

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 23, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 60 students from St. Johns High School under the direction of Mr. Rocznick. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

We also have 40 students from the University of Winnipeg under Jean Pierce Lalonde. These students are actually from Quebec.

We have 32 students from Seneca College in Ontario under the direction of Mrs. Walker.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here today.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Wawanesa and District Memorial Hospital, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Wawanesa and District Memorial Hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the Honourable the Minister of Education and myself, I would like to table the Report of the Joint Ministerial Task Force on Nursing Education in Manitoba, December, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. EDWARD MCGILL, Minister of Consumer Affairs (Brandon West) introduced Bill No. 29, The Commodity Futures Act.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with Oral Questions, there was an issue raised the other day by the Member for Lac du Bonnet dealing with privileges of the House. I listened very carefully to the argument put forward by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. I also listened very carefully to the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. It is my opinion that the privileges of the House were not abrogated.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister is satisfied that the 6 percent increase in the price of retail milk to the consumer has been authorized in such a way that his department is entirely satisfied that the consumer interests have been protected?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in our struggle to control the rate of inflation in our province, we are never satisfied with the increases which are required in order to equalize the additional costs that

are being experienced in the milk industry. We feel that the Milk Board has weighed all of the evidence put before them in a manner that is reasonable and fair and the conclusion which they have announced means an increase which is difficult to accept but we feel that under the circumstances that decision was made with due consideration of all the facts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable MEMBER FR Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Consumer Affairs tell us whether he would consider it appropriate for the Department of Consumer Affairs to be present at such hearings in such a way that they and their experts could analyze the material that's being presented on behalf of those seeking the increase, so that the public would be satisfied that it is represented before the board with people as skilled at least as those who are making a case in an attempt to get an increase?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for Inkster, the board itself — we commented earlier in a previous period of questioning on this matter the board itself is constituted in a way that represents consumer as well as producer interests and we feel that there is an opportunity presented and given by that board for consumer groups to present their views. We are always interested in the activities of that board which is under the supervision of the Minister of Agriculture, as the member knows, but up to this point we have not considered it necessary or indeed a proper step for the Department of Consumer Affairs to be represented or to make representations to the board.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the presentations that are made by the people seeking the interests are usually presented not only with legal counsel but also with economists and other professional people pursuing the position, would the Minister not consider that it would be appropriate for a consumers group represented by the public representatives rather than self-appointed consumer groups to assure the public that all of the considerations relative to protecting their interests are made known to the boards of this kind which have the authority to deal with a price commodity which is vital and basic to every family in the Province of Manitoba, both wealthy and non-wealthy.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the representations that are made by consumer groups, I think, are done very carefully and very efficiently. I think it is not the function of my department to lead that representation and to take a direct and active part in it. We are interested in the results, and in the way in which these presentations are made, but, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba, and it's not common to all provinces, there is an opportunity for groups who are interested to appear before the board which has the authority and the responsibility of determining what increases, if any, will be allowed in the price of such a basic commodity as milk.

And so we feel that we are rather in the lead with respect to the opportunities and the controls that can be improved upon, in the amount of activity and input that can be made to this board by the consumer groups, as it's now being made in Manitoba.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, do I take it then that the Minister is saying that he will not consider the massing of public information material to be presented to that board in the same way as is done by the province to the Clean Environment Commission where private people also make representations, but the public lends resources to the board so that it can make its decision? Is he saying that he will not consider such a procedure?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the same request might be made of all of the other boards we have in the province and the representations that are made to them. Should the government, itself, undertake to lead the representations, and to muster and marshal the facts and the presentations that are made? Mr. Speaker, quite frankly I think it would be inappropriate for the government to adopt that role in the hearings that are to be conducted by government agencies and boards.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture on the same subject. Can the Minister confirm that he has now received from the Milk Control Board a recommendation that the government investigate means of insuring adequate supplies of milk for people on low income, expectant mothers, and senior citizens, and does he intend to act upon that recommendation and therefore can we expect that this government will now undertake to develop means for insuring that there is adequate supplies of milk for those who need it and can't afford

it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, yes I can confirm that I have that recommendation from the Milk Control Board. I'm sure that our government is very much aware of the fact that people need good nutrition, as we are well aware of the fact there are harmful things in life for individuals too.

As far as the investigation of the proposal is concerned, I am sure that, in the coming months, the increase in milk itself would indicate any hardships if there are any developing, that we will be monitoring it and be prepared to listen to any reasonable recommendations. I'm sure as far as the health aspect of it, that we have the Minister of Health who is very capable, and we will be discussing this very matter with him.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept the capability of the Minister of Health, but I'm afraid the Minister of Agriculture didn't answer the question. Does he, or his colleagues, the Minister of Consumer Affairs or the Minister of Health, intend to establish a specific group within the government to investigate how the recent increase in milk will effect the ability of those on low incomes, senior citizens, expectant mothers, to acquire that particular basic food? Will they investigate that; will they develop an alternative program to provide for support for those who need it, and can we expect a report in this House in very short order as to how they intend to go about providing that kind of program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, as the people are purchasing milk at the higher price, we will be monitoring the situation and I am sure as time proceeds if we feel there is need, and the government of the time will decide whether there is such a review set up, we will certainly inform the House and proceed with the review if we feel it is necessary.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the — perhaps the Minister of Health will answer this. Does he intend to provide a review of the present rates being paid on social assistance so that it would compensate for the increased raise in milk prices for those with families with large numbers of children? Can we expect some improvement or increase in that particular portion of their budget to respond to this major difficulty now being faced by people to get proper milk supplies?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the difficulties to which the honourable member alludes, Mr. Speaker, certainly will have to be taken into account in calculating social allowance rates, social allowance provisions, for different applicants. It's not normal of course to shape the social allowance payments around one commodity unless that one commodity is such a basic one and has gone up in price so substantially that it has an impact on the whole budget. It's certainly worth having a look at; I will certainly undertake to look at the impact the price is having on social allowance payments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Since there could have been a much higher increase in the per litre price of milk, would the Minister have accepted any price increase recommended by the board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, that question is one that is based on a hypothesis. We know what the price increase was; I have responded and I think it would be not the right place or time to respond to a hypothetical greater increase or lesser increase in the price of milk.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister appears to believe in Ghandi's passive resistance. My question next is, would the Minister be prepared to challenge or limit government price increases in a given year, so that example — VPUT A CEILING ON A PERCENTAGE INCREASE OR A LIMIT ON THE NUMBER OF PRICE INCREASES THAT COULD BE IN EFFECT IN ANY GIVEN YEAR.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be the proper time to respond when a specific

question is put in respect to a specific price in a specific situation, but to give a general answer to that is clearly not possible at this time.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister whether he or someone in his government would be prepared to consider some subsidy to consumers as a whole or to a segment of the population to make sure that the price of milk doesn't become a hardship on people who can ill afford it.\$x

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the question now relates to the nutritional qualities of milk in diets and the effect that will have upon health of those who require milk in quantities, and quite clearly that is a matter for the Department of Health to decide, and if they felt that such deficiencies existed then I'm sure the Department of Health would propose some policy for consideration by this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Perhaps the government will consider freezing the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health advise the House as to the circumstances in which an adult was held in the Youth Centre and subsequently did \$6,000 damage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker, although I thank the honourable member for having given me notice of that question and I will attempt to provide him with a report on those circumstances as quickly as possible, certainly within the next twenty-four hours.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Can the Minister advise the House as to the circumstances under which a citizen was apparently dead for four or five days in one of the Senior Citizens Homes before he was discovered?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I'm waiting for a report from my department regarding that circumstance. It's a very regrettable one. Certainly it's something that can happen in Senior Citizens Homes as large as the one at 185 Smith where there's over 300 units, but I will certainly be prepared to report to the House the circumstances and certainly if there's any circumstances that were out of line regarding it I will give the information to the House.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister is looking at the report would he ask the staff to consider whether the possibility exists that the freeze or cutbacks in staffing that the government has generally issued to all Crown agencies was not a contributing factor in this regard.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I undertook to report to the House but at this point I know of no freeze or cutback in staff that could be attributed to the unfortunate mishap at Smith Street.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister of LABOUR WHETHER THE Minimum Wage Board has met since October the 14th, and if it hasn't when it shall be convened.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): As I mentioned earlier, a couple of months ago, the people that are the members on the Minimum Wage Board felt that there wasn't too much for them to discuss when it is a matter of policy of the government, and we are reviewing the situation.

MR. FOX: Since the Minister says she's reviewing the situation, would she advise what she is reviewing and what the policy is at the present time?

MRS. PRICE: When there has been a policy we will announce it, Sir.

MR. FOX: Is the Minister indicating there is no policy in respect to minimum wage?!

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: The Minister didn't hear me, Mr. Speaker. I asked, is the Minister indicating that there is no policy in respect to minimum wage at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: The situation is under review at the present time. That's about all I can tell you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources regarding the ferry operation and the freighting operation for the communities of Bloodvein and Princess Harbour, particularly their fishing operation. As I understand it, from information from those communities, they still do not know what service will be available to them in this coming year. I wonder if the Minister could be more specific in relation to answers he's already given to the House with respect to the freight service that will be available to that fish packing station at Princess Harbour which serves both communities, Princess Harbour and Bloodvein.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'll get an up to date for the Member for Rupertsland and I'll deliver it to him tomorrow.

MR. BOSTROM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could consider giving the communities of Bloodvein and Princess Harbour an opportunity to operate the ferry service in there on their own basis similar to the administration set up for the ferry operation which is serving the community of Matheson Island in which I believe the government makes a grant to the community and it is the community's responsibility afterward to maintain a service to that community.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we've ruled out any particular options as to the running of that particular ferry and providing that service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Labour consider a 6 percent increase in the price of milk to be an item which should cause her to have the Minimum Wage Board reconvene and consider the minimum wage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Health mentioned earlier, he is going to be looking into it and we will use that as part of our discussion with considering it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour another question. Does she not consider a 6 percent increase in the price of milk sufficient reason, without consultation with the Minister of Health, to convince her to have the Minimum Wage Board to review the existing minimum wages?

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, after the Minister of Health has looked into it, the government will be checking into it and see what the feasibility is and how it relates to it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the Minister of Consumer Affairs advise me whether the Department of Information Services in his department will be facilitating requests by MLAs for the publication of their speeches and other information which would be useful to the people of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Speaker, I believe I understand the Member for Inkster's question to be whether

or not the Information Services Branch of the Department of Consumer Affairs would accept an application from an MLA to publish certain views or certain comments in relation to debates within the HOUSE. Mr. Speaker, the Information Branch, I believe, does not attempt to comment on debates within this Legislature but merely to act as an arm of government to provide information to the taxpayers about the way in which the funds of the government are being spent and the benefits that allegedly accrue from that control of the taxpayers' money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism. Can he report to the House whether the provincial parks system was opened this weekend without any hitches or any troubles and that the provincial park system is now fully operative in terms of receiving visitors and guests for the summer period?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, some of the campgrounds, as I mentioned previously, were under construction. We are doing some construction work at Falcon Lake with regard to some improvement in electrical hookups. We had certain areas where we were not charging admission yet such as up at the Paint Lake area and a few of the other areas which will be coming onstream in the beginning of June for July and August. Other than that, I understand from departmental officials that the facilities were very well used and in very many areas we had to turn people away.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the government's strong interest in the issue of user fees, could the Minister tell us why it was that several of the admission areas to the provincial parks, particularly those in the Whiteshell, were totally unmanned, no admissions were being charged. Had the government declared a particular holiday for users of parks this weekend that was unannounced or was there just simply a bungling in the department so that there was nobody at the gates to receive visitors at that time?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in checking some of the areas where we were charging particular admission, whether it be at Moose Lake, Asessippi and some other areas, we found out that it was costing us more to man those particular stations than we were getting in in revenue. As a result, there are certain parks where we will not be charging park entrance fees. The heavily used park areas, such as Falcon, West Hawk, and other areas, will again be manned and I assure the member there will be people there collecting money for the day use as well as seasonal users.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to announce exactly which those are that people will be allowed free admission and could he also indicate whether in fact the decals that provide for seasonal or monthly passes to the parks are now ready and are being distributed at those areas where there is some manning taking place of the admission gates. Thirdly, would he be able to tell us whether the fact that there was nobody at several admission gates to the Whiteshell indicates that the Whiteshell Park is no longer heavily used.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that the decals especially to those people having cottage lots in the Whiteshell area will be mailed out along with the request for payment for the lease usage and again the cost of that particular decal has been included as it has been in a number of other years in the cost of the lease.

With regard to the several booths not being manned, I would appreciate it if the member would advise me either here or outside the House and I can check into that particular matter. I know that most of the locations that I was advised would be manned were manned and if there is any further information, I'd be pleased to get it from the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the fact that over a week has transpired since the closing date for the call for tenders for the sale of Morden Fine Foods, could the Minister now advise the House as to the successful bidder, if we want to call him that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was advised about a week ago and I understand there were some

ads in the paper accordingly that the extension for particular proposals with regards to Morden Fine Foods was extended to the 23rd, which is today, and I haven't got any information from the MDC with regard to that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did have a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs but you recognized another member — with regard to Information Services. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister whether he consider the publication of press conferences in which Ministers extol the virtues of legislation and the benefit of legislation being presented by them is not the publication and the dissemination of political information as distinct from administrative information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the Information Services policy is to reflect the positions of government, to give as much information as possible of a factual nature to the people of Manitoba in order that they will be fully informed. And I might further tell the Member for Inkster that with respect to his earlier question as to whether or not opposition members would have the opportunity to avail themselves of that medium, no change in the present policy of the government in the operation of Information Services is presently contemplated.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister, is he aware of any opposition member requesting the services of Information Services as part of some pre-existing policy, because I'm not.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure that I understand the member's question. Would he place that again?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicates the policy has not been changed. Is he aware of a pre-existing policy where an MLA made a request for the dissemination of information and the policy was to refuse it?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, if the member is referring to a previous request from a member, meaning in past years, I'm not aware of any such request having been made nor of the disposition of that request at the time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House why the restraint policy, which has limited increases in budget to a suggested between 3 percent and 4 percent, has not been applied to Public Information Services where the budget for salaries has gone up by more than 20 percent?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster is now clearly into a problem that should be brought up under the consideration of the Estimates of the department. I would hope that we would reach that stage relatively soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Can the Honourable Minister indicate to the House what actions he is taking to ensure the continuation of the Thompson Mental Health Unit?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. SPEAKER, THE Thompson Mental Health Unit remains in the same position, in terms of the approach and attitude of the government, that it has been in in the past. There are some immediate problems that my department officials and I are looking at; if the honourable member is referring to long-range policy or long-range approaches there is no change and we can certainly examine that in detail on my Estimates.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister then undertake to meet with the staff at the Thompson Mental Health Unit and discuss their concerns in regard to a lack of what they perceive to be clear policies, and also to allay their fears as resulting from their interpretation of the Task Force Report? -

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I certainly would undertake to be in very close communication with them,

Mr. Speaker. I can't say that I can meet with them in Thompson during the course of the study of my Estimates. If they have any intention of sending a group or a spokesman down here I will certainly meet with them; failing that I would be happy on my next trip into the north, which I'm looking forward to, to meet with them in Thompson as soon as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and various of his colleagues decide that they can let me out of my Estimates review.

MR. COWAN: A related question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate when the vacancy created many weeks ago by the transfer of the social worker from the community of Lynn Lake will be filled, and if that filling is not perceived to be in the near future will he consider re-opening the Lynn Lake Counselling and Resource Centre to fill the gap created by the transfer of that social worker?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I can't give the honourable member a specific date on that, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if we could examine that in more depth and detail during my Estimates process? There is no specific date I can give him at this juncture; I would appreciate his views on the situation in Lynn Lake vis-a-vis the Lynn Lake Counselling Centre; there was a rationale for making the change that was made which appeared to be justifiable. If the Honourable Member for Churchill feels it isn't justifiable, or there are other perspectives that should be brought to bear, I would certainly like to discuss that with him in the Estimates process.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. It refers to the decals that are sent out to those people having cottages in provincial parks, insomuch as in previous years the decals had been sent out about a month before the opening of the season, can the Minister explain what the delay has been this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the matter of getting the decals out was delayed to a certain extent because of the adjustment of the fees; they had to be gazetted and there was a little bit of a delay and I think most of the people that were out at their cottages were made aware of that and that the bills will be coming out very shortly; hopefully this week.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister inform the House whether there will be increases in the leases this year, and if so, by how much?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the schedule that has been released, there is an order-in-council that was passed. It varies from whether you're front tier lot or back tier lot and I could supply the member with that particular information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Is it the intention of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to sell 40 acres of land in the city of Brandon known as the Williamson property?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East has asked me a couple of times regarding the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation land in Brandon. The Housing Corporation and the board of the Housing Corporation have been looking at all of the land that is owned by the corporation. The Brandon property that he is speaking of is under consideration; I have not got a recommendation from them as yet but I know it's being studied.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Given the objectives of land banking, which I believe the Honourable Minister is familiar with, can the Minister advise what is the reason for looking at the question of disposing of such property in the city of Brandon?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the objection of land banking is far different on this side of the House than it is on the other side of the House, I assure you. The property that the honourable member is speaking of will have houses on it. Now, further than that, whether they're built by house

builders; whether they're built by government or whether they're built by who, they will have houses on it.

MR. EVANS: But Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get a clarification from the Honourable Minister. I'm sure at some time there may be houses on property that exists within a city boundary, but is the Minister telling us that it is likely that this land will be disposed of by Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and that therefore MHRC will have no influence, for example, on trying to alleviate the accelerating prices of new housing in that city?

MR. JOHNSTON: I've explained to the Minister before that MHRC has never had any influence on holding prices down as far as housing in Manitoba, and I know the Member for Seven Oaks will probably disagree with me on that. I have offered to give him an answer very soon on one piece of property on his constituency.

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member chooses to place his words like, is the Minister, or is the Corporation "likely" to do something by putting words in my mouth, I don't intend to answer it that way. He will have a report on what will happen to that land when it's decided by MHRC.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Did he apply the same principles of business sense and business management to Morden Fine Foods as he did to the Lord Selkirk, that is to say, did he as he did in the case of the Lord Selkirk cancel the bookings; did he similarly cancel orders for the purchase of vegetables by Morden Fine Foods for the producers and orders for the sale of the canned products to whoever the purchasers maybe?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that question because I would like to tell the members that the Once Upon a Time products that are being manufactured by Morden Fine Foods are still available for sale and hopefully will continue to be once we find a suitable buyer. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the company is continuing. They have contracted for this year's growing season and will be canning their fine products again in the months to come.

ORDERS OF THE DAY ORDER FOR RETURN

ORDER NO. 56: On Motion of Mr. Fox.

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information:

1. Since October 24, 1977 to May 17, 1978 how many trips have been made on official government of Manitoba business by Ministers; Deputy Ministers; and Assistant Deputy Ministers out of province and overnight or extended trips within the province broken down by departments,
2. The names of accompanying individuals on each trip made.
3. The destination of each trip.
4. The nature of the official business of each trip.
5. The total cost of travelling for each trip.
6. The other expenses relating to each trip.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): We accept the order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and Social Development and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Executive Council.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Committee come to order. We have a quorum now. Some

were mentioning prior to the commencement of the Committee, did I still have my list from last week — I do, and the list reads as follows: the Member for St. Johns followed by the Members for Burrows, St. Vital, Inkster and the Minister of Finance. That's the way it was left at 5.00 p.m. on Thursday and then we sat Thursday evening and then Committee rose almost moments after sitting. The Member for St. Johns is first.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm continuing from where I left off at 5.30 on Thursday afternoon. I was speaking and we adjourned at 5:30 in order for me to resume at 8:00. I want to draw to your attention firstly that at 8:00 o'clock — we didn't meet at 8:00 o'clock, the Committee was late in forming a quorum. But for some peculiar reason, although the record doesn't show that, the Minister of Finance spoke and moved a motion. According to the record he wasn't even recognized, but the record shows that he spoke. You, Mr. Chairman, indicated the same order of speakers as you've just indicated now, but the Minister of Finance is recorded to have spoken so, if you take that in a sense of criticism of your chairmanship, I guess you may be right in assuming that, but I wonder that the Minister of Finance could speak when indeed I was still in full flight of my oratory.

Secondly — I'm glad the Minister of Finance has come in — I think he ought to know, he's been around this Legislature for quite a long time, that no one really has a right to just walk in and say, "We are not meeting."

There are two ways I know of that a legislative Committee does not meet: one is by agreement — by the courtesy of the House Leaders talking to each other and agreeing, for whatever reason, that a Committee will not meet or will not continue to meet, and the other way is to have the Committee meet and then, if there is a reason and it doesn't even have to be a good one, if there is a reason for the Committee to cease meeting then the motion to rise is an order.

But for someone, even though he is the acting Premier, to walk into one Committee and announce that because of a conflict in Committee meetings which wasn't really true' only one Committee will sit is a little bit arrogant, Mr. Chairman. I think it would have been a matter of common courtesy to either clear it in advance, or clear it at the time, as is often done between House Leaders, or to come into the Committee which was destined to sit and tell them, rather than leaving members in this room just sitting and twiddling their thumbs which was the situation.

Mr. Chairman, this is not terribly serious but I think that the acting Premier should know that when there's a Committee of the Legislature due to meet he doesn't control its operations except by the weight of the majority which he swings. He then came in and did it the correct way — one of the two correct ways.

MR. CRAIK: Are you arguing on a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, not really. Not really. For the benefit of the members of the Committee I read off the five names of persons that I had listed from Thursday afternoon last. The Member for St. Johns was first and he's just addressing the Committee in that manner, not on a point of privilege or order or anything.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I think it does become a point of order then, Mr. Chairman, because of the nature of . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I did not raise a point of order.

MR. CRAIK: No, well, I'm raising a point of order then because it becomes a point of order when it's raised . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance on a point of order.

MR. CRAIK: . . . in that manner. I think Mr. Cherniack realizes that a motion to adjourn is in order at any time and that is what transpired. It was commented on in the Main Chamber prior to coming into this Chamber and then it was followed up by coming into this Chamber and of course doing it formally.

I realize that Mr. Cherniack and some members that are on this committee were not in the Main Chamber and probably had come directly here. It was the intent to do it whichever was the proper way, and having done it both ways I thought we had covered off properly as the situation existed. I'm sure that you will find that in the past many motions to rise have been placed at the discretion of the Government House Leader or whoever the person was that decided to do it in the days of the former government as well, so I don't want to let the matter go by without raising a point of order that a motion to rise is in order at any time and that's exactly what took place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if I can, as Chairman, comment to the members of the committee, I accept

the Member for St. Johns as constructive criticism but the Minister of Finance put a motion that the committee rise. I was instructed by the Clerk that it's a non-debatable motion and therefore we called for the numbers on the vote and the vote carried so the committee rose. As the Member for St. Johns has said, I have in the past tried to follow my listing of speakers as they are written down, as I write them down, and try to follow it most times but the Minister of Finance did interject the other evening with a non-debatable motion and I did recognize him.

The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACC: Mr. Chairman, I stand to be corrected and really I do stand to be corrected, I was under the impression that a motion to adjourn is in order at any time but not so as to interrupt the speaker and, you know, when I had the floor, and that's the only point I make. I don't question firstly, that a motion to adjourn is in order at any time; secondly, that it's not debatable. I don't question that. But I stand to be corrected in my impression that you cannot interrupt a speaker with a motion to adjourn. That was really the point I made.

The fact is that Mr. Craik would have had no problem, really no problem, had he spoken to the House Leader or to anyone else on our side in advance and said, "Hey fellows, we goofed; we made a mistake and le're sorry but we don't want to go on." I think there would not have been a problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: I repeat, Mr. Chairman bfore we came in here.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, it was done not saying, "Hey, we goofed. Is it okay if we don't go ahead?" — but rather a decision was made that we are not proceeding because of a mix-up in committees. I still say there was no mix-up in committees; there was a mix-up in the planning of the government as far as holding a Cabinet meeting is concerned, and I assume it was urgent and necessary and I've no objection, Mr. Chairman. I'm not walking out for any reason other than that apparently I have an appointment for which someone has come to see me. -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows is the next speaker on the list. The Member for St. Vital on a point of order.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, one evening last week when we adjourned, it had been brought to your attention, Citation 242 of Beausheune dealing with an amendment or a motion that you had accepted that evening. As I recall, when we adjourned you had taken it under advisement. I would ask you if you have had time to consider it and if you have anything to announce to us at this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I haven't, to the Member for St. Vital, at this time. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. During the meetings that the Committee of Supply has had dealing with the salary of the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force on Government Re-Organization and Economy, we have heard the Minister state that the Task Force is quite at liberty to state its impressions, observations, as perceived by it, and if anyone disagrees with the Task Force, well, they re quite free to disprove the statements, the allegations, conclusions, formulated by the Task Force. I suppose I can perhaps appreciate that a bit more today than I did last week after hearing a colleague of his, the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, make a similar comment in the House that on the basis of whatever — he had made certain assumptions about the performance of the previous government or one of its Ministers.

Anyway, that's the position of this Minister, these are our conclusions; anybody disagrees, disprove them; prove that they're wrong. And all throughout the debate, Mr. Chairman, in this Committee, and comments made by the Minister outside the House, we've heard him talk about lack of control by the previous government, stating that the Ministers had no knowledge of the financial position of their department as they proceeded through each fiscal year. There was a lack of direction; waste, leakage, mismanagement, and so forth. And we heard comment made that somehow or another the Task Force, or somebody on the Task Force — perhaps the co-chairman, this co-chairman of the Task Force T had discovered that the Premier had taken one week to review the Estimates of all the departments of government and on that basis —(Interjection)— yes, on that basis gave his approval to the Estimates of Expenditure for that particular fiscal year.

Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, as well as all of us know, that the Minister really had brought

no evidence to back up those charges that he made. In fact, Mr. Chairman, those charges and others of a similar kind have at this point in time been proven false by his own colleagues. So really, if he's looking to us to disprove his charges, they have already been disproven by his own colleagues, certainly in the departments of which the Estimates have already been considered by the Committee of Supply, because every Minister had been asked whether he had, upon assuming office, whether he had discovered, identified any waste, lack of control, leakage, mismanagement, and the answer was in the negative from every Minister. We've completed approximately half, perhaps a bit over half the departments, so by that number of Ministers, which likely at this point in time is a majority of them, comments of this kind made by the Minister without Portfolio whose salary we're now debating, they have been disproven. So by this Minister's own rules, the ball is back in his court so he ought to, if he were to read Hansard he will find that many of the charges and accusations that he's made have been disproven by his own colleagues and if he still feels that he's right, then, as I've said a moment ago, the ball is back in his court and he will have to come up with some stronger evidence — I shouldn't say stronger evidence because he's come up with none at all. He'll have to come up with some evidence to back up the statements that he's made.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate of the Minister's salary we may have lost track of the fact that he was not the chairman of the Task Force but he was one of the two co-chairmen of the Task Force. I don't really know what the division of responsibility was, if there was any division of responsibility, between the two co-chairmen. Were they jointly and severally responsible for the entire operations of the Task Force or was there some division of responsibility that Mr. Riley from the private sector was responsible for certain areas of activity and the member of Cabinet and the member of the Legislature being the other co-chairman responsible for some other area of activity. That, Mr. Chairman, we don't know and perhaps the Minister ought to comment on that.

I think today it's even more important that he do so than it may have been before, particularly in the light of the interview with Mr. Riley, it was published in one of the daily newspapers last Saturday. My impression on reading this story — this is my impression, I think that I have just as much right to state my impressions of a newspaper publication as the Task Force has to state its impressions of the operation of government, my impression of the newspaper story was that Mr. Riley was called in to head up the Task Force, to make his recommendations, whatever recommendations he chose to make, but maintain a low profile, and that the elected member was appointed to co-chair the Task Force, the Minister without Portfolio, that he take the political criticism for it and not Mr. Riley. I can assure the Honourable Minister that all that there will be will be criticism because there won't be any praise.

Up to this point in time, what have we heard the Ministers of line departments say? Most of the Ministers at some point or another during the consideration of their Estimates have indicated that, well there is evidence that some of the recommendations made by the Task Force have already been implemented or are on their way to implementation by the line departments. So, therefore, what's the purpose of a Task Force, that's already been done. Some Ministers have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that other recommendations are unlikely to be implemented by the Ministers at any time so therefore it's quite unlikely, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister will come out of this exercise a hero, as an architect of a more efficient and a more effective *modus operandi* for government. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would suspect that when the day comes in his Cabinet or in his leader's Cabinet that it will come to a parting of ways. The situation could conceivably come about that his leader will say to him, look, you recommended nothing new because much of what you had recommended my other Ministers have already commenced implementation prior to the make of the recommendations. You attempted to take credit for what the Ministers are already doing and any new recommendations that you made, Mr. Chairman, he will say the administrators of the line departments aren't accepting them anyway. So, on that point, they could conceivably, and quite likely, part company.

I suppose originally quite a different scenario was envisaged. I would suspect that it was originally intended that the Task Force exercise contribute toward or lead toward a reduction in the Civil Service and that the Minister will be the hatchetman to do that job, that he will take the blame for it. But that, Mr. Chairman, hasn't happened because the Civil Service has not been reduced all that much. There has been some reorganization, reclassification, but I doubt very much whether by the time the end of the fiscal year rolls around that we will see the type of reduction in Civil Service that the Minister talks about now. In some areas where there has been a reduction in the Civil Service it's the Ministers of the line departments that were held accountable for it and they have to take the flack for it and not the Minister responsible for the Task Force. So, therefore,

Mr. Chairman, I think that the title ascribed to this exercise by my colleague, the Member for Inkster, is quite correct that this is nothing more than a task farce.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I must state for the record that there was no evidence in the report on which the conclusions and the recommendations contained therein are based, no appendix indicating the data that the Task Force had accumulated and said, "Well, here's the state of affairs as we found them, and on the basis of this, these are the recommendations that we're making." An example I can give you of that, Mr. Chairman, is in, I think it's in Volume II of the Task Force — and I would not want you to rule me out of order, I don't want to debate this at this time, I'm merely giving this as an example — there's a statement made to the effect that the financing of public school education is chaotic. Well, Mr. Chairman, we note that the present Minister of Education is continuing basically, essentially the same formulae for the funding of education. He may have beefed them up to cope with inflation; he may have introduced some slight variations but basically and essentially the same basic formulae are continued.

So, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that if in fact the government believed what one of its Ministers said in his report, or which he claims to be his report, that the financing of public school education is chaotic, that surely that would be one of the first things that this government would want to correct and say, "Well, these are the formulae that were previously in effect. We're scrapping those and we're establishing new ones."

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, there was no attempt at any overall integrated or interrelated review of government programs and of government operations. For example, I really wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether in reviewing the education program, the review teams consulted with Northern Affairs because, after all, whatever is done in the education program, in the education departments, certainly would be of concern and interest to what is happening in the Department of Northern Affairs. I doubt very much whether the education review team consulted with the review team doing a review of the agricultural programs. You know, it made a recommendation that the future of Assiniboine Community College be closely examined. Well, Assiniboine Community College, Mr. Chairman, as you probably now, offers a number of agricultural programs. Now surely one would think that the education review team would want to obtain the views of the agricultural review team on that particular point at least or with Tourism, Industry and Commerce and so forth. I don't think that that type of dialogue took place.

MR. SPIVAK: You don't know, though, you don't know.

MR. HANUSCHAK: We don't know.

MR. SPIVAK: No, but you don't think.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I don't think and I assume that it doesn't.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, I see.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I assume that it doesn't.

MR. SPIVAK: Okay.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'll indicate again, Mr. Chairman, in fact, I will come in a minute or two to something that is, I think, a bit more conclusive than an assumption.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, that each review chairman went into his corner, did his job, didn't compare notes with anyone and, as I've said, the Minister interjected by saying that I don't know whether this in fact happened or didn't happen or I don't think that it happened or didn't happen. Well, Mr. Chairman, you will recall that some time ago, during one of the debates in the House, I read into the record a letter which I had received from Mr. Runciman who headed the Agriculture review team in which he admitted that at no time had he any consultation with, or met with, Mr. Fulcher who chaired the Education review team. That was by his own admission, Mr. Chairman, that's not just merely my assumption as the Minister goes upon. The Minister wasn't in the Cabinet room at any time while we were government but somehow he was able to formulate an assumption that the premier took one week to review the Estimates, but this is not an assumption, Mr. Chairman, I'm making this statement on the basis of a letter to which I had referred and which was tabled in the House, which I had received from the chairman of the Agriculture review team.

Then, Mr. Chairman, as further evidence of the unlikelihood of that type of dialogue having taken

place, at a key point in time, approaching the middle of March, about the 10th of March, at which time I would have thought that the review teams' recommendations would be in their final stages of tidying up and pulling together loose ends for presentation to the Minister co-responsible for the Task Force, that the chairmen of the review teams would have been very much involved. Lo and behold, I have discovered that three of the chairmen of the review teams were out of the province at a key point in time, the beginning of March throughout the practically the balance of the month of March — Mr. Benham until about the 21st of March was out of the province; Mr. Jones until the end of March; — I'm sorry, I don't have the name of the chairman before me — it's the president of one of the insurance companies, Monarch Life; and Mr. Runciman was away in Geneva until early April, at that key point in time, Mr. Chairman. So there were no review committee chairmen to hold that type of dialogue amongst themselves.

The third point, Mr. Chairman, in addition to there not being any overall integrated or interrelated review, there was no consultation with the consumers of the programs and there again, Mr. Chairman, we know that. It's not that I think that or that some of the members of this committee think that, but we know that, that was the main complaint made by the Manitoba Teachers' Society about the Task Force Report, that there was no consultation with them. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you that there was no consultation with the teachers, or the trustees, nor people in the north, nor the farmers, nor the hospitals, nor with anyone.

Of course, the Minister uses as an excuse that, well, they were pressed for time, the shortness of time, they wanted to report back as quickly as possible, the Task Force was established in mid-November, or thereabouts, and they wanted to come back with a report as quickly as possible. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you that either you do a job properly or you don't do it at all. You know, Mr. Chairman, there's the future of a million people at stake here that can be affected by whatever is contained within the Task Force Report, so simply rushing through the whole thing in the manner in which the Task Force did once again demonstrates the disregard of this government for the welfare of the people of Manitoba. Everything was done on the basis of an immediate cost-benefit analysis. If whatever is being done today, if it can be demonstrated that it is to your advantage rather than to the government's advantage from a financial point of view today, fine, that's what we do. But no long-range view of programs, programs that may be somewhat more costly today but they may pay dividends over a period of 5 years, 10 years, over 20 years, that type of thing was disregarded. Either they've got to pay their own way today or else they're scrapped.

So, Mr. Chairman, it indicates that the recommendations that were brought in of whatever kind, that there was one main overriding objective to them and that is the concern of this Minister of the government about their own political survival at whatever cost, at whatever cost to the people of the province. Never mind the long-range implications of programs. If it should appear that the program would generate some appeal, some attraction to the public over the next while, hopefully until the next election, that's what will be recommended regardless of whether it's good or bad for the people but as long as in their opinion they would hope that it will get them re-elected to government.

My last concern, Mr. Chairman, and this is something that I would want to give you, as Chairman, notice of at this particular time because I'm not quite sure how we would handle it. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that some member of the committee may want to move a motion that this Minister's salary be reduced to \$1.00 and you will note, Mr. Chairman, in the Estimates that there is only one line for the salaries of the three Ministers without Portfolio showing 3 x 15.6 whatever that comes to — \$46,800.00. And that line in the Estimates' Book doesn't give us an opportunity to identify any of the three Ministers individually. Now, I suppose, one could move a motion that the salaries of the Ministers without Portfolio be reduced to \$33,201 and hopefully that whoever signs the check cheque will pay the \$15,600 apiece to the other two Ministers and reduce this Minister's salary to \$1.00 but unfortunately I don't sign the cheques and the rest of us over here, many of us here, don't sign the cheques.

MR. SPIVAK: Not unfortunately, fortunately.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Now, it may be that whoever signs the cheques may choose to pay this Minister's full indemnity of \$15,600 and reduce the salary of one of his colleagues Ministers without Portfolio to \$1.00 and I wouldn't want to see that happen, Mr. Chairman. So it would seem that the only alternative that we may have is that the three Ministers without Portfolio may have to stand or fall as a group and reduce the salaries of all of them to \$1.00 and then that problem that I've indicated

a moment ago will not arise. Then they all stand or fall, either all receive their full indemnity or have their salaries reduced. This, I would not want to see happen because, well, insofar as the . . . Well, no, I don't know, because it may be that when we come to deal with the salary of the Minister responsible for MHRC, we may also want to reduce his salary to \$1.00, so that will make it two. The House Leader, I can think of no reason at the moment why I would want to reduce his salary to \$1.00 so it will still leave that problem with us.

But, nevertheless, I think that the simplest way may be that the three of them stand or fall as a group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPIVAK: You've got a problem there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess, to the Member for Burrows, I'll have to handle that one when it's presented to me.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital is next on the list.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had one comment or question on Chapter IV. If any of the members of the committee wish to deal with Chapters I to III, I will defer until we get to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for St. Vital, we're discussing the Minister's salary and so we're just discussing the report in general and no one has given me, from the committee, direction as to whether they were wanting to go in general terms or page by page so I've assumed from the outset that we are discussing his salary and any pertinent parts of the report that you or other members wish to discuss. We're sort of discussing it in general terms.

The Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I'm wondering if it would be wise to attempt to at least clear up any questions that there might be on the early part of the report, at least in Volume I before proceeding into Volume II if we shouldn't have some sequence of movement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm the servant of the committee, so . . .

MR. SPIVAK: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that there was never any, and there's been some misunderstanding of this because of the press reports . . . This report is not here for adoption by the committee. This report is related to the work that I've done in which my salary is open to question. This report can be discussed in relation to salary in whatever form the members in the opposition and the members of the government want to, and that's all. It's not a page by page or chapter by chapter item and we should make it clear so that there should be no problem with that .

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, that's right, no problem. Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly there's nothing to make clear because certainly we understand that to be the case. I'm just wondering, in order to assist you, if it would not be better that we deal in some orderly fashion rather than skipping from front to back and then from back to front. That was the only purpose of my suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How we deal with the report is really up to the committee at large as to which way they feel is the most favourable way of doing it. To date we have been dealing with it in very general terms because the real thing in question is the passage of a Minister's salary rather than the adoption of a report but the Minister happens to be responsible to a degree for this report so therefore that's the item that you can discuss the report in is under his salary.

The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Well, to the same point, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to deal with one specific page in Chapter IV and if members were still discussing the generality or the introduction background or methodology in the first three chapters, I would defer to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for St. Vital, I have no objection when a speaker is recognized, that he can deal with any aspect of the report he wishes with the Minister responsible.

MR. WALDING: Very well then, Mr. Chairman, I'll refer the Minister to Page 19 of the

first part of the report where there is a graph. Graph III is listed and I note that there is no vertical scale to the graph which makes it practically meaningless. It shows the two lines ascending at approximately 45 degrees. Since there is no scale there it becomes meaningless. Whatever scale is proposed or suggested can show the graph ascending at any rate whatsoever, which seems a pretty sloppy, a misleading graph to presumably make a particular point to people. It says at the bottom that the source is Tables 1 and 2, and I suppose by reading the text that maybe something could be inferred as to what the graph in fact refers to.

However, more seriously than that, it says at the top, the heading for the graph, as Gross Provincial Product and Manitoba Provincial Government Expenditures. And referring back to the graph, Graph No. II shows the total expenditures; Graph I shows the total expenditures as a share of Gross National Product, Gross Provincial Product. So I'm really not sure how Graph III, which shows Gross Provincial Product, is derived from Graph I. What the graph would show, Mr. Chairman, to anyone just looking at it and taking the heading as being truthful and accurate, it would show that back in 1967 Manitoba Government Expenditures were equal to the Gross Provincial Product, and since that time that government expenditures have been rising at a rate faster and in excess of Gross Provincial Product. Now, that is patently false and misleading, Mr. Chairman. I suspect, well, it's obvious that the two were not equal at 1967, and if the people who had drafted this really wanted to show those two in relation to each other, they would certainly have shown those two lines on that graph as being separated by a very large amount.

To look at Graph III and find how misleading it is, and it's so sloppy as not to have a vertical scale on it, really makes me doubt the accuracy of anything else that I would see in here. I would like to hear from the Minister just what the explanation of this is and whether it was meant to be misleading or whether there is some error, or just simple sloppiness in it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The list that I initially started with had two more speakers that I have indicated earlier that wished to speak and neither of them are present; that's the Member for Inkster and the Minister of Finance. Is there anyone else that wishes to go? The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I had a few points that I wanted to question the Minister on. Again, on the notion of zero-base budgeting, this to me is sort of a trendy concept that the Minister is promoting and we know that he likes to be with it and to present us with the latest techniques of management, but I am wondering how useful this really is. I wanted to ask the Minister if he could explain how this would work in fact rather than in theory. Let us say, for example, that the Department of Education was appearing at Estimates time in the Cabinet room to make its case. I gather, if I read the report correctly and I read the press releases built around the Task Force, that the Minister would expect the Minister of Education to come in with his senior staff and argue from square one on the need for funds and the need for staff, so that we would find ourselves in the ridiculous situation of the Minister of Education, for example, arguing on the need for an elementary education system.

So it strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that one of two things would happen, that you either get the ridiculous situation of every Minister trying to justify his very reason for existence — like, in this case, the Minister of Education saying "There shall be, should be, would be desirable if there was an elementary education system," and then thinking of arguments to back that up. Now then we would go to the following year, and I'm just wondering in the second year whether the Minister would require new and forceful arguments, or whether he would accept photostated copies of last year's submissions. In other words, how would it work in application? Do you just simply have people coming, thinking of novel arguments to justify a program that's been in existence for a hundred years, or do you have a staff coming in and throwing down huge quantities of photostated material saying, "Well, this is what we said before, and really there's nothing to add, so if you'd read the material, or if you would access your files from last year you would see why, *raison d'être* of this particular program."

So I'm asking the Minister, how would this work in fact? It strikes me as great in theory, if it's great in theory, but in practical application, ridiculous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister responsible for the Task Force.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I think that's a valid question and one that should be discussed, but one has to understand, in the perspective of the approach of the Task Force dealing with the whole question of government control and the management information system, the basic thesis that managers should be given clear responsibility for carrying out their tasks — and I refer to Page 39, "Managers be given authority over the resources necessary to accomplish the task; A fair and

equitable method of evaluating task performance should be established and used to assess management performance; that Managers be held accountable by their superiors." Now, that's on Page 39.

Now, I've indicated that there is a need for a management information system which will deal both with financial accountability and program accountability, and we have indicated on Page 43 with respect to the report that Manitoba should move towards a system of financial control which has come to be known as zero-base budgeting. And this is something that must be individually designed for the government; it must be conceived in co-operation with the various managers of the departments and with those who have been involved to a large extent in the auditing of programs, and it must be accompanied by a training program within the government. And that's why something cannot be just introduced just as a matter of practice, nor can you substitute one thing for the other.

The traditional systems of accounting are based on legal requirements rather than the information which managers need. The traditional systems do not provide bases for evaluating discretionary overheads, advertising, research, accounting, office administration. Where the benefit is worth the cost, in which there is really a requirement for a performance yardstick, I have to go back to the basic theory of government. We are not an employment agency; we are here to service the people; we are not an agency which is supposed to simply buy supplies from those who produce supplies in the province. Our purpose is to serve the people in those programs which are necessary for government, in those situations where those who are in need require our assistance. And the measure of what we do has to be based on our ability to perform, and those performance yardsticks have to be established and they have to be established in a way that there can be a continual monitoring. There is a requirement annually, for those who are the managers, once the authority has been given and once the information systems are set up, to be able to come back, as they have to come back, and deal with their budgets and start from zero, start basically right from the beginning and go through it to be able to prove that the targeted group of people whom they were supposed to deal with had in fact been met; that the programs had met the budgetary requirements of the previous years, or if they didn't, the reasons why they didn't; that they in turn are able to justify the inputs of the dollars that are required against the measurement of the outputs of the services that have in fact been provided.

Now, the traditional systems are unsatisfactory in assessing non-capitalized development costs, Research and development and program development and this is also very much a part of it. We have to have, as I say, the value of all the expenses against a yardstick so that when you go through the transitional period of going to zero-base budgeting which is really what you're talking about, how we will do it if we proceed with this. What we're really talking about if this is accepted is a transitional period in which there is both training and a requirement for the development of the yardsticks that are necessary and for the development of the management information system which is basic as to whether you can continue on with a zero-base program.

I suggest to you that that management information system is basic to government being able to operate in the future. There is no way in which governments are going to be able to realize the amount of moneys from the public just by general increase in taxes without indicating in a very direct manner that they are efficient in what they are doing, that they know what they're doing and they have the capacity to make the relevant decisions based on correct information. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre is not here and he is correct when I said valid information, it's correct information on which you make valid deductions and valid conclusions and that's what has to be done. Correct information upon which valid conclusions are made.

The whole object of zero-base budgeting is to identify the minimum level of service which is necessary to achieve whatever the purpose is. Now, once you go through that transitional period, you hopefully will be able to suggest that because you have to employ analysis techniques to provide for the decision makers the opportunity for knowing what the minimum levels of service are and for being able to recognize and determine the prioritized package of options that can be available because those options have to be understood, they have to be clearly identified and they have to be quantified to be able to be understood in terms of the approach that's being made. The following year when the person comes back and starts from base zero on the program, they're in a position to be able to make an assessment on the basis of the quantifications that were indicated and in effect on the monitoring of the program through the information services and the determination of the targeted group who are supposed to be serviced and whether they have been serviced and whether the costs related to this are correct or not and the discretionary costs that are referred to have in fact been applied correctly. Because, Mr. Chairman, I think I can say this, that there are many programs of government in which the dollars involved and the people who are targeted

to be received have an administrative cost and have less numbers of people than other significant programs which have less money that is put out with a smaller targeted group but, for some reason or other, the bureaucracy itself has built up and all the things that are attendant with it.

The managers, in assembling the decision packages, have to address questions such as the consequences of eliminating particular programs and the means by which objectives may be achieved at less cost because that is the motive, to be able to try and achieve the objectives at less cost, again coming back to the objective of government. The package must be developed with various levels of funding and with performance measures already formulated and then after the years of experience, you have the basis on which decisions have to be made.

The individual increments that are prepared in each package by the various managers who, again, as I've told you, have now been given the authority once the budget is approved to manage without having to go back for the complete procedure of the checks and balances that now exist within the system. Once that has been done, they have to, in their preparation for the following year, be able to have the prioritization of their increments based on several possibilities, one of which there may be no more money; there may be less money or there may be more money. That will really be dependent on the economic conditions, the revenue conditions and on the realities of the time.

Again, zero-base budgeting must be individually designed for the government. It will have to be dealt with in co-operation with all the managers in the government itself and it has to be accompanied by a training program as I suggested. It would mean those who are responsible would come in with their program, would be able to produce that information, that information would be quantified, the targeted group would be set, there would be an information system that would present information to the treasury committee on a monthly and on a quarterly basis, and on a yearly basis, which would indicate whether in fact in a financial and program accountability way, they have in fact been met, at which point the assessment then could be very easily made that the program is capable of being continued or must be modified as a result of the information that one has. If, during the course of the year, the revenue picture changes and there is either less money or more money, the government of the day will know where to put that money if they have more money; they will know where to stop expenditure of money if they have less money. So therefore in budgeting for the next year, based on the anticipated revenues there will be a basis on which to make judgments. Programs which cannot support the rigorous tests that will be required would not be continued on the basis that either there is something lacking, either the financial information isn't correct, the targeted group haven't been reached, an alteration is taking place on the assumptions that were responsible for that program or possibly those who have been responsible for managing it, have not managed it as capably as they could. So for that reason there will be an alteration in program and in some cases a discontinuation.

I think that governments have to put themselves through this test as business has to be put through the test. So, although zero-base budgeting is a terminology like sunset provisions are terminologies which become sort of the jargon of those who are in the consulting field at this particular time, from a point of view of the government of this size dealing as it has to in the prioritization of decisions with limits, I think, to the kinds of revenues it can expect in the next little while, with the reduction in the amounts of money that will be available in terms of cost-sharing commitments, some of which are going to rise substantially in the next period of time, there is a need for the kind of technique to be adopted that is referred to in the report and that I've tried to describe in terms of zero-base budgeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister outlines with great vigour a concept and it just strikes me that this kind of an approach may have some validity where one is producing a product like peanut butter, jars of peanut butter, or spark plugs or some other commodity where you can measure the quantity, you can measure your output, you can measure your profits, you can gauge the market, etc. But I'm not sure that these marvelous techniques which he's placing such great faith in can be effective in terms of government because of the fact that you're providing in most cases services. I think it's been proven time and time again that although business experience is valuable, like any other experience, having run a company, having been a manager, is helpful in being in government, it does not ensure the fact that a person will be a competent or capable political leader. In fact there's all sorts of examples that would prove the opposite of that.

I'm saying to the Minister again, I ask him this question once more, I want him to tell me what he expects to hear when the Minister of Education comes into the room and sits down opposite

him sometime next fall or late in the year and starts describing what he's going to produce. I mean, I assume he's going to say, "We're going to produce sound little minds in sound little bodies; that's going to be our goal." What does the Minister expect to hear, for instance, from somebody who runs a department like Education? In Highways, it might be easy, you might talk about roads of X length for X dollars per mile but I'm saying: What does he expect to hear the Minister of Education tell him in terms of quantifying an output? —(Interjection)— Yes. And secondly, what does he expect to hear the following year, having heard it the first year, does he want new and novel arguments?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I don't think that I'm going to be able to convince the Member for Elmwood about this very much because he seems to be convinced that this is something that is not within the capacity of government. I should point out that President Carter ran an election in the United States on the basis of his experience in Georgia where zero-base budgeting has in fact been introduced. . .

MR. DOERN: did it work?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, it's working in Georgia right now, and there are other governments who, in fact, have adopted it. If you want me to deal in a general way with Education, I can. I would expect that the Minister of Education once the position has been set up that we have a proper information system — and I want to stop at this point. Without a proper information system, it doesn't function, and that proper information system is a very simple one, but it still has to quantify. You have to know the target or group of people whom you're dealing with, you have to be able to relate that information and quantify it, you have to be able to see whether in a given year those targets have been met, and if they haven't been met, then you have to understand why they haven't been met. If there's been overexpenditure, you have to understand why there has been overexpenditures. If your support services in one phase of the program appear to be higher than the other, then you have to understand why. If it's simply because there are people within the Civil Service who are still remaining within the Civil Service and there's been no desire for anyone to change their positions, then you have to simply say, well, do you want to continue that way, or do you want to alter and change it? If, in fact, there are attendant costs, whatever those costs may be with respect to the program, they will have been quantified the year before and you'll be able to make a judgment as to whether in fact the information in front of you, whether it's been met, whether in fact that program should be continued or altered because of the lack of expenditure in this area, or the overexpenditure, or the numbers having been different.

Now, the point is that there's an attempt to do this, but it's not quantified in the way which will give you the basis for a constant review, which I mean is the review throughout the year, nor at this present time is it structured in such a way that the managers are in a position to really manage. Half the time of government has been spent in the last period of time simply passing paper back and forth with civil servants who are asking for permission to be able to proceed with those things that have in fact been voted. I'm suggesting that once a vote has been given, once the approval has been given, that the manager be given the authority to manage.

The problem here is because there's no bottom line of profit, and there's no way of measuring it in the same way as business. You have to establish and quantify to the extent that you can, the things that can in fact be quantified in terms of programs, and having done that, you have some measurement to be able to make that judgment. That's required. It's required in government today, and I don't think it's such an impossible system. It's going to be required, I suggest by all the social service agencies in Manitoba, those who are the private agencies. There is no way that there is going to be a continual funding, as I can see it, without an attempt to try and develop a proper management information system, which in fact will allow for a quantification and identification of the target or groups that people in a volunteer way are supposed to be trying to assist, or a program that's trying to achieve a certain objective. Unless we have that, there's no way there can be measurements of whether the dollars spent here or the dollars spent there are correct.

So I don't see any difficulty. If you went through the Department of Education, you could take every branch, you can take every division, you can quantify and indicate what the target or group was supposed to be, what was supposed to happen; if there were supposed to have been 50 meetings held during a given period of time, you'll know whether those 50 meetings have been held. If they haven't been held, then the question will ask why ' and then ask why it has to be continued. If there were only 20 meetings instead of 50, then you can budget on the basis of 20 meetings and you'll be able to reduce your cost accordingly.

That's what has to happen. Right now, that's not the process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister, in other words, contained in this report is his recommendation on school trustees, that if the trustees are not operating in a satisfactory manner to the government, that the government will crack the whip and do something about it.

MR. SPIVAK: That's not what it says.

MR. DOERN: No? Well, that's what some people think it says. For instance, Allen Rouse, who I believe is the President, or is a prominent school trustee in a division close to home, I believe he said that he wouldn't stand for it and neither would the other school trustees. They are supposed to have some autonomy and then the government was going to start withholding grants. This would be adverse, as far as they are concerned.

I also say to the Minister, he talks about Georgia. He gives us one example. One example, the state of Georgia. My information is that the state of Georgia didn't do all that well. I'm quoting a friend of mine — I'll have to get more information on it — but I can only say this that I don't know whether the state of Georgia is doing very well, but President Carter isn't doing very well. He is not very popular, he's not doing too well in the polls, and all I know is that Teddy Kennedy is doing well, partly because, I think, the President is doing poorly. But this is this great President, of course, who accepted zero-base budgeting, which now Manitoba is stampeding towards.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I agree with the Member for St. Johns, President Carter is a Conservative and obviously Senator Kennedy is a New Democrat.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, another point. The Minister talks, I think rather glibly about the fact that Manitoba should move toward — these are his words — “Manitoba should move toward a system of financial controls.” I mean, is he telling me, that over the last decades, the Roblin administration set up a program, which I think was implemented, maybe in the Roblin years and then followed in the Weir years and then followed in the Schreyer administration and so on, is he telling me in effect, that in the past, since let's say at least 1958, the last 20 years, there really haven't been effective management controls in the Manitoba Government? That under the Conservative administration, there were poor controls or no controls? That management committee wasn't a very effective group, that the New Democratic administration then carried that on and it continued to be as ineffective as it was before, and that now we're going to have zero-base budgeting, and this is the millennium? We're now going to have really efficient cost controls and budgeting and everything else, until of course, a new system is discovered, and then we'll all discover that we were not doing very well at all and that what we were doing in the past was a complete waste of time.

I'd like the Minister to answer that, and I would also like to ask him whether he visualizes a government run by bookkeepers and accountants? That's what I hear. We're going to have a group of bookkeepers, accountants, and economists, they're going to tell everybody else what to do, because the other poor simpletons don't know anything about how to run a government. The way you run a government is, you look at the dollars. That's the only way you run it. You don't look at services, you don't look at human considerations or compassion, you don't deal with such a thing called quality. What you do, basically, is you look at dollars. You get so many dollars and you produce certain quantities of statistics, and if you reach those targets, then you get more money. So I'm asking the Minister, what does he visualize here, a bunch of CAs sitting around the Cabinet table juggling statistics? Is that what we're moving toward?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, what I visualize is that you will have a bunch of politicians who are Cabinet Ministers who are going to make decisions on correct information, which is as complete as it can be for the decisions to be made. The problem point of government today is that it's much larger than it was ten or fifteen years ago, government is involved, and the procedures that we have, I do not think, are as good as they can be, and the concept of financial control which zero-base budgeting would give, I think is a means towards a better system. That simply highlights, I think, the problem areas of the past. The problem areas are very simple, that in effect if there are programs that have to be altered because of whatever the change, because they're not meeting the need, because there has been some lack of policy somewhere, because in effect the costs overrun are too high, or the costs are less, that it takes an enormous amount of time and effort before they're caught in time for alterations and changes to be made. In some cases, it requires researchers to

research for a year or two, and then after a program, after a two or three year research is altered and changed, when it should have been changed two years earlier when the research commenced, simply because that correct information is not in front of the individual Cabinet Ministers, or in turn the policy group, whoever they may be within Cabinet, who have to undertake and make the final determination and decision.

§

I've tried to indicate that the checks and balances within the system have been based on now, the theory of management committee, before a theory of Treasury Board which had a different kind of structure, but which involved a tremendous amount of the manager's time, back and forth, and a tremendous amount of paper work in determining the final decisions for the expenditures of money. It would seem to me that you are far better off to devise a system which the managers can manage without that control, but the control is within the information system and a treasury committee made up of staff Ministers as opposed to line department Ministers, who in fact would have the responsibility of measuring and evaluating and being able to alter and change those programs without having to wait for the delays of the years that have happened in many cases.

We can cite examples, but I don't think it's necessary. By the way, this is not a reflection on the previous government. I think it's a reflection on all governments. There's a need now for more accurate and correct information so that the policy decisions, the numbers of which are very very high, that have to be made by any government today, and they are high in terms of the numbers that have to be undertaken, that they may, as best they can, on the basis of as accurate information as you have. Otherwise, what happens is, it takes a process, a long process, before the alterations and shifts can occur, and that requires additional research, additional consultants, further information. If, in fact, the management information system is designed properly, if in fact you go to zero-base budgeting, if in fact the managers are given the authority to manage, I believe you can adapt that system to a much quicker and better way. And the value of that will be both savings, and the value as well will be that in the long run the policy decisions then can be determined by the policy people, who do not have to be involved in the day-to-day administration, and the Minister and the line people who are responsible as managers can manage, and those who are the staff Ministers can in fact administer the government, and I think that this is necessary, with direct accountability of those people who were involved in the administration of government, to a Minister.

That function, I think is very different than the kind of way in which we've operated in the past. I think it's an evolution really, or an evolving system from what has happened in previous years. I think that governments are much more complex; I think there is a need for a continual assessment of the value of programs. As I indicated before, governments exist to be able to serve the needs of people and not to be in a position to become a creature of its own and be maintained simply because it existed in the past. There is a need for a real understanding that yearly there will be an assessment, and a valuable assessment made of the continuity of the program, and of the continuation of those who are within the system, because that has to be measured and tested and quantified against those who are to receive the service, and the nature of service, and whether, in fact, that's been done. That information is pretty valuable.

MR. DOERN: Would the Minister accept that there are certain goals of government that cannot be quantified, or does he think everything can be quantified?

MR. SPIVAK: No, I accept that there are certain goals of government that cannot be quantified but at the same time I think once you've established the goal and you've hit out for a target, that there is a way in which you can at least establish in some formal way, what you're trying to do. And whatever the program, if you have an income security program, then you're trying to reach a targeted group, you can have an estimate of what that targeted group is, and you can continually monitor and determine whether you are in fact meeting that group, whether you're meeting in fact another group, whether the group has increased, whatever the circumstances are, or the group has decreased, whether the money that's being spent has in fact been delivered, whether your costs of service are relatively the same as the delivery of costs of services in other areas, and if they're not, why they're not, and what changes should occur, so that in effect when you make the assessment, you can then deal in the next year of carrying out that general policy but with specific information of alterations and changes that should be made in order to try and make it more efficient. I don't think that should be of such a concern if it can be done. Now, the question is whether it can be done.

I'm saying to you that the way the system is operating now, it's not quantified in that way, the evaluations do not occur in that matter, and there is need for a much more modern technique, and this is why governments are considering moving towards this. This is why we propose this as a consideration, recognizing again that the transitional period would be very hard. It's not going

to be easy, but nevertheless, it would accomplish the results that I've talked about before. I don't want to repeat it again, there's no need, I've already put it on the record.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Minister for the last ten or fifteen minutes, and what he seems to be saying is that this whole Task Force deals with the bureaucracy. It deals with the problems of the bureaucracy. It deals with management. Once the decisions are made, you plug in the Task Force Report and it doesn't really matter who's in charge and it doesn't really matter what the goals of the government are, in that regard this Task Force is neutral. I'm simply saying to the Minister, would he have us believe for a split second that this Task Force went in in an objective way and just looked at the dollars and looked at the organization of the government without reference to the goals of government, without reference to philosophy, ideology, aim, direction, without reference to the fact that the New Democratic Party was in office. All it did was go in and say nothing and have no implications in regard to government goals and objectives. This is simply sort of a mechanical procedure; it would work well under the Social Credit Party, under Liberals, Conservatives, New Democrats, or whatever, because it's neutral. It's a neutral study with neutral findings and neutral conclusions and neutral objectives and this is what he has presented. In other words, it's sort of a brilliant technocracy, this is what the Minister visualizes.

Well, I would suggest something different, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that people went in with preconceived notions, people went in and were either told what to produce or they understood tacitly what goals to produce and then they came up with certain conclusions and scrambled to find something to back it up with. So I'm saying, I don't believe the Minister when he says, in effect, that what he has produced is a neutral scientific tool that can be used by his government and by our administration in the future. I think what he's done is he's produced an organization that has had a set of objectives which they have tried to reach and back up and that they were political in design and that this thing is shot full of political biases, etc.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Elmwood's statement is sheer, utter nonsense and I say that —(Interjection)— No, it's not true, it's an opinion and I say it's sheer, utter nonsense. Mr. Chairman, there has been a continual attempt on the part of the members opposite to somehow or other tag this with a document that did not deal in a fundamental way with the objectives of government. I want to tell the members opposite that when the review teams went in — and I'm quite aware of what happened — the first thing they asked the departmental people that they dealt with: What were your objectives? They asked them, yes, they asked them. In many cases, you know, those who were the departmental people who were within the previous government could not say what their objectives were, notwithstanding that the government had been in eight years. Now, let me just explain it. They could not say what the objectives were for the simple reason that in many cases the policy determinations hadn't been made; in some cases there was confusion of policy determination because they did not know whether the Planning Secretariat's policies were, in fact, their policies; in some cases the departmental people assumed the policy to be a certain policy and therefore carried it out in that way. So, I want to tell the honourable members opposite that very clearly there was confusion in terms of objectives.

Now what we've attempted to try and do in terms of the reorganization — and we've done this — is to try in a very simple way to restate what the objectives of the department should be and we've presented them on that basis because the reorganization that's proposed is proposed on the basis of the objectives that are set forth. These are not necessarily the objectives that were carried out before in a general way by some of the departments. So, I simply say, I cannot prevent the members opposite, nor do I expect them to stop from saying the things that they are saying, they are perfectly entitled to say it and they will say it over and over again but the argument is not correct and I place that on the record.

MR. DOERN: A brief question or two, Mr. Chairman, then I'll pass to one of my colleagues and so on. The Minister is telling me then that he . . . I assume that a typical conversation might have gone like this when he says to a senior civil servant under a new government change, "What were your objectives and so on?", I suppose that one could almost predict the kind of answer that one would obtain. It would be an answer that would tend to please the person asking the question. Maybe the debate went, "What are your objectives, sir?" and when the Minister states the new objectives, then that would be palatable to the senior civil servant and so on.

I would simply conclude on this particular point at this time and say to the Minister again, when he visualizes an ideal Cabinet, from what I gather he's again visualizing a Cabinet of chartered accountants or bookkeepers. This is what he thinks would be a great government, people who can

examine figures, people who are familiar with working with figures and nothing else. That would be the ideal political Cabinet in relation to what he tells us the Task Force is all about. I would suggest the ideal Cabinet is one that has teams of chartered accountants and other people working for them but not running the show.

MR. SPIVAK: I would agree that the ideal kind of Cabinet would be a Cabinet which would be a reflection of the people in the province in its makeup and its composition representing the areas throughout the province but I have to suggest that it should not be one that would contain the former Member for Elmwood.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might inform all members of the committee — Can I have your attention, please? — inform all members of the committee that I have been instructed that there will be no Private Members' Hour today and that it's an agreement worked out between the two House Leaders, I'm told. The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order. People were canvassed to see whether they wished to proceed with anything in Private Members' and we didn't find anything. If there is somebody who wanted to proceed with one of the matters in Private Members', then we will go back to Private Members' but we didn't find anybody that wanted to go ahead with anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can ask all members present, is that the situation as far as your concerned? Agreed? (Agreed) All right, then we will proceed with committee and the next speaker is the Member for Lac du Bonnet who, I understand, is going to defer to the Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to indicate that I believe that there is a fundamental fallacy with regard to what the Minister is saying which, in my mind, brings into great doubt the conclusions and the recommendations that the Task Force has made. The fundamental fallacy is that there are some people who are able to apply very efficient business methods which, if translated to government, would result in great savings. Of course, Mr. Chairman, no substantiation is put forward for this position, it is merely relied on and then proceeded with. It doesn't bear examination. Once one goes, Mr. Chairman, into the so-called method which has achieved great saving, one doesn't find great savings at all. As a matter of fact, one finds abuse in expenditures which could never happen within the public sector and do not happen within the public sector.

One also finds, Mr. Chairman, that the public in following misdirected representation gets to policies such as were exemplified in the paper last week which no business would subscribe to: cost first, needs last. No business will operate on that principle. A business would operate on the basis of what are its objectives, what are its needs, what costs are required to meet those needs and then how does one realize those costs if they are realizable. Of course, if they are not realizable, then one doesn't go into business because the amount of money that will come in in order to deal with the objectives that the business has set for itself would be less than sufficient and the business would not continue. But in following that kind of fallacy, one is led to formulate a policy on this type of objective which I don't think was better articulated than in the area of all fields, the field of Health, which comes out, costs first, needs last.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I dispute the fact that any private sector business would proceed on that basis. Secondly, I dispute the fact that private business has found a method of operation which is more efficient and therefore when translatable to the public will result in government savings. Now how do I know this, Mr. Chairman? Well, first of all, we know it with regard to every private business which has had the top of the tea kettle removed and the public then able to stare at what it is doing and find out what kind of expenditures take place because normally private expenditures are not subject to public scrutiny and the times that they are opened up and are, we find a mess which is so terrible that no government could survive for a day if they were permitted to exist. I name several examples, Mr. Chairman. One was Atlantic Acceptance; one was the Cornfield affair; one was the Brandon Packers incident in the Province of Manitoba, that private business was regarded in Brandon as being such a wonderful thing. Paton and Cox were looked upon as captains of industry, people that would probably be appointed to the Task Force if the lid was not taken off. —(Interjection)— Yes, Churchill Forest Industries, that's another one, Mr. gchairman, that once the lid was open and we found out that it wasn't private investment that was rushing into the province and that it was a private sector business using the public money for the purpose of its own gain, Mr. Chairman, that it doesn't bear examination. But even if we look at some of those that although they're not completely open are at least available for public scrutiny, we find that the Great-West Life Assurance Company which is one of the principal groups that has been looked to by the

of Manitoba, that in 1967 their expenses amounted to \$22 million. In 1976, their xpenses amounted to \$58 million, which is roughly three times their expenses with much less to do, much less to do — and I am not dealing with the commissions that are paid to the people who sell policies, I'm dealing with their administrative operative expenses.

Not what has happened in this business, Mr. Chairman? Their expenses have gone up some \$22 million to \$58 million a year and they will say, "Well, we are regulated by the competitive market." What competitive market? The prices for all insurance are roughly the same. There is no competition in price. The established people in the industry will have a greater capacity for selling and then the insurance companies, many years ago, went to the government and made sure that anybody else who conducted a lottery would be put in jail. This was the competition that was permitted in the insurance industry. So, the insurance field was reserved to the insurance industry and protected by an umbrella by the public. Nevertheless, their expenses went from \$22 million to \$58 million in one year and by the way, over the last three weeks when the shareholders of these — maybe more than three weeks, maybe six weeks — shareholders of this company have done nothing, done nothing, they've done no productive work to those who love the work ethic. Do you know what has happened to the value of their shares? I know because it happened to the value of mine. They've gone up from \$72.00 to about \$96.00 in eight weeks and this, Mr. Chairman, is millions and millions of dollars that have been accrued by people who have not added one ounce of work to their existing value. That's what's happened to the shareholdings of the Great-West Life Assurance Comtany.

But when we look at what is happening, Mr. Chairman, is the Great-West Life Assurance Company president or the directors building offices for less money than the Minister of Public Works? Mr. Chairman, are they driving automobiles less desirable than those driven by the Ministers of the Crown? Are their offices less adequately furnished? Are they given less salaries? Are they less adequately taken care of? Are the rugs in their offices of less quality? Well, the answer, Mr. Speaker, is that they are not. The fact is that private spending in the private sector has not shown itself to be more efficient spending than in the public sector. As a matter of fact, it has been shown to be less efficient.

We've looked at an aircraft factory in the Province of Manitoba that produced 13 planes and almost certified another on a total expenditure of roughly \$40 million. It was a problem and it's not something which I can look back to with great satisfaction except the satisfaction that we were willing to try to do something — \$40 million. Mr. Chairman, in the private sector, we have one company that spent that amount, or close to that amount, on bribes alone, on bribes alone. Didn't produce anything but bribed the purchasers to purchase for it to the extent of roughly \$30 million and that was an open book and it became an open book and they said, "Well, this is what one has to do in order to make money." Well, how are those people going to come in here and teach the public sector to do a job. Mr. Chairman, the public sector could go in there and teach them to do a job. The honourable member says they have reduced \$10 million by their restraint program with the "hoo ha" of the Great-West Life. A year ago in the fall, we reduced \$20 million with no help from the Great-West Life. \$20 million, we doubled it. So they owe us \$10 million, Mr. Chairman, when they talk about restraint.

Nobody disagrees, nobody, Mr. Chairman, disagrees with restraint. —(Interjection)— The Minister indicates he disagrees with restraint. —(Interjection)— He disagrees with the figure, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the figure that was given — if he doesn't believe that, Mr. Chairman, then he is calling the Minister of Finance a liar, because the figure I got, the figure I got — Mr. Chairman, will you try to subdue the Member for River Heights who is having a problem. —(Interjection)— He doesn't, well, then shut up.

The fact is that the Minister of Finance came out and produced a figure of \$10 million, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPIVAK: Why dont you sit down?

MR. GREEN: Oh, I'm going to use my time.

MR. SPIVAK: I don't mind you speaking, why don't you sit down.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to sit down. I wish to stand. Unless the rule says I must sit down I'm going to stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are permitted to stand if you wish.

MR. GREEN: Thank you. I get much more consideration from you than I get from the Member

for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Be accurate.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I admit that maybe I am not accurate. And the reason I am not accurate is I am using the Minister of Finance's figures and the Minister of Finance's figures are very dubious and are subject to complaints about their accuracy. The Minister of Finance gave the figure that was accomplished by the restraint program, as roughly \$11 million. Mr. Chairman, that is the figure that he gave. The other types of restraint that my honourable friend is talking about are not restraint at all. For a Minister of the Crown to resort to talking about reductions in departmental Estimates as being part of restraint is to use, and it was best put by Bob Stanfield, that this would only be resorted to by people who were desperate to show that they did something, when in fact they accomplished nothing. And that's what he said about using reductions from the departmental Estimates to prove that you have reduced spending.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that on last year's figures, the Conservative Government of today is increasing the budget and have used figures of 4 percent, if you use the absolute figures that you've been using over the year, their increase this year was just as high as our increase last year, in dollars. In dollars, Mr. Chairman, it's the same. And the reason is, the reason given by the member — you know, he won't listen to anybody — but the reason given by the Minister of Health, \$600 million of the budget, that's over 1/3, what did he get up? Did he tell horror stories? He said it was an exceedingly well-managed department. And I believe that I am being less complimentary than was the Minister of Health.

That has come through, vis-a-vis virtually every department, because, Mr. Chairman, that is what happened. There are possibilities for anybody, and I do not deny it, to take a budget of \$1,600,000,000 and reduce it. If you reduced it by \$16 million it would be one percent. So, there is the problem with a budget of \$1,600,000,000, and I'm not suggesting there's not. I'm not suggesting that the people in management committee, and the people in our departments, could not do a good job in helping you reduce that budget, even in conservative terms. What I object to is getting these guys in the private sector, who have never shown that they can reduce anybody's spending, particularly their own, and say that all you have to do is apply their methods to our government, and we will be spending less money.

Well, Mr. Chairman, what are their methods? You know, I've been in the private sector, and I have been associated with the private sector. When I was in Newfoundland and wanted to come home to Winnipeg and the flight did not leave until the next day and I would have had to stay over, I had no problem. Falconbridge took me home and it was very nice of them. Did they have to worry about getting to the airport on time and meeting the plane? No, Mr. Chairman, we went in our "our" plane, that is, the Falconbridge plane. And it was a very nice plane, and it took me from Newfoundland to Toronto, and I was then able to go from Toronto to Winnipeg by the public service, what do we call it? — economy. The people in the private sector are not travelling on the kind of expenses that the people in the public sector are travelling on, nor do they have a guy who will get up in the House and say, what did you spend, what hotel did you stay in, and how much did you pay for dinner? Which can be asked in this House, and I agree with it. I'm not objecting to that at all. When I was travelling at public expense I always knew that I travelled on the basis that what I spent was available for the public to see, if and when they chose to look at it.

But Mr. Chairman, do you think that the private sector has something to teach us in this connection? I went home in the Falconbridge plane, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is much nicer than an Air Canada plane, and the entertainment is nicer, and the surroundings are nicer. I have nothing against Falconbridge. Nothing. I believe that they are entitled to their plane, they earned it under the rules of the game that were set for them, and they are entitled to have it at their disposal. But to tell me that they can reduce my expenditure on the basis of their practice is a fallacy.

What about Tantalum? I was asked in the House whether Flyer had built a cottage. Well, Flyer did, indeed, have a cottage. You know where it came from? It came from the private sector firm that built Flyer. They also built a cottage, and the cottage was at the disposal of the executives of that company, and I'm not objecting to that. If that's what they want to do, that's their concern. But they are not to tell me that they can introduce an efficiency in the private sector — and the Flyer cottage is a shack compared to the Tantalum cottage. Go to the Bernic Mine, it's yours and mine. It's ours. We not only own 25 percent in a mine, thank God, well, I guess I should thank Mr. Banman, is he the same? But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that we have a very nice guest home at Bernic Lake. It is a guest home that I would be happy to place in a street in Tuxedo and the neighbours would be proud of it. That's in the private sector, Mr. Chairman.

Now, we are asked about restraint. There is a need for restraint. We are too spoiled. We are

too fat. I am waiting to hear from the private sector that the hotels in the city of Winnipeg, including the International Inn, in a policy of restraint, are now changing sheets once a week. That they are now changing sheets once a week, or even twice a week, or even every six days, as I count the 14th, the 15th, the 16th, the 17th, the 18th, the 19th, that a guest would stay in one of those hotels, and have his sheets changed on the 14th, and then not until the 19th. These are the people, Mr. Chairman, that we are told will help us reduce our expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, we had an example in the House today, which I will make use of more on another Estimates, but it's singular absence from this Task Force indicates just what was being looked at. If there is any place that you guys would have saved money to your advantage because they are going to be your albatross, it's Information Services. You've got in Information Services a bunch of amateur politicians who think that they can do you a favour by writing press releases and sending them out. The favour that they did you was they said that there was a 30 percent increase in highway expenditures. Now, Mr. Chairman, if it's mentioned in the report, and I'm making a mistake, then I will . . . —(Interjection)— it's mentioned. All right. If it's mentioned, Mr. Chairman, then I have to apologize to the Minister and the members of his force. But, Mr. Chairman, if it had been mentioned, and it's one of the things that can be done, why not this year? Do you know that of all the expenditures that have gone down like sheets in hospitals, Information Services has gone up. And the salary aspect of it has gone from \$280,000 to \$330,000.00. But even if we ignore the salary aspect of it, the whole amount has gone up in a greater percentage than the other general expenses of the government.

Now, if they were looking for a way to eliminate unnecessary services, or if the government was looking for a way, and if the Task Force suggested that it be done, then more power to them, I'll find something good, finally, in the Task Force. —(Interjection)— I'm glad that it's there. And if it's there, Mr. Chairman, pardon me? Sure, Sure.

MR. SPIVAK: "It is recommended that the Information Services Branch should no longer produce tape, audio, or photograph material that would normally be produced by the media. The branch's current budget of \$406,000 should be reviewed with the intention of achieving reduction."

MR. GREEN: But then, I have to say that if that's what they got out of the Information Services Branch, then they have succeeded in taking a mountain and turning it into a molehill, because if they are merely saying that you should stop taking the photographs, you should stop taking the clips, but that you should continue writing the stories, this is the part that I most object to. The part that I object to about Information Services is people paid by the government, paid by the public of the province of Manitoba, to write political releases for the Conservative Party.\$

MR. SPIVAK: They wrote eight years for you. Did you object to it? Did you change it?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, yes, I certainly did object.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, you couldn't have had very much influence then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster has the floor.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member said I couldn't have had much influence on the previous government. I want to tell him that I can guage that I had more influence on that government than he is going to have on this government. —(Interjection)— On this item, yes, Mr. Chairman. I'll show you how my influence was felt. Nothing was done by Information Services for my department. Nothing. They were instructed to print no releases. They printed no releases. The only thing that Information Services did for my department, and you can check it with them, is that I prepared releases, which I considered it my job to do, I sent it to them, and I asked them to use their clerical services to do with those releases what they would normally do with other material. But they did not write my material. They did not write my press releases. They did not write *precis* of my statements in the House, *precis* of my press conferences, which is what they do now. I objected to it when I was in Opposition, and I objected to it when I was in government, and I am objecting to it now, and I am being perfectly consistent, and if you asked me, did I succeed in getting the government to cancel it? No, that doesn't mean that I am not going to stop trying. I did try, d I did so publicly, I said so in the House on several occasions, that this is continued, it's not something that I use, but it is there.

I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that if that's what the Task Force said, that they should — by the way, they said the present budget should be reduced or \$406,000, I believe it's now \$416,000,

if anybody's got the departmental Estimates here. —(Interjection)— \$418,000, so the Task Force has suggested a reduction from \$406,000 and it's gone to \$418,000, which shows how much influence you had on this particular area, that's right, to deal with that question.

Well, Mr. Chairman, you're the one who was talking about how much influence people have. It shows how much influence — and you know, I agree with that. This Task Force will be shot down by the artillery of the Conservative Cabinet Minister. They will not permit this Task Force to be realized. We won't have to deal with it very much, we'll deal with it in committee, there'll be this kind of talk, but essentially, the honourable member will not be able to put it through the Conservative Cabinet, just as he has indicated what has happened to Information Services. They recommend that the film clips and the tapings for radio be discontinued, but they don't recommend the essential function, and that is, to have a group of people paid by the public to write political information for a political party. That they don't ask to be removed.

So Mr. Chairman, my general statement with regard to this document, is that it represents a task farce. That it is a farce because it is based on the premise that if we apply business methods to the government, that somehow we will be spending less money. What we will find, Mr. Chairman, is that certain needed programs on the part of the people of Manitoba that these businesses don't wish to pay for as part of their social responsibility to the Province of Manitoba is eliminated, but efficiency in operation; we have nothing to learn from them. If we adopted their methods or any group of Cabinet Ministers adopted the private business practices in the operation of a government, they would be defeated immediately because these are not private business methods that are being suggested to this government. This is the policy of the Chamber of Commerce, of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, of the other vested interests groups in this society being brought to the government to ask the government to do their will with regard to public policy, not with regard to public expenditures or public efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, there is something in this forum which produces a brand of competition that no private enterpriser could survive, let alone in this forum the Minister for a period of four months has got to stand up every day in the House, every day, answer questions from people who are seeking to take his job if he makes one error. And he has got to withstand that every day of the week, and not only from his competitors, from the opposition who are seeking to take his job, but from the entire media of the Province of Manitoba. And no private sector person could survive his business under that type of competition, under the restraints that that kind of pressure imposes on a government, and it will happen to every government; I agree with my learned friend. And when they start not being able to deal with it, then they are defeated, which is right; I never argued with that, it is right. And, Mr. Chairman, that kind of competition, that kind of rugged individualism, that kind of necessity to be right, to survive, you cannot locate in the private sector, and I have operated in both. And therefore I don't argue with the policy of restraint; I believe in the policy of restraint. In my department, before the hoo-hah — and it's confirmed by the previous Minister — what is the first thing that he said, the next Minister, Mr. Ransom, the Minister of Mines, what is the first thing he said in coming to our Estimates? The first thing we did was to apply a six percent efficiency cut. He had to go through the department on the basis that nothing is sacred, you know, which now has a ring to it, it's called zero-base budget.

Mr. Chairman, I ask honourable members here, to think about that for a moment. Zero-base budgeting means theoretically that you start as if there was nothing, and then you budget on the basis that every program has to justify its expenditure. Now, I believe in that. What are you going to wind up with? You are going to wind up with an increase of \$160 million in expenditures over last year's estimate. You're not going to wind up with zero plus a dollar, or zero plus a million dollars. What you are saying is, that we did not zero-base budget, so on a budget of \$1.2 billion, we increased by \$150 million, so our increase was \$150 million; that's the amount by which we increased the budget. You want to adopt the policy of zero-base budgeting? You know what you did? You started from zero and you increased the budget by 1.650 billion, that was your increases, which is ten times what we increased it at, if you start from zero.

But you know that you didn't start from zero, you know that you started with \$600 million in health expenditures which aside from certain things that you could eliminate was going to be your basic health expenditure budget. But you started with, I suppose, \$150 million in rebates which you are going to continue, or else if you didn't, if you started from zero, then my God, you've given us the biggest increase in budgetary expenses that has ever been established by any government anywhere in the world. Similar . . . start from zero — in one year, you got us to 1.600 billion, that's a big increase.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe in restraint, I believe in trying to minimize expenditure, I believe

that there are vehicles to do this, I believe that the vehicle that the previous Conservative government spent roughly \$700,000 on, which planned a planning and priorities committee, which you all laugh at now, and a management committee, which were the two basic committees, is as good a system as any because you know you can move from one system to another and then if you've got particular Ministers who push very hard and you don't have a resistance and they increase their budgets regardless what the system, you've increased expenditure. And that will happen in the private sector as well.

But I agree that expenditures have to be paid efficiently. I submit that many of the expenditures that we are now foisting on the people of the Province of Manitoba are going to result in great inefficiency, and it is not more efficient to charge a higher user fee — which is a user tax — and a lower universal tax. But that's not inefficiency, that's a philosophy. And you know, we can argue about philosophy but don't tell me it is more efficient.

What we are really arguing about is different views as to what government should be doing, and the method of once those views are established, and this I agree with my learned friend, the Member for River Heights, that once your objectives are established, then you have to have efficient mechanisms to get there. And those efficient mechanisms are not going to be given to us by the private business sector because they are not efficient; they are less efficient than the public sector.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister Responsible for the Task Force.

MR. SPIVAK: One of the problems in dealing with the Member for Inkster is that to a large extent he gets carried away with his own presentation and this is really what partially has happened here as well in his remarks, particularly with respect to zero-base budgeting. Because basically what he is saying is, that in effect the government obviously has to come back to where it was before and then continue on, and that's not what zero-base budgeting is about. Because, as an example, there is a need for some justification; there's no way that I think you can justify the garage of 70,000 square feet that you built on Logan Avenue. I don't think that can be justified. There is no way that a whole range of programs up north with respect to the target group that were supposed to be assisted and helped, can be justified on the basis of the performance that occurred and on the basis of the programs that were continually funded year, after year, after year. I don't think that you had enough meaningful information to be able to make correct assumptions, or correct decisions on that, notwithstanding the fact that there were some well motivated intentions with respect to what you were trying to achieve. Now you've got to distinguish between that, between the motives of the attempt to try and achieve something that is desirable and the results that have occurred, and the need for the assessment to determine whether you're achieving it or not. And all that is being proposed here. . . and to this extent I think there is some benefit that can come from the private sector, I really believe this. The Honourable Member for Inkster does not. I believe the private sector can in fact give us some support. In the private sector they have a problem, you know, if they don't have profit, they are in trouble, if they don't have profit they can go bankrupt, if they don't have profit they can't continue, and there is need for them to be able to measure what they are doing against the marketing conditions and the basic operational costs that they have to undertake, and they have to make that continual assessment. So I believe that in effect the kinds of proposals we're talking about are fairly important.

Now reference was made to the fact there was a Planning and Priorities and Management Committee, and that's true; that was suggested in the operation productivity. But what was suggested there is not what ultimately evolved in the sense of the change that occurred, and I think that change occurred without the members opposite really understanding the nature of the change that was taking place. Well, if they did, then I'd like them to be able to sort of justify it. The Planning and Priorities section was originally conceived as being a group of seven people. It ended up to about one hundred. At the time of the takeover of the government, there was 78. The Management COOMMITTEE PROPOSAL WAS FOR A NUMBER OF APPROXIMATELY ¾?: IT HAD ABOUT ONE HUNDRED. Now, what I am saying is, that it was a growth in the numbers, and one then has to question what those numbers were doing, and the kind of information that was coming forward for the decisions that had to be made by Management Committee, and in turn by the Cabinet and by the Ministers in dealing with the various projects that they were undertaking. And I believe that, you know, the concepts that we have talked about, the central management changes that have occurred which are in fact adopted in the private sector, have merit. I am not saying that there have not been private sector firms that have been inefficient; I am not saying that there's not waste; I'm not saying that shareholders in many respects have the kind of control that they should have, and certainly,

those who are directors and presidents and chief executive officers are not put to the kind of scrutiny that we are in the Legislature; we know that, and I accept that.

But having said that, it doesn't mean that some of what they are doing in the private sector cannot be adopted, and certainly that we can draw from their experiences, because the experiences many of the people in the private sector are not the same as the Member for Inkster, with all due respect. I'm not suggesting that he hasn't been involved in the private sector; I've been involved in the private sector. I have a certain experience; it's different than the Minister's, it's different than some of the others. The point is, some of the people, not all of the people, were people who have a very different kind of experience and whose decisions are of a different nature than the kinds of decisions we may have had to make in the private sector, but I want to point out as well, that it is not only members from the private sector who are involved in the review teams and in the work of the Task Force itself, there are other members who had particular expertise in involvement and who made a contribution I THINK WAS PRETTY IMPORTANT AND AGAIN CAME BACK TO THE BASIC PROBLEMS OF WHAT GOVERNMENT'S ALL ABOUT BECAUSE THEN WE COME BACK TO THE ONE PURPOSE.

Government does not exist and this is something that has to be accepted and it hasn't been accepted. It does not exist for its continuity as a structure by any government, whatever change occurs, at any time of change on the basis of what's happened in the past, must be continued. It has to be based on the assessment that what is being done is in fact achieving the objectives that are desired by the government of the day, or has achieved the objectives that were supposed to have been the objectives of the previous government, the government that they replaced. And that assessment has to be made and because there has been a continuity of a program, it doesn't mean that it should follow that it must be continuing from years here on in, simply because what has to be assessed is whether it is really achieving its objective and whether people are achieving what is supposed to be the service the governments provide.

Zero-base budgeting, central management, management committee, the operations of the Legislative committees, none of these are important unless they in fact in the process basically target in to meeting the requirements and needs of people. There can be a difference of philosophy and there obviously is, and that difference was placed before the public, and the public accepted that they wanted a change. And there will be a time when they will accept that they are going to want another change. That's the process, I accept it. But to the extent that we can, we have attempted to try and provide a means for a change which we believe is a change that has to be examined now, and I have no doubt that change is a continuing kind of thing that will have to be altered, hopefully within the structure, within the time limits of the present government and by another government when it takes over, because another government will ultimately take over.

Now I want to deal if I can just with the question of the Information Service, because I want to place on the record something that's fairly important. The Minister has not explained the Estimates. He will be. I don't want to comment; I have a suspicion that there is probably some additional information that in fact may be supplied that may alter a bit of what the discussion has been in this Committee, and we'll leave it on that basis. With respect to the review team's recommendations, the review team's recommendations were recommendations of several types — some which were able to be considered during the Estimate process, many that were not, and those will be considered by the Ministers and the ministries in the next period of time.

The honourable member has a position with respect to the purpose of Information Service which was obviously not accepted by the former Cabinet, because in effect we are talking about the same group of people who are here now, who were there before, and I am sure that he will express his view in public, he's entitled to express it. I would disagree with him to a certain extent; I think that information Service is a necessary part and when we get into that debate, I will be prepared to debate it. But with respect to the specific explanations, that should be left to the Minister and a more detailed explanation — and I think there may be some information that he's priv to that I'm not that may be fairly important — and lay it on the table.

Now the debate will continue but you know we have a fundamental disagreement with respect to whether this exercise was worthwhile or not. The Member for Inkster believes it not to have been worthwhile. I believe it has been worthwhile and if we're not going to on that come to any agreement, and I believe there is an opportunity for experience of the private sector to be brought to government. Government hires consultants; if one has to look through the last eight years, the former government hired a lot of consultants. Those consultants were hired and they are in the private sector on the

basis that they have some particular expertise. In some cases they dealt with private organizations; in some cases they dealt with public organizations and they brought to them that experience. Some of what they suggested and some of the things that they proposed were things that they proposed for private organizations so I don't think it's just a black and white situation but I think realistically we were able, in a short period of time, to highlight some central problems. The information system of government is not adequate today; the managers have not been given the authority to manage because of the development of the treasury board into the management system and there is a need for clearance of the paper and clearance of the time and effort that's put forward on that. There's a need to determine the objectives and to be able to quantify as best you can the expenditures and the targeted group who you are trying to meet so that in effect there can be a continual assessment and monitoring. If there's an agreement even on that to a certain extent, regardless of whether you'll accept this as a proposal — there may be others — then I think we've made some progress with respect to the report.

Notwithstanding all of the political hoo-hah that's been applied to the report, I have a suspicion that the members of the former government recognize that there was a need for a change, maybe not the kinds that were proposed, maybe some others — it would be interesting to hear what those others are — but nevertheless, it wasn't perfect, there was need for a change, the workload was very very hard and the flow of paper appears to have been excessive. —(Interjection)— What? It appears to have been excessive. —(Interjection)— Well, good for CFI but maybe we shouldn't worry about CFI at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet next.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister tries to suggest to this committee and he has repeated the suggestion to us that this document is somehow intended to be a document from which we are supposed to learn the wherewithal to bring about a greater efficiency in government administration and program delivering. I would like to just make a couple of observations in that regard because in going through this document, in a number of areas I can site instances where rhetoric has to do with some of the things that were said by the Conservative Party in the last election and prior to the last election campaign.

Further to that, I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the secretary to this particular Task Force happens not to be a neutral individual from political point of view but rather was involved, very much involved in the election campaign of last October. So one has to obviously raise these points of so-called neutrality or otherwise in order to put this document in its proper light.

Now we know that there are a good number of people from the community that have contributed toward the operation of this Task Force. To the extent that any of these people knew that this was going to be a political document, then one can only conclude that they were willing to prostitute their own professionalism — and I leave that where it lies, Mr. Chairman, because whoever was so knowledgeable and carried on the work will wear the hat that fits so I leave that at that particular point. I know, Mr. Chairman, that a number of these people are indeed very credible individuals, at least to the extent that I am aware of their background and ability and I regret that they were used in this way, in the putting together of a document that is intended to further the aims of not government efficiency, Mr. Chairman, but further the aims of a political party who is now in power. That is in essence what we are talking about, whether this is a document that is apolitical in nature or whether it is otherwise. Mr. Chairman, this document is a political document. With all the respect that I might muster for the people that were involved, I regret that they were so used by this government.

In the introduction on Page 2, there is reference made here to a new government faced with a bureaucratic apparatus which had grown rapidly with the expansion of the provincial public sector. There are a number of graphs in here and if you look through them, Mr. Chairman, you will notice that for some strange reason — perhaps it's a coincidence — that the graphs begin in the year 1968 and end in the year 1977. To me, that is a political posture in itself because if we're talking about a neutral document and we're talking about governments generally, then it would have been much more beneficial for positive discussions to have had a graph dating 20 years, 30 years, over two or three different governments. Then I think it would have been put in its proper light, Mr. Chairman, but this Task Force chose not to do that and the reasons, Mr. Chairman, are obvious.

The other consideration that has not been made by the Task Force and by its chairman, at least perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if I'm wrong the Minister could correct me. The Minister could correct me. And that is that built into the expansion of government spending over the last eight years, we have

gross expenditures shown by graph. I'm not satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that we are looking at that particular aspect rationally in the sense that a lot of that money was simply money put through the system but rebated to the taxpayers of this province in one form or another. So that if you talk in terms of growth, from the budget figures of 1968 to those of 1977, yes, you will see a lot of growth but it has to be taken into account that a couple of hundred million dollars, Mr. Chairman — which is no small amount — of the last figure is money that is recycled back to the taxpayer through one form or another.

The other thing that is not taken proper cognizance of is the fact that in that period of time we added a substantial amount to our gross budget by eliminating premium taxes on the people of Manitoba which had the effect of ballooning our provincial budget but which in essence, which in essence was in fact an efficiency move, an efficiency move on the part of the government. The elimination of some — I would guess but I think I'm not far out — of some 100 people, approximately, involved in collecting premiums and doing the accounting for the Health Services Commission was indeed a major efficiency move. Philosophically, it is not acceptable to my friends opposite, of course, because they would have preferred to maintain an efficient tax collection system in order to preserve the tax base of their friends, of the wealthier groups in Manitoba. I can understand that, Mr. Chairman, but to lump all of that money into our budget figures is not something to be fearful of, it should have been something that we cheered about from the point of view of efficiency of government because that in itself saved us about \$1 million in administrative costs annually.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is the wish of the committee to adjourn at twenty after five.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the members of the committee, the Minister responsible for the Task Force has an engagement that he would like to get away from committee a few moments early and he has asked me if I would put the question to you and ask you if committee could rise at 5:20. We will just rise until 8 p.m. tonight. Is that agreed? (Agreed) Committee rise and reconvene at 8 tonight.\$\$

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 37, under the Estimates of Health and Social Development. We are on Resolution 59, Clause 3. Community Operations Division, (b)(2) Other Expenditures, \$1,094,400—pass — The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: I wonder if the Minister can give us a breakdown of what is included in Other Expenditures in this item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Sir, I am just getting my papers organized here. Other Expenditures in this particular branch appropriation refer to medical administration; epidemiological services; the encephalitis surveillance; biological products; lifesaving and cystic fibrosis program; rheumatic heart disease; diabetic drugs; polio vaccine; mumps vaccine; other vaccines and immunization agents; storage and distribution — and it should be noted as we're going through this list that there is some substantial increases in the appropriation this year due to the increases in drug prices — venereal disease control; clinical services and the hearing conservation program. And then some ancillary expenses. Those are the main Other Expenditures, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(2)—pass — The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on the lifesaving drugs that we have; this was a program that had existed for a number of years and when Pharmacare Program came in, I think that what happened then was that the program was frozen, that is, no new people were admitted on this program but those that had been receiving it at the time were still getting this under this program. Now, does this program still exist or is it strictly under Pharmacare at this time? In other words, do they pay the first fifty dollars of the lifesaving drugs and 20 percent of the balance?

Also, while we are talking about drugs, there had been a discussion with the Federal government at one time I think, that when we were afraid of this epidemic, the provinces had agreed to let the Federal government to do the buying for all the provinces, and I think that the Province of Manitoba was sent a bill. But the vaccine, some of it anyway — at that time anyway — had not been delivered; it was late and I think it was coming in at a time where had we needed it, it would

have been too late. Now, there was discussion going on with the Federal government trying to get at least a compromise in this. Could the Minister tell us if that has been settled and was Manitoba saddled with the whole bill, or did the Federal Government take part of it? In other words, did we have to accept what had not been delivered in time, and, if so, do we still have quite a supply, Mr. Chairman? And has anything else been found, it was felt that this would not be good for much more than a year, or maybe two at the very most? I think a further study was being made, so maybe the Minister has added information.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the honourable member's last question first. The Emergency Measures Organization deals with the distribution and application of the vaccine and sort of implementation of the program; there still is a considerable inventory, we still have vaccine on hand. I can't give him an answer to whether Manitoba is sharing the whole financial burden of the program or whether it's being shared — I'll have to get him the information on that.

The question on Other Expenditures and Lifesaving Drugs, we're looking at drugs for rheumatic fever, cystic fibrosis, leukemia, growth hormones and diabetes. In that first category, there were 465 recipients; in the diabetic category, as of November 1st last, there were 712. Now that program of distribution and availability of lifesaving drugs is still operating the way it was before; it has not proven administratively, or financially practical to bring it under the Pharmacare Program. It's operating without change, as it was before. There are no new patients for diabetes, but lifesaving drugs have been extended to additional patients . . . no new patients for diabetes. There are some substantial increases in the appropriation, in the vote being asked, for example, Lifesaving and Cystic Fibrosis Program last year's vote was \$93,700 and this year we are asking for \$157,300.00. That is due in the main to growth hormones, which are used to prevent dwarfism and afflictions of that kind, and to the enormous increase in drug prices.

I'm not sure whether I missed a question or two of the honourable member's in that list.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, actually what I was after was finding out the policy of the department and I think it is ambiguous, because the Minister said that nothing has changed, and the policy was — fine, I agree with the Minister — that it would not be curtailed immediately, and the people would be covered under the Pharmacare system, but that no new patients . . . it would be frozen. In other words, it would be eventually phased out and we would find ourselves with only the Pharmacare Program. I think the Minister is saying that in some areas this is the case, but in other areas they have accepted new patients. So the policy is not to phase it out, then, this is a program that will continue on its own, and everybody will be judged on its merits? Is that the correct answer?

If that is the case, then there is a change in policy.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, that's certainly the correct answer with respect to the lifesaving drugs, Mr. Chairman. As far as diabetes is concerned, diabetics, I believe, are covered under the Pharmacare Program now. But with respect to those patients in the lifesaving drug area, as I say, it evidently proved unworkable and impractical to try to handle that under Pharmacare, and so there is no policy intention now to pursue that objective or proceed with trying to bring it under Pharmacare, and there is not technically what could be called a freeze in that area. We are adding new patients in that area.

I think that the diabetic area represents a holding pattern. We had 712 patients on the register this past November, and there were 712 patients on the register in 1975, so you could certainly say the register has been frozen in that area, but not in the lifesaving drugs category.

MR. DESJARDINS: I won't pursue this any further, I just wanted the policy of the department, but in 1977-78, the diabetic drugs were 798, so I don't know why, I thought they were decreasing all the time, but that's not that important at this time.

Now, today there was an announcement in the paper to say that those receiving their drugs, Outpatients Department at the hospitals, will have to be covered by Pharmacare — exactly the same as Pharmacare. Now, are there any of those that are getting these lifesaving drugs out there, and these people are still not going to be covered by Pharmacare, will they?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the announcement in today's paper, Mr. Chairman, I can't answer for it specifically, because I just had a quick glance at it, but if it referred to lifesaving drugs, I don't know that it did —(Interjection)— It shouldn't have, if it did, it shouldn't have, and if it didn't, then it was correct in not referring to lifesaving drugs.

Well, first of all, we aren't talking about inpatients, and as the honourable member well knows,

that's a different thing altogether — they're covered. Outpatients on lifesaving drugs will still receive their lifesaving drugs free of charge under the program that we're looking at right now. That service has not been discontinued — it will continue and to the best of my knowledge, the best estimates from the Health Sciences Centre and the Health Services Commission are that it will cost about \$100,000 per year. As the honourable member knows, the total Outpatient Drug Program being operated at the Health Sciences Centre up to this moment, has cost about \$175,000 per year. But the \$100,000 that refers to lifesaving drugs remains in place, with no change. The other part of it were drugs that were not lifesaving drugs, they were drugs that were used in treatment of ailments for outpatients utilizing that particular medical facility, and it was felt that that service could be curtailed or cut back at a saving to the taxpayer without serious consequence.

I believe the same type of thing was tried and implemented successfully within the last couple of years at St. Boniface, so the change at the Health Sciences Centre is just an application of the same pattern, but it does not include lifesaving drugs at all. They are still being made available in the same way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on this question of the change of policy at the hospital in the Outpatients Department, the Outpatients is used many times by people, because of an accident they are brought in; parents bring in children who have been involved in accidents who need treatment and certain medication. I know that people on welfare, on social allowances, whether it be municipal or provincial, have their cards and therefore will be able to get whatever medication is required, but is the change in policy going to result in people not having the money to pay for their drugs, requiring it because as I say if an accident — something occurred that they couldn't go to a doctor, they had to take the child into the hospital or themselves into the hospital, requiring certain medication, and they can't get the medication unless they pay for it — whether it be pain killers, whether it be penicillin for infections, or what have you. Is the Minister saying that if they haven't got the funds the hospital will not issue the medication?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the implementation of a change in policy of this kind would certainly require the application of discretion, and for out-patients who were injured in accidents or in pain or in emergency difficulty, I would be prepared to assure him there would be no difficulty in having drugs made available and issued free of charge. I think what is being looked at here is a practice of distribution that was not always related to serious ailments, and the inclination on the part of certainly some advisors in the department and in the Health Services Commission, was that it could be curtailed or restricted without the kind of danger or impact to anybody in need of drugs such as those referred to by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. Now it may be that we have to monitor the situation pretty closely and see whether it's practical for the amount of dollars involved which — I don't like to minimize any amount of dollars — but when you're dealing with the budget for this department I suppose one could say "in relative terms" the amount of dollars is fairly limited, and we will have to monitor it to see whether for the amount of dollars, which is relatively small, it's practical to try to curtail that program. But I feel confident I can assure the honourable member that no one in need would be refused them. I think there's been a practice of perhaps unnecessary, somewhat unrequired distribution, that tends to create an additional small cost that the taxpayers perhaps shouldn't have to bear, but it'll take some monitoring.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting. The Minister, of course, says that this is up to the Health Sciences Centre, the Health Services Commission, to somehow work it out. Of course he recognizes, I'm sure, that the reason they're faced with this dilemma is because of the cut in their budget which is not the Commission's doing or the Health Sciences Centre doing; it's the doing of this particular government and their determination to cut costs in health facilities and to cut the budget in health facilities.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . a separate item entirely. It was proposed as a separate item.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, if the hospitals weren't faced with the kind of impossible budgetary requirements that they're faced with I don't think this matter would have come up. But they are forced into looking for every penny they can find because they don't have the funds, and, faced with that, they're going all over the place looking for the odd dollar here and there. The Minister mentions \$145,000 and in the Health Sciences Centre, which is the largest emergency hospital in Winnipeg, it probably does more than all the others combined, so that the

amount of money is not all that large.

But I'm really concerned that people go to out-patients because things occur during the middle of the night when doctors are not available, when other services are not available. I've had occasion to take members of my family in and it seems to me that to say, well, you're going to have to pay for the drugs, otherwise sorry, we can't afford to just hand them out, is very viciously putting cost before need in neon lights, and I can't fault the hospital and I can't fault the Commission. They are faced with budgetary cuts which force them into this kind of action, and I'm concerned, despite the Minister's assurance that it'll be monitored, effective June 1st — I think it's June 1st the paper stated — at that point in time people working in the hospital, whether it be nurses or staff, are going to require dollars or pennies or whatever it is, for whatever medication they happen to have to give out, whether it be as I say an antibiotic or some other kind of drugs, and to simply say we'll monitor it is not enough. You know, the suggestion that there was unrequired medication given, you know, I can't really accept that because that implies complete irresponsibility on the part of hospital staff and the doctors on staff.

To suggest that, if I go into out-patients because I have to go in some time during the night or weekend, and I don't need an antibiotic or some pills of some kind or other they're going to give it to me anyways, I'm sorry, is nonsense. It'll only be issued, and it has been issued, only when required, and usually in an amount sufficient to carry me until, let's say Monday, Tuesday, when I can see a doctor and I can then get a prescription and go to my drug store.

But the amount is small. I think it's \$145,000 that they're talking about out of a budget of millions at the Health Sciences Centre, and so it seems to me you're creating a situation in the Health Sciences Centre which is going to make it very difficult for staff to perform their functions. It's going to put a tremendous burden on many people who may come in there at three o'clock in the morning who haven't got the funds with them and they're going to be told well, look, sorry, — and this is what you hear all the time now from people in the health field — we can't help it; that's the regulations. That's what's come down from government. We just don't have the funds. We have to cut this, we have to cut that, and this is an area that we're going to have to cut.

I'm concerned about a deterioration in emergency care and out-patient care at the major facility in Winnipeg and what the government's saving here in relation to the total size of the budget is comparatively small. If the Minister is concerned about unrequired and unnecessary medication then let him close that door. Let him check that out, not simply slam the door shut so that people in need — and at that point they're not in a position to argue — people in need are not faced with the refusal of medication when, in fact, they need it because of their particular physical condition at the time.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all let's get the onus turned around the right way. The Health Sciences Centre did not come in response to a budget prescribed for it, a limited budget increase prescribed for it by the Health Services Commission and say, look, in order to save some dollars and cents we're going to cut out this service. It didn't happen that way. The Health Services Commission, through the department, through my office, through the Estimates process, took the initiative and said there is a service there that costs \$175,000 a year that needn't cost \$175,000 a year. There was a similar practice at St. Boniface General Hospital, not quite that extent in size or expenditure, but a similar type of practice, and it was terminated a few years ago without significant impact or difficulty.

Secondly, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks says, "Well, we are doing this because we are looking for the odd dollar here and there." Well, I don't quarrel with that — that's exactly what we're doing, and if we don't look for the odd dollar here and there, we aren't going to have the hundred dollars here and there, or the hundreds of thousands dollars here and there that the odd dollar here and there adds up to — that's precisely what we're doing. If there is a service where an odd dollar can be saved, far better to save the odd dollar there than in a far more crucial area where there is no opportunity to exercise some tightening of the budget, and in fact perhaps make it possible for expansion in some budget areas because of rationalization in those areas where the odd dollar here and there can be saved. So I don't quarrel with his statement, where we quarrel is on the implications of his statement. He thinks to look for the odd dollar here and there is unfair, I say to look for the odd dollar here and there is the only way to do it.

Thirdly, this clientele that was served with free drugs at the Outpatient Department of the Health Sciences Centre still has access to drugs through Pharmacare. They still can obtain their drugs through Pharmacare. Admittedly, there is the \$50.00 payment that has to be made on Pharmacare purchases, but that program, that system hasn't changed, and if they need drugs and if they are

on Social Allowances, it's an entirely different thing — if they need drugs they've got Pharmacare to utilize, and if they're in any kind of medical condition or situation bordering on the emergency of the type that the honourable member refers to, he can be absolutely assured that nobody at the Health Sciences Centre is going to refuse to provide them with the drugs that are necessary.

The situation, as I understand it, is that there was a fair clientele off the street in the middle of the daytime — nobody's talking about automobile accidents in the middle of the night — that was having made available to them free drugs. In some cases I believe some of the drugs were utilized in a fairly free capacity, as far as dispensing went, in order to test their effectiveness for certain things, and that ran into a considerable expense — what the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks refers to as the odd dollar here and there. It ran into approximately \$75,000 of those odd dollars every year, as I've pointed out, and if it's possible to save \$75,000 there, and therefore not have to effect a budgetary squeeze on a more crucial area of the Health Sciences Centre operation, then I think that that's the rational and sensible and businesslike way to go about it. If it turns out that that particular clientele or their children are not following through in attention to personal health because of this move, then it will have to be reconsidered, and that's a very simple thing to monitor, a very simple thing to monitor. There are nurses in the Outpatient Clinic at the Health Sciences Centre who can tell us within one month whether families who were taking advantage of the free drug program are now not following up on the proper medication for their children, because that free drug program has been terminated, and if that happens, then we will have to reconsider it. But at this juncture, on the basis of what happened at St. Boniface, we are reasonably confident that it won't happen and therefore here is saving that can be made without an impact on critical health situations.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is making quite ado out of the saving a dollar here, a dollar there, and ending up with \$100, etc. That sounds all very good, and you know, indicates how interested the Minister is in saving dollars. I still say that he's saving dollars on the backs of people — and what people? He refers to those, not the accident victim, not the person that comes in at night, but he says, "They are people during the day, who reside in the area, and have been making use of these particular medications dispensed through the Outpatient Clinics."

Now let's look at the clientele — if you want to call it that — who use that facility. These are core area residents. Many of them have come there — they are not necessarily Welfare recipients, they are just at the border, they don't qualify for Welfare — but these are core area residents who finally been motivated enough to seek assistance in an Outpatient Clinic for their children or for themselves. The Minister has often talked about prevention. I can tell him that if you want to prevent far more serious and costly ailments later on down the line, the time to do it is early on. If you have children who require special medication, then you don't impose or put in front of their parents that burden of having to dig down and find that \$5 or \$10 bill, which they may not have, and they don't have in many instances, because these people are just at the border line, many of them. I'm suggesting that this is being penny wise and dollar foolish, because what you think you are going to save is going to cost you a lot more later on. You can say all you want about monitoring 30 days down the line, 40 days down the line, once these people are faced with having to put out the money or being refused, the likelihood of them coming back is very remote, and your preventative aspect is totally lost at that point.

So I can't accept the fact that this is a wise move, I don't think it is an economical move. It's saving a dollar now, so you'll spend \$10 later on — that's what will happen. And the business about it isn't the Health Sciences Centre, it was the Health Services Commission who suggested this to the Health Sciences Centre, that may be, but the Health Services Commission also has to recognize and did recognize that they were granted far less funds for hospital use than had been the case in the past, so I can't blame the Health Services Commission for scrabbling around and looking for every dollar they can find, but again I have to put it on the doorstep of the Minister and his government — they're the ones who created the situation by cutting the moneys available to the hospitals through the Health Services Commission.

So, Mr. Chairman, I look at the introduction of this kind of so called penny saving, to very short-sighted and in the long run a more costly approach to health care for particularly an element in our City which needs it most and which traditionally wouldn't go, and couldn't afford to lay out the moneys to go to the doctor, get a prescription, go to a drugstore, and pay it out and eventually hope to get a refund from Medicare, because in the meantime they've got to put out that money which they just, in many cases, don't have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge1

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take up with the Minister some other issues related to the Public Health Program in the province and one which I think has been long avoided and evaded in being dealt with, and one in which there is increasing evidence is reaching a fairly critical stage, and that is a lack of serious appraisal, investigation and analysis of different kinds of chemical and pesticide poisonings or ailments caused by the use of different chemicals in the air and other forms of it. It's been a subject, I think, that has been brought to my attention for the last four or five years and it's only in the last two or three months that further information has been submitted to me concerning the incidence of Reye's Syndrome, which is a child-related disease oftentimes caused by different kinds of chemical spraying. A program which has now been outlawed or has been cancelled in the province of Nova Scotia is probably the clearest indication of the seriousness with which it's treated in that province, and yet it's been brought to my notice, Mr. Chairman, that in the Province of Manitoba there is virtually no provision for testing of that disease or that problem; that there is literally nothing within the requirements under medical examinations for examining the incidence of Reye's Syndrome and the way it impacts upon children. In fact, parents whose children they suspect have been subject to that particular problem have been told by different medical bodies that in fact they're suffering from liver diseases or encephalitis or some other kind of problem that affects the liver, simply because there is no provision in this province for doing a proper job of detecting the signs or symptoms of it, nor, on the other side of it, is there I think much awareness on the part of the medical institutions or the public health, medical public health services, that it is indeed a difficulty.

In fact, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that on the other side of it, there has been kind of an over-emphasis placed upon defending the use of chemicals and promoting their uses in this province. There's a strange kind of attitude on the part of some public health officials concerning this, that they've almost become the defenders or the proponents of chemical spraying and of chemical uses as opposed to being equally concerned about the medical problems that can be related to the use of chemicals.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that it's the kind of thing — Oh, I know that in the past, and I can think of some gentlemen fairly close to me — it's been dismissed by saying "Well, that's another kind of environmental problem and who cares about that these days, anyway?" The fact of the matter is that there has been an incidence of cases in this province where children have been taken and because of the lack of procedures being set forward, there is a suspicion that they've suffered from Reye's Syndrome and yet there's no form of treatment or diagnosis in the province available to them. I would bring to the attention of the Minister that in the province of Ontario, for example, Reye's Syndrome is now considered to be a reportable disease under The Public Health Act as of June 1977. It is not so under our Public Health Act; it's not considered to be an incidence of disease affecting children that should be considered or included as part of our arrangements, and I would certainly like to have the Minister agree that he will undertake to examine the evidence that was available in Ontario on Reye's Syndrome and determine why or how perhaps it might be included, incorporated as part of The Public Health Act here as a reportable disease in the Province of Manitoba.

I could, if the Minister was so interested, provide him with a number of cases that have been brought to my attention where the parents of children have felt that in fact their offspring have been suffering from this particular area, but I want to use it mainly to indicate to the Minister that I think that in the area of public health in this province that we have not done any kind of a serious job of beginning to provide facilities or instructions to the medical fraternity to begin doing proper examination of the effects that uses of chemicals can provide in a variety of ways, particularly those with respiratory diseases.

I think that what the Minister has to be conscious of is to measure that lack of treatment and lack of diagnosis and lack of examination, against the almost geometric frequency in increase of use of chemicals in this province; that there is something like — I don't know — 5,000 licensed chemicals now available in the province.

The Clean Environment Commission was really denied controlling power over the use of chemical spraying, that we now have a variety of chemicals being used in a variety of different ways without anyone really doing any serious testing or examination in the province. And what concerns me — in fact, Mr. Chairman, I picked up a news account just after the new government came to office which indicated that they were putting on the market some 500 gallons of a chemical spray, methoxychlor, I believe, that was used for the Spruce budworm spraying — because the Department of Renewable Resources had got a more powerful spray, a dioxide of some kind which has a hell

of a lot more potency to it — and this was taken as a matter that all of a sudden we could kill things much faster, and yet you have to weigh that particular event against the fact that the province of Nova Scotia has now banned the use of that family of chemicals altogether.

So we have a curiosity — perhaps the anomaly, in the province where we are increasing the use of chemicals in a variety of ways and yet are not providing any commensurate improvement in the detection or analysis or diagnosis or treatment in our public health systems to compensate for it, or respond to it. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is a problem that we should begin to pay some serious attention to, and the Minister has it in his power, both through his ability to amend The Public Health Act to provide for different regulations under The Public Health Act in terms of examination of these areas to begin making a major turnaround in this particular area of problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in response to the problem and the challenge posed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, I would have to say that doubtless, many jurisdictions in North America have not been as sensitive to the cumulative impact of various chemicals, sprays, insecticides, etc. over the past few years as one perhaps would have wished. With the wisdom of hindsight we can see that there are toxic and harmful effects resulting from many of those applications, particularly taken in a cumulative way, and if we had known then what we know now when we engaged, really in terms of a continent-wide approach to the use of insecticides and sprays, doubtless there would have been some stricter rules and regulations and we would have been more careful. So I don't dispute the importance of the point that the honourable member raises; I think there is now, though, a consciousness of that kind of danger, an awareness, and a resulting attempt on the part of officials, federally in Canada and here in Manitoba, to watch and monitor those kinds of applications in their uses and eliminate the dangerous ones, or potentially dangerous ones, and minimize the discomfort resulting from the use of all of them.

The overall matter of insecticide monitoring and testing falls to a very large degree into the area of responsibility of the Federal Government, as the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge knows, under the Food and Drug legislation, but there are certainly things that can be done and are done by provincial officials, particularly our officials here in Manitoba. Our provincial Public Health personnel have a responsibility for maintaining a watch over health standards and conditions in restaurants, in our water, at all times being ready to act to prevent and eliminate the appearance of any hazards in those areas. The Clean Environment Commission and the Environmental Protection people operating under the Department of Mines and Resources have a responsibility, and a considerable one, for environmental protection, and our Department of Agriculture, under my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, does some pesticide testing, so that there is a watch being maintained; there are efforts that have been mounted and are pursued to try to isolate and identify dangers of this kind as quickly as possible, to try to minimize the impact and to try to eliminate from use those that are recognized as potentially harmful. The cumulative effect and impact building up into conditions such as the Reye's Syndrome and others described by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is something that we have to analyze and assess much more deeply, acquaint ourselves with much more fully. All we can do is take his and others' warnings that there is a danger abroad that has not been properly controlled or curtailed and renew our efforts in this area.

The point is well taken; the Federal Government will have to be equally vigilant. My own department personnel, particularly in the Medical Public Health Branch, will be reminded of this concern, I'm sure, because of this particular debate; in any event, I'll take pains to remind them anyway. I will attempt to obtain additional information with respect to Reye's Syndrome in particular to see whether it's reached a range of impact or an extent of impact that would require further programming, further personnel, than is being maintained at the present time through the department.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I don't think that the Minister's remarks leave us much further ahead than where we were. His expressions of interest and concern and to some degree sympathy, have been expressed before, but nothing much has changed, and I think that it would be wrong of me just to leave it at that and not point out to him some basic flaws in his own response. One is that the nature of testing that's done on the federal level by the Food and Drug directorate does not really look at the question of application, at test toxicity of the different kinds of chemicals when not under controlled or usable circumstances so that what they're basically indicating is that it's safe to use, it's safe to handle, but that there is no way of measuring its ultimate impact in terms of amounts used and how it may impact upon human beings, particularly if those

human beings have respiratory diseases.

Secondly, I would suggest that there are things that the Public Health Service in this province could be doing, more than it's doing now, to respond to the issue. There is not, as I pointed out, any adequate form of testing or measurement done in this province to determine when major spraying programs are undertaken, what the impact will be. And certainly there is nothing in the way of major information programs to give people proper warning so that if they themselves or their children are susceptible to these kinds of effects they will at least be able to move out. If there is widespread spraying going on in different localities and provincial parks — last year we sprayed for budworm in a variety of provincial parks when people were inhabiting those parks, without giving any warning at all — so that there are a number of steps that could be taken without any major investigation. I think steps that have been taken in other jurisdictions because they recognize the danger. As I pointed out to him, the Province of Ontario has already amended its Public Health Act to include a Reye's Syndrome as a reportable disease, which does then put a certain onus upon physicians to use it as part of the various symptoms that they will watch out for when they examine a child who comes in with certain kinds of problems, rather than assuming it's diagnosed for some other reason.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that in this province we could be a little more progressive than we have been up to this day, and that we would not only just take goodwill wishes as our standard, but in fact do some specific action and direction in this field. I think, particularly because we are in a province which is highly agricultural, which uses a large number of sprays as part of its industrial and agricultural procedures, that it would seem a natural and logical program to be undertaking in a province on the prairies, say, by comparison to what's being done in the Province of Alberta. Again we are substantially behind in this area in terms of looking at these kinds of tests and measurements.

So I would only want to register, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the Minister's remarks; I think that he is, while expressing concern, is going through that time honoured game of — let's get by this one quickly and go on to something else. I simply think that that's not being good enough. I think it is too important to pass by and I could only suggest to him that if he began looking at the problem he would understand that for those parents who have had children, who are susceptible to it, or have been affected by it, or concerned by it, he would realize the anguish that they feel at the present moment in this province, and on that basis alone, I think it requires more direct action than he seems to be prepared to take.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item I would like to discuss with the Minister the question of prevention, because this is an area where this can be achieved. I am very pleased to see that the Minister of Education is here because I think that he and the Minister of Health must be very close if they are going to work in that direction.

I must apologize to the House, to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister; I did make a mistake when I was talking about the Hearing Centre — I said that there was money for two other centres in the Department of Health and then I looked at the report that I saw, the clipping in the newspaper, they didn't mention any centres — and of course we were talking about the Dauphin and The Pas Centres. My mistake was that I had been discussing it with the then Minister of Education; in all these programs we had a policy of the government which was accepted by Cabinet and the money for the two centres, it would have been for this year, was announced — it was a two-year plan because the Department of Education paid for the Brandon and Thompson Centre also — I think that the statement that was made, that there would be no new centres this year, no aeded centres this year. That was something that had been announced by the then Minister of Education and the money was in the Estimates of the Department of Education.

Now I say this is something and I hope that the two Ministers are discussing, are talking together, because I think that this is the best way to achieve this prevention. I suspect that the Minister of Education is very interested or I don't think that he would be the Minister of Education, but I know that the Minister of Health is as interested as I am in prevention.

But again, it's just like the answer I guess that he gave my honourable friend for Fort Rouge, it's a lot of verbiage but no commitment of any kind, and I think that this is what we need — more commitments. Even if we go by the rules of this government of cost first and need second, even then it would be foolish to think that if we do away, if we don't go ahead with these programs, that we're going to save money. It's going to cost an awful lot more money if we don't go ahead

and proceed in that direction of prevention program.

A MEMBER: It's costs first, and need last.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, well I thought that's what I said, well I don't know about last, but cost and then need. I don't want to exaggerate; I don't think that he said need last. I think it was cost first and then if they had extra funds, well then fine, they would look at the needs. But I would say that people other than socialists or New Democratic government, have suggested that for instance that immunization should be a public health function, should be taken out of the hands of private doctors. This was suggested by medical people and I have reports, for instance from the Globe and Mail, that immunization of school children will never be adequate until it is taken out of the hands of private doctors, and this is doctors that are making these statements and they are saying how important these things are.

I had announced, and the government had announced, that we were going in that direction; we had started with the Dental Program which was prevention and education, and education is a very important thing. The Minister has always talked about prevention and the main thing is education; the people have to be ready for this, and you have to educate the children how to take care of themselves and so on, and what a better way but to have this testing through the Dental Program. We have facilities in schools, it was brought to the schools, where we could have had — just imagine, Mr. Chairman, how nice this would have been if you would have had the Dental Program, Hearing, Eye Testing, and Immunization, right in the schools, and this would save funds, this would save money. It's not just a wide-eyed radical program to spend more money or to involve the government; it's not that at all.

I explained many times when I talked about the Dental Program — we'll come back maybe this week or next week sometime and we'll talk about the Dental Program — and it wasn't something that we didn't want the medical profession to do, it wasn't that at all. It was that there is a shortage of dentists, very large shortage of dentists, especially in the north and in the rural areas, and it was something that the Minister is saying — that the cost of care, of the health care, is so high that something has to be done to lower it. We were saying that if we could plateau it we would be happy; the Minister is saying that it has to be lowered, and this is where we had dental nurses who could be trained to do certain things and this is why you can have in certain areas nurse practitioners who can do some of these things, it might be better sometimes. And this is no reflection on the medical or the dental professions, but in certain areas they can do better because they do more of it; they do it now in the doctors clinics, and so on, and we feel that this is where it should be done, it would be easy. At one time there were about 95 percent of the children of this country that were properly immunized and now there is about 75 percent.

At the time when they had polio and so on, people were so afraid that they were going ahead, now it's not compulsory and it's a lack of education to the families of these children. And I think that this is a very, very important thing and I think that this is an area where the two Ministers should get together and promote this kind of understanding, this kind of education in these kinds of prevention programs.

And as I say to the Minister, you are going to allow the people of Manitoba to live a much richer life, a better life, you will teach them how to take care of themselves and therefore not to later on have to resort to very expensive programs, and you will detect all kinds of disease and you will kill certain disease that you will never see again, like polio for instance, there's not much of that. There is an area here that a Dr. Green was talking about, this eye testing, and this is a statement and I'll quote the newspaper, "There are 400,000 people in Canada who have gone blind from amblyopia and if we had picked it up when those children were young enough to be treated properly the blindness could have been avoided." This is the kind of thing that I am talking about. In the immunization also there are certain diseases that are not heard about anymore because of our /ard about immunization.

So my suggestion, and I certainly would hope that this government would follow the announced policy of the former government, who said, "Fine, we will go ahead and we will try to protect the youth of Manitoba," and I'm saying in schools, and of course the health clinics are also very important because some of this immunization can go to pre-school children also.

But at least at schools if you had the record and if you knew the immunization that they had, their eye test, their ear test. As I said last week, Mr how many times do you hear that this child can't learn, he's retarded, he can't learn, and then you find out, a simple test, that the child was deaf. He might be a genius and it was felt that he was retarded.

I say, Sir, that this is an area — there is a committee, I would imagine this committee still exists,

maybe I should ask the Minister — I think that Dr. Eadie of his department had established an advisory committee made up from people in the agencies involved, in the Hearing Services for instance, to advise the Minister. I don't know if the Minister is aware that that committee exists and if he has discussed this with Dr. Eadie and the members of his committee, but I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is an area that the government and the Minister should look at. This is an area where I would hope, that even if you say cost first, need second, that the cost that is involved, that you will save, once the people of Manitoba are properly educated and are given these facilities and these tests. This will help, will do exactly what you want to do, will help keep the health costs in the province down.

And of course, what is probably more important that that is that these people will lead a much more productive life, a much happier life, their education will be improved in many cases and I think that this is very important. So if the Minister says there is no freeze —(Interjection)— well, I'm not going to start an argument. The Minister said that whatever was there last year we didn't cut. That's right. But there was a the same as he froze policy he construction plan, it was a five-year plan, it wasn't all done in the first year, the same as this, this was not done in the first year but this was announced for a two-year plan — I am talking now about the Hearing Program, the hearing testing and then there was the Dental Program, but that is a different issue that we'll discuss — but those things were done when the policy of the government was announced. And now we hear, well, it is frozen and there might be a reduction but certainly there will not be any new programs at all in any new areas.

In fact, on the Dental Program, the rumours that we've heard is that they are going to do the opposite of what was recommended by this doctor who was saying take this and make it public health; these kinds of programs make it public health, you've got to do it in schools. They are getting away from that, changing a dental program and sending it back to the dental clinics where it hasn't worked in the past. So I would hope that the Minister who was for many, many years, before he was in government, has genuinely been interested in these kind of prevention programs. I know that, I've heard him many times and I have no reason to doubt his sincerity at all. But this I think is a chance to prove it and he could still be within the guidelines of his government if he has enough progressive people, and he should certainly be helped by his colleague, the Minister of Education who should be just as interested, and they can go to the Cabinet and say, just a minute here we might need a few more dollars now, but this is what we're going to save in the future years. If you don't want to build hospitals because you'll have to maintain them, we understand that, but this is an area that you will bring savings, and savings, very very soon.

So I would hope that there will be more. I'm not satisfied with the money that is voted, especially after what was announced by the Minister last week, but I would hope — I think the Minister said, "We will look at it and if it's needed we might go back to Cabinet and we'll move in that direction," and I would be satisfied, Mr. Chairman, because after all, it's a new government, and it's a new Minister and they have looked at a pretty high budget, and they haven't had a chance to evaluate all the programs and to look at this because they were looking at practically the day by day — they haven't done I am sure any long range planning. This is what the Minister told us and I can understand that. I would be satisfied though if he would tell me today that yes, I think, that this is certainly a good enough idea that we're going to look into; we're going to look at your announced policy, I'll discuss it with the Minister of Education, and although I can't commit myself to do too much this year because the budget has to be approved, but if we find that this is the case and these programs are going well we will look at it, we will bring recommendations to our colleagues.

I would imagine that I'll have an announcement to make next year at this time when I discuss my estimate. I would be satisfied with that because I want to be reasonable to the Minister; it's a hell of a big department, there's an awful lot to think of. He hasn't had a chance to discuss with his advisory committees and so on, but if the Minister could tell us, fine, but if he repeats, if he repeats, "Well, it's money first, and we've got to cut this," I would say that he doesn't understand these programs and I would say that he's way off and I would doubt of his sincerity when he talks about prevention and education for the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, there was one other item that I wanted to just ask a question to the Minister. It's one that I do with some hesitation considering its sensitivity but I indicated to some constituents that I would be prepared to bring it up, and that has to do with the reports

that appeared this March concerning the difficulty with the spraying of marijuana with a poison down in Mexico and you can understand with the nature of my constituency it would be a matter of some concern to those resident therein. There was a report Dr. Davidson of the University of Manitoba's Pharmacology Department raised concerning that a fatal herbicide was being used as a way of trying to destroy marijuana crops in Mexico. I think it's called Paraquat, if I'm not mistaken. It was, according to Dr. Davidson at the university, liable to provide serious lung damage or heart failure and that the incidence and possibility of it being used in Winnipeg was relatively high considering that that is the major source of our imports of it, and I say that, Mr. Chairman, only from second-hand knowledge — I'll have to trust my sources. I wonder if the Minister could provide us with some report whether the Public Health Department has responded at all to the question or difficulty raised by Dr. Davidson and whether it is something, considering that there is a frequency of marijuana use in some parts of it, whether there is anything being done to try and inform people about the dangers or to respond to that danger in some way and I think particularly if there was any way in which the Public Health Services dealing with American officials in the use of this program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all on the points raised by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface let me just say that I want to repeat what I said the other day, that I have not stipulated and this government has not laid out a policy in the health field of cost first and need second. I think I made it very clear and I attempted to reiterate it on Thursday or Friday that the message that was geared to the perspective of cost was the message that I was delivering on behalf of the government: in the area of construction of capital health facilities and the so-called five year capital construction program. And I said that in that area when we're looking at building new hospitals, building new personal care homes, building new facilities, we are having to ask ourselves five questions, the two most important ones, the first two and the two most important ones in this current period of economic and financial difficulty for the province being: (1) How much will it cost? And (2)— which I said was probably even more important how much will it —H/.cost to operate every year? And then there were three other questions related to those two, and I won't belabour the Committee with repetition, but that essential yardstick, or those essential criteria were introduced by me and are applied by this government in the area of capital construction. They were never specified as being applied to the health field generally. There is a discrepancy there bordering on a misinterpretation, bordering on a deliberate misinterpretation which I would like to head off at the pass if it's at all possible before it's disseminated any more widely by members of the opposition than has already been the case.1

Now, with respect to the whole field of prevention and the comments that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has made in that area, let me assure him that we are not cutting back, freezing, restraining, or even tightening down in the area of prevention. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface is looking at an appropriation being requested of the Legislature here of \$1.7 million compared to last year's actual vote of \$1.4 million. In other words we're looking at an increase of \$340,000 or approximately 23 percent in what is being requested this year in Public Health Services over the vote for last year. If you look at the specific biological product area of the field, the items coming under the heading of "Other Expenditures," we're looking at almost in total an expenditure that goes to prevention. As the descriptive paragraph stipulates here we're dealing with a branch that provides preventive health and medical services, including epidemiological surveillance of communicable diseases, venereal disease control, and certain clinical public health services, and as I elaborated to the honourable member a few minutes ago, the other expenditures include the whole encephalitis surveillance program and the biological products field with all the life-saving drugs and all the vaccines, the preventive vaccines and immunization agents that I detailed for him at that time. That is preventive medicine. That is prevention. That's what we're intent on pursuing with commitment, and that is what we're intent on expanding. So what the honourable member has in front of him is a tangible example of my commitment and our commitment at this juncture to preventive medicine and immunization programs, and it's a field that I want to assure him I intend to expand, I intend to broaden and I intend to move in as quickly as I can and as rapidly as funds permit and it will take a very high priority with me in consideration of the whole program in the field of Health and Social Development for which I'm responsible. As long as I'm Minister this area of prevention and immunization will command and receive a very high priority of attention and of dollars in relative terms.

Now, the screening program . . . Just before I get to that let me say that we have recently received Management Committee approval for 15 new staff man years, 15 staff man years that are currently

required in the Community Operations Division, the majority of them in this particular area, public health nurses particularly in the rural areas. In addition to that, as I pointed out the other day, our immunization program is going to be sophisticated and modernized and improved through the introduction, I hope this year or very shortly, of a computer approach, a computer program that is being prepared in proposal form for me by officials in my department and that I look forward to receiving before too much longer, certainly during the current calendar year, so that we can put our whole immunization program on computer technology, and it will enable us to control the program, direct it and expand it in a much faster and more practical way than is presently the case. That's something I intend to find the money for and I can assure my honourable friend that I'll be building it into my program and my estimates for next year because I believe that it'll be ready in proposal form for me this year.

Now, on the screening program, the hearing program, that program is in place. Admittedly we did not expand into Dauphin or The Pas, but the units that are operating in Brandon and Thompson are operating. There's mobile equipment in the schools that continues to maintain the screening program in the schools. There's a mobile van in use. There are referrals from different areas to Brandon and to Thompson and the program is carried on in conjunction with the Department of Education. With reference to those permanent centres in Brandon and Thompson, plus the mobile unit that it's operating in rural Manitoba, some 30,000 children from kindergarten to Grade 3 are checked each year. Of that 30,000 screened approximately 7 percent fail their initial screening, and of the 7 percent who are then referred to audiologists and our own ear, nose and throat specialist, Dr. Vic Magian, 3 ½ percent require medication, hearing aids, and/or surgery. As time permits, and as resources permit, and as quickly as I can do it, older children and adults are checked. Older children and adults are checked now but I would like to expand that application, and we're also discussing screening services to industry through the Department of Labour. Those are discussions that are under way and discussions that I want to pursue and develop into a tangible program. This is done, as I say, in conjunction with the Department of Education. That department is involved. My colleague, the Honourable Minister of Education, is concerned with it and I can assure the Committee that I will continue to work with him and he with me to develop this screening program. I would like to put additional permanent centres into place. It was not possible within the budget this year but certainly the program that's carried out through the schools and by means of the mobile van is being maintained at a very comprehensive level and there's been no cutback in it whatsoever. The only difference between the position that we're in at the moment and the position that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would have liked to have been in, and that I would have liked to have been in, is that we have not installed or established the permanent centres in Dauphin and The Pas.

The question of funding available for the hearing screening program was raised by the honourable member. It was \$96,000 in 1977-78 — the amount of money spent on that program; this year in 1978-79 we're asking for \$149,000, so notwithstanding the technical argument that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a disposition to continue on in Committee of Supply rather than interrupt the proceedings to proceed to Private Members' Hour so if it's all right with the honourable members we will just continue in Committee of Supply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So that notwithstanding the technical point on which the honourable member has a legitimate challenge for me — that of the permanent centres in Dauphin and The Pas which have not got off the ground — we are in fact engaged in an expansion and a broadening of the program this year in terms of money invested and in terms of the outreach. But I do assure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that I want the program to be expanded beyond this point, and I've not abandoned the concept or the hope for those permanent centres in Dauphin and The Pas and that's under discussion between the Minister of Education and me and will continue to be as I attempt this summer and fall to work out additional adjuncts and innovations and increases to the program that I hope to be able to introduce in the House next winter.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked me about marijuana that had been sprayed with a fatal herbicide. I can't offer him much hope or much consolation on that subject, Mr. Chairman. The weed is illegal, as he knows, and therefore it is administratively impossible to have the

carrying out an inspection or implementing a program related to recognition and acknowledgement of an illegal ingredient, an illegal drug. The advice that I would give to anybody who has been smoking marijuana cigarettes is twofold: (1) quit, and (2) go and see your doctor. I don't think that any doctor, certainly none that I know, would concern himself or herself very much with the fact that a patient coming to see them perhaps had been using an illegal drug. I think that that judgmental aspect is something that the doctor might get into in conversation with the person later on, but I'd think that his or her first reaction would be to take whatever steps were necessary to provide an antidote for the poison contained in that particular herbicide, if the marijuana that that person had been smoking were, indeed, poisoned marijuana. I would at least gamble on that, rather than take the chance that I had been smoking poisoned marijuana and be afraid to go to my doctor because it would be admitting commission of an illegal act. Frankly, I'd take the chance that my doctor would perhaps verbally rap me on the knuckles, but would not set himself up in a judgmental position any further than that, and would deal simply with my medical complaint.

So that would be my advice to them. If they think they've been smoking any poisoned marijuana, to go and see a doctor and take a chance on the fact that I think is 99 percent guaranteed, that the doctor would deal only with that aspect of it and not with the illegality of it, and secondly, change habits to something less hazardous.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure people will be more than thrilled at the advice that the Minister was able to pass out, although, I'd say that and 50 cents gets you a ride on the bus these days, I think, would be a way of describing it. But what I am a little concerned about, he seems to indicate that there is no responsibility on the part of the government. He may interpret it that way, but I think it would be useful . . . The United States government, which has an equally strong and reprehensible position concerning the use of marijuana, has issued a warning because of the dangers that they see and has provided some information to doctors concerning the dangers that might be expected if people come in with certain kinds of symptoms. And I'm wondering if either the provincial government or federal government here are undertaking anything. I think it's right for the Minister to say, "Look, maybe people shouldn't be using it." The fact is, people are using it. I don't know how widespread it is, I don't think anyone really knows, but it doesn't sort of fit into the arena of some sort of heinous crime. I think it's one where even under our Criminal Code it's now been moderated where it's no longer a major crime under the Criminal Code. In fact, I think there has been talk of decriminalizing it.

The fact of the matter is that people are in danger of becoming seriously ill by its use, or perhaps even dying, or having their lungs severely damaged, and it seems that we could do more than just simply offer advice of saying, "Don't do it." I was just wondering if there would be any inspiration on the part of the Minister to perhaps to see if there was a more effective way of his department handling that problem, than simply the issuing of his homilies about proper morals and standards that we should follow in the province. Simply because I think that he would, in his more serious moments, recognize that there is an incidence of use amongst people in this City, and that it would not do any of us any good to simply have them come down with serious illnesses simply because we say it is a problem that we can hide our head about, or stick our head in the sand and say, "Because it's not legal, we can't recognize that the problem exists."

So, I would just ask the Minister, perhaps, to take it up and perhaps, Mr. Chairman, a way of dealing with it would be to contact some of the private agencies working in this field. I think there is the Federal Organization on Drug Abuse that's operative in the province, there are certain groups like Klinik, although I know he's not a great fan of it but it has had very wide activity in dealing with young people in uses of drugs, perhaps they might be prepared to take information programs or detection programs of some kind. Perhaps he would at least ask his officials to take those matters up with some private agencies if he feels the government itself can't directly do it, to see if they would be prepared to respond to it and maybe deal with the problem more adequately.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, yes I can do that, Mr. Chairman. I will, I will. As a matter of fact, I was asked about it the other day, and I did carry out a sort of tentative investigation to see what might be done, and the first situation I ran into was the technical one, the legal and administrative one, and I have not pursued it any further. But the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge raises a good point. I'm not trying to pass moral judgment on people who use it, or I'm not trying to suggest moral conduct for anyone, I'm simply suggesting that the first thing they should do is go and see their doctor. I'd take a chance on their doctor coming through for them, without regard for the

technicalities of the law, but I will carry that further and see if there's some kind of assistance in the way of warnings or directions, suggestions, that can be publicized through my department.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, just a word on the problem brought by the Member for Fort Rouge and he certainly could speak for himself. I think that he was worried about the spray that they were putting on this, and the Minister said, "I would take a chance, I would go and see my doctor, and I'm sure that he wouldn't say too much, and if it's poison he would try to find something to get rid of the poison," but this will continue. You know, you have a very good example of the same thing on V.D.

The doctor will say, "Fine." He'll give you the . . . My honourable friend from Ste. Rose is not here, he's the expert on that as you found out last week, Mr. Chairman. But the point that I was trying to make, that the doctor then will say, "All right, we must need the contacts, and so on, because we want to change this," and I think this is what the Member for Fort Rouge wanted, that if they have somebody, they should find out where he purchased his supply and then get to the root of it to see what the spray was.

But anyway, I want to get back, I'm more interested in the question of Rehab. The Minister gave an endorsement to the program that we were trying to follow, and he assured us that he will continue to keep on, but I find myself pretty well in the same position as the Member for Fort Rouge. I've always said that the Minister is a darn good P.R. man, and he's proving it again, but what I want to know is, first of all, not only the immunization — he wants to keep on with that — but it hasn't been proven successful. Will the Minister look at the possibility of trying to introduce that in the schools? That was one of the questions that I asked.

Then the Minister also said that were more staff for these programs. Well, with the list that he gave me, I compare last year to this year, and he says there'd be more staff in this item that we're looking at, the Medical Public Health Service, it's exactly the same. Well, then I thought he must mean the people in the field, Community Field Services, and I looked at it and that also is exactly the same as this year; and then I looked also at the Public Health Nursing Services, and that is also exactly the same as last year, so where are these new 10? The Minister suggests that the Cabinet had allowed 10 more staff man years. I'd like to know where, I'd like the Minister to point that out?

Then the Minister, Mr. Chairman, has said that last year for the Improved Screening Program there was about \$96,000 spent, and this year was in excess of \$130,000.00. Now, the Minister said, "All we're doing, is we're doing what was started last year." And last year in that \$96,000, the share of this department, that allowed for equipment and so on to set up these testing centres, the two that were open, and they're open now. Now I would like to know why \$137,000 if there's nothing new that is being done, just the same service, the same centres that were opened. I suspect that the answer might be, "Yes, but this is for a full year operation." That might be the case. If that is the case, if it's a full year operation, well then it's not necessarily an increase, it's not new programs. Of course, when a program is in place, you've got to maintain the program, and it's going to cost money.

I was hoping that the Minister of Education was still here and would participate in this. Now, there was part of this program that was funded by the Department of Education, and the announcement for the new ones were made by the Department of Education. I want to know, has there been any transfer at all, or is it the same funding, is it done by the two departments? And if so there's not much point in finding out what is done in one department until I find out that the same thing is done in both departments, or if the Minister is going to tell me, "Well, now it's all my responsibility," or, "It's the responsibility of the Minister of Education." But I think that, at least, the Minister has endorsed the idea of going in that direction, although he didn't talk about the use of schools in these programs, he's talked about general, and it might be fair and it might be better not to try to trap the Minister or force him to say something that then he might not want to back down, so I'd just as soon leave it at that. The Minister has promised that he will come back next year and discuss that, so I think that this would be satisfactory.

Now, there was another area the Minister tried to back away from, this business of the statement that he'd made about cost first then needs. Well first of all I don't care in what area, or what department, if you say, "Cost first then need" — it could be in capital construction, it could be in everything — it's still true to say then that you're placing the cost first and the need after, because the need might be just as real — a personal care bed as a Home Care Program — but that is

not the way I took it. I know that the Minister talked about the Five Year Program, and we'll discuss that later.

I think that it was a statement by the Member for Fort Rouge, in answer to that that the Minister said, "Well, all right, there's so much I can do but then I have so many dollars, and that's the dollars, " and we were talking about the program. Anyway, I think once the Minister is familiar with the department, and he's working very hard at it, I think it won't take very long. Mind you, it's impossible to know all the angles in this department and I think he'll be the first one to admit that also, but I think in general he'll understand the program, and I hope, anyway, that then he will change his mind and he'll come back next year and say, "Well, fine," because he made certain statements, he said, "Well, before I was the Minister I felt that we should cut down in this area, and since I'm there, it's not the same thing." And he also said that a few months or before October 1st he might have agreed with the Task Force in certain areas, but he's not ready to do the same thing now, so I feel that in time these things would change, and I would hope — I'm very happy to know of his priority but I just don't want lip service — I would hope you know not these areas about a statement or a certain speech, talk about volunteers and leave the impression, maybe this wasn't done purposely, that this wasn't done under the former government, and this is something new, something that we invented. I guess under the next item we'll talk about the Abuse Centre, and that's the same area there, as if it was a brand new program and it was something that was being done. But I still think that there has been some cut in this area, because that was an announcement for this year, the same as the Five Year Program, and the Minister and the government felt that they had to say, "Whoa! We're freezing this government," and this is the same thing. There were two new centres that would have been opened this year.

Well, you know, there's enough on that I think, Mr. Chairman, we can repeat and repeat, but the point that I was trying to make is that there has been a certain cutback or a certain freeze in certain areas and I hope that those will be lifted very soon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Just on the 15 SMYs, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member wanted an explanation of that. Those are positions that were frozen; those are positions that had been budgeted for; they were in the establishment; they were in that list that I handed him the other day.

MR. DESJARDINS: No freeze on those — very good.

See, you have been doing quite well. Next year you'll do some more talking and they'll unfreeze other things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. .

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister could tell us what agencies are referred to here under External Agencies, what the amounts were last year and what they are this year?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The External Agencies being funded are the Canadian Public Health Association and the Family Planning Association of Manitoba. The total being asked, as the honourable member can see, is \$21,800 as compared to \$41,800 from last year; that is because there was \$20,000 in there last year for the St. John's Ambulance Council; that's been taken out, that is not in the list of agencies being funded under this branch of this department any longer.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that the St. John's Ambulance is still being funded, but through another appropriation?

MR. SHERMAN: The arrangement with the St. John's Ambulance people, Mr. Chairman, was there was a \$20,000 vote on the understanding that they would train our staff, they would train our people for us in the capacity that the St. John's Ambulance Council practices in the first aid and medical field. There weren't a great many people who applied for it, but nonetheless that was what it was for; it was a one-year proposition.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that this should be specified; it wasn't quite as cut and dried as the Minister said; it was for the training of not necessarily just our staff, for first aid training in the rural areas; this was something that had been requested for years by the rural members of this House in the rural areas because nothing had been done in the rural areas. Now, that wasn't just for training our staff at all. So is this curtailed then? It was for a special program, the Minister

is absolutely right. Now, are they not training anybody in the rural area now, in the first aid?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I might have to look into one aspect of that question, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member is quite correct that it was for training in the rural areas, but there was the understanding it was for any of our staff that wanted it. —(Interjection)— Yes, including any of our staff who wanted it. Now, apparently the response was not, as near as I can determine from my officials, all that impressive, and further to that I don't have in front of me a report on the success of that program, the use of it, the utilization of it. In any event it was a special project, whether it was successful or not, I can't at this juncture say. But it was not intended to be an ongoing program as I understand it unless there was a terrific response and I am advised that there wasn't that much of a response, there wasn't that much interest, and we haven't heard significantly, to any significant or meaningful number, from people who desired it or who took it or who would desire it in the future. So there doesn't seem to be any justification for maintaining that special project on a continuing year to year basis at this juncture anyway, on the basis of last year's experience. I can check and see if we have had a report; my officials say they're not aware of one, but the information that they have had back is that there were very few people who applied for it and there wasn't that much enthusiasm for it.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the program was launched last year, and it's not uncommon for programs of this type to take some time to develop. The fact that the Minister says that there wasn't all that much activity, or much advantage-taking of the program, doesn't necessarily mean that the program should have been cut. I am wondering whether the Minister did in fact discuss this with the St. John's Ambulance people; whether it was simply done, they simply cut it because somebody on the staff thought that this was a nice — knowing the Minister was looking for savin, that this was a place to save — and simply cut a program.

We launched the program because it's recognized by everyone that there is a need for more than just professional people to have training in first aid and medical field treatment. It's commonly accepted that the more of our citizenry that are equipped to handle this kind of emergency when it occurs, the far better off we are in using our resources. So you don't always have to call a doctor because a doctor isn't always available. And it would certainly be something that this government should be promoting, the utilization of people, not professionals, to acquire a certain level of skill in first aid and field prevention so that they can help, when needed, when something occurs. And although there may not have been an immediate response I think it's incumbent on the government to encourage St. John's Ambulance to promote the program, to get people interested in the program, to advertise it so that more and more people will take advantage of it. It is a skill that, once learned, you don't forget, and it's a skill that once learned, can and will be important to a healthy society. Too often we tend to leave things to somebody else; here's a situation where everyone can participate and should participate.

Now, we don't do it through the schools to any extent; we leave it to people to voluntarily become involved. This was a vehicle through which they could do it, by St. John's Ambulance, which is equipped to do it, which has the manpower to do it, which is willing to do it, and to simply say, "Well, in the very first year that it was launched it hasn't proved all that successful," — numerically, I suppose, that's how you measure it — to me, that simply is brushing aside a potential program which potentially has great value not just for Winnipeg — Winnipeg doesn't need it perhaps as much — but certainly, in rural communities where they need that kind of expertise which they've lacked all these years, in northern Manitoba, and our own provincial staff, who I suppose unless somebody pushes them aren't going to take the course. But I think that's something the Minister should see to, that the provincial staffs are qualified in first aid and to get groups of people in every community, in every town and village, to take the course on an annual basis so that more and more people can be trained in this — it could be a life-saving skill.

So I find it strange when the Minister simply says, "Well, somebody suggested we cut it; the staff felt that it hadn't taken off and therefore, we were looking for somewhere to cut and we cut this." I find this more and more; unless somebody apparently has fought for a program, the government says, "Well, if somebody doesn't want it, let's cut it." Or if there's no one to protect that particular program, we'll cut it. They seem to respond to that sort of push-pull. If there's somebody who has a stake in something and speaks up, they may save the program or maintain it, even though they freeze it, but unless there's a champion for the program, they sort of just dismiss it as not being that effective.

I'm just wondering whether in fact the Minister did discuss it with the St. John's Ambulance people; what are their views? What is their explanation for the lack of utilization or enrolment in the program

if in fact that is the case? Did he sound them out? Did he discuss it with them? Was there something wrong with the way the program was launched, perhaps? Not the program itself, but in the launching of the program? Did they need more support from government in order to make the program more successful? Simply to say, "Well, it's been in existence for 12 months," — or 9 months, or whatever it was, because last year was the first year and I'm not sure it started April 1st; it may have started in the fall — "it just didn't seem to take off to any extent and therefore we're scrapping the program." I'm wondering whether the Minister in fact would tell me whether he even discussed it with the St. John's Ambulance people and whether it was with their concurrence that the program is now being scrapped?T½

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, let me hasten to assure the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that I'm not in any way downgrading the St. John's Ambulance or its work; I have the highest regard for it, for what it does and for the useful contribution that it makes. This was not a program that had been in existence since time immemorial; it was a special project last year. We assessed at various stages of Estimates review every program, every line, every item that is in the Appropriations and the determination was made during that process that notwithstanding the excellent work in effect of the St. John's Ambulance Council, that if people were not responding to the course and didn't seem particularly to want it, then it might be an item that could justifiably be left out of this year's budget. If there was a substantial reaction either from people interested in taking the course or from people taking the perspective that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has just put on the record, there is no reason why it couldn't be introduced again as a special project in an easier budget year, one year down the road, since it was only a special project to begin with.

However, in answer directly to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, no, I don't recall personally having had conversations with the St. John's Ambulance people but I daresay officials of my department have had, and he raises a question and an issue that I will take under advisement. Certainly, first aid training, certainly preventive measures that are designed to prevent worse emergencies from developing out of ordinary emergencies, if there is such a thing as an ordinary emergency, is all to the good, and certainly those are targets that we are aiming at and I'm aiming for, and I'll take the suggestion of the Member for Seven Oaks under advisement — \$20,000 is not an impossible sum to be considering. It's a dollar here and a dollar there, as we talked about earlier, and if it was a special project that was not drawing the kind of support or enthusiasm that had been hoped for, then it was \$20,000 of those dollars here and dollars there that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks referred to earlier, and I think it's entirely justifiable on the same rationale that I gave in that exchange with him, to say "Well, here's another \$20,000 that can be saved." But I haven't talked personally, to my recollection, with the St. John's Ambulance people and for the moment let me say that I'll take the honourable member's suggestion under advisement, but no door is closed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass; (b)—pass; (c) Child and Family Services; (1) Salaries—pass; (2) — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this is an area of concern, I guess, to all people of Manitoba. This is an area where the department admitted last year that there was a weakness, this was the weakness of the department. There were a lot of suggestions last year, more than suggestions, there were programs that were started. I wonder if the Minister would care to elaborate or tell us where he is going in that direction, to give us a progressive report of what was done by the department since last year, since the funds were voted for this? I think that this is very important and I, before launching into a debate I'd sooner give a chance and hear what the Minister has to say, if he has any comments.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think I'll have to ask the honourable member for elaboration on that question, as to whether he's referring specifically to staff, or to the whole program? —(Interjection)— It might do. Let me say with respect to the whole program that we're looking at a maintenance of programming in the field of Child and Family Services that is undiminished from the existing program from last year. We are in fact calling for a considerable increase in foster home rates; we have a total staff man year complement of 22, which is the same as last year at the Head Office and Adoption Registry level. I think that figure includes some field staff too. There's no reduction in the size of the official establishment from 22 SMYs. Total Expenditures, as the honourable member can see, are virtually the same as last year, fractionally — well, \$1 million higher, which takes into account price increases and increases in foster home rates. Essentially, the direction of the province with respect to the essential nature of this service remains unchanged.

There are a number of questions relative to philosophy touching on the question of group homes

as opposed to individual foster homes and they're not entirely resolved either in the department's mind or my own mind yet, but we recognize the need to support foster parents effectively from the provincial treasury and notwithstanding the restraints that have been placed pretty well across the spectrum everywhere else, we're looking at an increase in the foster home per diem of I think 8 percent — is that correct? I believe it's 8 percent, which we hope is practical in the present circumstances.

The whole question of The Child Welfare Act versus The Juvenile Delinquents Act, which is a subject that the honourable member is very familiar with, and some of the answers to which turn on the decisions that the Federal Government makes in the area of young offenders' legislation which has not been drafted, formulated in anything approaching final form yet, although in March at the meeting of Social Development Ministers in Ottawa that I attended on behalf of the province, the Solicitor-General, the Honourable Jean Jacques Blais, did present us with a fairly firm proposal on the form that the young offenders' legislation would, he hoped, take. It was not acceptable to the Ministers attending because of the lack of time to consider the ramifications of it and all Ministers including myself will be contributing with input, thoughts, ideas and comments within the next few weeks in the hope of arriving at a consensus and something we can live with in the field of Corrections as well as in the field of Child Welfare.

So that's an area that is unresolved as yet and it really is central to the whole philosophic approach that will eventually evolve for this government in the child welfare field, and I can certainly discuss that to the best of my ability with the honourable member. Aside from that, I don't know — as a sort of a preliminary statement — what else I might be able to convey to him at the moment. Perhaps he would like to put some questions?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be fair to the Minister — I realize that he can't guess my concern, so therefore there are certain questions that I should ask. I might say that I can't criticize too much the increase of 8 percent at this time. I find myself the same as the Minister, there are so many new things going in this area, and there was quite a big jump, if I remember right, last year also because we wanted to do more in this field. We recognized how weak we were and how much improvement had to be made, so 8 percent over last year doesn't seem too bad, especially with the announced and the known policy of this government. So this could be looked at at a future date. But there's no point in criticizing that just for the sake of criticism.

One thing I find I'd like to have an explanation for, is first of all on the salaries. The Minister has exactly the same number in this branch, I think it's 22, and there's quite a reduction with the wages usually going up. So I don't know what this means. It might be that again they're going to have many vacancies but this is something that I would like to know.

There's another area also; last year I think there was an added number, and External Agencies was No. 5; No. 4 was Program Expansion. Now, it might be that this money was just divided amongst these other areas. I rather suspect that this is the case and it makes sense because Program Expansion was made — I think we wanted a cushion to develop something and this was done and now they assign this at the proper areas.

So therefore, having said that, I think the important thing is I want to make sure that the progress that was finally made last year — and here, Mr. Chairman, this is something that I hesitate in doing — I wanted to be very charitable last year — and it's no use fighting past elections, but the last election that we had there was a Liberal candidate who made a point to say that things weren't too well in that area at all. I would have accepted that from anybody else, any other candidate but that candidate, because he was the Director of Child and Family Services and to tell you the truth, Sir, he wasn't delivering and he was replaced. I think he was doing his best, but I think it was a little much for him and there was no point in crucifying anybody at the time, but the fact that he comes in and blames the government where he should shoulder much of the blame — I think that at least I should mention it at this time. Now, that director was replaced and it was felt that there was an improvement there, but in all justice I'm not saying that all the fault was to the director; the government of the day must accept the responsibility, but much of the program and recommendation and so on was and is from the director and I think a good, strong director is very important.

Now, I want to know some of the things that were approved last year, where it's at, because I haven't been there for a while, and I'll mention some of these so the Minister might want to take note of this and answer those because I figure that this is rather important. I think the first priority was the establishment of a 20-bed psychiatric extended treatment facility in Winnipeg, and I think that the Minister also stated many times that there was a shortage of this, and this had to be done, and so on. I know that this was a priority. Then there was the establishment of a Wilderness Camp

Program in the Duck Mountain area; that was in the process, I think, of negotiating with these people and so on.

Then the increase in the foster home rates. The Minister said that we might defer — I'm not quite sure of his words — I took it that he said that we might prefer, is it better to have community residences or foster homes? I don't think that there's any debate there at all; I think that if there is foster homes, I think that we would accept the foster homes, but in certain areas it is difficult, the people can't be — they might be the worst cases and so on, and you might have to have homes. I would imagine that the Minister is doing the same thing as we did before, accept all the foster homes possible, but then it wasn't that easy, especially in the rate that we were paying, and there was supposed to be quite a significant increase in these rates. I'd like the Minister to report on that to see if there's any further rates this year. Because I don't remember exactly the percentage, but I think that these people were taking, I think 77 percent of these people — I might have it here somewhere — 77 percent of these cases were being taken care of in foster homes and the remainder in group homes. And the cost of course was the other way around — yes, there was 23 percent in the group care, and that represents 68.5 percent of the cost of the department, whereas the foster home level which took care of 77 percent, that was only 31.5 percent. We found a situation in this department that you had certain people that were supposed to deliver the services and some were actually paying, it was a two-tier system. Some actually were paying for the service; it was just like going to the medical profession and saying, "All right, when you have somebody in the hospital we're going to pay you and you pay them." There was lack of co-ordination. I think that it was felt that what should be done was for the government. The government's role in there because the government was doing very little in the actual — except in the regional areas — but in these foster homes and a lot of that, the placement was done by the Children's Aid Society and so on. I think that it wasn't a question of changing it but of co-ordinating that better.

Then, of course, there was the establishment of the Child Abuse system, which we talked about before, and the Minister made a statement, I think, that the government was going to take that over. It is true that I had made a statement in the House at one time that we weren't satisfied; it was delivered, I think, by the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg and it was supposed to take care of all Manitoba; that was the only service that we had and there was a backdown from the department at that time at the request of the Children's Aid Society. There was more discussion and discussion with the experts and the police force and the special unit that the Winnipeg police had and so on, and I think the recommendation must have probably come after October 24, and then it was felt that the Children's Aid Society would do the work. I don't object to that at all; the main thing is that a decent Child Abuse system should be established.

I want to know now, and the Minister had announced that this will be done, and he announced a certain amount of money also, now that money, is that additional to what was provided in the Estimates for that or is that an additional — I think he mentioned about \$16,000, or something to that effect? And will this group — I would hope they are still that same committee — I hope that all these experts and all that will be a group, and they won't just walk out now that the Children's Aid Society will be asked to deliver the program. I hope that these people, including the department, will be involved in this and will they deliver the service to all the people of Manitoba? Then, of course, I think the first priority to try to do all this and to help this area, was establishing the office of residential care, and is that working in this area also? I think that was quite important.

And then, I think this is the area, Mr. Chairman, that we talked about last week, the hiring of a number of native counsellors to work with the native families in the area, especially in the core of Winnipeg. So this was one of the things that was announced; I would, as I say, would like to know the cost of the foster homes and the group homes, what the rates are.

There's another — in the out-of-province placement, this was something that two years ago we had announced that we would cut that, that it wouldn't be any more, there would be less of these people with the 20-bed hospital and new facilities and so on.

I think that we also had mentioned there was a review of the placement of group home resources in the north. I wonder if this was something that was being discussed at the time. So this is what I would like the Minister to give us a progressive report, to tell us if there is any of these programs that were cancelled or replaced for some reason or, other, if there's any new programs for this year, or if it's just continuing that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, to begin with, we're looking at a reduction in dollars in the salary

line that the honourable member referred to, that reduction in salary dollars relates to contract funds. Contract funds are reduced from \$145,000 to \$105,000 which . . . —(Interjection)— No. No, there was contract staff that simply weren't expended. It's \$145,000 to \$105,000 because it wasn't expended, so that accounts for the \$40,000 difference in the salary line. The honourable member asked about the native family counsellors — there were eight of them hired in 1977. They've all been maintained and retained, they're continued in their positions.

The honourable member asked about the expansion that he had in the item last year. That expansion has been reallocated into the program. We discussed the increase in foster home rates which is 8 percent and amounts to \$278,000.00. It's 8 percent on the 1977-78 per diem rate. The regular monthly foster home rate on a monthly basis and on a per diem for infants to four years of age is \$3.62. —(Interjection)— Yes, these are the rates approved as of April 1st, 1978 — effective as of this past April 1st and which incorporate the 8 percent increase. Children to four years, \$3.62; five years to ten years, \$4.00; 11 years to 13 years, \$5.00; and fourteen years and up, \$7.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's not an increase.

MR. SHERMAN: Those are the rates effective April 1st, 1978.

MR. DESJARDINS: If I may, Mr. Chairman, those are, except the one to four at \$3.62 — the proposed was \$3.50 last year but the others are actually the proposed of last year, there's no 8 percent increase there at all.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the base that we were working on, the comparable base that we were working on, Mr. Chairman, for under one year was \$3.18; one to four years, \$3.36; five to ten, \$3.77; eleven to thirteen, \$4.66; and fourteen years and up, \$6.50. Maybe if I gave the honourable member the monthly rate it would be easier. There is a sort of consolidation of categories in this year's list. We are looking at four categories instead of five because we put birth to four years in the same category.

As far as group home rates and institutional rates it's the intention to increase those as well, Mr. Chairman, but I can't give the honourable member definitive demonstration of that this afternoon as I can on the foster home rates. That's been done. Group home rates we're hoping to increase by 5 ½ percent and institutional rates by 6 percent but those are recommendations that are coming forward to the Executive Council from Management Committee with the endorsement of myself as Minister, and I hope I can assure the honourable member that we'll get them but I can't give him specific assurance of it this afternoon because it hasn't cleared through those two stages yet, but that's what's being asked for.

The honourable member asked about out-of-province placements and they have diminished in a substantial degree from 90 at March 31, 1976, to 48 on March 31, 1977, to 20 on March 31st of this current year, this past fiscal year, this current calendar year, March 31, 1978 — 20. They are in the United States — basically in Canada in a variety of places — mostly in Saskatchewan and a few in the United States.

On the 20-bed psychiatric facility which is something that I have to confess I was pressing the honourable member on himself when he was Minister — we haven't got it yet, Mr. Chairman. We need it and I remain very, very concerned that it be provided, found and created somehow as a major priority. I think the honourable . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Just that it hasn't been done yet.

MR. SHERMAN: It just hasn't been done. We've had some considerable discussion about utilization of existing space. I know that the honourable member when he was Minister was talking about the construction of a new facility, a new plant on the Health Sciences Centre property or adjacent to it. It is not possible to construct that new plant or that new facility at the present time under the capital construction deferment embargo that we have in place. However, there are possible sites in other parts of the city that I believe and some of my department officials believe could be very political effectively utilized. There are a number of small "p" problems that have to be resolved as the honourable member well knows. When you start locating or siting a facility like that some distance away from the psychiatric department at the Health Sciences Centre itself, and those are not questions or entanglements that are easily resolved in one afternoon's conversation, so we're embroiled in trying to find a solution to those differences of opinion at the present time.

The Wilderness Camp program proceeded on course, although possibly on a different site from

Tuesday, May 23, 1978

the one that the honourable member anticipated. It's in place and functioning at Elbow Lake, north-east of Lac du Bonnet. It was the Sir Hugh John Macdonald hostel people who essentially organized it and it handles about 15 juveniles.

In the area of child abuse the honourable member knows where I stand on that. It's a field in which I think almost any expenditures that we can find within reason can be justified in order to mount a more effective campaign against the incidence of child abuse, and as he mentioned I have outlined plans for additional efforts, additional funds and additional personnel to fight child abuse in the current year through the establishment of an arrangement with the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg under which we will be funding their child abuse function to an additional \$61,000 a year in approximate terms, and also providing them with three additional staff who will be seconded to them from our department and paid by us so that that additional money should be added in to the overall funding increase that is being provided for the CAS. —(Interjection)— Pardon?

MR. DESJARDINS: It's the CAS of Winnipeg, isn't it?

MR. SHERMAN: This is the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg dealing with child abuse in Winnipeg.

MR. DESJARDINS: In Winnipeg only?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, dealing with child abuse in Winnipeg.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh. Who's taking care of the rest? —(Interjection)— Don't kid yourself. You must have been dropped on your head. Look what happened to you! .

MR. SHERMAN: . . . the institutions with whom we contract, the Children's Aid Societies in other parts of the province . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair and I will return at 8:00 p.m.