

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 p.m., Thursday, April 8, 1976

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Johannson): \$187,100 (2)(b)(1) Salaries - the Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, shortly before the dinner recess the Committee was subject to a long tirade from the Member for Fort Rouge on the subject that I feel that he should be a little more informed than he was. It is obvious, however, that my honourable friends knowledge in this field of social services is mostly academic. I think he has proven that today and he doesn't quite understand that real word of "external agencies".

The Member for Fort Rouge initially accused me of not being acquainted with my staff's attempts to negotiate capital funding agreements with any of the social agencies operating in the residential care field. I can assure my honourable friend that it is not my intention to hound my staff on an hourly basis. I have every confidence that they are carrying out government policy and I can confirm that it is most definitely government policy to protect public funds.

My honourable friend quoted a clause from a draft agreement and I want to emphasize the words that I said earlier, "a draft agreement". This is exactly what it is. I have now in front of me two agreements that have been finalized and I understand that they are the only two that have been finalized. One is with the St. Amant Centre and one is with the Sanitorium Board. I challenge the Member for Fort Rouge to accuse the government of trying to take over these two agencies. I challenge him to speak to these two agencies to see if they have anything other than a positive response. I challenge the honourable member to look at those agreements now and tell me that an option to purchase for \$800,000 is stealing. I refer to the agreement with the St. Boniface Sanitorium:

"On or before the date of completion the government shall pay or cause to be paid to the Sanitorium as the purchase price of said assets a sum equal to \$845,000 plus three percent of \$845,000 for each year between December 31, 1971, and the date of completion."

Now this is the kind of agreement - I might say that we went out with, I think we had about four or five drafts, before we reached a final agreement and I daresay that the first draft talked about an option to buy for \$1.00 until it could be demonstrated, the equity that the nuns had in this institution. Now, Mr. Chairman, why are we doing this? I'll give you some of the situation the way it was before.

For instance the Concordia Hospital. My honourable friend was talking about the public, the citizens of Manitoba, and the government as if it was two different things. He might think it is but we don't. We feel that the money that we have is certainly not the government of this party, the money of this party, or these people sitting here, it is the taxpayers' funds. We had a situation at Concordia Hospital where we built a brand new hospital, there was no owner's equity at all and the Board went out and sold - everything was legal, there was no protection - went out and sold the hospital to the City of Winnipeg for \$1.00. Now does anybody here think this is fair? I'm saying fair to the taxpayer. There's nothing illegal at all but we're trying to change it.

Grace Hospital. We are paying now debts on bonds on the old Grace Hospital that is being torn down and we will have to pay for quite a while. Now with the nuns and with these people - some of that money was put in maybe by the Salvation Army or the Grey Nuns and so on, and the agreement is that this money will not leave the province. This is the kind of protection that we have. We want to protect the public funds only if the agencies go out of business. That's the only thing that we're trying to do, prevent Manitoba funds from leaving the province to prevent the government from having to buy back what it originally paid for and to prevent public funds from being channelled into purposes where the government does not set a high priority.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a single private agency of any size that does not receive virtually all of its money from the government and therefore from the people of Manitoba. Not only operating funds but also capital funds, and the day of private capital funding is past. But the Member from Fort Rouge does not want to acknowledge this.

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)

If he thinks that we want to run and own agencies, he certainly has another think coming. We don't want to own and run hospitals. We don't want to own and run nursing homes. We don't want to own and run child caring agencies. We don't want to own and run residences for the retarded, and I could go on. We want the community groups to do all these things.

To promote these facilities we now have a policy that the government will pay 100 percent of the capital cost, 100 percent. And we do want to protect our capital investment. The honourable member read from a draft agreement mentioning a purchase price of \$1.00. Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the agency put \$1.00 into the land and buildings and the government put in the rest, well then we'd want to buy it back for \$1.00, not a penny more. In the case of St. Amant Centre, they put in over \$800,000 and the government put in \$8 million. Well then we want to buy it back like that.

All right, I won't do like my honourable friend, I'll give him a copy of the St. Amant Ward. Would you give this to my honourable friend? I broke my promise already, I'll help him out. --(Interjection)-- Yes, he'll have to give it back to me, I want a copy made for my honourable friend. No, I take it back.

Now I could quote from agencies, what agencies have to say about that, and I'll quote from a letter from Mrs. Ellen . . . Executive Director of the Childrens Aid Society of Western Manitoba.

"Dear Sir: First of all I would like to express our appreciation to you for being prepared to meet our Board of Directors and for the specific way in which you have dealt with the material. As you will note from the Board meeting, there are some questions about the specific agreement. However as the agency indicated to the government, at the time we were requesting approval of capital costs for Victor House, we understood and accepted the principle of equity. Certainly our major concern is for service and the continuity of service to children.

"There is some concern about the commitment of the government to see that such properties were used for service. There is also some slight concern about those buildings which we presently own and where private moneys represented a major factor in the financing, all of which we would lose any control over. However we are prepared to forego our equity with the understanding that the government equally accepts the principle of support for capital expenditures for child care costs.

In summary therefore, after considerable discussion, the board passed a motion accepting the agreement as outlined, for signature, subject to the perusal of our honorary solicitor. Our honorary solicitor has perused the document and has raised the same questions, but again is in agreement with the agencies that the common good of service is best served in this way. The whole situation makes such ultimate sense and supports the argument which we have put forth for several years. Perhaps that is why we are more ready to accept the validity of it than some other agencies."

Now at Pelican Lake, there's another agreement here, that's the second one.

"In the event this agreement is terminated under Section 10, the province will pay the board all costs and expenses which it may incur to terminate the operation of the facility as an institution. And in consideration therefor, the Board hereby grants to the province an option to purchase all its real property and interest, and real property comprising the facility legally described in the schedule thereto annexed hereto, and for the price of \$250,000 free and clear of all encumbrances save and except for the assumption of any approved capital debt upon the assurance of title enquiry of the province."

I suppose the Member for Fort Rouge expects to see headlines tomorrow after his question the other day, because he did talk to the press and again today, such as government take over private agencies. I guess this is what he wants. He might well find those things. But let me assure this committee that such a banner would be totally false. The entire thrust of Health and Social Services is to finance, not to own and operate facilities and services. We are encouraging community help in Social Service Centres, District Health Systems, community residents, for the retired and mentally ill. We are doing these things with the intention that they be owned and run by community

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . .groups. Now, you know, my honourable friend can't have it both ways. We were criticized not too long ago on the basis of the Provincial Auditor referring to large grants being made and not accounted for. Let me assure you that in Health and Social Development this will not be the case, and through capital funding agreements of the type being waived by the Member from Fort Rouge with a misbegotten outburst of indignation, where I not only accounted for these grants but we also are protecting them in the event of future discontinuance of the agencies' services.

Sir, there is no way, no way, that the government wants to take over these agencies if they can produce. But we have some of the agencies, and I suspect that one of them is the one that has talked to my honourable friend - that might be one of the reasons why after promising a copy of the agreement, he didn't want to send it to me, the draft agreement. Some of these people do not want us to set up a capital budget, and in fact they don't want to submit a budget to us at all. They want us to give them a blank cheque, and that, Mr. Chairman, we certainly will not do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister made a number of interesting responses, and I'm glad that he was able to develop a prepared statement over the dinner hour to make sure that he got his words in properly because I wouldn't want him to sort of act in the heat of the moment.

But let me deal with some of those points. First, some of the minor ones, particularly the ones of his own outburst of indignation before the dinner hour ended. One was his great concern of course that somehow or other I wasn't going to give this agreement to him. And as I said I found it somewhat strange that there'd be such a sound and fury over something that could have been easily obtained by a phone call to his own department or a memo or --(Interjection)-- Oh, no, there was no. . . I'll tell you what happened, Mr. Chairman, because I think it relates to exactly the kind of issue we're talking about, and that is the role of private agencies, is that the reason why when the agreement was given to me, and it wasn't one agency by the way, Mr. Chairman, it was a couple of agencies that talked to me, and he may know them all. I'll tell you the reason why they didn't want agreements, for exactly the same reason that the Minister sort of evinced a few minutes ago is because they are afraid he's going to get even with them. That's the reason why they don't want to see agreements. They didn't want him to see the name on it because there has been a continual sense of intimidation on many of these agencies. And that's the reason, Mr. Chairman. --(Interjection)-- If he wants to know the reason why he didn't have the agreement, they asked specifically not to have that agreement picked up, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. On a point of order?

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order. There has been an accusation that we have tried to intimidate these people, and I would like my honourable friend to either prove that or withdraw that statement.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was not listening carefully; I didn't say an act of intimidation, I said a spirit of intimidation, a fear of it. --(Interjection)-- Oh, well, it's there. --(Interjection)-- Those are the words I said. If the members opposite don't like it then you can go back to reading your New Democrat, whatever it is that you spend all your time . . . --(Interjection)-- The fact that I'm making is that the reason why people did not want to see that agreement passed on is because they feel intimidated, and if there is a bad spirit between private agencies and this department, and there has been ever since this government came in. And all the assurances that the Minister gave tonight are not the assurances they have received in the past, whether they're received from officials or if they received from Deputy Ministers, because they are in fact . . . they do not feel that this government is interested in the perpetuation and continuation of private agencies. They feel in fact that there is an effort and an attempt to take them over eventually and to provide sort of rigid controls on them. And if there was a better spirit and a spirit of co-operation and assistance, then there wouldn't be the kind of problems that we continually run into. I'm not saying the Minister is responsible for it. But if he wants to start looking at it, then he should look at his

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . .department, because his department has been continually carrying out that message, and it may be because they're listening to other people in the government. Maybe they've talked to Planning and Priorities, junior G-men too often.

I don't know what the reason is. But the fact of the matter is that too many people in the private Social Service Agencies in this province feel that this government is not interested in co-operation, is not interested in helping them, but in fact is interested in more and more control and eventual takeover. Now that happens to be the way that they feel. And Mr. Chairman, whether you like it or not it is there, otherwise they wouldn't be coming and raising these kinds of concerns. And that's the reason why the agreement was not given. Because, Mr. Chairman, and I assume that the Minister is quite able if he were to get his own agreements and to look at them the way they are.

But let's clear the air, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister is prepared, if he wants to say, I'll take it at full value and face value. But I think that you have to go beyond words. You have to start demonstrating in actions. I think that, Mr. Chairman, is just as important. Because what the Minister said is not exactly the way things are. Because after this particular issue was raised a couple of other agencies got in touch with me, some that were prepared to say okay. A number of the Community Association of the Mentally Retarded who have supplied all the capital funding for their institution and simply work on a per diem grant from the government per patient, they're being asked to sign the same agreements. It has nothing to do with capital, Mr. Chairman, it has to do with operating grants. It has to do with operating grants.

So, Mr. Chairman, when we go around saying, well we're only protecting our interests . . . I said before the break, I'm quite prepared and interested that the Government of Manitoba protect its investments, but I think, Mr. Chairman, that they "dost protest too much" about protecting their investments because in protecting their investments they want to take the whole thing over. That's a very funny way of protecting your investments. And if the Minister is prepared to say that in each and every one of these agreements that his officials in negotiating them are prepared to make some assessment of what is the capitalization that has come from private sources, be it foundation or churches or private fund raising, and work out a formula by which the government would get its share and the rest we could preserve, then fine the issue is over. There is no issue. --(Interjection)-- Well, what am I yapping about? Because I've got an agreement that doesn't say that.

MR. DESJARDINS: I just finished telling you.

MR. AXWORTHY: All right then. Let's clarify it and let's state it as a matter of policy, because, Mr. Chairman, that's not what is being said to those agencies. And I think the Minister better go back and talk to a few of his officials because they're not making the offers and saying, let's split up the difference, they're saying, - sign these things and sign them the way they are. And if there is negotiating going on, fine and agreed. So let's just make sure that we now have it clearly understood in this committee that that is the formula by which it will be used. That in fact when it comes up to a matter of signing an agreement, it will be based upon a proportion of what has gone in from private capital and what has gone in from public capital, and all that we're interested in is protecting the public's side, not taking over every big piece of property, not taking over the furnishings and the chattels and the light fixtures and the land, but taking over only what exactly has been invested from the public side.

Now if the Minister is prepared to say that that's a matter of policy, then I'll say fine. Then the issue is over. But let's raise some other issues because I think in the Minister's remarks something else came along.

The Minister of Mines and Resources got a little exercise this afternoon about --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm not changing the subject, we'll come back to it. And he said, okay, let's talk in a theoretical way, the academic way about the rights of Parliament and everything else. And yet it was the Minister himself who perhaps in an outburst, that he may want to retract saying, "Hey, you know, I've been a nice guy to you up to now. I've been helpful. But from now on I'm going to treat you like everybody else." Well, Mr. Chairman, that was a very revealing remark about how other people

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . get treated in this province. It means that from now on I guess because whatever privileges, which I'm not sure, that were extra special that were being endowed, all of a sudden they're going to be taken away and I'm going to be treated like everybody else. Which is fine with me, Mr. Chairman. It simply means that everyone else is going to have to dig and may be rejected and told no. And so much goes with that silly argument the Minister used this afternoon about the rights of Parliament.

The fact of the matter is there are daily occurrences where Ministers of the Crown and officials of this government say no, no, no, to people that want information, and we're going to be treated all the same, in other words we're all going to be treated in the same negative kind of way. And I think that has to be an issue, and I'm sorry to use the Minister's inadvertent remark but I think it deserves . . . because it simply deals with that theoretical little piece of rhetoric that came up this afternoon from the Minister of Mines and Resources. It didn't deal with reality. It didn't deal with the way things are. And the way things are is that countless numbers of people feel that they are being turned back, that they can't get the information they want, they don't get the kind of data they want, and all they're doing is they're going to be treated the same way that the Minister now says he's going to treat me and I suppose other members of the opposition.

So the fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is, for all the sort of imputation that the Minister made, this was a serious matter of legitimate concern by private agencies. It is not a single exclusive example. It's part of a pattern and that pattern has been, that since this government has come in it has expressed and evinced a hostility and oftentimes an antagonism to the works of public agencies. The same way that the Minister of Urban Affairs says, I don't want anything to do with private people in housing, I want to do our own. Well I think we've got the same thing going the social agency. It is not an isolated example, Mr. Chairman, it's part of a general pattern of this government to distrust anything that is done in private hands, whether it is non-profit, charitable, social or profit. We could just simply say that the only thing that makes sense and is good is something that they've got their hands on. Well, Mr. Chairman, that's the thing that I'm against. I think that if the Minister of Health and Social Development is prepared to say that that is not his policy, that he is prepared to encourage and support the activity of private agencies, to give them full co-operation, to deal with them fairly, to make sure that their assets will not be unfairly taken away and based upon an equitable formula, then fine. Then I would say, okay, let's proceed on to other matters because there are other matters in this department.

Well let's get that clarified. Because, Mr. Chairman, for five or six long years it has not been clarified and there is a lot of people trying to do a serious job in the field of private agencies who don't feel that way because they have not been told that way. They've been told quite the opposite and they've got the message kind of clearly that they're really not wanted. Well if it's a lie, Mr. Chairman --(Interjection)-- Well all right. I think, Mr. Chairman, by the way, that what the Minister just simply said is against the basic procedures and decorum of this House. I think the Minister better be prepared to back that statement up, otherwise I think we'll perhaps ask the Chairman or the Speaker to call him on it. Because the fact of the matter is all I'm expressing is the kinds of concerns that have been raised with me by members of the private agencies. If he wants to say that I am lying and they're lying then he'd better have proof on his side to show that in fact it is not a lie. I think it is exactly that kind of attitude, that you're not prepared to take those kinds of criticisms but that if you don't agree with them you're a liar or a thief or a charlatan, whatever the kinds of forms of abuse or what was the word that was used.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. I meant to say - I withdraw this. The spirit of lying, I meant.

MR. AXWORTHY: Fine. Well whatever. Okay, we're exchanging spirits at this point. The fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is that it is that kind of attitude of mind that has so pervaded the attitudes of this government in dealing with the whole

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . .range of private people in this community that there is a sense of antagonism and a sense of hesitation and a sense of feeling that this government really isn't interested in having them do their best job but really is trying to encroach upon their activity and finally and ultimately take it over. Because, as the Minister of Urban Affairs once said, we're much happier doing it ourselves. Well that's fine.

If that's what they want to do then we've got some basic disagreements in this community and we can fight them out. But let's get it out on the table and if there is a disagreement between the kind of feeling expressed by some members of the front bench and the Minister of Health and Social Development, that's fine by me too. Because I happen to think that what the Minister is saying, that he is trying to encourage them, is the right form and I'm glad he said it. Frankly, thank God, someone said it finally. Because it's been a long time coming. If the Minister is prepared to tie it down or tap it down, then great, we've made some progress so far in this debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate mainly because what the honourable member said is that during the last five years that there has been a demonstration by this government that it is against the participation in the delivery of social services of the existing private agencies. I gather that is the thrust of his remarks and that that is what has to be discounted. I don't know how long the honourable member has been around; I don't know what he knows of what occurred during the last five years. I don't know what he knows has been the history of the government with regard to the private agencies. I discount from this discussion for the moment, for the moment I discount for this discussion what services are being delivered by the public agencies; what services are being delivered by the private agencies; what is the best manner of ensuring the delivery of services. I think that the Minister of Health and Social Development has indicated the government position in this connection and I accept that position.

I am dealing with one charge only. That is the suggestion that since this government came into power there has been an attempt to downgrade or to eliminate or to take over the delivery of services now delivered by the private agencies, by the public. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was the Minister of Health and Social Development in this province from July 15th, 1969, until the middle of December the same year. At that time, Mr. Speaker, there was filed in my office a Social Services Audit commissioned by the Progressive Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba and filed with the New Democratic Party Government of this province or immediately before. I actually think that it was presented to me, I believe that it was presented to me as Minister. I am not thoroughly remembering of all of the details of the Social Service Audit but I do remember that what it said was that there had to be a rationalization of all of the existing delivery of services; that these services should be delivered from comprehensive social service development units, social development units scattered throughout the Province of Manitoba. Then each of these units would have a comprehensive service, would contain a health unit; it would contain family counselling; it would contain children's counselling, it would contain all of the services now delivered by various agencies and these would be delivered by one unit. The supervision of the total of the social service development units - and I hope I am being fair to the concept, I'm sort of looking over to see whether I'm making a dastardly error but I don't think so - that there was to be a Board of Directors appointed by the government and that this Board of Directors would be the agency that the government used as its agent for the delivery of comprehensive service through these Health and Social Development units.

This plan was presented to me by the following Bolsheviks: C. Rhodes Smith was the Chairman of the Social Service Audit; Ann DuMoulin, Head of the Family Counselling Services, Bolshevik No. 2; Sol Kanee of the Soo Line Mills, Director of the Bank of Canada, Bolshevik No. 3; Don Thompson of the firm of Thompson Dilts, Bolshevik No. 4 --(Interjection)-- That is right. Not a Menshevik amongst them.

This Social Service Audit was presented to this government, this New Democratic Party Government. Mr. Speaker, if the sinister objectives attributed to us by the honourable member in fact existed, what better authority, what better moment, what better

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . .support than to do it on the authority of the social service audit, which in fact called for that kind of treatment and which frankly had some degree of approval within the Government of Manitoba.

But that was not the thrust of the government. If the honourable member doesn't know it then he should know it, that the thrust of the government was to continue to deliver social services for the most part through the existing agencies and not to do this takeover that was recommended by the Commission appointed by the Progressive Conservative Party and which delivered its report to the New Democratic Party, and was urged upon us by these people.

Now is the member being credible to himself or to the people of the Province of Manitoba? There was a lot in the Social Service Audit. Perhaps these people were New Democrats in a hurry. But the fact is that, for whatever reason, the New Democratic Party Government wasn't in that much of a hurry and decided to continue to deliver services through the private agency. But one thing that we want to guarantee is the delivery of these services. For the most part these services are now operational and capital. The day of the substantial delivery of services through the charity of well meaning people in the community is finished. These services, although they are private agencies, they are substantially funded, capital and operational, by the public of the Province of Manitoba.

The public of the Province of Manitoba has the right to say, that if we are buying a building and paying capital and operational and a per diem to include the capital, that we are entitled to think that when that organization no longer wants to do it, the building that we have paid for for the delivery of service will be available to the people of the Province of Manitoba for the delivery of service. Is that a bad objective? Because that is all that has occurred. The anomaly is, Mr. Chairman, the anomaly is that there are now private organizations, and I think that sincere dedicated well meaning people, I am not certain, but I don't want to get into the argument as to whether it saves the public money that these people are involved, I believe their involvement is a good thing in any event, but that they are private in name only in many cases.

One of the sort of disconcerting things is that they often make much fun of the public agencies. I won't deal with the actual agencies involved, but there are certain services that we deliver where the Assistant Deputy Minister's got to come in and fight with the Minister of Health and Social Development for how much food the patients or inmates are going to be allowed, what kind of beds they are going to sleep in, what kind of staff they are able to hire - they have to go through Management Committee every time the amounts per diem for food is over by 10 cents, or what have you. --(Interjection)-- That's right. And the private agencies get their grant - they do not go to Management Committee - it's true we scrutinize their budget, and they say, look how much better we private people do than those public people, isn't it terrible, and their per diem has been higher in many cases. And they throw this up as a demonstration that the private operates better than the public.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't accept this. I accept the fact that the history has been that private agencies are doing the work; I accept the fact that the people involved in this are doing a good job, but I do not accept the fact, that because they are private they are entitled to do, as the Art Gallery wants to do, that we want the public to buy us an Art Gallery, but we don't want the public to put the Art Gallery in the name of the public, it's got to be put in the name of the Art Gallery because we own the Art Gallery. They own the Art Gallery, yes, with \$800,000 of public money and deficits of \$400,000 a year, that we have to pay for it, but we are private. Well if they are private; then let them not come for their deficits; and if they are getting public money then the public is entitled to ensure that it will continue to be a hospital, that when it no longer serves as a hospital, it will not be these people who say, this is our hospital, we will now sell it and use the money for whatever purposes we want to despite the fact that the public put up the money in the first place.

I say that any other policy that the honourable member wants to defend, he can go ahead and defend, and I will go to the public of Manitoba and defend the position that this government is taking, and I believe that we will be supported, because I think that

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . .the contrary, just does not make sense. The suggestion that what is being done is a sinister takeover of the private agencies, makes no sense at all. Because that was proven, if proof is needed, by the fact that the Social Service audit commissioned by a Progressive Conservative Administration, headed by C. Rhodes Smith, Anne DuMoulin, Sol Kanee, Don Thompson. Were there any New Democrats? I can't remember any - called for that nature of a program - I'm not saying it calls for a takeover of the private agencies; it certainly recognized the work that the private agencies were doing, but it certainly called for rationalization, which ultimately puts these things all into the public sector. At least that is the way I see it, and certainly if one wanted to move that way, one would have used the Social Service audit as the vehicle to get there. So it may make the honourable member think that he can sort of pour out what, you know, he says, rhetoric, that he can follow up the rhetoric that we used to hear from his former leader, the Member for Wolseley about state control, state takeover; state this, state that, that somehow he can make a point of it. But the difference between the rehtoric and what has actually occurred is like the difference between the Honourable Member for Charleswood's political philosophy and the Member for Wellington's political philosophy, and you know, I don't think that they are very close together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it is clearly, certainly obvious now that there is a case that somebody that had no case at all, somebody that complained - he didn't bother checking, and he's trying to make a big thing out of it - when he finds out that he has no case at all, he says, well let's forget it, let the Minister make the statement and then everything is fine, and then he can go back tomorrow and say, oh we've got him to make the statement. Let's review what has happened. As is his right, a few weeks ago he asked the question, and I gave him the answer. I gave him the same answer as I'm giving him today. I've given the answer, the policy that the government, the Cabinet - everybody was in favour, it's not just the department, I told him exactly that. I talked to him privately, I said, if there's any complaint, let me know, we'll try to find out. And that's the only thing, I'm sure. I can be responsible for my department to help things and that's the only assistance that I'm talking about. He was going to give me a copy. He volunteered that, but I never got the copy, and this is what my only concern was today. Then I went out during the supper hour and got the copy, I got the facts, and then he comes back, he chastised me because I have the facts. --(Interjection) No, he was told, he was told exactly. He's trying to make a point. I will challenge him now. We enunciated the policy weeks ago. I said the same thing today, it's not the policy that we've changed, tell him exactly what we want, that we've got to protect the public, I give him . . . if he wants to say we're wrong. If he agrees that we should let things go the way they were at Grace Hospital, Concordia, in these areas, then let him state it. Let him say, you were wrong, go back to what you were doing before, and I challenge him today because he made a statement, and that's easy, to get up and say this is what you people want. We get up and say this is not what we want, but that's what you people want, because that's what he wants to say.

I challenge him to bring the facts anywhere that we've tried to intimidate any group at all of these people, and we will see, and let the members of this House decide the fact and I'll bring the correspondence that I have. I certainly challenge him to do that. Now, saying that they're concerned, showed him the only two contracts that we have, and I asked him to go and talk to these people, but he doesn't want to do that.

Then I read him a letter from another agency that we are negotiating with, but he doesn't care about that at all. Now there is one agency, and they're not very happy, probably there is certainly more than one, but one is not very happy with us, and if he ever wants to mention these people that he's talking about, then I can mention names also, and I'll bring correspondence where we're chastised because we dare ask them for their budget. We dare ask them for this budget. You know, privately, everybody tells us we've got to do something in this field of Health and Welfare, you've got to be careful, spend wisely, and so on, do this with the department. Do you know how much money, Mr. Chairman, do you know how much money we're spending on agencies now?



## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . All right. I hope that everybody is sitting down, so you don't fall down. Very close to \$50 million, \$50 million. So we ask for an option. We want to negotiate an option. We want to negotiate with them, and do you know what we're asking for an option? If they decide, not us, if they decide to close we have an option to buy. I publicly stated, and I said it again today, I don't know what else we can do, I don't know what else I can do, I stated that we are interested in protecting the equity of the people of Manitoba, and we are ready to negotiate with them and protect them. It's a fact; we've proven it. I've offered to give you a copy of the contract that we have with the Sanitarium Board and with the St. Vital, St. Amant Ward, and those are the only two contracts that we have.

Now if my honourable friend wants to be fair, let him stand up and let him tell me, let things go the way they were at Grace Hospital. You know, build another hospital the people that own the hospital, let them sell the thing. This is what happened. In fact it might be that they might want to take this money and invest it somewhere else. It's possible. It could be the Grey Nuns, the Salvation Army and so on, and this was done perfectly legally. One minute we're told that the Auditor tells us we have to be careful, it's not our money, it's not our money. Then we try to be careful; we're trying to take over.

You know what kind of taking over we want in this field, in the Health field? We want to transfer this to the community. We hope to see communities that will have boards that will run the hospital, the personal care homes, the housing for retardates, for crippled children, for the whole thing. This is exactly what we want to do. We want to transfer that and in fact we hope, in an orderly fashion, transfer our staff also to do that. This is exactly what we want of the people. And then today, so unfairly - he received his answer before the Orders of the Day. He asked a question and he was given the answer. He was given the answer. Now again he was told today, but he insisted even after my explanation, after telling him the two contracts we have, reading that letter, telling him to bring any complaints that he has. He still insists well, okay, let's forget the thing; there's other things. Yes, there are other points too but let the Minister make a statement. Well that statement was made, Mr. Chairman. So, that's the danger with this member. He'll glance at the paper; he'll get some bit of information and he'll come in and get his publicity and so on and try, you know, put the onus on everybody to defend and so on. He doesn't have to prove anything, he can get up every day and make a stupid statement and that's it. He gets the answer; he doesn't want the answer. He wants the answer from what he says is a member of the staff that has said something, that had threatened somebody. There's 5,000 people in this bloody department and I can't be with them all the bloody time.

I've made the statement, I've made the statement of the policy here and if there is any complaints bring it up to me and be able to justify - --(Interjections)-- Get back on your seat and tell me that.

Now my honourable friend was talking about the financing not too long ago. He was talking about the - now he isn't in agreement that he can say that's an unjust agreement, he has nothing. Then he was talking about people that have billed that. Most of them are being billed and the debt the return on the debt is included in the per diem; we're paying for it. The public is paying for this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit a question. On the basis of the \$50 million that he indicates is annually paid to the private agencies, has he proportionately broken down what is being applied to capital and what is being applied to operational in terms of that 50.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well that's the whole thing because there's per diem in there and the per diem covers the whole thing. We pay them mostly in per diem and the debt that they have is retired through the per diem. So capital would be included in there too.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm not intending to debate now. I just want to know whether the Minister has done anything which would give us a breakdown of how much of that 50 is really capital, how much of it is for Operational. It's blended, I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Would the gentlemen please stand if they're going to

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) . . . .talk into the mikes. 2(b)(1) - the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, before the matter goes on, I think that there were some points that were raised that can't go unresponded to. I think one of course is the interesting response of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who says, "Hey, you know, we're such good guys. Look, the Social Service Audit came in; we didn't immediately run over and take everything over therefore it proves that we're not out to do it." Which is what's known, I guess, in the books of logic as being a logical fallacy. You know, to take one example and therefore prove a general case out of it, that, Mr. Chairman, just does not, it just does not wash. It may come as some surprise to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources but he is not the only one that has read the Social Service Audit. It had a fairly wide distribution.

What he said about the audit was not exactly what it was saying. There were things in the audit that were a little bit different and I think that if you look at the nuance you might see that there is a difference between the approach that was taken in the audit and the approach that is oftentimes taken by this government. The difference is that the audit did recommend that there had to be rationalization and a form of planning and that the public should naturally be involved in setting up an agency.

At that time it recommended that it take over neighborhood services or Logan Neighbourhood House to be the agency, but it said it should be involved basically in the planning, setting of priorities, allocation of resources - not taking over agencies. It didn't recommend that at all. It didn't suggest that we should become the owners or the operators, it said that there is, if you like the analogy, the government should really act as a conductor of an orchestra, that it should keep things in tune, it should keep the harmony playing but it should not necessarily be in there playing every instrument. That is really the point that was taken. That, I agree, Mr. Chairman, makes a good deal of sense. The public responsibility in the field of social services should be to provide a basic planning approach, to establish priorities, to try to rationalize the operations of one agency against another. That does make sense and I think that it is a logical approach. But it doesn't mean to say that there is a continual sort of erosion, mainly using the power of the purse to begin to hedge in and hem in the activities.

The Minister says, "Give me examples." Well, I'll give him some examples. There are a couple that come to mind offhand. A thing like the work activity projects, most of which were established through private initiative, have now been taken over by the government. All right there's an example. I don't think they had to be. There may be a good economic rationalized reason why they should be, but in effect that the boards which were mainly private have now been brought into the rubric of a department.

Things in the alcohol field. A number of the agencies which were supplying services in the alcohol field sort of went through a whole extended period of negotiations with the Foundation to the point where again many of them are now being brought in under the umbrella. Now I'm not saying that's necessarily wrong, Mr. Chairman, if that's the way . . . . But it does indicate patterns and I think that that is the issue that we're trying to raise.

Because if in fact that is the way it's going to be then that should be clearly stated and we shouldn't be going around preaching the virtues of the private agencies and doing something very different when it comes down to sitting over a bargaining table when you start talking dollars and cents about it. Because that's where, that's where the real tilling comes in and I think there is a very interesting statement I think that Kenneth Clark once made in the book "Civilization", where he said, "If I had to judge the progress of civilization and look at the speeches given by the Minister of Housing and the number of housing units built, I'd prefer to look at the number of housing units built." An awful lot more is being told by what is being done than what is being said. That, Mr. Chairman, is the point that we're trying to make, that is is not being clarified very clearly.

The Minister accuses me of saying, okay, I have a statement. He says, I gave him the answer. Well he didn't give the answer. In fact if the Minister would go

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . .back and look at Hansard - he is so upset that someone would have the audacity to challenge in an Estimates, my goodness, what a horrible thing to be doing. The fact of the matter is when that question was asked he was saying, I'd be prepared to deal with it more at length in Estimates which isn't what we're doing. So what is all the upset if we raise questions. All of a sudden we're saying that I should have been totally satisfied and docilely accepted at face value his explanation. Well the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman - let's go back to the original case in point. Let's deal with it and let's deal with it fairly as the Minister asked for.

The fact of the matter is that several private agencies providing services primarily through a per diem arrangement were visited by a member of his department, in fact someone who was seconded from another department I believe and working sort of because maybe he's got more experience and where he said to people, here is the agreement. --(Interjection)-- I'm not being sarcastic. I'm just simply saying --(Interjections)-- I didn't challenge it. What am I saying? --(Interjections)-- What am I saying? --(Interjections)-- Well I think the Minister should cool it, take it easy. Let's go through the case, okay? Okay the facts are this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Would the members kindly talk through the Chair, not talk to one another privately.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . talk to the Chair. I find the Chair is less vociferous this evening than he normally is and therefore it's much easier to talk to him.

Mr. Chairman, the point of the matter - let's go through the case - is that several private agencies in the mental field, child care field, juvenile field were visited by a member acting on behalf of the Minister bringing an agreement in. The report back was he said, "Please sign that agreement." Not negotiated, not moneys, not sort of saying we're going to pay you \$800,000 and if it's true . . .

Mr. Chairman, we heard tonight at 8:05 this evening in fact that there was something more than a dollar being offered. That was not given in the original statement from Hansard that the Minister answered. That was not said. The first time we heard it was this evening, was that in fact the government was prepared to do more than simply require this agreement to be signed which at most offered a dollar and the other agreements offered nothing at all. Now that is the problem. Can you wonder that people would be disturbed by that kind of approach.

Would not also the Minister wonder if someone would feel intimidated. I did not say, and I would challenge the Minister again to go back to my remarks, I did not say that the government was going to take over. I said that when you give the power to do it, power can be abused. That is, the fact of the matter is that unless it is surrounded with some protections, some very clear delineation of the rights of the agencies involved, when they go about signing agreements like this, and all of a sudden they realize that for their maintenance they depend solely upon government support. At the same time they sign an agreement which says that this is the precondition for getting that support and that we have to sign over the thing. The obvious potential is there by which the government could when and if it wanted cut off the grants, the agency goes broke, the government takes over the assets and then as the Minister of Mines and Resources says, "delivers the service in its own way."

Now I'm not suggesting that that --(Interjections)-- well, --(Interjections)-- Well the fact of the matter - that's the problem. It is his combination. Mr. Chairman, I think that we had some mandate to talk about; what is the facts. And the facts are this: you have at one and the same time government giving grants upon which these agencies are dependent. On the other hand coming with an agreement and saying, we want all your assets, sign the agreement. Is it any surprise that some of them might think that in fact they're caught in a squeeze play. And at least, that even with all the best intentions and all the statements of honourable sort of, agreement, the fact of the matter it still gives the government the power, if, when and how it wants to exercise it, to simply stop the grant, agency goes broke, the agreement's in hand. They take over the assets; government has an agency on its hands. Now that is the potential that this kind of agreement that was being passed around represents. Mr. Chairman, that is the issue

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . .we were trying to clarify. That is the issue that we were trying to get at the heart of saying. There is no objection whatsoever to this government providing insurance against some return upon those moneys that it gives to private agencies, whether they are in per diem operating grants or even a proportion of them which would be added to capital. Never have I said it. The Minister of Mines and Resources and the Minister of Health and Social Development are again as they are wont to do, saying it's dormant. That was not said. But I am saying that within this agreement and the arrangements that are made is that potential for abuse. And I think that it is incumbent upon the government to ensure that there is perfect rights protected and that those rights are protected.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order. My honourable friend said let's stick to the facts. He is continually repeating that he has an agreement, that agreement was brought in, and stated to him that there was no agreement, that this document was brought in, these people were told not to sign it, to study it. There's no way we can put \$100 million - you can put \$1.00 and then let them bring out the equity that they have. They were told, this is not an agreement; they were told not to sign it. If we're going to stick with the facts, stick with the facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: It is a point of order, Mr. Chairman, when he says that we're going around with an agreement and telling them to sign it, because it's not right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's obvious that there are times in this House when one can disagree on the facts. And I think that the interpretation of the fact that I have are just as valid as those that the Minister offers. In fact perhaps maybe in that court of public opinion that the Minister of Mines and Resources so lovingly likes to appeal to, that it may be that the interpretation of my facts may in the end be more valid than his in the sense that he is trying to evince them. --(Interjection)-- We're bringing it out. What do you think I've been doing for the last hour but bringing it out. We've been talking about it. We've been talking about the fact, and the issue really is this. The issue is, if you are going to compel agencies to sign these agreements.--(Interjection)-- Well, let me ask this question then. Do the agencies get the grant if they don't sign the agreement? Let me ask that question. If an agency says, sorry, Mr. Minister, we don't like the agreement - basically, you know, go peddle your papers or whatever it is - we will have our lawyer draw up our own agreement and you sign our agreement. Will the Minister then still say that that won't affect the basis of giving a grant at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, they won't get a damn cent of capital grant until we know that we are protecting the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. Order please --(Interjection)-- Would the honourable gentleman please sit down. Would the honourable gentlemen please wait until they're recognized? No. 2(b)(1) Salaries. The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: The Member for Fort Rouge made some statements that I think have to be corrected. He's trying to give the impression that somehow this government is taking on to itself to push the private agencies out of the field because they desire to get into it. It's a lot of hogwash. Now, he gave the example that he'd like to see figures and not just hypothetical cases and not just policy stated. Well, I'll give him figures: 17 community residences for Mental Retarded have been started by this government. There were none before. The only one in Winnipeg was government-owned, that they had to take it over. But now there are 17 community residences, their own board, private groups, individuals are interested. And this government has never said that they want to do away with the private agencies or groups of citizens who feel that they want to contribute in their own way. We have welcomed it.

He mentioned the Housing Corporation. This province was the first province - I think there's one other now that's joined - which has recognized that where public housing is built a local housing authority should operate it, citizens living in the community, they are the housing authority who look after the housing. That's how it is in Manitoba. It's

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . .not run from a government office.

Mr. Chairman, if the member has any integrity at all let him go back to 1969 Estimates, let him go back to the 1970, and see the number of agencies, the growth in the number of agencies, which are funded by this government compared to former governments. There's been an increase regularly over the years. So any suggestion on his part as trying to picture this government as wanting to take over, is nonsense. He obviously this afternoon, or a few weeks ago and this afternoon, got himself into a bit of a jam and now he's trying to talk himself out of it - and he's a good talker I'll admit that, he's a very good talker - but it's nonsense. It just doesn't stand up to the examination, it doesn't stand up to the facts, it doesn't make any sense. He knows very well, and he himself would do this, and if he didn't I'd be surprised, he would want to protect the public equity. He has to protect it or he couldn't be in this House in all honesty and stand up and say otherwise.

What the government decided to do a number of years ago was that when the government, the public of Manitoba is contributing to capital, the capital, which over the years will mean that the property is enhanced, that when that organization decides they've had it for whatever reasons, they want new facilities, they want to get out of the old, whatever reasons, or they just want to fold up, that the public input shall be protected. If the organization raised \$10,000 for \$100,000 facility and \$90,000 then comes from the public purse through the per diem, then by God that \$90,000 has to come back to the Provincial Government through its equity. That's the only right way and the fair way. And what's more, the agencies know this and they're not really arguing. I don't know which particular group he's talking to, but I suspect that it's maybe somebody who has the old idea, just give us the money, never mind the accountability, never mind anything else. There are still some of those around, but they're very few and far between, because most people have enough sense to realize that that's not the way to operate. You cannot use public money to satisfy your own particular philanthropy and your own whims. You have to be accountable, as government is accountable, so that when that agency goes out of business it will know that it put up \$10,000; it will get back its \$10,000. It will not get back \$100,000 which wasn't theirs in the first place.

. . . . continued on next page

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, there's been a good deal of debate over the philosophy, the philosophical approach and the policy approach that the government has taken to this whole area of social service and the operation of private agencies in the field, and three Ministers have insisted to the committee tonight that the government does not want to do away with the private agencies; and if we accept that premise for the sake of argument, I wonder if we can proceed from that point to examine a couple of specifics.

I would like to ask the Minister and his colleagues, the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Minister of Urban Affairs who have backed him up in the position he's taken in this debate thus far, if the government does not want to do away with private agencies, is the government prepared to maintain an open door approach and an open ear approach to private agencies who want to get started in the social service field, particularly in the area of medical services, and I broach this subject because I have a specific in mind that I want to ask the Minister about. It's related to the crucial need in the province for treatment facilities and treatment programs for emotionally disturbed children, and I'm talking about seriously emotional disturbed children, those disturbed children who require medical treatment, who require medical attention.

The province at the present time sends most of its seriously emotionally disturbed children out of province to other provinces, to other treatment centres, because there are no facilities here for the treatment of the really psychotically ill child. So I pick up the debate at this point on the basis of the assurances, at least for the sake of argument, that the Minister has given us that there is a role for private agencies and the government does not want to interfere or intrude or do away with them, and I ask him to what extent is the government prepared to work with private agencies, to encourage private agencies to get into these fields where service is necessary, where they are prepared to give that service, but where they need support and of course funding and co-operation from the government itself. I'd like to start at that point with the Minister and then look at this specific field of service and facilities and treatment in the community of emotionally disturbed children.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I hope my honourable friend doesn't think we're going to go in that area under this. He says no with the first question but he said he wants to go from there and go on emotionally disturbed children. There'll be another chance for that. This is not what we're dealing with at all. We're talking about dealing with the agencies in general. I can tell my honourable friend that just two weeks ago we approved, Cabinet approved \$176,000 to set up a facility through the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Health Science Centre to do that, and then we're looking at other areas.

Now let us not, because I say that we want to work with the community, that doesn't mean that everybody that wants to open something that we will go ahead. We have to look at priorities. We have to look at standards, and so on, and I can tell you if my friend thinks that we want to encourage private hospitals, for instance, this is not what we've said. I'm not in favour, I'll tell you right now, I'm not in favour of seeing private hospitals where profit will be made out of people that are sick, and so on, I'm not too interested in that. You know, and if I'm going to be taken to task for that, well let's do it because I don't want to be misunderstood in the statement that I've made.

Now, there is a question of priority. I said that in general we want to do all the service, give them back to the community. I don't say that I want necessarily to have somebody that wants to make a profit out of this and that we're going to give them the per diem rate, and so on, then he can close his shop tomorrow, and so on, and sell his building. No, we don't want that.

Now, I certainly will have more to say on this field. I think it's a very important field. I think that we recognized last year that more should be done and we're moving in this direction. But his answer, talking about the agencies, we have a staff that look at all the requests that come from the agencies. Some we approve as I say - there's close to \$50 million in our budget for this year on that - and others are turned down and others will continue to be turned down. We have to have the standards where we're ready

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . .to move and the programs when we're ready to move, and so on, and we certainly will talk to the agencies. Some of the agencies will, I hope, not be taken over. Some of the agencies will probably not be funded after a certain time if we can transfer some of these things to the public, to the community, and so on, if we feel that it could be done better, and so on. But we will look at every agency the way we're doing now. We will look, but I can tell you now when 100 percent of the money comes from us it is no longer just an agency or volunteers, and so on, there's very little donations coming. And I think my honourable friend knows that. And they hire staff, and so on. Now are we going to be sitting here and you're going to tell us how many civil servants we have, that we have too many of them, and we're scrutinized by you that this is your role, and I think you're right, and I think you're right and say we have too many civil servants, this is all fine. But if we're going to have, one of those agencies is going to tell us, how dare you tell us how many people we should have; and we're going to pay, give them a blank cheque. No, Sir, no way.

You know we've got to see how this money is spent. We can't go on forever. We've got to try to plateau, to reach a plateau, to do everything we can. We've got an awful lot of work to do. We will look at the agencies. But the statement that was made, and it was made by other members, that we do not intend to take over the agencies and run everything. Well that is correct. And now we are going out trying to change . . . We've made some changes, and you would be the first one to chastise us if we didn't do anything. Last year we did away with the 20 percent owner's equity, and so on. We're paying the whole thing.

Now, all we want and I'll repeat again, that we want to protect the equity of the taxpayer or the people of Manitoba. This is all we want. Before we're going to give any other grants for capital, it would be ridiculous to say, well we'll decide that later on, or we'll have another situation like those that I've mentioned. This has to be rectified. It is something that was started by the Liberals many years ago. It was improved by the Conservatives. There's changes, and so on, by the former government, and now we're doing the same thing. We took the owner's equity out and we are saying we want to protect, and that's all we want. You know, I can say it in two words, we want to protect the equity, the money that the taxpayer, through grants, the government put in. We will definitely protect that. And the option is only if they want to quit. If they want to quit, if they want to sell, if they want to get out of the business. As long as they go out of the business, fine, that's something else, providing of course that we certainly, the same as we say to the hospital, we want to see your budget, and you would be the first one to knock me if I sent them a blank cheque. Because the agencies are doing a worthwhile service for the people, and so on, and if they come in with this attitude that who in the hell are we and why should we dare scrutinize their budget? Why should we say that we are not going to pay for certain staff? Well, then, fine, we're in a battle and I'll stand on that. I'll stand firm on that and I'll take all the abuse. I don't think I will get any abuse because I think he would want me to do exactly what I'm trying to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I perhaps will need your direction on this because the Minister started by saying that we would get down to this later in the Estimates. But, Sir, we're considering, we're discussing external programs here and that's what I'm talking about, external programs. I'm talking about groups, agencies associations, organizations, individuals, what have you, who are prepared to, who are interested in going into the social service, the community service field, particularly in the area of medicine, and I've raised a specific and that is in the care and treatment of emotionally disturbed children. There are other fields too, but this is one specific that I'm interested in and want to raise.

Now if you say to me that I can't talk about that until a further item on the Estimates, that's fine, but I hope you're still in the Chair at that time and I don't get ruled out of order when we hit that item, because I'm talking specifically about external programs. I'm talking about a program that would meet the needs of some of the emotionally disturbed children in this province which are not being met at the present

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . .time by any government-structured facility or government-structured agency or organization, but which would require a financial commitment, a financial input from the government or from the Province of Manitoba, and would be an input that was diligently scrutinized by the government in order that the operation could get off the ground to begin with. But I'm talking about the kind of proposal that can come to the government and be documented, can be financially audited, can be prepared with great diligence and great conscience so that the government knows precisely what the costs are, fixed and variable, knows precisely what the capital input would be, how the debt retirement would work; knows precisely what all the other costs the program would be. I'm not talking about a profit-making enterprise. I'm talking, in fact, about non-profit enterprises. But certainly the people that are connected with the kind of facility would be paid salaries. If that's profit then we live in a - we're in a crazy philosophical debate here. --(Interjection)--Naturally the salaries of the people involved would be included.

But if the government is not prepared or is not capable, or because of other priorities cannot undertake this kind of program, what I'm asking the Minister is, why can that type of external program not be undertaken by a private group of Manitoba citizens with government endorsement and with government support? And I'm asking him whether the door is open to that kind of approach and that kind of program, and what is necessary for the government to find it acceptable in their view to permit this kind of program to be launched by a private group? Are those doors open and if so, what are the procedures and steps necessary? Another aspect of it is related very closely to the emphasis the Minister has placed on scrutinizing the public purse. He says that he has a responsibility to protect the equity of the taxpayer of Manitoba, and there's no one here who would disagree with him.--(Interjection)--Well, I don't accept that. For the record, I don't accept the suggestion that the Minister just made to me. I think that there is no one here who would disagree with that. Of course, the equity and the taxpayer have to be protected. It may well be that the taxpayer could be better protected by permitting some of these private groups to do the kinds of things that I'm prepared to propose to the Minister rather than having the government take emotionally disturbed children and send them out of the province and have them treated in other provinces at a substantially greater cost. Perhaps it could be done here in the province by private groups cheaper; it will require per diem funding by the government. But I ask you, Sir, to compare that to the cost to the taxpayer of sending these disturbed children out of the province to be treated. So what I'm really, I suppose, asking you is, why can we not debate that under external programs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, external programs, first of all we've debated it already. But besides that I think that external - we're talking about in general how it functions - and then we have a pageful where there's no way that you're going to be deprived of your chance to speak. If you look on Page 28, you see under (k) Institutional Mental Health Services and (l) Institutional Mental Retardation Services, at the end of the bottom of the page (p) Community Field Services, and then Psychiatric Services on Page 29. I don't think this is the proper place to debate all these fields. We will focus on that in one of these places.

Now I answered the generalness, this is all I'm answering at this time, the general, how we deal with agencies. We will look at the application; we do that. And there are many factors. Some of them we approve and some of them we don't approve. We look at the priority. Now just because my friend - maybe this will make him happy and keep him until we can discuss it at greater length, I agree with him. I said that last year that I want to see us keep these children here as much as possible instead of sending them out of the province, and we are moving in that direction. As I said, there will be a holding hospital, and so on, if you would, the Health Science Centre, to start that, and that's Number One, and then there will be other facilities. I would like to discuss this at further length. But I would hope that under Resources which is just the staff and so on, that . . . fine. Let's talk about the principle, how we deal with agencies and this business of contract, that's exactly where we should discuss that.



## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . But if we're going to single out a program it would be a lot easier if we waited until we got to that and then give it a good go.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, that's fine then, Mr. Chairman. I will wait until we get to that section of the Estimates for most of the questions and most of the examination of that subject that I'd like to pursue.

But I would like to return to one basic technical question then, that I think does apply under this particular appropriation, and that is, how does a private agency, organization, or group go about obtaining the ear and the sympathetic hearing of the government for a proposal, for a proposition of this kind? It seems to me that many, or at least some approaches that I've been acquainted with have received pretty short shrift in the bureaucracy, and I'm not relating that to any specific provincial government, but the bureaucracy generally of a province such as this one? The appeal, the approach, the proposition seems to receive little sympathy, little attention from government because there seems to be an attitude on the part of government that these things are better done by the state, better done by government itself, than that if private organizations or agencies or groups are allowed into this kind of activity, well somebody is liable to make a profit. It seems to me that many of these things are rejected before the financial proposals, the detailed financial proposals, are even scrutinized, because many of these detailed financial proposals can demonstrate quite clearly to the government that the taxpayer could save money by doing it this way.

What I'd like to have from the Minister is an assurance from him that the practice of the department under his stewardship is one of open doors and open ears where this kind of an approach is forthcoming and some assurance from him that this department and this government encourages initiative and input from private groups who are interested in moving into this field in a non-profit way.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, there again, that's another example, you know, that my honourable friend probably hears from some people who might have been turned down. I don't know if he has any particular . . . so he makes the statement that we are not sympathetic and we're not listening.

Well, let's be realistic. We must have some sympathy when we spend very close to \$50 million funding these agencies. If somebody has a project he will bring it to the government, to the attention of the government, if it is something definitely that it is against the policy, and I'll give you an example: let's say that my friend tomorrow morning comes in with an idea of funding a hospital, a private hospital like they have in certain areas, well, fine, he will be told immediately - he was having a bunch of meetings and so on - he will be told immediately that we are not interested in that private individual or a group having a private hospital. So, all right, fine, then I suppose that he wouldn't be very happy. But if we're going to talk in general I say that the people bring their application, they will discuss it with us - I don't think it's fair to say that we haven't an open mind. As I stated last year it was difficult, it took a long time, and it still does, I think we've improved an awful lot, we're trying to streamline the system. There is a lot of information that we have but, you know, there's so many staff that we can have. Again, we go back to the staff that we have and we can look at these things, but we can't give him an answer, tomorrow. Oftentimes there is more information that we have to have.

If it is something that is definitely against the policy of the government, these people will be told. Like I say, if you want to start a hospital tomorrow, a private hospital, you'll be told immediately. And fine, it's fair game to discuss this and say, fine, you should allow private enterprise to go in the hospital field. We're against it and this could be discussed in the House and debated and fine, I certainly will still feel the same.

But in general, if my honourable friend is talking about general, we will listen to them and we do listen to them, and we will try to streamline the . . . we have and there's an awful lot more we can do. We'll never be satisfied. We've got to try to give the man that time. We're lax. It takes an awful long time to get an answer. That's true, you know. We're mortals and we have so much staff and fine, but at least we're trying constantly to improve the situation. But under this area I can't tell him

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . any more than I've told him and if under certain programs my honourable friend wants to bring in a certain example or a certain case, we'll debate it and we'll tell him. You know, I can't say offhand right now we're against this or we're for this in general. We have to know what my honourable friend is talking about, what case he's talking about. And some of them have been told that, no we will not participate. We certainly have to say no sometimes. It's certainly impossible to say to everybody that comes in - and I'm sure this is not what you want, that everybody that comes in fine, we should invite him to come in right away and give him all the answers in a day and accept everybody that comes in. There's no way that this will be done. Sometimes that's the name of the game. That's what a government is there for, to be able to determine priorities and policies and then go along with it.

So in general, if I can talk in general, I would like to see as much as possible these things run where we'll end up paying for the whole thing anyway. I think this will have to be run by the community, by boards in the community, and so on, but not by the government, not necessarily the government. The government doesn't run the hospitals. It's something in the same field.

Now, there's some people that come in and they want more. They want a level of standard that we are not ready and we're not able to give at the present time. And I suppose we will be judged on how well we determine our policies. But there's no doubt that some time we will have to say no, and we do say no, and those people then will come to their MIA and say, well you know they won't listen to us, they're not interested. That's fine. And then our MIA will write us letters and say you're not fair with them, and then when collectively we talk to them they'll say, yes put the lid on. They all tell me, put the lid on, there's too much, you're doing too much, too much staff, and so on. So you know, you can't win, but we'll try.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, yes, I do have a specific case and I will bring it to the Minister's attention, although it's already been brought to his attention and I don't have any information on it that he doesn't already have. But I am aware that he has a good deal of information cross his desk and I'm sure it's perhaps not uppermost in his mind, and I wouldn't expect it to be, but I will remind him of it and discuss it with him at the appropriate time.

But I'd just like to get one thing clear before we move off this item and that is, the Minister is saying to me that the policy of the government is that he is not in favour of private hospitals of any kind, that he is not prepared to consider an arrangement that would provide public support for private hospitals of any kind, even where the private hospital would be a non-profit operation that would meet a need in the community that the government cannot, because of particular priorities and particular time constraints, meet itself at the present time. Because if that's the case then, you know, then I think that the Minister and I are in sharply juxtaposed positions and we could get into a pretty lengthy debate on this point itself.

I would hope that the door that I spoke about is open and that there is an opportunity for consideration of requests, even from the private sector, when it can be demonstrated that it is a service that is necessary and that the government, because of particular constraints, cannot provide by itself.

MR. DESJARDINS: This door will certainly be open as long as I'm the Minister because I have no ideologies, hang-up on these things. And why I say I do not want private hospitals where people will make money on that, because I don't think it would work. I don't like what I see in the United States, and so on.

Now it is very difficult when I don't know, I have no example, we're talking in general, but policy in general is this, that as far as private hospitals, no, we're not interested. Now if there is something, there might be some situation that something cannot be done, and so on, fine, we'll look at it. You're talking about a situation where we have sent kids out of the province. Well, you know, fine, if we're going to pay a fortune out there and if there's something that can't be done in another way and there's people that can do it here, and give the same service, well I'm not going to say just, I'm against that from principle, we'll look at it. But now we're talking about in general, and the general I think it's pretty sound to say that this government and I as Minister,

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . I don't favour private hospitals where there's a profit motive normally in the hospital field.

I think that they have nothing but trouble in the United States and I don't think that it is the best way to run a hospital. This is not something that there should be a profit when you're dealing with sickness and the health of our people. But there might be some area that, as I say, I have no ideology hang-up. So you know, it's not just because this party or myself feel well, no, we'll never do that; we'll look at everything. But in general I might say that we would have to be proven that this is the only way or certainly the best way without any doubt at all, then we certainly will look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that I'm right in these external programs and I've been going through books here trying to find out, first of all, Mount Carmel Clinic, is that covered under External Programs? What kind of money are you contributing to Mount Carmel this year? What's the projection for 1975?

MR. DESJARDINS: It . . . by the MHRC.

MR. McKENZIE: It does come under this item.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, it'll be under the Manitoba . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Honourable Minister please wait until he's recognized. Otherwise the Honourable Minister will not be recorded in Hansard.

MR. McKENZIE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Well, that then will include Clinic Incorporated and the Health Centre on Aikens Street, they'll come some place farther on.

Now, may I then ask the Minister about the Family Planning Programs or the Rural Community Clinics, are they covered under this, because it's very difficult?

MR. DESJARDINS: This would be on Page 28 under (p) Community Field Services, External Agencies, if you look at (4) External Agencies.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, it comes under this item?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, most of the financing of the Mount Carmel comes under the Manitoba Health Services Commission which is the last of all in this department on Page 32, Manitoba Health Services Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister for Fort Rouge. Just a minute. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well then may I ask the Minister, would the Family Planning Programs then or the Rural Community Clinics, the Family Planning Program such as the pilot project that was taken at Duck Bay and Camperville, is that under this item?

MR. DESJARDINS: Page 28 (p) Community Field Services. It will be under that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned in one of his statements that he felt that the private agencies that received public support owed the public certain obligations, primarily ones of accountability, which makes sense. I presume that he would accept that the obverse holds true, that in effect the public agency that provides the support also has some obligation and requirements in relation to the funding that they give to the private agencies themselves to ensure that in fact the way in which that funding is administered, decided upon and delivered doesn't in fact end up becoming a burden or interfering with the operation. If the Minister will recall in discussion of his Estimates last year when we were discussing somewhat the same issue, we brought to his attention that again there had been severe problems in the transference of those funds so that some agencies were in fact still waiting to receive funds from one budget year in the next budget year and at the same time preparing for a third budget year. So in effect they were almost - and on going back and checking that this year we find out that again several agencies who were still waiting for word on their 1975-76 budget, were now operating in the 1976-77 budget year and were being asked to prepare budgets for 1977-78. So in effect there was a very large time extension, that they found any attempt to plan, to allocate costs, to absorb the kind of increase, inflation that one gets, like every institution gets, and that came down in part, and I'm prepared to simply ask the Minister in this case, that by the nature of the line by line budgeting system that was being required, that there seemed to provide one of the reasons for the

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . .tremendous delay in the transference of these funds or at least in the assessment that was being made by them. I'm wondering if it is not possible still holding to that principle of accountability, that the way in which agencies are financed, rather than requiring line by line budgeting for every item that has to be put down and negotiated, and quarreled about, in fact couldn't be done in forms of block granting where there would be certain amounts of payment for services per se, and that those would be the basic formula that would be applied. Now some agencies have per diem rates, and I gather, the problem again, with the per diem rate is that you are arguing about last year's rate while you are in this year's budget year and trying to prepare a budget for next year, your ability to assess and estimate costs gets slightly out of whack. So the question I would raise specifically with the Minister is: has there been any correction in the way in which the funds are both administered and transferred and is there any examination being done by his Policy Planning Division or his evaluation teams or his review analyst or whomever he assigns to these things to come up with a more efficient way of delivering the funds into the hands so that there isn't this long sort of time gap and time lag in the ability of these agencies to operate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly recognize some validity in what my honourable friend said. We still have not caught up. I think that we have improved an awful lot and in areas where we're late, we have paid for the deficit and in other areas we have given people funds in advance. I say I'm ready to recognize the validity but I want my honourable friend to do the same thing and I think that as a member of the opposition, what he's doing now is exactly right. But as a Member of the Government I want to say also, that it is not all one-sided. There are some people that have been asked, some agencies have been asked for certain information repeatedly, and if they don't come up with the information at times there is going to be a delay. So I think that there has got to be co-operation from both sides. I do hope that we can improve and speed this thing up, I know that we have to a considerable degree because I remember when I was the Health critic in opposition I felt exactly the same thing. I was a member of the board of the hospital and this is something that we're improving. I don't think we'll ever be perfect. I think that's impossible. I think we're improving but I don't want to let this go with the feeling that all delays are always the fault of the government. I know that at times I've been receiving calls from these agencies; I've called back ready to give them hell then I find out that there's letters, they've asked for information that was never forthcoming. So I think it's give and take on both sides and co-operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, taking the Minister's answer and saying that if there is in fact some problems, is there any progress being made in putting a different budget system into effect. Again I think that part of the problem rests on the existence of the form of line budgeting that is being required. I think that many other jurisdictions have discovered that while that gives accountants an awful lot to pour over, it doesn't necessarily end up in a more efficient allocation of resources. And whether in fact there are ways of re-assigning budgets really on the block granting per service and if they give - there's so much for administration, and so much for service, and so on, so that in fact, the budgets can be designed that way and the agencies wouldn't be required in effect to give the highly detailed information that is now being required, but at the same time it would be required to provide evaluation of the services at some junction point every two or three years or whatever it may be. So that there is that form of accountability still being held but without all the red tape and hassle that goes on between them in terms of making sure that they are able to operate efficiently - plus the fact that many of them are so small that they can't afford, or find it very difficult to get the kind of manpower to put those kinds of budgeting efforts into full effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this is quite interesting. My friend said that maybe this should be done every two or three years. Maybe I can make the suggestion

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . .that we deal with my Estimates too, only every two or three years. But I can say this to my honourable friend, that we've tried different methods and we're always going to explore to see if we can improve things. I can tell my honourable friend that we placed the hospitals on a global budget and now most of them want to come back on a line by line. So it is quite difficult.

I can say that to remedy this, to help improve the situation, we are moving towards the establishment of an office of residential care. We've had some of these agencies that through no fault of theirs and so on, they have to place a child and so on, there's something available, it might be a \$50 a day bed when all we need is a \$20 a day bed so we're trying to co-ordinate that. I have a staff that will do that and know the kind of the service that we can expect from certain areas and so on and that will be made available. You know, I think it's wishful thinking to think that everybody will have an answer the next day, once they've submitted their budget and so on. All I can do is promise, to go on record in saying that we're going to do everything we can to improve the situation. But again I say - and I've had that many many times, where I called staff in not too happy with them because of the long delay. Then they produce correspondence and so on that these agencies had requested certain information and so on that is very vital to decide on the per diem rate and that has never been forwarded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(b)(1) - \$187,100--pass; 2(b)(2) - Other Expenditures, \$15,000--pass; \$202,100--pass; 2(c) - Operational Support Services (1) - Salaries - the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to thank the Minister for having these inserts in the Estimates this year. At least it gives us some idea of what we're discussing even if we maybe had not been sticking to whatever it says in those particular items. But at least it gives us some type of idea of what to go by. Under (1) I would like to know how much space the department is renting and at what cost? I would like to know how many cars there are in this particular service and we are talking about communications. I'm wondering what type of communications the Minister is talking about and who decides the Drug Standards? Are there any actively practicing doctors or pharmacists on the Drug Standards and Therapeutic Committee? Actively practicing doctors on this committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: They're all actively involved doctors and pharmacists, druggists, all of them. Now as far as communication, we are talking about telephones, telex and so on. The cars, I will try to get that for you. I haven't got this at this time. The space, it's administered and run by the Department of Public Works. Okay?

. . . . . continued on next page

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(c)(1) \$539,300--pass; 2(c)(2) Other Expenditures - \$147,700--pass; \$687,000--pass; 2(d) Program of Review (1) Salaries \$122,500--pass - the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: I wonder if the Minister could give us some further explanation on this particular item. It says it provides evaluation and analytical services for the management of the department's programs, support programs, development and implementation and activities. I see that in almost every area, that we're, (a)(c) we have Planning, 2(a) we have Planning, 2(b) we have Monitoring, (c) we have Consultations. In (b) we have evaluations, and we have Evaluations and Programs and Policies all the way along. I wonder if the Minister could tell me whether these are pretty well the same people that are doing this evaluating or is this a different evaluating group for each area? Could he give us some explanation on the Program Review Board?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, as I tried to state earlier, I thought, pretty naive, when I got in the department, I thought we could make it very clean, that we would have a Department of Research and Planning and so on, and we would just farm out all this work, and it's not working quite like that. I talked about the Policy Committee and I said there'd be a staff of five or six, although there's only one, now. We're only talking about a staff of nine, of people that are evaluating some of these services, and so on. For instance, our air-ambulance service and so on. This is the kind of work that these people will do. So we're talking of about nine, now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I wondered if these are the nine gentlemen that are responsible for an overview of the whole \$395 million. Are they analyzing all the services as this suggests. Do they go in and analyze every department? Are they the efficiency experts is maybe what I'm getting at? Would that be the proper term?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: First of all that has nothing to do with MHRC. They are analyzing the programs within the department, the management of these programs and so on and the program that we have in the department now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(d)(1) \$122,500--pass. 2(d)(2) Other Expenditures \$50,000--pass; \$172,500--pass; 2(e) - (1) Salaries, \$216,500. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: This provides personnel services to the department in the recruitment, selection and evaluation of staff, the evaluation and classification of positions and the development and training of staff resources. Here, I'm wondering again, are these the same nine people that we were talking about in (b) evaluating staff?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: No. This is 15 people that are dealing strictly with staff now, with personnel. They're retraining, hiring, the classification. Don't forget we are the largest employer in Manitoba.--(Interjection)--Well, it's a fact. A while ago I was told we'd get more money from more people. No. There's over 3,000 people in there, employees in there. Well, no, there's more than that because you've got Beausejour also. They evaluate, they recruit, they employ, classification and so on is done there. This is strictly the personnel, dealing with employees, not with programs or anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, do you mean to say that - through you to the Minister - that these 15 people, are they the people that are responsible, that have brought in all these contract people over local Manitoba staff? Are these the same 15 people that would be responsible for importing all these Americans on the Mincome Program? Are these the people that make those decisions, these 15 people?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: These people look at all the employees, the evaluation, the hiring, the recruiting of the people, not only in Mincome, but in all the areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(e). The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Where does the Civil Service Commission fit in? When you make application that you need a certain staff in your office don't you make application to

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . the Civil Service Commission and they select a suitable person for the position?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Of course we have to know what kind of personnel we need so we have to have the job description and so on. When it is decided to see if we are going to hire anybody or replace anybody, all that has to be prepared. It is sent to the Civil Service Commission. When there is a Board, there is always somebody from each department there, because you know civil servants are not necessarily expert in everything. But there is somebody from the Civil Service Commission but every department is usually represented. Usually it's two from the department and one from the Civil Service. It could vary. They are people that go along with that and prepare all the forms and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(e)(1) \$216,500--pass; 2(e)(2) \$67,500--pass; \$284,000--pass; 2(f)(1) Salaries - \$325,700 - the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Under this particular item, Vital Statistics, I wonder is there any duplication in this of work that is done by the Federal Government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1) \$325,700--pass - the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, this section of course just deals not with The Child Welfare Act itself, of which the Member for Point Douglas brought in that curfew situation, but would this be the department that one would go to to find out if we have an exodus of people from the province or we have a surplus of people. Would this be the people that would compile this information?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, they'll give us the births and the deaths but the travelling between frontiers no. That's not their job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: The question may have more validity than may have been realized by the Minister because I think there is a mystery as to how the government determines how many people do come in and how many people leave. Although that is involved in immigration and emigration.--(Interjection)--No, obviously it's not involved in vital statistics. Nor I would think particularly within the department. But it's interesting because if in effect if I'm correct - and I mention this because it has been mentioned by the Honourable Member for Wolseley - really all we have in determining how many people come in and how many people leave is a formula which is based on family allowance cheques and in effect all they do is multiply a factor on that as to the determination as to what happens. All that is done is the determination of the base figure in which births are added and deaths are deducted, and the formula is applied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: I have enough problems without worrying about something that is not in the department. But let me say this, that my honourable friend . . . very good data through the Manitoba Health Services Commission. I think more and more this is what we rely on because we really have facts. Now I'm not talking about visitors but people that are established residents in Manitoba.

MR. SPIVAK: But there is no way in which that is affected by Vital Statistics, that that is something apart so we'll discuss it later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I'm wondering like in the Department of Vital Statistics how the Minister or the Department made out with those two gentlemen that wanted to get married a year ago. Was that ever registered?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Would you do me a favour, Mr. Chairman, and not recognize me at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine. 2(f)(1)--\$325,700--pass. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, last year we passed an Act that redefined the meaning of death which came under Vital Statistics, and I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to report on the degree to which that Act has been implemented and what the state or condition of those kind of changes were. Has it been applied in the hospitals and

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . has there been cases where in fact it's had to be interpreted?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, Vital Statistics will record death. My honourable friend is talking about a change to determine death, this is for the use of the doctors in the hospital. But I don't know what I can report except that that is the legal description of death now. This is only the registering of death, not the determined death.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I guess the question is then: who in fact is looking at that issue? I think that we've all been aware because of the particular case down in New Jersey about the difficulties of determining when someone's life comes to an end. This House spent a number of fairly long hours last May or June in a bill that was, at that time . . . bill and called Vital Statistics which was to change the meaning of death from heart stoppage, I believe, to when the brain ceased to function. It caused some concern. There was a fair amount of dispute and while I realize it is something that the doctors themselves have to apply, I would have assumed that the Department of Vital Statistics whose - at least that was the name of the bill that was given, it seemed to be in their jurisdiction - who in fact is monitoring the developments under that particular bill to find out how it's being applied and whether in fact there's any problem in its application and really in effect what has been the result since that bill's been passed?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I haven't heard of any problems. The time of death, there's a registration has to be filled and filed before a burial permit is given and the physician attending the patient or the coroner, if there is no physician, will have to sign this registration form, will have to give the cause of death. That Act gave the guidelines. That's all I can say about that.

As far as monitoring to make sure that this is doing well, I guess the only protection we have or the best protection, because before this thing was brought in last year there was a lot of work, a lot of scrutiny. I think that the recommendations - and the study was made by the Law Reform Committee and this is at their request that we change the Act, amongst other people.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, again I assume then that the Act is in effect being applied, I gather from when he says, that there has been no exceptional cases brought to his attention about where in fact there's been an issue about that. I wonder again - because I'm not sure where within the jurisdiction, perhaps it's under the Public Health - about the question of autopsies and the registration of those kinds of examinations that are given to determine the cause of death. Is that something that would be under the jurisdiction of Vital Statistics or is it something we can raise in the matter of Public Health areas.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I raise it is that again a case was brought to me by a constituent where in fact someone had died under fairly unusual circumstances. An autopsy was performed but several tests, for example, tests that would have registered if there had been any effects of chemicals, is not performed as a normal part of an autopsy. The Minister recalls the great fuss and furor we had last summer about the spraying and there was claims and counter claims on both sides of that issue. But one of the groups of parents involved, who became very concerned about the death of one of their children, discovered that when the autopsy was performed it didn't include certain tests that might have registered whether in fact there had been any effect of chemical poisoning. I'm wondering what the requirements again are in the performance of autopsies, if again the department is reviewing whether in fact there should be a change in the autopsy operation and a wider range of tests administered.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I'd like to inform my honourable friend that I've changed professions. I'm less interested in dead people now and I'm more interested in keeping the people alive. This question that you're talking about would come under my friend the Attorney-General. It used to be The Coroner's Act, I think, now it's The Medical Examiner's Act. Is that it? And it comes under the Attorney-General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(f)(1) \$325,700 - the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I have one more question and it's on Page 21 on the Annual



## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . Report. It mentions that the Minister intends to appoint more marriage commissioners. Is that a request by the clergy or are they not able to fill that position or . . . ?

MR. DESJARDINS: This has been a request from the judges that want to be relieved of that and so on and we're appointing marriage commissioners in certain areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(f)(1) \$325,700--pass; 2(f)(2) \$39,000--pass; \$364,700--pass; 2(g) (1) Salaries \$198,200 - the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: This provides medical equipment to facilitate the care of patients in the home and the central distribution of certain other medical supplies, wheel chairs and home oxygen delivery system. I wonder if the Minister could elaborate, for instance, approximately how many wheel chairs are there out under this program? What type of monitoring program does he carry on to determine whether these wheel chairs are still in use. I'm wondering if the equipment that is under this Home Care Program, whether it is being used and returned at its earliest possible date. I wonder is there any monitoring going on in this particular program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend - you were asleep this time. We had 17, now we've got 19. We've got an increase here.

Yes these programs are monitored. I think that we have a little in excess of 3,000 wheel chairs and about 30 to 40 motorized wheel chairs. This was a new program we started last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wish to say to the Minister that the program appears to be orientated to the city and not to the country and the north. How would he answer that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, there are approximately close to 2,000 wheel chairs and services in Winnipeg and 1,500 in the rural areas. We've opened offices in larger centres such as Brandon and The Pas.

MR. SPIVAK: Can I ask the Minister where the distribution centre is for all of this. Is it not Winnipeg?

MR. DESJARDINS: We have also opened centres in Brandon, Dauphin and The Pas.

MR. SPIVAK: The main distribution centre is in Winnipeg? In terms of the demand, in terms of satisfying demand, is the Minister in a position to indicate now that with respect to the demands that are made that they are satisfied and that there is no difficulty at all or are there hardships in the province, in the north and in the rural areas.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend says there's always a problem but this is an area where not a single problem was brought to my attention and although I received a few letters of people that have been very pleased with the services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just one question to the Minister. How do people in need of medical supplies and home care equipment go about getting it? How is the administration of the equipment handled? Is it directed through a person's doctor or is it obtainable on request? Depending on that answer, could the Minister advise us whether there are any areas of the city that would be particularly disadvantaged where that kind of service was available, or does it meet needs in a general way throughout the community?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, it's a free lending service and usually the request will come through the doctor, and also we have people in the team that I was talking about in the region, in each region, and the request might come from them also, when they see a need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(g). The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask the Honourable the Minister, with the home care treatment of patients, what the experience is? I certainly support the program. There's certainly lots of people that can be treated in their home much cheaper and maybe better than a hospital. Is the policy still in effect that the next-of-kin don't

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . qualify, it has to be - I've had some problems where it had to be somebody that wasn't next-of-kin come in and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: This is not the area. There must be a place for home care. Oh yes, Page 27, under (g) Continuing Care Services, we could study because it's quite an important program and I imagine there'll be a lot of questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1). The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: The Minister didn't answer one of my questions, and that is, who is monitoring this particular program. It has been brought to my attention that sometimes when this equipment is delivered into a home and it is no longer needed that it may be staying there months at a time before it is picked up. I'm just wondering whether there is anybody or any group in charge of that particular program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, there is an automatic follow-up but I guess it depends how busy they are and what the demands are. And they might at times, be I suppose a little slow in doing some pick-up. I think when you're dealing with so many pieces of equipment that's bound to happen, but there is a pick-up. Every month or so, this is checked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(g)(1). The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Yes, Well I just wonder if the Minister on the Other Expenditures there, are you adding more equipment. It's gone up from 397,000 to 688,000. Is there more, that's more wheel chairs or more - what's new that's being added there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the major items covered are \$124,000 for the Ostomate Program, and I think that's a program that we're very proud of; I think that's one of the only places that they have such a--(Interjection)--the only place. We've had people from different areas in the States, and so on, that have been coming, trying to get information on that. \$55,000 for motorized wheel chairs; \$160,000 for new home oxygen delivery system; and \$144,000 for the purchase of home care equipment and medical supplies. And other costs cover warehousing and office expenditure.

I should tell you maybe as I stated that we have two, we felt that this was an important program. There's new programs in there also. We have two additional staff man year. One new staff is to assist the present shipper-receiver whose workload has increased by 70 percent, and is still increasing; and the second position to train as a maintenance technician in the oxygen delivery system. And I think we will probably have a much better service and we should save an awful lot on this by delivering this service that before they used to have to come to the hospital, and so on.

MR. McKENZIE: Well Mr. Chairman, then are these supplies all drawn from one warehouse or are they scattered in - is there one central warehouse? I just wondered if the Minister could advise are all the supplies stored and drawn out of one central warehouse or are they in scattered locations?

MR. DESJARDINS: I've answered that question. The main people are here in Winnipeg and then there is Dauphin, Brandon and The Pas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(g)(1) \$198,200--pass; 2(g)(2) \$688,000--pass; \$886,200--pass; Resolution 57, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,645,600 for Health and Social Development--pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee has considered certain Resolutions, has directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, that the report of the Committee be accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Who is your seconder?

IN SESSION

MR. JOHANNSSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the report of the Committee be accepted.

MOTION presented and carried.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Before we adjourn I would like to ask leave to replace the Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources with the Member from Point Douglas on the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: (Leave)

The Hour of Adjournment having arrived the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow. (Friday)