the break and enter person who may be at risk to anyone who is unwilling to be at risk - I don't know of anybody who is willing to experience a break enter and theft - and is dealing with people who come to him willingly, whether or not they should is another question; and who, if they were not in his clinic on that day or the following day would be perhaps in the Health Sciences Centre or in North Dakota in any event. The circumstances are not analogous and I for one would not make that analogy.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the Attorney-General, I get the impression from his remarks that the person charged with break and enter initially in our hypothetical example is concluded to be guilty, while Dr. Morgentaler in the Attorney-General's view is innocent.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't say that.

MR. G. MERCIER: In the judgment of Mr. Justice Kroft, in the application for - I think it was the League for Life - an application for an injunction, Mr. Justice Kroft stated, "... that the initial conditions of bail imposed after the first charges were laid do not restrict Dr. Morgentaler's activities. These conditions are, however, always subject to review on a motion of the Crown. What is more, the Attorney-General may have an early occasion to consider the matter of interim judicial release in connection with newly laid charges. He can, if he then chooses, request and a court in its discretion can order stringent restrictions on Dr. Morgentaler's activities."

I would ask the Attorney-General if he or his department does not consider that the subsequent laying of additional charges on two more occasions is not a change in circumstances that would justify the Crown, as Mr. Justice Kroft has said, in asking that bail be reviewed and seeking some restrictions on his activities.

HON. R. PENNER: It appeared to me from a reading of the judgment of Mr. Justice Kroft that he was unaware

that this matter, in fact, had been canvassed in the courts below, it makes reference. The reference that was just read, in fact, indicates that it was not brought to his attention that in fact the matter had been canvassed in the courts in the first instance a I'm not so sure that he would have come to the same conclusion had he been aware of that.

In any event I think we have to realize that the matter at present is hypothetical. There is an injunction which is continuing, a matter to be heard further in the courts this month and concluded by some order of Mr. Justice Wilson. We'll just have to wait and see what that is and we'll have to review the circumstances that occur at that time.

The police certainly will have to consider what their response will be if the injunction is lifted and the clinic opens. I doubt whether at that time we'll have a judgment of the Court of Appeal. We may, but not likely. We'll deal with the situation as it arises subsequently.

MR. G. MERCIER: Two points, Mr. Chairman, one, the previous review of Dr. Morgentaler's bail, that the Attorney-General refers to, occurred I believe he said in July of 1983.

HON. R. PENNER: The first bail hearing was on either June 26th or June 27th of 1983.

MR. G. MERCIER: The first point I would make, Mr. Chairman, and this would be applicable to any case. Subsequent to that, there have been two additional series of charges laid, that obviously is a change in circumstances that in any normal case would justify the Crown in seeking to have the bail of any person reviewed. I think it's obvious that Dr. Morgentaler is receiving some special treatment.

The second point I would make is that this whole event, I think, obviously is causing a great deal of consternation and difficulty in the whole community of Manitoba. In my view the sooner those charges are resolved in a Court of Law in a trial in Manitoba, the better; and to allow this to continue to happen, perhaps there will be further charges. I don't think any Attorney-General, surely, would not rely on a third party group to obtain the civil injunction against an accused person as part of the protection of the public under the criminal law. Surely the Attorney-General's Department has not been reduced that low that the Attorney-General's Department has to rely on the Manitoba Medical Association to obtain a civil injunction.

I think the Attorney-General's Department has a clear responsibility which they should live up to on their own and I would ask the Attorney-General one further question. When this whole series of events started, the Attorney-General indicated to me in the House quite clearly that the Director of Prosecutions was going to handle this whole prosecution and be solely responsible for the laying of charges and handling of the prosecution. Subsequently he, personally changed the charges and obviously through that event he took away the responsibility of the Director of Prosecutions. Is he still retaining a personal responsibility for all decision making with respect to this matter? Or has he returned it to the Director of Prosecutions?

HON. R. PENNER: I'd like to deal with all the points raised briefly. In the first instance, I don't consider that

this is - to use the words of the Member for St. Norbert - any normal case.

The unusual feature is the one that I adverted to earlier, namely that this accused, under approximately the same circumstances, has faced trial four times and four times has been found not guilty. Those are not usual circumstances. Those are very very unusual circumstances. It's a strong indication to those of us who are charged with the responsibility of administering criminal justice that the particular defence which is being raised is one that is being given serious consideration by juries and is of particular notice to those of us who are involved in the administration of criminal justice, that we cannot make any assumptions about the guilt of the accused in any way. Again I would say that there is no special treatment that is being given to Dr. Morgentaler.

Very briefly, Dr. Morgentaler, when he decided to open up his clinic, wrote me and asked that he wanted - I'm using his words - an immunity from prosecution. He was immediately advised that there could be no such a thing as an immunity from prosecution. He came here nevertheless and opened the clinic.

Prior to his coming, I was asked questions often in the House, what would happen? I said, "the law would take its course." The law took its course. The police, as I said they would, who have a duty under the Criminal Code - it derives from the Criminal Code - it derives from law not from a person; it derives from law not from me. They did what I expected they would do and that is, on complaint being received, carried out with an investigation with the aid of a search warrant, put the material in the hands of the Crown attorneys. The Crown attorneys proceeded on the basis of the evidence that was then known, to lay charges of conspiracy. There was an application, the person was arrested and bail conditions were imposed.

There were representations made about those bail conditions, we've been over that ground. The matter was handled by a trial judge. There was nothing abnormal about that. The law was taking its course. I did not intervene. I obviously don't intervene with the administration of justice at the judicial level in any way; don't intervene with respect to the police in any way.

Further, following those events there was a subsequent arrest and the matter of charges was considered. Additional charges were laid. At that time there was sufficient evidence to warrant charges, not only of conspiracy, but of substantive charges. However, in the view of my Crown attorneys they felt that the preliminary should proceed on the basis of conspiracy. I didn't intervene. It was a question of what evidence would be adduced before the trial judge.

The evidence was then adduced before the trial judge. At that time we knew exactly what the dimensions of the case were in a variety of ways. We also knew because Dr. Morgentaler made a statement of what his defence would be, what, in fact, his particular defence or what shape it would take in the Province of Manitoba.

The trial judge on committing for trial noted that the particular defence of necessity would run into some difficulties from any point of view in a conspiracy charge, but it was clearer as well, that there was if anything a stronger substantive case than there was a conspiracy case. On the basis of that and having in mind my responsibilities as the Attorney-General to make sure

not only that charges are laid but that trials are fair or that I directed an indictment on the substantive charges.

Let me note here, and I do so emphatically, that in my view, and indeed I think the view is shared by my Crown Attorneys, that it is from the point of view of the Crown, easier to make the case on substantive charges than on conspiracy.

One should not lose sight of the fact that the acquittal of Dr. Morgentaler in Toronto was on conspiracy, not on the substantive charges. We don't know, of course, why the jury acquitted. There's lots of speculation about that. One of the reasons might be that as juries often are, they are confused by a charge of conspiracy. What does that mean? It means an intention to agree to do something. What does the Crown have to prove? This is much different and much more difficult than dealing with substantive charges. The law was being dealt with in the normal way and I make no apologies for having directed an indictment at that time. Subsequently, of course, the other events took place including the charges in Toronto and the acquittal.

Had the matter rested there, then I think the following is what would have happened in Manitoba, that is had there been no appeal from that judgment. The matter having gone through a preliminary would have been set down for trial at the next assize. Dr. Morgentaler's lawyer immediately would have raised the constitutional issue here. He made it clear that that's exactly what he would do.

If he had raised the constitutional issue, he would have applied for in the normal course, and I think things would have taken a normal course, would have likely obtained a stay in terms of the trial while the constitutional challenge was being raised. That has happened not infrequently. I have myself, as a defence attorney, been associated with events of that kind. They are certainly not abnormal; they're not unknown to the law.

But, by agreement, rather than reinvent the wheel with all of that massive evidence having been adduced in the trial in Toronto, and the fundamental issues of the validity of the law, and the validity of the defence, of necessity, being raised as they are now, day after day, beginning two days ago, being raised in the Ontario Court of Appeal before a very formidable bench, it became clear that that was the proper way for the matter to be adjudicated. Indeed, it is clear that the fundamental issues which would have to be addressed here are being addressed. These are issues of law and, certainly, the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal will be very persuasive. We will have to wait for the outcome of that, but doing so is by no means abnormal.

Finally, in terms of my reply, the question of an injunction has been raised. I have satisfied myself; my senior officials in my department have satisfied themselves; the Attorneys-General - two of them - Mr. McMurtry, now the Canadian High Commissioner to London - looked good on TV the other day as he greeted Mr. McMurtry . . .

A MEMBER: Nice background.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, nice background there - No. 10 Downing Street - never been in there myself.

. . . and Mr. Welch, and their senior deputy, Archie Campbell, have advised us that they have satisfied themselves that a civil injunction in criminal matters is not obtainable and that, at the instance of the Attorney-General, there has been some suggestion that it may - I don't think so. The injunction that was obtained by the College of Physicians and Surgeons is an entirely different matter, it doesn't relate at all to the criminal charges in any way; it relates to the question of practising medicine without a licence.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I hadn't even raised the matter of the civil injunction that the Attorney-General had been requested to consent to the application with the review of bail, I wonder if he could address that subject, in the light of additional charges having been laid, and whether that would not be appropriate.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, I have said that at the moment the issue is hypothetical and whether or not a different approach will be taken by the Crown will have to be reviewed in the light of changing circumstances.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government, I assume, are still in the process of reviewing the provisions of the Criminal Code. Has the Attorney-General himself, or through his department, made any representations with respect to changing the existing provisions of the Criminal Code on abortion?

HON. R. PENNER: On abortion?

MR. G. MERCIER: On this subject of abortion.

HON. R. PENNER: I, personally, have advised the Minister of Justice of the fact that I, and my party in Manitoba, by resolution, are opposed to Section 251 of the Code.

MR. G. MERCIER: Would the Attorney-General make any substitution for the existing section, or simply repeal it?

HON. R. PENNER: I should note, incidentally, the matter is not under active consideration by the Federal Minister. The House, in fact, has just dealt with the omnibus amending bill to the Code, and sections of that will be proclaimed in the near future. A lot of it deals with drinking and driving and so on, but there is no active consideration being given by the Federal Minister to changes in the Code.

I think that any consideration would await the outcome of proceedings presently before the courts. As the member knows, the law is being challenged from both sides, as it were. Mr. Borowski in Saskatchewan has challenged the law as it exists, he thinks it's too liberal, too permissive I suppose is the word he would use. He lost that contention at the trial level and the appeal is set for December of this year. They don't move that quickly in Saskatchewan either. The law is being challenged currently in the proceedings before the Ontario Court of Appeal.

I suppose, to come directly to the question that was being asked, if the matter were an issue and it was a

question of the Federal Minister saying, well, look we are going to have to have some law and the lot of you, or the courts don't like certain aspects of the law as it is, what would you change?

I think the thing that, probably, from the Manitoba perspective, is most bothersome to women is the notion of the Therapeutic Abortion Committee. They feel they have to, not go on the advice of their own doctor and have the issue dealt with by their own doctor, in whom they can have some confidence in a very traumatic and difficult time in their lives, but they have to go, in a sense, notionally - they don't go personally - before a committee of doctors who don't know them, who have to make a decision about their state of health and their future. They find that particularly offensive and that feature, if there had to be a law, would be one of the features I think should be looked at most closely.

MR. G. MERCIER: On another subject matter, Mr. Chairman. Would the Minister explained to the committee what he did in 1984 with respect to payment of witness fees to police officers in the City of Winnipeg; did he simply, the department, stop paying witness fees for police officers who appeared in court?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: And that, Mr. Chairman, I believe resulted in a revenue loss to the city of approximately \$155,000, and City Council in late May had asked that the official delegation discuss this matter with the Provincial Government. Did the Attorney-General participate in any later discussions with the City of Winnipeg on that issue?

HON. R. PENNER: The city has been very silent on that issue in recent months - I am just looking to see if I had the figures. One of the reasons is that about the same time we changed the summary conviction proceedings with respect and, in particular, to parking tickets, so that in fact most of those that are disposed of are disposed of without the necessity of appearances by the police in ex parte proceedings, as they were, took place at 207 Donald at great cost to the city in terms of time and resource allocation.

The city has, not only saved a tremendous amount of money from that, but its revenues in this area have gone up - I haven't got the figures - but by something in excess of \$1 million that the city is doing extraordinarily well in terms of revenue as a result of these changes. So that, on balance, they have lost a little, in terms of the witness fees, but they have gained a whole lot more.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have another question that will take some time and I don't think there is enough time to answer it . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Committee rise?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall we call it 4:30?

HON. G. MERCIER: Yes, we could.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 p.m., we are interrupting the proceedings of this committee for Private Members' Hour.

The committee shall resume its proceedings at about 8:00 p.m. this evening.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 7, Manitoba Health Services Commission, Medical Program. I believe when we last met we were ready to pass this, but the Member for Ste. Rose had one comment he wanted to make.

The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I realize that there was an agreement, I guess, or a willingness to pass this item last night. I tried to get the floor to raise one point on this particular item, but I was unable to last night. I don't intend to take up the time of the committee at any great length but I want to raise a point, as a result of a complaint that I have received in this regard.

Yesterday you may recall, Mr. Chairman, that we discussed the number of visits to the chiropractors and volume office visits and referrals; that was only touched upon in a very small way. But the complaint I have received, and I think it is a legitimate one, has to do with the . . . Well, the Member for Niakwa says that the Minister is not listening. As long as the Member for Niakwa is listening that will be fine. I believe that he was listening, he certainly was listening.

The complaint that I have received is the number of office visits that one has to make for the most minor tests or examinations, and the complaint was that in order to get a simple blood test one had to make an appointment with a general practitioner. There is a consultation and the patient is referred for a laboratory test, and when a patient goes to consult with a doctor the patient would like to know and would like to have the information of the result of the tests, and that very seldom is forthcoming. In order for the patient to find out the results of any tests he has to make another office call where another charge is made, and it seems to me that the complaint was that a simple telephone call would be sufficient to get that kind of information, without loading on additional costs on the system.

No doubt there are some medical practitioners that may provide that information without having another office visit, but I do believe, and according to this complaint that I received, they had to on a number of occasions, go back and make another office call to find out the information.

This goes, likewise, I understand in regard to referrals. If you go to see a practitioner and this doctor, or this medical practitioner, cannot deal with the health problem of that individual he may refer that individual to a specialist or another doctor who would be able to deal with that question, or that problem. Again, there is nothing that has been done, except to make a referral, but there is an office charge made.

I want to ask the Minister whether or not, in negotiating with the MMA for fee for service, whether or not this is a point to negotiate with, whether or not there are some guidelines on how this should be done. Is it possible to make one referral to a doctor, and that

doctor can make another referral, and another referral, and you end up with maybe three or four referrals for the one case; is that possible? Do these questions come up for negotiation? I think the system is already under pressure and it seems to me that there should be more attention in this area.

I advised this party that brought this to my attention that I would raise it with the Minister, and I would appreciate, at least, having on the record what is the practice in regard to this type of thing. I know, Mr. Chairman, if I had a mechanical problem with, say, my automobile and I went to a mechanic and I said, could you fix this vehicle, or this problem that I'm having with the vehicle; and if that mechanic wasn't able to do it and said, well I can't do it but I can recommend you to another fellow who can do it, I'm sure there wouldn't be a charge.

By the same token, if you went to a jeweller with your watch and if he said he couldn't fix it, or couldn't repair it, and referred you to another individual, I am sure there wouldn't be any charge. So I am just raising the question why these charges are made for not having performed any service. I think the party that brought that to my attention really has a legitimate complaint.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I understand the example of my honourable friend, but it is a little different in fixing automobiles and human beings. The last thing that the Commission wants to do is play doctor or practise medicine, but there is a committee of their peers, the Medical Review Committee, and this pattern would surface, and if they feel that there is any abuse at all these people would be called in.

Now, it is very difficult to say, well after how many referrals would you put your foot down? I think a lot depends on the situation.

A MEMBER: He wants to cut them off.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What? His foot?

A MEMBER: Pete wants to cut them off.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I don't think he said that, I've always known Pete to be a very reasonable and responsible person, and he . . .

A MEMBER: But he's changed since he's out of Cabinet, since he's the Premier's Legislative Assistant.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I've noticed that most of the people that leave Cabinet, like those across change a hell of a lot, I've noticed that.

A MEMBER: All of a sudden we have all the answers.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You sure have. Mr. Chairman, this is a problem that has been brought to my attention. We've discussed that with the medical profession, they also agree that we should be looking at any abuse, and we have a review committee at the Commission which is part of our overall study to make

recommendations; that is being studied and established very closely between the Commission and the MMA because there is some abuse, but it would be very difficult to give an example and say it's an abuse until we know all the facts.

But there is presently the Medical Review Committee that looks at that; the profile would show up and they would be called in if need be; and also, further than that, there are negotiations or discussions at the committee of the Commission also. We hope that we can try to eliminate all the abuse that we have.

MR. A. ADAM: I appreciate the Minister providing that information. One case was brought to my attention where the individual had to see his doctor to get a health clearance for driving, or whatever it was, and it was an eye inspection that was required. His doctor could not provide that service and he was referred to a specialist, and the result was that there was a double charge made for that and absolutely no service provided, just say, well you go to see this other fellow. I think that should be looked at.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Medical Program - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would also like to thank the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose for giving me the opportunity to pose just a couple of very minor questions to the Minister. I wasn't aware that I was going to have the opportunity inasmuch as last night when I was out visiting a neighbour just two doors down the street - she has been incapacitated because of a sore back for the last three weeks - and she thinks there's nothing like the chiropractic people in the Province of Manitoba as far as her back is concerned, because medical doctors haven't been able to help her before now.

I was just wondering whether the Honourable Minister can advise, and he doesn't have to give me his support for the chiropractors or the medical or vice versa, that's not really what I'm looking for. Has there been any support for the starting up of a chiropractic school here in the province and giving them privileges at hospitals wherein they are able to take advantage of the medical facilities at hospitals, particularly the X-ray equipment, without going through hassles and having to purchase that type of equipment for their own offices which most of them, I believe, do have X-ray facilities there? Is there any way that we can provide this type of facility for them so they do not have to incur this additional cost, and provide a service that's well needed here in the Province of Manitoba?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, no, there hasn't been any talk of setting up a school here, nor have there been any requests that I know of. They're fully satisfied with the schools that they now have.

I think there's been some help in putting teeth in their act so they can control and police their own people, their own members. A lot of people believe in psychiatrists, as I was saying. Most of the time, I overspend my allotment on psychiatrists. I was there yesterday at noon — (Interjection) — isn't that what I said? Are we not talking about chiropractors?

Well I've got psychiatrists on the brain. That's all I've heard lately. No, I won't touch that one because I meant chiropractors. There hasn't been any talk of making hospitals available for psychiatrists. The only one that has admitting privileges are chiropractors. The situation is that I have tried to get the medical profession and the chiropractors closer together. I hosted a small unofficial lunch and, to the credit of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, they attended informally and things were going well. Certain things were mentioned, and you could see then they were still quite a ways apart.

I would like to see them work together. There are some that, unofficially I'm told, work together. There are some doctors that will have referrals to chiropractors, but I think things are improving somewhat but they're still quite a ways apart.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Just one final question, Mr. Chairman. When the Honourable Minister said that he had been attending with his psychiatrist, I actually believed him because I am not about to disbelieve the Honourable Minister. But I would hope that it wasn't a Freudian slip, particularly when I had just asked the question, and if it was a Freudian slip, that it was probably in reference to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It was a slip all right, but it was a slipped disk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, before we pass this item, I would like to send a copy of a press release, July 25, 1984, over to the Minister in which the Health Minister announced, "... that the negotiators for Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Manitoba Chiropractors Association have reached an agreement for an increase in chiropractors' fees and in the maximum benefits payable to individuals and families for insured chiropractic services. The agreement on fees, covering April 1, 1984 to March 31, 1985 provides for a 2 percent increase," the kind of agreement the Minister wasn't aware of come January, when he changed the fee schedule with the chiropractors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Medical Program—pass.
Hospital Program - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — why didn't you know about it then? — (Interjection) — No, there was an agreement. It says whenever you signed an agreement, it was good until March 31, 1985 which you claimed yesterday you didn't know about.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister's press release says, "the agreement goes to March 31, 1985," and he claims he didn't know about that yesterday in the debate on the chiropractors' fee schedule. He put out a press release saying that was the term of the agreement and the length of time it was in effect. He doesn't even know what his own press releases say.

Mr. Chairman, since the Minister is interested in questions and banking of questions, I've got a series

of questions on the Hospital Estimates — (Interjection) — we already have — (Interjection) — you can if you want.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I just wanted to make the point that the maximum - that's the news release - "The maximum benefits payable for insured chiropractic services is the same percentage increases for fees, and for the calendar year, 1984, it will be 1.02 percent for a single person." Calendar year, that is supposed to be where we broke the agreement.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, why would the Minister have in his press release in the second paragraph: "The agreement on fees, covering April 1, 1984 to March 31, 1985 provides for a 2 percent increase . . . "if indeed it didn't?"

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The benefits were for a calendar year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister wants to bank a series of questions, and I have a series of questions on the Hospital line.

Can the Minister indicate whether the current guidelines on funding to the hospitals - and these questions, I presume, will apply as well to the personal care homes - but if there's any difference he might note them? Then we won't have to deal with them when we hit personal care homes.

But could the Minister indicate whether the current guidelines of 2 percent for supplies increase still apply, and whether the 0 percent on salaries is still in effect or whether a new directive has gone out indicating something more specific than the letter that was in about the first part of April?

In terms of the breakdown in the global budget for Hospital, could the Minister indicate what would be an approximation of the percentage of a Hospital budget that's spent on salaries versus supplies, and if that same information was available for personal care homes could give that as well?

Also if the Minister could give an indication on what current estimates of cost increases in supplies to the hospitals they base their 2 percent guideline, and whether that meets with information that the Minister or the Health Services Commission have at their disposal to indicate that it will be sufficient to cover supply cost increases.

Within the Salary line, I would appreciate if the Minister could indicate whether there is available a breakdown in the Salary category which would separate administrative functions from staff functions. Could the Minister indicate whether, in terms of the budgets for the major hospitals, the St. Boniface, Health Sciences Centre, Concordia, Seven Oaks, Misericordia, Grace, Victoria, the seven majors in Winnipeg, and the Brandon General Hospital are more or less the major hospitals in Manitoba - I'm not saying that Dauphin and Thompson and some of the other ones aren't important, but those hospitals that I've mentioned - I'd like to get a global budget for this year on? That would do to initiate the discussion on this line.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The guidelines for the funding is actually the Commission, that's 4 percent, but the

hospital gets the 2 percent and they would have to justify the other 2 percent and then come back to the Commission. They would get the 2 percent automatically, but the Commission gets 4 percent, depending on their application and their making the points. So the Commission has 4 percent, but 2 percent is given to the hospital and they have to make their proof that they need more before the other 10 percent expended.

The contract is still the contract that was signed last year - you're on the second year - that of course was put in the base. The contract all starts at 2 percent. The guidelines will be as soon the contract is signed - that will be reviewed. There is no more, it's 2 percent now. For instance, if the contract with a nurse is signed, that will automatically be increased because they are negotiating constantly; the negotiator is in touch with the hospitals.

You didn't hear me say 2 percent for wages.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's what I thought you said.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, no. Two percent for the supplies. There is 4 percent for supplies; they are given 2 percent for supplies, and then the other 2 percent they have to make the point.

MR. D. ORCHARD: To justify the other 2 percent.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: To justify the other 2 percent.

In the contract there is nothing; wages there is nothing. It is announced, though, after the contract is signed. As you know, during negotiations, the MHO or whatever represents the management, is constantly touching bases with the Commission and, of course, the government is advised and when that is finished that is added on. That's what I was saying a while ago, it's very difficult because you do not want to let the people know what you've got in there. In the past, at times, they've put in a certain amount, not the full amount, they've had to go back. Now, we haven't got any amount for that but, as I stated, there's no way that's going can stay at that.

The percentage is roughly 70 percent of the total budget - 75 percent is for wages and about 18 or 20 is for supplies, and the balance is capital and so on.

The breakdown in Salary, I'll try to get that for you. We haven't got it here. That is, I think you mentioned in a hospital setting or a personal care home setting - the administrators, those in the administration and the others. I don't imagine you're talking about nurses and doctors and professionals on that, are you? Oh, you want that, too. You know when there's a contract for nurses - well, we'll try to give you. The nurses have a contract that covers all the nurses, and you still want that?

MR. D. ORCHARD: What I'm seeking is within the 75 percent of the hospital's budget, it's salaries, and the component of salaries is, I presume, the entire salary package from management right through to LPNs and related nursing staff.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay, you want all the salaries at different categories.

MR. D. ORCHARD: If it was possible to break it out into management versus staff cost, and I don't know if I'm using staff cost as the right word. But there is management function at various levels throughout the hospitals and if you could separate management, too.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That could be a tall order. We could break up the administration vis-a-vis all the others and then, of course, you can break up nurses also. We'll see what we can do, we'll do the best we can.

This is the 1984-85 Budget. The Health Sciences Centre - \$154.5 million; St. Boniface - 96.7; Misericordia - 33.4; Grace - 28.6; Victoria - 22.6; Brandon - 26.2. I think there are all those my honourable friend wanted except for Concordia and Seven Oaks that I'm trying to get.

Maybe you can ask other questions while I'm waiting for that. Oh, here it is.

Seven Oaks - 29.4 and Concordia 12 million.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What were those two?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: 29.4 for Seven Oaks and 12 for Concordia.

MR. D. ORCHARD: 12 million even for Concordia.

Mr. Chairman, in striking the budget line this year on hospitals, in particular, first of all, just for a matter of clarification, are personal care homes the breakdown in staff versus supplies, versus capital pretty equivalent for the hospital figure you gave?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There is about 78 percent staff in personal care homes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, in striking this year's Budget of 592.575 million, is this figure of 592, composed of the 4 percent, the 2 plus 2 on supplies, no increase allowance for salaries and, presumably as it was with the medical program line, possibly some increase for projected volume or anticipated volume, is that the way the 592 has been arrived at, using those two factors, volume and 4 percent supply increase?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, 4 percent for supplies, nothing for wages, that will be added later on. The volume is only added - the volume deficit from last year, not this year's projected volume. The deficit, because of the volume, volume deficit from last year is included in the base, but not a projected volume increase for this year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I'll get into my next line of questioning, Mr. Chairman. In terms of the hospitals, particularly the ones that we dealt with on this year's global Budget, can the Minister indicate whether those hospitals operated within their budget allotment last year, or whether any of them experienced a budget deficit and, if so - this does get a little tricky - but let's deal with St. Boniface or Health Sciences Centre, it doesn't matter which one. But, let's say, St. Boniface at 96.7 million this year. The Minister must have some preliminary figures now, as of the fiscal year end, which would indicate whether last year the St. Boniface Hospital was able to operate within its budget allocation last year.

Now, I don't know what the circumstance is with St. Boniface, but the fiscal year, one year previous, I believe they had something in the neighbourhood of a \$3 million operating deficit, and presumably that ended up figuring into the base for the fiscal year 1984-85 that we have just finished. What I'm asking the Minister is, the \$96.7 million St. Boniface budget, if they ran a deficit for fiscal year 1984-85, is the 4 percent increase that is globally allotted to St. Boniface to achieve the 96.7, does that add in last year's projected deficit?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it would be included in the base line adjustment. Actually, I'm not too sure. I have the deficits here of all the hospitals, the major components. The hospital deficit from last year was \$4,519,000.00. Now that is made up of intensive care, Health Sciences Centre, surgical 484.5 - let me start over again.

This is the components of the overexpenditures of the major hospitals. The Health Sciences Centre, surgical, 484.5; nursery at the Health Sciences Centre, 498; pediatrics, 442.7; for a total of 1,425.2 million. St. Boniface, neonatal, 274.6. So the total now between those two hospitals for intensive care was 1,699.8 million.

Then there was the cardiovascular surgery at the Health Sciences Centre - I guess you know that there is one team but it's two hospitals - that is 63.5. The hospital deficit was 4,519.1 million. All that adds up to 6,782.4 million.

Then I can give you the additional, starting then at this overexpenditure of 6,782.4 million. Now the general cost increase another 5,131.6 million; increase in rate authorized as charges - well, there was a reduction there of 89.8. New initiatives were allowed, 1,408 million; introduction of residential charges for chronic care patients, that will save 1.8 million; the approved equipment borrowing annualization of '84-85 borrowing, 508.7; new borrowing for '85-86, 508.7; new and renovated facilities - that is the annualization of facilities opening in '84-85 - would be 783.7; and new facilities opening, 11,241.02; so the total net increase over the past year should be 24,470.3 million. That is just for budget facilities.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, the Minister gave out a lot of figures there and I, quite frankly, didn't follow most of them because it didn't appear as if one particular line dealt with a hospital, either the Health Sciences Centre or St. Boniface. But do I take from last year's line in the budget where we had 566 million, that the total Hospital Program, all 111- or 120-some facilities, the total overexpenditure was 24.407 million?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is what has been approved, of now; there could be more than that. The 24.7 is not a deficit, as I explained, it includes the deficit. The deficit actually is included in the 6.782 overexpenditure; in fact, the hospital deficit was 4.519. This is the increase over last year, the approved increase. Now, besides that, that is for budget facilities - or do you want me to start over?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: All right. What I was trying to give over last year what the increase was. Then I looked,

and I started by saying, okay, the total hospital deficits - these aren't things that I am repeating now, not new figures - you can check those that you have - the hospital deficit was 4,519.1. Besides that, there was 1,425.2 for intensive care at the Health Sciences Centre, if you remember. I had broken that down between surgical, nursing and pediatrics for a total of 1,425.2. Do you have that?

Then I also added St. Boniface neonatal at 274. So the total for intensive care was 1,699.8 million. You added for the cardiovascular surgery at the Health Sciences Centre is 563.5, and you added the hospital deficit - which I already mentioned at 4.519. That made a total of 6,682.4 million and that is the overexpenditure. All right?

Besides that, there was a general cost increase besides the 6.7 - I am adding Others now - general cost increase was 5,131.6 million; increase in rate re authorized charges, that was a reduction of 89.8; new initiatives - they were allowed the 1,403.8 million; introduction of residential charge for chronic care patients, a reduction of 1.8 million; and the approved equipment borrowing annualization of '84-85 was 508.7; and the same figure - 508.7 - for new borrowing in '85-86; then, of course, the annualization of facilities that open and then run the full 12 months in '84-85 - that was 783.7; and the new facilities opening in '85-86, 11,241.2 million. That is for the budget facilities, so the budget facility was increased this year by 24,470.3 million.

But then, if we are going to look at the whole program now - so far, so good?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Maybe.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, that was the budget facilities. I started by talking about the deficit, the things that were approved in the Health Sciences Centre and other areas, and then I talked about the increase in costs, the new programs that hadn't been functioning all that time and so on and that came to 24, and that is for budget facilities only.

Then the rest will be hospital programs, including the Red Cross - there is an increase of 333.8; the federal hospitals, an increase of 120.3; out-of-province hospitals, 349; Cadham Lab - where you serve in the hospital - 41.4; Manitoba Health Services Commission diagnostic units, 379.6; and the new RH Institute, 560.3; so then the total would be 26,254.7 million. That figure of 26,254.7 million, if you look under hospitals, that should be the difference between the printed last year and the printed this year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I thank the Minister for that information, that was more than what I had wanted, but that's all valuable. If I can recap and try to do it in sort of layman-type terms, the \$26 million that is a print-over-print increase in the hospital line, '84-85 to '85-86, includes a deficit allowance for all of the budgeted facilities of about, say for rough figures, \$6.8 million.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, it was 4.5. You could include deficit but, in the 6.782, I also included cardiovascular surgery, intensive care, things that were allowed during the year. It's not really the same as a deficit where they

come at the end of the year and they say they have a deficit. We've asked them to go ahead and provide the money. It was approved. It is adjusting the base line every time something like that during the year is approved though, but it's not really a deficit.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So then the 6.8 million is the actual deficits for volume and services, etc., etc., that were anticipated, but also includes an amount for cardiovascular that was allowed on top of the budget as an addition to the budget.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And intensive care.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And intensive care, okay. Then also as part of that of the 26 million, print over print, is about an \$11.25 million increase in this year's budget to account for new facilities coming on stream this year.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. Now that, just doing a rough figure - and here's where I may misunderstand how you go about this process - the Minister earlier on indicated that the increase in budgeting from year to year doesn't include volume but you do that de facto by adding in the deficits, to account for, say, a volume increase, you adjust the base. But 4 percent on supplies which roughly equates - if I can find my notes - roughly 20 percent of the Hospital is supplies - so 4 percent - you'd have .8 percent which would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5 million, say. Of the \$26 million increase year over year to print, would be maybe roughly a \$5 million - and I'm not looking for exact dollars and cents - but of the 26 million, roughly 5 million of it will be the Commission's anticipated increase in supply costs of 2 percent automatic, and then another 2 percent which has to be justified and that is part of the 26-million increase.

The balance is 11.25 on new facilities that are going to come on stream that weren't funded last year, then you've got roughly 6.8 million adjusted to the base of last year's funded facilities, part of which is deficit from those facilities; the other part is increase in budget for approved activities that took place during the year.

There were a couple of other items like Red Cross and Cadham Lab that the Minister specifically mentioned, but that's how you have arrived at the \$26 million that you're budgeting for this year's increase. Okay.

Now can the Minister give an indication as to what sort of additional authority because some contracts are in place - certainly MONA and others are to be negotiated and aren't settled yet; the voting is on - I think it was yesterday, I believe, but I'm not certain - but has the Minister got - (Interjection) - yeah, you don't want to get in trouble, Larry.

Has the Minister got a ballpark figure that - in other lines, for instance, with the Selkirk and Brandon mental institutions, the MGEA settlement on salaries - allowed him authority to go back to Treasury Board and have approval for salary cost increases, whatever they may be? Has the Minister got a similar arrangement with Treasury Board for the Hospital line and the Personal Care Home line? And if so, what is the approximate dollars that he's got there?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The only information that I have for a contract is, for this year especially, we have a 0 guideline. When a contract is signed, that has to be discussed also. When that is approved, the base is adjusted accordingly.

First of all, we in the Department of Health are not always sure, we are never sure in fact of what it's going to be. I'm indicating it wouldn't be very good collective bargaining for one thing, so we're adding that only after.

MR. D. ORCHARD: But you've got Treasury Board authority for that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I have no funds. Automatically, if the Compensation Committee of Cabinet makes a recommendation, if we approve and a settlement is made, then we automatically get the okay from Cabinet.

That's what I was saying with this percentage earlier. It doesn't mean that much to me, because I know they'll need more than that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I would like the Minister to refresh my memory. We discussed this one other night 10 days or so ago. Was it a \$5 million item for hospitals and personal care homes, both, for every 1 percent of potential settlement?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have some other general questions on the Hospital line which the Minister may want to bank. Just a small question before I even start on that. In terms of King Edward and King George, is funding for those hospitals included in this line as well?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. Mr. Chairman, in terms of the general budget requirements and particularly the supply line, is the Minister confident that the institutions will be able to continue operating at the same level as last year and they've got an automatic 2 percent increase on supplies, and they have to justify the next 2 percent through the Commission. It would seem from looking at any breakdown of projected cost increases that I have seen - well just a small example - telephone is expected to increase by about 7 percent and Hydro by 8 percent, electricity by 8 percent; municipal taxes, 3 percent; fuel, 4 percent; general purchases, 6 percent.

The list goes on, and it seems to indicate that basically the supply costs are certainly going to be all of 4 percent. Now does the Minister have indication other than that, that the 4 percent - the extra 2 is justified - will be sufficient to cover the supply cost increases that his department anticipates for 1985-86?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend would know as much as I do about that. We are as optimistic at the start of each year, the same as we are this year. Now things can change. There are certain areas where there might even be a reduction - that happens every year - or at least no increase. There could be some large increases, for instance,

something that comes from Japan maybe but you have no control over that. So, fine, we try to stay as close to the vest as possible, but I can assure you if we need the supplies and if everything is being done and orderly, we'll get the supplies and worry about it after.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, in terms of national comparison, how do our Manitoba hospitals compare with national averages in terms of utilization, in other words, of patient days per 1,000 population, whatever the standard figure is? I guess more importantly, how do our hospitals compare with national averages in terms of costs per patient day and even in terms of costs for staffing within our hospitals as compared to national averages?

Another interesting statistic that would be of value in a discussion today, would be how our average length of stay statistics in our Manitoba hospitals compares with national averages and any U.S. experiences the Minister might have at his fingertips.

Now, those questions are sort of related. Maybe I'll leave the Minister with those ones.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: As far as cost we're comparing quite favourably with most hospitals, but we're quite high - higher than the others that are teaching hospitals and we try to find out why, that's at the St. Boniface and Health Sciences Centre. Now, we're trying to find the information. The length of stay - I think it was - is higher here, certainly higher than in the States and higher than most provinces also, and our admissions are lower also. That's what caused the problem. With the same beds, if they stay that much longer, you don't admit as many people. So the admission is lower. That is one of the reasons why we're talking about reduced stay in the hospital, or early discharge programs.

MR. D. ORCHARD: If I follow the Minister's answers, he's indicating that in Manitoba hospitals we have a lower admission rate than national average, yet our average length of stay is higher than the national average. Now that would bring into question as to why, and one of the reasons that has been offered by outside observers, if you can call them that, has been the fact that our hospital beds are being taken up more and more, our acute care beds are being taken up more and more by chronic care patients, panelled patients if you will.

Now the two things the Minister has mentioned, namely the lower admissions and the higher average length of stay statistic would seem to point to that. Does the Minister have any information which would tend to confirm that trend?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There is no doubt that there are many different factors, that's why it's so hard to compare and that is what the committee is looking at now. The subcommittee will get this information as soon as possible. I guess you could say that, first of all, the different type of beds. We don't all define beds in the same way in all provinces, and I should make that clear because that could be misleading one way or another.

There is the question of the age population that we have also, and then people who have been panelled who are in personal care home also. That is why a

while ago during the five-year program, I'm talking about more extended treatment beds and maybe some of these beds instead of having acute beds. So these are many factors that have to be reconciled and we'll have to look at and we haven't got all the answers at this time. But the comparison that we have is that our people are staying in the hospital.

That could change very much in different parts of the province, also, depending on the beds that they have. For instance, as I mentioned yesterday, Brandon has more beds than the city by far, but it's remarkable that the patients do not stay as long in Brandon hospital. So, therefore, they see many more people than they would normally, but there are many more people who are hospitalized there than in Winnipeg or in the rural area, for instance. There's no doubt the beds and the way the medicine is being delivered by the doctors, those are all affected by what's in place - and the admissions per 1,000 also and there are not as many discharges. People are living and talking about personal care homes. Also people are living a lot longer and therefore the beds are needed a lot longer.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that our teaching hospitals have a higher cost per patient day significantly above average and our general hospitals, or our non-teaching hospitals were comparable with the national average. How comparable to the national average are each one of those two classes of hospitals, teaching versus non-teaching?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: In the general hospital we're not doing too bad, we are like the rest. Now the 16 to 17 teaching hospitals, the St. Boniface is in the upper half and the Health Sciences Centre is about the third highest. So we're higher than average. To tell us why, we don't know at this time, that's what we're looking at, to see if we are really comparing apples and oranges or if there are other factors in there also.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that would be an interesting analysis. I posed the question to the Minister in an initial series as to our staffing costs, how they compare with national averages on staffing costs. Are they above or below a national average?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: As we mentioned earlier, it certainly has an awful lot to do with it because we said that 75 to 78 percent is salary and that is the big difference. It is the salaries that are being paid in those hospitals and that's what we're checking. I'm told not the rate per hour, but the hours per day. They pay more hours for the day but the rate is about the same.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So, Mr. Chairman, if I can glean from the Minister's answer, our cost per patient day in terms of staffing costs is higher, not necessarily because our wage rates are higher, but because we possibly utilize more hours of staff time, more staff in our hospitals.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a figure has been banded about, for '82-'83 as an example, that our total per capita costs were about 12.5 percent above national average and utilization rate was part of it, as well the cost per patient day was higher. The two of them combined come up

with a figure that's guesstimated at 12.5 percent. Now the breakdown has been roughly almost 8 percent in terms of our hospital cost per patient day and the other 4.5 has been attributed to a greater utilization than the national average.

Mr. Chairman, those are pretty significant figures and I haven't got my rough calculations close by me. I've got them, I guess, down in my office. But given that our budget is roughly \$600 million for our hospital institutions for this year and maybe by the end of the year, saddled with contract settlements, etc., the 8 percent cost increase over national averages for our cost per patient day represents on \$600 million almost \$50 million that our hospitals are indicated to cost us per patient day more than the national average. That, Sir, is quite a significant figure. Then you couple in, if you use the full 12.5 percent that is the figure that has been banded about, you end up with a figure that's between \$70 million and \$75 million in total.

What it would seem to indicate to me, and maybe the Minister can comment, is that if there was a resolvable reason that those two phenomenons occur and they could be correctable, and presumably the national average in terms of quality of care is not significantly different, Manitoba versus the rest of Canada, that would be the only other factor, one makes the assumption that they're probably fairly close to our hospital average in Manitoba versus Ontario or Saskatchewan or Alberta. But if there is an identifiable reason why those costs, particularly the 8 percent cost per patient day is higher and that can be resolved, that represents a pretty significant method of budgetary control in this Hospital line section.

As I say, presumably and maybe this is an incorrect presumption, because I don't know whether there is such a thing as a national standard which says our hospital care is No. 1 out of 10 or No. 3 out of 10, but one would assume that the standards are relatively comparable. But with our costs being indicated at some 8 percent higher, there is a significant amount of money that we are spending in Manitoba basically, one might assume, to achieve the same level of care. That certainly is something the Minister and any Minister of Health in the province would want to determine the cause of and see whether there is an achievable remedy to that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, we also do not know all the answers for that. I might say that some of this information will be found in the Evans Report that I intend to table in this House within a few days when we get enough copies. One of the things that should be — (Interjection) — eh? Yeah, they're all over the place. They seem to disappear pretty fast. We're sending the police force to pick them up, but anyway when this comes out, I think that will show that information.

Also one important point is the aging population. We're second in all the provinces for aging population. That is a factor on that.

Now the only thing that I have now as far as - this comparison was made in the United States. That's with the Kaiser Permanente thing. It's comparing the same kind of patients, the same age and so on. We will see that from age one or just up to one there is a difference of two days - that's patient days per 1,000 population

- two days more in Manitoba than out there. Then from four to 54, it varies about half-a-day, somewhere half-a-day. Then it starts picking up to approximately a day in 69 and up at 84 to three full days, practically three full days more. So that is one of the things that - it's a different motivation there, but these are exactly the things that we're trying to do.

I might say also that in our budget we put for the first year, in a long while, St. Boniface this year on the line-by-line to get all of this information, and we're doing the same thing with the Health Sciences Centre this coming year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the tabling of the Evans Report so that we can determine what's in it. I'm sure it will be enlightening information.

Mr. Chairman, that was sort of the information that becomes important in the question I posed earlier on about the breakdown in salary within our hospital system, if the breakdown could come on administration versus staff. Whether it's legitimate or not, I will lay out to you concerns that have been given to me in terms of nursing staff again, not necessarily the management end of it.

But there is a feeling amongst the nursing staff, and I certainly haven't talked to anything close to a representative sample of them, but they offer the complaint that, as I mentioned before in terms of the staff at the mental health institutions, they have to go through a significant layer of supervisory administration to achieve their work. They are tied up with reporting duties, etc., etc. When we've got in our Manitoba hospital system, even factoring out the seniors and the length of stay of seniors - because theoretically I think anybody that takes a look at filling a hospital bed, they will indicate that someone who is in extended care, someone who is panelled for a personal care home and in the hospital may only require an hour-and-a-half a day of nursing care, where someone who is in intensive care is up to 23, 24, maybe even 26 hours.

So even if our population is shifting towards a higher degree of seniors and an older population and they are in the hospitals, they don't contribute to the budgetary problems and to that concern that Manitoba hospitals in general are costing more per patient day than the national average. Because if it was the senior citizens who were the cause of the factor, if you will, or the reason for that, then our cost per patient day should be down because they don't require as much nursing care and as much supervisory care, etc., etc., when they are patients of our hospitals.

I think it would be a most valuable exercise if the information was available to see whether our management lines of control, our supervisory lines of control within the hospital are in excess of what other hospital institutions and other provinces have. Because if that is consuming a sizable portion of our budget in our hospitals and is driving our cost per patient day higher than the national average, it probably has nothing to do in terms of reflecting on the quality of care. Because after all, it's generally your R.N.s or LPNs or V.N.s who are delivering the actual care to the patient. If the supervisory and administrative staff are above them to a greater degree than a national average and consuming a higher percentage of the budget, it doesn't

follow that the quality of care to the individual patient is necessarily improved.

So it will be very interesting if later on this evening, if it's possible, that we might have the rough breakdown of administrative versus staff. I'm not certain whether that could be compared with other provinces, other jurisdictions, to see whether we are high or low in that category but, Mr. Chairman, those figures would be most interesting.

Mr. Chairman, can I ask the Minister a few questions in terms of the panelled patients who are long-term residents of the hospital. They have always been subject to the per diem of 15.25 now, or for a number of times — (Interjection) — but that's back several years ago. — (Interjection) — Yes. The Minister's change that was announced about a month ago added in non-panelled patients, who are extended care patients or chronic stay patients in our hospitals at the doctor's recommendation, I believe was the way the Minister's press release indicated it.

Can I ask the Minister if he anticipates any problem in having a chronic care patient who is not panelled, made subject to that per diem on the recommendation of the physician, because bear in mind that without panelling - okay, when a person is panelled, it's automatic. They are panelled for a personal care home; the panelling board makes the decision that they are panelled and should be placed in a personal care home; there is no one specific individual who then can be identified as the one that caused the per diem to be charged.

But the new policy that the Minister announced about a month ago leaves the one person as the individual who is going to identify that that charge should apply, and that's the attending physician - unless I misunderstood the Minister's announcement. My question to the Minister would be: Is he anticipating any problem with having the physician put his patient into the chronic care per diem charge category? I think the Minister can recognize the problem there. Is he anticipating that as a problem? Has he had any concerns expressed by the MMA or the College of Physicians and Surgeons about - I don't know whether it's a conflict of interest - I wouldn't even want to call it that - but it is a problem to the physician. He's got to go in and then report that his patient, who is extended care and not panelled, should now pay the per diem, and it's him that is going to make the recommendation. Is that going to cause some problems with the profession?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that is going to change anything at all in the role of the physician. The physician has a patient in a chronic institution. We are not asking him should they pay or shouldn't they pay; we are asking him, is there anything that could be done, anymore that can be done for this patient in the acute care. He has to do that anyway; he should tell you that. Or, in rehabilitation and if he says no and if it's been over a month, fine, then we are working with the hospitals on that. We might still have some difficulty. You are dealing with human beings.

You've got doctors now - I'm sure it's no secret and I'm not making a blanket accusation - telling people go and see me at the admitting office, at the emergency

to get you in the personal care home. Then they wait in the hall for awhile and people raise hell; then they are finally given a bed and then they are okay until there is a personal care bed. So there are all kinds of little tricks. But if that is done, it is not certainly above board - it's not fair - and that could be done.

But I don't expect too much. We are not asking the doctors to do any more than they have been doing because they are required, when they have a patient, to assess the patient. Are they saying should he get more acute care or should he get more treatment? Then you say, well, make them comfortable, there's not much more we can do. These are people over 65 that could be in a personal care home and the same thing. So we don't think it's a very difficult thing.

Now on the other thing, the teaching hospitals, I am told that as far as nurses are concerned, we have quite a bit more than the average in total nurses that we have. We are not below the average; we are above the average. In administration, we are average or maybe a little bit slightly below. Now somebody tells us that we can't believe, we can't understand that they are more acutely sick at different degrees, that's hard to understand. We would like to see this.

We feel that one of the main reasons is that the allocation of teaching beds in Manitoba per capita is higher than anything else. We are trying to wrestle with that to see what the situation is and we feel that's probably your cost. Now they'll talk about standard. If the standard was measured by that, we would have the highest standard of them all. So this is one of the situations and, of course, here too, especially between contract times, they are told there are not enough nurses and so on. Then I get calls from retired nurses who are saying it's not the same, they have too many, they have too much; so it's very hard to tell. But if we are going to judge by these other provinces, we are higher than the average.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that makes for an interesting discussion, I guess. If, in fact, we are about or a little below average on our administration and in our teaching hospitals we are higher in terms of our nursing staff, to complement . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Excuse me, that's in the teaching hospitals.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes. No, I appreciate what you are saying. In terms of the beds, HSC and St. Boniface, they represent - what? Well, that's not really that important to have right now - 188 . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: About 1,800 beds.

MR. D. ORCHARD: 1,800 between the two, out of a total of what - 8,000? — (Interjection) — No, in Manitoba. The statistics can be national averages; not just the seven hospitals in Winnipeg that these statistics are based on.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that presents a quandary in trying to figure out then how we can be, because of our two teaching hospitals, above average in terms of about 12.5 percent of the national average on per diem costs. Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that may well

cast some additional light on it is if the Minister had a breakdown of what our bed allocation, our per patient day in hospital, what age groups break that down. Who are the greatest users? Are the seniors our greatest users of the patient days in hospital facilities? If the Minister had those kind of statistics readily available, it would be interesting to discuss those briefly this afternoon.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The closest to that . . . general hospitals is the '82-83, and I'll give you the days by age and the percentage, and cases if you want, also.

The 1 to 10, there are 129.6 cases and 534,300 days for 79 percent of the cases and 31 percent of the days; 11 to 14, there are 11,287 cases and 139,770 days or 6 percent of the cases and 8.1 percent of the days; 15 to 19, there are 7,683 cases, 128,343 days or 4.7 percent of the cases and 7.4 percent of the days; 20 to 29, there are 6,939 cases, 164,529 days, 4.2 percent and 9.6 percent - that would be mostly maternity beds, that would be many births in that area; and 30-59, there's 5,792 cases, 233,820 days. You can see how the days increase, and that is 13.5 days and 3.5 only were the cases. Now, 60 or more, there are only 3,080 cases or 1.9 percent, but the days, they have 30.5 percent of the days with 526,236. That gives you an idea. The average length of stay in a general hospital is 10.5. That's all of them.

Also, the speech that my friend referred to, I'll read the paragraph: "There is approximately 1,000 days of hospitalization for every 1,000 persons. However, when you look at the population who are 65 years of age and older, you will see a huge increase in the rates of hospitalization as a result of the aging process.

"For persons who are 65 years of age and older, the rates increase rapidly to a peak of almost six times greater than those who are younger than 65. There is a steady increase in the proportion of Manitoba's population, age 65 years and older who translate into an ever increasing demand for institutional health care services. This is even more startling when you consider there is a causal link between age and health care utilization in the knowledge that the very elderly will also increase such that within the age group of 80-85, 86-90, there will be a 50 percent increase in this block of persons over the period of '84-95," and then the days go up there too.

That is the informal discussion and then also the formal writing with the Federal Minister of Health, and asked him if he would go along with us in some of the study or pilot projects that we might make, and I think it's encouraging. As I say, we are one of the largest, we're the second one as far as aging population goes, and problems that we have now will be that of the other person in a few years, later.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, now, if I understood the last figure that the Minister laid out before he read from one of his speeches, 60 and over represent 3,080 of the patient cases or only less than 2 percent of the patient cases, but those individuals accounted for over 30 percent of the patient days in our hospital system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister able to determine from any analysis that he has done whether those people over 60, some of them are there certainly because

they're acutely ill and are needing medical treatment, but of the 3,080, has the Minister got any indication of what numbers of those would end up in terms of percentage of patient days, would be panelled patients or chronic care patients? The chronic care residents, extended care residents, who are there that now are going to be subject to the per diem even though they aren't panelled, and what I'm getting at is the question of how many of our hospital beds are in effect being used as expensive, if you will, personal care home beds in our hospitals?

Does the Minister have any kind of a breakdown on that over 60 which would lead one to a conclusion as to whether 20 percent of the days, 10 percent, 5 percent of the patient days are taken up by citizens over 60 who are resident in hospital, not because they necessarily have a medical problem where they are undergoing acute treatment, but rather because they are not well enough to go home, probably should be in an extended care facility or personal care home? Does the Minister have any kind of an indication on that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, we've had a year or so with the chronic patient, but if one of the questions was, how many are now taking beds in those acute hospitals that have been panelled already? That, I'm sure, we can get. Was that one of the questions? Okay. Then that we'll be able to get it. Have you got it now?

In the acute hospitals in Winnipeg, there are now 244 such patients who have been panelled, and in extended treatment hospitals, there is another 189 for a total of 433; and in the rural region there is 298 for a total of 731. But let me say that I do not worry half as much of these 298 in the rural regions than those in Winnipeg because if we try to get all the patients that had been panelled out of rural hospitals, it might be that we would be looking at closing hospitals. I don't think it's that bad. They might leave it with a reduced staff and so on because like you were saying a while ago, they might not need as much time and so on. It's a mixture where they'd have a lot of empty beds in some areas. In a hospital, most of them are personal care patients. I'm not saying we're not going to look at them, but I don't think it's the same problem as here where these people might be stopping elective surgery and so on.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Agreed, Mr. Chairman. Now, the Minister back when we discussed several days ago and we were talking about the potential revenue from the Brandon and Selkirk Mental Institutions of the per diem, I think the Minister indicated that he anticipates additional revenues of about 1.8 million from the non-panelled chronic care people in the hospitals, or 1.8 million. Now, the figures the Minister gave me represent panelled patients. The 1.8 in revenue - 7.31 is the panelled for the whole province - the 1.8 will come from non-panelled, and surely in developing that the department must have a ball park idea of patient numbers throughout the system on that category as well.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The 335 was the total.

MR. D. ORCHARD: In total?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Those are chronic, not those that had been panelled for personal care homes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, dealing with specific patient costs, it's fair to say, I believe, that a panelled patient or a chronic stay patient who is not panelled, who occupies a bed in one of our acute care hospitals, is a lesser cost per day patient than someone who has been in for elective surgery or someone who is acutely ill, a level 4 or 5 or 6 acutely ill patients.

Mr. Chairman, this presents a dilemma to this Minister and to the next Minister of Health because if you solve that problem of bed blockage by personal care home patients, or panelled patients and the chronically ill, you free that bed up for what probably it was originally designed for and you're going to be in further budgetary problems in the hospital system itself. So you know, resolving that problem really puts one on the horns of a dilemma, and we'll probably have to continue this discussion at 4:30 - that's why I didn't want Private Members' Hour today, we could have finished with this probably today - but that causes a lot of problems.

Now there has been the indication that because hospital budgets have been constrained, that the administrators have been not discouraging - I wouldn't say encouraging, but not discouraging - panelled and long-term chronic patients to be part of their patient spectrum, because it helps them stay within their budgets. Now, hopefully, this evening we can get into that kind of a discussion, and the Minister may want to comment before we shut down the committee.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay. You're right it's a problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 4:30 p.m., it is time for Private Members' Hour. I am leaving the Chair, and will return at 8:00 p.m. tonight.

Call in the Speaker.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, Adjourned Debates on Public Bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill 20, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, Bill No. 20.

MR. R. BANMAN: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 30, the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I request the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

**RES. NO. 6 - ROAD ACROSS
RIDING MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK**

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolutions, Resolution No. 6, the resolution by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, the Honourable Government House Leader has five minutes remaining on Resolution No. 6.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We did discuss this resolution in some detail the last time it came forward. Without recapping what I had to say at that point, because I believe, Mr. Speaker, I made my views very very clear with respect to the need for government and for this House to assess both the interests of the local communities of Rosburn and Grandview and also the interests in the long term of the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada with respect to a national park which many in the Parks Canada system view as one of the flagship parks of the national system.

In fact, it may not be known to all members of this House, but I'm sure that some recognize what I understand to be the outstanding character of the park in terms of national interest in that I believe it had the highest number of visitors in 1983 of any park in the country which is surprising, Mr. Speaker. When I first heard that, I was surprised that it outranked Banff and Jasper and some of the other national parks, which I thought were very great attractions nationally. So I think we have to look both at the economic, tourism potential of the area, and I think that depends both on the local communities and, Sir, on the viability of the park.

Sir, one of the things that I hope the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell is aware of, and if he isn't, certainly I would be happy to advise him today of that, is that there is a specific task force of officials under the direction of Ministers at both the federal and provincial level designed to look at the park and the periphery area. The purpose of that task force, Sir, is to examine a lot of questions of local impact and of a local character and of local significance, both in terms of parks planning and in terms of municipal government in the area and provincial interests in the immediate park area.

Sir, the questions which hinge on this, for example, don't include just the question of road access, but the question of aggregate resources in certain areas which might be of importance; the question, Sir, of escarpment drainage, silting, particularly in Lake Dauphin where an extensive Water Commission study was just finished; the whole question of ensuring a viable, potable water supply for the Town of Dauphin; several questions relating to the silting of drains in the Turtle River Conservation District where extensive monies have been directed by the government of which he was a member prior to 1981 and also by the present government.

All of these things, Sir, have become issues which were addressed on an individual basis and, therefore, not in the context of the overall needs of the region. What has happened, Sir, now with the establishment of the task force is that we can look at the issue, not just of the road but all of these other peripheral issues, in the context of regional needs, the interests of the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada.

I think, Sir, that it may be premature for us to decide in this House that a road should be built or that a road

should not be built. I think the determination that's needed is one that relates to a lot of factors that need to be studied. We've got that under way and, Sir, I think the Minister of Labour, as a former Minister of Natural Resources, deserves the applause of this House for the fact that he, along with the Federal Minister responsible for Parks in that day, initiated some very extensive work to ensure that the Federal Government accepted some of the responsibility for the impact of the park on surrounding regions, and that the province could work with the parks planners and the Federal Government to ensure that the impact of the park on those regions could be ameliorated and that the Federal Government had a role to play.

These are the questions we have to address in dealing with this resolution, Sir. I think it's premature to say yes or no to the question the Member for Roblin-Russell raises.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell will be closing debate.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the honourable members for their contributions to this matter, a very important matter. The matter has been on the desks of municipal people, city, the villages, towns, councils for many years, 25 years and more that I know of. As late as this week, I again got more resolutions from the municipalities on both sides of the Riding Mountain National Park, who are again most concerned that they can't be heard. So I thank the members that made their contribution, and I'm most grateful that I had a chance to bring this resolution before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Do you require the resolution read, it is No. 6?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, did you say that the Yeas had it or the Nays had it?

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, the Yeas had it. I declare the motion carried.

Call in the members.

The question before the House is Resolution No. 6, moved by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell. Do you wish the resolution read? If not, those in favour of the resolution, please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Banman, Downey, Driedger, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, **Hammond**, Johnston, Kovnats, McKenzie, **Mercier**, **Nordman**, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom.

NAYS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Corrin, Cowan, Dodick, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Penner, Phillips, Santos, Scott, Smith, Storie.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 15; Nays, 22.

MR. SPEAKER: The resolution is accordingly lost.

Resolution No. 3 - the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe there may be a disposition to call the hour 5:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: There is such a disposition. The time being 5:30 p.m., I am leaving the Chair. The House will resume in committee this evening at 8:00 p.m.