

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 21 July, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY — ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: Committee will come to order.

We are on Page 69, Resolution 66, No. 5., Workplace and Worker Services - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

If there's going to be a motion for reduction in salary, it won't be the Minister's. It will be the Chairman's salary that will be reduced.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll let you go two minutes over.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I think that we've got a job to do and, with a little bit of cooperation, we can proceed with this. Maybe we can even finish this department this evening, even if we have to go a little bit longer than normal.

Workplace Safety and Health is an important new function of the government. It hasn't been in existence too long. We've always been concerned about the workplace and the safety in the workplace. All we seem to have done in the past is compile statistics as to how many accidents and how many deaths and things of that nature. I like the initiative of this department now in trying to reduce, in fact, eliminate. I don't think that you're going to be able to eliminate accidents and fatalities in the workplace, but it's a noble goal to try and reduce them to as little as possible and if, in effect, we can reduce the accidents to nothing, I think we'd all walk pretty tall.

I think this department is concerned with the protecting of the health and safety of the workers in the workplace, and I know that it administers and enforces The Workplace Safety and Health Act. I think what I would like to do at this point, rather than go into a long debate, I would like to ask the Minister how inspectors are chosen to look after The Workplace Safety and Health Act. What experience do they have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Just for clarification, does the member refer to how they're hired?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes. What is the criteria in hiring inspectors to govern The Workplace Safety and Health Act?

HON. G. LECUYER: Within the Department of Workplace Safety and Health, there are safety and health officers. There are staff who are there as training and education officers; there are industrial hygienists; there are mines inspectors; of course, a great deal of

support staff. We've got staff in the area of agriculture safety. Of course, we've got staff who are there to provide information and training to members of the Workplace Safety and Health committees. Therefore, there is a variety of expertise as well, I should have mentioned, in that administration. Quite a few of the members on staff have been for quite some time. When there is a vacancy to be filled, it's filled by Civil Service bulletining of these positions in the newspapers, just as other civil servant jobs. They look for expertise or training in those areas where the individual will be required to work.

You have to understand that this whole area of Workplace Safety and Health and the training that is required very often, especially if we're dealing with occupational medicine, is not an area - and I think the member was referring to that perhaps when he opened the question - where there has been a long-standing attention paid. Very often, to find someone who can just fit in is difficult, and very often you have to find the best individual and provide him with this additional component of training on the job.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I wasn't really trying to set up the Minister when I was talking originally. Then it started going through my mind how the Estimates went last year, and we were talking about the mines' safety and health inspections. There was an inspector hired, I guess it was, from Flin Flon, and this was just about a year ago. The choice came from the union rather than from - I think it was somebody who had never ever been underground. I'm not against the union but I think that, if you've got a choice on whether you're going to hire a mines' inspector, you take somebody who has been a miner, who's got some experience in it, rather than a union representative. I think the Honourable Minister will remember, because it was brought up last year. Again, I wasn't trying to set him up. It just came back to me when we started discussing it. Is this the criteria on how inspectors are hired? Do they have to be a friend of the governing party, or do they have to be the most qualified?

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, I do remember the individual in question, or this being raised last year. The individual indeed was hired. He was hired because, at that time, he had been for two years employed by the company in the area of safety and health inspections. He didn't have mining experience, I believe, underground, but he certainly had experience in monitoring and inspections underground. I certainly had no part in interviewing the individual. The individual was hired because he was thought to be the most suited.

MR. A. KOVNATS: If you have a chance of picking somebody with some experience, I think this is the one that has to be chosen. Is that person who was chosen as a mines inspector still inspecting mines or has he moved back to representing the union?

HON. G. LECUYER: He's still in the employ of the department and mines inspection for which he was

hired. As I say, he wasn't hired by the union, although he was an individual that was, I believe, a union rep at one time or before; but again I say to the member, at the time he was hired, he was under contract to the company for doing that very type of job, so I assume the company thought he was capable of doing that job as well.

MR. A. KOVNATS: If I could just refresh the Minister's memory, we had somebody who had many years of safety experience, mine experience, who had applied for that job and had been told that the job was his until the very last minute when the announcement was made that the job wasn't his. He thought enough about it to come down to my office and we spoke here in Winnipeg at his expense. At that time he knew that he had been bypassed for it, but we were trying to establish that, in our opinion, the best man was not hired for the job and there was a little bit of hanky-panky; hanky-panky meaning preferential treatment in hiring somebody who was not as qualified.

I think we've established this and I would hope that the Minister would have more regard for the safety of miners so that if there is going to be more mines inspectors hired that the Minister take a personal look-see to see that the most qualified person is hired.

I would hope that the Minister would some time in the future, if there's going to be any more mines inspectors hired and I'm sure that there will be, that he give it his personal attention or at least ask one of his staff to make sure that we're hiring the best person and it's not on a political basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a question there?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I gave remarks to the member in line with that last year; but again, as the member himself has said, this is an issue we dealt with last year.

I wish to remind the member that I don't get involved in the hiring of staff who are going to be doing mines inspection. I repeat, he was hired because it was felt - I admit that the other candidate the member refers to was one of the three who were on the short list, who were considered, and was not hired. One of those interviewed felt that perhaps he should get the job. That was no confirmation that he got the job. The member should know that there are always two sides to a story, of course. I'm sure that the individual who discussed this with him perhaps did not give him all of the details.

The individual in question had been out of any type of mining operation for many years, I believe it was seven years, and prior to that, in fact, I don't think he had any actual mining experience. He had been doing some inspection, but some seven years before, during which time there was indeed a tremendous change in mining operations, in mining technology, which did not, certainly from the interviewer's standpoint, qualify him as being the most appropriate candidate.

The member may wish to say that there's been political interference in the hiring process. I wish to assure that member that that is not the case.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I really wasn't trying to get down to that. I certainly feel that there was political interference and from what I understand, the man was out of the mines business for a short time. It was nowhere near seven years. I was told, if I remember correctly, it was a couple of years. He had been in business in Flon Flon and he had still been there and associated with that area. I think he was running a taxi company, as a matter of fact. That's fair enough. It was a difference of opinion here and I don't think a difference of opinion constitutes a point of order. I don't think anybody raised a point of order, did they?

A MEMBER: Not yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the member, though - I was not chairing the committee last year, but if it did come up in last year's Estimates, perhaps it's in Hansard. People can review the arguments of last year.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, when you find — (Interjection) — . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, 64(2) which is specifically relevant. This is 1986-87.

MR. A. KOVNATS: . . . it's like a football quarterback, when he finds a weakness, he keeps playing to that weakness. I'm quarterbacking this team right now and I think that was a weakness in hiring a political person rather than the most qualified. If it came up last year and it came up again this year, I can almost assure you that it will probably come up again next year, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we're talking about this committee, the Workplace Safety and Health coordinates health and safety training and education activities. Education activities, are these regular meetings that we have, when we take people out of the workplace to these educational facilities, when we take people from Thompson, from Churchill, from Brandon, and from Winnipeg, to a central location where we give them specific safety training in the workplace? Do we break it down into different categories? Are there different categories that we break it down, so that we're not getting safety training, we'll say, for hospital personnel for people that work in mines? How is that coordinated, Mr. Chairman?

HON. G. LECUYER: There are seminars that are given by members of the training and education in the Workplace Safety and Health Division on specific issues related to safety and health. As well, they provide some courses within the provision of the act which says that the members of the Workplace Safety and Health committees, or the representatives, or where committees are not mandatory, are qualified for two days of paid educational leave per year. So staff within that section then have been providing that type of training.

As well, they provided sort of a course module for the first phase of training under The Workplace Safety and Health Act of preparing courses for more advanced training at this point in time, and I hope to have that

ready, I believe it's this fall. From there they will be preparing a third-level course for further advanced training into areas of workplace safety and health. As well, staff within that division also relates with the whole spectrum of the workplaces in Manitoba, including all of them.

MR. A. KOVNATS: What I was really asking the Minister is do we train everybody for everything, or are they specializing? Do we train people working in the mines to be aware of health and safety problems, as I mentioned, in hospitals, in schools, in paint factories? Do they go through the whole gambit or are we specializing?

Because I think if we're going to train people for everything, then they know a little bit about everything and not enough about anything. What is our program in training these people is really what I'm asking. This time I'm really not trying to embarrass the Minister. I hope that he can suggest the proper way of doing it because if we set it up now in the proper way, when we change government in a short time then I don't have to make all those changes.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, yes, indeed, and I said on specific issues and that's what I meant by areas of specific concern. For instance, the Safety and Health Committee Training Program is one of the areas. Under that, for instance, there were 124 sessions provided in 1985 compared to '86 and '84, a total 992 hours spent in that area with 2,480 participants.

In the area of school safety and health training programs to develop awareness of basic understanding of safety and health hazards involved in schools, especially vocational courses and other workplaces, The Workplace Safety and Health Act regulations, for instance, school children enrolled in the vocational courses, especially industrial arts and in community training and education programs, there were 37 sessions in there in 1985 with 1,480 participants.

In the medical institutions' safety training programs, our target audience being workers, management and professional groups directly involved with medical institutions, there were four training sessions in there, a total of 30 hours with 48 participants.

In the area of agriculture, again workers, management and farm families directly involved in primary agricultural work, there were 26 sessions with 64 hours and 834 participants.

In the area of special interest groups - and those are specific areas dealing with a specific regulation or safety and health involved with a special or a specific work process - there were 27 sessions in there, 216 hours and 621 participants.

In the area of stress management - it's an awareness program - the target audience being workers, management, self-employed persons in all types of workplaces in the province, there were two such sessions for a total of 18 hours and 90 participants. In the specific topics of concerns of workplace safety and health, there were eight sessions for 74 hours and 122 participants. This will be, for instance, in such specific areas as logging or mill safety or ladder safety or lifting techniques, specific areas.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm just going to touch on this because it's Workers Compensation, but I just want to touch on it and then I'll go right back.

You mentioned stress management. I had somebody who was under workers compensation who is no longer receiving workers compensation, who had been held up as a cashier in a grocery store. Her nerves are so bad that she can't go back to work, and she's been cut off of workers compensation. So that's one thing I'll throw at you when we get to Workers Compensation, because you had mentioned about stress management. I don't want to jump all over the place. I just throw that at you right at this minute.

You talk about this Workplace Safety and Health, the act is governed - and this is the act that orders limits and controls hazard in the workplace. Now you also mentioned about, in 1985, there were 10 formal charges laid under The Workplace Safety and Health Act for non-compliance with fines from \$100 to \$5,000.00. You're talking about 10 formal charges that were laid. I imagine some discretion was used, and there were warnings made rather than formal charges. I understand that. I think you've got to be tough but, you know, you've got to be somewhat understanding. I don't want you breaking the rules, but you can bend them a little bit.

What are the companies that came under this Workplace Safety and Health Act that were fined for non-compliance? There were only 10. I would imagine the Minister would have them pretty close at hand. If he wants to just give me what the big ones were, or maybe read them all off.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the provisions for penalties are in the act but the actual penalties, when imposed, are imposed by the judge in court, not by the Minister sitting in judgment. Therefore, these penalties are within the ranges that are provided in the act.

Just to give you an example, in 1985 Tundra Excavations, charges were laid in court and, on the final court date in August, 1985, there was a guilty plea and a fine of \$500; City of Winnipeg Hydro proceedings were stayed; Atlas Utility Contractors, a guilty plea entered, \$300; W.J. Emery Construction, a guilty plea entered, \$300; Beaver Construction, a guilty plea entered, \$500 - I don't know if the member wishes me to read them all here - Red River Construction, guilty plea entered, \$400 . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: What was the \$5,000 one?

HON. G. LECUYER: I haven't got to it yet; I don't know if it's in here. Yes, just a moment, I'm getting to it. Dapien and Sons charges, a guilty plea, \$500; Atkins Underground, it was struck off; Monarch Metal Co. Ltd., guilty plea, stayed one count, \$5,000.00.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Monarch Metal Products?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member will remember the student that was killed at that plant.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That was my next question.

HON. G. LECUYER: The Crang's Autobody, Shilo, found guilty, \$800.00. I believe that covers the gamut where fines were imposed. In some cases, proceedings were stayed.

The member has to realize that the fines are as a result of appearances in court and, as under other legislation, the level of fines reflect the degree of severity of the non-compliance with the provisions of the act.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Honourable Minister advise whether charges were laid on these particular companies before or after an accident occurred? Were accidents what initiated somebody from Workplace Safety and Health to inspect these places? We're talking about Monarch Metal Products, where a death occurred after an explosion. Do you have any there that were initiated before an accident took place?

HON. G. LECUYER: Nine out of ten were before an actual accident occurred.

MR. A. KOVNATS: So then the only one that was after the accident was Monarch Metal Products. What initiated the Inspection Branch to go into these places to inspect? Was it just haphazard, or is it on a regular basis that they're inspected?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm sorry, there were eight out of ten. Two were after.

MR. A. KOVNATS: What initiated the inspection?

HON. G. LECUYER: The staff in the department carry out regular inspections. As well, they respond to complaints. Complaints can come from various sources. They can come from members of these Workplace Safety and Health committees, for instance, who would seek maybe a redress of something they perceived to be wrong and changes are not effected, in which case they would bring it to the attention of the division who would go and carry on an inspection. Then charges may occur after an improvement order has been passed or imposed by the division. Sometimes, it's even a stop order. If changes are not effected, of course, it becomes a repeated refusal to comply with the Workplace Safety and Health inspections.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, that's fine. What is happening then, from my understanding, is that these companies were given warning and it's non-compliance to the warning. Therefore, it's after a second or third warning that they were fined and, no matter what you fine them, it doesn't seem enough money to be fining them. It's just like a tap on the wrist, particularly when they've had warning.

I think what has happened - and the Honourable Minister can't just sit back and say, it's not my responsibility; it's his department. Sure it's the courts that are levelling the fines, but \$400 for refusing to obey an order is a ridiculously light tap on the wrist. I think that the Honourable Minister should advise the courts that he's not about to accept any little taps on the wrist for non-compliance, particularly after they've been given a warning.

HON. G. LECUYER: In some cases there's no warning, Mr. Chairman, because if there is imminent danger that is being caused, they know perfectly well the regulation. I'll give the member an example, for instance, showing

for underground or excavations. Those would be imminent dangers where there could be an immediate charge imposed.

There were, in the course of 1985, 81 stop work orders and 128 stop work warnings. Obviously, the action taken by staff in the department who are trained in this area varies with the degree of danger that is posed. If it's a minor situation, a work improvement is all that is required and the employer can effect the changes quickly. Generally, there is a deadline by which this work has to be completed, and staff will go out and reinspect to determine whether the changes have occurred or not. If the change doesn't occur, they may decide to pass a stop work order, depending on the severity or the degree of danger that is being posed to the workers immediately handling that piece of equipment, for instance.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I would think it would be a big job, probably too big at this point to ask the Minister to evaluate whether the concentration of inspections that we have now, rather than from two, three or four years back, have eased and relieved the situation. Can the Honourable Minister, just off the top of his head without getting into too much detail, advise whether the workplace is safer today than it was even two or three years ago when we did start concentrating on workplace safety? Has it reduced the number of accidents in the workplace?

HON. G. LECUYER: I can only speculate to a certain extent in this area . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: I understand, Mr. Chairman.

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . but it will be some time where changes can be obvious in the workplace. We're talking about recent developments in the area of workplace safety and health. We are continuing to put efforts in that area. It's undeniable, by all accounts, in the area of workplace safety and health that this will come about through a joint commitment from everyone in a particular workplace, from the employer, the workers, their participation in cooperatively achieving this goal, the knowledge about those aspects of the workplace which compose a danger to their health.

We are doing a number of things in that regard. The establishment of the committees was only one step; the education to the members of the committees is another; the right to refuse without discrimination to work in situations that pose dangers to their health and safety is another step. We are now carrying on, as I have mentioned we would do when we were in last year's Estimates, an occupational health study which we hope to have completed soon, it's well under way, which is another step which will give us an indication of what measures we are to take to improve safety and health in the workplace.

The number of committees continues to grow. We have some 925 committees. Not only does that number grow, but they are getting to be better informed to be able to recognize those situations or conditions that can pose dangers to their safety and health and, as they meet in committee, hopefully they will be insistent upon seeing these conditions changed and along the

way we'll see results, but results don't occur overnight in this areas.

As I said, it will continue to require persistence and commitment before these changes, but I think there has been progress. I don't want to equate that knowledge with the number of accidents. The number of accidents is still rising and too high. It's partly, as well, because of the increased number of employed in workplaces. I can give in terms of figures for the member, when we get in the Compensation after a while and he'll see that, perhaps, as also adding to the

The more employees you have, the more you're going to find accidents; but hopefully the combination of these efforts, and added to that what will come in place with regulations under the handling and transportation of hazardous goods, will also add to the measures of safety in the workplace. So along the way we hope that these will show indeed effects toward a downward trend in the number of accidents.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I hope so. I had mentioned earlier to the Minister that I was tired of listening that we were studying the situation and monitoring the situation, but in some cases I've got to accept it because you have to keep studying a particular situation and you have to keep monitoring different situations. I don't want to allow the Minister to use it as an overall excuse and I don't think the Minister has used it as an overall excuse. I understand and I appreciate that.

We were talking earlier about - and we're still on Workplace Safety and Health - when we were talking about hiring northern Natives for the Limestone project, and I had suggested at that time that they were taking people out of protected reserves where they weren't aware of high technology equipment. I was prepared to support the training of these people with high technology equipment so that they could work at the Limestone project and other places around.

Can the Honourable Minister advise whether the training of these Natives not only in the highly technological type of work that they've entered into, but have they been trained in the workplace safety and health aspect so that there isn't an inordinate amount of accidents happening in the workplace, particularly with native Northerners?

HON. G. LECUYER: At the very early stage in the training of northern workers, I sent a letter to my counterpart, the Minister responsible for Energy and Mines, drawing that to his attention because we had an experience - I personally wasn't here at the time - but our past experience in such large scale projects, especially in constructions of that type, wasn't so good because there is indeed a high degree of risk involved.

In order to try and improve the picture, I asked that there be, as part of that training, specific components dealing with workplace safety and health. I'm assured that these are being provided to all workers who are being trained to work in the Limestone project, not only those who will work with highly technical equipment.

There are many precautions that one can take, even as a general labourer, especially working in conditions where you have fast flowing currents, rocks and falling objects, so everybody needs to know what are measures

to take to protect his own safety and health. Therefore, they all require that kind of training.

MR. A. KOVNATS: We were talking about the transportation of hazardous goods about how the drivers have to fill out forms when they're delivering these hazardous good by transport or by truck.

Are special courses given to the Natives on the workplace safety and health in Northern Manitoba in the language of their choice rather than in English or French, because I think if anybody has been on any of the reserves, there's quite an amount of numbers there that don't speak French or English. Is special language training given to these people in their own language?

HON. G. LECUYER: I can't answer that, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if any training is provided in the Native language and I don't know that it is required. It might make it easier. We'll find out if there is any. We're not overall responsible for the training courses that are being provided and I can't say whether there's any training in their native language or not.

MR. A. KOVNATS: When we talk about Workplace and Worker Services, which is that Clause 5, does that include workplace safety and health in a private home?

Let me go on a little bit further because I just happened to hear on the radio, I guess it was this morning, as I was coming to the Legislature. It was a beautiful day and I had my windows open; I didn't have to turn on the air conditioning. It was just a beautiful day and I was listening and somebody on CBC Radio was telling me over the radio that one-third of all fire alarm detection equipment in the homes is inoperable or not of standard procedure. Two-thirds of it still was good but one-third was not good.

We're talking about workplace safety, and if people have offices and they use their homes as their workplace, what inspection do we have of their workplace when its their homes?

HON. G. LECUYER: Obviously, anyone that is in the home full time and is a worker in that home, he's in a workplace, so I can't disagree from that standpoint. It's certainly not possible for the department to provide inspections of every home in the Province of Manitoba. You can imagine the resources that would be required for that.

I do understand - I don't know if that is throughout the province or just in the major cities and towns - that the fire department carries on at least annual inspections and these things are looked at during these inspections.

We, in the Workplace Safety and Health, do not carry on inspections in private homes.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Now that we're talking about firemen carrying on these inspections, what special advice do we give firemen when they're going in to fight fires?

I happened to attend the funeral of a very good friend of mine who was a fireman, and I was led to believe, and it was under discussion that he had died of cancer and that possibly the cancer was caused with him fighting fires in a particular location. I think it's exposure to carcinogens - is that the correct terminology?

What protection do we give these firemen? It's their job to go into these locations and put out fires. I know that they don't have to work in a workplace if it's not safe, but they're hired to go into an unsafe location. What do we do to compensate the widows for those people that die from exposure to some of these things that cause cancer and how do we determine whether, in fact, that's the cause of their death?

HON. G. LECUYER: The latter part of the question is indeed a compensation question. We can answer it anyways in terms of it is a compensatory injury and that is determined under the adjudication of the board through the medical specialties that are there.

As far as the first part of that question which deals with how they train, they're trained as part of their firefighters' training. Last year, in fact in January of 1985, we passed a code of practice for protective clothing for firefighters. They have three years to fully implement this code of practice in the firefighting department. This deals with their own boots and clothing, etc., which we want to be up to code.

If they deal with a fire where there's burning hazardous substances, that is partly the reason why we put on this training program under the transportation and handling of dangerous goods at the fire-training college in Portage so that they can recognize the substances they have to deal with and so that they can take the proper precautions to protect their own health and wear the proper equipment if it's called for.

As well, staff generally are called through our emergency response 24-hour service. We are advised immediately when this takes place so that staff can also come to the scene of the accident and provide advice to the firemen if that is required.

MR. A. KOVNATS: With exposure to carcinogens, I remember reading somewhere that there were 100 deaths that were attributed to cancer last year. Am I correct in my figure?

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, I think you are.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm not sure, but are all of these deaths compensated under some form through Workers Compensation?

HON. G. LECUYER: No.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Even though we know that they were caused through the workplace, a danger in the workplace?

HON. G. LECUYER: These are estimated figures. The direct link is not absolutely or scientifically established.

I can say to the member for sure that these are not all compensated; probably only a minor number of these are. If the accident occurs and it's directly related to the workplace, then it would be, but that has to be established. There are far more deaths associated with diseases in the workplace which, at this point in time, it hasn't been possible to adjudicate with any degree of certainty.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I will turn to - and I think we discussed this on Thursday somewhat - when it comes

to asbestos in the workplace, do we have any locations in Winnipeg that have been warned concerning the asbestos content in their product, a warning to replace it, that the warning has not been complied with at this point?

I would think it's the asbestos. Do we have a danger in the drinking water? There was a danger. Has it been corrected? Is there a danger of asbestos wrapping around pipes that could cause cancer? I'm not trying to scare people, but these are things that I've been made aware of. And have we corrected those types of situations?

If I might just add, I remember an interview with the people in Quebec where I guess the asbestos is mined and it comes out. I'll repeat how these people in there are prepared to take chances with asbestos rather than lose jobs in their industry. They came right out and said it. It's like the acid rain affecting Canadian trees. The Americans don't care about the acid rain because it's Canadian affecting trees. All they're worried about is affecting American jobs. It is the same situation taking place in Quebec at this point.

And how does it affect us in Manitoba with the use of asbestos?

HON. G. LECUYER: The asbestos control is assessed on a case-by-case basis. We are looking at adopting a code of practice, one that has been in the making for a substantial amount of time. I expect we will adopt this code in the near future, one that has been dependent upon discussions and going on also elsewhere.

The member is right in saying he hears a lot about this recently; in fact, it has been in the news a lot especially in relation to the sewage pipes or water pipes used in the City of Winnipeg. Exceptions to this case-by-case approach have to do with schools or government-owned buildings where the Department of Education and Government Services are also involved in the program.

It operates in four different phases which consist of identification, and that includes responding to concerns or complaints from both management and workers of possible presence of asbestos insulation. In actual laboratory analysis, we have a staff person, an industrial hygienist, who monitors and responds to complaints raised in this particular regard. Then there is evaluation, as part of the identification, we assess to confirm the presence of asbestos and the evaluation assessment of the problem is done within the branch.

If we establish, for instance, that there are loose fibres, they could present dangers; that might indicate there is urgency to remove these asbestos insulation or fibres in a proper way as quickly as possible. If they are not exposed or behind other building materials and are not disturbed, perhaps to remove them would create more of a problem than to leave them where they are. So depending upon the individual cases, I said we will identify, evaluate and consult and then proceed to control the problem if it needs to be removed.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I had mentioned a year ago I guess, the last time we were in Estimates - it doesn't seem that long ago but I guess it is a year or maybe even longer - when I had suggested that special code painting

Monday, 21 July, 1986

take place inside factories to identify danger zones and to identify the different types of liquids that were flowing through pipes in case there was a break in the pipe during a fire or at any time during the working day. If there was a danger of an elevator, it was red-coded or black-coded and if there was a drop in the floor, there was another code.

Actually I saw one over at a paint factory. They get their product at a reasonable price and they're able to provide their own product for their own buildings, and I'll tell you it really did spruce up the place. It's kind of enjoyable working in a nice bright place. When it serves another purpose of providing warning to people in case there's any danger, and we're talking workplace safety and health, and the Honourable Minister at that time didn't consider that it was an important aspect that I had brought forward, and again I bring it forward. We're still working towards the same goal and that goal is to provide warnings and safety in the workplace. Will the Honourable Minister after a year of thinking about it - and I wouldn't want him to move too quickly on it - but after a year, would the Honourable Minister reconsider the proposal that was made?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I bet if the Member for Niakwa were to look back at last year's comments - and I do very distinctly remember him raising that - and contrary to his remembrance of what I had said at that time, I said I thought that was a good idea. I've seen some places like that myself especially, as the member has, in paint factories where it's easy to carry out because they have the product right there on the spot to do the job. They're more likely to do it very quickly.

There are Canadian standards involving the colour code for these substances. We certainly encourage, especially in those plants where they handle chemicals or other hazardous substances, especially if there's a variety of substances in the workplace using piping system, I certainly would encourage them to adopt this measure that the member talks about. I have no problem agreeing with that approach.

On the other hand, the workplaces that use piping systems to carry hazardous substances are rather few and far between.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I was just about to let my associate from Portage la Prairie carry on, but just to finish off on the colour code in the factories, it's not just in the pipes that carry the hazardous materials. It's a step down that I guess could be almost every bit as dangerous if you're driving a front-end loader and you don't see that there's a step down and all of a sudden you end up a few floors below with a front-end loader on top of you. I think if it's colour-coded, you know that there's a drop in the floor or there's a low ceiling or things of that nature.

I would hope that the Honourable Minister would not just agree with me, but would do something to get it off the ground. I think one of the paint companies has even suggested that they would be happy to encourage it, not just for the profit in the selling of the paint, because I really don't think there's that much paint involved. You're not going to be painting a whole skyscraper different colours because it is only a small

area that is required. I think this is something that could be initiated and I think the Honourable Minister can accept whatever credit it is in providing safety into the workplace.

HON. G. LECUYER: I am told that there is under the Fire Commissioner's Office and The Gas Act, there are colour coding of pipes that come under that act which I wasn't aware of. But as well, anytime that we come upon an area or an issue that we feel presents a degree of danger to safety or to health, we use this approach here to communicate to some 20,000, 22,000 workplaces in Manitoba. — (Interjection)—

MR. A. KOVNATS: I have the same one and I read it religiously.

HON. G. LECUYER: So do I and, I think as well, if there are specific issues; as an example, the split rim, for instance, which has caused . . . fatalities, we make a special bulletin involving that specific issue, or if we are made aware that a type of equipment for instance could pose certain dangers, we would then proceed to have labels made for that type of equipment so that all workplaces could use it directly on the equipment, so that it would be visible to the operator at the machines.

So certainly in every way, shape or form that we can help to reduce situations that present risks, we are certainly all in favour of providing that type of information, either through the training that is provided in the branch through this review or special bulletins, or to the labelling - and the member has to remember under the dangerous goods handling and transportation - I always mislabel the name of the act. There will also be labelling requirements for various products or containers under that act. So there will be additional requirements to come in place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: You don't have the '84-85 annual report. In the area of the actual money expended, do you have those figures?

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes.

MR. E. CONNERY: I'd like you to give them to us at a speed that I can write them down.

HON. G. LECUYER: I believe they're in the supplementary figures that I gave. All for '84-85?

MR. E. CONNERY: Yes.

HON. G. LECUYER: Total budgetary figures for the department - if the member will just give me a minute or two, we'll have that information.

MR. E. CONNERY: Appendix B, in the '83-84 one, that's where the 4 million showed up for the Workers Compensation. We don't know if there are any surprises or things in there this year. It makes it very difficult to do a proper estimates when you don't have the annual report.

HON. G. LECUYER: We'll have that information in a moment's time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you'd like to carry on with another question while he's getting you that information. Anybody else?

The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, my questions are related to Workplace Health and Safety regulations in the public schools.

The last couple of years - three years ago, I guess - was when the schools were asked to comply with Workplace Health and Safety regulations and set up committees within the schools, the same as in industrial workplace situations. I would ask the Minister if he can give me a rationale as to why that was extended to that degree into an area that's already heavily regulated? What rationale was there for the involvement of getting right down into the classroom situation for Workplace Health and Safety?

HON. G. LECUYER: The requirements under The Workplace Safety and Health Act for the committees and the Workplace Safety and Health Committees in the education system is one that has always been part of the act for that matter. There was no additional requirement. The additional requirement applied to all workplaces, and because the school system is a workplace, they applied to the school system. Now, under those provisions, the school districts and school divisions were required to implement just like other workplaces, Workplace Safety and Health Committees. The purpose is twofold, basically, to reduce accidents or risks to health and, as well, to educate our young people to the proper workplace practices that might affect their health down the road.

Out of the 48 school divisions and 10 school districts in the province, all have implemented at this point in time their Workplace Safety and Health Committees. I can understand that it poses a degree of complexity because those workplaces are not single unit workplaces. Very often where you have from the school divisions and districts that vary from five schools to some that have 84 schools.

In Phase One, we are talking about the establishment of these committees. Then, having established these committees, to proceed to develop a policy procedural manual as terms of reference for the committee members. As Phase Three, it is hoped that eventually there will be some education and training of school representatives where subcommittee members regarding their responsibilities and activities as outlined in The Workplace Safety and Health Act and the regulation thereunder. We hope that these will be carried out in the school divisions. We are not saying that all have to operate on the same model. We have offered a variety of models. Some school divisions proceeded more quickly and developed successful models. We provided some of these examples to other school divisions who found difficulty in implementing these, and we have a staff person in the Workplace Safety and Health Division whose job it is to assist the school system in doing just that.

I have sent to all school divisions, secretary-treasurers of school divisions and the Teachers Society, the

Trustees Association, the chairpersons and the co-chairmans of the Safety and Health Committees in the workplace a letter with some guidelines which went out in September of 1985. As I said before, all have implemented these committees at this point in time. Some are obviously functioning better than others.

The school system is an ideal place and we would be remiss as a society if we did not do something to prepare the future workers of tomorrow to educate them in the proper safety and health measures to take to protect themselves.

I have here a bulletin which comes from the Hamilton Board of Education. It's called, "Safety in the Workplace Gets a Start in the Schools." It states that in 1981, for example, in the 15-24 year-old category, they accounted for 30 percent of Workers Compensation Board claims in Ontario while making up only 19.4 percent of the province's workforce in the manufacturing sector; there are also teachers; there are also bus drivers; there are also maintenance people; there are also custodian staff. You know, all of these people may not be, and students may not be, salaried employees; they are not employees, but they are workers in that workplace. So their health is just as important as that of anybody else.

Our life there is just as important as a life somewhere else. Maybe the member would be surprised how many accidents do occur in the school system. Generally, you know, we say it is a rather safe place because they are under the guidance and protection of a teacher. The teacher is there basically to make sure they are not exposed to hazards. The teachers eliminate the hazards, if you want to put it that way, but what is needed is more than that. They have to be trained how to recognize situations that might pose a threat to their health and how to handle such situations properly. There is an education that has to be provided and we hope that what we're dealing with now is a first step that has to go much further than that.

This article ended with this message and it says, "The message is clear. Good safety practices learned in the school can be translated into the workplace where individuals will be better equipped to handle potentially dangerous situations to the health and safety of themselves and those around them." That's part of the responsibility I think we have in providing a well-rounded education to our young people to help them to work as productive individuals in society without becoming a burden to the system because they didn't know how to cope with dangerous situations.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I think if I'd have gotten the short answer, this might have been a short question. When we start talking about this is the way that we're going to teach the workers of the future their safety consciousness, then it should be part of the curriculum surely. The school divisions are controlled under almost every other department of the government that has anything to do with public health and safety, and to imply that this is being put in there to improve instruction to the children I think borders on ludicrous. Your bus garage is controlled under the Department of Highways, Motor Vehicle Safety. Your Industrial Arts area is controlled already under Workplace Safety and Health, as I concur, and I agree that it should be.

I guess what bothered me, when I was on the receiving end, you say that all the school divisions have now

Monday, 21 July, 1986

concluded. That's because they were told to, or they'd be faced with non-compliance. Quite simply, I think a lot of the school divisions concluded because they were given no choice. I think, if you check the records, you'll find there were a significant number of them who didn't comply until the very last moment.

I find that the committees that have to be set up, and you alluded to this - you obviously recognized it as a difficulty - where you have schools that are spread around a school division and you have representatives from each school and you have a legislated number of meetings that should be held with representatives from each area. Then flowing from those committee meetings, if there's a problem, a committee shall be set up to go and view the problem. You're talking thousands of dollars cost in a school division to run these committees. I can give you examples of costs of \$10,000 to \$15,000 in a school division to handle a Workplace Safety and Health Program that was implemented in the school division.

I would wonder if the Minister would consider the fact that there is a difference between this type of a workplace and, for example, an area that would be much more dangerous to work in, and you can choose any example you wish. But is there any thought that perhaps this area, if we must maintain a presence there, could be handled in a less complicated way, let me say?

HON. G. LECUYER: I certainly agree with the member that there are different types of workplaces and this is a more complex type of workplace. They do come under various legislation depending, as the member has referred to, whether it applies to the bus garage or whatnot, but that's true of other workplaces as well.

The requirement is that there be - and I have to say this before I begin. The requirement under the proposed regulation, which is not finalized at this point in time - I've met with representatives of the various school divisions, I think it was approximately a month ago. Following that, I've also met with representatives of the Teachers Association. Maybe they don't exactly agree on how to go about it, these representatives of the schools. They were secretary-treasurers and trustees who I met. Not one of them disagreed that this doesn't have to be done in the school system, not one.

They may disagree about how to go about it. The requirement that is being considered is that they have four meetings a year. The costs that this represents for an average school division will be probably less than \$5,000 a year. This is no great cost when you measure it against the number of accidents that may occur or the lives that may be lost. It depends on what value you place on these happenings.

The member has to remember that, in the construction industry, they have to provide 15 minutes every week of training on the job. We're not imposing that type of requirement. Other workplaces where the risks are higher will have to meet more frequently than four times a year. So we've taken that into consideration. All I have to say to the member is that there is a need for it. It is a recognized need for it, and I haven't met anybody who disagrees with that yet.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Well, I would challenge the Minister on the question of whether or not there are

people out there who have had some serious misgivings about the implementation of these additional regulations. After the fact, of course, now that everybody has got committees in place, the question is not nearly as close to the top of the agenda about whether or not it would be thrown out. Then the question becomes, how can it be modified so that it is workable.

I guess, I would take that approach also. When you're talking about pull-out situations where you have professional people who are taken out of the classrooms for meetings, you have travel time, you have replacement time, there can be the easy way and there can be the hard way. It opens itself up to a situation where it also very much can become embroiled in negotiations which it shouldn't but, if staff and school board relations are not that good, I think the Minister would understand that this is another lever where, if all of the regulations are in place, they can be worked to the point where it becomes a very costly operation for the school division.

I can give you examples. I don't need to get into it here. I guess I was only trying to encourage the Minister to look at a way of implementing it in this particular workplace so that it would be a little more suitable. Don't forget that we're dealing here with school divisions where, at the professional level, the average salary is probably in excess of \$35,000.00. Every time you have a pull-out program, that's a pretty costly state of affairs, particularly when that pull-out also implies that you have to put a replacement in there for the classroom to function at the same time.

HON. G. LECUYER: As I said before, we haven't finalized that regulation, and we certainly will be looking at the comments that will be forthcoming from the staff from the various school divisions. I've told them that before.

I think that the problems or the complexity of establishing such a system and the cost that was perceived to be associated with it, to a large extent, has been dissipated because, when we're talking about the central committee for a school division, it's not as if you're going to have a whole lot of teachers on this. It may be that you'll have in some cases only one of them.

So it's more of a perception than an actual case, because there will be management representatives on this central committee; there will be worker representatives on this committee. Some of these worker representatives could be - there's no reason why there cannot be, for instance, a volunteer parent from the Parents' and Teachers' Association who would be on that committee. In the community college or high school level, there could be a student on that committee as well. So there could be a bus driver; there could be a custodian.

We're not talking only about teachers being on that committee. These meetings are not going to - that will be a difficulty to iron out yet, when these meetings will take place. As I said before, we're talking about a frequency of four times a year. We've gone through a cost scenario of how much this would cost to a school division, and we arrive at the figure that would be around \$5,000 and no more.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, this gets stranger and stranger. There may, no doubt, have been some

changes since I was, two years ago, involved in being part of a school division, but if we're now talking about parental involvement, student involvement and, very specifically, I believe I just heard the Minister imply a couple of minutes ago that in fact the students in this case are considered the same as if they were workers in Workplace Safety, is that correct, or a workplace situation?

HON. G. LECUYER: They are not employees but they're workers in that system, so they're a part of that workplace.

The scenario that I'm talking about, I'm not saying they'd have to have a student; we're not saying they'd have to have a parent. We've built the scenario, for instance, under a system whereby the accounting that I have here is based on having two trustees; two school division management people, whether superintendent, secretary-treasurer; two teachers; one custodian; one transportation maintenance person; one clerical person; and one student. That would make for a committee of 10 individuals. That scenario that I referred to is based on these type of individuals. They don't have to have a student on that committee. They don't have to have a parent, but this is the kind of flexibility that is built into this regulation.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: That same flexibility, I think also, can make the system very nearly unworkable. I would give you, as an example, frivolous situations that can be brought forward. The committee must then strike a subcommittee or the whole committee must go to view situations in the other schools within the division. Then you're looking at a day or two or three or four during the course of the year when this committee that you just spoke of will be on the road. I find that very hard to justify, realizing at the same time that there is no expense, in many ways, that cannot be justified in the name of safety.

I would ask the Minister to look fairly carefully at this because there's problems out there that may not be coming to the surface. There's certainly an awful lot of discontent on the part of the trustees that I've talked to. When you have things like the buses idling in the loading zone being considered a hazard when, in fact, if the buses don't idle to keep them warm the windows fog up, and you waste committee time hour upon hour just whether or not this is a CO2 problem in the area. You can see where this gets all tied up in negotiation problems.

I would suggest, also, that when you look at all the areas that govern the schools, that this is probably an overlay that is there more for the purposes of the professional staff than the other staff because they are covered under other regulatory areas to give them protection.

I would also ask you to give some serious consideration to the idea that if this is to be put in place as an educational tool, then let's do it the right way as we would implement any other program into the schools.

You're talking, I understand, where it would be an educational tool by example, but we can also provide some pretty ridiculous examples for our students. I suggest that workplace safety is an important vehicle.

To wander for one minute, Mr. Minister, the school bus safety that the divisions comply with, the motor vehicle safety regulations and the safety certificate that goes with trucks that are the main frames that these school buses are put on, provide for a certain amount of wear on brake drums. In the educational system, that amount of wear is not accepted to the point where we have drums being taken off of school buses, thrown in the scrap heap, picked up and put on heavy trucks and used again for another 40,000, 50,000 to 80,000 miles. Yet we in the school division go to the extent that we provide that extra leverage of safety.

You can justify almost anything in the name of safety but let's use reason, and this is what I want to appeal to the department in this area, also, that you may be getting into an area of overkill.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I've said before that we will certainly look very carefully at the recommendations coming forth in preparing the final draft of that regulation. As I said before, we're not at that stage yet where the mandatory committees are there. Now, the regulation governing that process is not yet in place, or hasn't been finally revised yet. We are out there with that regulation for consultation. They were told they have until September 15 to respond to it. So, therefore, I haven't finished receiving their comments at this point in time, but I did meet with them to listen and hear about their concerns.

We will look, certainly, at making it as reasonable as possible. Having said that, I say it does apply to them. There will be committees in the school system; whether there has to be a central committee that goes to each school, I don't think that that is mandatory. There are other methods that can be employed to do that. Maybe a subcommittee could be struck at the school level and then nobody has to travel from one school to the other to do these things. So, sure, we'll look at it very carefully.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I appreciate that.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Does the Honourable Minister have the figures that we requested?

HON. G. LECUYER: The actual expended for 1984-85 in Workplace Safety and Health is \$2,886,100.00. I can give you the number for 1983-84 if you wish as well. That was \$2,858,200.00.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's not the figure that's here, Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Is the member referring to the special payment to the board of \$4 million in that year, the one-time payment?

MR. A. KOVNATS: No, I'm talking about - it's Appendix B on Page 60 of the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Fiscal Year 1982-83 versus Fiscal Year 1983-84, Actual Expenditure Comparison.

Could the Minister confirm that the 1983-84 actual expenditure was \$2,340,300.00?

HON. G. LECUYER: Can the member refer to the page number again?

Monday, 21 July, 1986

MR. A. KOVNATS: Page 60. That's in the Annual Report. We don't have this year's . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm told that's because that figure did not include the transfer of the Mines Inspection Branch which was transferred as of April 1, 1984.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1) - the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: Just one brief question to the Minister again, Mr. Chairman, in the area of small businesses. I'm thinking specifically of small garages where the number of employees are large enough however to require committees to function in the manner that we were talking about a minute ago.

I would appeal to the department to consider the idea that some areas are a great deal more hazardous than others. In talking to some of my constituents who are involved in auto garages, for example, they feel that they are being governed at the same level as if they were running a much more hazardous or much more dangerous workplace. In fact, they have reached the point where their regular meetings become a situation where they'd have to generate something to prove that they had a meeting. Is there any possibility that they might be given some consideration in this area?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, these meetings can be fairly expeditious if the whole operation is running well, it's a well-looked after operation and these meetings are not time-consuming. I have to remind the member that he might be surprised how many accidents occur in garages - four fatal accidents in this last year. So it is a workplace which presents quite a variety of hazards; from that standpoint, perhaps much more than many, many other workplaces with that number of workers.

So it is a place that can be considered a place of fairly high risk. It is only proper that they should sit down and look at what are these factors that cause these accidents; what are the factors that can pose threats to their health, and redress these measures. Once these have been done, they're not going to be consuming great amounts of time dealing with issues that pose problems, because they'll have addressed them. There's no requirement that they spend a specific amount of time resolving issues that are not there. It's a joint approach to try and solve the problems, so that all those involved will participate in reducing the risks to their health.

We've got a situation now where it's tremendously costly to industry in a variety of ways; it's tremendously costly to the whole economy, the situation which presently exists, not only here in Manitoba but everywhere else in Canada, and large operations have been able to change their operations so significantly to break down levels of time loss by 50, 75 and 80 percent. It can be done and the benefits are there for everyone around. For everybody involved, there's a benefit to gain in this process. So it's not a question of just looking at the time aspect that it takes, but let's look also at the benefits for everybody involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2)—pass.

We now go to 5.(b) Worker Advisor Office - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, this seems to be the "court of last resorts," where it provides assistance to workers whose claims have been rejected by the Workers Compensation Board. I think by that time, you're kind of whistling into the wind. There's another expression "into the wind," - it's not whistling - but you get the same results and it blows back at you.

Once the Workers Compensation Board have rejected a claim, I would imagine there's not too much that can be done because the Honourable Minister can't get involved with it. The critic for the Opposition has tried in the past and these are the rules that are in effect and we have so many people that are going unsatisfied because the Workers Compensation Board, in their own wisdom and with the facts and figures that are presented in front of them, have rejected workers compensation claims.

Now, these worker advisors are brought in, after everybody says no, and given the responsibility of trying to get these people who have been rejected onto workers compensation or try to look after them to some degree. It says here that they have closed 2,478 claim and files. How many of those claims and files have been successful, or do they just take them and close them and put them away and go through the motions?

HON. G. LECUYER: First of all, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a group that necessarily deals with after everybody else has said no. It's there primarily to assist injured workers to take their cases to these levels, whether it's to the review committee or to the appeals level. So it's to assist with the presentation of their case at these various levels, not after they've said no, but before.

If a claim has gone through adjudication and has been rejected, then the next step is for that claim to go to the review committee and the claimant may require some assistance in preparing his case to present it to the review committee; or if it has been rejected at the review committee level, may require assistance to take it to the appeal level and that's where the worker advisor comes in.

As far as the specifics of that question, I can't say to the member how many of these claims have been successful. I don't have any figures in that regard. The member has figures in terms of the number of files they handle in the course of the year, but I don't have figures in terms of how many were successful and to what degree they were successful. In some cases they get a partial claim recognized, but maybe not the total claim, so there are certainly some cases where they're not successful at all and some cases they are partially successful; perhaps in certain cases totally successful, but I don't have figures for that.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I would have hoped that the Honourable Minister would have figures on this particular aspect of it, inasmuch as if there's been no successes, then I would say eliminate the worker advisors, that is suggested they're not doing the job. I've got to correct the Minister, inasmuch as when I

Monday, 21 July, 1986

read it, it was from a release from the Minister's Office, where it says, "Provides assistance to workers whose claims have been rejected by the Workers Compensation Board." It's straightforward. It's exactly what I just read from the Minister's Office.

Previous to that, there's something else that says where they're involved in other things but I wasn't making up when I say this is a "court of last resort," where the Workers Compensation have obviously rejected just what I read.

Earlier, as a matter of fact, it's the same statement on both ends of the paper and on Page 43 of that supplemental, it starts off the same way. It says, "Provide assistance to any claimant whose claim has been rejected by the Workers Compensation Board or who may have difficulty establishing a claim." That's the original.

If you look at the bottom part where it says, "Operations," it says, "Provides assistance to workers claim who has been rejected by the Workers Compensation Board" - straightforward. A claim has been rejected by the Workers Compensation Board, unless there's a typographical error, which I know the Honourable First Minister uses as an excuse on occasions, but I don't think this is a typographical error. It think it's intended to say that this is a "court of last resort." Can the Honourable Minister not agree?

HON. G. LECUYER: See, that's the wording I tried to correct, the "court of last resort," because they're not the court at all. They don't make any of the adjudication. They are there as a facilitator; they are an advocate of the claimant in a sense. They will assist and prepare, assist the advisor in presenting his case, not in that it's the last resort, and that's why I explained that there are various levels where they may be called upon to assist not only after the case has been done at the appeals level. If the worker has had his last resort, then they really can't intervene unless they are asking for a review of that appeal process with new medical evidence that they may have.

Once the claimant has been dealt with at the appeals level, that ends it. I mean that's the court of last resort. The commissioners of the board that look at the case after initial adjudication, after the committee review, and at that committee review the worker advisor may assist the worker, the claimant, in presenting his case. Again, if it's rejected there and it goes or he requests an appeal, then he may seek the assistance of the worker advisor to present his case at the appeal level. So it's not after the process; it's to prepare for to present it at that process.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I knew the answer except when I read it here, and any lay person reading it would not be able to understand it as well as I; at least I wouldn't think so. But from what I see here, I'm just trying to follow where it says "provides assistance to workers whose claims have been rejected by the Workers Compensation Board." I know that there are other kinds of appeals, and maybe I shouldn't have used the . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: Maybe that's not good wording.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, maybe my wording wasn't correct, but I don't want to get into any great hassle on that.

Worker advisor office was established in 1982 as the Minister had originally suggested, and I believe that his figure is correct. I think he had mentioned that it was in 1986, which couldn't be September '86, because it hasn't come about yet.

And it says: ". . . continues to provide much needed assistance to claimants having difficulty in resolving their claims with the Workers Compensation Board." In a lot of cases, there are some difficulties and it's a needed position. I'm not saying that the position isn't needed because it is needed.

But the Minister has suggested that there were four positions - let me just find it here. Under this program, four advisor trainees are undergoing extensive training and application of Workers Compensation Board and worker advisor procedures. There are four trainees.

Was this the original amount of trainees, or are these four to replace any trainees that are no longer working as worker advisors?

HON. G. LECUYER: There were seven originally in the first phase of that program and there are now only four.

MR. A. KOVNATS: There are only four now from an original seven, so we . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: No, that's a different group. The first four underwent this training for a year and that training program is completed. This group of four that I'm talking about is a new group of trainees.

MR. A. KOVNATS: How many worker advisors, starting today, from before are now working as worker advisors?

HON. G. LECUYER: After completing, I gather the appropriate . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: How many worker advisors are there right today?

HON. G. LECUYER: There are six worker advisors, and of those I believe - at least one that I'm aware of, perhaps more - two - are people who were hired as worker advisors. As the member can well understand, over a period of time, it is a stressful job and, as any other job, people can look elsewhere to seek employment. Some have left in the worker advisors' office and have had to be replaced and we were able to hire two of those who had undergone the training.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm a little confused. It seems to me that these worker advisors were union representatives who were on loan from the union to Workers Compensation Board for a period of approximately one year, if I remember correctly, and were to be returned to their union after their terms were finished. Now it seems that we're taking them from the union as worker advisors and we're looking at steady positions. I don't think that was the original idea with these worker advisors. Am I incorrect in my thinking?

HON. G. LECUYER: Let me just correct one of the - I think maybe the member made a slip when he said

that. They weren't hired by the Compensation Board because this is a program that doesn't come under the Compensation Board.

MR. A. KOVNATS: It comes under the Manitoba Jobs Fund, I'm sorry, but . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: It's an integral part of the department. The training program was financed through the Jobs Fund. But, yes, indeed, the intent was to have these trainees go back to the workplace and provide assistance, especially in these larger workplaces, to the workers and those workplaces.

But when we seek to fill in a vacancy that has occurred, and we advertise through the Civil Service for filling a vacancy on the Worker Advisors' Bureau, then you will find that some of those who applied might be among the trainees. Because they already had one year of training, they are in a position where they are suited to fill a position and can become useful employees much sooner than if we were to take someone who had never had any experience in that area and had to train him from zero. So having had one year's training, if they were successful candidates to fill a position, as was the case in two instances, they become useful employees very quickly because of the training they had previously.

But that was not the intent in providing the program. The member is correct in saying that.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm disturbed again because now that we're hiring these people in some cases on a permanent basis, they are given preferential hiring treatment because of their experience which they got because they were union representatives in the first place. Therefore, it is preferential treatment in hiring union representatives to do this type of job.

Are these jobs, when they come open as worker advisors to work for the Workers Compensation, do they come under . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: Not for the Workers Compensation.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, as worker advisors. But when these jobs come open, are they advertised as open jobs? Is special consideration given to these union representatives because of their experience which they got because they were union representatives?

HON. G. LECUYER: It has nothing to do because they were union representatives. It simply has to do and, in some cases, I don't know that they were union representatives per se. They were chosen by their various unions to be on this training program, not necessarily because they were union reps, but it's like any other job, Mr. Chairman. Yes, indeed, it is advertised, but when you try to fill a vacancy, you try to fill it with the individual you think is most suited to the job and if he has qualifications that another individual doesn't have, yes, it might serve that individual in good stead.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Let's get back to when you choose a person to do a job because they're the most qualified

- or you think they're the most qualified - let's get back to the mines inspector before where you don't choose the most qualified, you choose a union representative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a dispute on facts here. Perhaps you maybe will agree to disagree on that.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, we agree to disagree. I'm disturbed also that the Minister can't give me any kind of results on when these people are represented by the worker advisor to give them some assistance.

We should have some results of their work. I don't know where you would get it, but I think if I was the Minister I would have those types of figures to relate if anybody asked me, because it's his department and I think these figures should be at his fingertips.

HON. G. LECUYER: The purpose of the advisor, of course, is to assist the claimant in making his case and having a voice and having the most effective voice possible to be able to present his case in the most efficient manner possible. But, having said that, I think I will say to the Member for Niakwa I'll take his advice as a good suggestion and see if we can have that type of statistics for next year.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's fair enough. I don't want to leave on the record that I'm unhappy to the point of getting rid of the worker advisors because I've had some contact with them and I found them to be most cooperative and, in most cases, well qualified. I'm not speaking of that. I just don't like them being given preferential treatment in being hired and that's the only disturbing point.

Again, I do support the program and I would hope that there would be a little bit more openness somewhere in the future in seeing that these people are hired because they've got a very, very important job, inasmuch as they do help prepare submissions for the review committee, the medical review panels and the board of commissioners. They do assist in that regard, but for the amount of cases that they have to be involved with, Mr. Chairman, I just don't see how that few a number could possibly do the job in a proficient manner.

I'm not saying, hire helter-skelter, because all you're going to be doing at this point is hiring more union representatives and, again, I think this is very unfair. I think that there should be more consideration given so that the people who are applying to the Workers Compensation have every opportunity of presenting themselves in the most proficient manner for themselves, because a lot of them, some of them don't know how to answer boards, how to appear in front of panels and these worker advisors can be of tremendous help to them.

I wouldn't want to see one person making a claim be rejected of a claim because they didn't have the proper manner in presenting their claims. I would think that's probably somewhat the case, although I do know of some people who have been rejected, who in my opinion should have been given a little bit more consideration, possibly because of language barrier. I've been told that there's no language barrier, that they can be supplied with people who can speak their

language and give them advice, but it's an awful thing when you have to rely on somebody else to express the way you feel and to have questions come back and translated for you.

There's something that's lost in the translation. I think it's a hackneyed phrase, but there's something lost in the translation, and some of these people are at a disadvantage. I know that the Minister and this department provides translation services, but there's got to be some better way of helping these people, particularly when they're coming off of a traumatic experience where they've been injured in the workplace and they're looking for assistance. I think that's there's got to be some dealings from the heart, rather than straight black and white figures.

I was reading where the MFL has made recommendations that workers be given absolute benefit of any doubt. Well, I don't think that's the case and I don't agree that much with the Manitoba Federation of Labour but, in this case, I think they're dealing from the heart. It's not just on a political basis. I think that we all must deal from the heart a little bit more than what we have been and some of the claims that have been rejected should be reviewed and some of these people just need the consideration that they deserve.

We had one fellow up at Flin Flon and every year we'd come up with the same ones. I've got the names and I give them to the Minister and our hands are tied. There's got to be some way of helping these people. I would hope that this review committee that the Minister has working right now is going to come up with some idea where these people who have been rejected get some consideration.

We have people who are 64 years of age, 65 years of age. We have people who have spent time in hospital and things of that nature. I think we should get back to this worker advisors; there's a place for the work advisor and again I suggest that the worker advisors are an acceptable group, but I think we have to have another look at how they're chosen.

HON. G. LECUYER: Just very briefly, I appreciate the fact that the member supports the work that is done through the Worker Advisors Office. Certainly it is my concern as well that every worker who is injured at least get the fair and equitable treatment that his case deserves and we, through the Worker Advisors Office, do everything we can to assist every worker or every claimant who needs assistance, whatever language that may be.

It's not possible, of course, to have advisors to speak every language that could potentially be required, so we do the best we can in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1)—pass; 5.(b)(2)—pass.

Resolution No. 66: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,443,100 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Workplace and Worker Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

We'll deal with Workers Compensation Board now, before we get into the Minister's Salary.

The Minister wishes to make an introductory remark.

HON. G. LECUYER: I had prepared some remarks. I'm going to try to perhaps shorten these as I present them, but I do want to put a few remarks on the record.

The compensation system, through legislation, is intended to provide financial benefits and services to workers who are injured in one way or another at work, and at the same time gives protection to the employer from civil action.

This is important because it's an historic trade-off which occurred several decades ago and is still the underlying theme of Workers Compensation legislation. In essence, it is a no-fault insurance scheme and, therefore, by its very nature, one that will always be at the centre of two divergent viewpoints.

It is recognized that the ongoing review of the Manitoba compensation system was relatively neglected until the very late Seventies. Various reports to the government, which include the Lampe, Cooper, Cereco, and the Section 100 Rehabilitation Advisory Committee Reports, provided strong indications of the areas wherein the Manitoba compensation was deficient.

Our government acknowledged these deficiencies and has mandated the Workers Compensation Board to implement most of the recommendations contained in these reports.

Some of the recommendations requiring a change in legislation have been put on hold pending the report of the External Legislative Review Committee whose work is currently under way. It should be noted that The Workers' Compensation Act has not been reviewed since 1957 and for decades has not been revised through legislation amendments on a piecemeal basis.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back for a moment to the effect and costs associated with the recommendations that the board was mandated to implement. I'm sure my colleagues appreciate and accept the fact that improvements to any system cannot occur without directly proportionate costs.

Although it would probably be desirable to phase in improvements to the system, this was not possible due to the lengthy neglect that had occurred. In late 1982, it was abundantly obvious that the major improvements had to occur, at the very least, within a three-to-four year period.

The major improvements are in the area of increased communications and accessibility to both the workers and employers, provision of rehabilitation benefits and services, improvements to the medical review panel system, improved medical monitoring of the care that injured workers receive, improved computer and financial services, proportionate increased staffing, among many others. The cost of these improvements are reflected in the rise of the administrative costs over the last four years.

This is not to say that the system is currently functioning perfectly. It is acknowledged that once changes to the system are implemented, an ongoing evaluation and review of the system should occur to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the system.

I'm pleased to note that concurrent with the external review process of the Legislative Review Committee, the board is conducting, on a continuing basis, its own internal review of its policies and procedures. There has been a lot of criticism levied at the government and at the board for increases in administrative costs. We acknowledge that administrative costs have increased; however, the bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that we cannot create something out of nothing, and that improvements have a price tag.

The government and the board have also been severely criticized for non-compliance with Section 66(1) of The Workers' Compensation Act, a section which stipulates that the accident fund must be maintained in a fully funded position. It should be obvious that we are very much concerned about this matter and have endeavoured to find a reasonable way to deal with this difficult problem.

We believe that ideally the compensation system should be fully funded at all times as required by the act. However, through our consultation process, we have heard from industry and business sectors that they would prefer gradual increases over the next few years to that of one sudden increase in rates.

Government had to make the difficult decision to allow a temporary aberration of unfunded liability only because of our concerns and sensitivity for the financial prospects of our industrial and business communities and the negative effect that a large increase could have on job creation.

As we said last year, we believe that the continuation of reasonable, yet responsible, assessment rate increases will gradually allow the board to achieve a fully funded position. Mr. Chairman, the government considers that the 20 percent average increase in the 1986 assessment rates strikes a reasonable balance between over-burdening employers and letting the deficit grow too large.

The approach taken by government in this matter appears to be one among a number of factors which has helped the economic recovery taking place in our province. In fact, Mr. Chairman, there were 19,531 employers registered for workers compensation in 1985, the highest number ever recorded. This represents an increase of 434 employers compared to 1984.

Manitoba's business rate formation rate of 36.1 per 1,000 businesses compared to the national average of 30.7; business bankruptcies are at 8.0 per 1,000 compared to the Canadian average of 8.4 per 1,000, according to the information from the Federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics and Statistics Canada Business Register.

The costs of insurance, Mr. Chairman, have dramatically increased throughout North America. The Association of Workers Compensation Boards of Canada late last year received information from the U.S. Employment Standards Administration which details incredible increases in workers compensation insurance rates in the Southern United States. I could cite examples such as in Louisiana where it went up 40 percent where the actual recommendation by the council actually indicated a need for a 95.1 percent increase. In Oklahoma, it went up 41.9 percent; in Texas, it went up 48.7 percent, etc.

In Canada, Mr. Chairman, many insurance companies now are unwilling to underwrite private liability coverage as the most recent court awards in many cases amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars. For instance, the city of Toronto was reported to have difficulty finding an insurance company to underwrite their coverage. In fact, some companies have received annual insurance increases exceeding 1200 percent.

The president of the Manitoba Truckers' Association late last year indicated that insurance premiums for trucking firms rose by 100 percent to 300 percent,

quoting directly from the newspaper article in which Mr. Painchaud, the president, stated the same thing is happening right across Canada and North America. "It's a serious blow to the industry. To make matters worse," Mr. Painchaud said, "certain types of coverage are becoming more difficult to acquire because some insurance companies are pulling out."

The private insurance crisis is the result of many factors, quite a few of which are common to the workers compensation system as well. It is noteworthy, however, to consider comments by leaders of the private insurance industry. Borden Voigt, (phonetic) the chairman of the Liability Committee of the Insurance Bureau of Canada, said on liability coverage for pollution, "the possibility exists that sudden and accidental coverage will be difficult to purchase in the future." I could cite other examples that I will skip over to save time.

When we consider that approximately 71 percent of workers in Manitoba are covered by the Workers Compensation Board, and that 19,531 employers are also provided with protection by the system at the same time, an average assessment rate of \$1.36 per \$100 of payroll is certainly a modest premium.

We must also remember that the compensation system is a non-profit system designed solely to service its kind, workers and employers alike. In the compensation system, the benefits and services are provided at a fairly consistent level compared to court awards which could drastically vary from one award to the next. One only needs to look at the recent reported court awards to appreciate this difference.

Mr. Chairman, there has also been much criticism about the rate increases usually only focusing on the percentage increase and not on the actual dollar figures. When we look at the average rate for 1976 and see that the average rate then was \$1.10, and the average rate for 1986 is \$1.36, that seems amply reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, I know all of us share a deep concern that the business and industry sectors in our province maintain whatever competitive edge is possible over business and industry sectors in other provinces. Assessment rates could be an important factor in this regard. Therefore, it is in all of our best interests, the government, the board, industry, labour, and the community as a whole, to try and keep assessment rates as low as can reasonably be expected while providing fair and equitable treatment to injured workers and employers.

Notwithstanding that, the compensation system is by far the best vehicle for the provision of this service. Our government recognizes the necessity of a complete review of The Workers' Compensation Act and board policies and practices in this regard. This is to ensure a sound check and balance on the system and appropriate revision of legislation to bring the Manitoba workers compensation system to today's standards.

Having said these few words, Mr. Chairman, rather briefly, and having shortened my remarks, I am open for questions from the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 10:05 p.m., I assume you wish to continue until we complete this. Is that correct?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, if we didn't stop at ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we carry on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, agreed.
The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you.

The Honourable Minister was very kind when we started on Thursday and, in his remarks, he thanked everybody except some of the working staff in the building here who weren't directly involved with him. But I would think that with the chairman of the Workers Compensation Board and one of the commissioners here, it would be incumbent on us to pay some special remarks.

I would allow the Minister, if he wants to make any additional remarks, to carry on.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, normally the staff is not present when I make opening remarks. I didn't say anything and you didn't say anything, so staff came up to the front. It's only at this point in time that I would normally intervene and do wish indeed to express my thanks for the work that is being done by staff of the Workers Compensation Board and, at the same time, introduce staff who are present here at the table.

I have Sonny Arrojado, who is chairperson of the board; John Wiebe, who is the director of finance; Carla Moore, who is a research analyst; and Ken Carrolls, liaison officer.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, are there any other members here, any other commissioners of the board?

HON. G. LECUYER: The two other commissioners of the board are sitting in the audience, and I would ask perhaps that they stand up: Don Bullitt,? commissioner; Al Fleury, also a commissioner.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Is the heavy one in the front . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: They both looked at one another.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Now that all the nice things are finished, let's get down to it.

A year ago, and the Minister made some mention of it, we were talking about the Class Fund. The Provincial Auditor states in his report: "As indicated in our last year's report, this deficit financing is not in compliance with Section 66(1) of The Workers' Compensation Act which states that the board shall every year assess a levy upon and collect from the employers in each class . . . sufficient funds . . . (a) to meet all amounts payable from the accident fund under this Part during the year including administration costs . . . (c) to provide in each year capitalized reserves sufficient to meet the periodical payments of compensation accruing in future years in respect of all accidents that occur during the year . . . ""

The Workers Compensation Board, the Class Fund has deteriorated to the point that it's causing some great concern whereas the Minister is operating under an illegal operation. I know that he's trying to correct the operation - but lo and behold! - I told the Minister that I didn't want to hear any more of we're monitoring; we're reviewing; we're evaluating; when we're talking about The Workers' Compensation Act, I've got a new term: "It's on hold."

I don't think that we can be on hold. We can't keep reviewing. I know that there is a review committee, and I would hope that they would be giving a report pretty soon so that we can take action. It's been a couple of years now that we've been sitting on it. That requires some action.

When will the review commission on The Workers' Compensation Act be making a report so that we can keep the Minister out of jail from this illegal act?

HON. G. LECUYER: Although the Compensation Board is in an unfunded liability situation which doesn't please me any more than it pleases the other member but, as I indicated, the premium rates charged for a number of years and the implementation of the recommendations of four different reports, which I think I outlined last year, and I can again this year indicate what has been implemented and the costs associated with the implementation of these changes in the operation, have necessitated additional staff. We have put in the on-line computer system in the board. All these have a price tag associated with them.

Having said that, the member will notice that the rate of growth of the unfunded liability has been arrested and has been reduced this year as compared to last year. So, if I judge by that, we're going in the right direction in that we said that by increasing the rates at a reasonable level, because that was in the interests and the route that was favoured by all in spite of the fact that the provision of the act stated that the board was to assess rate increases at the level which was projected to pay for all costs of the operation in one year, which would have necessitated rate increases higher than what we imposed; in other words, there was government intervention to prevent the rates from going up at that level because various business sectors were in agreement with that proposal as well.

We hope that with ongoing reasonable rate increases, and as a review in process - we got legal opinions in that regard - and because there is a measure now being undertaken to revise legislation, that was sufficient as a clear step. Although the Auditor does comment to the fact that we haven't raised the rates to erase the deficit, at least he notes the fact that measure has been undertaken.

MR. A. KOVNATS: How can the Minister make such a statement, that a measure to revise the legislation has been undertaken? There's a review committee, but we don't have any idea as to what the recommendations of that review committee are going to be. How can he, in all honesty and sincerity, say that there's a measure to revise legislation?

Was that the intent when this review committee was brought into being, that they were told to revise legislation, or were they just told to bring in recommendations that they thought were appropriate?

I would hope that they weren't given any specific instructions from the Minister when he appointed them to do their job.

HON. G. LECUYER: The committee's mandate was to indeed review the entire legislation, the procedures and the policies of the board, and make recommendations which are intended to be considered for a review of the legislation, exactly that.

Monday, 21 July, 1986

While I remember - I did not answer that part of the question the member asked a moment ago - the mandate of the committee is an 18-month mandate, which means that towards the end of this calendar year we should be having a report from the Legislative Review Committee.

It's a lengthy and arduous process, and I remind the member that the mandate of the commission that reviewed the legislation in Ontario was one of three years. We've given the review committee 18 months to perform their task.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm not going to fight the Minister on that, the amount of time. I think that we were late in getting started. There were the indications that the Class Fund was going to be in a deficit position going back a few years now. The Minister can't use that as an excuse that Ontario was three years and ours is only a year-and-a-half.

But the Honourable Minister had made a remark about how the courts decided that they weren't going to proceed with any action because there was a committee revising the legislation. At least, that's what I wrote. The Minister changed his word now to "reviewing" the legislation.

Is it reviewing or revising the legislation that the committee was given instructions to do?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, a review leads to revision, and the government is the only one in power to do the actual revision, but these are made on the basis of recommendations of the committee that makes the review. So there is no misuse of words there, the words are the correct ones, and they were not used accidentally.

I did not refer to Ontario as taking three years as an excuse, Mr. Chairman, just as an indication that this is indeed a difficult task, and that's the context in which I gave that explanation.

MR. A. KOVNATS: We're not going to get into any arguments at this point - we've been very, very friendly up until now - but review certainly doesn't mean revise. Review means to have a look at it over again; revise means to change it. Let's not get down to the semantics of these words. It's not worth it at this point. I can't accept what the Minister has said.

"We are concerned that the failure to charge adequate assessment rates will result in an unfair burden being placed on future employers." Now, ". . . an unfair burden on future employers," has the Minister considered special allowances to the workers compensation, other than coming from the workplace, to bring the Class Fund up to par?

HON. G. LECUYER: We did at one time, as the member knows, make a contribution to the compensation system of \$4 million out of general review. We stated that was a one-time only. We are not currently considering making any contribution towards the system. We stated that with the improving economy, the growth in the number of employers and the workers, the additional revenue that that brings in, we will be able to keep the rate increases at a reasonable level and get back to a fully funded system.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm sure that the Minister's staff at the Workers Compensation is trustworthy. I believe that; I truly do. But we did have some problems in another Crown corporation, in Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation where there were some problems, and the chairman was replaced because of some practices that were not accepted by auditors or by law.

Some of the privileges that go with being a member of the Workers Compensation Board or staff, has the Minister had any reason to believe that there are some problems at the Workers Compensation Board similar to what might have been at the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation?

HON. G. LECUYER: In an operation like the workers compensation system, there is no way that one can say there are no problems. There are always improvements to be brought to the system, and I cannot deny that is an ongoing process that we have to be on the lookout for. Hopefully, we can overcome the problems as they occur.

I'm not aware of problems such as the member is referring to.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Has the Minister initiated any investigation through the workers compensation to see that these people, in fact, would prove to be trustworthy? Wouldn't that be wonderful, to be able to go to your staff and say thank you very much for doing the job that you were hired to do? I would hope that would be the result.

Has the Minister initiated any investigation into the actual working similar to what happened at MPIC?

HON. G. LECUYER: I am told, Mr. Chairman, that there are currently conflict-of-interest guidelines within the board and at the staff level. The board has requested an internal investigation involving one particular case. They've requested that from the Provincial Auditor.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I don't need any names at this time, Mr. Chairman. I'm just looking to see that they're doing the job that they're capable of doing. Obviously, if there is some investigation going on at this time - I would hope that there wouldn't be - but if there is, that's all to the board's credit, so enough said at this point.

We've got some problems with some of the claimants who have been rejected. Some of them have been over years, many, many years. I've got one, and I can't mention names. It seems to me that we agreed not to mention names at one time, and I'm not going to. But the Minister is most cooperative. He said that if I got any particular persons who require some help, please let him know and give him all the details, and he would be happy to look into the matter.

Then I get from the Minister that I am limited in what I can do. I am the Minister in charge of Workers Compensation, but I can't put my nose in. You know, we've sat there and we've discussed particular cases, but he can't do anything to help them. I was wondering whether the Minister could change it so that there could be some way that we in government, we as elected representatives, could be of some assistance to these people who have no other recourse, who have been

completely rejected now, and maybe rightly so. But there's got to be some way - and I wouldn't want it to go through the . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: Don't mention any names.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Okay, maybe I won't.

There's got to be some way we, as political persons, can get somewhat involved and have some influence, I say, because I think that as political people, we've got to have that right. When I say some influence, I'm not saying that you direct the Workers Compensation to follow your ruling. What I'm saying is that you can put pressure on them to at least review maybe once more. You might come up with the same answer, but there's got to be some way that we as the political animals are able to get them to maybe give us one more kick at the cat. I think that — (Interjection) — Well, we're talking about kick at the cat.

We're talking about people who just can't understand why they can't receive compensation after they've been injured in the workplace, and these are the people that we've got to give some special feeling for and some special arrangements; they just don't understand and it's causing them great concern. I guess I'm a very compassionate person and sometimes I would see that they would get workers compensation even if they didn't quite deserve it in the manner in which they think they did. I'm compassionate enough that I would think they require some special consideration. Would the Honourable Minister give them the consideration that I think they deserve.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I as the Minister would like to make sure that every injured worker gets a fair and equitable treatment and that the provisions of the legislation are applied and interpreted as intended to insure that each member that qualifies for compensation gets it.

But, having said that, the member would be the first one, I think, to agree that to have a system which is open to the whims and fancies of all sorts of political interventions would not make for consistent and fair and equitable treatment. Therefore, the legislation has been set up in that way that the board - there is a process which has been refined since 1982 whereby in 1983, I believe, the three levels of adjudication - the claimants officers and the senior claims officers, the review committee, and, if necessary, a medical panel, and to the final level, which is at the appeal level, are to deal with each one of these cases and adjudicate them with their experience using the legislation as their guide, implementing policies which will help to make for a greater degree of consistency of application and guidelines to achieve that same end. The board has been doing that in recent years and a number of policies have been implemented to assist in that process and to insure that there is a consistency of adjudication, rather than to go piecemeal and be subjected to the whims or fancies of each one presenting his case in whatever light or with whatever pressure they can garner.

As far as assistance, I've mentioned before, there are worker advisors to assist in facilitating that process, but I think that the member would not want the system

to be subjected to the pressures of whatever individual intervenes on behalf of a claimant. I think that would not make for a just system, it would not make for equitable or consistency of application of the legislation. Having said that, when one asks me what I can do, I indicate what the restrictions under law are and apply to me, and I can get a status of the actual file and, should I be informed that the board has contravened or not implemented the legislation properly, or if they have put in place procedures, then sure I would certainly see it as my responsibility to point that out that there's an inconsistency or that is not in keeping with the legislation.

Having said that, I don't think the member would in my position intervene to try and see that any specific or favourable treatment be given to one individual versus another. I know that's not what he would do.

MR. A. KOVNATS: As the critic of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health which takes in the place, the Workers Compensation Board. I'm just trying to think of my position, I get dozens and dozens of requests. I get the signed forms so that I can get the medical review and all of that, but there's got to be some better way of giving these people that last chance at being accepted by Workers Compensation.

I think the Honourable Minister would be reminded of a particular case that we sat in his office and discussed, because when I've got a problem I go to the Minister and he has been cooperative to the point where we have been able to sit in his office and discuss it. We agreed that this man was deserving. In fact, there were things that didn't come out into the open that we were aware of that would have almost ensured that this man be given some special consideration, and there just was no way that we could get him back into that special consideration. I don't have the right to phone the chairman of the Workers Compensation and say, would you have another look at it. That's not the terms of the chairperson's contract. There's just got to be some better way of helping these people, and I'm at a loss trying to think of which it would be without putting myself in a position of trying to put additional pressure on the people on the board because I don't have that right.

The Minister goes through the same thing. We go through anguish. Why isn't there something we can do on a political basis to help these people? We are elected on a political basis, why can't we use that elected position that we were elected to to be of some assistance?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I really can't provide much additional to what I said awhile ago. I know what the member is saying is that when a claimant comes or addresses his concerns or complaints or describes his case to him, or to myself, or to other members of the Legislature, we sympathize with his situation; we'd like to see it corrected. On the other hand, we're not the adjudicators and we haven't got the information of the full file. What the member should know is the percentage of rejection of claims is very low and generally I would hope, and always I would hope. I know that human beings are the adjudicators and there is quite an involved process. As I say, it can go through

Monday, 21 July, 1986

a variety of levels before it gets there. They seek medical opinions, the board has medical specialists. There's the Occupational Health Centre that also can examine patients or claimants and make its recommendation. I would hope that, knowing that we can be always wrong when we're talking about human beings adjudicating and making decisions involving another individual's concern and trying to assess the validity of his claim, but hopefully we're almost always right.

Now having said that, the member knows as well as I do that if you are the claimant and you consider your situation to be such that it is worthy of recognition or of compensation, of course, you would like to see your case being recognized and compensated, independently of the fact that you're not perhaps the best to make an objective decision when it involves your own situation. I certainly expect that there are instances where people perhaps have not had their claim as fully recognized, in certain cases, or have had it recognized perhaps a little bit too generously in other cases, but I think with the expertise there, and the staff involvement on these claims that, as I said before, by far an overwhelmingly high percentage of cases - and I would hope that it's in the 99 percent-plus - where the claimants are treated as they deserve to be treated. And I suspect that to be the case.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I was just reading in the paper the other day concerning a chiropractor - I guess it was the President of the Chiropractic Association - making statements about how they weren't considered in the same light as medical doctors. I wonder, can the Minister advise why chiropractors are not regularly included on medical review panels. Is it because their opinions - I said regularly now - are not considered on the same par as medical doctors?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the Compensation Board of Manitoba does provide for chiropractic treatment under Section 24(19) of the act. Some other compensation boards do not. The Compensation Board of Manitoba recognizes chiropractic treatment, and also has two chiropractic consultants on staff for consultation in matters involving chiropractic treatment. So chiropractic opinion is taken into account when evaluating a claim. Chiropractors are also invited, I believe, in certain cases to present their views to the Medical Review Panel as well.

So they are perhaps not recognized to the extent that they would like. The only thing I can say in that regard is there is a review going on, and they will make their case there, as other members of interested parties in Manitoba. Those will be considered by the review committee, I'm sure, and recommendations will be made in that regard.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Dr. Gil Bohemier, I remember the name well. Why was Dr. Gill Bohemier complaining? Is he crying wolf in anticipation that his request will be denied, or is he not treated on the same par as a medical doctor? That was the question. Is he not treated on the same par as a medical doctor?

HON. G. LECUYER: That is correct. They're not treated in the same respect as a medical specialist, by legislation.

MR. A. KOVNATS: By legislation. Is the Honourable Minister thinking of changing that legislation?

HON. G. LECUYER: The legislation, Mr. Chairman, is as I said under review by the committee. We will, when the report comes to us, consider making many revisions to the act, and we'll look at that at that time.

MR. E. CONNERY: I'm quite concerned. I think the government knows that this is paid for by the employers so, no matter what you do, the employers are going to have to pay for it. I'm concerned at this lack of concern over costs. I think, if we went through some of the financial costs, Administration going up 12.4 percent. I find that this is just a totally irresponsible amount of money to be going up in Administration. How does the Minister justify 12.4 percent increase in Administration?

HON. G. LECUYER: As I said, Mr. Chairman, a while ago, to implement those recommendations, to bring the system up to par to the services provided by other compensation boards in Canada, we had to provide those services in Manitoba.

You know, until 1983, there was practically no rehabilitation provided in Manitoba. In fact, I have figures on that, and can give you an indication, for instance, of the staff who have been brought on to add the medical expertise, for instance, the medical coordination and medical monitoring to provide the rehabilitation that wasn't there before; to put in place the job-finding club and the re-employment officers. These cannot be implemented without additional costs.

So these are additional costs to improve the system, to get the treatment to the injured worker, to get him back in a job as quickly as possible. But in order to do that, you have to provide the services. Those represent additional costs. I fail to see how you can improve the system without having the costs associated with it. There is no getting around that. But inasmuch as we are successful in doing that, we'll also, in the end, hopefully have a better system and have reduced other costs.

I want to also draw to the attention of the member that you can't compare this to anything else. You've got to compare with what's happening elsewhere. Manitoba just cannot lag behind and say, well we'll just disregard the services that are being provided elsewhere. The average assessment rates, I mentioned awhile ago, have not in dollar amounts increased substantially. Very few things have increased so little as the compensation rates. Talk about any consumer goods or services, and just the inflation rate is way beyond the increase in assessment rates in Manitoba. When you look at what it was at in 1976 and you compare it to 10 years later and you go from \$1.10 to \$1.36 per \$100 of payroll, as average assessment rates, you know, that's not much of an increase.

But having said that, we don't want to be completely out of line either, as I mentioned. Nova Scotia's got the lowest rates. We've got Saskatchewan with an average assessment rate 1 cent per hundred less than Manitoba. So we're in third place, almost equal with Saskatchewan at a second-place level.

MR. E. CONNERY: Is that what it is? Well, of course, to say that the rates haven't got up when you're operating . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: They've gone up, but not . . .

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, not up, you know, to say there's such a very low increase, of course, is when you're operating illegally and not putting the increases according to the costs that you've incurred.

Have you talked at all with the business people? They gave you a presentation, I do believe, the Manitoba Employers Task Force. I'm sure they must have given you that presentation where they are very concerned, and I'm sure in other provinces the employers are equally concerned.

How much is workers compensation becoming a social benefit also? How many people are now getting benefits for injuries that were not related to the job that were already in place before the person was employed and then is now working on compensation; back injuries, lung conditions, all these sorts of things, that now they're getting full compensation and it's being charged to the employers where maybe it's a social problem rather than a workers compensation problem.

HON. G. LECUYER: By the same token, the other question that can be asked: How many claimants are the social systems carrying that should be carried by the compensation system? Where do you draw the line? That's the difficult question because it can also be the other way around.

Perhaps when the rates were too low, the rejection level rate was much higher and many of the claims that should have been paid through the compensation system were paid through the other social systems, welfare or Medicare, etc.

Mr. Chairman, I don't take any pride in the fact that the assessment rates are among the lowest in the country at all. What I'm saying is that the compensation rates should be at the level to provide that the services which are intended for under the act and should be fair and just to the injured worker. That's the way the system was introduced; that was the trade-off. The employer is freed from any liability suits being taken against him and I indicated what's been happening in that sphere of insurance across the country and across the continent, so the member knows where the employers would be if that were the case.

The system provides, through the collective responsibility system, many benefits to employers and they know that; and these benefits - yes, they do pay for it, but they are also benefits that are deductible from the cost of operation. There are also benefits that are generally charged back to the consumers. Who pays for those benefits very often and to what extent, I don't know, but the average consumer of Manitoba, generally speaking, pays for those benefits because they're charged back on these goods that are sold to the public of Manitoba and elsewhere; they're charged back.

Some of the claimants themselves pay for a certain amount of these costs through their purchase of goods and services that are produced through the employers.

A MEMBER: Except on agriculture.

HON. G. LECUYER: That may be a good example. I have to say, on the other hand, the member states,

except on agriculture; Except agriculture is one of the sectors that there are very few people who carry compensation because it's one of those sectors where compensation is available on a voluntary basis and therefore there's not too many people who pay assessment rates for compensation in the agricultural sector.

We have said that the rates, obviously, to provide the services that should be provided should be more than they are now. But I've met, as the member has said, with the employer groups, and it is their desire that the rates not be raised in one fell swoop at the rate that would create an unfunded liability situation.

They prefer, in spite of what they've said afterwards, they're the ones that tell me directly that is the route to go. It may not be the message that you heard because of course any time they pay a penny more, they would prefer not to have to pay it. That's understandable, but comparing them in the light of other employers in other provinces, I can give you reams and reams of statistics that will bear this out, and if the member wishes to hear them out, I am certainly prepared to go into that area.

MR. E. CONNERY: We better order breakfast with the length of the answers we're getting; we'll be here all night, but so be it.

What is the total deficit of the Workers Compensation Board at this time?

HON. G. LECUYER: The total accumulated - the deficit is \$25,800,000.00.

MR. E. CONNERY: That is compared to a \$36 million, was it, surplus in 1981-82?

MR. G. LECUYER: A \$35 million surplus in 1981.

MR. E. CONNERY: There has been a significant change . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: It wasn't a surplus, I have to say. It was a reserve.

MR. E. CONNERY: A reserve - there's been a surplus, are much the very same thing. At least it was when I went to school.

There are some interesting things. One of the areas that I looked at here, in Doubtful Accounts, you've gone from \$150,000 to \$270,000 in Doubtful Accounts. How did Doubtful Accounts come about?

HON. G. LECUYER: This is a sum that is set aside which is proportional to the amount of the receivables in case there are some of these assessment rates that are not paid. Some employer, for instance, goes out of business or eventually this amount is not possible to collect.

MR. E. CONNERY: Basically, they're bankruptcies that you haven't been able to collect?

HON. G. LECUYER: Not necessarily. It may happen in such situations as that, but those are not the only incidences or occurrences where . . .

Monday, 21 July, 1986

MR. E. CONNERY: What other incidents would there be that you couldn't collect? If a person doesn't go out of business, they're obligated to pay their account.

HON. G. LECUYER: Someone may discontinue business in this province, for instance, and continue operating elsewhere.

MR. E. CONNERY: And you don't pursue . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: Certainly, the board pursues and makes every effort to recover, but there are instances where the cost of recovery might be judged to be unduly high as compared to the amount that is being recovered and therefore is an amount that is classified as unrecoverable.

MR. E. CONNERY: What percentage would we have to go up just to put the fund in a break-even point, not reducing the deficit, just to be breaking even?

HON. G. LECUYER: In 1986, the amount or the average increase that would have been required to do that would have been 53 percent and we allowed only a 20 percent average rate increase.

MR. E. CONNERY: So our deficit is increasing. I thought I heard you say earlier on that we were now in an improving situation. I don't think we're in an improving situation.

HON. G. LECUYER: The previous year we did not allow the rate increase that would have been required to do that, and the year before that we did the same.

We said we will continue to impose. If we did it the full percentage rate we would be in a funded situation, but because we did not, therefore the unfunded situation grew. Therefore, when it grows you have to get a higher percentage to recover to get back into a fully funded situation.

On the other hand, the deficit situation I said improved because the deficit year-over-year operation in 1983 was 19 million; in 1984 it was 17.7 million; in 1985 it's 12.1 million. That peaks with the reasonable rate increase, as I've indicated, and inasmuch as we continue that, we'll eventually get it into a fully funded situation.

MR. E. CONNERY: How many years do you anticipate then before you're going to be at the break-even point and then recover the deficit?

HON. G. LECUYER: We have calculated that and I'll give you that in a moment. Providing everything else remains constant, and the same average rate increase, we would be at that level in 1992.

MR. E. CONNERY: What are you anticipating in significant increased costs for '86? I don't think there's a budget for the Workers Compensation, is there? There are no estimates. Where are the costs going to go for '86 compared to '85?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm sorry, I missed the beginning part of the question.

MR. E. CONNERY: What are you doing this year now that is going to make any significant changes to the

expenses of the Workers Compensation Board for '86? Are there a lot of new programs that are going to come onstream again?

HON. G. LECUYER: There are some factors that will reflect additional costs. There are some other factors that may bring about some reduction in costs. The Long-Term Claims Committee may effect a reduction in costs in terms of closer monitoring of long-term claims. On the other hand, there is, according to statistics available this year so far, a significant increase in claims which might reflect additional costs. We can only make an educated guess in terms of how much these will affect the additional cost of the overall operation at this point in time.

MR. E. CONNERY: Do you have an estimate for the administrative expenses?

HON. G. LECUYER: For next year?

MR. E. CONNERY: For '86.

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, this is an estimate which shows approximately a 1.8 million increase, which will include the cost, for instance, of the Legislative Review Committee which is currently reviewing the act. That represents a significant cost of approximately \$300,000.00.

There's an amount of increase in practically every category because that reflects inflation, that reflects adjustments in wages, and there will be minor additions to staff. There will be increases in staff. Through the collective bargaining process, the Estimates make provision for some amount, some increment amount. This is the recent collective agreement last year.

MR. E. CONNERY: You're looking at going from somewhere just over 10 million to about 12 million in administrative expenses?

HON. G. LECUYER: That's correct.

MR. E. CONNERY: That's a 20 percent increase.

HON. G. LECUYER: There's approximately an 18 percent estimated increase. What that will be, I don't know.

MR. E. CONNERY: I'm sure the health facilities, like hospitals and the universities, would be quite happy to have a similar increase. These are increases, and that's just for administration. What is the deficit . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: The total increase, I'm sorry, is 15.7 percent, when you take into consideration . . .

MR. E. CONNERY: 15.7.

HON. G. LECUYER: .87 percent.

MR. E. CONNERY: What is the estimated deficit for the Class G group this year?

HON. G. LECUYER: The estimated figure I'm being provided is 15 million.

Monday, 21 July, 1986

MR. E. CONNERY: 15 million. And we had a deficit this year of?

HON. G. LECUYER: 12.

MR. E. CONNERY: So the deficit then is going to be increasing or what? Yes, it's increasing if that's your estimated deficit. How are we going to achieve a break-even point by 1992 if the deficit is increasing?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm told that part of that 15 million within that part, that 15 million provision, is made for adding funding through the various reserve funds.

MR. E. CONNERY: What portion would be going to reserves?

HON. G. LECUYER: 5.6 million.

MR. E. CONNERY: Do you have a breakdown by the various groups as to where the problems are in the deficit? Going through your groups 1, 2, have you broken them down as to what areas are contributing the most?

HON. G. LECUYER: Without going into a tremendous amount of detail, suffice it to say that there is currently within the board the review of the classification system which will provide a great deal of that in terms of which particular class is perhaps not being assessed sufficiently according to reflecting the costs that they actually represent to the system, whereas others, perhaps, are assessed more than the actual cost that it reflects to the system. The areas which present the highest risks are the ones that would fall in that category such as forestry and mining.

MR. E. CONNERY: Are the rates not somewhat set actuarially, so that you're recovering from each sector a reasonable amount, or do you let some have a large deficit and then put in increases, and certain sectors then are paying a very disproportionate high rate compared to others and not really having made the claims in that area?

HON. G. LECUYER: There is, within the rate-setting process, which is outlined I believe in the annual report, how the rates are set. There is an actual reflection within that. The collective responsibility factors in there - the administrative costs of operating the system are reflected in there and shared. Beyond that, there is a reflection of the actual risks involved and accident frequency and the degree of seriousness of accidents. That is reflected in these rates, yes.

The process, if the member wishes me to go in further detail, assessable payrolls are estimated for the coming year for each rate group; industry trends and current wage supplements are taken into account. Coming year estimates by rate group of direct costs of compensation, medical aid, pension awards and rehabilitation are prepared.

Cost trends over the past three years are taken into account. Each rate group is allocated its portion of anticipated administrative costs. Each rate group is allocated its portion of funding required for reserve

funds such as equalization, second injury and future costs of existing claim.

A factor is calculated for recovering the legislative costs for past pension increases from each rate group, and each rate group is required to contribute for interest costs on the unfunded liability deficit.

MR. E. CONNERY: If the Minister could table, I would like to know what groups - where they're at as far as paying their way.

We talked earlier about the voluntary group and I've got a break-out of one group which is one that I know the most about, market gardening, 905-08, and we've got claims in the last two years of \$2,891 but revenue or assessments of \$37,000.00. This is one of the complaints that our group has, that we're not having claims but we have a high rate. So we have people then going to the private ones which are not as good, in many ways, as workers compensation, and I recognize that. But when you get this sort of an expense, then it forces them because they know that the rates are too high. How does the Minister justify that sort of a breakdown, or don't they keep a close enough tab to see where the industries are at various sectors?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm told that we don't keep a cash balance in terms of how they break in relation to the rate assessed but, on the other hand, I have told the member the factors that go into considering how the rate will be established for each successive year and that reflects all the factors I've mentioned a moment ago. These are taken into consideration in establishing the rate for each one of the groups, so it is a reflection of how the group is performing.

MR. E. CONNERY: I can't agree that this is a reflection of how the group is performing. Obviously it's not a high claim sector, but you've established rates for that sector that are bringing in an awful lot of money and of course deterring people from using workers - and since it's a voluntary one and that's a concern. The workers in that particular group have been lobbying the government to try to put it in to be compulsory, but more people would take it if the rates charged were more in line with the incidents.

From under 3,000 to 37,000 in revenue brought in, there's obviously and other sectors, the other group in grain farming, where they're paying their way. Are some sectors now being forced to pay for groups that have a high incidence of accidents?

HON. G. LECUYER: I realize the rate is not a reflection only of the accident costs in that group because, as I said before, there is a factor in there which reflects collectible liability, reflects administrative costs, so it's not purely and only a reflection of the costs of accidents within that group - (Interjection) - that's right. The best example - and I've given it before but I've forgotten about it now - car insurance, house insurance is not solely a reflection of what you've cost to the system. There's a projection in there in terms of the potential cost that you may represent. It reflects the car that you drive and even though, if you haven't had any fire in your home, your cost may go up because there is a collective liability principle involved there too.

Monday, 21 July, 1986

MR. E. CONNERY: But there are actuarially put in place and then if there's a high incidence in certain categories - I'm talking about a category, not a farm.

HON. G. LECUYER: There is an actual factor to take in setting these rates as well.

MR. E. CONNERY: Would the Minister table - and I would like a breakdown on the various groups as to whether they're in a plus or minus position. I would like some sort of breakdown for these groups based on this and it must be there. You've got computers. I see the data processing. You have gone way up this year, so the information must be on computer. If it's not and you haven't got it, then you darn well should have it. So if you have it, I would like to see it tabled for us to review. If you haven't got it then, by gosh, you should be doing it.

HON. G. LECUYER: There is, as I said awhile ago, a reclassification that is under way now. As part of that study, each one of these groups in order to calculate, to do this exercise, they would establish this plus-minus situation in relation to the rates being charged. This hasn't been a practice of the board to publish that type of information. They would provide that as applicable to the group in which the employer belongs. They would provide that to the individual employer category groups only.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well how are we as an elected group supposed to analyze that this board is functioning properly? If we aren't given the information, then we have no way of determining whether you're doing an adequate job.

HON. G. LECUYER: The employer would want to have that in order to be able to, in his discussions with the board, determine whether his rate is fair. Because the system is there to provide the collective liability principle, an individual employer would see, for instance, perhaps a plus situation in one category versus another individual employer would see a minus situation and would say, well mine should be "X" dollars less and his should be "X" dollars more. It's to avoid that kind of multitude of debates you would have on the relation of difference of cents, plus or minus, in comparing one employer to another employer.

MR. E. CONNERY: But I'm not asking for individual employers within a category. I'm asking for within the category. I recognize that our farm might not have an accident in 10 years and we still pay a premium, the same as fire insurance. We haven't had a fire in our family history, but we still pay fire insurance. We expect to, but we don't expect to be paying for somebody in other groups for high incidents.

HON. G. LECUYER: What I can say to the member, I will look at that and endeavour to find out if that information can be provided to him and will do so if I can. If there is no legislative impediment to that, I certainly will provide it to the member.

MR. E. CONNERY: Have you considered merits within sectors? If one industry within a sector or business is

in a sector, is much more careful what's in the program and has a very low incidence like we do in the Motor Vehicle, has this been considered to encourage the industries to improve their safety? Everybody doesn't like to see someone getting injured. So if we can prevent the injuries, everybody is ahead, and that will happen if you have some sort of merit system.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, that is not a clear-cut case that can be made on that. Employers don't agree among themselves on that particular statement. Some would prefer to see that happen. There have been discussions with the board and employer groups in that regard. I expect the smaller employer will not get any benefits from that. Probably it would be the reverse. In the end, the total costs are the same.

A discussion paper has been circulated to the board for the various employer groups for comment on that particular point that the member makes. But I have had occasion to read the goings on in other compensation systems across the country and it's not all one-sided as one would believe it to be. Indeed, it may be penalizing some sectors in applying that particular type of system. I'm sure it is one of the issues that the Legislative Review Committee will also be considering.

MR. E. CONNERY: As I believe the Workers Compensation has also become a social tool, if this is the goal - and maybe it's good - then has the government considered the employees picking up part of the cost because we are also including a social aspect with the Compensation Board?

HON. G. LECUYER: As I indicated at the beginning of my remarks opening this section, the system, the way it has been established over a long time ago, was established as part of a trade-off whereby the employer would pay the costs of the compensation system; in return, no injured employee would be able to sue an employer for any accidents. Therefore, to change that would destroy the compensation system as we know it today.

MR. E. CONNERY: Why would that destroy it? You've gone an extra step when this was put in. The system is different than what it was back then. You've gone a lot further and I think in many cases beyond injury related to the workplace. So we've got another dimension brought in. I don't see how that would destroy the whole thing. Now, you explain to me how that would destroy it.

HON. G. LECUYER: The compensable injuries are only paid for, or there is only compensation for injuries that have taken place in the workplace. In fact, in order for a claim to be accepted, it has to be shown that the injury is part of a workplace accident before it is compensable and, as I said before, the intent of the system is not changed; provisions within that system have changed but the intent of the system is the same and the trade-off that I referred to still holds. If you remove that trade-off on the one side, you remove it on the other, and that's where I say the system is destroyed.

Monday, 21 July, 1986

MR. E. CONNERY: We see from the employer's perspective that they feel that there is a lot of certain types of injuries; that the employee went to a new employer with problems and they weren't detectable to the employer. He got back problems; he could have lung problems. It ends up the fellow has cancer and then it's attributed to the job that he's been at. I think we've gone a lot further in this case and this is where a lot of the extra costs come in.

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm told this section in the act has been there for many years, since 1972 in fact. So that provision is not a new one in the act.

MR. E. CONNERY: The Minister, Mr. Chairman, said earlier that growth in employers and employees would help reduce the deficit. Are these new employees not going to be as accident-prone and they'll have a better incidence? That was in your comments earlier on.

HON. G. LECUYER: I was looking for some information, I missed the gist of the question.

MR. E. CONNERY: Earlier on you had said you're going to help reduce the deficit by having more employers and therefore more employees, and that would help reduce the deficit. Are these new employees going to be less accident prone, so you'll collect the premiums and not have to pay out the claims?

HON. G. LECUYER: I indicated that there were more employers and that was a reflection of the growth in the economy, but associated with that, there are also more accidents and we see the statistics for that are there to prove it so far this year. That is disheartening and it's only when the full impact of the regulations and the legislation under The Workplace Safety and Health Act are in place that we hope to see, in fact, an impact on the reduction of accidents.

As there are some types of accidents that decrease, new types of accidents come into the picture. There was - and time does not perhaps permit me to go into length on this particular - an article which appeared recently in a French review, which is called *La Monde Diplomatique*, *The Diplomatic World*. It's a lengthy article which goes on to show that inasmuch as there have been accidents reduced in certain areas, they have grown in other areas with new technology and the challenge is always there to further implement measures to reduce accidents in new areas.

There are other factors that come into the picture that keeps the rates up; the ceiling of wages are higher; the weekly wages are higher; the medical costs are higher; the days lost have increased; there are occupational illnesses which are as a result of workplace accidents which were not being considered at one time which are today. These are factors that are new challenges that we face in the compensation system today.

MR. E. CONNERY: If a person is injured, and can't go back to his old job, and the injury is of such that he can't do a similar job, but is still capable of doing some work, but it won't be at the same rate of pay, does he go to work at a lower rate of pay and then is

given the difference, compensation, through the Compensation Board, or do they just leave him on full workers compensation?

HON. G. LECUYER: There is a vocational rehabilitation provided. The employee - suitable re-employment is found. If there is a discrepancy in the wages earned at the new employers versus his original job as a stop gap until the wage level reaches the same level as his employment before, there is wage adjustment provided by the compensation system.

MR. E. CONNERY: I have one last question and it was kind of an odd one to me. I was looking through the cause of accidents and the fourth highest cause of accident is being struck by a stationary object. I wondered if the Minister could explain that.

HON. G. LECUYER: More people striking stationary objects, maybe.

MR. E. CONNERY: But you're struck by a stationary object.

HON. G. LECUYER: The member is referring to the Annual Report.

MR. E. CONNERY: Yes, Page 33, "Struck by a stationary object".

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, that's the intent of the meaning. "Being struck by a stationary object" is perhaps not the best wording to use.

I wanted to add in regard to the previous question, that one of the things I would like to see happen to an increasing degree, and many employers who would like to see as well, I'm sure, is that the former employers would rehire the rehabilitated workers. Hopefully there will be a greater effort made on the part of employers to do that because inasmuch as they can, they help reduce the cost to the system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Back to Item 1.(a) The Minister's Salary. We finished with Workers Compensation Board. The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Excuse me, we were on Resolution No. 66.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we passed it. We agreed before - remember - to deal with Workers Compensation Board as a non-resolutionated item.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Did you read off Resolution No. 66, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I most certainly did. It was passed.

MR. A. KOVNATS: The Minister's Salary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister's Salary, 1.(a) - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: It look like we've wound up too late to do anything about reducing the Minister's Salary

Monday, 21 July, 1986

or the Chairman's salary. It wasn't our intention in the first place.

I want to thank the Minister for his cooperation. I want to also thank the Minister for not standing up like the Minister of Highways and say, you know, we go through that little Jack Horner syndrome about what a good boy am I and how many good things that I have done. Then I realized why the Minister didn't get up and say all of the good things that he's done because there are none.

Anyway, I do want to take this opportunity of thanking the Minister for his cooperation. It has been good but he has had some problems. The problems are that the Minister is a Minister of the future. Everything is going to happen somewhere in the future; nothing is happening now; nothing has happened before. We don't seem to be accomplishing anything. We're talking about sites for hazardous materials somewhere in the future; we're talking about cleaning up river banks somewhere in the future; we're talking about cleaning up the Red River, the water supply out at Selkirk, Manitoba, somewhere in the future; we're talking about the Review Committee on Workers Compensation somewhere in the future. Well, we do have some times when we know when it's going to happen.

The Minister is famous for his monitoring, his reviewing, his evaluation on hold. I hope that when we get back next year — (Interjection) — anyways, when we come back next year, I know there are going to be the same questions and I know I'm going to get the same answers; it's under review. You know, maybe we won't have to spend as much time next year because we'll just say the same answer as last year.

HON. G. LECUYER: We'll say the review is finished. We'll add to additional regulations we've passed over and above those this year.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, I hope so. As the Minister knows, I've been trying to be cooperative with him, also. I think that it's a most important department and it does scare me that we're not able to come up with more facts and figures and more results. — (Interjection) — Well, we have the facts and figures but the results don't seem to be there and I hope the Minister can rub my nose in it next year and say, see, now we've accomplished this and we've accomplished that. I don't think he's going to be able to do it but I would be most pleased because it's to the benefit of all of the Province of Manitoba.

I thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution 62: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,345,900 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Administration and Finance for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Thank you all.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY — HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order.

This Committee of Supply section is dealing with item No. 2.(b)(1) and 2.(b)(2) Community Health Services, Communicable Disease Control: Salaries and Other Expenditures - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, just before we broke, the Minister was going through a rationalization of the Other Expenditures. In that, he indicated that he was saving \$64,000 through the department to undertake the reduction in the monitoring flocks for equine encephalitis.

Can the Minister indicate to us how many areas of the province, or how many of these monitoring chicken flocks there were throughout the province and where they were, the breakdown say between the City of Winnipeg and rural Manitoba? How many staff were required to undertake the monitoring program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We had 10 to 15 or so; three or four in Winnipeg and the rest in the rural areas. The work was done by STEP students. We didn't require any staff from the department to do that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister, in rationalizing this reduction, this cutback, indicated that to the effect - and if I'm not paraphrasing the Minister properly - he indicated that they provided no useful benefit in that the parents, if they're interested in protecting their children from contracting equine encephalitis, they should take precautions at all times.

Mr. Chairman, that argument is a little difficult to accept, given the experience, as indicated by Dr. Roy Ellis, who is Winnipeg's Chief Entomologist, who indicated that the monitoring flocks gave us the advance warning on previous outbreaks of equine encephalitis in the province.

Given that the Minister doesn't have that advance warning, because he no longer has his monitoring flocks throughout the province and in the City of Winnipeg, what sort of advance preparations, or what sort of contingency preparations are there in the department? I suppose that begs the question of what use are they if the first indication you have of the incidence of equine encephalitis is an actual diagnosed case in humans, not being aware of the reporting process for any cases so detected in say horses, which are the next stage up on the detection of equine encephalitis.

When the Minister dropped this monitoring program, what sort of beefed-up preparations did he put in place or are in place in the department?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, in discussing the subject we could be in a pretty lively, lengthy debate. My honourable friend could quote Dr. Ellis, who is known for his certain views on the subject, and I could quote I think it's Dr. Labella at the University of Manitoba who opposed it and we could have part of this unending discussion.

I had stated at one time that in the field generally, speaking on the question of health, that we'd have to have some pretty difficult situations and decisions to be made that wouldn't be always popular. We felt that we had to look and get the best value for our dollars.

The situation is that, especially after - I don't remember exactly what year when we had the scare and we brought in the air spray and so on - that we look very seriously; a number of Ministers involved; the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Health. We each had a role to play and also the Minister in charge of EMO. We looked at the effectiveness with the experts that we had, such as Dr. Wilt and Dr. Eadie - the people from the Cabinet . . . We felt that the information that we were getting was very, very questionable to say the least. It couldn't prove anything; we felt that even with the pressure of the - even if we used in an emergency, if we used the air spraying that we weren't accomplishing very much. It might have been something, it might have worked more as the people seeing what was going on and all the reports in the newspaper and so on figured that there was an awful lot. Now, I think that cost us \$3 million.

I'm not going to argue that doing that did not do anything at all but when we look - the area where we have to choose and select, for instance, with cancer and so on and cardiac and in any, name it, they always feel that you should do more, we can do more and we probably would get more. I didn't quite say that if parents - I didn't put it quite like that - but if parents were interested in protecting their children; in fact, I said everybody because the mosquitoes will not get only kids. I said that it was an education, that in most instances we would doubt very much - we didn't exclude that - but to say that we would spray again. They would have to show us that we're going to accomplish something.

Now, that could still happen. We would have an expert in the field in entomology who will look at this, get the data and then he feels that there's the disease, they would advise the government and then we would be at the same position which we were two years ago. The emergency would have to be called by the responsibility with the Minister of Health and after that the spraying - I forgot the Minister of the Environment - to discuss what chemical would be used, what damage that it'll do to the birds, gardens and everything, not only to human beings also.

So that could still happen but we felt that it wasn't giving us much information. You remember this year that what was said this year, that it was going to be a bad year and so on and then the next week - the same Dr. Ellis would say, well, it's practically all finished and the next week it was starting all over again. The best way, I think everybody agrees with that, is with the larviciding. In other words, start by getting rid of them before they can do any damage at all and get them in that situation before they're born or just about that time when they're being hatched. So the situation is that we are now focusing on the question of education. And it is true, it might be too late when you get down. Even with all the research that we can do, it could be too late. The people should get used to - not this false security that we might have if we have these chicken flocks, and I think the situation is education has tried to address properly and not expose — (Interjection) — We've missed you this afternoon; we never heard any of those things.

Mr. Chairman, I think that what we've said that we've evaluated the situation. We felt that it wasn't money well spent with all the other priorities that we have and

we felt that there's nothing to replace education. If we had some funds that have been a little more serious, we would have, again, passed the message on the radio and put out some ads, but in the meantime we feel that people should learn how to protect themselves and their children. That is the best way.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has succeeded in confusing a number of issues all rolled into one. He's talking about education. He believes that education of the people is the way that you prevent equine encephalitis. Education of what? You've just dropped your monitoring flocks which are going to tell you whether there's the vector of mosquito present which is capable of spreading equine encephalitis and indeed is doing so. So what do you educate the people to do? Educate them to do what? Because you're not able to forewarn them that equine encephalitis is there as has happened before.

Now, is the Minister telling us that he's going to run an expensive advertising program to education people for no threat? That seems as wasteful as anything he could do. The proposition that the Minister just indicated is that his Cabinet colleagues and others sat around and had a discussion on the costs and he mentioned \$3 million. That wasn't the cost of monitoring for equine encephalitis, that was the cost of aerial spraying — (Interjection) — I know you didn't say that, but you're trying to confuse the issue. What you have dropped here is a \$64,000 program which is a protective program; a preventative maintenance program; that's what it is. You just said a few minutes ago that if there is a threat that some biologist may well tell you — (Interjection) — well, I don't know how, but nevertheless you'll get information. Then you may consider whether you spend money to spray and what chemical to use.

So the Minister has indicated that he's willing to drop \$64,000 worth of monitoring to provide advance warning, but they're still open to consider spending up to \$3 million on spraying. I mean that doesn't make sense.

The most economic use of preventative medicine dollars is to find out whether you've got a problem and to find out in sufficient advance warning time to do something about it to react to the situation. The Minister has cut back in this area of monitoring in the most futile fashion.

Constantly, we hear the First Minister talk, and I've got a letter here that, you know, I could quote from where he's talking about the Federal Government and they've got the money, but it's just a matter of the priorities of where they spend the money.

Well, this Minister and this government decided they were going to cut mosquito monitoring, the chicken flocks that monitor mosquitoes and equine encephalitis. Mr. Chairman, you might recall the sweetheart contract to a defeated candidate, the former Government House Leader, Mr. Anstett, who got himself a \$55,000-plus contract. Well, the money came right out of here.

Where are the priorities? The Minister chuckles, but his First Minister constantly talks about the Federal Government not having their priorities right. Here is another instance where this government hasn't got their priorities right. They cut away the very ability to monitor for the incidence of a serious disease and they cut

Monday, 21 July, 1986

away \$64,000 worth of monitoring to leave money for the Anstett contracts, for the September group contracts on tax reform, and you name it, to fatten the pockets of their friends. They've got money, but when it comes to monitoring for equine encephalitis, no, that's a major area where they

The Minister is wrong in this cut-back, the government is wrong in it, and there is no justification for this kind of a cut-back when he even tells us that they're considering if there was an outbreak continuing the spraying. They've got their priorities extremely wrong, Mr. Chairman.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if anybody is trying to confuse, it is my honourable friend.

First of all, I wonder if my honourable friend would say that he would spray if he had the responsibility. Would he bring in the aerial spraying? That's — (Interjection) — the No. 1 thing. — (Interjection) —

Well, I can deal with one of you but not the two of you together. So make up your mind who I'm going to deal with.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: You guys are stupidity in stereo.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health has the floor.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the situation is this, that there is not much point in getting this information if you are not going to spray. I'm talking about air spray now. That is No. 1. We haven't ruled that out completely, but we would with the discussion that we had, not just the Ministers sitting around the table, with the experts that we had, and we issued a statement explaining all that last year at that time why we were doing it.

Now my honourable friend says that I'm confusing because I'm talking about education. You're going to wait and people aren't going to take no precautions at all until they are told, hey, there are horses dying and we've got this test that we have with chickens, so be careful. That is what we're trying to stop. First, it is false security, it's too darn late many times, it is too late.

So the point is, well, the horses always come before the human beings for one thing. So why the mosquitoes? It is a waste of time. And what did we do that year? We had to wait until the horse had it and we want to make darn sure because it is quite a responsibility. There's at least half of the people that say you should never spray, for one thing. So fine, you can quote an expert who is known to like these spray cans and there's others that don't.

So the point is that I'm saying that the people should be educated during that period that the mosquitoes - and it's not that long a period - well, then they should take precautions. That's what I'm talking about education. You don't have to keep telling them okay, you're okay now. Take all the chances you want, we'll let you know. That is wrong advice to the people. You tell them how to protect themselves and they should do it all the time and then it becomes automatic. That's what they would do and that would be the best thing.

There's not much point in keeping these chicken flocks if you're not going to spray at a certain count and we certainly don't intend to do that.

We don't apologize for that at all. It's the best advice that we've had. There are some people, you can be evenly divided - it's frankly like aid to private schools - you got half the people that want to spray every day and other people that feel there shouldn't be any spraying at all. So I don't apologize for that decision at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to go back to the whole issue of STD's for a minute. We've had a long discussion about chlamydia but I'm particularly concerned about the herpes and the vaginal warts incidences that we've had in the last little while.

I know, without the Minister having to tell me, that these are not diseases which, in fact, under the usual terms of communicable diseases, that we can control. But what I am concerned about is the relationship between these diseases and sexual abuse of children. I'd like to know if there is any connection of material spreading from the Department of Health immediately to the Department of Community Services to report any incidences that come to light in these two areas.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think my honourable friend was satisfied with the answer that I gave previously, except I think the question now is the concern with child abuse with the warts. I think the main thing is that we do not want to mix the two; that right now, in fact, any venereal disease could be child abuse and in that way, through the Child Abuse Directorate that is where that should be reported. We're trying to do it in that way instead of having all the venereal diseases be reportable. That would be difficult to do and I think that we would lose track of what we're trying to do under Communicable Diseases. So we will encourage that and the concern that you had was passed on to the Minister responsible to make sure that something is done while we're looking at child abuse in the Directorate that we have there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just getting back to the Surveillance Program that has been cut; the Minister indicated that people need to be educated and people need to take precautions. I think that people are educated and are taking precautions, especially when it comes to looking after their children and preventing excessive mosquito bites. I don't really think that's the issue, Mr. Chairman. I think that as far as the surveillance program goes, the Minister is kind of burying his head in the sand when he says that if we don't know there is a danger, then we don't have to do anything about it. I think that's what he's really saying to us when he's discontinuing the program. It's a direct cutback in prevention.

I think, if we take a look at the health care budget, there must be other areas in administration that don't directly affect the citizens of Manitoba that could be

cut rather than \$64,000 in the preventative area to warn people of a potential outbreak so that something can be done.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is not necessarily just the amount. There's always some other programs that should be cut, never the ones we're interested in. If I go around, on this side, also, this is exactly what we'll see, that we have too many beds except in their constituency, that we have too many personal care homes.

I certainly didn't say that if you don't know there's a danger, you don't have to worry. I think saying that is proving exactly what I'm saying, that you do not wait and say there's no worry because nobody told me. I'm saying this is false, that is not foolproof, and I'm saying that we should teach our children and ourselves to take the ordinary precautions all the time when the mosquitoes are there. You don't know if that special mosquito is carrying a disease or not and that information you are seeking will not tell you that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, it will.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It will not tell you that. It might give you an idea and you're going to wait till there's so many of them and so how do you know? That is not the kind of information that you want to go on. If you really care about your children, you'll take the precautions at all times when the mosquitoes are there. That is not foolproof information and we don't want people to do exactly what you are saying, if you feel that there's no danger because nobody told me. We think that this is wrong, this is false.

The main reason why they have these traps was for air spraying. We're telling you that we don't believe, that it would be very rare indeed, if ever, that there will be air spraying because it is not accomplishing what it was supposed to do and what it should do, and it leaves too much to chance and it doesn't cover half the mosquito population.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, I think I asked the Minister of Health back in question period of several weeks ago for some information that he's not yet provided for me and maybe he could answer now.

How many people have died - oh let's go back say the last five years - of encephalitis, and how many people have had residual effects from contracting encephalitis but haven't died? Have you got statistics?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You'll see that even when we had these traps, people were affected and some people died, and this year, no traps and nobody died.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this subject, the Minister can't conveniently duck the lack of a monitoring program as being a reasonable and sound cutback. He can attempt to do it in any way he wishes. He has said that larviciding is one of the most effective ways of reducing the mosquito population, yet he sits around the Cabinet table with a Minister of Environment that has made that more difficult to do.

So you know the Minister can't give one answer here and then have Cabinet Ministers cutting his legs off

from under him, which is happening. The point that we are making with the monitoring flocks, the surveillance flocks is that they provided us with a good advance warning system because it shows up first, and most readily, and most easily detectable in the chicken flocks. By the time your horses acquire it, you may have infected human beings and you don't know about it because the incubation period is different in horses than it is in humans. This Minister has cut a monitoring program that allows the people of Manitoba to be aware of whether the mosquito population, regardless of how large or small it is, is carrying equine encephalitis.

That is something that Manitobans have known in the past, until this Minister made the cut in his budget, and it's something that they should know. All precautions, all education program aside, the people of Manitoba, I believe, would want to spend \$64,000 a year to find out whether the mosquito population is carrying equine encephalitis. They don't have that ability except, I presume, maybe in the City of Winnipeg where the city themselves have reinstated a surveillance flock program to give some advance warning to the people of Winnipeg.

The people in rural Manitoba have no such convenient warning. Mr. Chairman, I simply say the Minister made an error in reducing this monitoring program because it provided valuable advance warning and valuable knowledge to the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2)—pass.

Item No. 2.(c)(1), Maternal and Child Health; Salaries - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, just looking through a few notes here, Mr. Chairman. First of all, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate what external agencies are funded in this appropriation, and to what external agencies are receiving the \$105,000 increase in assistance to external agencies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me call them all then. 2.(c)(1) Salaries, 2.(c)(2) Other Expenditures, 2.(c)(3) External Agencies - the Honourable Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I have the same problem as I explained last year, that there's no commitment made to individual groups at this time. To give you an idea, I'd sooner give the idea, that is in other words, we're reviewing with them and negotiating with these different groups. What I would prefer to do is give my honourable friend the figure that they had last year than to say that amongst them the increase, there's no new ones. No, there are none of these, the new ones. The recipients were Planned Parenthood of Manitoba that received 161.7 last year; Serena Manitoba 10,000; Klinik 21.6, Klinik - the other program 125, Youville Clinic 245 and a reduction of the Health Grant for Outreach Workers 18,000 and Women's Health Clinic 6.8.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I take it last year Klinik received \$146,000 under this appropriation. Now, the Minister says that he hasn't got his grant structure established for this coming year. Then if he hasn't got the grant structure established, why is he requesting

Monday, 21 July, 1986

another \$105,000.00? Surely, the Minister must know where he intends to spend an additional request of \$105,000 this year over last year.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm sorry I missed the last part.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, if I heard him correctly, you indicated that you did not have this year's grant structures approved. The numbers you gave me were for last year, if I followed you correctly. That does not explain what you're needing another \$105,000 in this appropriation for. Surely, one must have an idea of where you are going to be spending additional money when you request it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I can give him most, I think he'll get most of the information. Yes, the total sum is approved but the finalization of this division is not quite approved, but I think you'll get most of it. We're talking about an increase of 105 - I can tell you that the Youville Clinic will get \$115,000 increase and that is for funding in support of the Diabetes Education and Prenatal Health Program - that is a new program that they're doing there. If you remember I talked about the diabetes last year, prevention or learn to live with it and so on, and that is a program that was started at the Youville Foundation, running that program.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And the other 100,000 - that's 15,000 increase.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: 115.

MR. D. ORCHARD: 115.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes for the whole program - that's a new program.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Last year's grant involved 125,000, I believe, to Klinik. Does that include the major amount that was funded to Klinik?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, no, this is just for the internal, this is just for this directorate. If you remember we talked about a program of advising the people on planned parenthood, and so on, and that was advertised last year. That, by the way, will not be paid this year. There was some money left and there's no money for that. The Klinik received 125 for that program, 10 to Serena for that and Planned Parenthood for that particular program - 161.7 last year. Now Planned Parenthood will keep on with the same amount, so will Serena, and the special thing to start, last year 125 for the Klinik, that won't be there. But that would be under the Commission if you want to know the funding for programs at Youville, it would be under the Commission.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Under the advertising program that took a major portion of the budget last year for Family Planning advertising, can the Minister indicate which advertising firm undertook that program?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The committee of these groups advertising together did their own advertising. They put

that to tender, and I might say that I was notified just a while ago that the advertisement was deemed - I don't really know where, to be honest with you - but there was, I think, an award given as the best advertisement. It was very well received. It's a delicate thing; it was done with good taste. They went to tender for that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I presume, under this line, this is where we would discuss the early release program for mothers and their new-born children. It's my understanding that each of the major hospitals that are participating - I think only Health Sciences Centre is not participating, of the Winnipeg hospitals, I believe. Each of those hospitals has a coordinator on staff to coordinate the early release program. They, in turn, will be working very closely with public health nurses who assist the mothers when they go home and go back to the community.

I realize that we'll discuss this more fully when we get to the regional services aspect of it, but in Winnipeg, now that we've got the early release program and it's been with us for several years, the Minister is now proposing that the regional services in Winnipeg be split up into three separate regions. That brings in the question, the whole area of coordination between this area of the Department of Health and, of course, the now-established coordination between the hospitals participating in the early release program and the public health nursing staff in Winnipeg Region.

Can the Minister indicate whether there has been ongoing discussions with the Director of Maternal and Child Health to assure that the new regional breakdown, when it comes into effect in Winnipeg, will not impede the early release program, that you will still have the coordination between the department? What I'm really interested in is whether the Director of Maternal and Child Health has been fully consulted and is working with the establishment of the three regional areas in the City of Winnipeg to be able to deliver the same quality of service that has been there in the past with the early release program, and whether that consultation and cooperation has been undertaken?

No. 2, I suppose an important question in terms of the early release program, is whether the Director of Maternal and Child Health believes that further regionalization in Winnipeg is going to make her job in the coordination of the early release program easier to do or more difficult to do.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Early Discharge Program started as a pilot project in a big way, in an organized way at St. Boniface about two years ago, and Dr. Becker, the Director, was certainly involved in that, as well as the hospitals and the Commission.

I should point out that this was voluntary; it was the doctor and the patient that would decide. It wasn't forced on anyone. Of course, in certain instances, if there was concern, they wouldn't participate. Of course, you have to beef that up with the proper home care and visits and so on in the community.

It was very successfully done. It was done, as my honourable friend says, on a smaller scale with no extra staff, at other smaller hospitals like, say, at Grace, Misericordia, and Victoria, and until this year it wasn't

done at the Health Sciences Centre, not in an organized way. If it will, the Health Sciences Centre were given two extra staff years to administer, to run this program. That will be done and Dr. Becker will very much be involved in coordinating this program, not only working with the hospital, but also equally important with the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

If anything, the regionalization of the service will make it easier to coordinate that particular program, not more difficult.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, given the multi-year experience on the Early Discharge Program, is there an identifiable saving at the hospitals that have participated in the Early Discharge Program?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is a saving, something that we explained in the exchange, I think, that we both agreed in the exchange we had when we started these Estimates, that it is a saving in this sense. It's a better utilization of beds, the people who would need an extra two or three beds, leave the beds for somebody else. There's no actual saving unless you close that bed, but the saving will be in better utilization and also no need to build more acute-care beds in the province. That will be one of the factors that will help release the beds, so there's certainly a saving in that way.

MR. D. ORCHARD: In terms of this program, where we're talking a specific, a very specific type of hospital patient, that being a mother who's delivering, the accounting procedure within the hospital should be pretty definitive because you're not keeping the mother there with her child for four days or five days, it's only two or possibly three. There should be a readily identifiable saving to the delivery wings of the hospitals that are participating. Whether those savings get used up elsewhere in the hospital budget is a decision that's made by, of course, hospital management.

Basically, why I'm wanting to find out from the Minister, because we do have a substantial direction given to us by his Health Services Review Commission, wherein they say we must go to more community care and away from institutional care. Now, the first step to finding out whether that is a laudible goal and a goal which will provide more economic delivery of health care, we first have to know whether hospitals have achieved savings in their maternity wings, or maternity divisions of their hospitals, what those savings are, and whether they have been offset, in part or in whole, or more than offset, by the community support program that is necessary for the Early Discharge Program.

I would think that this is something that certainly the Minister, under monitoring of the pilot project, as it was at St. Boniface and with the other hospitals that are participating, has to know because it is indeed almost the entire basis for recommendations out of the Health Services Review Committee reports, wherein we get away from institutional care and more to community care.

So I pose the question to the Minister: The savings to the hospitals in the maternity wards have to be there. I don't think there's any doubt about it. Whether they're used elsewhere is not what I'm talking about, not what we're discussing, because administrators may well use

those saved dollars in the heart ward or whatever. Who knows?

What I'd like to know is if there are identifiable savings from this program to the hospitals in their maternity operations, whether those savings are offset, in part or in whole, by support staff costs in the community? You have your public health nurses under your Continuing Care Program.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, certainly the saving is not offset by the extra support staff. It cost way less money to send staff for a few hours a few times a week than to keep people in a hospital.

The situation is that there has been an increase in deliveries in these hospitals, partly, not all of it, because it might not be a true saving because they could have had these programs at Seven Oaks and Concordia, but part of it was that you wouldn't have to add to the beds because there were more people referred to St. Boniface, and even more so when we closed these beds, and there was no need to build any more beds because of that. You could handle more patients with the same number of beds. That's partly it. Then, as I say, the increase that they've had in the births at that hospital. Well, that's the same thing. Most of them were coming in from other hospitals, from Concordia or Seven Oaks when that was going on. Then if there's an increase in births, you wouldn't need the extra beds that you'd have to build.

There is no doubt that, if those beds aren't occupied, you're saving money. Now it might be because they would have so many beds that by doing that - I'll have to check that, it hasn't been going that long - it might be that some of those beds are not occupied as much as they were before. I think that's really what my honourable friend wants to know. If that is the case, well then definitely there would be an added saving.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that there is a saving. I presume he is indicating there is a saving both to the hospital involved and indeed a net saving deducting the cost of community support staff, be they home care attendants or public health nurses.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister, if he doesn't have it, if he wouldn't think it would be an excellent area to find out just exactly what the empirical savings are in the hospital, replaced in part by additional costs in the community. We need to know those kinds of numbers, and this seems to me to be an excellent, easily and readily identifiable line in which they can be analyzed and given in fairly finite terms without too much slippage of dual use of the staff, etc., etc. It's pretty clear-cut when we're talking the maternity ward.

The reason I think the Minister needs as accurate a statistical analysis as possible is because this is, as I say, the whole direction that's primarily recommended to him as a way of reducing and controlling health care costs, is to get away from institutional care. This is one area where once again, if it hasn't been done, it should be done. Through all of the statisticians, either at the Health Services Commission or within the line Department of Health including Mr. Pascoe's shop, a pretty finite analysis should be done so that the Minister can back up with good numbers the statement he made

about there being significant savings, because your care outside of the institution is always more economic. For instance, when we get into the Mental Health estimate, it has been said that argument doesn't hold true. That may or may not be a fact; I'm not certain. But in this case, the Minister can find that kind of information and can have it readily quantified, and should do so.

Mr. Chairman, one other question before we leave this line, there is a reduction in the Other Expenditures. Does that represent a cutback in any particular aspect of the Maternal and Child Health Division's activities? Is there some particular area that is going to no longer operate as it has in the past with the \$37,500 reduction?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The only thing about the beds and the reduction in the costs and the saving to the hospital, I wonder if we could wait while we deal with the hospitals under the Commission. Then you'll have all the other factors, and we can certainly be in a better position to discuss that.

There is no doubt in the world that, if you close beds, if you don't need beds, there has got to be a saving. Now if you are using these beds for something else, there won't be an actual saving on the budget of this hospital if you do it for that particular time. What we are saying is that in fact the hospitals - and we're talking generally now, not just on this program. It'll be more costly. We hope that they will keep sicker people, and I used the example, I think, in the introductory remarks. The people, instead of maybe staying nine days would be six days, and they wouldn't have the last three days where they're walking the hall. They're in better shape, and they don't need much assistance or much care.

Those last three days will be replaced by a new sick patient coming in who will need the care. The hospital has been able to balance their staff with that. But if everybody needs more care, the staff probably won't be able to handle that. You'll need more staff. The hospital itself would cost more money, but it might prevent the building of other beds somewhere else. That's what we're trying to say. I'll get this information.

This was, as I say, a pilot project that was started. I don't imagine that you'll see much saving at the hospital at this time, but I think it only stands to reason that, if the people are not occupying beds, unless you're spending that money for something else or putting more different patients in those beds, you're going to save money.

Then to really save money, it's not only the beds. You'd have to eventually maybe cut staff for that particular area. It might be that you won't need the same staff. Those are all factors that we can discuss during the discussion of the Commission.

The next question, I think the reduction in Communication expenditures was \$34,900.00.

MR. D. ORCHARD: In Communications? Well, Mr. Chairman, when we do get to the Hospital line, I hope we have an opportunity to discuss that. As I say, the point I'm making with the Minister - and I think he fully understands it - is that a hospital with its accounting system can indicate - and sure, their total budget at St. Boniface, as an example, may well be more than what it was two years ago when they didn't have the

Early Discharge Program, but that would be a function of increased numbers of births. So your cost per birth is probably the most indicative figure that you can have in St. Boniface Hospital.

If the Early Discharge Program has lowered that by some 25 percent or 30 percent and your cost of support staff in the community only eat up 5 percent or 10 percent of that, then you are a net saver to the system. That would add a lot of credence to the recommendations made in your Health Services Review Commission that a trend away from institutional care will be a method of controlling the budget, not simply from the standpoint that we won't be building more acute care beds - that's one area where you save - but indeed, if you are substituting that institutional care with its very heavy reliance on staffing, management and plant costs and substituting it with a lesser community cost of support workers, be they public health nurses, be they home care assistants, be they orderlies, then the system net saves. That's where, I hope, when we get into the Hospital estimate, we certainly have the figures and the time to discuss the perceived saving at the Hospital line.

Mr. Chairman, before we pass this item, I wonder if we might revert back to Communicable Disease Control for one question. I cut my colleague, the Member for River East, off on a question ahead of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreeable to the Minister to go back to . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I just wanted to add something. I agree with my honourable friend but, don't forget, I said that partially it was from added births coming in. There were 800 births that were taken away, let's say, from Concordia, the Health Sciences Centre and Seven Oaks. The majority of them went to St. Boniface. There are at least 400 at St. Boniface, so that is another factor that would help them to do that. That was part of the whole program.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's why you're down cost per birth.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, just before we go back to the previous line, I'd like to ask another question about the Maternity Early Discharge Program. With the decentralization or dividing of the City of Winnipeg into three different regions, which I presume is coming shortly, can the Minister tell us whether the quality of care will be maintained with this Early Discharge Program, whether there might be some duplication or in fact some breakdown in the system. Is there going to be communication and consultation between the three regions so that if some of the patients in one region come to Health Sciences Centre and there'll be other patients from another region at Health Sciences Centre, maybe from all three regions having their babies at Health Sciences Centre, is there going to be some consultation and communication so that in fact all of these patients are going to be seen out in the community after they leave the hospital?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes and no. There'll be better coordination, but I don't know where you got the idea

that there is no decision made on three regions, unless you're talking about the staff, the regional directors and so on. But at the hospitals, no decision has been made. But yes, this will be easier to coordinate from the information I'm getting.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Just going back to the previous line on Communicable Disease, there was a question from this afternoon I was wondering about. I guess it was in Other Expenditures that you were talking about life-saving drugs. Can you tell me why they're in this line in the Estimates?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Why they're in this line?

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Yes, why cancer drugs, heart drugs, asthma drugs, diabetes are under Communicable Disease Control instead of some other area?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Just because that part of the program is being administered by this branch because they had the position there. There is no particular reason. I think you probably heard me say that we should review that. We're quite concerned that originally it was planned that this would be phased out when we brought Pharmacare in, and then they felt, well you'll keep the program but you'll not accept new people, and now it's building up. We will have to see if it should be rolled in with the Pharmacare Program, if there should be a new decision made, or should it be administered by the hospital. So that is under review, but there is no particular reason. You're right, it has nothing to do with the contagious diseases.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Just another question, there was an article in the paper a couple of weeks ago, I believe. I don't have the facts with me; I remember reading it. It was on immunization of children between the ages of two and four years for the, I guess, Influenza D Virus. Do you recall, HID? I know it's a program that is not funded by the Health Department.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I know what you're referring to.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: You know what I'm referring to. Anyway, it's for children ages two to four years, or it's suggested for children 18 months to four years when they're in a day-care setting. I guess it costs the parents now about \$10 per vaccination. Seeing that it's very highly recommended by pediatricians, is there a time in the near future that it will be covered under the Medicare Program?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is being considered by the Commission at this time. They feel that there's not enough information as to the value of it. There is a new vaccine coming out also for that and this, as I say, is under consideration. No decision has been made yet. It could be covered at a future date.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Maybe the Minister could tell me whether this vaccine is being used elsewhere in the country, outside the Province of Manitoba, and is it covered in any other provinces?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is licensed as a vaccine in every province including Manitoba, but it's not covered in any province. That's the latest that we've heard.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I gather we're back to Maternal and Child Health at this particular point. With the onset of the early release program, a program which I think is very valuable by the way as far as bonding with mother and child is concerned, what is the relationship between the public health nurse and information with regard to future planned births in that family? In other words, is she accessing them to the information, or is she telling them where to go for the information, or is she giving them the information?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: At this time, the information is given by the public health nurse of our department, who gives all the information so the woman can make her choice. This is given by the department through the public health nurse at this time.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: So in other words, the whole range of programs, be it from natural forms of birth control, to chemical, to artificial, to whatever, are in fact provided for her on a one-to-one counselling session?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes but when you're talking about birth control, as you know, certain agencies will have the whole options and other people do not consider, for instance, abortion as an option. Of course, that part is not presented in certain clinics, like Youville Clinic and so on. But the majority of them have the whole program except that particular one. That's the only one, I guess, and Serena also. I don't know if they're involved in counselling on one-on-one but, whenever they do, they would not offer abortion as an option.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the public health nurse at this point wouldn't be offering abortion as a solution either. One would assume that the mother has just had a baby and she's now going to want to prevent having a baby for perhaps a year or two years or three years, depending on the parent's choice.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I meant just family planning. We're talking about confusion.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: She provides the information, and then does she provide them with a list of agencies that they can then go to for additional and further information?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They are referred back to their physician who certainly has the list of these agencies. That recommendation probably would come from the physician, unless of course there is a request for that information. I'm sure the public health nurse would discuss that and give the proper information, reference of the agencies to the patient.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, before we pass this item, since I have taken some critical notations of some

Monday, 21 July, 1986

of the Minister's staff, I'm led to believe that this Maternal and Child Health is a very well-run division of your department, Mr. Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Your director does a fine job.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Dr. Becker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)(1)—pass; 2.(c)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 2.(c)(3) External Agencies—pass. 2.(d)(1) Health Promotion: Salaries; 2.(d)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(d)(3) External Agencies - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the most obvious item in here that we will discuss tonight, and there may be others, is the removal of the Home Ec Directorate, the six staff, four home economists and the two support staff, from this division. Can the Minister indicate to us the current status of the Home Ec Directorate that is being removed from the Department of Health? Are they now suitably lodged in the Department of Agriculture and functioning, or what is their current status?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They are now with the Department of Agriculture and temporarily. At least they are still lodged with the Department of Health, but they are reporting and working with the Department of Agriculture and, eventually, I guess the space will be found for them to be moved.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So, Mr. Chairman, what we've got is a circumstance here where the Home Ec directorate is physically split. We have nutrition maintained, presumably, in Health promotion, and the other four disciplines of the home economist group, the other four home economists, are now receiving instruction, presumably, from Agriculture, as are their support staff, and yet they are still at 880 Portage Avenue.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Temporarily.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And the Minister indicates temporarily. Could the Minister give us an idea of how temporary the temporarily is?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You'd have to ask that question to the Minister of Agriculture. He has the responsibility and we're just not turning them out on the sidewalk until they find a place for them. I imagine that is being done now, but I have no idea. That would be through the administration of the Department of Agriculture.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'll share with the Minister a rumour that he might not have had shared with him. When your deputy allegedly talked to the Deputy Minister in Agriculture about moving those staff over there, the indication was that your deputy got rather a blunt message from the Minister of Agriculture's deputy, indicating they weren't really interested in getting anything done too quickly.

Mr. Chairman, whether that is right or wrong is irrelevant to the whole decision-making process of

removal of the home economists. There appears to have been no planning whatsoever in this reduction and relocation to Agriculture.

I will hypothesize with the Minister that this removal of the four home economists and their two support staff was an outright reduction in the services. They weren't intended to go any place else; and it was only a substantial amount of pressure from the Home Economists Association, from the Women's Institute, from ourselves in Opposition, from the various user groups within the City of Winnipeg - many of them welfare mothers, many of them people who relied very, very substantially on the kinds of services that those four home economists were providing to provide them household budgeting, to provide them meal planning, to provide them advice on furnishing their homes. Many of these were single parent mothers who virtually had no other place to provide that kind of homemaking advice.

I think once the Minister announced the cutback in the staff positions, the hue and cry was so substantial, particularly to his Leader's office, the Premier was extensively involved in the lobby effort by the Women's Institute and others, and I think that what happened is that this decision to remove them was made without very much consultation. It was obviously given on bad advice to the Minister.

After they found out the kind of political problem they were in, they decided they better discover a fall-back position. History sort of repeats itself because back in, I believe it was 1974, the Department of Agriculture decided they were going to do the same thing. They were going to eliminate the home economists from 1974. In 1974, the same hue and cry from the user groups, from the Women's Institute and others forced the then Schreyer Government to find a home for these home economists in the Department of Health.

Now we've got sort of history revisited where the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Health seem to have forgotten the 1974 lesson, attempted the same kind of curtailment of services in the Home Ec Division, found the same public resistance, only more, because in the ensuing 12-year period of time, that group of home economists established themselves very formidably as a low-cost highly efficient group of people who could deliver to many target groups throughout rural and urban Manitoba very valuable advice and knowledge on homemaking skills; and having those user groups faced with the potential of losing that kind of expert advice, the same and greater resistance to the cutback was mounted, and I believe that this government, in a very desperate move, decided, well, we better find a home for them and the natural place was back into Agriculture.

We've been through the Agriculture Estimates. There's no allowance in the budget for these staff, which sort of makes questionable the Minister's answer earlier on when we first started the Estimates about how this was all some sort of a far-ranging plan where they were going to leave Health and go over to Agriculture.

I don't think that was ever in the plans when this Minister first announced the cutback of the home economists staff. It was only after the fact and the public pressure was put on the government that they indeed decided they had better do a saving-face effort

and move and find a home for the home economists, which they now have done. They're to move over to Agriculture. That move, we understand, is being resisted by Agriculture.

And here we have a group of professionals, women professionals, very much providing needed services throughout Manitoba, in limbo. They are housed in Health; they are given instructions from Agriculture, presumably. They are in a veritable no man's land in the bureaucracy, and I can't help but see how their effectiveness as a group delivering services to Manitobans cannot be very, very much inhibited by this lack of leadership and this lack of positive direction as to where they should be going.

Mr. Chairman, when we started this whole line on Community Health Services, I indicated to the Minister that morale was not good in this part of his department. The Minister indicated that was true. And this is part of the reason why morale is not good here because here you have a government that didn't know what they were doing, they attempted to cut staff, they had to back off, they had to give them a new home and it's all up in limbo. It's truly a fiasco.

I would urge this Minister to sit down with his colleague in Cabinet, the Minister of Agriculture, and get this move accomplished so that at least they can pick up the pieces of the programming they were putting out for the people of Manitoba and start delivering it in a very meaningful fashion again instead of being in limbo and not knowing where their next directive and order is coming from.

It's a disastrous way to treat professional staff, it's a disastrous way for a government with so much emphasis on the Status of Women, as this current government is alleging to have, to treat a number of highly professional and highly trained women in the cavalier fashion that they've treated these home economists.

It's a disgrace; it's still an ongoing disgrace because it isn't resolved. The Minister cannot even tell us when it will be resolved. They're still lodged at 880 Portage and he tells us to ask the Minister of Agriculture when he's going to make room for them.

I suggest he's the Minister that cut them; he's the Minister that should be talking to the Minister of Agriculture and getting the Minister of Agriculture to move forthwith and expeditiously to establish those home economists in the Department of Agriculture so that they can begin to resume providing services to the people of Manitoba.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'll be as candid as I can be and I'll explain the situation as far as I'm concerned, and part of that I stated earlier during this debate in the Estimates.

First of all, we're dealing with people that talk about money management and housing and all that. I can't see that in the Department of Health. Now the decision during Estimate time - I'm not going to fight that - we were told here that we should be very careful and cut down wherever we can. I can assure you that you've backed a lot of tougher and I think worst cuts coming from the Federal Government because you wanted to reduce the deficit, then you must be a little consistent, all of you. That was the thing.

Now we are asked during this exercise, and it's a very difficult thing, and there are tougher debates than we're having publicly here between the two different parties, I can tell you that, trying to fight for what you can get for your department. Now staff have identified a sparse - and we were concerned. We work with our department, that's the main thing, and as Ministers, as my honourable friend knows - he was a Minister in the previous government - we work collectively and we accept all the responsibility.

Now the point is that was brought to the attention of Cabinet and I felt that this is something we can cut out of this department. It was flagged that it was an important thing. At no time did we say it wasn't an important service. In fact I've always encouraged and I've always tried to - I don't know if it was around '74; he talked about '74 - I was Minister of Health at the end of '74 and that didn't happen at that time; it must have been earlier. Mind you, that was only late December, so it must have been of '74 that I became the Minister of Health, so that might have been before. But in one of those first years we increased the home economists in that department because I've always believed in that.

Also in the Department of Recreation, Fitness and Sport, we had a very small staff on fitness out there with that department with sports, and I didn't want just a couple of jocks that would be involved in that with a bit of running and so on. I felt that it was important than that and we always advocate that that should be in fitness with the Department of Health. So that was taken over by the Department of Health and the economists dealing with nutrition also, and that is working well.

So I advised the Minister of Agriculture, because he had some of the home economists also out there, and that was discussed around the table. Now what was decided that the service would be given to reduce staff if possible - definitely, I'm not going to pretend that is not the case - a reduced staff of the Department of Agriculture.

There is no doubt that you can't on one hand say you don't want to discuss with other people and then they say you're backing down. What do you want us to do? At times there was no doubt that there was pressure, and, in fact, I certainly encouraged that.

I was asked by home economists if they can do anything right in the early days, and I suggested that they make representation and they did. We've allowed, if anything, through staff, more representation of staff practically getting so involved in this that practically wanting to dictate to us. I don't know, but there are not too many employers that would accept that. We accept that as constructive criticism; we work together. It was felt that fine, it should go in Agriculture.

The Minister of Agriculture was very much involved. He was advocating that, and the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, and there were some discussions and meetings with the groups. Call it backing down if you want; I'm not ashamed of that. The point was that with discussion they felt that fine, yes, we won't be able to give the service with that staff, there will be some reduction, some of the staff would have to be taken from within by the department. We lost the staff in our department.

Now I think you were quite right in many instances, but you know you're wrong when you start blaming us

for making a big thing and embellishing it by talking that they're in another department and so on. You know that is done and it takes a little while. I don't give a damn what the Deputy Minister of Agriculture said; it's not up to him. The point is they will be found a spot in the meantime that they are there and I don't think that's a valid point.

Sure there was some disruption and so on whenever you change anything, and it's not going to be the first time. It will come in another area that you won't find any money at all and there's been some change, and not because of pressure at all, because don't forget that preparing this Estimate wasn't an easy thing especially at this time when the election took place, and to try and get ready for the Session it's no easy matter, especially when you're trying to reduce the deficit and you don't know what kind of money you'll get from the Federal Government. Those are all factors.

So you're right in many instances on that. Without trying to put you down or anything, I don't think it took a genius to figure that out. I think that if you read the paper, and so on, you knew that there was something; you knew that there was pressure and that's the democratic way of doing things. There was no doubt there was pressure, but the fact to say that there was always intent that the service was not given - no - it was felt that we would do it with all the savings that we could. That's not the only place, there are many other places, and we're going to keep on doing that and there will be more. You've talked today; every time there's a reduction you're opposing it, but then you tell us, through your critic of Finance, and he's been quite consistent, you've got to cut your deficit and whatever, it's always in the wrong place. That's possible.

I know that you're going to say that the \$55,000 or whatever Andy Anstett is getting doesn't pay for all those things. You've used that so much now that you'll have to use something else. — (Interjection) — Yes, I agree, I'm being very candid. And a lot of things are not exactly as bad as you say; discussions took place and there's other things that were in the department, some of them without any pressure at all, that were changed. Either the Minister came back and figured, well, we can't do that and so on and there's been some adjustment, especially, as I say, with the little time that we had in trying to prepare this. This is exactly the way it happens.

I don't feel that it belongs to the Department of Health, and I think that's right. It was by tradition that they've always felt more secure with the Department of Agriculture. I feel that that is a service that should be in Community Services, to be honest with you, but it was decided to keep it in Agriculture. It was started there because of the nature, the makeup of the Province of Manitoba at one time, and no doubt that they gained by being well organized and making representation and insisting and getting meetings with the Ministers. There's no doubt about that. I'm not going to try to hide the fact.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, now that the Home Economics directorate will be split with nutrition staying in Health and the other disciplines moving to Agriculture, what assurance do we have that the people using that balance can coordinate an approach involving nutrition,

budgeting, household economics, counselling, all available to many families throughout rural Manitoba and many families in the City of Winnipeg, many single parents?

What assurance do we have that with the split in this group, with nutrition staying in Health, the balance going to Agriculture, that that balanced service will still be available?

I have to tell the Minister that I have difficulty in seeing the same effective program able to be delivered at as economic a cost as was being delivered before when it was all housed together in health promotion.

I don't particularly have a problem in having budgeting and household economics being part of the Health Department. The Minister just a minute ago said that lifesaving drugs were in community disease control because it was a convenience to be there.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I wish they would keep it down to a shout. I can't understand what you're trying to say.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's what these are for.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, that's what these are for so when you start talking everybody doesn't yell at the same time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You would hear a lot with this on. I tend to use it when your people are talking over there and it seems to work quite effectively for me.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't see where this group, now that they will be split, are going to be able to offer to the people of Manitoba the same level and quality of service that they were before. So not only will we see the same amount of money being spent between the two departments — (Interjection) — Pardon?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You won't see see the same amount of money.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You mean there's less money to be spent?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There's been some savings with the readjustment.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, the Minister indicates there's been some savings through the readjustment. If the savings are in the area where it was indicated, I believe it was a figure of \$25,000 that the Home Economist Directorate had available to them to farm out to other professional home economists in the province for various small research projects, to avail themselves of the expertise that was out there in the private sector. If that's the kind of saving the Minister is achieving by cutting out that kind of resource research money, then that isn't a saving at all.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm not talking about that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, the Minister isn't talking about that. We don't know what he's talking about; we'll listen to him.

I maintain that now, with the split in this, with nutrition staying and the rest leaving, that you're going to have

Monday, 21 July, 1986

a disjointed, uncoordinated service that isn't going to deliver an efficient program, as it was in the past. This just reinforces the position that was made to this Minister by myself and by many others, that his original idea to cut the home economics service and to reduce the staff in the Directorate was a mistake. I think it will remain a mistake and will not see the people of Manitoba getting good value for their budget dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Minister was going to answer. I have another three questions for the Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm not going to take time in discussing that. My honourable friend wanted to make a point.

You can say that about every department. For instance, that's one of the reasons that there's been so many changes in Manitoba, probably more than in other provinces, where they had Health and Social Development together; like in '74, the other period. That was divided by the government. There's been some reassignment.

I can say the same thing. I can say that the division that you've made with the single-unit delivery, where it was all under one department, that caused us an awful lot more trouble than that. I'm not saying that it can't be done. For instance, the home economists who are staying with us are doing a particular job and are working very closely, as I said, with the people at Fitness in the other. They're getting back that extra help and they're working with the different groups, all doing the same thing, and I think that's working quite well. I don't think that because they're home economists, it's the same as the public health nurse or the doctor and would all have to be in the same department or in the same area; they're doing different things.

The point that I'm making, I've never said that it wasn't very important. I said that the situation is that it did not really belong to the Department of Health. I'm following what you did when you divided - you're right, many of the social programs are very hard to separate from Health. They are being done because this department is so big to start with and it is very difficult to equalize the responsibility of the Minister compared to lesser departments, and there's been an effort to do some of that. So it's being tried, there's no doubt about that.

The savings, I'm not saying that the savings are going to be enormous. I'm not saying the saving is in the help that they could have, but in the reorganization of that and the staff that was reduced in the departments. I think that it involved six staff, and I think that there were only four positions. The other positions were taken - four or three - there were three positions the same - maybe not there - but in the reorganization, the department had to take the cuts in staff here because of that. Not necessarily that there will be less home economists and they won't get less money to work with, but the reorganization has been done.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I just trust that after this reorganization is finally complete, that the home

economists in the Department of Agriculture can avail themselves of the nutritional services of those home economists remaining in Health Promotion, in that we don't see a loss, a slipping between the chairs, as it were, of the services they provided.

Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate if there's any other staff reductions in Health Promotion?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, there aren't.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that there were two staff positions within Health Promotion which were primarily involved with the delivery of services to seniors and that one of those individuals, Mr. Gordon Kroeker, has now moved to Community Services. Has that happened?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . this Directorate. He's on our staff but has seconded to this program to work in the Elderly Abuse Program in that department.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Seconded to the Elderly Abuse Program in Community Services, did the Minister say?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And not available to carry out his normal duties with the Health Promotion group, then, presumably?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: He'll be available but his primary, his main function will be to administer the Elderly Abuse Program that we're preparing now.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Pass, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d)(1)—pass; 2.(d)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 2.(d)(3)—pass.

2.(e)(1) Hearing Conservation: Salaries; 2.(e)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(e)(3) External Agencies - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, what external agencies are funded through Hearing Conservation?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is just the one, Mr. Chairman. It's the grant to the Winnipeg School Division in support of the audiology services to the school division; the Winnipeg School Division is delivering the audiology services through the Child Guidance Clinic.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's just available to Winnipeg School Division No. 1?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We've used that service delivered here today have been going on for quite awhile through the Child Guidance Clinic. The other area outside of Winnipeg, of the Core Area, it is done by our staff.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, is there a program available to assist seniors in the acquisition of hearing aids?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, not yet, but this is something that we've been looking at. There was a

shortage of audiologists to start with. The first part of the program is to try and recruit and form, or develop audiologists, and we've opened different centres like at Deer Lodge, Seven Oaks, and different hospitals in some of the rural areas. We've practically covered all of Manitoba now.

The next step would be to find out through these services - they've been quite busy. There is a shortage of audiologists. Anybody can go directly there if you're referred by the doctors and I think they specialize maybe a little more with the children than they have, but there's still a shortage. All the places aren't open and we'd have to start with that before we have any program, if we do, to cover that partly, or whatever, of the hearing aids for the seniors.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat amused at the Minister's answer. I've come across a nice little pamphlet that may be familiar to people, probably familiar to the Minister, a checklist on the score for the NDP on their election promises. A 1981 election promise was eyeglasses, hearing aids, and dentures for old-age pensioners. That was a promise made. And a promise kept, it says partially implemented. Eyeglasses for seniors included under Pharmacare.

That was a 1981 election promise some five years ago, that hearing aids would be provided in some manner, both through assistance from the Provincial Government. It hasn't been delivered in the Minister's answer.

This Minister, I have to give him credit, he's skillful politically because he knows when I ask a question about a program for hearing aids, he knows what my next line of questions is going to be. He's been here long enough to know that when his Premier makes promises for him that he's going to have to answer for them from time to time.

The Minister's answer was what I found quite amusing. The reason they don't have a hearing aid program is because we didn't have audiologists who could identify the hearing problem, presumably amongst the seniors. Now, you know, Mr. Chairman, that's an interesting reason for not bringing in a program as promised to the seniors back in 1981. It would almost make one think that there wouldn't be too many seniors or too many people with impaired hearing throughout the province that could ever avail themselves of a hearing aid because there were no audiologists to tell them they couldn't hear. That's simply one of the weakest excuses I've ever heard for not implementing a program to say there weren't audiologists around to tell seniors they've got a hearing problem.

The reason it hasn't been implemented is because it was one of those promises made by the Premier, by the First Minister, when he was Leader of the Opposition, to simply garner votes. Once the votes were garnered, the program didn't necessarily have to be implemented. It could be delayed for a number of reasons. That is the situation that we find ourselves in today.

I note with a great deal of interest that I don't believe - and the Minister will correct me - but I don't believe that in this last election campaign in 1986 that the Premier renewed the promise for hearing aid assistance to seniors. I don't think he mentioned it. I think it is

fair to say, given the lack of movement to date, that is probably a promise that will remain as we approach the next election as partially implemented eyeglasses for seniors included under Pharmacare; nothing else said.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I was aware of this commitment like everybody else. I don't really like these debates during these Estimates. That's strictly a political thing. If my honourable friend wants to make a point, that's fair enough.

The situation is that there is commitment dates by all parties, and god knows by all parties, and I think the best thing you can do is get on your knees and thank God that you weren't elected because you wouldn't have gone with any of your promises or very few of those promises . . .

Now, let me tell you this. Most of the promises were kept and many others. Even if we just stay in the field of working with the seniors, there is no doubt that was a commitment, the three of them.

We started with No. 1; that's partly done, but there's a long way to go. There were a lot of things we didn't know that we were going to get less percentage funds from the Federal Government at the time, not at all, because if we had have kept on — (Interjection) — Wait a minute now, you had your say. At that time, if we would have known that they were going to change and even before the time that they were committed to go along with the same funding, it might have been different.

Besides that, we realized when you get . . . and tell me of one, I can tell you all kinds of commitments were made by the Federal Government. For instance, I'll give you one that they would go back to cost-sharing in the field of Health, and that was never kept.

I think that the government has to be very sincere. I don't like all these promises at the time. I don't think that we're giving enough credit to the people of the province with all these commitments and promises at the time. I think if you make promises, they should be sincere and I can tell you they certainly were; those promises certainly were at the time. It feels that things develop and you feel all right, we're not ready. At no time did we say we weren't going to do it. We felt it could be a lot worse. If we were to be persistent enough or stubborn enough that when times are difficult and you haven't got the funds, that you're going to go deeper in the hole or get more of a deficit because you made a promise in 1981.

I think my honourable friend gave me too much credit for political savvy when he says the way I answered them. What I said what this: that we felt that, first of all, we should, which is in the same field, giving that service to the public and the seniors as much as we can to make sure that we have enough audiologists to have these facilities. Right now the recommendation would be if we go, and I would think that if the money becomes more plentiful, that's a possibility.

As I stated many times, the way health care is going up now, we'll be fortunate to keep what we have. We didn't know that. We didn't feel like that in 1981. Show me somebody that can adopt and that can change their mind when they see certain things. I think that takes a heck of a lot more courage and I think it's more

important. Sure, we can have a program of helping with the hearing aid and then take something away somewhere else. That would be a lot easier. The point is that I think the only way when we start that, we started with the eyeglasses and whatever was saved, without making any accusations at this time, cost us a lot more money when these people bought their glasses.

With the hearing aids, I think one of the big concerns is that if we go in this program, the audiologist would fit them right there with the hearing aids. That is where we would help, depending on the amount of money we would have to put in that program. That is a concern that we have and I think that it is a possibility that would come in.

I lobbied, to be honest with you, not to make that promise again because of the concern that I have in keeping the services that we have at this time. If you're making promises and you're not sincere, and if you make promises and you don't keep any of them - but if you look at the list of promises that we made at this time, I think we have a pretty darn good record. I don't know of any government, including the Lyon Government, that were in a position to fill all the promises that they made. I don't know of one; federally, provincially, no matter what political stripe it is.

Yes it was a promise made in '81. It's still on the books as something we would like to see and we will have to look at the priorities to keep probably more pressing programs that we have. But it would be very easy to get around that to cancel other programs or to bring in some utilization fee or that kind of thing and have this program. I think we're showing very much responsible by saying no, we're not going to bring this at this time; we can't afford to.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I think the Minister was more candid in his last 10 words than he was in the previous amount; that's the reason why they're not bringing it in.

To attempt to say that from 1981 to 1986, the program as promised was not brought in was because of Federal Government cutbacks is simply not factual. The Federal Government was, at that time, increasing the transfer payments to the province for Health and post-secondary education and they still are.

The Minister was - and I give him credit for honesty - in one instance with the senior citizens in saying that the Federal Government had reduced the size of the increase, which is exactly what's happened - not the cutback that his First Minister would have everybody in the province believe.

Later on we'll get back to this Minister when he didn't quite be so forthright and honest in one of his presentations to the people of Manitoba. We won't deal with that now; we'll deal with it at the appropriate line because I don't want to disturb the Minister's flow of Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that this is one of the First Minister's promises that hasn't been kept and probably won't be kept. The Minister, in his last 10 words, as I said, is because there isn't the dollars to do it. That's fair. If people know that's where you're coming from, they're more apt to accept it than to simply say, well, you know, it's coming. We're going to do it as soon as we can. That doesn't serve any

particular useful purpose because they've been waiting five years and I think the last answers probably would suffice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to pass these items? 2.(e)(1) Hearing Conservation, Salaries—pass; 2.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 2.(e)(3) External Agencies—pass.

2.(f)(1) Gerontology, Salaries, 2.(f)(2) Other Expenditures — the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we've got a quite sizeable increase in Other Expenditures in this item. Could the Minister give us an idea of what the Other Expenditures, the increase - it's about a 50 percent increase - \$385,000 - what the Other Expenditures are increasing, what programs will be undertaken?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There are \$332.2 thousand for annualization of cost for support to seniors' projects brought into the program during '85-86 and also 56.2 thousand for annualization of support to seniors' projects that start from less than full bases to bring the projects to full capacity.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What are those projects?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is support services mostly, that new program that we brought in, and to refresh my friend's memory and I've used that so much that I still have trouble with the new term. We used to call it enriched services to the elderly. This is the program, that is that you work in different communities and the whole thing, the meals programs in personal care homes and so on; in other words, programs that'll keep seniors out of institutions as long as possible or coordinators for certain work, depending on the need.

We were saying before, as I say, it was an enriched housing project and it looked too much like a capital program. Well, it is and it's working with them, the gerontologists and the advisory committee work with these people and with the requests that they have, whatever their needs are. It varies but I guess the biggest part of that is for the meals programs. I can give you some of the places if you want.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, \$330-some-thousand increase for a meals program, and just using an average figure of even \$4 per meal - that's 80,000 meals. Is that what the money is going for? Is it to provide actual meals or is it to support volunteer organizations to undertake provision of Meals on Wheels and other assistance to seniors who are not in institutional care?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I said that was the largest of the programs, not the only one. There are coordinators for different programs. It is subsidized meals but the seniors will pay for their meals, they'll pay less than \$4.00. I don't know exactly what subsidy, I guess that varies but that is where that money is going.

I'll give you some examples - there was 185 Smith that was a program coordinator there at \$52,600; Bethel Place on Stafford, meals and volunteer coordinator, 26.7; Winnipeg Housing Authority, meals, 70,000 and

that is on 515 Elgin, 357 Kennedy, 601 Osborne, 875 Elizabeth Road, . . . Country Club Road and three additional sites. Home Health Project meals and tenant resource coordinator, 29.1 - that's two addresses on Arlington, one on Wellington. Tri-Council at 303 Goulet, meals, 6,003; Foyer Vincent, meals 8.6; Northwest Winnipeg, Fred Douglas Lodge, Community Resource Coordinator and meals, 30.2; Villa Cabrini on River, meals, 10.4 and anticipated during '86-87. Some of them were during the year and the others will be a full year so that'll be, in some cases, extra funds. This was last year that I'm giving you.

The anticipated Park Manor, Transcona Community Resource Coordinator, 26.9; Hebrew Sick Benefit Gardens on Sinclair, meals, 7.8; Carriage House North, meals, 7.8, on Leila; Parkland existing, Ethelbert, needs and transportation, still .6; Dauphin and District Community Resource Coordinator and meals, 44.6; Swan River Community Resource Coordinator and meals, Westman, Virden and district, the same thing; Community Resource Coordinator and meals, 34.4; Neepawa and district, same thing, 31.5; Senior Helping Hand of Alstone, Pipestone, Reston, Bellevue, Foxwarren, 17.2 and that can go on.

I've got Interlake, I've got Tri Lakes, Killarney, 26.9; Elgin, Hartney, Souris, 20.9; Brandon, 2.6; Melita, 2.6; Russell-Roblin, 2.6; the Interlake, existing, Riverton Friendship, 9.3; Moosehorn Handicraft Centre, 7.1 - these are meals and community resources, Oak Park Lodge, Woodlands, meals, 12.2; Fisher Branch Medical Centre, 10.7; in Inwood Manor, 10.9; Gordon Howard Centre, Selkirk, 36.9. We anticipate in the Interlake, Ashern, 10.4; Gimli, 5.2; Stonewall, 5.2; Arborg, 6.26; Central Winkler Senior Centre, 31.3, that's existing; Portage Housing Authority, 33.8; MacGregor-Austin, 46, anticipated; Gladstone, 5.2; Carman, 2.6. Do you want me to continue?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Just 2.6 in Carman, Larry?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, you're slow out there. You've got to make a . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: It's been said they don't vote right out there, Larry. Is that the reason it's only 2.6?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's only for the last quarter. They don't eat as much out there - that's for the last quarter only. The Eastman Fernwood Place . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: You could take a lesson from them out there if they don't eat as much, Larry.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . c'est mon oncle - 10.7; Stony Plains, Beausejour, 18.4; Oakbank, Springfield, Kinsman Complex, 39; anticipated Lac du Bonnet, 7.8; Pine Falls, 7.8; Sprague-Piney, 5.2; Steinbach, 5.2; and Norman anticipated during '86-87, The Pas, 7.8; Thompson sites to be identified . . . or 55.6.

MR. D. ORCHARD: One initial item caught my ear. The rest of it I shall read if it's readable in Estimates. 52.6 for the Smith Street housing coordinator, is that one position? The 52,600, or is that several positions?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The project it's one full-time and two part-time. There are 408 people in that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, in terms of providing services to seniors, this department, the Department of Health, basically provides services to seniors in a number of different areas and health promotion there's provision of nutritional services and other services to seniors. Certainly in the next page when we get into Continuing Care, that's a line in this department's Estimates which provides substantial services to seniors. As well, when we get over to the Manitoba Health Services Commission, the Personal Care Home line is certainly, with few exceptions, service to seniors.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: With no hearing aids.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, that's - I suppose it's an advantage if they don't have hearing aids, then they can't hear what the programs are and you don't spend the money.

Mr. Chairman, Gerontology would seem to me to be the other area and probably the area with the lead responsibility in planning and coordinating those kinds of services. Does in fact Gerontology provide that kind of coordination and leadership role in the provision of services throughout the department to determine whether there is efficient delivery of those services, and that other branches of the Department of Health and/or Health Services Commission aren't offering duplication in their service? Has that kind of an overview been taken by the staff in Gerontology to determine whether we're getting an efficient expenditure of our dollars, or are all four areas of the Department of Health each proceeding at their own speed and maybe bumping into each other out there in the community?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Provincial Gerontologist is just that, a Provincial Gerontologist. It happens that the lead Minister is the Minister of Health, but the gerontologist has a - that committee my friend was talking about that Mr. Sherman started as an advisory committee to the Minister. We felt that would be improved. It has been for a number of years an advisory committee to the gerontologist and chaired by the gerontologist - not chaired by the gerontologist. But they're working very closely with the gerontologist in two ways, two directions: to get the information and advice to the gerontologist and, therefore, the government; and also to get from the government the information on programs that are available and so on. So that is the contact with the outside, the public.

As I said, the gerontologist is a Provincial Gerontologist and there is also a subcommittee, an interdepartmental committee, where all the departments concerned are represented, and that is chaired by the Provincial Gerontologist. Those decisions and recommendations such as the meals, they look at where the needs are and so on, and they make recommendations with the amount of money that they have. This was, I think, a program that all the members, no matter where they sat, have advocated. It's working quite well, that particular thing.

As I say, it's working with the different departments to work with the seniors and for the seniors. Much of the financing and so on comes from our department, such as the item we have in front of us and also either through us or the Commission. There are other

programs, other areas where the other departments are involved. As I say, they're all working together. There's excellent coordination, and I'm very pleased and proud of the service that is given by our Provincial Gerontologist and our small staff and their advisers.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So, Mr. Chairman, we can rest assured that overview within the Department of Health has certainly been done to assure that there's no duplication or fragmentation of services, and that there's no overlap within the various sections of the Department of Health and Manitoba Health Services Commission overlapping in terms of their provision of service.

The final question I have here, can the Minister provide me with the travelling itinerary of the director and the expenses incurred in travelling?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Part of the answer is, he hasn't been out of the province in two years where it has been paid by the Provincial Government or the taxpayers of Manitoba, but I'll get this information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(f)(1) Gerontology: Salaries—pass; 2.(f)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

2.(g)(1) Continuing Care: Salaries; 2.(g)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(g)(3) Home Care Assistance; 2.(g)(4) External Agencies - the Member for Pembina.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What are we on? Can I ask the member . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(g)(1) Continuing Care: Salaries.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think he's passed that, haven't you, or do you want to start at (1)?

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, we're going to do the whole thing again. We'll do the whole discussion, and then we can pass the whole works at the end of the discussion.

Mr. Chairman, has there been any change? I don't have my staffing sheet with me. I neglected to bring that with me again tonight, but have there been any staffing changes in the Continuing Care line from (g)(1)? I'm not interested in staffing assistants in the Home Care Program but, in the Salaries component, any increases or decreases in vacancies?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, there were eight. There are no vacancies.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, let's go right down to External Agencies. What External Agencies are funded under Continuing Care and, once again, the question being: which agencies are receiving the additional \$32,400 in terms of increase in funding to External Agencies?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Meals on Wheels of Winnipeg. Unless my honourable friend wants a description, I think he knows about that program. I'll just mention the agency, unless you want more information, but it's Meals on Winnipeg of Winnipeg. It was 147.6 last year, going to 180. That's the total.

There are four agencies. Meals on Wheels of Winnipeg is one, Youville Foundation - that's not the Youville Clinic; there's a Youville Foundation also - Independent Living Resource Centre and Ten Ten Sinclair Avenue.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Which ones have received the major increase? Is the increase shared equally by all of them?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Youville Foundation has - I don't know if they're dealing with more patients or what. I know that Youville Foundation for awhile was funded mostly or in part anyway. At first, it started with the Grey Nuns funding the whole thing. It might be that we've reviewed that and there's been an increase. I think that's the answer.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well I'll tell you what. Could the Minister provide that answer tomorrow, if it's not available today? Can you provide that information tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman, under Home Care Assistance, which is the major expenditure in this appropriation of Continuing Care, I presume - and the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong - that here we have the budget for the Home Care Service as it applies to Manitobans who qualify, and I presume also that the Home Orderly Service is part and parcel of the funding under Home Care Assistance.

Now I've got a number of questions in terms of the staffing of both those programs but, before I get into that, I'd like to have the Minister indicate to us what are currently the criterion under which a Manitobans qualifies for either Home Care Assistance or the Home Orderly Service or both, if the need be. Having determined what the qualifications are to allow a Manitoban to receive assistance from Home Care or Home Orderly Service or both, can the Minister indicate the circumstances under which the level of service which was established would be reduced and cut back for an individual Manitoban who may have qualified? I'll pick a figure out of the air. It's not a specific example but, say, a person was living in their home and was receiving 20 hours a week of home care assistance, and then their assistance would be reduced down to say 15 hours per week or 10 hours per week. Can the Minister explain both sets of criteria and how you qualify? Then what review mechanism is in place whereby the level of service would be reduced to a Manitoban at a later date?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: First of all, I found some information that won't have to wait till tomorrow. All of the increase goes to the external agency, the Youville Foundation. There's an increase of 32,400.00.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What did they receive last year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll have to try to get you that from what the four agencies received last year.

Now if I understand the question my honourable friend directed to me, it is not a question of means. Everybody qualifies for home care. The question is strictly on a question of needs. Now the thing is that obviously, you have to monitor that quite carefully. There are certain workers who are quite comfortable with certain clients

and they would like to stay there, and there are clients who want to retain or augment the hours they receive. That is being looked at and monitored in looking at the needs. It could be increased or decreased, whatever their needs are deemed to be, but there's no means test on that at all.

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, I realize there's no means test, but who are the supervisors who make the determination, No. 1, that a person should have some home care? Are they the public health nurses? Are they specific coordinators who are in there? Who makes that decision? Furthermore, on what basis do they make the decision to reduce the level of service that's available to that individual, recognizing that decision is not always made to reduce services?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is the case coordinator with the social workers, public health nurses and people in the area, in consultation with the family and, if possible, with the patient also with certain guidelines.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, this is probably one of the areas that I receive and members on this side of the House probably receive as many calls on as most areas. Particularly, we get the calls on the basis of, why were our hours of service reduced. That's normally the call. There are some instances, I have to tell you - and I've taken them up from time to time with the staff. I haven't really got it resolved. The status quo prevailed; there was no increase in the level of services. But there were some difficult reductions in the hours provided to some individuals.

One case that comes to mind that was local - I heard about it via the grapevine; I didn't intervene directly - but the mother was restricted to the house, to a wheel chair and, because children were available who were high school age and could assist, that family had their hours of home care reduced. There was no husband in this case to assist at home. It was just that the children had gotten older.

I appreciate that may well have been a legitimate reasoning on behalf of a caseworker or a public health nurse, etc., but the home circumstances then dictated - because the children certainly were going to look after their mother. But it really denied them of a number of social activities in school, etc., because they weren't able to put that time in pursuit of extra-curricular activities at school. They had to spend the time at home with their mother, with their remaining parent.

I just found that particular decision not to fit any particular criteria, because definitely the need was still there. As a matter of fact, the need was getting worse, because it was a progressive disease that the woman had. It didn't seem to fit any logical criteria, except the children could be used to replace home care workers and the assistance provided there.

I found that to be somewhat strange because - and I know the analogy is not a good one, and the Minister will no doubt engage in some debate. But we've heard comments from his side of the House and even the Minister talk about, well we could return to the days of children labour, and that would solve all our costs of production problem if we simply put the children back to work. Well, that indeed was what was happening

in this instance with his department in home care, because the children had reached a mid-teen age, they were presumably considered to be able to assist more at home and home care was reduced.

The bottom line with any of these reductions that we've pursued, not only myself but other members, is budgetary. The budget simply isn't unlimited and we understand that, but that's why I am trying to determine what criterion are used. Is the availability of school-age children at home to assist the parent who might be undertaking home care, is that a criterion which allows a reduction in the hours available?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: These decisions are made by human beings, and you know how difficult that is in this case. I have no doubt at all that this is one of the areas that you would get more calls and I do also.

I might say that in most cases, when they're checked, there's always a reason we've tried to explain to the patient. There are not unlimited funds; it is a very costly thing. It is new. It was something that originated here in Manitoba. It is far from perfect; it never will be. That doesn't mean we won't strive to better it all the time. It has to be adjusted.

At one time, there was one program, so you'll have to look at home care. There are certain rules that at times still don't seem to make sense. We change those as soon as we can when we catch that, and we will always have to strive to better it. There's no doubt about that. But no matter what, you will still get more calls on that than anything else in health and so will I, because there's concern and that's a decision based, we hope, on guidelines and in consultation.

What surprised me - and I don't want to exaggerate and I don't want him to take my explanation and change my intent. But I must say that I'm surprised at hearing from somebody on that side - usually it's the people on this side who have been making these statements and so on, that the kids shouldn't be made to work and all that. I think that it's not just a question of money. Definitely that's the consultation that we have and, if there's somebody in the family, we want to encourage the people.

That doesn't mean that we should have child labour, or they should work at all times and they shouldn't have any time at all. But that is a responsibility. I remember where I was warned by members on that side of the House to make darn sure that we don't take this responsibility of the family and divide the family. That is a responsibility that we must have and the children and the people in the family. We are looking at that.

I think it could be in certain cases where it has been exaggerated. Definitely you don't treat a youngster so they don't have any time at all, but that is a sacrifice they have to make. It's not just up to the neighbour, to the taxpayers to pay for that. Why should they take care of that?

Then the next step is that you're going to start paying relatives to take care of them. That was something that was suggested and that's a concern. In certain instances, you would save money by doing that, and we'll have to look at that. We've looked at that other times. I've always been very, very leery of starting anything where we would pay somebody for their

responsibility. Mind you, it's unfortunate for them that they might have a sick father and mother or whatever, but I think it is a certain responsibility.

A few years ago, nobody dared say, well you know somebody else is going to pay for it; we're not going to. I don't want to exaggerate. I know that's not what my honourable friend is saying, but he's getting pretty close to that when saying, you know, talking about child labour and so on.

It is a question of erring because they are human beings making decisions, complicated decisions, to the best of their ability. It is also the question of the funds, there are no unlimited funds and some people, for instance, do not want to go in institutions.

We're trying to keep people out of institutions, but not necessarily at all costs. If it costs more money to keep somebody outside of an institution, it's pretty hard to justify that. You can have people around the clock, two or three attendants around the clock, in all the facilities and so on, it gets pretty, you know, we're a province of a million people to pay for all those costs. That is something that not too long ago did not exist and that is something that is not as advanced in all other provinces. So these are all factors.

And yes, the availability of relatives and so on to give some care, to do some work, to stay with the people, to assist them or go for help and all that are factors. At times you have people who normally would not need as many hours, but they are completely alone and for some reason or other you have to keep somebody with them; although they might not be as sick as others, the fact that they are all alone they need more people. So those are factors. It's very difficult to

Okay, I'm getting the signal not to be so long.

MR. D. ORCHARD: In the interests of keeping the Estimate process smooth, I wasn't doing it. That's why I brought my colleague in.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right, I get the message.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes. Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate, and I don't suppose he's got the numbers handy, but how many home orderlies does the province have, and are these home orderlies a full-time position or are some home orderlies on a part-time basis and have other employment as well?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There are roughly 25 orderlies in all. The majority of them are full time, but some of them are providing so many hours and so on to give the flexibility needed.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What qualifications do the home orderlies have?

I want to find out from the basis that I recall this being the centre of the controversy as we got into the 1981 election, the home orderly service at that time was provided, I believe, by contract through private sector and now it's in-house through government. I'd like to determine what kind of qualifications for employment as a home orderly the government establishes and if the Minister had a standard curriculum vitae that they used for hiring home orderlies

and the expertise they expect, the training they expect, that would be sufficient so that one would have a handle on the type of people who are currently being employed as home orderlies.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, previously it was on contract. We've had a lot of concerns, and I'm not putting all the blame on the people who are running the service; there are different reasons for that. We've tried to improve the situation. We have a full program. We try to hire people who have the background or who work at that in some area, but we also have something new, something that wasn't there before, a full training program on a regular recurring basis so that they get this added training and then new orderlies would get trained as soon as possible. There is also training on the job and there is also an additional supervisor has been added to improve the quality of service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just allow me to participate in the Estimates just for a moment and to first of all indicate that it's my belief that this is a most worthwhile program.

My question to the Minister would be: In terms of the availability of this program to rural Manitoba, as the Minister indicated a few moments ago that there are some 25 to 30 orderlies involved in this program, how many of those would be involved in rural Manitoba?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is a program that replaced a program that was farmed out in the City of Winnipeg, the 25 are in Winnipeg now. In the rural area it is more difficult, but they are hired the same as we would with nurses and homemakers and so on. We try to provide this service. It's not as readily available, but we do the best that we can to provide the same service. This particular program is in the city and the others are hired. I don't know if I'm clear enough, but I hire the same as we would homemakers or public health nurses and so on individual in the rural area.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm aware that there are - and I may not have the terminology right - there are providers of home services in rural Manitoba.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Homemakers.

MR. H. ENNS: Homemakers, and there are a number of them. There are some in my constituency and they're doing a good job.

I'm just trying to establish whether or not we are, in rural Manitoba, receiving reasonable attention versus the impressions of the urban situation which are always on the doorstep of the Minister.

I want to assure the Minister that there are many instances in rural Manitoba - in fact, Mr. Chairman, there are often instances - where you have elderly people who are still proud enough to maintain their residence or want to maintain their residence and need some assistance. I agree with the Minister; it's a question of economics. If it can be done economically in providing some of these services in the home, it should be done. If it's not economical, then other means have to be sought.

But I'm trying to just establish in my brief intrusion in the Minister's Estimates whether or not a reasonable balance of this kind of service is being provided to rural residents.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think I wasn't quite clear. When I was talking about homemakers, I'm not saying that work is being done by the homemakers. Homemakers do the same thing as they do in the city. I was saying that they were hired the same as needed.

Here, for instance, out of those 25 they are guaranteed so many hours and so on, those who are full time. It's a little different - you know how we work with homemakers, and some people who need nurses, if we need nurses, in the city it's the Victoria Order of Nurses and people like that - that is the way orderlies are hired in the rural area whenever they are available and so on, but we try to provide the same service, the orderly service, and we get them where we can take them.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, before we move on to another area on the Continuing Care Program, can the Minister indicate to me whether the home care staff - and here I'll deal just with rural Manitoba because that's what I'm most familiar with - were they put through a requirement for an upgrading of their training over the past short while?

The proposition that was put to me is that it was indicated to home care workers that if they undertook, I think it was Home Care II is what they would end up with if they took an upgrading course. Then, of course, their salary schedules would increase and that was a sort of a carrot, an incentive, for them to upgrade their training.

Was that kind of a program conscientiously offered through the home care division so that home care workers and home care assistants would further upgrade their education?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can't give the percentage at this time. We could have it for tomorrow. We have had a development program through Red River College and the people going through that to graduate from different levels, from Level 1, for instance, to Level 2. As our resources go, we try to have as many people as possible, but we started that program.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me, in a given home care situation, how many classifications of employee there might be providing assistance within a home? There's the Home Care Worker 1-A, etc.; there's a Home Care Worker 2. Is there a homemaker category and other, say, lesser-paid individuals in the - I've got a Daily Home Maker classification here, a Home Support Worker, and then the Home Care Attendant, and then Home Care Attendant 1-A, Home Care Attendant, theoretically, 2.

All of these provide different wage groups. Are those the entire classification of individuals that are available under the Home Care Program?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You'll have to straighten me out if I'm not giving you the answer. I can give you what we have. Home Support Workers: we have

registered nurses, LPN's, home care attendants, therapists, volunteers and, of course, the orderlies. Now it depends what service is needed. You could have consultants and so on, different things that could work through other programs also, so I can't tell you.

I think what you're driving at is to know if there's duplication and so on, like the criticism I used to have about the social workers. You'd have five different social workers going in the same place, not knowing each other, and they all brought in a different specialty. I used to be very critical of that. I don't know if that's what you're driving at, but these are people doing different things. If you need a nurse, fine, or an LPN, or a therapist or some of them - we haven't got that many, but we have some - and volunteers, and registered nurses, and home support workers.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's what I'm getting at. We had your Continuing Care office send over the various job descriptions. There's Home Care Attendant 1, and the salary range is from \$7.78 to 8.01; Home Care Attendant 2, 7.69 to 8.28; Home Support Workers, 5.61 to 5.82 an hour; Daily Homemaker, 4.30 per hour for the first eight hours, etc.

The basis of the proposition that was put to me is that under the lure, if you will, of availing themselves through upgrading to a home care attendant level, a daily homemaker or a home support worker at a lesser hourly rate of pay, should they take their upgrading, could qualify for the higher schedules. Then the proposition was put to me that, once they upgraded themselves, then they were overqualified to do one-third to one-half of the hourly work that they were performing with given clients, and another person would come in and do that.

So what happened is, when the person upgraded themselves to qualify for the roughly \$8 per hour salary range, which is a pretty laudable target for many women in rural Manitoba which is the example I'm using, they found that once they had taken the upgrading, they were overqualified. Even if they wanted to, they couldn't do the same number of hours of work in the home taking the lesser rate of pay for doing the duties that they would have done before as a home support worker. So they ended up with fewer hours, a higher rate of pay, same take-home pay, no advantage.

There was some bitterness amongst the home care workers that I talked to in that they didn't get a full and complete explanation as to the outcome of upgrading themselves to become home care attendants. Mr. Chairman, once again, the budget seemed to impact as it always does, but in this particular circumstance where the upgrading was taken, those workers did feel somewhat - well, I don't know what to use and keep the term entirely parliamentary. But they didn't believe that was going to happen. They believed that their hours were, say, 30 hours per week or 25 hours per week that they were putting in on a part-time basis. If they upgraded to the \$8 an hour, it would be a straight increase in take-home pay but, in fact, their hours were reduced. Another worker was brought in to do the housekeeping duties, and they weren't allowed to do it under the new classification. Is that possible?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I know that everything is possible. That's possible in a certain area. It would be

more of an exception than the rule, and we'll certainly look into that.

The situation is that we've tried. We have three, I think, different levels, as my honourable friend says, of home care attendants. There are different levels of care need and, in fact, we haven't got enough that are at the third level to take care of these patients. I thought that was what my friend was going to say. Therefore, we'll have to take somebody that hasn't got that training to look after the sicker people, the people that need more care at this time, because we haven't got anybody else. One of those cases has gone to the Ombudsman, I'm told.

If I understand my friend correctly, he's saying that these people were trained. Now I would not advocate that somebody, because they're overtrained in certain cases - and I don't think that's what my friend is advocating - should be always paid at this sum if they're ready to do work that doesn't need as much training. In other words, I can have a Master in Education and, if I want to peddle beer, I'm not paid for the - and if that could accept, I personally can't see any reason why that's not the case here, and I'll certainly look into that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's the proposition, Mr. Chairman. I'm not arguing with the additional training to meet a need. Certain duties within the home that the home care was provided in, they needed the skills of a home care attendant for maybe seven hours a week. The balance of 13 hours, if it was 20 hours in total, needed the services of a home support worker. The proposition, as it was put to me, was once they had upgraded themselves to home care attendant someone else came in to do the home support work. Even though the individual was willing to do the full 20 hours, take the lesser salary for the home support work for the 13 out of the 20 hours, and receive the higher pay for seven of the 20, that opportunity was not given to them. That's what I'd like the Minister to check out, and he's indicated he would do that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'll look into that, of course. That is not saying that if we have people in an area, especially in the rural area, automatically these people would get all the hours, but they should not be punished because of that. If we have people, we could try to keep a certain staff when they're needed to try to equalize that, but not be punished because they not necessarily get all the hours they want but to get their share, regardless of their training, not to say, well you're overtrained for that. You know what I'm saying, not necessarily to keep the other people out also, because then when we'll need them we won't be able to get them.

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, that's not the proposition I'm making to the Minister. What I'm saying is that, in a given home, a home care worker or in this case I suppose, before she was upgraded, she was a home support worker who had a couple of households to look after. In order to put in the same number of hours as a home care attendant, she had to move to about five homes. By the time you travelled and everything and the distance in rural Manitoba, it made it

uneconomical for her to go to five different locations to undertake 20 hours a week for five different families. She was willing to work as a home support worker in two locations, upgrade for a portion of the hours and do the rest of it at the same work. That's the proposition I'm putting on the table.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We're looking at that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had been going to ask the Minister about another subject, but on that one I was sitting here listening.

From the point of view of the people who are receiving this home care it is very confusing when their worker suddenly is upgraded, as the Member for Pembina said, and suddenly you have to change workers. People get very attached to their home care worker, elderly people particularly.

I think it should be looked at from the point of view with people who are receiving the care, too, because it is very traumatic for them. Suddenly, you know - "You used to help me with this; why can't you do it now?" - and in cases of these senior homes where a worker has been going in to help someone who has got very attached to them and no longer can help them almost have to sneak in the door at the other end to do their assignment in case the person will see them and "Why aren't you coming to me any more?" This, in small communities, can cause a great deal of problems. So you should look at that part of it, too.

The question I was going to ask the Minister is: Is this part of your area involved at all with guest homes? I'm thinking of privately run guest homes. Are you involved in the licensing, the regulations, etc.?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, no, my honourable friend, the Minister of Community Services, licenses the guest homes.

MRS. C. OLESON: What involvement do you have with them? Do you assign patients to these homes or absolutely nothing to do with them?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, we might have some of our patients, somebody coming in out of Selkirk or Brandon or something, we might assist them and refer them to that, and there might be some welfare clients that will be paid by the Department of Welfare, but we have nothing to do with the licensing or anything - that is my colleague in the Community Services - and the standards, of course.

MRS. C. OLESON: You don't have anything to do with the standards, but you do have with the referrals?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We help out because we want to assist the patient but it's not a responsibility, we have no office doing that. It is just that we will, of course, have a list of these people and if somebody needs a place we might assist them like that, but no responsibility.

MRS. C. OLESON: Okay, thank you.

Monday, 21 July, 1986

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, can I ask the Minister? We've got Continuing Care helping seniors in the home. Presumably, also, Continuing Care does provide the in-home backup for patients released from hospital whether it be senior citizens who are in the hospital to get built back up so they can get back home to the community or it might be patients undergoing fairly substantive surgery where they need some backup in the home.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And Early Discharge that we were talking about earlier.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, and Early Discharge that we talked earlier on, but I'm not as concerned about that aspect of it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what mechanism there is in place to coordinate the discharge of patients from hospitals and coordination to allow the services of Continuing Care to be provided to those people when they arrive at their home setting.

What type of mechanism is in place to coordinate that effort?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: My friend is talking about a short-term stay, somebody after surgery and so on. That is coordinated, the service is provided on contract to the VON, and that's coordinated through the VON in Winnipeg. In the rural area, we provide that service ourselves, the department does.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So the Minister is saying that the mechanism for coordination with discharge from hospital is in place - VON in Winnipeg and an in-house departmental function outside in rural Manitoba.

I know that we'll deal with this more fully when we get to the Personal Care Home line, but certainly some of the senior citizens who are receiving home care under the Continuing Care Program are panelled seniors who are awaiting personal care home placement.

Can the Minister indicate what the size of the panelled waiting list is right now and whether that list has been changed in any significant way over the past year not only in terms of numbers but whether there is a new system of assigning priority in terms of the panelled patient waiting list?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: As of May 1986, in the rural region there was a waiting list, people panelled, of 594; in the Winnipeg region, 861; for a total of 1,455, and it had gone down some.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is there a priority assigned to the panelled patient list?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there has to be cooperation - and there is - between the personal care homes and the government. We have a list of priorities, depending on need, of course; and then there's some flexibility with the personal care homes who are given so many names of people in the same category, but they also have emergency cases that, by agreement, they go right to the top, a straight emergency, in discussion with the personal care home.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Presumably, your emergency advancement on the panelled list would be, say, your

medical circumstances changed through stroke or some other medical problem?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Or completely alone, no family, nobody at all. That is a factor also.

MR. D. ORCHARD: A final question on the panelled patient waiting list for personal care home placement. What is the projected waiting time now from the time panelling occurs to placement in a personal care home?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's quite difficult because there are so many reasons or factors. First of all, it depends on the help needed, the emergency, the situation that person is in; and, secondly, it depends on the home. Some of them don't want anything but one home.

It could be two years at the Holy Family or quite a long time at the Tache hospital. Those two, and I think it's Luther Home, have the staff and the facilities and the capacity anyway to treat people who are in need of a lot of care.

Tache Nursing Home is practically a hospital, so it's the worst cases that are there. To compound the concern, some of them need that because of their condition and it wouldn't be as easy to get that care at any nursing home. Furthermore, because it's St. Boniface, and the same as we were talking about awhile ago, they try as much as possible, the French people and so on, people in that area would like to be there instead of going somewhere else in Winnipeg, so that makes it more complicated. So these two are the ones with the largest waiting lists and it depends what home. So it's very difficult to say because they're not all in the same condition.

I don't know if this helps, on information that I'm getting, that there's a complete turnover of all the beds every four years. Do you understand what I mean? Every bed would have a new patient every four years, so that gives you an idea; and how many beds we've got altogether - 8,500 beds. That's not the complete answer but that's about the best I can do at this time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Under the Home Care Assistance line, where we're dealing with the \$24 million, can the Minister give us an idea - he had the numbers of home orderlies - of how many nursing staff are employed through Home Care Assistance, because this is primarily a salary line - nurses, LPN's, the various classifications of home care workers? How many people are we talking about in total on line No. 3 that would be availing themselves as salaries in that line?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The numbers of each category, right?

The home support workers, the actual 1985-86 was 1,788; registered nurses - 289; LPN's - 146; home care attendants - 899; physiotherapists - 37 - or therapists; volunteers - 1,200; for a total of 4,359.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Presumably, the volunteers are just that; they're not paid, they're volunteers. So your salaried people would be primarily made up of the first categories?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate how many of the LPN's, for instance, are term staff, or are they all term staff?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They're all term. All these people are not employed directly or governed like our Public Health Nurses. They are all on term. Some of that work is done on contract with the Victorian Order of Nurses. That's on a contract to provide so many hours also. The Victorian Order of Nurses are over and above this but that's in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The VON assistance, the staffing requirement is above what the Minister has given me but the dollars are still inclusive in the 24 million.

Mr. Chairman, I guess this is sort of a delicate subject and I'm pleased there may not be any media around because I don't want to have any ideas presented. Presumably, when these people are all term, they don't represent any downstream costs to government in terms of pension provision, etc., etc. The Minister has indicated that one of the potential problems I'm alluding to might not last. It's my understanding that there are some organizational efforts going on right now to organize, from a union standpoint, the whole staff complement in the Home Care Assistance line.

Mr. Chairman, as much as we would all like to see individuals with long-term benefits and pensions, etc., etc., that's a laudable goal, but, as the Minister so often has said during the course of these Estimates already, we don't have unlimited dollars.

If we get ourselves into a circumstance - and once again I will make my highly partisan comment that the current governing party is probably the least able to control this kind of thing because they thrive on union support - but I can see a great deal of downstream difficulty in funding the level of service should that kind of organization be successfully completed and a contract formally established whereby in addition to salary lines which are paid only for hours worked and no ancillary benefits, as I understand it, right now, we've already had the one difficulty some six months ago where less than minimum wage was provided to all night workers. Of course, that's been rectified in terms of the latest numbers we've been supplied by the department in terms of that category of worker but, Mr. Chairman, that alone must have represented a pretty significant drain on the number of families or the number of individuals who could avail themselves of home care assistance.

I realize that we have a substantial increase on the line of some \$3.2 million, but given the change in the overnight work rate to \$86 for a 24-hour assignment, that probably chewed a pretty considerable hole in the number of hours available to all Manitobans through this home care assistance. There's more money here, certainly, but I think it would be fair to say that the additional monies don't necessarily indicate the availability of providing more services to more Manitobans because the costs are going up because of recent developments.

Has the Minister any idea from his staff as to what some of the costs might be should this union drive be successful and our home care workers of all disciplines be organized? What kind of downstream costs are we

looking at in terms of providing Civil Service benefits to the workers in the Continuing Care field?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there is no doubt that what my honourable friend has said is absolutely true. The concern, I think, is not just a question of political support. I think that a government that has been advocating a free collective bargaining would find it very difficult to deprive these people of that. There is no doubt that there is some effort being made, and that would be if organized through the Civil Service Commission.

All I could do, if that is the case, as Minister of Health, is request additional funds from the government. It's as simple as that. My honourable friend is right on the nose that it's either that or cut the services if this takes place. As the Minister of Health, I'm quite concerned, but we have no idea, we haven't made that calculation. We have no idea what the cost would be if let's say they were unionized. It could be that at one time they would. I could only say I hope not, but it could be that these people would be civil servants at one time. I don't know; I shouldn't guess. The Civil Service Commission would certainly be involved if that's the case.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, one of the last questions I have to ask here is we've got a line "Recoverable from Canada" - \$4.2 million this year; it was \$3,311,500 by last year's Estimates book. That is a fairly generous increase from the Federal Government. It amounts to, in rough figures, almost a 25 percent increase over last year.

What is that participation by the Federal Government designed to do? Is that to assist in the Home Care Program specifically?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll get the signal if I give you the wrong answer. I believe that it's the Federal Government. It is a program of recovery to encourage programs that would keep people out of institutions as much as possible and you apply for it. It encourages the provinces and so on to initiate programs that would endeavour to keep the people out of institutions as much as possible. You would apply for it to see if a program would qualify.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And that particular Recoverable from Canada is above and beyond the EPF transfer payments, the tax point transfers, etc., etc. That's an entirely separate funding vehicle that the Federal Government has to assist provinces in basically preventing institutionalization of their citizens.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It may be over and above, but it's a program that has been in existence for quite awhile.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I might just make a few comments before we wrap up this line.

My colleague, the Member for Lakeside, indicated our feelings on Continuing Care, that it does indeed provide a quite valuable program to citizens of Manitoba to keep many of those citizens in their home environment for quite a number more years than what might have been possible before.

Monday, 21 July, 1986

I noted with some interest during the election campaign that the Premier made a commitment for \$5 million additional to support seniors in their home. Now maybe the balance of the 5 million is elsewhere; I don't know. But I note that, by the time you factor out the increase from the Federal Government, the net increase in terms of home care assistance would be in the neighbourhood of \$2.5 million or maybe slightly less. I would ask the Minister, and we can pursue this in other lines of the Estimates, where the balance of the \$5 million as committed by the First Minister during the last election campaign, where we would find it throughout his department. Certainly the \$5 million additional commitment is not here, and we'd like to know where the balance is, if in fact it's being provided this year.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The commitment was 1 million, and it is here. It is provided to provide more workers and so on. I think there will have to be an awful lot more than that if we go in the direction that we want to keep people out of institutions, and to even sick people in areas and maybe teams of doctors, I think that'll change. But the commitment during the election was for \$1 million, and it is provided here.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well I haven't got the press statement in front of me. That's fine, I'll check that out. I'll have to stand corrected if it wasn't the 5 million. I thought it was the 5 million.

Mr. Chairman, then can I just add to the Minister our support of the program and, if he could find out some of the answers that I posed to him tonight about the changing in working arrangements for the home care workers when they've been upgraded, that would be most beneficial in myself providing answers to those home care workers who are finding themselves in that kind of a position. I believe that is the sort of circumstance, if I can carry on along the lines of our most recent discussion in terms of the union-organizing effort, that's the kind of dissatisfaction that people may well think could be resolved through a collective agreement.

I don't think that the request, as it was put to me, as was put by that person to her immediate supervisors was that unreasonable, that she would undertake her previous tasks at the previous salary scale and avoid moving on. It fits well with what the Member for Gladstone said about seniors. Once they have availed themselves of this service, they become very, very comfortable with that home care worker. That home care worker becomes a part of the extended family, if you will. Any disruption there causes problems. I think the Minister can well understand that.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those few comments, I would move we pass Continuing Care.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(g)(1) Continuing Care: Salaries—pass; 2.(g)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 2.(g)(3) Home Care Assistance—pass; 2.(g)(4) External Agencies—pass.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the committee?

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: Is there a motion to adjourn?

The Honourable Minister, do you want to adjourn the House?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes. I move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services, that the House be now adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until tomorrow 2:00 p.m. (Tuesday).