



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 46B - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 14 APRIL, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virten	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

Thursday, 14 April, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

**CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY - LABOUR**

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The meeting will now come to order. For the benefit of everyone and for the guidance of the Chair as well, there is no official list of speakers in the order of precedence. Any member may endeavour to catch the eye of the Chairman and he normally will have the right to speak. The succession of a speaker is left entirely to the discretion of the Chair but it is customary that there be an alternation or rotation among all the speakers. This is in accordance with Beauchesne Citation 301, Page 99.

There is a motion on the floor raised by the Member for St. Norbert that the Salary of the Minister of Labour be reduced to \$1.00. As many as are in favour of the motion say "aye". As many as are against say "nay".

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now are down to the consideration of 1.(a) Minister's Salary.

Does the Member for Thompson wish to speak?
The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in reviewing some of the material in earlier questions I want to return to one item with respect to first-contract legislation. I'd asked the Minister how many applications there were and I believe she said nine. I would like to know if those nine were referred to the Labour Board to consider.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: You're asking if all nine were referred to the Labour Board?

MR. G. MERCIER: Or did the Minister just receive them and simply pass on . . .

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I don't have that listing in front of me right now; I could probably find it in a few minutes. However, if my memory serves me correctly, all but one were referred.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, is it the Minister's interpretation of the amendments that the government passed at the last Session that once the Minister of Labour refers a matter to the Labour Board for a first contract, the Board has no discretion but to impose a first contract?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Part of that matter is before the courts and I would have to be a bit careful about how deeply into discussion I got at this time. But in reference to your earlier question perhaps I can offer some clarification there. There were nine requests; one was settled prior to any referral to the Labour Board; seven were referred to the Labour Board; one was withdrawn by the Minister on the request of the originator.

The Labour Board did decline to impose an agreement in one case, two have already been settled by parties after referral to the board. If you remember the legislation, there is the possibility even of an extension beyond the time the board is given to assist the parties in settling the dispute, the board can actually offer another extension if they feel that the parties are nearly ready to come to an agreement. That is what has been happening most often. There are a couple of situations right now where that is the case, where an extension has been granted and the parties are, in fact, concluding their own agreement. That certainly was the intent of the legislation and that is, in fact, what is happening in most cases.

There are a couple, as I say, of legal entanglements particularly dealing with those situations that were already in process at the time that the legislation was passed, so those that were sort of on the cusp are the ones that are the most difficult to deal with.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the Minister's answer with respect to her interpretation of the law. Would she not agree though that it was her interpretation and I think the government's interpretation, that by reason of the amendments that were passed particularly in committee at the last Session of the Legislature, that the board would have no alternative but to impose a first contract unless the parties settled before a decision was made?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Yes, that was our intention. That one way or another whether the parties settled it or whether it had to be imposed, there would be a contract for a year that the parties would then be assisted in living with or learning to live with.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, that was certainly my interpretation of the intention of the government if not the interpretation of the amendments that were passed. In the light of that, could the Minister advise the committee as to what criteria she uses and applies before deciding to refer a matter to the Labour Board for imposition of a first contract?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The criteria that is used is whether or not all the statutory regulations have been met, whether there is a bargaining unit that is properly certified, whether the time limits have been met, whether proper notification to bargain have been met and so on. This is all very subjective, I guess, and it is done very clearly and carefully according to the statutes. There isn't a matter of value judgment. It's all done according to whether or not the statutes have been met, the time limits have been met and whether a certified bargaining agent is in place.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister consider it necessary to review the matter with both sides to the dispute before referring it to the Labour Board?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I believe that that is the case. This is handled by the Deputy Minister and staff and both parties are informed that a request has been made and are invited to present any information they may have, or concerns they may have. It is also necessary to check with both parties to see if, in fact, the time limits have been met.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just to confirm one other matter, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Minister indicated there is still a possibility that amendments might be introduced at this Session of the Legislature to amend the existing legislation with respect to the imposition of first contract.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: My feeling at this point is that the entire issue of amendment to the first contract legislation, if that is what is desired, ought to be a part of the Labour Law Review since it is what we intend to have as the first part of the code, in other words, the group law. That would be the appropriate place for it. A final decision has not been taken on this.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I thought I had the final question, but in this review, in light of the Minister's answer, of the labour law on which she agreed to hold public hearings, does she see this review as encompassing all labour law presently on the statutes and any modification or amendments that might come forward with respect to that, or would that review be confined to certain areas? I believe in her opening statement she only referred to three or four areas.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: No, we intend that the Labour Law Review cover all aspects of labour law and those Acts which affect it even peripherally. I am happy to say that as of a Cabinet meeting this last Wednesday that review is under way.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, then are there people appointed now to undertake that review?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: There is a person who has been approved as being in charge, yes, and will be hired to conduct the kind of public hearings that you're talking about and to lead us through this Labour Law Review.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I had the understanding that there would be perhaps a number of people, or commission, or task force, or whatever you want to call it, with representation from both labour and management that would undertake this review. Is there now to be only one person who will be in charge of the review?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: It was not our intent to have a committee do this work. There has to be one co-ordinator, one staff person, if you will, someone with the legal background and knowledge in this area to pull the whole thing together. That person will use a lot of different means to access information, to gather opinions and so on. The exact structure is somewhat worked out, but not finally worked out. Certainly public hearings and input from groups such as the people involved in the Economic Summit Conference, the steering committee which is a labour management

committee, the Labour Management Review Committee, other groups such as that, plus experts in this field from anywhere they happen to be, that we can contact them and bring them into share their opinions with us. All of these people will be used, but there will be a co-ordinator of research assistant support staff to actually do the staff work involved in bringing forward this code.

MR. G. MERCIER: Will the public hearings then be held by this single person?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: That hasn't been determined yet. No, I can't say that would take place. Who would be involved in those public hearings, I just couldn't say at this point who would be the panel.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister is referring to a chief administrative person?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Basically, yes, a lawyer.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the Minister indicate who that is?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: That's Marva Smith.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)(1) - the Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, we've got that much out of the Minister at the present time. Some of the comments the Minister made did cause me a little bit of concern. She's dealing with the Labour Board and she said that they would be sticking very closely to the statute and the laws and she left me with the impression that there would be very little leeway given to the Labour Board in any of their dealings. Am I correct in that assumption or is there some leeway given to the Labour Board in making their decisions in various matters?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The Labour Board is an arm's length group. I don't, at all, interfere with their decisions. Whether I like the decision or not it stands. I don't understand what the question is, about their sticking to the law. They have a law which guides them which they enforce and they may recommend changes to that law but there is a law that guides all of us. But the Labour Board makes its own decisions and certainly verification of that is the fact that the Labour Board declined to impose an agreement in one of the first contract situations.

MR. H. GRAHAM: So, in essence, what the Minister is telling me is that it doesn't really matter what the Minister is concerned about, the Labour Board is going to do what they want to anyway regardless of what the Minister says, is that right?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The Minister doesn't say, the Minister does not ever direct the Labour Board or even suggest to the Labour Board a way in which they should move. The Labour Board is there to see that justice is done and they are placed on that board because they are fair-minded people. Their decisions are made

in the light of the information that they receive and I honour their decisions.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, there's reason to scratch my head because I had been talking to the Minister of Co-op Development and there's a matter that concerns the Co-op movement in Manitoba very seriously that has presently been referred to the Manitoba Labour Board, and I refer to a matter that goes before the Labour Board on the 25th of this month, that's two weeks from Monday, dealing with the Birdtail Equipment Co-op Limited, which is now in receivership and is defunct for all purposes.

But the directors of that Birdtail Co-op which is a dealership of the Co-op Implements Limited of Manitoba - which has been the beneficiary of the taxpayers' dollars for quite a number of years and has this equipment co-op - the directors are now being held responsible for the payment of wages to the tune of \$5,575.04, being wages apparently owing by the directors of that Co-op.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these directors have served without pay and served their community well trying to keep together a dealership for the Co-op Implements Limited which has of its own volition, even though it's received millions of dollars from the Provincial Treasury, the Co-op Implements Limited have withheld substantial monies from their dealerships to the point where the Labour Board is now going to be hearing a case of the employees claiming wages from the directors because of the activities of Co-op Implements Limited in withholding payment from the dealership in warranties and things of that nature.

So it's a matter of concern to me, and I'm sure it's a matter of concern to everybody in Manitoba who has anything to do with the co-op movement because I would suspect that this may very well place the entire co-op movement in Manitoba in jeopardy if directors, trying to serve the interests of all people, are suddenly going to be held responsible. I was wondering if the Minister was aware that this case was going before the Labour Board on the 25th of April in the City of Brandon and if she was going to do anything to try and put pressure on the Minister of Co-op, to make sure the monies are available that are due to those workmen, come forward from Co-op Implements Limited, and these people who are acting in the best interests of the community are not being personally held responsible for something that probably isn't of their own doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair wishes to remind the Member for Virden that members are expected to refrain from discussing matters that are before the Courts of Tribunals which are a course of record. The Labour Board, the way I understand it, it's a quasi-judicial tribunal.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Yes, just to underline that. I do not question nor interfere with any of the cases before the board. I don't know what cases are before them, I don't ask and I don't feel that I should in any way know what is before them. They are a tribunal. That's their purpose.

The Payment of Wages Fund, the member might recall, has been swelled this year to \$700,000 in payouts

for cases just like this. Up to \$1,200 per employee can be paid out so that the people who rightfully have earned those wages get those wages. The wages that are paid out of the fund and therefore paid by the people of Manitoba to these employees, we attempt to recover. We attempt to recover them from the people who should have seen to it that they were paid in the first place. We are not always successful in recovering but it is our responsibility to the people of Manitoba to attempt to recover them. But as far as any payment of wages case that is before the board, I know nothing about them and I don't believe I have any right to know anything about them.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, without referring to the specific case involved, does the Minister not consider it inequitable and unjust that volunteer members of a Co-op Board of Directors, endeavouring to serve their community and coming into certain financial difficulties with their employees through no fault of their own, should be liable to personal judgments against themselves in amounts of \$5,000 to \$7,000 individually, when they clearly have been volunteers. I, myself think that is inequitable, wrong and unjust to the volunteers who serve in this capacity on this virtually non-profit community organization.

I welcome the efforts that are made by the department to collect judgments for wages against directors of ordinary commercial profit-orientated operations, but I think there is a different situation when volunteers in a co-op movement are put in this position through no fault of their own.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, you have quite rightly pointed out that it is not wise, it is indeed improper, to comment about a case that has been the subject of a reference either to a court or a quasi-judicial tribunal. Even though the Member for St. Norbert says without referring to a specific case, there is specific reference to a state of facts which has probably no other parallel in Manitoba and obviously refers to an application that has been or is about to be made to a tribunal. So I don't see how the Minister can give her opinion independent from your concern, that there should be no commentary about a matter that is before or has been referred to a quasi-judicial tribunal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair believes that in the interest of fair play, and it could be one of the issues that might be decided by the Board, we should refrain from making comments on anything that has relation to the matter which is before the judicial tribunal.

The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We are not trying to influence the decision of the Labour Board in any way in this, but there remains some larger questions that still haven't been asked.

The Labour Board apparently is only going after certain individuals. When there remains the receiver who is in receipt of large sums of money and there is no attempt being made by the Labour Board at all to

collect those wages from the receiver, I would hope that the Minister . . .

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Point of order, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the member state her point of order?

MS. M. PHILLIPS: I think the Member for Virden is asking for opinions based on what he surmises the Labour Board is going to consider and I think, again he is out of order based on your ruling and I think we should move on to another topic, unless he wants to talk about Payment of Wages Fund, or whether he wants to talk about the Labour Board's function. I don't think he should be talking about and making suppositions based on what the Labour Board might or might not entertain as evidence in that particular case. We should talk about the co-op movement under Co-op Development.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I am talking exactly in compliance with the very essence of what the Member for Wolseley is referring to. We're talking about a matter that is going to go before a tribunal. It seriously affects the co-op movement in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is a matter that's going to the tribunal precisely, the more we should refrain from making comments on it.
The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, we're talking about the field that is open to the Labour Board to deal with, and apparently the Labour Board is making no attempt to try and collect the wages from the receiver who is in charge of the money, and that is the important issue that's before this committee at this time.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: A point of order, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley state her point of order?

MS. M. PHILLIPS: The Member for Virden is assuming what the Labour Board is going to attempt to ascertain at a hearing that is not taking place yet for two weeks, and I think it's absolutely wrong for us to be discussing this any further. I think we should move on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. We are dealing with a matter that is before the Labour Board and we know what the issue is because we have the papers here before us, and there is no attempt being made, and for the record I would like to read the statement out — (Interjection) — so that you would know what is before the Labour Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think it's our duty, collectively, to spare this committee from the embarrassment . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: Certainly it's an embarrassment.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . that the honourable member wants to create because it is improper for anyone, particularly politicians when we're considering these Estimates, to be reflecting on a matter that is before the courts or a quasi-judicial tribunal. It is just improper and we cannot do that. I will appeal to the Honourable Member for St. Norbert to confirm that. He's aware of that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: You are talking about something that's not before them that should be before them.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, it is before them.

HON. A. MACKLING: There has been an application presumably made to the Labour Board — (Interjection) — and once it's before that, the Board is seized of that application. We ought not to deal with it in any way, shape, or form.

MR. H. ENNS: Stifling the co-op movement.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, not at all, come on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Member for Virden is going to present evidence he will be out of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: With all respect, the members don't know what we're dealing with until I tell them what we're dealing with.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: They should not know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Point of order. As the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Labour Board, I feel I must say I do not feel that it is proper for any evidence to be brought forward to this committee. That should properly be brought before the Labour Board since the case is going before them.

I do not wish to be influenced about this case. I do not feel it is proper for me to hear evidence to influence me about this case. I will not discuss this case with the Labour Board, which is what I believe the member is asking me to do. — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I think it is highly improper for one member of this committee to threaten the committee as the Member for Wolseley has done and I would ask her to withdraw that remark.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair moves that anything related to the matter before the judicial tribunal, we should exercise our self-restraint in the interests of fairness and justice. Besides we will be prejudicing the independence of the judicial tribunal.

The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in fairness and justice and that's why I'm trying to raise

the issue at this committee, to see that fairness and justice is done in this province. Until you hear what information I have, you cannot make any judgment as to whether it is fair and just . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden is forgetting . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . and it is not trying to attempt to influence the Labour Board in one way or another. It is not my intent to attempt to influence the Labour Board, believe me.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: There is a bill coming before the House, second reading will be called probably next week, amendments to The Payment of Wages Act. If the member wishes to debate an issue about who can be charged, or where the money should come from, I believe that is an appropriate place to debate the principles of that Act, under the amendments that we are bringing in.

To bring evidence here, as if it was a tribunal, is improper and I am saying again categorically, that I do not wish to hear that evidence. I don't believe it's proper for it to be brought here.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, again the Minister is not willing to hear even what the case is.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: A point of order, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, you've made a ruling that we were not going to discuss issues that were before a tribunal. The member keeps insisting on having permission to enter evidence that should only be entered by the two parties present at that tribunal. It should not be dealt with at this particular session and he should not be allowed to continue asking permission once you've made a ruling, unless he wants to challenge your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)(1) - the Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, if there is apparently no justice available in the Department of Labour under this Minister, I feel sorry for the people of Manitoba. I feel sorry for the people in the co-op movement. If this Minister is going to hold every person guilty without even listening, Mr. Chairman, justice is a charade under this Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member may have the privilege, as a member of the Legislature, but that privilege extends only I believe in the Chamber.

The Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. H. GRAHAM: This is the highest court in the province, Mr. Chairman.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairperson, I would appeal to the Honourable Member for Virden to appreciate and understand that the courts have made it clear, not once, but many many times, that it is improper for

anyone to - in a public forum - comment in any way in a manner which could prejudice the fair hearing of any matter with which a judicial tribunal is seized, or a quasi-judicial tribunal has seized. Therefore I, as a lawyer, understanding the view of the courts, and as an officer of the court, am bound to advise my colleague that she should not entertain discussions, dialogue, opinion, evidence, whatever, in respect to a matter that she knows, or someone says, is before a quasi-judicial tribunal because to do so would be a contempt of the court process.

Now the reason the courts have made those decisions in the past, is because they are concerned with justice, and that no one interfere with the courts of justice, because parties before a judicial tribunal or a quasi-judicial tribunal have the right to be heard without prejudice, to present evidence themselves with or without counsel and they are entitled to a fair hearing. That is why the courts have made it clear that commentary about cases before those bodies should not be made, and to suggest that the Minister of Labour is being unjust because she refuses to do what she is not supposed to do, is unfair. This Minister has indicated that she is prepared to entertain argument, dialogue . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair interferes. This line of debate is entirely out of order. Shall we proceed to another matter?

The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The difficulty that we face with this is that this particular matter which the Member for Virden . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's the same point, the Chair will . . .

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, this policy matter, a policy matter which will now see the credit union directors held responsible under The Payment of Wages Act . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that this line of debate which will prejudice the hearing in the judicial tribunal is improper, out of order.

The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if the directors of the Red River Co-op which is experiencing difficulty and has no legal action before the courts, whether those directors should - heaven forbid - that co-op have to declare bankruptcy and go into receivership, will those directors of that co-operative be held personally responsible for the payment of wages to those people and employees of that Red River Co-op? It's a good question.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: That's a hypothetical question which would depend on whether or not they had paid the appropriate wages in the first place. If they had not, a charge could be laid against them because payment to employees is what we ascertain will take place under our law.

Now you are raising a hypothetical situation. There is no way in the world I can give you a yes or a no

because that would appear in a case before the Labour Board. So it is not very different from the line of questioning you were pursuing earlier. You are simply putting the name of one co-operative in the place of the other.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, the whole life of the co-op movement is at stake on this issue. If people serving on the board of directors of a co-operative will now be held personally responsible for the payment of wages should that co-operative or credit union go into receivership, I suggest to the Minister that the co-op movement will have a terrible time trying to attract directors because nobody is going to be held personally responsible.

Who is going to serve on Co-op Implements? The Manitoba Government is now, along with its federal counterparts and other provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, going to turn over the reins of Co-op Implements where we have millions of dollars involved. We're going to turn over the reins, the Minister of Co-operatives has said, to the elected board of directors. I suggest to the Minister, if that board is going to take over the operations of Co-op Implements and will be held personally responsible if Co-op Implements, for some reason, goes into receivership, that those directors are going to be held personally responsible for the payment of wages, I suggest to you that the whole co-op movement is in jeopardy because you will not find people who will go ahead on a voluntary basis, who are doing this for their community without pay in many instances - they are not going to let their names stand.

It's fundamental to the co-op movement to know whether or not directors are going to be held responsible under The Payment of Wages Act for a default on wages of a particular co-op. I think it is fundamental to the co-op system and the people out there will want to know because if that is a principle that this government is going to enshrine, I say to you that the co-op movement is going to be in trouble.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, first of all I think it absolutely ludicrous that the members opposite are now crying crocodile tears about the co-op movement after they totally decimated the Department of Co-op Development in the first year of their tenure as government. I think if they want to discuss the details about the incorporation of a co-op or whatever you call it - I'm not a lawyer - they can discuss that under the Estimates of the Department of Co-op Development.

I think the issue they're talking about in terms of volunteer boards covers churches, covers day care centres, covers all kinds of non-profit organizations in this province who hire staff people. That's a much different issue and a larger issue than what they raised.

If there is a certain situation where there is a problem and employees are not being paid, both parties have the opportunity under the Labour Board to make their case and justice will be served there. It is a quasi-judicial board and for the Member for Virden to accuse the Minister of Labour of not serving the interests of justice, I think that she is upholding the interests of

justice to the nth degree by saying she will not discuss this issue. It is before the proper authorities. By trying to subvert the Chairperson's ruling that it will not be discussed, by bringing in hypothetical situations or the whole gamut of non-profit organizations, I think is totally out of order.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is responsible for the Labour Board. She is responsible for The Payment of Wages Act. We can discuss in this committee the principle as to whether or not directors of non-profit organizations, co-ops acting in good faith, unpaid, personally should be held responsible for the payment of wages. I point out, I use the words, "acting in good faith." Mr. Chairman, that is a principle certainly on which we can ask the Minister, despite whatever the existing law is, does she agree that directors in those situations should be held responsible for payment of wages or should they not be?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Given the questions that were asked earlier, and given the close relationship between this general question which might have been appropriate and might have been discussed in its rather general manner, had we not had the other information about a case of this kind coming before the Labour Board on April 25th and all of the detail involved, I think we might have had a reasonably good discussion about this issue because I think that the member raises a point at which we should look.

Probably in a time of economic downturn, this kind of issue rears its head. It would not be a problem in other times. We simply didn't have the bankruptcies, the receiverships that we have had in these past several years, so it becomes a problem at this time. Now I would gladly say that we will look at the matter. I will investigate it. I would think that we could discuss it rather thoroughly during the debate on the amendments to The Payment of Wages Act. That would be the time to do that.

I would suggest that perhaps if that Act is referred to committee that there might be some information brought to the committee at that time. We always have groups and individuals and interest groups bringing their particular points of view to legislative committees before a bill goes to third reading and is passed. But I do not wish to enter into any kind of personal debate, or opinion, or hypothesizing at this point, given our discussion of the past half hour.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, there's no further questioning in that area. I hope the Minister will, as she said, take the matter under advisement and consider it, particularly in the light of recent developments because there will be further questions on it in a matter of a few weeks, I'm sure.

On another matter, Mr. Chairman. I'm informed that the Minister appeared on, I believe it was Channel 13, earlier this week addressing a group with respect to certain cancer studies that were under way. In commenting, she indicated that there were cancer studies going on at Bristol Aerospace, Motor Coach,

Manitoba Hydro and one other firm, and that she hoped the studies would be complete before these places were closed inasmuch as she had received so many notices of layoffs lately.

I would like the Minister to, in view of that public statement, clarify the situation. Perhaps she could indicate which was the fourth firm she was referring to, and are there more layoffs being referred to than the ones that have been announced with respect to Motor Coach.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The two agencies or companies that I was referring to in my remark - and you must understand my particular concern with this study - were Motor Coach and Shell. We have a layoff announcement as you know at Motor Coach, and of course we all are aware that Shell is shutting down its operation to just a skeleton-crew group of people here. So from those two companies, I'm sure, the information has been gathered from them. I understand that it probably has.

The study began last July, I think. The responsibility for this study and for gathering the results of this study and publishing them, of course, lies in a different department than mine and I was appearing at the Occupational Health Conference. The reason I was there was that this particular department used to be within the Department of Labour, and also because of my particular interest with the subject of this year's conference.

HON. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the question to find out if the Minister received some notices of layoffs of which we were unaware.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: No, there are just the two that you already are aware of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution 104. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$2,932,000 for Labour and Employment Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

We are now moving to another department, the Civil Service Commission.

SUPPLY - CIVIL SERVICE

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're now moving on to Civil Service Commission. The Honourable Minister.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Chairperson, in introducing the 1983-84 Budget Estimates for the Civil Service Commission, I would draw attention to the 65th Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission which was introduced in the House March 10, 1983. This report explains in some detail the organization, programs and activities of the Civil Service Commission over the 1982 calendar year.

I would also draw to the attention of the committee, the supplementary estimates which have been produced by the Civil Service Commission to provide additional detailed information and clarification to the printed Main Estimates. The purpose of this information is to provide background on the Commission which will complement the information contained in the Main Estimates, and

it is hoped that this will assist members with the Estimates Review now before us.

The contents of the supplement are organized to provide a departmental overview including organization, statutory responsibilities, expenditures and staff-year summaries for the 1983-84 fiscal year. Detailed financial information for each of the divisions and branches is provided along with an explanation of the various employee benefit plans. Finally, comparative historical information is provided which sets forth expenditures and staff summaries by appropriation for the five-year period March 31, 1980 to March 31, 1984.

The Budget Estimates for the Civil Service Commission are comprised of three main components. These include the salary and operating expenses of the Civil Service Commission as set out under Item No. 1; the government's contribution to the various Civil Service Benefit Plans as listed under Item No. 2; the Levy for Health and Post-Secondary Education as set out under Item 3. This latter appropriation is new for 1983-84 and has been consolidated within the Budget of the Civil Service Commission for administrative purposes.

By way of a very general summary, it can be seen that the major areas of increase are associated with the government's contributions required to fund the various government benefit plans along with the addition of the assessment for Health and Post-Secondary Education Levy.

There are no major increases to the general salaries and operating expenses of the Civil Service Commission. In fact, the level of operating expenses has been reduced consistent with current economic constraints and repriorization.

With regard to the various Civil Service Benefit Plans, the majority of these are predetermined and fixed through statute or collective agreement and there is little or no discretion which can be exercised in the terms of their cost.

Finally, the Health and Post-Secondary Education Levy represents the government's assessment as an employer based on the existing government payroll. As mentioned earlier, a detailed supplementary information package has been prepared for legislative review. As stated in the preface to the supplement, we would welcome feedback from members as to the usefulness of this additional information. The document has been developed on a trial basis to provide greater detail and clarification to the printed Main Estimates in order to provide members with a better understanding of the information placed before them for their approval. It is hoped that this information will prove useful and assist members of the Legislature with Estimates Review process.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we can get an agreement in advance. Do we basically discuss the whole of our concerns with respect to the Civil Service Commission under Salaries, or do we discuss the MGEA contract under Item 2? Do we discuss the special early retirement under Item 2., or is it under Item 1.(a)? Do we discuss retirement issues under 1.(a)?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: It seems to me that, if I can remember all of the things you asked about, under 1.(a)

and/or (b) we could discuss the activities of the Civil Service Commission which included the renegotiation of the MGEA contract as part of their activities. They were involved in that, also, the early retirement plan. I would have no problem with discussing those under that section. There isn't a specific item for that because it's not a money item. I might also wish to, I suppose, wait with the early retirement issue to 2.(a), but it's not truly necessary because it isn't that Act that's being changed.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just with respect to Item 2.(a), has the the Annual Report been filed?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: That is ready to go before their board for approval and then it will be tabled.

MR. G. MERCIER: When is it required to be filed under the legislation?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I would have to look that up on the list, I'm not sure. You're talking about the Superannuation Board.

MR. G. MERCIER: You know, it is difficult when we're considering the Estimates of the department not to have the Annual Report. It was difficult enough to operate in Labour with the typewritten . . .

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The Superannuation Board doesn't report through the Civil Service Commission per se, so their Annual Report doesn't come through them.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we might adopt as a procedure to work from the Annual Report and try to tie it in with the additional supplementary information.

My first question would be with respect to, under Salaries, it would appear that there is over a 20 percent increase in Salaries under Item 1.(a). Could the Minister explain that?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I can give you the figures for the increase as we did in the previous Estimates. The 1982-83 general salary increase, our share of that, amounted to \$216,000; the 1983-84 general salary increase is \$205,000.00. Then the costs of increments, promotions, new positions approved last year is \$49,800 and the additional pay period which of course appears in all of these salary lines, is \$89,000.00.

MR. G. MERCIER: So, essentially then you have two years of salary increases.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: General salary increase, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in the supplementary information, it does relate to 1.(a), under Policy and Audit, there is shown the one staff year salary \$74,200. Is that correct or is that the audit fees?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Isn't that the commission too? Yes, that's where the stipends for the Civil Service Commission Board appear.

MR. G. MERCIER: Who is the one person in there then?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I just have to find it; I know it's in here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I believe the line you're referring to is under - you said reference No.7, Policy and Audit Division - and this \$74,200 figure. Yes. It includes all the Civil Service Board members and you will recall that this year, Mr. Ted Poyser was appointed Chair, and that's a half-time position. We did not have a person sitting half-time, or employed half-time in that position previously.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: The one position shown is his position.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: No, there's a Policy Analyst. Her salary is there, then there is the half-time salary of the Chair, and the stipends paid to the other board members. That adds up to \$74,200.00. It's a lot of people we're getting for that amount of money.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in the Annual Report there is an indication that the Civil Service Commission adopted an Affirmative Action Policy. I wonder if we are able to get a copy of that plan.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: If you wish a copy of the policy statement, yes, you could have that.

MR. G. MERCIER: And the plan?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I'm not quite sure what you mean by the plan. If you want to know what we intend to do or who's going to be involved, I could perhaps help you with information on that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Would you like to perhaps speak to it now and provide me with the written material later?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: All right. The target groups, as you may be aware, include women, the physically disabled and Natives.

The policy is going to be implemented through a central joint union management Affirmative Action Committee along with individual departmental committees comprised of union and management representation. So there will be a central committee of people from the MGEA, and from government, who will be the Affirmative Action Committee and then there will be parallel or sort of offshoot committees within each department that will be set up in a similar manner with representation, both from the department and from the union group.

The first responsibility of these committees will be to conduct a review and an analysis of the established employment practices. That includes recruitment and selection procedures, to determine in which job

categories target groups are under representative. So it's a sort of a needs assessment.

Once the problems are defined, special measures will be undertaken such as outreach recruitment, career opportunity information, alternative selection methods, staff training and development that will address the specific barriers to employment.

So what they are basically going to do is look at the situation in each department, determine where people in these target groups are having trouble in either improving their career paths, or in fact in getting into them in the first place, and then determine the best ways to overcome these barriers. It may be education programs, it may be a way of simply spreading the word, getting the information out when a job does become available so that people know about it and can apply for the job.

It may be informing people who might want positions within these particular departments, or might want to advance within these particular departments; informing them of what skills they need for the jobs that are coming up so that they can prepare themselves; or alerting them to what kind of courses are offered through the Civil Service Commission in their very fine Training and Development Branch, so that people can take advantage of them and be ready when these jobs come along. But the entire mechanism spread throughout the government, is done in co-operation with the union and is a way of using what is already there to better the situation.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has undertaken to forward me a copy of the plan, which I appreciate.

I wonder if she can undertake to give a report to the committee, or perhaps it will be included in the Annual Report for next year, on the results of implementation of the plan in 1983.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Certainly I will. I'll be very proud to do that.

As the member probably knows, and I think it's noted in our Annual Report, that this was adapted by the government just in December of 1982 - I think November or early December - so we are just getting under way with this policy. But I'm sure that by the time our next Annual Report comes along we will be able to report quite a bit of action in this area.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition filed an Order for Return in the House last December requesting a list of all Civil Service appointments from November 30, 1981, for which competitions were held and selection committees appointed showing the following: the position, the competition number, the names of positions of the people on the selection committee, and the name or names of the persons recommended, and the name of the person appointed.

Does the Minister have that information for the committee?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: There was a response filed to one Order for Return that gave information part-way through - I'm just getting the date now - and we indicated that

we would provide information from the date of that previous Order for Return until the date indicated by the Leader of the Opposition. But it takes a long time to gather this information, to gather the specifics requested.

Also I would like to point out that I did indicate to the Leader of the Opposition, at the time that we accepted the Order for Return, that confidential information would not be released. In other words, names of persons who were not successful in competitions, that would not be released as a part of the Order for Return. When this information is gathered we will make it available in the House as we indicated. But it does take a long time and it's something that has to be done extra beyond what is normally done by staff, so we have to wait for when we have a little down-time in order to get the information together.

By the way, there were over 1,000 competitions between the dates of November, 1981 to December 15, 1982 - over 1,000 competitions - so you can imagine that it is quite a task. Easier to ask the question than to find the answers.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the report refers to senior executive recruitment, and a policy which has been introduced by the Commission and confirmed by the government during 1982, whereby senior management positions will go through a screening committee, consisting of the Civil Service Commissioner, the Clerk of the Executive Council and the Deputy Minister of the Department concerned. There's an indication in the report that this process is being used to assist the Premier and Ministers responsible, to select candidates for deputy minister vacancies and during 1982, 40 senior competitions, including 11 assistant deputy ministers and three deputy ministers were undertaken.

Just for the record, could the Minister just confirm that the Clerk of the Executive Council is Mr. Michael Decter who was appointed by the Premier and the Cabinet?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: That's correct.

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the Minister not confirm that the First Minister, in appointing Mr. Decter, indicated that he wanted someone for that position who was politically sympathetic to the government and the fact that he is an NDP partisan, no doubt, contributed towards his appointment as Clerk of the Executive Council?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I would have to say that I would find it most unusual to have appointed someone who was at odds with the government.

MR. G. MERCIER: I would remind the Minister that the previous incumbent of that position had served through Conservative and New Democratic Party administrations.

Mr. Chairman, I am looking at copies of correspondence that the Leader of the Opposition had with the Minister and with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and I do point out for the record that the opposition, I believe in fact, congratulated the

government on the appointment of Mr. Poyser as Chairman of the Commission. But I'm looking at copies of correspondence with respect to the appointment of Mr. John Morrisseau as Assistant Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs after going through a very difficult selection committee for him; Mr. Ron McBryde, the Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs; Linda Jolson, Assistant Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs and Michael Decter, Clerk of the Executive Council, all of whom are political appointments of the government. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, how many persons applied for that position?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Which position are you talking about? You have named five or six people.

MR. G. MERCIER: The one that Mr. Morrisseau was successful in obtaining.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Okay, I'll get Mr. Morrisseau's information for you. There were 22 applications received for that competition.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, The Civil Service Act provides that, in Section 13(2), "Selection for appointment, etc., shall be based on merit with a view to developing a Civil Service comprising well-qualified personnel with abilities, skills, training and competence required to advance from the level of initial appointment through a reasonable career consistent with the type of work and the classes of positions pertinent thereto."

As I see it, in my view, the Civil Service Commission is there to ensure that the merit system is retained in the Civil Service. Would the Minister not agree that to have a selection committee composed of such NDP partisans as Ron McBryde, Linda Jolson and Michael Decter, the whole idea of merit appointments is going down the drain in the Civil Service? Would she not agree, Mr. Chairman? I think this is a blatant political appointment. Given that he had some merit, would she not agree that justice must not only be done, it must be seen to be done?

To have a selection committee, and I'm not in any way - I want to make it clear - commenting or inferring any criticism of the representatives of the Civil Service Commission. I'm talking about the other members of the selection committee. To have a selection committee composed of such partisan NDP members, does she not agree that the whole question of merit has just been severely diminished by having such a committee?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: If politics was a criterion or an item that would in some way enhance — (Interjection) — could we have some order? If politics was a required criterion for the position, then you might have a point to make, but the fact is that at no time during the initial screening or during the subsequent interviews are candidates questioned regarding their political background or preferences. That is not a part of the interview; it's not a part of the application. As you well know, that is in fact against the Act or against The Human Rights Act.

Selection is based strictly on merit through an assessment of the suitability of the individual's experience, knowledge, skills and qualifications against

requirements and expectations for the position. I think the member is also assuming that if one has a particular political preference, one couldn't possibly also have the skills and the knowledge required for a particular job.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, were competitions held for all deputy minister and assistant deputy minister positions?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Although I wasn't a member of Cabinet at the time, I believe the policy was adopted December, 1981, early January, 1982. From the time that policy was adopted, yes, all of the deputy ministers' positions, assistant deputy ministers', all the senior positions have been bulletined and have gone through a selection process.

MR. G. MERCIER: Prior to that, they were simply appointed.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I was not privy to the information at that time. I would presume that may have happened in the first month. Yes, some were and some weren't, according to the information that I have, but the policy was adopted within less than two months of our taking office.

MR. G. MERCIER: The report indicates during 1982, three Deputy Ministers went through this process. Who are they?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I've got that list here, right in here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The Deputy Ministers of Economic Development, Co-op Development and Cultural Affairs and there are two in process right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, I'm not finished, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The line of questioning is not yet finished.

The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: It's Economic Development, Co-op Development and Cultural Affairs, would the Minister give me the names of the people on the selection board for each position and the name of the person who is appointed?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: For the Deputy Minister of Cultural Affairs - Joy Cohnstaedt. The composition of the selection board was Paul Hart, and the Premier.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Premier?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The Premier, yes. Mr. Kostyra, the Minister, and Michael Decter. The pre-screening was done by Mr. Hart, Mr. Decter and Mr. Poyser.

In Economic Development, you would have the same board composition, with the exception that the Minister

would be different, of course. It would be Muriel Smith; otherwise, the board would be the same. In the other one, of course, it would be John Bucklaschuk for Co-op Development. The Deputy Minister of Economic Development is Ed Robertson, and of Co-op Development is Eric Harbottle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the member finished with this line of questioning?

MR. G. MERCIER: No.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: May I also point out that these are still Order-in-Council appointments, I'm sure the member is aware of that. But we believe in the process and so we are using the process in order to encourage the greatest number of applications. — (Interjection) — Yes, that's right.

MR. G. MERCIER: Will the Minister name the 11 Assistant Deputy Ministers, who were hired and their selection boards?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I will have to get the names of the people appointed as I go through. I have the board composition for you and then I'll get the name. The ADM or Registrar for the Motor Vehicle Branch, the selection board was Mr. Edgeworth, Mr. Brako, Mr. Kinley and Mr. McIntosh. Carl Prociuk was the person appointed and it was an internal appointment.

The ADM, Rural Development Division, that's in Agriculture, the selection committee was Doug Birch; Michael Decter; Ron Bailey, the Deputy Minister; and Ted Poyser. Cliff Cranston was the person appointed.

ADM, Corporate and Economic Development, Crown Investments, and the ADM, Finance and Planning, Crown Investments, and Management Services, Crown Investments, the selection committee . . .

MR. G. MERCIER: The three ADMs?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: They're Executive Directors, actually, but they're included at the level of ADM. The selection committee was Paul Hart, Mal Anderson, Rick Stevenson.

If you wish to trace these names, perhaps I can give you the Order-in-Council number. It's a little bit difficult for us to keep an entire listing of the entire Civil Service in front of us.

The three that I just gave you were 684, 685 and 686 - all '82.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I haven't finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no list.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. G. MERCIER: You don't have the names of . . .

HON. M.B. DOLIN: All right, we just looked it up. You have to wait for this. As I said, we don't keep names in every department in front of us.

There's Mr. Jardine, that's Corporate and Economic Development; Gord McLean is Finance and Planning; Garry Hastings under Management Services. Then there's an Assistant Deputy Minister, Child and Family Services and Rehabilitation, Community Services and Corrections, that's Aleda Turnbull, who was appointed to that position. The selection committee was Paul Hart, Michael Decter, Ron Johnstone and A. Penner.

MR. G. MERCIER: How many applications were there for that position?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: We'd have to look that one up; I know it took a long time. We can get that information, we don't have it here tonight.

MR. G. MERCIER: How many ADMs are there in Community Services?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I believe there are four . . .

MR. G. MERCIER: Are you sure it's not five?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Either I'd have to get the information for you or you'd have to ask the Minister of Community Services.

MR. G. MERCIER: I'm not finished, Mr. Chairman. There are 11 Assistant Deputy Ministers. We have one, two, three, four, five, six - we've done six.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: One is in my department that we did, my other department, the Assistant Deputy Minister for Employment Services. The selection committee there was Paul Hart, Ron Duhamel, Mary Eady and Michael Decter.

MR. G. MERCIER: What was his name?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Doug Davison. There is one in Education, Program Development and Support Services. The selection committee was Paul Hart, Ron Duhamel and Bill Claydon. John Dyck was appointed; that's an internal appointment. There is another one in Education, Administration and Finance Division; Glen Nicholls was appointed there. Paul Hart, Ron Duhamel and Bill Claydon again were the selection for there. Have I gotten up to 11 yet? There is an ADM in the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, responsible for Strategic Planning. The selection committee was Paul Hart, Michael Decter and Bob Thompson - that would be before he left. He was the Deputy Minister at that time, and George Ford was the appointment. ADM for Local Government Development, Northern Affairs, which is the Morrisseau appointment that we were speaking about earlier, and I believe you have the selection committee there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, I think the members opposite should be very satisfied with the list of both the appointments and the selection committees. Knowing many of the people on those selection committees from my years in the Civil Service, I would

think that they would trust their judgment as being fair and looking for merit. I think it's absolutely ludicrous that the member would even raise this issue considering their past performance of never bulletining senior positions.

To imply that they would do a political litmus test, as it were, which would be totally against the Human Rights Legislation, I think would be a slur on those fine people that were on the selection committee. To single out specifically the Clerk of the Executive Council, I would think, as being a person that would influence these selection committees, I would like to remind the Member for St. Norbert that they felt that he had sufficient administrative capabilities to be on the Spivak "slash force." So I think that he should withdraw his innuendoes that these were a sham or a farce in terms of finding competent, capable people to fulfill senior positions based on their merit in the service of the people of Manitoba.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, on another issue, it's referred to in the Annual Report, Retirement Issues, could the Minister indicate how many people are now working in the Civil Service who are over age 65?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: There are 79.

MR. G. MERCIER: I take it, in view of the decisions of the courts with respect to mandatory retirement that perhaps the Minister could simply indicate her position because I think we have had difficulty getting a position from the government in the past. Does the Minister have any concerns, or is she proposing to have any changes in legislation, or is she simply going to allow people to continue working in the Civil Service past age 65?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: First of all, it is not for me to say once the court has said whether people can continue working past 65. — (Interjection) — Let me continue to answer, please. I believe that the special severance benefits that we are offering will more than offset those few people who choose to work beyond age 65. I really have no worries in this regard, because we set the take-up on the early retirement not to mention the usual retirements that do take place will allow for many more people to retire, so that we needn't be terribly worried about the few who do wish to go beyond age 65.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Minister has said, that she knows what the courts have said. My enquiry from her was just as to whether or not she was proposing to change the existing legislation to in any way affect the right of people to work past age 65.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I would like to point out, first of all, that the vast majority of retirements are still early retirements, not late retirements. There is a report which is under consideration at this point in time. The member may be referring to The Civil Service Superannuation Act and the changes that may or may not be required in that Act. All I can say is that is under consideration in light of the court decision.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the Minister saying she is giving consideration to, in some way, affecting the right of people to work past age 65?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: No, what I am saying is that we are studying the report. When we do that, no matter what report we're studying, we look at the way that it matches our impact on laws that we have in this province.

MR. G. MERCIER: I wonder if the Minister could give an indication - it's probably too early because this has just started, so that I imagine the people who are working past age 65 are 66, 67, in that age vicinity - how does the Minister of the Civil Service Commission propose to deal with this issue and people maintaining their jobs like this.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I'm not sure, but I think the member may be referring to job performance. I am not really sure whether he is assuming that, you know, at age 65, you suddenly begin to perform at a different level. The recommendations or, I should say, comments in this regard are made in this report, in the Rothstein report. So we're looking at the whole thing.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, that's the area I was referring to. As the Minister well knows, there are people who take strong positions on both sides of this argument and I'm sure that she's well aware there are many people in the labour movement who advocate mandatory retirement at age 65. One of the arguments that a number of people, I've heard, who have argued in favour of mandatory retirement have argued on the basis that, in many instances it is a kind way of having an employee retire. Not to have a mandatory retirement, an employer is sometimes compelled to deal in what may seem like a harsh way with a person whose job performance because of age has deteriorated, and I would think, that given human nature, some of these people may very well be - maybe all of them - performing as well now as they ever did in the Civil Service, but with no mandatory retirement and with the argument that some people have used that the Civil Service Commission may be put in a difficult position somewhere along the line in the future in having to deal with what may seem to be a harsh way with a person who is unable to perform in the job in the manner that they used to.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Well, I'm quite aware of the members concerns, or of similar concerns. I don't know that the commission would ever be put in the position of having to deal with any employee in a harsh way, but I know that there is the danger, or it certainly has been brought to my attention that there is the danger of some employers doing just that in order to encourage, shall we say, the person to leave their employ. I think this is one of the problems that we have to deal with.

I certainly would much rather assure that people's pension plans are adequate enough that they don't feel they have to continue to work for that paycheque. When they reach an age at which they should retire in dignity and in grace and want to - nearly all of them want to - and if they had such a pension and could retire with financial security, I would feel quite assured that they

would. But I am quite aware of the dangers that the member brings to my attention.

Again, I would say that I would reject though, the suggestion that the commission might have to deal harshly with its employees. I think that the commission is a much more sensitive and caring employer than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairperson, I'd like to pick up on that. I'd like to remind the Member for St. Norbert that the labour movement's concern about the issue of mandatory retirement is based on the fact that most workers in this province and, in fact, throughout Canada have inadequate or non-existent pension coverage and that by not having a mandatory retirement age, workers, because of the fact of facing near-poverty existence after many years in the labour force, would choose to carry on with their job. That's the basic philosophy behind holding to mandatory retirement or urging earlier retirement. That goes hand in hand, of course, with their very active lobbying for improvement in pension plans and of course this Minister is looking very seriously at improvement in pension plans.

So the case within the Civil Service is that we do have a very adequate pension benefit for people and they can make that choice based on whether they actually want to stay on in that job and that fits in with their lifestyle, and based on their performance appraisal, they would be dealt with in the same way as any other employee. I think the argument about slacking off in performance is the same one that's used at the other end of the age scale and a lot of employers said, well, they don't want to pick someone who's too young because they're not responsible and they're not devoted to their job and they don't perform as well as someone who's older. In fact, they used to always say middle-aged married men were the best employees in terms of performances and I think that stereotype has gone down the tubes as well.

So, I think that following the court's ruling in this particular case is not only absolutely necessary, there's no choice in that, but I don't think it has any detrimental effect to the performance either of the Civil Service as a whole or to the individuals.

I'd just like to mention that on May 25th I'm attending with the Minister of Community Services a retirement dinner for 31 employees in that particular department. So, I think the issue of 79 employees throughout the Civil Service who have chosen to stay on is a very small number and based, I'm sure, on their job performance and on their individual preference in wanting to stay on in that particular job. I don't think it's an issue that's a very major one, but I think in the area of human rights it's very important to follow that one through in the best manner possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, my own personal position is that a person should be allowed to work past age 65 provided they can maintain their job performance. I think as the studies show, that is where the problem becomes a difficult one for the employer.

Have any employees who have chosen to work past age 65 been released - whatever the proper word is - because of a reduction in job performance?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: No, none of them.

MR. G. MERCIER: I wonder if the Minister can indicate what the position of the MGEA is on this issue.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The MGEA is very supportive of the pension reform and of the severance supplement. Apparently in the past they have indicated that they are in favour of mandatory retirement.

MR. G. MERCIER: They favour mandatory retirement at age 65?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: That's what my staff tells me, yes. I have to say that honestly they have not brought that forward to me, but maybe that is because they just haven't had time, I don't know.

MR. G. MERCIER: Does the Minister not meet with the representatives of the MGEA on a regular basis?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Certainly I do. It's called Joint Council and certainly I do, but apparently in a brief that they presented to the Rothstein Commission, they made this statement. That was, I think, in the previous administration, which was much before I became Minister.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister indicate that the MGEA supports the Early Retirement Plan?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The MGEA is supportive of severance supplements, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: The one that was announced in the Budget and the one on which the Minister recently issued a press release?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: In general, yes. I don't even think this is the place to discuss this, but obviously they would want benefits like we have in the window all the time. But that's what they're there for, to ask for that kind of special or better benefit for their employees.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Finance Minister first of all, in the Budget announced a special initiative to encourage early retirement for eligible public servants, and a special set of early retirement pension benefits. Then the Minister at the end of March issued a press release with respect to this. My first question is, does this apply to people between 55 and 65, or does it apply to people between 55 and 60?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Yes, 55 and 65 or beyond to 79.

MR. G. MERCIER: Oh I see, okay, I understand. It's the early retirement penalty of 1.5 percent per year that was applicable to the people between 55 and 65.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: That's correct; that's part of the window.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister indicated in the press release that there are some 3,000 civil servants and employees of agencies who are eligible to partake of this plan. Is there a limit on the number that will be allowed to take advantage of this plan?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I suppose there's certainly no limit on the take-up except the number of employees in the plan. Anybody who's in the plan and who is eligible under this structure, could take advantage of it.

MR. G. MERCIER: All 3,000 could take advantage of it - hypothetically?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: If they wished, certainly.

MR. G. MERCIER: In a newspaper article, Mr. Doer has described this as a pension lottery, good news for those who are in that age category but bad news for those who miss out on the brief window opened on richer pensions.

I take it, inasmuch as it applies, the Finance Minister has indicated that it was for a three-month period starting March 1st, and the Minister, I take it, has expanded it for a period of a month.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: An extra month, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Does she have any comment on that? I think the rationale for Mr. Doer's argument, as I think I heard him on television, is somebody had decided to retire, for argument's sake, within 30 days prior to March 1st. They perhaps missed out on some significant benefits and if someone doesn't, say, turn 55 until July 5th, and would otherwise have wanted to take advantage of these benefits, they miss out.

I think the Minister's argument is, well, it's arbitrary and those are rules of the game, and that's the way the cookie crumbles.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Well, the window is there to create an impetus. That sort of thing is going to happen when you have an extra benefit added. If the extra benefit is added forever, then you still even have a starting date. So, the window was created in order to offer people that little extra push, if you will, that little extra help, that little extra incentive to retire if they had, in fact, been waiting to do so and perhaps were going to work for the extra few years because they needed to improve their pension benefits to a point where they felt they could afford to retire. This would give them that kind of help.

Any plan - and I think I explained this to the press, too - whether it's a dental plan, or a medical plan outside of Medicare, describes exactly who is eligible and at what point you're eligible and that's the nature of those kinds of plans.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, who absorbs the costs, the additional costs?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: The government does.

MR. G. MERCIER: This does not in any way require any further contributions from other employees to finance this?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: No, it requires no contribution on the part of the employees.

MR. G. MERCIER: What is the cost - it's difficult obviously for you to predict what the cost is when you don't know how many employees are going to take advantage of it or what age they are, etc. Is there any guesstimate that you have?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Well, you can figure on an average Civil Service salary, and on per-100 people retiring and you can come up with figures. If you use 300 as your number of possible retirees and - what do we use, 24 - okay, based on an average Civil Service salary, an averaging of these salaries, the annual cost per employee of the retirement supplement is \$1,000.00. So the supplement would be \$300,000.00. We figure it will cost in the first year about \$30,000 in administrative costs, and that the severance pay is about \$2 million. Now, that would come to \$2,330,000, if I'm reading that number correctly.

Then you have your savings, of course, to offset that. In the first year, the savings are not as great as in subsequent years. Balanced against your savings for all of these 300 people that are retiring, and that you therefore no longer have to pay salary to, you have to, I think, reasonably estimate that you are going to hire to replace some of them at least. You're not going to leave all of those places vacant forever. But you're going to hire at a lower salary level most likely because you're hiring someone with less experience, and in many cases you may be leaving the spot vacant. It may be a position from which you redeploy the responsibilities.

If you have 300 early retirements, the first year you could fill approximately 175 of them; in the second year, 240 of them and still not lose any money, still not have to pay out anything more than you're saving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 10:00 p.m., what's the pleasure of the committee?

A MEMBER: The 10 o'clock window - and let's retire, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 7. Manitoba Health Services Commission.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I have discussed the presentation of my Estimates with the opposition's Health critics and have agreed to make the following suggestions to the committee. I intend to start this evening by announcing the department's capital program. I have prepared a press release covering the full programs; I would like to have copies distributed to all members of this House.

I wish to assure you that the statement is only now being made available to the press. I haven't released anything yet, but I have informed the members of the

media that I would be available at 9:30 tomorrow morning to answer any questions. This would be at the Information Services studio in the basement. The printing of the statement is not of the best quality, and for those that are interested I would suggest that maybe they should follow my presentation and make the necessary changes on their copy.

Then after the presentation of the capital programs, we will start with the Estimates of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. I would like to suggest that we deal, like we did the last few years, with it line-by-line, approving each line. So I wonder if you could please number the lines, Administration, one; Hospital Program, two; Personal Care Home Program, three; Medical Program, four; Pharmacare Program, five; Ambulance, six; Northern Patient Transportation, seven.

Under no circumstances of the agreement that we made will we cover two, three and four, that is, Hospital Program, Personal Care, and Medical Program tonight. If we finish the other lines by 10 o'clock, I think that it's been suggested that some of the members, because of a committee that is touring the province, might want to ask questions or make statements on these three, either Medicare, or the hospitals and institutions. We'll go along with that, but under no circumstances would we approve any of those until the next time we meet.

I understand also that we will not finish this. After tonight, I think the next time will be Thursday. Apparently, there has been an arrangement made that on Monday and Tuesday we'll be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Finance.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to announce government approval of the Manitoba Health Services Commission's five-year capital construction program, a program which includes continuation of \$102.1 million in current construction; \$82.7 million in projects to be started during the year; and \$4.0 million to upgrade existing facilities through the year.

In addition to meeting the health needs, these projects will have a major impact in stimulating the construction and design industry.

It is estimated that:

the projects currently under construction will generate 400,000 days employment for the construction and design industry when they are completed;

The projects to be started this year will stimulate 350,000 days employment for the construction and design industry;

The projects approved for architectural planning will result in 25,000 days of employment for the Planning and Design sector of the building industry.

"Given the current economic conditions in the province, a more conservative approach would have been to defer all except the most urgent capital projects." However, in line with government policy, the projects will stimulate the economy through the creation of meaningful jobs. The construction schedule was developed in consultation with the Minister of Education, Labour and Manpower, and the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I want to emphasize that these projects have been thoroughly reviewed and are designed to address the immediate and long-range health needs of our citizens.

The above projects will cost an estimated total of \$188.8 million and in addition to major hospital

replacement, will provide 350 new personal care beds of which 289 of those are replacements of older facilities.

The five-year capital program includes continuation of projects under construction or ready for immediate construction start totalling \$102.1 million. Those are definitely going for construction.

The Health Sciences Centre - a new paediatric bed tower. The new seven-level medical services building including support services and laboratory services and a new main entry. The upgrading of the fire protection system.

Municipal Hospital - an interim expansion of the new building, 28,000 square feet for service space.

Grace Hospital Psychiatry - a new 20-bed psychiatric rehabilitation facility.

St. Boniface Hospital - the first phase of redevelopment to upgrade and consolidate services. This phase includes a cobalt unit and a CAT Scanner. A major upgrading of laundry building.

RH Institute - a new facility to provide Western Canada with blood fractionation services.

Arborg Hospital - a new 16-bed hospital to replace existing 18-bed facility.

St. Claude Hospital - hospital upgrading.

Glenboro Personal Care Home - a new 20-bed personal care home attached to hospital; renovations to hospital. Closure of 16-bed substandard home.

Grunthal - Menno Home - a new 40-bed personal care home to replace 41-bed home.

Reston - a new 20-bed personal care home attached to hospital; renovations to hospital.

Steinbach-Resthaven: a new 60-bed personal care home to replace 66-bed home.

Adolescent Psychiatric Unit: a new 25-bed in-patient adolescent psychiatric unit in Winnipeg.

Now the next group is the projects approved for construction starts at various times during the current year and valued at an estimated \$82.7 million. These include:

Replacement and redevelopment of the hospital at Dauphin.

Construction of new space and upgrading of the present facility at Morden Tabor Home will provide for improved activity and day care space as well as life safety measures for the building.

Replacement of the two Brandon personal care homes, Bullock Booth and Eventide, operated by the Salvation Army.

Replacement and renovations to older section of Fairview Personal Care Home in Brandon.

Major upgrading to provide for improved activity areas, day care space and life safety provisions at Carman - Boyne Lodge, and Selkirk Betel Personal Care facilities.

Major hospital upgrading projects at Steinbach, Neepawa and Gladstone.

Personal care facilities including 30 beds at Lac du Bonnet and 20 beds and associated major hospital upgrading at Pine Falls.

A new power house at the Misericordia Hospital. This is the first phase of the proposed major regeneration of the hospital.

Approval is also included for immediate tender call on a number of smaller projects associated mainly with plant upgrading and improvement of life safety standards in health facilities at an estimated cost of \$3.2 million.

Negotiations between Canada and Manitoba have concluded with the transfer of the Deer Lodge Hospital to the Province. A major redevelopment of the present site at a cost in excess of \$30 million is expected to start this year.

Also approved for construction is an allowance of \$4 million to accommodate a number of facility upgrading regeneration and life safety projects in various facilities throughout the year.

Now the next group is where the government has also approved \$6.7 million for architectural planning to be carried out during the current fiscal year for projects worth an estimated \$127.3 million. These projects, following finalizing of architectural plans, must come back to the government for approval before proceeding to the construction stage. The projects in this stage of planning include:

PROJECTS	DESCRIPTION
Brandon Personal Care Home	Replace three time-expired personal care homes;
Portage La Prairie Personal Care Home	Replace a time-expired personal care home;
Red Cross Building	Upgrading of existing building to alleviate crowded conditions and lack of storage facilities;
Winnipeg - Bethania	Construction of 50 personal care beds;
Flin Flon Hospital	Diagnostic unit upgrading;
Virden Hospital	Replacement of the existing 32-bed hospital;
Municipal Hospitals	Redevelopment or replacement of the older hospital buildings;
St. Boniface Hospital	The further phase of a staged redevelopment program to upgrade and consolidate services;
Laundry-Health Sciences Centre	Upgrade existing Central Laundry;
Concordia Hospital	Expansion of emergency and outpatient departments;
Winkler Salem Home	Replacement of the 1956 section of the home;
Grandview	Upgrade existing hospital building;
Gilbert Plains	Replacement of the existing 20-bed hospital with a new 30-bed personal care home;
Swan River	Convert the existing 53-bed hostel to a 60-bed personal care home and build 20 personal care beds in the district possibly at Benito;
Misericordia Hospital	Phased redevelopment program as previously announced will continue architectural planning through the year.

By giving approval for architectural plans on the above projects, the government will maintain maximum flexibility in timing the health construction to best respond to economic conditions of the province.

I should emphasize that some of these projects have been proposed to the Federal Government as a National Recovery Program and these are currently under consideration by the Federal Government. These include the projects at Selkirk Mental Health Centre, Adolescent Psychiatric Unit, Steinbach, Reston, Neepawa and Flin Flon hospitals, and the Red Cross Building in Winnipeg.

In addition to the foregoing programs approved by government, I've instructed the Manitoba Health Services Commission to continue to work with facility boards and communities in determining and refining the functional programs of the following hospital and personal care home projects:

Grace General Hospital	Hospital regeneration;
Gimli - Bethel	Replacement or major redevelopment of the existing facility;
Brandon Hospital	Redevelopment and upgrading;
Eikhorn	New 20-bed personal care home plus primary care unit attached to EPH unit; this will replace the existing hospital;
Manitou	Construction of a new personal care home and renovation to existing hospital building;
Gimli	Hospital upgrading;
Shoal Lake	Renovation and expansion of the hospital;
Concordia Hospital	Addition of acute care beds;
Vita	Facility expansion and replacement;
Swan River	Hospital expansion and upgrading;
Foyer St. Boniface	Replacement or major redevelopment of the existing personal care home;
Hostels	Upgrading and hostel bed replacement in a number of facilities to allow for a heavier level of care.

In addition to these projects, funds will be considered for planning for the ongoing programs of health facility regeneration, upgrading and life safety improvement each year.

These projects will be submitted to Cabinet in subsequent years for consideration and if approved will proceed to construction.

With regard to Health Sciences Centre Redevelopment, I am pleased to announce that tenders have been called for the second phase of construction of the new seven-level building containing a new main entry, laboratory and support services at the Centre. This will be the second major new building start within

the last year with construction now well underway on the new paediatric bed tower.

The Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Centre are presently working on plans directed to program and service areas with the highest priority for redevelopment. These include areas such as psychiatry, emergency departments for adults and children, surgical suites for adults and children, perinatal services, as well as critical and intensive care complex and organ imaging.

Further redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre is under review by the province and a Cabinet decision is expected to be made in the next several months.

I would like to make sure that there is understanding, because you might recognize some of the projects that I mentioned last year. I want to make sure that we're not trying to parade this every year.

The system is this, that first of all, we work on a five-year plan because I think that's the only way to plan. Then we could make sure that the service is as needed in the province. What is done is that there is approval for functional programs. That doesn't entail any commitment of the construction. There is no money involved. It's up to the community. Now we can't prevent anybody from doing that, but these are those that we recognize and that is the first start in feeding them into the five-year program. Every year this has to come to Cabinet.

The next step would be to approve all of them, or some of them, or none of them for the next step, and that's architectural design. There again, the only commitment - and that's for all governments, I'm sure - is to go ahead and use the money involved, that is all that is approved by Cabinet, to allow for preparation of architectural design. Of course, when you do that, you pretty well have a good idea that you're going ahead with the planning, but there is no commitment either by the same government or a change of government that said, no, that's it.

Then the next step, they either stay in there for another year if we want to stretch it or, if it's agreed, then it's approved for construction. Then of course, the plans are all ready so they start building.

So the first programs are those that are still under construction or that were approved for construction. The second programs, the ones that I think that we mentioned, 82.7, are some that last year were in the list of architectural drawings; now they're approved for building. The others are in architectural drawing; either they were there last year or they graduated from the functional program.

I want to say also to present the full story, that through the part of the province's 1983-84 Capital Estimates which will be presented by my colleague, the Honourable John Plohma, the Minister of Government Services, there is also another \$5,350,000 has been allocated for major capital works at Brandon and Selkirk Mental Health Centres.

Now, these projects that are associated with this capital expenditure include the Selkirk Mental Health Centre, design and initial construction of a new 100-bed patient care building - I say design and initial construction, I'm not talking about the full thing. The total cost of this, if we go through with this, would be \$5.3 million. There's also fire safety upgrading of the reception building that we'll proceed with. Preliminary

design for renovation to the infirmary building. In Brandon, there's design for a new laundry building. This is just the design. Design and initial construction of a new 100-bed patient care building.

Then there are major capital works also. Now, the total of this of what is approved this year would be another 58,000 days of employment for a total, with the programs that I've just mentioned, of 833,000 days. Now, I want to make sure that this is understood also, as far as Brandon and Selkirk is concerned. In view of the comprehensive review the mental health system currently being undertaken by the Provincial Mental Health Steering Committee, it would only be appropriate to put on hold all design and construction for the mental health centres with the exception of fire safety upgrading, pending the reporting back of this committee though. The money will receive approval from the Cabinet, but there's a hold that the department has put on to make sure that we're going in the right way. We're waiting for the report that I mentioned so many times.

Now, I guess that is about it. I don't know if there are any questions for clarification of what I've said, if not, we can proceed with the other line-by-line . . .

Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that we start with line 1, the Administration; and then you go to 5, Pharmacare; and 6, Ambulance Program; finally 7, Northern Patient Transportation and see how we progress.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 7.(1), Administration.
The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: We have some questions on that particular area. Mr. Minister, again, I must express my concern about having one man in charge of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and also having him in charge of the Department of Health. Again, I realize the capabilities of this gentleman; I know that he is a capable person. We are talking about a billion-dollar Budget. We're talking about thousands of people that are employed in both these areas. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we can do better than just having somebody in each one of these areas working half-a-day in each one of these departments, or whatever the time schedule is that he spends in each particular department. I would like to know how much time is spent, for instance, in the Department of Health and how much there is spent in the Manitoba Health Services Commission, how the time's divided? I know that there must be considerable time spent in traveling.

Again, I must express my concern, Mr. Minister, that I think both of these areas should require the full-time attention of a capable person in each one of these areas. I wonder if the Minister could answer some of these questions as to how much time is spent in each particular area.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I'm sure my Deputy Minister will be touched with the concern, but let me assure you that we are managing quite well. The Deputy Minister spends most of his time at the office of the department and there is something that should be added, that we have two very capable people that we promoted to Associate Executive Directors, Mr. McCaffrey and Mr. DeCock.

So I could assure the members of this committee that Mr. Edwards will go to the commission once or twice a week and he's always in contact because it is actually one big unit working together. You know, it's the same thing that you only have the one Minister for the two departments, or the department and the commission. Also, we have very capable people at the commission and I don't think I want it any other way because the Deputy Minister now can co-ordinate the whole operation; we can't divorce one from the other. Then because of the Act that there are certain things that have to be for signatures and so on, and that is why pretty well that he has retained the title and the responsibility of the Executive Director. But I can assure you that maybe we're working him too hard, but knowing him, he would work as many hours I think if he was only - I don't know, what's the easiest job in the department? - the Minister. Even if he was the Minister he'd work as many hours.

So I don't think there is any need for concern and if you don't stop that he'll probably be asking me for a raise and I can't afford one.

MR. A. BROWN: My major concern, Mr. Chairman, is as far as administration is concerned. I wonder how he can effectively give direction to the various ADMs and directors and senior management when he has such a large portfolio to carry out. This brings me to the question of incidents which we witnessed just recently in Flin Flon where a person, because of lack of knowledge of the Department of Health, the department had not been notified that there was a problem over there as far as their emergency ward was concerned, and a person lost his life because of the fact that he had to be transferred to Winnipeg and he could not receive the kind of emergency treatment that was required.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we had a little more time to spend with the various hospitals to find out just exactly what their problems were; to have ourselves better advised as to what difficulties these hospitals were running into, so that we could cope with these situations before they turn out to be real serious situations.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I can assure you that if we'd had a full-time executive director and no associate executive directors, you wouldn't see any difference in the example that was given today. This is something that can happen and probably will be happening again. I think that you must understand the function, the role and the structure of the commission. This has nothing to do with the executive director; he can't be everywhere at the same time. Now we have the board of the commission, of course, the executive director and then there is the chief medical consultant and a secretary to the commission. Then there is, as I say, Mr. DeCock and Mr. McCaffrey are Associate Executive Directors and they each have part of the responsibility. But then, also, there are people that have certain responsibility for Medicare, or for personal care home, or for hospitals and that would not change.

Now, I think it is rather unfair to say that this is an insinuation that there is lack of knowledge or lack of care at the commission for hospitals in the area. I have

stated many times and we check quite often with the hospitals and besides that, they have a responsibility to bring any problems to their contact person at the commission. Let's remember also that all the brains are not necessarily just at the commission in government, that you have a structure of people that are on these boards who are responsible people the same as in the school divisions on school boards, and they do make decisions. They must accept part of the responsibilities. Then you go to the administrators and you go to the people, the staff in the hospital.

Now, the situation in this was, just about two days before, that unit was closed and it's not the first time that a unit was closed. It was done in previous years; it was done probably this year. It happens occasionally and it was unfortunate that this incident happened. Now, let me say again, the experts that I've talked to, and nobody knows for sure, but as far as they were concerned there was probably a 99.9 percent chance that person would have died anyway. But be it as it may, it hit the news and it became quite cause célèbre. I don't know if that's really fair.

Now, there were other options. As I say, I can't comment on this too much because we have some concern. I've asked the College of Physicians and Surgeons to see what other alternative and if proper care was given under the circumstances and the commission also is studying the report and investigating further. You know, I don't think it's fair to comment on it too much, but I can assure you this has nothing to do with the Deputy Minister being also the Executive Director of the Commission. This wouldn't have made one bit of difference.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, I'm pleased that the Minister is going to have an investigation into that particular incident. I think the major concern at the present time is that something like this doesn't happen again, either in Flin Flon or in any other area within the province. I think possibly that hospitals should be alerted that if they do run into that kind of a situation, maybe they could notify the Manitoba Health Services Commission that they were running into a problem so that some assistance might be given to them on some kind of a short-term basis.

From what the Minister has said and so on, it seems to me that the Minister is actively pursuing either amalgamating the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Department of Health. I wonder if the Minister could just further elaborate on that particular amalgamation. How would he see the Department of Health moving into the Manitoba Health Services Commission or vice versa? Or how is he planning this particular activity?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, I don't think the word "amalgamation" is quite correct when we are talking about the department and the Commission. That was certainly an option. It's an option that had existed in all provinces for a number of years and it's an option that has been considered by the previous government, by the one before that when I was Minister, and now again that we did. There are some advantages and disadvantages. I might say that many of the provinces who have eliminated the commission are now sorry

that they have done so. There are certain advantages that you have. It is a bit at arm's length.

For instance, this construction plan, I can assure you quite seriously, that this was done by the commission. There were no partisan reasons or playing games because of representation from a committee. That gives you that chance. I'm not saying that it couldn't be done, but there is always more temptation to take care of your own. I guess I am not saying anything that is not known here. The accusations fly all the time anyway and this is one of the things. But we definitely will try to get the two working together. I would imagine that everybody wanted that, but we are making a real effort and we will co-ordinate, associate or amalgamate certain things.

For instance, the planning group, we had very little planning under the former government. When the restraint came in some of the first jobs that went, were planning. I don't think that you can get anywhere in the department such as the one that we have without planning, without research and without evaluation.

So now we have recruited a department, Director of Planning, and we have taken the position at the Commission and the position that existed in the department, the planning, and that came under the department. Now, I'm not talking about the actual planning, Mr. Getz is the head of that. There is still that component of planning for all the work that was done. There is the work of Mr. Getz and his group in the planning of construction and so on. I am talking about for programs and so on.

It is quite a large operation, but we will look at the possibility even of administration. If I could leave the department and the Commission for awhile, I would think that there has been some talk, at least preliminary talk, to look at the departments of the government and try to have administration for maybe four or five of those smaller departments. It is done now in an area, in part of my other Department of Recreation, Fitness and Sports, the same administration acts for that and for the - what is it - Co-op Development, I think. So those are some of the things that we can do. It's the same group, the same people paying the costs. If you can improve the facilities or improve the performance and save money, well you certainly will do it.

As I said many many times, we have to look at where the dollars are going. The days of going on forever, it's not just a question of restraint. This thing of counting the dollars and being careful has to stay with us now.

There is administration. What else? There was something else that we mentioned the other day, Statistics Department, that is another thing. This is very close and the reason for statistics is mostly to plan, to see where the weak spots and where the needs are and that is now in the process of being brought together, but a decision has not been made where it will be. Well, we're certainly waiting for a recommendation from the Director of Planning and I would imagine that there is a possibility that might be even attached to him or very close in the department. So we are not trying to get rid of the commission. We thought of that, the former Minister did, but we want to keep the Commission, we've made the decision, but we want to bring it much closer together.

I guess that I am a little sensitive about that. I guess that I was very very fortunate in the 10 months or so

that I had a forced leave of absence from the House in 1973 or 1974, I spent time as chairman of the commission, and it was the best experience I ever had. I would suggest that anybody who aspires to become the Minister of Health should have a stint at the Commission. I think it would be quite helpful.

So I see the good work that is being done there. They have the good facilities and it's working quite well, but we are going to bring a rapprochement, a working together of the two groups, that's what we want.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there is some kind of plan that the Minister has been working on. Is there a detailed plan on how you're gradually going to amalgamate the two? Is there a plan available that you are working on? What I would like to know is, are we going to be saving on personnel by amalgamating? Certainly we will in some areas. Are we going to be saving money? Are we going to be running a more efficient service? How long a period of time are we looking at before this amalgamation is going to be complete? Is there a plan that the Minister is working on?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Please don't keep referring to amalgamation. I just finished saying that it isn't. But there is no plan that we don't know now what we are going to do in the next two or three years, except we are looking at it. We have only had a Director of Planning just for a few months. He is very busy with the priorities of the department and the commission. But we are looking with an eye to saving dollars; with the other eye making sure that we are going to improve the standards or whatever, the performance I should say. As I say, those are the two things that we can improve the efficiency of whatever the branches are.

I said that we have already moved in the Planning and then Statistics, and we will be looking at others. I can't tell you exactly now. This is done during the course of the year because you can't do everything at once. We don't have a preconceived idea of what we will bring together.

Bringing together might not even be forming just one department from two. It might be a closer working agreement or ties between the two and we have done that all along. That is one of the reasons that I've insisted that my Deputy Minister should remain as the head man at the commission, and more so, he's even the Vice-Chairman of the Commission, to have that contact. It's not like in the old days where it was strictly a Crown corporation generating its own revenues when you had premiums. Every single dollar, every single cent comes from this guy here and his department and therefore, we want to know what's going on.

MR. A. BROWN: I hope the Minister is going to be bearing with me when I ask some of these questions. I was not aware that a move such as this was under way. As the Minister knows, I had not been involved with the Department of Health since 1977 when I was the critic. Since then I was involved with other things and now I am coming back into this area. I'm trying to catch up in a couple of days what I've missed in six years. So I hope that the Minister is going to bear with me.

My other concern then would be, would quite a bit of the personnel be shifted from one area into another area? You have your various personnel in each particular department and would they be shifted into different areas. If so then who would be doing the co-ordinating of that particular shift, because I can well imagine what kind of a nightmare that would be to start off with.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I would like to make a proposition to my honourable friend. I would like to, through you, Mr. Chairman, to offer to take him around the commission to see the department because it's not as complicated as that.

I mean, if we take one department. I'll try to explain that. Well, let's take the example of one that we've already done. With the economic situation the way it was, we couldn't just go and ask for more staff years, so we looked at the situation in Planning. What did we have as planners and researchers?

So we found spots in the department, I think there were four, and approximately four at the commission. So we brought them together. We recruited a top Director of Planning. Now, they are one Planning for both. As I said before, this has nothing to do with the construction and the need for a personal care home because that is a specific problem, and it's a very important one. It's a full time job also. But I mean the Planning for the programs. They're all in the same place with the director, the eight of them. I don't know if all the positions are filled; I think we're still trying to fill a few. They work with the directors, and they work with whoever they need but they're all together so it's not very difficult and there's no co-ordinating to do. There is a director who's responsible for that department.

Now, if we move in the same way, if we decide to move in Statistics we would do the same thing. Now where they are, actually where the offices are I don't think that is as important because right now our department is spread all over the place. That's the kind of co-ordination that we would have and they would all report to the Deputy Minister.

MR. A. BROWN: The Minister mentioned that the first of the departments that would be united and so on, probably would be Planning and Research, and Statistics. I wonder what other areas he's thinking of changing in the near future. For instance, I can see computers. I cannot really see computers being in one department and Statistics in another. Would that be another area in which he would be moving shortly, or what other areas would he be thinking of shifting over?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You mean besides the Planning?

MR. A. BROWN: Besides Planning and Statistics, yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, Planning and the next one is Statistics that we're doing now, but we don't know exactly where it's going to be. There's a possibility that Statistics will be, let's say a sub-branch of the Planning; there would be a Director of Statistics but under the Director of Research and Planning.

Now, as I stated, those are the only two that we've decided to act on. Both of them are done now, except

that we don't know exactly where Statistics will go. We're still looking at that.

Now the others as I say, we're looking at the whole department. But I have nothing else to announce at this time.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, it's an interesting concept, and I'll be giving that a great deal of thought over the next while. I can see advantages; I can see problems. So I'll be giving that some thought over the next while. Like I say, I've only had since last night really to think about this.

Who is the Chairman of the Manitoba Health Services Commission at the present time, the Chairman?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mrs. Evelyn Shapiro is the Chairperson.

It's a smaller - I must have that somewhere - it's a smaller group and they don't meet quite as often. There's Mrs. Evelyn Shapiro; the Vice-Chairman, as I said, Mr. Reg Edwards; there's Bertha Baumann; Diane Howell; Allan Rosky; Rene Toupin; Dr. Sue Wood.

They meet approximately every second month. They have the same responsibility but they will look at anything that's referred by the government for the commission; also, if they have some suggestions to make, of course, they're going to make them. But it's a little less; they used to meet at least once a month; they're meeting less often.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, is the commission then, playing somewhat of a lesser role than what they used to play because they're meeting rather infrequently. It seems to me they must have one heck of an agenda if they're only going to be meeting every other month. Is their responsibility less than what it used to be?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They used to come in from all over the place to meet for a half-day. Now we try to save that expense, and they come in and stay the full day, for one thing.

Now, I could play games here but let me be very specific. As I said earlier, I remember when I was sitting in the back row on the other side in opposition 25 years ago. We used to come in and there was one line for the commission. In three minutes it passed, because it was a Crown corporation and we had very little to say.

Now, we can play the same game. I'm the one that started giving questions. It was not that long ago. Before that it was one line, then we started cutting that. That was in my stint in 1974 and 1975, probably because I'd had the experience at the commission and I felt that it should be something that was discussed here.

Now, for awhile we went through the motions, but I think that wasn't good enough. Every single penny comes from the government, so the government must accept the responsibility. You can't just start blaming the commission for everything — (Interjection) — that's right. There's much more money than in the past also. That's another factor. But the point is that, you know, I'd be playing games if I told you that they can act on their own, and start making decisions without looking at policies of government.

I'm not saying that it wasn't before but it was something before like the telephone or Hydro. They

used to come to get their rates approved, you know, when they were charging premiums but then they were left alone. Nobody did anything because there are no more premiums; they don't generate any revenue. They just spend money. So of course, the public has to be responsible and they're doing that through their elected representative. So they have the same responsibility they've had all during the time of the previous Minister, and before that also.

Now, we're asking for the commissioners. Last year voted was 51,100 and the estimate this year is 7.5, so I think it's worth the saving.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I believe this was also in the opening speech that we had or the Speech from the Throne, mention was made that we're going to look at setting up some more community clinics. I would like the Minister to elaborate on what he is planning to do with community clinics; what concept is it? Is it the Tolchinsky-type community clinic that he's talking about, or what type of community clinic are we talking about?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, that should be covered under Hospitals. I think we should get back on line now - we're in Administration. There was leeway because of Administration, but there's a line for hospital, clinics, because that will be something that I'm sure there'll be a lot of debate and a lot of advice that I'll be getting on that. But that should be - if you don't mind - under Hospital Programs. Now it's strictly the Administration, Line 1 is strictly the Administration and, in fact, we shouldn't even talk about that because the Planning is not there anymore. It's not their responsibility. It's just the actual Administration. So if we can do that and eventually we'll get to that and I'll try to answer it at that proper time.

MR. A. BROWN: It was not my intention to go into it into any detail, but I believe it is the Administration that works with advising the Minister as to what type of community clinic we're talking about. That is my major concern at the present time. Later on, of course, we can go into detail on discussion of that. But I would like to know, really, what type of community clinic are we talking about?

I believe that the Minister - well, I know, we've discussed this prior, when I was a critic of Health under the Schreyer regime, that one of the concerns that I had at that time was that we were going into community clinics, when every other province seemed to be doing away with them. I was just wondering whether the Minister had a different concept of community clinic at the present time than the one that - for a better description of it - than the one that Tolchinsky was proposing.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I certainly don't want to go into depth in this, Mr. Chairman, because we'll get all mixed up, but I will say this. The Minister is more sure than ever that something has to be done, and it's not just a small item. It is a very big item. Because where are we going? Are we going to try to go in the community more, the same as we've said in mental health, mental retardation, personal care homes, that

we try to keep people out of institutions as much as possible? That's what the chief critic of your party is also saying, he's talking about the day hospital and those kind of things and those are clinics.

Now I might say in defence of Dr. Tolchinsky, there were two things wrong with Tolchinsky. He was ahead of his time and then he came in like gang busters and scared the hell out of everybody, but his ideas were very good. I might tell you that you look at other provinces - and not socialist provinces - you look at the Province of Ontario, for instance. There was a statement that I read not too long ago that the Minister, Mr. Larry Grossman, said that the clinics are here to stay, they're a way of life. We can go into this in more depth, Mr. Chairman, when we get to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions here for the Honourable Minister.

The first one I would like to ask the Administrator of the Health Services Commission or the Minister is, how you're going to deal with Morgentaler? I'm getting all kinds of letters, people are phoning and wondering how we're going to deal with this matter, and I don't have the answers, and the calls are still coming and the letters keep coming. Maybe the Minister, for the sake of the committee and the province, can put something in the records, so he can tell the people this is the sequence of events that's going to take place and this is what's going to happen.

I suspect the Attorney-General's Department may be involved, but nevertheless, it's an issue that's growing every day in my constituency, especially, and I think that it's time for us to put something on the record and let the people know what sequence of events likely are to take place with Morgentaler.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, there again, Mr. Chairman, we're practically on the Minister's Salary at this place, or on Medicare. This is a question of Medicare. It certainly has nothing to do with the Administration. But let me - to show that I want to co-operate and help, because I think the members of the committee will be quite helpful and quite reasonable - let me say this, that as far as the legal part of it, prosecution and so on, you'll have to ask the Attorney-General.

Now I would say this, that the commission has no right to pay for anything that is illegal, and as the Minister of Health, this is my responsibility. If a clinic is set up that is not legal, it will not be covered. As far as closing the clinic, I have nothing to do with that. But as Minister of Health, I can tell you, that if the clinic is open - illegal clinic - that they will not collect under Medicare. That's all I can say at this time.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I thank the Honourable Minister. That answers a lot of the questions that's been drawn to my attention from constituents.

Mr. Chairman, this is the favourite manifesto that we refer to from time to time that was widely publicized in the province during the last election campaign says here, "Our health care system has been allowed to deteriorate over the last four years. The Lyon

Government has cut back health care budgets, the grants to hospital being regularly below the inflation rate. Community clinics have been cut in service and remote areas have not been expanded."

Can I ask the Minister what kind of dollars is the administration of the Health Services Commission or his office looking at to bring this system back up to the level that's promised in that election campaign?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Let me say that I certainly do not disassociate myself with anything that was said by anybody in my party, but I'm not the author of that statement that my honourable friend read.

I had concerns when I was the critic that we left the department - first of all, practically the exact moment we left, there was a change in the funding mechanism between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government and that increased at the time. I didn't think it was the right thing to do in the system. They could have increased their funds, but instead of cost-sharing, there was a different method of funding from the Federal Government. That brought in - I don't know exactly how much - millions of dollars more than we had, let's say even from '77 to '78 and '79, and so on.

The main criticism that I had that - all right, I've never stated that legally, like the Federal Minister did, that legally the department or the government had to spend all that money that they then decided to give and it was accepted and requested by some of the provinces; namely, Ontario and Alberta and it was block funding. Block funding is exactly that. Legally you can build highways if you want. I think that the Federal Minister probably will have trouble and that's probably why they want to change the Act, but I don't think now with this block funding they can dictate and tell the provinces how to administer the health, because that comes under the responsibility of a provincial government.

But that money, especially in the first few years, we had announced quite a bit of construction and I'm not saying that there's not one government that can commit the government forever and a day. I took the trouble of wanting to be very clear when I presented my program today, in saying that only one step. Like what I announce, it's only one thing, the only real value, the real important thing in what I announced just a few minutes ago, is what is in construction and then the \$82 point million that we've allowed, that we've agreed will go on construction.

The rest, there's only so much money to say, okay, the next step - but one step at a time. I want to make it clear, I'm not saying that nobody has the right to do that, but one of the criticisms is that everything was frozen. Every single thing that was possible was frozen, even those that were already let out to build. I'm trying to explain what the situation is - I'm not starting an argument at this time. I didn't like that because these were the needs, and it took years after, and they came in and there was some construction. But it was translated then, instead of 1977 dollars they were 1980-81 and it was quite costly. In the meantime, there was a backup in the whole system. There had to be a backup in the whole system.

Then in the period of restriction, not the last year, but if you look at your Budget and if you look at what you did in the last four years, look at the difference

between the first, second year and then it starts to move in the third and the fourth, well, then the purse was wide open. That's apparently when the corner was turned and that is the situation.

Now, the actual money that was spent with the rest - I had made the calculation that I brought in this House - and there was less money spent, I mean the share of the province. In fact, one year it went down. I'm talking for myself, the others may feel there were other things. I was very candid, I think you heard me in the question period that I said the Minister - and I think so - I think he asked for it. Now that I can explain a little better, whenever he was asked a question about any strip of bacon and so on, he was always going to change that. I don't intend to do that. The best word is, I think he was being sucked in. I don't intend to do that. I'm not less interested than he is but nobody is going to die for one slice of bacon less a day and that has to be left and has to be a decision of the hospital.

Who makes the decision in the hospital? It's the board and the medical staff and it might cause inconvenience. I don't think the Minister was that wrong, but the fact is the way he responded, that he was going to change all that. I don't think you're going to starve anybody if they get a little less. I don't think that's it. It's not just by the money that you're going to keep a high standard. There are certain countries where they think nothing of it. They think nothing of saying to the people, you're going to bring your own kleenex, your toilet paper and your toothpaste when you go. Those are possibilities, that might come.

But the main thing is the standards. If we're just going to measure standards by the money spent you're going to have a lot of fun because eventually we're going to have to start cutting down. We can't go right through the roof. Look at the money we're spending now. My department is a billion dollars and I will have some very tough decisions.

To the member that asked that question, that is why I'm taking a hard stand in Gilbert Plains. There is no way in the world that it is proper to build an x-ray, especially if it's going to be a personal care home. I know that the member has a responsibility in his constituency and I think he will do well to really find out what we want and I'm sure the staff of the commission are ready to sit with him and explain what the situation is and we will have better results. There were about 800 cases in a year and they will get the result practically just as fast; we'll see to that. The samples from the doctor and so on will be sent to Dauphin.

We are trying to build regional hospitals. If we build regional hospitals, they will be larger and they will help the people in the area and you won't have the recurrence of what's happening in Flin Flon, for instance. It's so expensive, you can't do that at every single little hospital. So, if you have regional hospitals you have to cut down. In six miles or 10 miles or 20 miles, you're not going to have x-rays and lab. It doesn't make sense.

So there'll be a decision and it's going to be tough because the press is going to jump on us, the media, and that's fair game, and the opposition, that's what's going to keep us honest. The same thing as the obstetric beds that are closed. This is just the start. There'll be other decisions like that but that is the real challenge of this generation, of the 80s, is where we're going.

You know, the beds, for instance, we have a question of beds. In the world there is no country that is richer or has more beds per population than Canada. What is it? I think I'll take the trouble of finding that for you. — (Interjection) — I think we're doing a pretty good job of restoring. I think we're planning. I think we know where we're going. — (Interjection) — You told me not to worry about '81. That election is finished. I'm talking about the future.

I don't think it was all that bad. I think that the worst thing that you did is that you stopped, you put a hole in some of the construction and it backed up. I think that you did away with your planners. If you really want to know, that's where I think you made a mistake. Now, across Canada there are 5.5 beds per 1,000. I'm talking about acute and extended beds. Great Britain, which is supposed to have such a good medical program also or health program, is 4.3. In the United States it's 4.5. Do you know what it is in Manitoba - remembering that Canada was 5.5 - it's 6.1 beds. So these are some of the things that I guess . . .

MR. H. ENNS: It probably was that in 1981, too.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, I don't think it was that much. There was a lot of construction. Well, maybe in '81, fairly close to that in '81. But there were four years there. There was '78, '79 and '80. I'm not saying that it was that bad, but I think it had to have a shot in the arm and look at the money we're spending in normal times. Under other circumstances we could probably be criticized for announcing the magnitude, the program of the magnitude that I did today. We feel that it is needed, there is an economic restraint, but we're turning the corner where we'll have a lot of senior people, a lot of older people around the turn of the century.

Also, as I said, we're trying to create jobs and we're trying to help the economy. Now that doesn't mean that it is mickey-mouse planning. There are only those that are absolutely necessary that fit into the plan.

So, I'm not here today to criticize the work of the former government. I think we're improving it and I think the worst thing was, there was no planning. We've done an awful lot in gerontology, for instance. We're very weak, I mentioned that, we're weak and we were weak when I was the Minister before in Mental Health and it's a step. We've got to move. Now, I'm not trying to blame anybody, but I hope that we can live up to what was committed in that statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, to the Honourable Minister, we got blamed. There it is in black and white, in this manifesto. It says the Lyon Government cut back health care budgets, the grants to hospitals have been regularly below the inflation rates, the community could be cut. Then it goes on, this famous article says, Mr. Chairman, "Health care is too important to be shortchanged. Manitoba New Democrats would restore the health-care system," and that's the question I want to ask him and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. What's it going to cost to restore this health system in the province?

The reason I'm asking that question, Mr. Chairman, is because I was called to a meeting of reeves, mayors,

school boards in Newdale last Friday about what it's costing the people of this province for Health and Education, and I'll dwell on that a little while because the people would like to know. What does the New Democratic Party and this Minister of Health mean? And what's the price tag on restoring the health care system in this province? Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of concern out in the country today. I don't know what the cost of health care was when I arrived in the Legislature with the Member for Lakeside or the Honourable Minister of Health, what the cost of the health delivery system was. But today, it's a billion dollars. That is a billion bucks for the first time.

That and the cost of education has created a lot of concern, because otherwise that meeting wouldn't have been called in Newdale on Friday. Unfortunately, there were no New Democrats showed up at that meeting and I don't know why, I'm told they were invited. But there would be likely 130 or 140 very concerned people at that meeting, Mr. Chairman, and they made some statements there that are alarming. As I understand it, all the members of this Legislature are going to get a copy of this brief from that area, that Westman region. It would be Brandon, Newdale, Minnedosa, Russell, up to the border.

They mentioned there the four concerns of this group as elected representatives of municipalities and school boards in western Manitoba. There were mayors there and heads of villages. The four topics that they were concerned about, Mr. Minister, were the total cost of education and health care, the present method of financing education, the present collective bargaining process and government deficits and that's what we spent the afternoon dealing with. But in this brief, Mr. Chairman, they mentioned some things that really concerned me and I'm sure the Minister of Health should understand what their concerns say.

They go on here and they say, "The fact remains that it's quite probable that we simply can't afford the level of service that we would like to have." They go on to say, "We do, however, want to be assured that we are receiving value for the money that we do spend and can afford it at the present time." They go on to say, "There exists a sincere doubt that we are receiving that value. The present grant structure of the Property Tax Credit Program and similar programs tend to confuse the issues and hide the facts, largely due to the government's paying increased grants for board money and no provisions for repayment." The brief ends up, Mr. Chairman, by saying that, and they dwell with other matters, "As municipal councils and school boards, we have made this commitment and stand ready to co-operate and assist the Federal and Provincial Governments in positive long-term actions to restore the confidence and stability to the economic and political future of the country."

That statement was one of their concerns, that the New Democrats were going to restore the health care system in this province. I am just asking the Health Services Commission - the staff's all there - and the Minister, what's it going to cost? What's it going to cost to restore the system that they promised the people of this province?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I accept the challenge to debate this. First of all, I wonder if the member would table the document that he read from.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know where the member stands, himself. I really want to know where he stands. Is he of one mind when he's with these people in this area and is he of another mind here? I challenge - we're going to go through a lot of money that I'm asking - and I challenge people to tell me where we should cut. The same member stood in the House again today and insisted that we should have lab and x-rays in an area where it is not needed. That alone, just the construction of that, adds another quarter-of-a-million dollars.

Now we've got to be consistent and if we are talking about no deficit, of too much money, we cannot say, hey, there's 57 constituencies and you're going to save in every constituency but mine. Let anyone of those people stand up and tell me they would want us to close their hospitals or to cut down. The same member that speaks, in the near future, will probably be getting and say, what are you doing? You're closing beds. They haven't got the money for the staff. You cannot have it both ways.

We have a priority in this department and the priority is, that we will do everything possible for prevention to save this kind of money. We have to move somewhere and they want to know where the difference was, where the accusation was. I said that I didn't concern myself too much with the question of bacon and those things, but I did concern myself when there was a 2 percent increase to the hospitals. Those are figures and you can find that in Hansard. In one year, there was a 2 percent increase in the hospitals and then there was freezing of all this construction, but you can't have it both ways.

I am ready to stand up to these people. I am ready to say we're going to be consistent, but we will also be compassionate. We have to do this. This is on record, that this party says we will not save money and we will not balance the budget on the back of the poor people in the province and the people that need help. I have said that we want to be careful. I've just finished saying the same thing. We are going to resist certain things. I am going to be criticized because we closed some obstetric beds in certain hospitals. I am going to be criticized.

The Minister was all for having me go to Gilbert Plains to make damn sure that I get it real good in Gilbert Plains. I don't mind going there, because I feel that is my responsibility. I have the reputation of spending money wisely, the public funds, but I think that we've got to do certain things and there is such a thing as false economy.

You can have deficits and that but the health of our people, the human resources, are our most important resources. When we talk about our deficit, it is not a true deficit. When we build a hospital, it's not just that money. You've got an asset there and people forget that. When you build roads, you have an asset and you have human resources and that's an asset. So I'm not one that says that we should go wild, but I think in times like this we've got to have a deficit.

I challenge anybody in this House to help me, to tell me, give me any ideas that they have, to see where I can economize, where we can save, not necessarily on lower wages for the people at the bottom of the ladder; not necessarily in trying to close all kinds of hospitals and get people that you would have to pay them welfare

anyway. That is not a true economy. I believe that there are certain jobs.

If I'm building cars and if I have got a field full of cars and I can't sell them, I can't move them, it is ridiculous to keep on. But when you are talking about delivering services and I am not producing any funds - I'm spending the money - I think there is a minimum of what we can do. I said a while ago that we have to look at things and I'm preaching that doctrine everywhere I go, that we've got to be careful. I've met with the Minister of Finance. I have met with the hospital boards and with the personal care boards and I am telling them that they have got to save money, but you people will have to make up your minds.

You can't come one day and give me hell for not building something in your constituency and on the same day, a few hours later, come and tell me that I'm spending too much money and the people are wondering where we are going. Let's make up our minds and let's start by ourselves. It's always easy to say, tighten the belt when we mean the guy below us; or save money, we don't need these new facilities.

I'll be very pleased to hear from you people and I can tell you, it's been said that any suggestion from your side, we don't look at. I can guarantee that we will. I can guarantee that I will. I need all the help in the world, but I want to be consistent. I will stand up to that. I will stand up that, yes, we'll have a deficit and a large part of it is in health, but we've got to work together and that means everybody. That means the people delivering the service. That means the people that are patients in the hospitals or people that are receiving the service, and that means the professionals. That means everybody. But, unfortunately, everybody is talking about, let's start economizing in other areas.

If you're a doctor, you must have the highest wages. If you're a worker somewhere else, to hell with the doctors. We have got to start pulling together. It is not going to be an easy job. As I say, I'll be glad to consider any suggestion that comes from anywhere in the House, any side of the House.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, now the Minister is turning around and trying to blame us for the election promises that he and the New Democratic people made during the last election.

I didn't go to Gilbert Plains and make any pledges or promise to those people. You and the First Minister are the ones that went to Gilbert Plains and talked to the people, and sent this election material around which said, "Our health care system has been allowed to deteriorate over the last four years. The Lyon Government has cut back health care budgets." They go on after, Mr. Chairman, they said, "Health care is too important to be short changed. Manitoba New Democrats would restore the health care system." That's what you told the people in Gilbert Plains.

Can you blame them today for standing there in line, writing me letters and briefs, and asking you to deliver what you promised. It's not my fault. I didn't make the promise or the pledges. The Minister is now trying to turn around and blame us.

This is because of your election material that the people of Gilbert Plains are standing up today and demanding for the government to deliver what they

promised. I didn't make that promise; the Honourable Member for Lakeside didn't make that promise; the Member for Rhineland didn't make that promise; the Member for Radisson didn't promise the people of Gilbert Plains. The NDP Party are the ones that promised the people of Gilbert Plains and all I'm asking is be fair and live up to your promises.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's going to be very simple, because you didn't promise, and they didn't promise, and I'll tell you something, I certainly didn't promise, and our party never promised.

I mean it's easier to wave a piece, oh yes you can wave that high, you can stand on your chair and wave it and say we made promise. We said we'd have good health service and it would be poor planning, it would be wasted money, and it would be throwing money away and the service would be worse if we build what the people of Gilbert Plains want.

So, you know, when we say we're going to build up the health care, that doesn't mean we're going to have a hospital on every corner of every street. That's asinine and ridiculous to speak like that, to say we made a commitment.

We said that we're going to do the best we can to give the best health and we have, and we will be. We're going to be criticized, we're not going to do everything right, but we're going to do our damndest to try to give the best care possible. The best care possible is not necessarily by spending money. To wave a piece of paper is really unfair to wave a piece of paper and say you promised because we said, yes. Read it again, read it again. What did it say. Did it say - first of all, I haven't been in Gilbert Plains since I used to strike you out many years ago when we played baseball. I haven't been there. The First Minister might have made a commitment in Gilbert Plains, I wasn't there. So it's been a long time. But the thing is that we said we will give good health care and we will. We'll explain, I challenge the member to come in and sit with us and find out what we've have planned for Gilbert Plains if they want to work together.

You'll see that we're saving money because at no time, I don't see anywhere where it said we'll spend all the money you want, just ask and we'll give it to you. We said we will provide good health care, we will restore good health care and that's exactly what we're trying to do. I'm not turning the table. I'll stand by that. I'll say that the 2 percent that we're giving the hospital wasn't enough. I say that it was a mistake in freezing some of the construction. I'll say that. But I'll say to you, make up your mind. I'm not turning around. We will do the best we can. That doesn't mean a guarantee of a hospital for every little town. That is crazy. There shouldn't be a small hospitals built and you can quote me. It's not very popular, but you can quote me, okay.

Now when I'm saying you're not consistent - this afternoon you got up and said that we should build and why weren't we taking care of the people. — (Interjection) — I'll take care of myself. You take care of yourself, and I'll take care of myself. I'm big enough, I'm old enough to take care of myself. I don't need any help from you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't help but want to participate in this debate briefly as having been one member of the Treasury Bench when the honourable member, now Minister, berated us from this side of the House. Allow me to be fair to the Honourable Minister. It was perhaps not so much himself that made some of the statements that tend to rankle with us, particularly when they are so evident to us in printed form, signed by the now Premier. When we talk about the restoration of a health system, yes, it does rankle us, Mr. Chairman, because that obviously leaves the impression, anybody that has an understanding of the word "restoration" it is to put back in place what once was, what was destroyed and taken away.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't place myself in a position of being an expert or a critic on the Department of Health, but it's my understanding generally, in broad general terms, and a nod from the Minister head will support this, or a nod from any of the Deputy Ministers surrounding him will support this, that by and large, given the last four years of the Schreyer administration, given the last four years of the Sterling Lyon administration, and given the 16 months of this administration, the Province of Manitoba, the people of Manitoba, through its government, is spending roughly the same amount of resources, 32 to 33 percent of the total revenue of the revenues of the taxes that we, the Government of Manitoba, collect.

Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Minister has different figures, I'll welcome them, but my information has it that an average of the four years of the Sterling Lyon administration that we in effect spent somewhat slightly in excess of the last four years of the Schreyer administration.

That's not really the point that I'm making. We may be out a percentile of a point. We may be out .4 or .5, but roughly speaking the New Democrats under Premier Ed Schreyer spent 32-33 percent of the resources of the province on health care; Sterling Lyon and the Conservatives spent 32-33 percent of the resources of the province on health care; and this Minister and this Premier are spending 32-33 percent of the resources of the province on health care.

So what was the whole propoganda noise all about during Sterling Lyon's administration? That really is what is of some concern to us, Mr. Chairman. The Minister refers several times to the fact that we froze certain construction. Yes, upon coming into office, upon taking the necessary time to repriorize, as is every government's privilege, the kind of construction, the kind of programs that a new government wants to engage in. Certain projects were frozen but, Mr. Chairman, let not the Minister get away with that phraze and glossing over the fact that when things got unfrozen the very substantial \$130-\$134 million redevelopment program at the Health Sciences Centre took place under the Conservative, under the Sterling Lyon government - a program, by the way, which languished for eight years while he was Minister, while various studies were studying as to the disputes between the teaching facilities and the other problems that are associated with it. They are very complex, very serious problems, but the Minister cannot deny it, because the Minister had to change, had to take Bud Sherman's name off the construction sign and put his name on the sign, you know, and rightfully so. But that \$134 million

commitment was made during the administration that I was part of, during the administration that people were led to believe nothing happened, that everything was frozen, that we were pulling back on health care.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just simply say this Minister has an excellent opportunity to really address the very severe problems that we have and they are serious. He is getting co-operation from the former Minister of Health of the kind that is not always seen in an exchange of government. He's getting co-operation from hospital administrators when services like obstetric services are being withdrawn, that cannot be faulted too badly. I'm now referring to the Administrator of the Concordia; he happens to be a pretty reasonable chap, Mr. Chairman. But can you imagine the noise that Sterling Lyon's government would have had to live with, had we tried that?

Well, Mr. Chairman, we all remember the kind of headline news that used to emanate from the kind of attacks made by members opposite, the kind of attacks made by the now Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he complained about the rash on his elbow because we weren't using sheets in hospitals anymore, we were using canvas. Canvas is what we were using. You remember that speech? Not only were sheets not being cleaned in the hospitals anymore in Sterling Lyon's government, but the now Minister of the Crown, your colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs got up in his seat and complained about the severe rash he got from the heavy-duty canvas bag that he had to sleep on in the hospital in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Chairman, even you are smiling about that and you know that really can't be taken all that seriously.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say to the Honourable Minister and his colleagues, on the overall problem of finding the necessary resources; the fiscal means of carrying out; meeting the obligations that we have obligated ourselves, as government; the kind of expectations that people of Manitoba had from their governments, you have, as a government, and you, as a Minister of Health, a unique opportunity to work co-operatively with us and with a co-operating opposition. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would not say this with the fact that our chief critic, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, is absent, but there are members in his group, in his party, that are not always pleased with the way the Member for Fort Garry co-operates with this Minister of Health. We often think that he should be piling into him a lot harder, instead of standing up and agreeing with him, acknowledging that some of the rationalization that has to take place was started and he had to wrestle with and he understands the present Minister's problem in this regard. Therefore, you have a remarkably high degree of co-operation that is taking place between this Minister and my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry, who is the chief Health critic of our group.

So, Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to indicate to him though, that does not mean that we don't remember the kind of stories that emanated from the New Democrats when you were in opposition - the kind of irresponsible stories that emanated from the New Democrats when you were opposition. We didn't spend any money on Health. We only built roads and highways. Remember? — (Interjection) — Well, that's what your colleague said on this side of the House. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Hansard is full of the speeches that were

made by honourable members opposite when they were on this side of the House in this particular regard. I don't think it's a credit to any of us.

I think the problem about health care is far too important, far too complex. Any Minister charged with the responsibility for delivering health care requires constructive criticism and help and we're prepared to give him that. I simply ask him though to indulge us every once in a while, because November 17th - that document, that promise for the great future that your now Premier signed, the signature that makes the Premier look so stern and honest. And he put his signature to it. That's the same document that said that there would be no necessity for raising any taxes. The profits from ManOil and Hydro resources would pay for it.

Well, since then, of course, we've had the payroll tax, we've had the sales tax increase, and Lord knows what other taxes are going to be increased. This same Premier, you're now the Minister, said that the Conservatives decimated the health system in Manitoba and we have to restore it. We have to build it up from ground one. There were no personal care beds during the years between 1977 and 1981. There was only canvas bagging in our hospitals. Never mind a reduction of one or two pieces of bacon, there was no bacon served in our hospitals. Remember? We put sand in baby diapers at the Children's. Remember that? That's what you said we did - or ground glass. And you were going to restore all that and now what the Minister is telling us, he is doing his darnedest and I believe he's doing his darnedest, to carry out the system, to improve on it, to rationalize on it, not to accede to every request whether it comes from Gilbert Plains or from Lundar or from you-name-it, but to try to bring about a rationalization within the most important service that we provide to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, we're prepared to help them in that task, but from time to time, we'll twig him a little bit to remind him - not precisely the things that he might have said in this debate during our four years of office, but certainly some of the kind of statements that were made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if we gave an opportunity, would like to stand up right now and confess his sins. If I had my collar on backwards, I think he might even be brought to stand up and confess his sins right now, and at least get that off his chest and say, that wasn't really a fair commentary about the health care system in Manitoba at the time he made that speech. I really don't think he believes that.

So, Mr. Minister, you'll allow us that privilege, from time to time, to remind you of some of the statements made by your colleagues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. H. ENNS: Confession time. Do you want me to go behind the curtain, Peter? I'll listen to you.

HON. A. ADAM: I am pleased to accept the challenge to stand up and substantiate my statements that I made, when I was sitting up there where the Member for Niakwa was sitting - I was up in that direction.

You know, we used to construct what we called "cabooses" to go out on the lake to fish. I'm sure in

the member's riding some of his people would be fishermen as well. We used to use what we called the 10-ounce duck. That's 10 ounces canvas. Now, that was the normal weight; anything lighter than that wouldn't stand up to the winds and the rough useage on the lake. I want to say that I'm sure that the sheets that we slept on from time to time in the hospital may not have been 10 ounces, but they must have been close to five ounces. Now, I'm sure that five ounces will be a durable material, very durable material, and perhaps you can't blame the hospitals to want to use certain types of cloth that will stand up to the useage day after day, and week after week, and month after month. I want to tell you that it does get kind of difficult to turn around when you're not feeling well in bed and you get your arms chapped and your back chapped. I wanted to tell you that when I made those statements, I wasn't far off, what I intended to say. It was correct.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the remarks from my honourable friend from Lakeside. Yes, I appreciate it also. I think it makes it a little more lively committee and I think he knows that I prefer that also. It's been very difficult to be so agreeable at all times. I'm saying that I am getting wonderful co-operation - I'll admit that. I think that I gave the former Minister the same kind of co-operation.

Now you know, unfortunately, we're made up here of 57 different people who have been in politics at different times. I know, I remember the time I started in politics what kind of a crusader I was and I'd attack everybody. Then I realized later on that - and I can tell you that I was the most sincere person in this House - and I remember the first time I was the Minister, I didn't get the same kind of co-operation from the Member for Fort Garry. It was after he had the responsibility that I had, and it was after I had sat there for awhile, and I think that's important, and I think that experience will change a lot of things. There are some people that come in and I'm sure they're sincere, and they make some accusations, some statements, and then they realize when they have the responsibility that things weren't that bad. I'm talking in general now.

There's nothing I would like better than to see politicians once in a while give each other credit and to say to the public - I've preached that in this House before - when the public are attacking us, instead of saying, well he's got it, when we know it's wrong, to stand up like any other profession does. Maybe we'd be respected a little more, but we don't do that, it's not the style, we're naive if we do that. Until we change the system, that's true. As I said, when I first started I was much more critical. Now I'm critical in certain areas, but I think that I've had more experience; I've seen the other side; I've seen the responsibility of a Cabinet Minister; I've seen the responsibility of a backbencher, and I say that the former Minister has done the same thing, and he knows how difficult it is. That's fine.

Now I did criticize before. I criticized, but remember, and look in Hansard. When did I criticize? I criticized when he was talking about raising the hospital for 2 percent, and I can go back and find you that in Hansard. I said that he couldn't live with that and he didn't. If he had tried to live with 2 percent, he had to make

that up. Then you would have had a complete collapse of the system. An awful lot of what the Member from Lakeside said is absolutely true - not all of it. Some it is not the right comparison. I don't think that a percentage of your total thing means that much. It gives you a percentage. I mean you can be consistent. — (Interjection) — No, it isn't the best. — (Interjection) — Oh, I see, okay.

Now don't forget this also, that \$700 million will be lost to this province in the next five years. I started to say that you had the advantage, and you're fortunate, you shouldn't be criticized for it, but in '77 they changed the system to give you millions of dollars more, and as soon as we came back in they changed the system again and now we're going to lose \$700 million in health - well most of it in health - \$700 million in the next five years.

Now, if we're going to make comparisons - it's not true, I'll tell you right now it's wrong to say that you destroyed the system. I would never say that. I don't think it would be fair. Now there's a lot of things that are said. I saw these things and I can't disassociate myself. I'm part of this team and there's an awful lot of things that were said on that side that you don't like, or that you figure is wrong.

MR. H. ENNS: Larry, you've got it wrong. We're the good guys, you're the bad. You got to start from there . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I should have known that. That's right. You can burn flags, if it's the flag of your friends, that's okay.

But you talk about the percent - and don't forget in 1977 you started by saying it was a very difficult year, the economic situation, and I don't fault you for it, that's what you felt. That is what we were criticizing, because there is no year worse than this year, probably in the history in Manitoba, or certainly in my time of recollection, and still we're spending the money.

That is the difference between the two. You've talked about a balanced budget; we said, we'll try to do the best we can, but that'll come first. It might not be that much, I'm not saying that we're the only ones that have compassion, and so on, but this is what this party is dedicated to.

Where I criticized - I thought it was a mistake when you froze the construction of hospitals. I think it was a little less than - well, no I've got to be careful - but it appeared to me that it is not very sincere to cut down for two years and in the year before election, and God spare me from that, the year before the election you went wild. Because you went wild; you said that we were throwing money at problems. We were accused of that. You said that we couldn't manage our departments. That's what was said when you took over.

Take that document, change the name, reverse it, and you did the same thing in 1977, and you'll do the same thing this year. We'll probably do the same thing the following year.

I remember when I was the Minister, and the now critic of Health for your party was criticizing what we were doing on day care, that we were spending too much money. Then all of a sudden you brought day

care in and it was the same program, the same department, and you brought the question of day care in your last Session. Not only that, you had a mini-budget and threw in another \$4 million or \$5 million that you never spent. So the thing is, nobody's perfect - not this side, not the other side. You're not, no. That's false; you're not the good guys and we're the bad guys and there's mistakes made.

Now my criticism - so I hope we're not going to have that forever, and the sooner you remember that '77 is finished, you lost that election . . .

MR. H. ENNS: That's the one we won, Larry.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No we lost '77 - okay.

MR. H. ENNS: That's the one I don't mind remembering.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're right - '81. No wonder you'd remember '77, but '81 and you should look at the next one. I think that's the important thing. We probably needed that, because I was waiting for somebody to stand up with our Bible and wave it and wave it and say that's that.

Now my criticism, as I say, this is the worst year. Last year we talked about the percentage, I'll talk about percentage increases from one year to the other, and remember, that you had many more thousands of dollars when you took over in '77. Then it went down when you left in '81. In 1976-77, over the previous year - God, I don't dare to quote you what it was in '68-69 - but anyway, in '76-77, the increase was 15.1 percent. Now your first year, your first Budget from that you went to 5.7 percent. So you know, you talk about percent. Now our first year this time we went to 18.8 percent; your second year you went to 7.8 percent. We're 11.27 percent of a much larger thing, and then as I said, with that money that you had - give me another \$700 million, I might even balance the Budget or come close to it. Then in '80-81 you went high. Now in '81-82 you went to 22.1 percent, and I said, well what's the matter all of a sudden this restraint? Well, I'll always remember we turned the corner. — (Interjection) — You sure did. You sure did. You turned the corner in '81-82 and look at the years we've had last year and this year. You turned the corner, but you forgot to look what was on the other side of the corner. It was an election and then you threw money around. So you know, you're not all that bad, but you're not all that good either.

Mr. Chairman, could you remind me where we're at? It seems to me that we're on the Minister's Salary. We haven't talked on it. We were supposed to finish these three lines tonight. We're not progressing too fast, but I enjoyed it.

MR. A. BROWN: The Member for Lakeside touched on a particular topic which I had forgotten about and which I was going to discuss just very briefly. The obstetric units at Seven Oaks and Concordia, have they been removed already, and if not . . .

HON. L. DESJARDIN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Please, we said we wouldn't discuss hospital and

medical. I think we've roamed all over the place. Please wait until we get to hospitals. We're trying to pass some of the other things if you don't mind. You'll have all the chance in the world. He knows, we're on Administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on Item 7.(1), Administration - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Well again, Mr. Chairman, that decision obviously was made by no hospital board. That decision was made by the administration of the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, please the question of order. The member knows. He has been away from that for awhile but he knows how we won this. We have won it strictly in administration, there was no policy made at all. It is not the Commission that made the decision, it is the government, it is myself for the government. That is, there's a special line dealing with that, so let's try it. This is strictly the administration of that building on Empress. Then we're on line-by-line.

They'll be many many occasions. There's the occasion when we deal with Medicare. We'll talk about that when we get there. If that is not on a hospital thing about closing certain things in a hospital I don't know where it fits. Then there's the Minister's salary, so I'm not trying to muzzle anybody. But we have to resist talking all over the place. If we do that on administration then we'll do it on hospitals, then we'll do it on Minister's salary, it's not quite fair, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister then tell me under which item we could discuss that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Under hospitals.

MR. A. BROWN: Under hospitals, okay, that's fine. We can wait.

Another area of concern that I have on the Manitoba Health Services Commission, the statistics versus Stats Canada statistics, populationwise, are always way out. I wonder if the Manitoba Health Services Commission overestimates or does Stats Canada underestimate, or why is this difference? Why does one come out with the statistics June 1st? Why does the other one use December 31st?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, there is always a lapse when the people leave the province and we're told there will always be a difference. That has been existing from Day One a certain amount because there's a lapse when people leave. You know, they don't phone us right away and say you're leaving and so on. It takes awhile before you get the proper check so I guess our statistics are not done exactly the same way or for the same purpose.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can hardly buy that answer because I know from my own home town where you don't have that many people leaving - as a matter of fact we have a growing community over there - and the Manitoba Health Services statistics are

always way higher, as much as 500 people per a population of about 5,500. There is always this discrepancy in figures between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and Stats Canada.

I am wondering why we don't have more accurate statistics and I don't know who's right. I don't know whether it's a matter of the Health Services Commission or Stats Canada but obviously something is wrong somewhere along the line.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I agree with what has been said but I haven't got the answer. I'm glad that he added he doesn't know who's right. Neither do I. I know I can't answer for Canada. I know that the people are keeping this as close as they can, is getting the statistics as close as they can, whatever is reported. I don't know what can be done about that.

The premium system, that was something else. It was a closer thing. With the elimination of their premium somebody might not register or they might leave or come in and we can't do much more than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 7.(1) - the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, at the present time, and I'm talking now if we're going to make one unit out of Health, with the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Department of Health.

I know the Minister is getting tired of discussing this but I do have some concerns. At the present time the Department of Health has eight regions and the Manitoba Health Services Commission has seven regions. How would you divide them?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's not correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. A. BROWN: Oh, well then somewhere along the line then I wasn't correct on that one.

I noticed that for some time the ward, one ward at the Health Sciences Centre had been closed for some time, closed for approximately six months. Is there any particular reason for that ward being closed? Is this in order to save money or what is the reason behind that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We'll discuss that when we get to hospitals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of very minor questions here. I was just noticing under Administration that the increase in administration is somewhere around the 18 percent. Can the Honourable Minister justify an increase of 18 percent over expenditures from last year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The main thing is the MGEA contract as we know it, you know the details of that. That was an increase of 21.4 percent. But I'd like to use this occasion to quote something, give some more information to the department, some information that we're all quite proud of, is the total cost, the percentage

of the total cost which is administration costs. It's been quite low.

Like '83-84 it'll be even with that increase, will be 1.44 percent only and that's remarkable. Last year it was 1.36, and it's been like that since 1977. Every year it's been under 2, since 1976-77. So it's gone down from when they started '68-69, 275, it's gone down to 1.44 so I think that's quite remarkable. But to answer the question directly the main thing is the employee contract which took 21 then but that's for two years, two years in one like with the 22.1.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I don't know how you separate, you know, the negotiations with the doctors when we're talking about percentage increases. If you would . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Excuse me. This is Administration. That has nothing to do with the doctors. Just the doctors that are working for us, for the commission. This is just the administration of the commission. It is not programs. Medicare is not covered in that. Hospital is not covered in that. See that's the first line if you look at your book, it is the first line. That's why we're going line-by-line. It's the 13 million. Now the total is practically a billion dollars. Now, there is \$13 million of that for Administration. It has nothing to do with paying the doctors, the nurses, or anybody like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: We'll leave that until we get to another department and I'd be happy to do that. The only thing under Administration - what about administration at hospitals, like hospital administrators. Nothing to do with it at all?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That comes under the line Hospital. All the hospitals and all the budget and they're responsible for everything. Their administration, everything - that comes under hospital. The Medicare is the cost to the medical professional; personal care home is the administration of the personal care homes. Then there is the different - because actually the Commission is pretty well like an insurance company that are paying out. They are paying. Then you'll see a line for Pharmacare, and then you'll see another line for the Northern and Ambulance Program and this is administration - only the staff at the Commission working to make that insurance company run, not providing any medical service or health services at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Honourable Minister. Regarding this petition I got from Rossburn from the Service Employees' Union regarding The Canada Health Act, which apparently is currently being negotiated at the federal level, I suppose. They're wanting to know - asking us to firmly re-establish the five principles of Medicare. I don't know if the Minister has received them or not, but I got one in the mail yesterday and there's a lot of signatures on it. I'm not that familiar, in fact, I'm not familiar at all with The Canada Health Act, or what they're referring to in this letter.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is a proposed Act that the Federal Minister of Health has said that she wants to bring in and that should be covered mostly under Medicare. That's where she's talking about no extra billing and that kind of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 7 - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Again, Mr. Chairman, I don't know where the Minister would want to have this discussed and I'd like to ask would billing come under this?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Extra billing?

MR. A. BROWN: No, not extra billing. What I would like to discuss a little bit is computers and whether it would be . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Do you mean the computers at the Commission. That's what keeps track of probably the payment to doctors and that. Yeah, that's right.

MR. A. BROWN: My question would be, is the billing all done by computer at the present time, and if it is done by computer, would it not be a good idea, every year to send every person who had seen a doctor, send them a statement at the end of the year just showing how much the government has paid out on his or her behalf that year? If it was all done by computer, that shouldn't be all that much effort in order to do that. But there's something that I'm concerned about and it is that I think that most people don't know how much money has been paid out on their behalf and I think this is something that we should definitely look into.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It certainly would be a good idea but it would be a costly idea, and don't forget too fast what we've been talking about, about this high cost for health and don't forget Wally's friends out there who give him hell if we spend too much.

MR. H. ENNS: Has he forgotten already Larry?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They forgot already. That would be about one-quarter of a million dollars to do that. Now we do this with about 5 percent of the people - a spot thing. It would be a good idea but it would be very costly.

MR. A. BROWN: I realize that the cost of mailing itself is quite costly. I think though that a lot of people would be interested just by knowing how much the government had paid out for them and if people were told that this would be available to them, I'm sure that many, many people would write in and request that type of information, because it's information, I'm sure, that people would like to know. Was the Minister going to answer that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I say that there's only one of the provinces doing that and I think that on request, if the people wanted that, they would get it. Now we do it in a global thing. We say how much we spend, we're going that right now and it's published and there's an Annual Report that anybody can have access to

and then through the media. Now, I'm not knocking the idea, but I think it would be too costly. There's other priorities that we have before that.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, Mr. Minister, at the present time nobody knows what a doctor is charging, for instance, for a visit to the clinic, or whatever. This is really the type of information that people, I think, ought to know, not only out of curiosity or whatever, but I think people ought to know what the cost is of them going for a visit to the clinic. Possibly the system might not be abused as much if they knew what the true cost would be, if there is abuse, and I'm sure that there is a certain amount of abuse.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: As I said, it would be a good idea. Now there's a way of knowing or they could find out and I've had - I don't think I've had it every year - I don't know if I'm just lucky and within that 5 percent once in a while - but I get that periodically. I've seen other people and I'm sure everyone here, at one time or another received it, and it says this is not a bill. This is what we paid, what the Commission paid for you. You must have received that. We don't get it every month. Now, of course, if they're going to an extra billing doctor, then they get a cheque directly so they know what the Commission is paying and they know what the extra billing is.

There's a lot of statistics we could have like that. Some provinces will publish the name of doctors and say how much they got from the Commission and sometimes I'd love to do that, but that's costly and I don't know if that would be the right thing to do.

MR. A. BROWN: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the government at the present time is looking at computerizing hospitals. I believe at the Victoria Hospital you're doing some research in computerizing. I wonder if the Minister could elaborate and tell us how successful that particular program was at the Victoria. I understand that you've installed some computers over there.

The other question then that I would have, how much money have we spent on computers in the last year, if that figure is available, and are we intending to spend quite a bit more?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Last year the computer rental was \$421,000 and this year we're asking for \$524,000.00. It's a 24.5 percent increase, increasing by \$103,000.00. The new approach has been taken for the development of computers in the hospitals and the original concept of developing a total MIS system in one hospital, on a pilot project basis, has been abandoned as there was not complete support by the hospital for this approach. I think that there is a model that's being developed by one of the firms that has a plan here. We've said that we would wait until we can see that in action. They were toying with the idea of putting a new system at Victoria Hospital, I think it was, and that has been delayed until we see that system - what is it? - Burroughs, who have a plant here, so we want to at least give them a fair chance to be able to compete. They'll have a system they're installing that should be ready fairly soon. It's not ready now, so no decision has been made yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 7.(1)—pass. Mr. Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I believe (1) is passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 7.(1) is, yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Good, so we won't have the Minister's Salary again. I move that the Committee rise, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.