

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 17 April, 1980

Time: 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY — CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order. 1.(c)(1) — The Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just before we broke, I was drawing to the Minister's attention the fact that the Museum of Man and Nature is not open in the evening during the week. The other organization that sticks out like that is the Winnipeg Art Gallery, which is closed Mondays and not open during any evening during the week, or on Saturday. So I say to the Minister that I think that it's imperative that she either get the money for these organizations to enable them to be open a couple of evenings during the week for the people who work, or should make it a condition of a grant that they are open, because they used to be open. And I guess as budget constraints got tighter, they started to reduce their hours, and if you're going to have a facility that's worth millions of dollars, it has interesting artistic and cultural objects, it's ridiculous that it is not open. And if you also want public support, then the public has to be able to access these facilities. So I simply say to her, has she considered this problem and come up with a solution, or would she kindly tackle it, because I think it's rather a sad state of affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, the restricted hours, while it's not the answer to the problem, dates back three or four years. But I would like to tell the Member for Elmwood that we have given the museum \$136,000 extra this year and we've given the Art Gallery \$94,300, and hopefully this will ease some of their budgetary problems and be able to have extra hours.

MR. DOERN: Again, Mr. Chairman, I think that the increased grants are desirable, and certainly is a step in the right direction, but what if the Minister continues to increase the grants approximately in line with inflation or expansion and the hours remain the same? I think the Minister should call these people in and have a discussion, and attempt to receive a commitment from them that they will open their doors a couple of evenings a week. Because the fact that you gave them money does not ensure access to those facilities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(1)—pass; 1.(c)(2)—pass; 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass; 1.(e)(1) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, it's difficult dealing with this Minister, because I just came out of dealing with the Minister of Government Services, and he matches you word for word, you see, and so I am unaccustomed to the brevity of the present Minister. On the translation services, this is something I just spoke about yesterday in regard to Bill 2. I assume this is the area of trans-

lation. Is this the area of Hansard — sorry, not Hansard but the Legislative Assembly translation?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. DOERN: It's allocated in this particular department. So I wanted to get some further clarification here. I see some sizeable dollar amounts, in fact I guess it's almost \$500,000, which is the figure the Attorney-General quoted for translation, and this is, of course, for legislative translations and court translations. I also ask the Minister this question. Today I happened to phone the Queen's Printer, and it occurred to me that they are going to be now printing in both languages, much more than ever before in the past, and I assume that this may also add to their costs and I was just wondering whether, in addition to these figures, which are hefty figures, whether there is also a corresponding cost. Now I realize it no way compares to the amount of money, but is there also some new demand on the Queen's Printer because of the fact that there will be more printing in both languages and maybe more proof-reading and a little more paper being used and certainly more time in terms of hours spent on this aspect of the English-French translations.

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned in my opening remarks, we did have four staff man years, and now we have 15, an increase of 11, which includes the Director, nine translators, a reviser and four support staff. With regard to the Queen's Printer, that comes under the Government Services and I can't answer any questions in that regard.

MR. DOERN: Similarly, certain publishing costs which I interpret to mean publication costs, there are ads put into the newspapers for different things, I assume that some of these may now be printed in French as well, although I'm not certain, and I ask the Minister whether this would be related to her department or whether that again is another departmental responsibility?

MRS. PRICE: The only thing that relates to my department is the translation, which they do for different departments, but I can't tell you how relative it is to the expenses of the different departments.

MR. DOERN: Are there federal recoveries here? Has the Minister or the government contacted Ottawa or received a commitment to recover these additional expenditures?

MRS. PRICE: In the past we have had some help in translation services, but the government of Canada has terminated their cost-sharing program with us as of this year.

MR. DOERN: But I believe the Attorney-General indicated he had contacted Ottawa. Is the Minister aware of that?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I am aware of it, but I don't know what the outcome is of the dialogue.

MR. DOERN: You have no part in that negotiation.

MRS. PRICE: No.

MR. DOERN: The other thing, Mr. Chairman, is other languages, I assume there is some in House capacity to translate other languages, that there are people available. I recall a few years ago in our government, I believe, that if letters were received in other languages, that there were people in the government who maybe were just in other departments who could be contacted. Do you still have that capability? And does any of the cost show up here?

MRS. PRICE: We hire some freelance translators from time to time for this just as the problems arise, or the occasions arise, I should say.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister give us SMY projections again? How many new staff have been hired and how many will be hired over the next few years?

MRS. PRICE: At the present time it is 11.

MR. DOERN: Eleven new?

MRS. PRICE: Yes. We had four and now we have 15.

MR. DOERN: Will that increase to another five or ten in the next few years?

MRS. PRICE: It is not likely.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister indicate where these people are housed?

MRS. PRICE: The people that we have from Quebec, the three translators, are housed, they are rather working out of 390 York Avenue.

MR. DOERN: And the other eight people?

MRS. PRICE: They will be too.

MR. DOERN: Oh, I see. They're not on board yet.

MRS. PRICE: We're just working on them now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(e)(1)—pass; 1.(e)(2)—pass; 1.(f)(1)—pass. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on the Film Classification Board, I note there is a reduction in the projected expenditures and I wonder how that can be explained. The salaries are up only a bare percentage and the other expenditures are down \$4,500.00. Can we have an explanation there?

MRS. PRICE: We had two SMYs. We still do have them. There has been a minor reorganization. We had the projectionist there and also does some work for viewing and saves time for and expense of others viewing, if he happens to be there.

MR. DOERN: How many people are on the board now?

MRS. PRICE: Fifteen.

MR. DOERN: Who is the chairman?

MRS. PRICE: Hope Carroll, she is sitting right here.

MR. DOERN: Who is that?

MRS. PRICE: Hope Carroll, Mrs. Carroll.

MR. DOERN: That's Mrs. Jack Carroll.

MRS. PRICE: No, it's Mrs. Hope Carroll.

MR. DOERN: Okay, it just clicked in my mind who she was, having met her some time ago. I was also wondering whether there had been any new classifications or any new policies in the past year? Has there been any liberalization on the part of the board or any new categories, etc., etc.

MRS. PRICE: No there hasn't.

MR. DOERN: Well then I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I detect some liberalization. I gather it is quite an experience to watch several hundred movies a year. If it doesn't turn your brain to jelly it certainly affects your aesthetic judgement. And I simply mention that I am quite a movie-goer and I happened to see the movie, Serial, the other day, which I thought was quite good, with Martin Mull, etc., Tuesday Weld, who is not one of my favourite actresses. But I heard a few words there that I had never heard before. Let's say no, I shouldn't say that. I should say I heard them a long time ago, and I've heard them every other day of my life, but I have never heard them on the screen. I won't repeat what they are but I'll whisper them in the ear of some of my friends at the end of the table later on. I was just wondering again whether —(Interjection)— No, it's the people who blow in your ear, you worry about, not the ones who whisper in your ear.

Mr. Chairman, I'm just saying that there were a few words that I heard at that movie and it just struck me instantly that there must be some liberalization in that I've never heard them on the screen before, and I was just wondering if the Minister is breaking any new ground or maintaining the strict moral standards of the previous Ministers or what.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think there could be any more liberal ground broken. You are asking the wrong one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: The difference between the titles which they have strictly restricted, restricted, mature, and whatever and I would like to find out the percentage point. What is the restricted? Well first, I would like to find out the difference of the nature of the films.

MRS. PRICE: If you will just wait while it is being compiled, I'll come back to you with the answer.

MR. MALINOWSKI: I beg your pardon.

MRS. PRICE: If you'll just wait for a couple of minutes while the definitions are being compiled, I'll come back to you with the answer.

MR. MALINOWSKI: And also I would like to find out the percentage of those categories of films, maybe in the same time.

In the meantime, if we will have a film, for instance, restricted, or vulgar, let's put it that way, what kind of power does the Classification Board have to reject?

MRS. PRICE: They don't have the power to reject. It's not a censoring board, it's strictly a classification board, and they tell the movie houses what they have classified it as, and it's up to the movie houses to accept it or reject it.

MR. MALINOWSKI: So it means that we don't have any power whatsoever to stop a certain film?

MRS. PRICE: That is correct.

MR. MALINOWSKI: We don't.

MRS. PRICE: No power to reject them, no.

MR. MALINOWSKI: No power to reject. Further concerning this, because we don't have any power to reject such films, it means, maybe I don't understand, if I am wrong, please correct me, that any film may come here and will be shown in our shows here.

MRS. PRICE: As I said, the people that have the movie houses are informed of the findings of the people in the Classification Board, and it's up to the movie houses to decide whether they are going to show them or not. They are given fair warning by the Classification Board how they feel about these certain movies, but it's strictly a Classification Board, not a censoring board. The police have the power to close them.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Who? I'm sorry?

MRS. PRICE: The Police Department.

MR. MALINOWSKI: If I'm not mistaken, several times the Venus Theatre has been taken to court. Who pressed the charges? The Classification Board, or the police?

MRS. PRICE: The Police Department did.

MR. MALINOWSKI: The Police Department. Well, I am waiting, if I can get those differences in percentages.

MRS. PRICE: The classification general means everyone can attend; mature, some mature content is in the movie; adult parental guidance, no one under 18 unless accompanied with their parents; restricted adult, no one under 18. Your other question that you asked about the percentages that are shown, general is about 8 percent; mature, 48 percent; adult parental guidance, 20 percent; restricted adult, 33 percent.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, again, I assume that some films are stopped, or am I mistaken in that regard? Are there some films that are not classified, but barred?

MRS. PRICE: I think that is on heresy. The police have to do that, not our board.

MR. DOERN: So I'm saying that if a film is brought in and the board looks at it and everybody throws up, they still classify it, they don't stop it.

MRS. PRICE: But they advise the movie houses and the police about it.

MR. DOERN: I see. Mr. Chairman, I'm thinking of the movie, I guess it wasn't that bad, it was just sickening, Cruising. I don't know if the Chairman remembers that one. It was pretty hard to watch. The other question I had again is, are any films classified that go on television or is there anything on television that the board looks at?

MRS. PRICE: No, we don't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm wondering about the customs at the federal level, whether they ban any films or not. Does the Minister know, Mr. Chairman, whether or not some films are banned at the customs level?

MRS. PRICE: The customs do have the power to seize pornographic movies.

MR. ADAM: Yes. Do they view all the movies, Mr. Chairman, or how do they get the information? Because I have received numerous letters in regard to a particular film that was made in Sweden. The title of the film was Many Faces of Jesus, which depicts him as a homosexual and whatever it says, anyway, in the Bible. There has been a lot of concern expressed to me in this regard and I'm just wondering if there is any mechanism from here, from the Classification Board, whether they have any way of communicating with the customs, that they recommend that such a film be examined and banned. Is there anything in that manner? I received 50 letters in regard to this. I did get in touch with the board and sent them copies of all these letters that I had received. And I got a reply and they told me that there were no restrictions, that there was no censorship on the films. I knew that, I didn't have to be told that that's the way that it was operated. But I was just wondering if there was any way that the board can relay that information or a recommendation to the customs to review this film, because they are very upset about this film, especially the Roman Catholics anyway, that I heard from.

MRS. PRICE: I'm sure that your colleagues, as well as my colleagues, all received many letters in that respect. I know I did. And I understand that the customs received many complaints about that picture, too, but any picture that the customs allows to go through, we do not have the power to reject them. However, by the time all this publicity has gone along, many times the movie house themselves will reject it, or the police, as I say, will step in and bar it.

MR. ADAM: Thank you. Madam Minister has just advised us that she has received many letters of complaint

on this particular film, I believe. Well, did she write to the customs?

MRS. PRICE: No, I did not write to them.

MR. ADAM: Would she write to the customs in this regard, bringing to their attention that this film is offensive to a great percentage of people in the province of Manitoba, and that they should review it very closely before they allow it to come in?

MRS. PRICE: I believe at this time the film is not available in Canada.

MR. ADAM: Did the Minister say it was not available?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. ADAM: And it's not banned.

MRS. PRICE: The Chairman of the Classification Board has had calls from members of Parliament in Ottawa who said they have been in touch with the customs in regard to this particular film.

MR. ADAM: I see. I know that it has been banned in a few countries, I'm not sure, France for one, and maybe Israel, and maybe a couple more. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, this is rather an interesting subject here to me this evening. I would like to ask the Minister if she could inform the members of the committee, prior to what is now known as the Manitoba Film Classification Board, was the Censorship Board. Could the Minister indicate what was the last year that we had the Censorship Board, pertaining to the responsibilities of the kind of films that are being shown to the public in Manitoba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: 1972.

MR. EINARSON: 1972 was the last year that we had the Censorship Board, and just shortly after that, the government of the day, in 1972, brought in the Manitoba Film Classification Board, am I correct on that?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, there was legislation passed and a new Act was put in, that's when it was rejected and the Classification Board was initiated.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I'm sure that the people who are responsible, who are to carry out their duties as members of the Film Classification Board, are concerned. Having listened to the comments from the Member for Ste. Rose and the kind of film that he described here this evening that so many people in Manitoba have great objection to, I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister through the Chairman of the Manitoba Film Classification Board and their members would care to comment whether that kind of film would have the kind of objection amongst the people if we still had the Censorship Board.

MRS. PRICE: Under the Censor Board that there was in the past, we would have had the powers to ban it,

with the change in the legislation and the Classification Board, we do not have it. I do think that the board does an excellent job in advising the movie houses as well as the police and the public so that they have an opportunity to know just how detrimental to their children, for instance, certain movies are to watch. I think they certainly have a good opportunity to be able to distinguish what is right for them or right for their families. The Classification Board does an excellent job.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister very kindly for her comments. I think it bears taking note that the comments and the questions that the members of the opposition have been asking who are a part of the legislation they brought in, in 1972, should take full responsibility for the kind of reactions the public is now conveying to the Film Classification Board, and those who are now responsible. This is a very important comment that I want to make. This is the reason why I'm posing these questions, Mr. Chairman, is to bring out this fact. I'm sure that the Member for Elmwood, the Member for Point Douglas and the Member for Ste. Rose must have some very serious misgivings of the legislation that they had to take full responsibility for when they established the Film Classification Board. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the comments by the Member for Rock Lake, I would like to point out that with 10 provinces it's very difficult for each province to have its own regulations. I'm almost certain that most provinces do not have any censorship; there may be some, but I would doubt if there's any left. It is much preferable that any censorship of films be done at the national level; in that way, you don't have to have a multiplicity of different legislation. For instance, if we had censorship in Manitoba and you had none in Saskatchewan, then the film would be barred from coming to Manitoba but it wouldn't be barred from coming to the province of Saskatchewan or perhaps Alberta or other provinces that did not have censorship. So I think it's much better to have that kind of legislation at the federal level. I am opposed to censorship myself, although this film here if it's objectionable to a great number of people, what we should do is recommend to those people at the federal level, the customs, because that's not the only thing that they stop coming in. They stop many other things from coming into Canada. —(Interjection)— Well, the Minister says you can't have it both ways but you can have it 10 ways, if you have 10 provinces with 10 different pieces of legislation in regard to it. And that's the point that I want to make. So I think that the comments that the Member for Rock Lake is making is irrelevant, really.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I can't let those remarks pass from the Member for Rock Lake. I also want to correct something that I said about him the other day. I said that he reminded me of John Wayne; I meant to say Gary Cooper, because I know that the member is sincere and I know that he is a clean-living, God-fearing farmer from southern Manitoba, at least I believe he is. I want to say that the legislation he's criticizing was

introduced by our government, but I'm saying, you're the government, if you don't like the legislation, change it. You cannot say that it's our legislation, that we're responsible. You have continued that legislation, you have supported that legislation; you now have a board which you appointed; you have a Minister from your party; you are the government; it's within your power, so therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is now your legislation. I also mention that there are categories, it isn't just a case of children going in to see dirty movies. There are categories, there is parental guidance, etc., etc., etc. And I also say — and maybe the Member for Rock Lake didn't hear me — I believe there has been some liberalization. If he wants an illustration, I'd tell him to go and see the movie, *Serial*; he'll have a good laugh but he might be shocked at some of the language because certainly in my judgement there's language used in that movie that was never before heard in the theatres in the province of Manitoba. So I simply say in conclusion that, sure, it's our legislation but it's now your legislation; if you want to change it, there's nothing to prevent you from changing it.

MRS. PRICE: I would like to say to the Member for Ste. Rose that, while you think that there are different types of boards in the different provinces, this is the only one that is a Classification Board. Every other province in Canada is a Censor Board. But I would also like to point out to him that when films are banned in other provinces, they very often are rejected here because the movie houses do not want to get the bad publicity for it. But this is the only Classification Board in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f)(1)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think there's an obvious question which comes out of this exchange with members of the government, and I would put it on behalf of those who hold this view, and ask the Minister whether she's going to tighten up or reintroduce censorship or do something of a more conservative bent, or is she going to continue in the same direction that she has been.

MRS. PRICE: I would tell the Member for Elmwood that I am certainly prepared to look at it because I not only share his views, I am probably even more conservative than he is as far as creative films are concerned; anything more drastic than Walt Disney is too much for me.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister misunderstands me. The question I just posed was not my question. I see certain films and certain liberalization. I am not suggesting to the Minister that there should be tighter censorship. I am saying that there are some who do, obviously the Member for Rock Lake, maybe the Minister of Agriculture, but I am just saying that —(Interjection)— I am trying to be careful and I am simply saying that I assume that the Minister and the government intend to continue along the same lines and do not intend to reintroduce censorship. Having said that, a lot of the films that come here, I gather, are already scissored and censored, so the so-called dirty work I think is done in Ontario for us and we tend to,

I understand, get their films and then we just classify them. Is that right?

MRS. PRICE: That is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f)(1) — the Member for Point Douglas.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how much the theatre owners are paying for a so-called classification of one film; and number two, how much are we getting per year.

MRS. PRICE: The revenues that we got for 1979-80 is \$73,600.00.

MR. MALINOWSKI: The Honourable Minister may have knowledge of what kind of revenue we had when we had a censorship board.

MRS. PRICE: Pardon me?

MR. MALINOWSKI: What was the revenue when we had, instead of classification, censorship?

MRS. PRICE: I would have to take it under advisement and come back to the Member for Point Douglas about it. It's approximately \$180 for a film; it's \$13.50 per reel; and the average price runs around \$180.00.

MR. MALINOWSKI: \$150.00 a film?

MRS. PRICE: \$180.00.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f)(1)—pass; 1.(f)(2) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I assume again that all films are classified, for example, here is the problem. The foreign language films — there are some films that play at Cinema 3 which are often very fine films — are all of those films classified as sort of art-type of film? And what about films in other languages like Italian, German, etc., etc.; do you look at those films as well?

MRS. PRICE: I understand that they are usually subtitled and the ones that aren't, on request they have people come in to do the interpreting. There are some on the board who can speak and understand different languages.

MR. DOERN: You're saying the language problem, sometimes somebody can translate and sometimes there are sub-titles. But I assume that in addition to that there could be scenes that you don't have to speak the language; you can see with your eyes. So all of those films are classified.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, every one is classified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f)(2)—pass; 2.(a)(1) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have a lot of general questions that I wanted to ask about. I don't know if this is the correct area but I assume it's as good as any and that is in regard to the Art Support Program; I'm thinking now of painters and sculptors. I was wondering

whether there has been any purchasing of art through this department or any leasing of paintings or sculpture through the department.

MRS. PRICE: There hasn't been any purchasing through our department and any support for these painters or sculptors is done through the Manitoba Arts Council.

MR. DOERN: I assume that the Minister reports for the Arts Council.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I do.

MR. DOERN: Can she indicate whether there have been any purchases and what dollar value that might be over the past year?

MRS. PRICE: The Arts Council doesn't do any purchasing. I can only tell you what the global figures are that we give them in this respect and how they break it down and spend it is their prerogative.

MR. DOERN: The problem is that there has been a fall-off, I believe, in art purchases and rentals in Government Services, because there hasn't been any new construction other than one particular building on Broadway and therefore the slack hasn't been picked up by your department.

MRS. PRICE: No, it hasn't. Any purchases that are done is either through Government Services or the Art Gallery but nothing from my department.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm tempted to involve the Member for Minnedosa here; I hear him talking about Louis Riel, but I haven't heard anything too choice yet. The other thing I would ask the Minister is this: I understand from talking to artists that they too are starting to leave the province. I'm talking now about some painters — I remember an article in the paper a few weeks ago about one of the sculptors, I can't think of his name now but he worked in wood and made large sculptures of figures, etc. — and other people, I am told, are moving west. And in addition to that, the CBC, which can provide a great deal of support and which still does provide support to actors and writers, they are doing a great deal of programming now in British Columbia and in Edmonton. I think at one time Winnipeg was the sort of centre for the west but there's very little live programming here and I am just saying that given a fall-off in Government Services in terms of purchases, given the CBC's contribution which is not positive here, and given that some artists for sure are leaving the province, is there any solution that the Minister has here of trying to encourage the painters and the sculptors and the writers and the actors. I have a great deal more to say about actors later, Mr. Chairman, but I ask the Minister whether she feels that she has been improving her program in terms of individual artists now, as opposed to companies? We now what you are doing in regard to companies of ballet dancers, etc., but what about the individual who works in a garret or a basement or a garage or whatever?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, we have the Artists in Residence Program and we have professional artists in each of the regions working in schools and in the communities.

MR. DOERN: What about writers; do you have any programs, competitions, grants for people who write poems, plays, books, articles, etc.?

MRS. PRICE: The Policy Review Committee recommended increased funding for the individual artists. They recommended that 1/2 percent of our budget policy be in government services.

MR. DOERN: Is this an enrichment over last year, or is this simply a continuation?

MRS. PRICE: This would be an enrichment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: How many dollars; what would it be last year, roughly, and what would be projected?

MRS. PRICE: I couldn't tell you. It is a new policy that we are prepared to look at as one of the recommendations from the Cultural Review Committee.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister about one event which I'm sure she was very disappointed in and, I think, was probably one event where money was spent and there was just no response, and therefore, there has to be some critical self-analysis: that is your program and expenditures for Canada's birthday celebrations last year. As I understand it, that was a complete bust and there were thousands of dollars spent. If I recall correctly, people were invited to come out to Bird's Hill Park and a couple of dozen people came, or maybe they were just standing around and came to this event. It was an absolute disaster in terms of public response. I ask the Minister if she can report on how much money was spent, on what advertising there was, and why the program was such a dismal failure?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Elmwood is mixed up. That was Manitoba Day at Bird's Hill. I was there and the weather was very inclement that day, which I think that was the main reason for the poor attendance. Canada Day was very well received and very well patronized.

MR. DOERN: How many thousands of dollars was spent on, I guess it's called Manitoba Day?

MRS. PRICE: Pardon me?

MR. DOERN: Was that called Manitoba Day?

MRS. PRICE: In Bird's Hill?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it was.

MR. DOERN: At our provincial birthday, I gather that thousands of dollars were spent and only a couple of dozen people showed. Could we have an indication of how much money was spent and for what purpose?

MRS. PRICE: \$5,000 was spent. That was for artists for the show that they put on and give-aways that they had. I think the reason for the lack of attendance was definitely the weather. I am just advised that that also was just at the time when the mayor died, that's correct.

We had originally intended it in city hall and at the last minute, we had to move it out to Bird's Hill.

MR. DOERN: I suspect that the location had something to do with the crowd. I was wondering, given that experience, what does the Minister plan for this summer, and where? I assume you are working on that now.

MRS. PRICE: We are just starting to work on this particular event. Hopefully it will be downtown, as we had planned last year, where it is much more attainable to the public.

MR. DOERN: Another festival, which I assume was a success, was the Winnipeg Folk Festival. My information was that the government was going to provide a grant of \$30,000, and I know some of the people were quite worried that they were not informed of the amount of money they were going to receive until very late. How much money did you provide, and was that a success?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it was a great success. Last year we provided \$15,000 and this year we are looking at \$25,000.00.

MR. DOERN: When will those moneys be dedicated for that purpose? Because I remember receiving a phone call last year, I think within weeks of the event, that the organizers were very worried that they weren't going to get their money in time. When would that decision be made and when would those moneys be forwarded?

MRS. PRICE: It will be decided on within the next few weeks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I will defer to the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister, on the same topic that the Member for Elmwood referred to, and that is if there are any cultural programs to assist aspiring young artists who have shown that they deserve support to go on with their painting? I am just wondering if there are any programs available, such as bursaries. I think of one young artist from Portage la Prairie who is doing excellent work, and I believe they are trying to raise funds for him to continue his studies in New York. I am just wondering if there are any programs and how would they go about getting assistance to further the beautiful work that this — there are many, I suppose, that are doing it — but this one, in particular, from Portage la Prairie, I'm sure is going to be a very prolific artist some day.

MRS. PRICE: The Manitoba Arts Council has two types of grants, the short-term grants, and established artists grants. Last year, through the Manitoba Arts Council, there was \$105,000 given to individual artists.

MR. ADAM: The procedure then would be for anyone wishing to obtain assistance, they would do it through the Arts Council?

MRS. PRICE: That is correct. In our department, in addition to that, we provide partial travel and tuition

fees for young talent to study in Manitoba — nothing outside of Canada, though.

MR. ADAM: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(f) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: The Minister provided \$50,000 to the Italian Canadian League in the form of a provincial capital grant for the purchase of a building to be used as a cultural centre for the Manitoba Italian community. I wonder whether that was a new program in the sense of — I'm just not familiar whether all the multicultural organizations in Manitoba are eligible for such grants or on what basis that grant was made — was it a first? It was certainly a sizable amount of money. Was it a first? And are those kinds of funds available to, say, the German, Italian, Ukrainian, Philippino, Irish and Polish communities.

MRS. PRICE: The Multicultural Capital Grants Program has been in existence since 1973. Another Italian group wouldn't be able to come along and say they want to open a cultural centre in Brandon or Portage; this will be the major Italian cultural centre, and any other nationalities that want to — bear in mind they have to have moneys before we give them a formula of one-third of the total capital cost to a maximum of \$50,000.00.

MR. DOERN: Was this the largest grant ever given?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister indicate of what order some of the other grants were in the past couple of years and to which groups?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, Steinbach got \$50,000; Ukrainian got \$50,000; the Greek got \$33,000; and the Japanese Gardens, \$50,000.00.

MR. DOERN: Those Japanese Gardens, are those the ones that were started or talked about a number of years ago? Is that now complete?

MRS. PRICE: This was a grant that was made by the former government and, yes, they are complete.

MR. DOERN: And where are they, again? Is that the Lakeview Centre?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(2)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(2)(b)—pass; 2.(a)(2)(c)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just in general on this item, this is where there has been a sizable increase. The grants seem to be up about 20 percent, and I'm just wondering whether the Minister was expanding her programs, or is this where we're getting some of this subsidization of the cultural groups?

MRS. PRICE: Which one is it that the Member for Elmwood . . .

MR. DOERN: I'm really thinking of 2.(a)(1), but falling into this whole (a) section.

MRS. PRICE: There has been no increases.

MR. DOERN: I refer the Minister to the line that says \$3.6 million and the line which says \$4.3 million.

MRS. PRICE: May I ask what the question is to the Member for Elmwood?

MR. DOERN: I'm just saying you're up 20 percent. Is this for expanded programs, or is this the area where you're funding the Ballet and the Symphony and so on?

MRS. PRICE: These are for the — I can give you a breakdown of the extra grants if you like — the Museum is \$136,000; the Arts Council, \$186,000; the Art Gallery, \$94,000; the French Cultural Centre, \$23,000; the Centennial Centre, \$201,000; and the Ukrainian Cultural Centre, \$30,000; for a total of \$671,000.00.

MR. DOERN: I think if the Minister listens to my question, she could probably answer it more easily than reading. Is this the area where you're going to give these special grants to bail out the Symphony and some of the other organizations which are in trouble? Is this where the funds are?

MRS. PRICE: Not necessarily, there will be some lottery funds used in that respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(2)(c)—pass; 2.(a)(3)(a) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: You have a new Provincial Archive — I don't know if he's here — Peter Bower — that's he?

MRS. PRICE: It's the gentleman right here.

MR. DOERN: I welcome him to the committee and to his position. I would ask the Minister if she can explain why John Bovey left his position, any comment in that regard, whether he was dissatisfied with anything?

MRS. PRICE: No, he is a native of British Columbia. He was offered a job there and felt that he wanted to go and settle there, but certainly he wasn't dissatisfied.

MR. DOERN: Now I note that there are some big increases here. Are these the increases that are related to the Hudson Bay Archives?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, they are.

MR. DOERN: You know, it seems to me that we almost got into a difficult situation, that the Minister and her department almost fell into the soup here in regard to the archives that there was some problem and some foot-dragging and then there were threats made to pull out the archives. The agreement was signed in 1973. One of the reasons for the renovation of the Archives Building, which was extensive, was to house the Hudson Bay Archives which are really, I suppose, the jewel in the archives. I recall that a few months ago Rolf Huband said in December that the government had not lived up to its agreement, that the Manitoba Government had promised to provide the same level of service to the public as was done in London, England. Before

the records were transferred, the government promised to provide a restoration lab which would preserve and restore documents in need of repair; and that in England there were five staff members, in Winnipeg there were four, and that the restoration lab on Vaughan Street simply was a room but had no equipment and was simply a storage space. So I ask the Minister why there was this skating on the brink; whether, first of all, why didn't we live up to those requirements in the last couple of years and are we, in fact, living up to them now?

MRS. PRICE: In all fairness to my department, I would like to say to the Member for Elmwood, that for three years before that, the foot-dragging started in your government's time. I would also like to tell him Mr. George Richardson was very annoyed with the letter that was attributed to him, or the article in the paper, saying that he was threatening to remove the Hudson Bay Archives. He said that he at no time did that and he was very annoyed with the newspapers for making that statement. I would like to tell the Member for Elmwood that the lab is being worked on, the staff have been put into place, and the Hudson's Bay is very happy with what is happening now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(3)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(3)(b)—pass; 2.(a)(4)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(4)(b)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there is some improvement here in the Legislative Library; it looks like this is up about 15 percent or so. Has there been any increase in staffing, and what is the increase in expenditures for? There again, there is about a 20 percent or so increase in expenditures.

MRS. PRICE: There's been an increase in staff, Mr. Chairman, of 1.42.

MR. DOERN: What about program or book purchasing? What's that addition \$21,000 for?

MRS. PRICE: That is due to the 6,000 for microfilming of Manitoba rural newspapers; 5,000 for microfilming of sessional documents of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly; workload increases of 9.1 thousand; and provision for price increases of .8.

MR. DOERN: I see that Miss Combaz is back. She was quite ill; I gather she is now recovered and fully functioning.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. DOERN: I welcome her back, because those of us who have been here a number of years know what a valuable job she's done over the years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(4)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(4)(b)—pass; 2.(a)(5)(a)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, here again, I find this difficult to understand. The whole section here — there were announcements made about the fact that there was a big increase in library grants. I don't know if that was this year or last year, but I recall an announcement the Minister made; it looked like they were going to enrich the program throughout the entire province.

There had been a lot lobbying done and it paid off, and yet when I look at this figure I see a reduction. I don't know what the percentage is, 15, 17, 18 percent reduction. Salaries are down; Other Expenditures are up slightly and Grant Assistance is down \$243,000.00. So the question is, what is going on here? I thought we were advancing and it looks like we're going backwards.

MRS. PRICE: I'm very happy to tell the Member for Elmwood that it certainly is advancement. We had an advance payment made to the libraries in 1980 in the amount of \$500,000, but it was taken out of the previous fiscal year.

MR. DOERN: I'm sorry, I would ask the Minister to repeat that. I was just trying to . . .

MRS. PRICE: I would like to tell the Member for Elmwood that we did make great advancements, \$1,000,000 actually in the past year, but the \$500,000 that is not showing here was made in the fiscal year. So, therefore, it showed up in 1979-80, but it was a partial payment towards the 1980 grants to the libraries.

MR. DOERN: Is the Minister telling me then that although it appears that there's a cutback, that there is no cutback here.

MRS. PRICE: There is no cutback; that is correct. May I tell the Member for Elmwood that this figure that you see, \$1.4 million, will be \$1.9 million because they have already been given the \$500,000.00.

MR. DOERN: I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(5)(a)—pass; 2.(a)(5)(b)—pass; 2.(a)(5)(c)—pass; 2.(b)(1)—pass — the Member for Point Douglas.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister what is her opinion concerning the deterioration of the inner core of the city and the preservation of historic buildings, the growing surplus of office and shopping space? These are matters widely discussed now at the present time. I notice also, Mr. Chairman, that the Tribune is to be commended for its efforts to preserve architecturally unique and historic buildings. I have visited many cities in Britain and different parts of Europe and I notice that the old landmarks and many historical buildings had been destroyed by the war, but then not only rebuilt but rebuilt in the same shape they were before. Here in Winnipeg we have an entirely different situation and I don't know actually who is taking the decision, and I have in mind a few buildings here in the city. What is the opinion of the Honourable Minister concerning this demolishing of historical landmarks in our city?

MRS. PRICE: There are some of the buildings over which I have no jurisdiction or my department doesn't. I would like to tell the member for Point Douglas that my department is committed to Heritage Winnipeg for \$500,000 at the rate of \$100,000 per year towards the preservation of some of these buildings.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Going further into this thing, I'm just wondering that city council has now the power to prevent the demolition of all historic buildings. But unless the city is willing to assume further power and

responsibilities for the urban development we could end up with a large number of empty buildings in our city. My point is, to preserve such buildings like 10 storey Confederation Life Building, the Bank of Hamilton and the Bank of Commerce Building on Main Street, —(Interjection)— Also recently the whole thing happened about this Bank of Nova Scotia, which is on Portage and Garry Street I believe, and still they are contemplating, so far as I heard, they are contemplating to demolish that, which I believe would be a great great loss. Because again I am saying that I visited many cities in Poland, in Europe such as Warsaw or Kiev or Leningrad or Paris and Berlin and many many of them, and London — and now they are rebuilt. I saw them right after the war and I saw them, maybe five or six years ago.

MRS. PRICE: I would like to say to the member for Point Douglas that these buildings are being looked into by Heritage Winnipeg and the Environmental Committee. I would also like to tell him that my department is arranging to have a committee — the terms of reference are being set up now — for them to study the alternative structures and to see what can be done to preserve the buildings that are of heritage quality.

MR. MALINOWSKI: So it means that we have a hope that we can preserve those buildings. Not only those that I have mentioned but we have more than that. For instance if I will take, the oldest building, it is not a big one, but historical building — right now it is on a historical site on Euclid 99. It's empty. I believe this is almost the first building in Point Douglas or in the city of Winnipeg. It seems to me that this building right now as a historical site is completely neglected. Why is it neglected? I was talking to the Historical Society in Point Douglas and they said, we can do nothing about it because we don't have any money, we don't have any funds. So can the Honourable Minister explain the whole situation — how can we prevent this kind of a thing?

MRS. PRICE: I believe the building in question that you are referring to is Barber House, is that correct?

MR. MALINOWSKI: Yes.

MRS. PRICE: It is owned by the city of Winnipeg so any directions as to what is going to happen to it would have to come from them, not us. But as I mentioned, we are just in the throes of setting up a Manitoba Heritage Council for the reasons and concerns that you have that we will be able to look at some of these historical buildings and artifacts and such and make sure that if there are some that should be designated and saved, this will happen.

MR. MALINOWSKI: So it means that this historical site, 99 Euclid is under the jurisdiction of the city — the province has nothing to do with it.

MRS. PRICE: It is owned by the city of Winnipeg.

MR. MALINOWSKI: I know it is owned by the city but this should be under preservation as a historical site, so I believe it should be under care, the jurisdiction might be under the city but under the care should be under the province.

MRS. PRICE: It is owned by the city of Winnipeg so it is up to them to make the overtures and I understand they are looking at ways to preserve it at the present time. They have been in contact with Parks Canada, the federal branch, as well as us, and they are looking into a way between the three levels of government of preserving it.

MR. MALINOWSKI: So now the federal government is taking care of it?

MRS. PRICE: No. The city of Winnipeg has contacted Parks Canada as well as our department, the province, and they are trying to decide on what can be done to preserve it.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Are you aware that they have any response from the federal government?

MRS. PRICE: Not as yet.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Not as yet. Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: The Member for Point Douglas raises a very interesting point. He says we are discussing the preservation of standing buildings in the city of Winnipeg that haven't been destroyed, but he brought up a point that countries he had visited were devastated by the ravages of war and other turmoils, and that they have been reconstructed in the same way as they were previous to their destruction. This is certainly a very interesting piece of information. I am just wondering why we can't even preserve a standing building whereas other countries are rebuilding buildings that have been demolished and bringing them back to their historic condition as they were previous to any damage. I am just wondering if it shouldn't be done at the federal level. I don't know I would be very interested to hear more information on what the Member for Point Douglas has revealed to us tonight.

I know there has been a lot of discussion and questions in the House, raised during the question period on this particular topic in regards to historic buildings downtown and in the city of Winnipeg and other areas, and here we seem to have a difficult time to preserve buildings that are there and existing. I don't know what is lacking that we have such a difficult time to keep these historic sites; and here we hear that in countries like Poland and England where they have been devastated by war, they have been reconstructed in their original —(Interjection)— This is awfully interesting, and I would be very interested in knowing how that's done and how the powers that be — who makes the decision — I know the Member for Point Douglas was asking where does the power lie and where are the decisions made? Maybe we should be looking at some of this. Perhaps we could preserve some of our heritage if we had a better way of doing it, or dealing with this problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1). The Member for Point Douglas.

MR. MALINOWSKI: I would like to explain certain things but I can't give him an answer. I am not the Minister of Cultural Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I think the Member for Point Douglas would be willing to head up a delegation to Poland which we would be willing to serve on . . .

MR. MALINOWSKI: And to other countries as well.

MR. DOERN: . . . to study this matter. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask about some specific buildings. Let me start with the Fort Garry Hotel. Does the province have any involvement in the preservation of that building, or is that the city of Winnipeg which has put some rider on that building?

MRS. PRICE: The new owners of the hotel are operating it as such and intend to continue to do so. I happened to be there just last night, as a matter of fact, and they have done some renovating in areas. When they first took over from the CNR, the new owner and the executive from the CNR paid a visit to my office and told me that they were planning on continuing the operation of the hotel. So there is no need for any involvement from my department at this time.

MR. DOERN: Isn't there a list of buildings — isn't there a committee, maybe through the city or the Manitoba Historical Society, is there no provincial involvement in listing buildings for preservation. I mean surely we don't want to ever see in this city the destruction of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce or the Fort Garry Hotel. I mean, in both cases I would be prepared to lie down in front of the bulldozer for those two buildings, because if we lose that kind of a building this city is finished. Let's take the Fort Garry Hotel — is there no legal means of ensuring the preservation of that building?

MRS. PRICE: I think the legal means would be that before they could have any demolition squad come in they have to get an O.K. through the Department of Labour so that would stop it there. We have representation on the committee that the city of Winnipeg has in which they are studying the different buildings from a point of view of preserving these buildings.

MR. DOERN: Is the city of Winnipeg the protector of buildings, as opposed to the province?

MRS. PRICE: Within the city of Winnipeg where they have the jurisdiction, yes.

MR. DOERN: But the department has an input then, so therefore you are involved morally and legally I suppose?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, we have representation on that committee with the city of Winnipeg.

MR. DOERN: What is the name of that committee and who are your representatives?

MRS. PRICE: The Director, who is sitting on my left here, of Historic Resources, is, the department is on it, as well as Neil Einarson who is an architect. It is called the Historic Buildings Committee.

MR. DOERN: Now I want to take an example. Derek Bedson, who is known to most of us, owned a very

beautiful home on Nassau. That home was in the Adam style of architecture. It was owned by, I forget by whom, some prominent Winnipeg family, and it was more recently owned by Viscount Gort. And I know that home was also — it was more than a home, it was a complex with a coach house and other buildings and a beautiful iron grided fence. And all of a sudden, one day the notices went up, it had been sold, it was demolished almost overnight, and now I guess an apartment block is going up there. Barring your eyes once, the building was gone. And that building was considered by some people as unique, and that building is contained, I am sure, in some books, certainly in one book that I have, as I recall, a brown-covered book, Buildings of Manitoba, or something, and that house is in there. Probably it is in a number of other books as a historic building, and yet it was just demolished. Nobody seemed to speak in its defence. If it can happen there, maybe it can happen in some other cases. There is a gorgeous building on Roslyn Road that is owned by Mireille Grandpierre and her husband . . .

MRS. PRICE: That's Wellington Crescent.

MR. DOERN: . . . Dr. Kantor.

MRS. PRICE: Wellington Crescent, that is.

MR. DOERN: No, it's not Wellington Crescent. It's on Roslyn Road. Now, that's a gorgeous building, completely unique. I suppose the next thing I know, I'm going to drive by there some day and it's going to be destroyed. What happened in the case of Mr. Bedson's residence? Was any attempt made to preserve it, buy it, renovate it, prevent it from being demolished?

MRS. PRICE: I am informed that the house was demolished after there was an appeal made to the Committee on the Environment. The house had been owned by a man by the name of Mr. Rogers, who had been a Cabinet Minister in the Roblin government.

MR. DOERN: Let's take the Kantor house — is that on any list?

MRS. PRICE: It is being looked at by the Historic Buildings Committee right now.

MR. DOERN: That again is the city's committee, is it, that we referred to before?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it is.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I can only say then to the Minister that I think there have been some slip-ups. I don't know how often that committee works, or I don't know how often it meets, but there are a large number of buildings around which I think have to be preserved, because once they are gone, they are gone forever and those buildings will never be built in that style. It's like this building; if this building was destroyed in a fire, I don't know what would happen. It would probably be replaced by a building with eight-foot ceilings and some standard, modern architecture, as is the contemporary style.

So I urge the Minister to get that committee moving because certain things have happened, even though the committee has been established.

MRS. PRICE: I understand that the committee meets regularly every two weeks. I understand they are in the process of taking an inventory of all the buildings in the city and looking towards the ones that are important that should be designated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I was going to ask the question that the Minister just answered, which is: have they got a documentation of all the buildings that should be looked at or preserved? It appears that they are just doing it now and it seems . . . The Minister in her comments said that they are in the process of doing it. It seems to me that should have been done a long time ago. I'm not sure, maybe it should have been done many many years ago instead of just now. We are becoming more conscious of our older architecture, how things were done in the older days. That's the question that I wanted to ask the Minister, whether or not, if they meet every every Thursday, are they just meeting to have coffee or are they really getting down to brass tacks and finding out where all these old buildings are?

MRS. PRICE: I am informed that they are setting up a photographic inventory, to be able to look at it in pictures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister indicate what guidelines are used or what model is followed in terms of preserving homes or buildings. Is there some general set of guidelines and then prioritization; are these buildings that somebody writes in and says there's a building on my street that is 85 years old that was owned by Louis-somebody or other, the eccentric millionaire, and it should be preserved? How do you determine what qualifies as a historic building or a building worth preserving?

MRS. PRICE: There is a set of guidelines. The director of that department does not have them with him, but he said they are graded according to age, the architectural style, and the historic importance of them. If the Member for Elmwood would like, I could get him a copy of the set of guidelines.

MR. DOERN: Yes, I would like to see that. I ask the Minister again if she can explain why the Bedson residence, which was a unique style of architecture, was let slip somehow or other?

MRS. PRICE: It was graded by the Historical Buildings Committee and it was appealed on the Environment and then the order was given that it was okay to demolish it.

MR. DOERN: Then why wasn't the demolition blocked?

MRS. PRICE: Apparently because of the condition of the building, that's why they were allowed to demolish it.

MR. DOERN: There again, I understand that the building needed extensive structural repairs, etc. Again, supposing somebody says, well, look, here is a historic building or a historic home; does the Department then say, well, we can only allocate \$5,000 and if it costs a

half a million dollars, it's out. How do you decide between preservation on a dollar basis?

MRS. PRICE: At the moment, my department does not have any programs whereby they can be putting out a half million or a million dollars in order to preserve these homes. If, on an appeal to the Committee on the Environment that was instituted by Mr. Bedson himself, and they determined that the building was not worth renovating, we certainly couldn't afford to take on an ambitious program like that. We don't have the funds and I'm sure, in your era, you didn't have the funds for that either.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister how many dollars she has for that purpose?

MRS. PRICE: None.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my relatives came from the Emerson Riding, but I only visited there. I ask the Minister whether this is an area that maybe she should break some ground in, that maybe she should ask for several hundred thousand dollars to be allocated on an annual basis. If there never has been an amount dedicated, then I think it's time there was.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, that is why we are having the Manitoba Heritage Council set up, with guidelines in this regard to look at it. We realize that something has to be done to make it more effective.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister whether, in moving in this area and in thinking about this problem, whether there is any provincial government, American state government . . . The British experience, I understand in London they are extremely successful in preserving buildings where facades are completely protected but interiors are sometimes gutted and used. All we seem to be able to come up with, in some cases, in the case of certain buildings, we save portions of the building and store them somewhere. I suppose some of them will be lost over the course of time or they will be forgotten or destroyed.

I was just wondering whether we have a model? For instance, does Ontario do something that we are following, or is it Heritage Canada that Pierre Burton is involved in, or are we going to have a completely unique Manitoba approach with zero dollars, or are we going to reinvent the wheel? Do we have a model that we want to emulate?

MRS. PRICE: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that we are at a standstill. I think Townsite is a good example that there is some work being done in that direction, and also Osborne Village. So there is work being done to preserve buildings and to have them in their original state.

MR. DOERN: I have to say to the Minister that I don't know whether Osborne Village is historic; it certainly is lovely and certainly is desirable, but I also have the clear impression that it's, if not dying, it is winding down. All you have to do is walk through that village and look at the stores for rent or for leasing, and I am

rather worried about what is happening there. Let's take that as an example. Has the provincial government ever done anything to assist the merchants of Osborne Village, or do we just give them moral encouragement and say keep up the good work?

MRS. PRICE: We haven't given them any financial help. When I was in the Tourism portfolio, we did have some advertising in that respect and I understand they are planning on increasing that this year with the Tourism program.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, two of the best buildings in Winnipeg are the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce near Portage and Main, and the Hamilton Building. I understand that there is talk now on the part of the city that they may, I don't know, is it close Number 10 Fort Street, or move from there — I don't know if they are renting that building or if they bought it years ago — but I know that the city has given some consideration, or is giving consideration now, to preserving the Hamilton Building, in the sense of buying it, renovating it, and moving in. I think I heard a figure of a couple of hundred thousand dollars for minimal renovations. Is the Minister familiar with that desire on the part of some councillors, or city administration, to move into that building?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I have heard that they are entertaining the thought of purchasing that building and moving into it and renovating it, but I don't know about the dollar figure.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister, are there any present plans by the city or by the province to do the same in regard to the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce?

MRS. PRICE: Not at this time, because it is under the city of Winnipeg and at this time there have not been any plans by our department.

MR. DOERN: I would say to the Minister that I would urge her to look at that building. Has she ever been through there in the last few years, into the building?

MRS. PRICE: No, I haven't.

MR. DOERN: I would suggest to her that if she was taken on a tour, that there is no way she would allow that building to go under the wreckers' hammer. She also might be inspired to access the building. It has a main banking hall with beautiful pillars, and I suppose marble work, etc., a glass dome and then 10 narrow storeys of offices. I guess about six or seven years ago in our administration, consideration was being given to buying the building, renovating it and turning it over to certain arts groups.

MRS. PRICE: There is no thought being entertained at this time of demolishing the building. It has been graded as Grade 2, and while it's graded like that it'll stay in perpetuity. You don't need to be worried about it being razed.

MR. DOERN: Right. I would say to the Minister that that would be the bottom line, that the building be protected. But I also say to her, given the various arts groups in Manitoba, and maybe other requirements of

her department, that I think she should maybe dust off some of the old papers and studies on that building and consider using it in the sense of using it for provincial government purposes and cultural affairs purposes, in particular.

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned earlier, before dinner, that is part of the mandate of the cultural facility study that is being instigated by the Manitoba Arts Council. They are going to be looking into numerous properties throughout the city, to see what is suitable for homes for various groups.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to duplicate a debate that's taking place in the House, but I wanted to ask the Minister — there was a resolution introduced by the Member for Fort Rouge on historic buildings and some talk about tax concessions, maybe grants, etc. I believe the Minister spoke on that resolution. I wonder if she could give me a brief summary of her remarks, or some comment on the stand that she took, because I didn't hear her speak. I read something in the press of her speech. I wasn't able to be there although I'm very interested in that resolution, and I just wonder if she could indicate what her position was on that general question.

MRS. PRICE: If the member would like, I can give you a copy of what I had. I can give it to you tomorrow.

MR. DOERN: But would you care to make a remark now on what you said in essence or in brief?

MRS. PRICE: I think the gist of what I had said was that a study had to be done through the tax department to see that it would be feasibly sound for them, because it is going to run into moneys for different levels of government as well, and the way it had been set up by the Member for Fort Rouge, left it too onerous; that there has to be a considerable study done before it'd be passed in that regard. I did mention to her that our department, for the past year, has been looking into the various aspects. But as I say, I will get a copy of it to you tomorrow if you'd like.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, another couple of areas here: the federal government, I assume, must have money available for these purposes and I just wondered if the Minister can indicate if there are funds available that we can tap on a block basis, or can we apply to the federal government on specific projects, for example, let's say in the case of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce? Is Manitoba eligible for funds for these purposes? Or can we apply on a one-at-a-time basis for moneys? For instance, if it was going to cost a million something to buy and renovate that building, can we go to the federal government and get a half a million dollars for that purpose?

MRS. PRICE: I understand there's all kinds of make-work programs but there aren't any that are structured that we could just automatically go and apply to the federal government for a grant to preserve, say, the Bank of Hamilton.

MR. DOERN: I'm not quite sure what is meant by make-work programs. Does that mean that something like Winter Works, something that has no relation to

historic buildings; that there are funds available for construction or renovation purposes that could be accessed?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. DOERN: Have those funds ever been accessed for historic purposes? I know that in Government Services, I'm sure that we've accessed all kinds of money for different projects. But given the last two and a half years, have any funds been acquired from the federal government, make-work, winter works, any other kind of projects, that then are fed into this particular area?

MRS. PRICE: Individual societies such as the Manitoba Historical Society have made applications for grants, but our department hasn't.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, can the province make application for these funds, or must they be indirect?

MRS. PRICE: To my knowledge our department has not made application for funds in that respect.

MR. DOERN: Has the province directly overseen the renovation of any historic building?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, we have. There's the Bohemier House and the Maison Turenne. Those two are in the throes of being renovated and overseen by my department.

MR. DOERN: I don't think the Minister was heard on the microphone. Could she explain which those projects are? I'm not familiar with either of them, where are they and what are they?

MRS. PRICE: The Maison Turenne is in St. Norbert, is it not? And the Bohemier House is also in St. Norbert; then the church at Hecla Island has been restored; they are under the supervision of our department.

MR. DOERN: Could we get an indication of how much one of those projects costs and how much in federal funding was obtained?

MRS. PRICE: I'll take that question as notice and get back to you tomorrow with it.

MR. DOERN: Could I hear an explanation of what those houses are? What are they? Why were they preserved?

MRS. PRICE: They are examples of early Franco-Manitoban structures. One was built in 1869 and one was built in 1889.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, another question is historic plaques. I wonder if the department has any program to place historic plaques on buildings and cairns, or whatever, to designate something of interest. I know in the United States and Europe these plaques are quite prominent. They are highly recognizable. You can recognize them by the colour or the design or the shape, and you're immediately attracted to that building. You can walk up and read it's such and such an event, or such and such a person was involved in this particular building. We don't seem to have any standard plaques.

They seem to come in all shapes and sizes and are very rare as well and I just wondered if there's a provincial program or a federal program or a city program to do something in this area, which is quite inexpensive in comparison to some of these other undertakings.

MRS. PRICE: We do have a program where there are plaques established in place if you'd drive out throughout the rural areas. You can go right out to Government House. I personally was the one that dedicated that plaque, I think it was two years ago, for the then Minister who is now . . .

MR. DOERN: Which plaque?

MRS. PRICE: Right outside the entrance to Government House, right by the sidewalk. There are approximately 30 throughout the province. But if people come up to advise us of certain properties that there are and figure there should be a plaque, then we look into it. We do have a program in place that we do put the plaques out.

MR. DOERN: Well, the Minister of Government Services is here, and I think one plaque should go on that hotel room door where that historic debate took place between him and the Member for Burrows and the Member for Fort Rouge, at which the Minister, I regret to say, got clobbered or ran third, I believe, in that historic debate. I'm quoting the Member for Fort Rouge, who was debating with me last night about day care and I kidded her about it; she said she won the debate, so I have to take her word for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Government Services.

MR. DOERN: The member?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister. All right, I'll upgrade him a little bit.

MR. DOERN: And the former star of the Micado.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, the matter of plaques of some kind, I suppose, should receive the kind of attention that the member is requesting. I think I can assure him that it should be also not a matter of partisan concern as to where they're hung.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid to analyze the member's remarks. If you have 30 plaques in Manitoba, that surely could only be described as a drop in the bucket. I mean there must be hundreds, if not thousands, of buildings — and you know we don't want to go to the other extreme and have a plaque on every building — but there must be hundreds of buildings and interesting things that would be of great interest to tourists and would be of particular interest to school children and to citizens in the community. I urge the Minister to get somebody in her department on top of this issue, to maybe develop a standard plaque, to start prioritizing and to maybe encourage people to make suggestions and then to respond to it, because somebody who really knew the history of Winnipeg and the history of Manitoba, I'm sure, could give you a walking tour of the city that would be fascinating, but it would

all be verbal because it would only be based on an extensive personal knowledge. I would like to see the Minister look into this particular matter more deeply.

MRS. PRICE: I would like to tell the Member for Elmwood that we do have a standardized plaque, and out of the 30 there's been between 15 and 20 that have been established in the last five years. I do say that people have to come forth and bring them to our attention. It's the only way we can be made aware of them, and we are certainly willing to look at them and if they warrant it, establish a plaque in that vicinity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, another thing I would like to mention — I am afraid the Minister of Government Services has left — but something that either Minister could do and that is that we have a lot of art work around that is not identified. I'm talking about paintings in the government collection, paintings and sculpture in government buildings, art that was bought by the government, and there's neither a plaque nor even a card identifying who the artist is and any information whatsoever. And I think that when you see a painting and you don't know who did it or when it was done or what the subject matter is, we're missing out on some educational purposes.

I also want to ask a couple more questions. Heritage Canada and the Manitoba government; I am not quite sure I understand Heritage Canada. I gather it's supposedly independent, that Pierre Berton is the president or something and that they have federal funds available. Could I get a general description of . . . ?

MRS. PRICE: Pierre Berton is the chairman and it is totally federally funded. I understand that they were given an endowment by the federal government of some \$6 million at the outset.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Chairman, I find this intriguing and my colleague has been exploring a number of areas mostly, I gather, around the historic buildings and so on. I concur with him that other areas of the world are concentrating on preserving their heritage and I think that we should too. I gather from the discussion that has been taking place that we do not have a specific policy or plan yet, we're just evolving it, and I would certainly commend that we do this and do it quickly because as time passes by and considering the technical know-how we have and the rapidity with which things are changing in our environment, we are tearing down much more than we should be and it's a shame that some of this isn't being preserved. So again I indicate that in London they have whole areas which they have designated as historic and they are retaining the faade and rebuilding the inside, because after all, there has to be utilization of the space. I know it's an expensive program but it can be amortized over a long period of time and the real thing about it is that it cannot ever be brought back once it's gone; something that was built 300 years ago, 400 years ago, even 100 years ago, once it's gone, like this building here, there is very often the kind of workmanship not available any more because of the changing technology that we have.

Aside from that, we have a tremendous ethnicity in Manitoba and I would like to know, besides the participating in Folklorama and the Folk Arts Council, what are we doing to identify that and to preserve it as well, because I think that is as important to our heritage as preserving buildings. There are artistic and cultural things that will disappear with time as well because I know from experience my mother could do a lot of things that I and my sister can't do because she had a special skill and she was taught that. And I think that this goes to the root of many of our cultures, there are things that are passed on from time to time. But because we live in an instant age of this and that and the next thing, we flip a button or whatever you do, you get everything instantaneously. We have become very lazy and we have not acquired all of these cultural abilities and so I think that some of that should be preserved as well.

I know that some of the cultural groups and ethnic groups are preserving on their own but I think they must also be supported and there must be a special effort made by us, and we the people, which as government, have to support that and have a policy and a program which will help it out and further it so that others that come behind us will be able to see some of this.

I wonder if the Minister can give us some explanation of what she is doing in this regard, what the government is doing, and to what extent they are involved aside from Folklorama and the Folk Arts Council.

MRS. PRICE: I think before the Member for Kildonan came in, I mentioned about the formation of what will be known as the Manitoba Heritage Council. The guidelines are in place, the committee people are. They hope to have their report completed by November of this year and this is precisely what they are going to be studying. In addition, we have \$195,000 for grants to preserve the heritage for the performing arts, the conferences, seminars, workshops, the festivals, concerts, tours; sustaining grants for ethnocultural organizations and archival and historical work, and there's \$195,000 towards that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Elmwood touched upon something which I rather concur with, but I wanted to ask — the government has a present policy and I wonder if it's a tradition across Canada, or would we consider breaking this policy or tradition. I understand that portraits are commissioned, as we see the portrait of the former Premier Ed Schreyer is at the end of the hall, and the Speakers of the House have their portraits done and they are put into crates and they're stored in this building. The taxpayers and the former government have paid money to have these paintings done and framing, and yet they sit in crates in a dusty storage room, and I wondered, what is the policy that causes all these portraits to sit in the crates? Does the member have to die or get defeated or at what point in time does he get hung in one of the government buildings, is what I mean.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think this is slightly out of order, to the Member for Wolseley. This was covered I believe

in Government Services some few days ago and you would see it in Hansard on how this comes about.

MR. WILSON: I'm suggesting that there should be a change in government policy. But the Member for Elmwood was talking about an inventory of art. Is there any way without an Order for Return that at some point in time we could get an inventory of art purchased by the government for say the last five years, and what is your budget for purchase of new art works in your current fiscal year.

MRS. PRICE: I mentioned earlier before the Member for Wolseley was here that my department does not purchase works of art in that respect. It is done through the Art Gallery and the Manitoba Arts Council if there is any done but it's not through ours, and an inventory of the last five years would have to be done through an Order for Return, I would think.

MR. WILSON: I was involved with the great art debate with the Member for Elmwood and at that time it was indicated that the then Minister had purchased \$166,000 worth of art, and the question that I'm trying to arrive at . . .

MR. DOERN: I have to point out that on a point of order that I don't want to get into this debate again because last time I think I wiped the floor with the Honourable Member, but he won't take no for an answer. I have to point out where I don't think we're talking about art under this section and therefore the questions and comments are out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the Member for Elmwood has a point of order and we are on Historical Resources, Salaries.

MR. WILSON: Under Historical Resources, Mr. Chairman, these works of art are something that the member himself touched upon when he asked that they be given a card and an explanation of the artists, and what I am suggesting is that art is something that is long, it lasts for a long time, and if the proper research was done and if a prudent type of research was done and the artists indeed were up and coming artists, then these particular works of art would have increased ten-fold in value. However, if the works were only pretenders and are of no apparent value, what I'm asking is are these historical paintings evaluated by insurance companies or somebody to indicate whether they have gone up in value or whether they are classed as questionable art of limited value?

MRS. PRICE: I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that the questions that are being asked by the Member for Wolseley I am not in a position to answer. That is not in the realm of my department and I think you would have to go through Government Services or whatever, but this doesn't come under my jurisdiction.

MR. WILSON: Then I'll finish with the indication of support to the Member for Elmwood in suggesting that some type of identification and card be given so that some of the unkind remarks about some of the paintings will be tempered somewhat when the people read and understand what the paintings are all about and who the artist is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask whose responsibility it is for the installation of plaques or cairns or other things along the highways in regard to historic things that have happened in the past. Who is responsible; is it your department or is it the Highways Department or Government Services?

MRS. PRICE: The Historic Society advise us and then we follow through on them.

MR. ADAM: The Historic Society — is this a new body, a new group, the Historic Society? Are they just in formation now?

MRS. PRICE: No, the board has been in place since the Act came into existence; a number of years now.

MR. ADAM: I see. It's my understanding that there was a cairn constructed to place at a wayside park in an area that's known as Kergwenan. It's about six miles south of Ste. Rose. I'm not sure what the cairn was for, but I believe it had something to do with parallels — I'm not sure whether it was the 51st parallel — which is very nearby or a few hundred yards away from this wayside park. It is my understanding that there was a cairn constructed and it was in storage someplace to place at that site. I am just wondering if there is any way that we could find out if that was ever done, who should we address ourselves to? Could I ask the Minister or her staff to check into it with Highways Department or Government Services or whoever was doing it?

MRS. PRICE: The Director advises me that it is not one of ours but if you like we can look into it for you, but he said it's not one of ours.

MR. ADAM: It was brought to my attention by some residents in the area and I am sure, I'm just speaking from memory now, whether it was the 51st parallel or something to do with a parallel, I believe. I would appreciate if the Minister would check that out.

MRS. PRICE: I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to head off a whimsical display from the Member for Radisson. Mr. Chairman, I just have two short questions and then I think we agreed to wrap it up at about 10:00. The Minister and I talked about this earlier. Heritage Canada: Do we have a Manitoba rep and, if so, who is that person?

MRS. PRICE: We don't have any representation on that board?

MR. DOERN: The funds that have been spent in Manitoba to date, I assume there have been some funds spent on Albert Street. I just wondered if anyone knew where Heritage Canada has spent money in Manitoba, and roughly how much?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, the Director informs me that Heritage Canada spent some \$250,000 on the building known as the Hammond Building.

MR. DOERN: The Hammond Building. Which building is that?

MRS. PRICE: 63 Albert Street.

MR. DOERN: I see. That's where there are some artists and some potters, or something like that?

MRS. PRICE: That's the building with all the different — no, that's not Albert Street. It's on McDermot, isn't it?

MR. DOERN: You've got me. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to pass this section and then adjourn until tomorrow or Monday, whenever we resume.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2)—pass; 2.(b)(3)—pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,445,900 for Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources—pass.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY — HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 59 of the Main Estimates, Department of Health. Item under discussion is under Resolution No. 75, 1. Executive Function (a)(2) Salaries.
The Honourable Minister.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, at 4:30, I was just replying to questions raised by the Honourable Member for Transcona with respect to the organization of the Department of Health and the organization, in particular, of the Minister's office and lines of reporting.

I want to reiterate what I said at 4:30 about the confidence that I have and my colleagues in the Executive Council have in the Acting Deputy Minister of the Department of Health, Dr. George Johnson, and reassure the Honourable Member for Transcona that the fact that his status and category is Acting in designation, is no reflection whatsoever on his competence or capacity or the faith that is held in him. What we are faced with at the moment is a difficult, complex restructuring of a difficult, complex and comprehensive former department, the Department of Health and Community Services, which I am sure the honourable member would agree, is one that is complex in nature and faced complex challenges, with a good deal of interrelationship between its parts. The decision was made to divide it into separate departments of Health, and Community Services, precisely because of the constituencies that have to be served and the requirements upon a Minister and his or her Deputy Minister and other senior officials in those areas.

We don't pretend that the reorganization is necessarily cast in stone at the moment. We believe that we have a successful format worked out that preserves the regional delivery system and that will enable the designated appointed respective Ministers of Health, and Community Services, to devote the necessary attention to those broad constituencies and not be spread too thin in those challenges. Pending the final resolution of how the Department of Health should be constituted,

and the final role and function and position of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, we have withheld the actual designation of permanency with respect to the position of Deputy Minister.

On the lines of reporting, I want to tell the committee that the reporting lines, both in the division of Operational and Support Services, and the division of the Community Health Directorate, come up through the Assistance Deputy Minister, Dr. Tavener, direct to him and ultimately from him to the Acting Deputy Minister, Dr. Johnson, with two exceptions, the Dental Services Branch and the Pharmaceutical Services Branch, which report directly to the Acting Deputy Minister.

There is a liaison official in the person of another Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Don McLean, who previously was an ADM in Health and Community Services and now is an ADM in Community Services, but functions as liaison between our Community Health Directorate and the regional delivery system, and the field delivery system in Community Services. We believe that his past experience and competence fit him eminently for that liaison role. The policy, the direction, the plans that are formulated and created and designed in the Community Health Directorate of the Department of Health. The service is delivered through the field delivery system and service on the community services' side. The link between the two is the ADM, Mr. McLean.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I could have the attention of the honourable members just for a moment, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left, where we have 30 visitors of the 104th Winnipeg Cub Pack at the Canadian Forces Base. This cub pack is in the constituency of Charleswood and the akela in charge is Sergeant Tweed. It's in the constituency of the Honourable Premier, Sterling Lyon. I would ask the honourable members to join me in welcoming this group here this evening.
The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: I just have a couple comments to make at this stage regarding the Minister's explanation about the Acting Deputy Minister. I certainly wasn't trying to embarrass the Acting Deputy Minister. I have some regard for the Acting Deputy Minister; I don't know him well personally. I understand that he has some very sound roots, philosophical roots, in terms of political attitudes. He may have been warped later on in his life, but at the same time I knew that he did have some sound beginnings with respect to his attitude about the role of government in society and, sort of, the societal relationships that should exist in society. I did want to again pass comment on the fact that it is rather unusual that the Acting Deputy Minister isn't sitting down here, especially, when we are on the Deputy Minister's salary. In all my experience, and it's not that much as a legislator, I've never seen that happen before. Perhaps my colleagues have seen situations like that, some of them have had much longer experience than I have had as a legislator. Occasionally, when I used to look down from the gallery I used to always know that the Deputy would be the one since he's in charge of the administration of the department, he would be the one sitting there with the Minister. Indeed, I wouldn't have thought that the Acting Deputy would have been shy about sitting in the Legislature,

in the Legislative Assembly itself. He spent some considerable time here as a Minister and, indeed, I guess if he wanted to, he could be sitting in the loge there watching us. If he, in fact, prefers to sit up in the gallery, that's his particular business and prerogative, but it does add fuel to the fire that exists as to the difficult circumstances within the department of a managerial nature.

In terms of the Minister's explanation about the reporting relationships between the two departments, I can appreciate that it is a very difficult process to go about, changing a department in this manner. I'm glad he's says that it isn't inscribed in stone and that I do think some very big difficulties will arise in implementation. There may be some easier ways in which to split up a very large department such as the Minister was in charge of up until recently. It's the type of department that puts tremendous pressure and just time-load on to the Minister. You have not only all the groups to deal with in Health but you had all of the community service groups, all the volunteer organizations, undoubtedly wanting to meet personally at some stage in the process of lobbying or consultation with the government directly with the Minister. I think that there is a tremendous amount of time pressure put on a Minister as a result of that, and I think there have been attempts from time to time, either conceptually or in practice, to try and split that load up so that a Minister could have enough time to devote to the management and policy tasks related to being Minister of a department, dealing with the House, dealing with the public as well as providing that type of liaison with public groups coming to see a Minister that I think the population at the provincial level of government expect. I know when delegations go down to Ottawa, more often than not they're told to go see the Deputy or the Assistant Deputy and they are probably satisfied with that, but at the provincial level, as undoubtedly the Minister of Community Services realizes today after yesterday's meeting, the people in Manitoba expect the Minister to be able to meet with them directly. They feel a close affinity to government and that's one of the reasons why things like health and education and social services are in fact delivered by a provincial government and not by a federal government. They do expect that close relationship with the Minister and possibly that was one of the major reasons that lead to the department being split up.

I do feel however that there are better combinations. I think that the splitting off the Income Security Group possibly with Corrections would be a better approach. The people in Corrections are probably a more stable population in terms of location than those located in the medical institutions in terms of trying to tie in an outreach program with them and following up with them afterwards. So I think that there are some other combinations that are better.

Secondly, I think from what I see here, the Minister is telling us that the Community Health Directorate is doing a lot of planning with respect to a different type of health services and that the actual delivery of these programs planned in the Department of Health is carried out by the Department of Community Services. I think there is a problem there in practice, in that whenever people are carrying out any program and any directives it is a matter of priorities. What priorities do they attach to those tasks laid out for them by the Department of Health as opposed to those laid out for them by the Department of Community Services. I

would expect that when it comes to a crunch the field staff of the Department of Community Services will do those things that it feels the administrative head of the Department of Community Services is more desirous of and they may in fact neglect many of the aspects of the Department of Health. That's why, whenever anyone talks about inter-departmental co-ordination and discipline, often it breaks down and from what the Minister has described to us right now I don't think we have sufficient means of ensuring that those plans that are developed by the Department of Health are in fact carried out systematically, coherently and evaluated properly by the Department of Health, if they are carried out by the Department of Community Services.

These are things that we can get into when we look at the particular programs and some of the areas of overlap but I do think there are those difficulties and I hope the Minister would take those into account and monitor the extent to which the programs being put forward by the Department of Health are actually being carried out by the people in another department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I too share with my colleague, and I'm sure with the Minister, some of the concerns about this reorganization. I am pleased to know that the Minister is leaving the door open, that if this doesn't work to the government's expectations, then there could be either some modification or going back to the way it was, or some other changes.

My main concern, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that it was a very big department and it was a difficult department and there is no doubt about that. It was difficult, but I don't think that it was impossible to run. It's impossible if you are going to do everything that you would like to do, but I think that you could say this about any department, even the smallest department there is, because there are so many things that you could do in public life. One of the things that is an important thing, especially with the present government, is the P.R. also that is being done in those departments. I'm not knocking it. I confessed before that I was envious of these qualities of the present Minister of Health, but I don't think it is the most important thing as, at times, I get the impression that the Minister does. The thing that I am concerned about is what we are going to lose also in the division of these departments, especially the co-ordination, because I think it is practically impossible to act independently. I know the Minister is going to tell me that they meet in Cabinet, but I have been there too and I know that you haven't got much time; you're not talking too much about planning and that kind of thing, programs, unless you have something concrete that you want to be discussed, and it's a valuable and necessary exercise. The HESP Committee, as we knew it, with the staff, was kind of ridiculed by the present administration. That is no longer there. I think that was helpful. I know that there is some kind of a similar committee where the Ministers meet, but my understanding is they haven't got the proper staff to do the work and it's just an exchange of ideas. I'm not criticizing that; I think it's something good. I think that probably it doesn't go far enough. I would like to know how often the Minister of Health,

for instance, and the Minister of Community Services meet.

There was another area, and I certainly can touch this because as far as I am concerned, it is very much related to that, there was a question of Fitness and Amateur Sport. A lot of people criticized that, that Fitness and Amateur Sport should have been with community recreation in there and it had some advantages there too. But I think and especially the present Ministers talk too much about the changing lifestyle and the fitness and prevention, we're all aware, we're all very much interested in prevention in this department because the cost is scaring the hell out of us, the costs, and it seems that we are trying to level them and it is quite difficult and it seems to go up all the time. It is something that I think should be considered, and it's going to get worse. I am talking about the dollars needed, because as we are going along there are more and more senior citizens, older people, they live longer now and we haven't got the same ratio of population that we had before of young people. The war boom is finished now and there is in fact a kind of tendency to plan families a little better and I think, Mr. Chairman, that you know the point I'm trying to make that there is less young people and as we go along in the turn of the century, there will be a much heavier percentage of people within the senior citizens or older people and this is a concern, and also the prevention is important. I was very disappointed when we went through the estimates of the Department of Fitness and Amateur Sport. The Minister himself agreed, in this year's estimates there are some changes, they were going into a program of Fitness but most of these programs were frozen, as were so many other things, when this government took office. One thing that we were just setting up and I had recommended to the Minister, the Minister of Health at this time, that they should have a kind of an inter-departmental committee to talk about that. There is no way that you can talk about fitness, and I am leaving amateur sport at the present time although amateur sport is a responsibility of government, especially when you apply it to fitness and the better life, but it is obvious from the answers that we received from the Minister that there hasn't been any meetings or the continuation of a formation of a committee of Ministers that would be involved in any way, even remote ways, with the fitness of Manitobans. I'm talking about the two Ministers who now are sharing the former department, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport also.

We had certain areas, for instance, the Minister of Education was queried on the problem in the gyms around the schools. There has been some difficulty also for the use — and that's not something new, I'm not blaming the government for that, but nevertheless it's not good enough to say, well, that has been there for so many years, we can't do anything about it. I'm talking about the proper use of the facilities paid for by the taxpayers of our province, paid either through a provincial government estimate or through the lottery or through the school division or grants from the Minister of Education. I can't see, those that were saying that fitness and amateur sport had no business being in the Department of Health, I couldn't disagree with that statement more, because that isn't the name of the game. What we're trying to do is keep healthy people and the best way to do it is go ahead and prevent disease as much as possible. It's impossible to change everything but to

get people to be healthier, not only for the cost but you see people that are old at 60 or at 65, that are sick, and you have other people 90 or older or more who are quite capable, are really enjoying life, and this is why this is so important.

As I say there was a committee, just at the end, not long before the last election so it hadn't had a chance to really get going too well. There was the Minister of Education, there was the Minister responsible for Health, Social Development and Fitness and Amateur Sport, and of course the Minister responsible for Community Recreation, because I cannot think of any way to talk about fitness, it's not just sports, it's not just exercise either, there are so many things. For instance, we mentioned in the past the junk food that is sold in the schools or in different areas, that it's very difficult even around here; I haven't looked lately, but you couldn't find a diet drink if you wanted to, there was all kinds of soft drinks and chocolate bars and so on. It's the same thing in schools, you're worried about them smoking pot and so on but there's many other things that might be practically as bad, because there is no doubt we were educated or brought up in a way where junk food is so important to us. We see that on television and radio so much that it is the common thing and it is very very difficult to do away with, but I think that there would be certainly an advantage. Maybe now the Minister should take the initiative, now that he's got a little more time on his hands, I'm not suggesting that he stays home, he doesn't come as early but I mean he could make time. I think that committee definitely should be looked at with the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport. At times the Minister who has Community Recreation now, the Minister of Social Development or Community Services, and the Minister of Education — especially the Minister of Education — and then the different departments in the department and it's not just that you have a Director of Fitness and Amateur Sport but who is the nutritionist? These kind of people go hand in hand. You can't just develop a program of fitness if you don't include the nutritionist, thinking of the food and with the proper exercise and so on. I think that is very important, I think that this will be missed.

The Minister also — I mentioned that and I'm not going to prolong this too much — I was very disappointed that the Minister who, by the Act of this House, had an Advisory Council on Fitness and Amateur Sport that the Minister did not use at all. They were good people; if the Minister wanted more of the people who were card-carrying or sympathetic to the party, that's fair ball, I don't criticize that. They could have added more, although I might say that has never been a concern of mine of what political party people were in those kinds of committees. I can assure you of that and I think the facts are there, and I think that this should be used. I said at the time that the Daly Committee just substitutes somebody that could have done the same thing. It would have been very easy to add Daly as the chairman and others, and I could only compliment the Minister for Mr. Daly, I have a lot of respect for him and I know what party he belongs to, but that doesn't change my respect for Mr. Daly or my opinion of Mr. Daly.

The situation this year that the Minister was totally ignorant of the fitness . . . he didn't even know — now I'm talking about the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport — had no idea what I was talking about when

I was talking about the Advisory Council Committee. In fact, he told me, well, that doesn't exist. I said, well, what do you mean, was there an Order-in-Council? Because as far as I'm concerned and he was supposed to check that, I don't think he did, I never got the answer, but what is the situation? Was there an Order-in-Council rescinding the appointment? Because if my memory serves me right, the appointments were until they were replaced. Then, lo and behold, when we were presented with the charts, organization charts, of the Department of Fitness and Amateur Sport, what do we see under Minister in a box? The Advisory Council of Fitness and Amateur Sport that the Minister said did not exist. I don't want to belabour that; I made my point last year and there's so many things to do, I don't think there's any necessity to rehash everything that was said last year. I could not recommend and I say that very seriously, not in a partisan way, but I could not too strongly recommend that such an interdepartmental committee be set up to discuss some areas that might fall between the two departments, if you are not careful, and I think it is doubly important now, Mr. Chairman, while you are going through this exercise of dividing the department to see if it is really going to work.

Now, my concern with Dr. Johnson, I have a lot of respect for Dr. Johnson and if the truth were known, I think that unless he has changed an awful lot, I think that Dr. Johnson's philosophy would be a lot closer to the members on this board than the other side. I remember what they used to call him and so on when he was the Minister of Health. I don't even fault the Minister for having these two very capable men in front of him because Dr. Johnson, I would suspect, and the Minister organizing a department certainly has the right to employ his personnel and go to their strengths instead of their weaknesses, and I see Dr. Johnson more of an idea man, more of a politician type of fellow than an administrator who will prepare the Orders-in-Council and check and the books and all that. So I think that maybe the Minister is better served by the two people that he has in front of him for this exercise.

I have an awful lot of confidence in Dr. Johnson and I suspect that he is used mostly as what we were intending to do, as the Chief Medical Adviser. Call him what you want, you have a doctor that is capable, that is well known, and I congratulate the Minister on his choice of personnel for that role. There is no problem with me at all.

I am a little concerned about the Manitoba Health Services Commission. The Minister, unless the Minister is just telling us everything that is in his mind and he just doesn't know yet, but that has been repeated over the last three years is, what is going to happen, if anything, to the Manitoba Health Services Commission? You have, and I can understand that, the Director, the senior full-time there, Mr. Reg Edwards, is doing the work of at least an Associate Deputy Minister because he has more than half of the department, certainly the biggest share of the funds in there, and I can understand that. But I think it is important for us to know what is going on. Is that going to disappear; is it going to be brought into the department? If so, will there be an Associate Deputy Minister, or what? The Minister is saying, well, we don't know yet and that's one of reasons why we haven't named a permanent Deputy Minister.

I agree with the Member for Transcona and believe it at times could be embarrassing to the present Acting

Deputy Minister, though. I think there is no reason why his role can't be confirmed and that could be changed later on, instead of Acting, because Acting has a connotation of maybe somebody that's on trial, somebody that you're not sure of. I know that people in those positions would much sooner be officially designated for a certain spot.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister will have more time now for what I consider the important points in this department. Certainly he will meet with as many people as he has; I think that he has done that in the past. It would be wasting my time to suggest to him that maybe he should be less interested in P.R. at this time because I realize that the department and the government is panicking right now. It is obvious when you look at the Throne Speech, when you listen to the Minister, when you read the remarks in Hansard made by the Minister last year and the year before where, you know, it was costs first and then need second, and where the Premier of this province supported the federal Budget, and I bring that in only because of the support given by the First Minister, who said there was only one thing wrong with it, that it didn't go far enough. Three or four days after the Throne Speech was brought in, we could see the change. It is a question of catch-up.

Now, I'm not going to criticize the government for catching up, because I have listening to the things that were said and I see very little, if anything, new, and the things that were new were certainly being — and they can take all the credit and they deserve the credit for that — but it wasn't some new philosophy of a different party who is going to do, or was going to do things better; it is the things that were in the mill and running. We talked about the Cadham Lab; we talked about many of these things, and it was a continuation of that. So I can't criticize the government for trying to do it, but I think that they should realize and maybe then they should have the decency to say that all these awful things that were done, that we were throwing money at problems. I think we saw the Minister, in his statement today, it was partisan politics and, again, he has got to take the responsibility. But it was obvious that there were other Ministers involved. After freezing the construction of personal care homes for so long, then was stuck in a place around the Interlake, and who has made some commitments to have even more hospitals that definitely — I'm not saying they're not needed. We were always challenged, what would you say to that constituency or that place? Are you ready to say . . . We had a good example the other night, The cheque didn't go, yet you want to advocate that this is done. I think, yes, that you have to have an overall plan, and this was done. This wasn't done by me — it was accepted by me — but it was done by the Commission. We didn't worry about which way the people voted in that area; we looked at the needs. We had a situation where catching up cost us an awful lot of money. It caused us an awful lot of money, because I listened to the capital projects of the Minister in the Throne Speech, I think. I look at it and I dug out again his statement on Capital of last year, and of all the programs that the Minister announced, there were maybe two or three at the most that were very small ones that were not included in the five-year plan. The Minister announced what the number of personal care beds will be when this is finished and I think there are less than 30 different from what we would have now, or very very

soon, had that program been allowed to continue. I say it would cost, because we all know around this House that the 1975 or 1976 dollars, that you can add at least 10 percent on that every year, and that makes quite a bit of change. This is what we have to face. This is quite difficult.

They have talked also and that, I think, is related to it. There was a question of the role of who should operate personal care homes. It was stated many times in the past that it wasn't a question of ideology but it was felt that the field of health wasn't a place where you should have somebody, a captive market such as it is, and allow the people to profit by it. Now, it is not socialism again the free enterprise system. It was suggested a few years ago and repeated again by the Member for Transcona, the question is: Why not the hospitals? It's a very legitimate question. I'm talking about acute beds now. There is no reason why this isn't done. What do we have against it? It's not the fact that people are making money. Certainly — I'll speak for myself — to make sure that I am not putting words in anybody's mouth, but the fact is it is the service and the needs. For instance, the Minister can say, well, we approved last year, facilities for Selkirk. Then he can wash his hands of it and say, it's not in our court and it's not our responsibility. That's not good enough. I'm not faulting the operators, the people, because they are in there to make a buck. Some people seem to think that people on this side, when we say that, that we think, well, that's wrong. I don't look at it like that at all. I don't think there is anything wrong to make a buck; I would like to make a few bucks also. That's not the thing at all.

The thing is that the department and the government are there not necessarily to protect or to encourage that or discourage it. The main concern, it shouldn't concern itself with that at all, is the service and the need. You had a situation, and it's going to get worse because of the high cost of money, and people would sit down and look at what it would cost them to build an establishment and they backed away at this time. They couldn't do it. But the need didn't change, the need was there, the need is greater all the time. The construction the way it is going now, it's not going to get cheaper, and no matter who . . . That to me makes me laugh a bit when we talk about free enterprise and we are going to defend that in the battle of the fittest and this is going to separate the men from the boys. In this case, the private enterpriser who builds a personal care home, who do you think is going to pay for it? How is that going to be assessed when he presents his budget to the government? Because don't forget why I say this, it is an insured program, it is an insured service. I certainly haven't heard the government say we want to get away from that. I know they never would have put it into effect if they hadn't inherited that and there's not that many provinces that are doing that. But politically they know and I know that politically there is no way that they can back away from this at this time and they don't intend to. But because it is an insured service the government has some responsibility and the operator, you or I, Mr. Chairman, if we were to build a personal care home, it has to be licensed by the government. What do we do when we look at the budget? We're going to prepare our budget, we're going to look at the staff, we're going to look at all the needs, then we're going to add a certain amount for profit, we're going to have some money tied up, you'll

want at least what you can get in the bank or something, and then the cost of that, because you are going to have to pay interest on the money for the loan because I don't think there are too many people that will build it and pay for everything by cash, even if they could. So that will be reflected.

Now the government rightfully can say, look at these bad guys, look at what they did. We're using the free enterprise system to help us in this field of health, we're going in as partners. It would have cost us so much money and it's not costing us anything — well that's not true — that's just a bit of bookkeeping that you see it now instead of having it lie there, interest for capital programs, you have hidden per diem rates for personal care homes going to the proprietary nursing homes. So it is not a question of ideologies at all, Mr. Chairman, it is a question of the need is there and then if you — like any operator — you're a businessman, Mr. Chairman, I was a businessman and what happened if we had trouble, if we couldn't make any money? We'd start looking around and we'd cut down staff, we'd tighten the belt somewhere else, and we might try to save a little money in the kitchen. A few years ago, last year, there was quite a bit done about it — things that looked so ridiculous and in itself they were small things. They were very small things and it was laughed at, you'd hear, they're trouble makers, referring to people on this side, they're just looking for trouble, but where the service will deteriorate is in little things like that and when you add all these little things it makes a big thing.

At least the government has a responsibility and it scrutinized and so on. At no time, it might be changed now, and I would imagine it will be if they are given more licences, but at no time did the personal care homes, in the time that I was there and the time that my colleague was Minister of Health and Social Development, did they want to open their books to us or to the Commission. They figured, this is our business and that's it, in my time — I won't speak for anybody else. So that was very difficult —(Interjection)— Well, I am told they still don't but I hope at least if they get a licence then that will be changed.

This is the concern that I have, without faulting — you know in this House, whenever you say anything, because you are charged with a certain mandate you are trying to go for good administration, that doesn't mean that I'm right, but I think I am right and the Minister thinks he's right and the parties think their right. But if somebody has the nerve or the courage, I would say, to say well alright this is very difficult politically, but this is not the best way of doing it. For instance, what we heard yesterday in this House about the lottery, where you know that you are not going to make friends, but you have a concern and you think this is the best way to do it and you voice that concern. Automatically you are against them and the present government sure tried to make a big thing about the confrontation with doctors and so on, which I felt then and I still feel now wasn't quite fair and we'll talk about that, I don't want to go too much, I want to stay on the reorganization, Mr. Chairman, but these are some of the concerns that we have.

Now I would hope that we are going to have a little bit better planning. I've read and I've heard the Minister, and the Minister — I can't repeat that too often — is an expert at PR, and thank God the government has him for this difficult department, where they did not

provide him with the resources that were needed under this, but he did a good job and he does a good job — anything in his power — by flying kites, by being on every side of every issue and this is just fine but that's not going to last forever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I will refrain, I don't want to take too long, maybe I got carried away a bit, I was talking about the administration and wanted to voice certain concerns that I have. The main question, I guess, would be what is being done to keep this rapport and good co-operation between the two Ministers, especially in the field of lifestyle, fitness and nutrition and so on between the different departments? Maybe the Minister can answer this question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, let me say to both the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the Honourable Member for Transcona, both of whom expressed relatively similar concerns, that I don't dismiss their concerns lightly. I recognize that there are some unresolved questions with respect to the best kind of format for carrying out the responsibilities of the Departments of Health and Community Services. I simply reiterate that we took the position that a division of the department was desirable if it was practicable, because of the size of the constituencies that have to be served. That whole exercise is in review in terms of its final shape and form. I'm not suggesting that the division of the Department of Health and Community Services into two separate departments has not been completed in concept but it has certainly not been completed in detail. The Member for Transcona raised some particular perspectives with respect to how the split might, in his view, be better organized, he had particular references to the Income Security Division; the Member of St. Boniface has had the same concerns and expressed them particularly with respect to preventive services and fitness.

I can only say to them that we felt on balance that the total area of service and responsibility that has to be met through these two departments could best be met by dividing the one original department into two departments so as to provide more opportunities for ministerial attention to specific problems and specific constituencies but the final shape still must be refined. There may be improvements and modifications. I appreciate their suggestions. We would certainly hope to finalize it this year. In fact, we would certainly hope to finalize it by this summer, but there are a number of questions and options that are still open and it isn't final yet.

On the subject of liaison and communication between different departments and Ministers, particularly with respect to prevention and fitness, I want to assure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that there is a Cabinet committee, a Standing Committee of Cabinet, in place and functioning that meets regularly under the chairmanship of the Minister of Health known as the Community Services Committee of Cabinet, that embraces the Ministers of Health, Community Services, Education, Fitness, Recreation and Sport, Cultural Affairs and Urban Affairs. So that the opportunity for li-

aision and cohesive co-operative approach to problems such as those cited by the Member for St. Boniface is there and is utilized.

On the subject of the future of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, I can only say at this juncture that the Minister of Health and the people of Manitoba are extremely well-served by the personnel of the Manitoba Health Services Commission under the Executive Director, Mr. Reg Edwards, and there is no implied criticism of that personnel or their duties, their functions, and their services. The question that remains in our minds, and it's one that's been addressed in virtually every province of this country in the past few years and resolved differently to the manner in which it has persisted in Manitoba in most cases, is whether or not that operation which is responsible for such a large portion of the Health budget and which employs such a large portion of the Public Service employees who work in the field of health on behalf of the people of the province, should be an actual operating division of the department or should continue as a free-standing agency or commission, as it were. Many provinces in Canada have abolished their commissions and folded them into the Departments of Health, as you know, and as honourable members opposite know. Many of my colleagues in other provinces have offered opinions to me as to what we should do and I might say, Sir, that the opinions break down just about 50/50. Half of them say fold your commission in and half of them say I wish we'd never folded our commission in, we'd like to separate it again. So the question is not answered, but it is no reflection on the commission personnel themselves. We intend to resolve that this year, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am concerned about this separation or division, call it what you will. I don't see it simply as has been — I get the feeling that the way it's been discussed — as simply a matter of putting different boxes in different places. The Department of Health and Community Services or Social Services as it was formerly called, is the one department of government that really deals with the blood and guts of the people. I used to refer to it as the department of miseries; all the miseries of the world flow through that department. The idea that separation is taking place, that it's administratively possible to do it, and the concern about taking the pressure off a particular Minister and the administration — those are valid concerns if you are looking at it administratively. But let's look at it from the other side, from the recipients. And what I see in this move, Mr. Chairman, is a move by this government to pursue a direction which I think is in line with their thinking, of sticking or going back to a very traditional approach to health; the traditional approach being that of a curative treatment oriented system. You get sick, you go to the doctor; if you have to, you go to a hospital; if you're a certain age, you go to a personal care home, or you need home care, you need treatment.

Now surely in this day and age we've gone far beyond that. That might have been fine in the 40s, the 50s, when hospitalization came into being and in the late 60s when medicare came into being, but the purpose and direction which Justice Hall originally pointed in his first study, his first report to the federal government,

back I think it was in 1964, was that medicare be implemented, hospitalization was already in, but that it be the forerunner to a comprehensive health scheme. And health is not simply sickness or the treatment of sickness. Health is, as the World Health Organization defines it, the well-being of an individual. And so I can't see how you can separate the problems, the social conditions in which people live, the economic conditions which then lead to medical illness, very often they do. They lead to problems in the educational system. Very often the educational system is blamed for things which aren't the fault of the educational system; it's the fault of the home conditions from which the child comes, and we all know that. And the same applies in spasms, to the field of social services and the field of health. Because to me they're — I was going to say two sides of the same coin, it's the same side of the same coin, Mr. Chairman, you can't really separate them.

The points in a person's life when they become ill, when they must see a doctor, they must get treatment, that very often comes as a result of other factors in their life; their working conditions, the situation at home as between husband and wife, perhaps a drinking problem in the family, creating stresses and strains, and in this modern time of ours with the pace in which we are living, the stresses and strains are greater than ever before and they are not going to ease up. Because the rate of change, the rapid change all around us is so quick and so fast, that whereas a few generations ago — not very many — people had time to adjust and they could absorb the changes. What you hear more and more of is that people cannot adapt to the changes quickly enough. They're left on the outside, they don't know what hit them. That leads to medical problems, but you can't separate the two.

My concern therefore, is in creating a separation, this government has in fact taken the path to a very traditional approach to health, doctor-oriented, treatment-oriented, and are departing from the direction that we had introduced a few years ago — which is not unique to Manitoba — of the single unit delivery system where all the people who are involved in rendering service to the public are together, can treat the person as a whole person. Not that if you have a particular social problem or housing problem, you see this social worker. If you have another problem with regard to lack of income, you see somebody else. If you have a health problem, or the child has got a problem at school and they say you'd better see a doctor, then somebody else steps into the picture. And you get a truncated system, a fragmented system, with 10, 12 different people sort of all congregating around that child or that adult when the time comes.

My concern is that although the Minister says, oh, there will be liaisons and there will be regional offices, they will still be in the same office and still be in the same building, I predict that inevitably, with different ministries, with different deputies, that the natural flow within a line department will take hold and the kind of — not just interchange — but the kind of close linkage where they all became part of the same delivery vehicle, will in time break down. It won't happen immediately, just as it wasn't that easy, I can tell you, to bring them together, because they were so used to being separated that it took — I can tell the Minister — a few years to break down the resistance in the field. People have said, look, I'm a social worker and this is my spe-

cially; let somebody else worry about the other aspect, that's not my job.

We had, I know, bickering in the field, but gradually it broke down. Now we are turning it around and we are starting to go back to the traditional system. My concern is that it's a retrogressive step, it's a backwards step, and it really runs counter to the natural flow which was inevitable and had to take place. For whatever reason, maybe it's only because the government felt that this Minister was overworked and, I acknowledge, it's a rough job. I was deeply involved in it, as the Minister probably knows, both as Minister and as chairman of the Health, Education and Social Policy Committee. Nonetheless, it isn't really the pressure on the Minister I have to worry about, it is the people of Manitoba. It can be so arranged that some of the pressure can be taken off the Minister, but the system should not be impaired. It is my concern the system will be impaired and that, in fact, it will go back in a very short time to people saying, this is my thing, this is what I do, this is my line of communication, this is the line department, this is the flow of the hierarchal, administrative steps that I have to follow, and the two will separate. When they separate, you cannot and will not give the kind of attention and the kind of service to the public, which is the recipient of this service and which should get that service in a unified way, in a comprehensive way, in an all-embracing way, rather than have to shop around for this service and that service and the other service. It is with those few comments that I am expressing the concern about the direction that the government has taken and my feeling that it isn't just a matter of drawing boxes on a flow chart and lines of communication and lines of authority, but rather this is going to strike at the very root of the service itself and the concept of what is health in its broadest terms, the well-being of people. I'm afraid you are departing from that and going back to what it was a decade or two decades ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. I wanted to go back to a statement that the Minister made in his opening statement. I believe he said that the government didn't believe in a double standard between rich and poor in the provision of health care to Manitoba citizens. I feel that in some respects, we may be moving in that direction. I believe the Minister did say that the government's position, at least conceptually, was that they didn't believe in any type of double standard between the rich and the poor. I think that that can only be heightened by an example. Does the Minister believe that health care should be provided on the basis of need, not status or ability to pay? If you take a particular example: If there was only one bed available in a hospital and the Minister, or myself, supposedly we have status, are there waiting for elective surgery, and a poor railway worker was there for emergency surgery, I assume the Minister would agree with me that we shouldn't go first, that rather the other person should go first because they have greater need.

I think it is quite important to clarify those particular positions so I ask the Minister that, not facetiously.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, I do agree with that position, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. The interesting thing on that is that I would like to now welcome the Minister into the arms of socialism. He has expressed with me agreement of the most fundamental socialist principles, namely from each according to his ability, to each according to his need. I congratulate the Minister for agreeing with that. As I said, some of his colleagues often talk about creeping socialism, and how creeping socialism will take us down to totalitarianism. I think the member sitting on his right is the greatest example of that line of thinking.

What struck me when I was going through some of the submissions to the Hall Commission and some of the statements being made by a number of people, is that surprisingly and somewhat humorously, I saw great numbers of supposed Conservatives and Liberals strongly defending socialism as applied to health care, namely that the health care system that is best is that which indeed provides on the basis of need and is paid for collectively by people accordingly to their ability to pay.

That is something that I think was brought about, not for ideological reasons in the health care, but because it works best. That's why premiums were abolished; that's why the health care system that we have in place to date, and it by no means is comprehensive, is in fact paid for by people through income tax on the ability to pay.

I believe, and we strongly on this side believe, that people should have access to that care on the basis of need, not status, not privilege, not income.

That holds true for some of the services that exist to date, and I'm glad the Minister agrees with that proposition. I think before, he said that his government believes that. I'm not sure if his government believes that, but I'll take the Minister's word for it when he says he personally would, and I commend the Minister on that particular position. I think it is a practical one. It is one that works. It is one that has probably been the greatest advance of civilization in the last 50 years, namely that we are prepared as a society to provide something as critical as health to people on the basis of need.

I think that when one in fact starts looking at alternative ways of providing for needs, and we certainly have a lot more health needs to provide in our health care delivery system as it develops over the next 10, 20, or 30 years, I am hoping that the Minister will keep in mind that he indeed has a fairly open mind with respect to the provision of health care services on the basis of need, and that he in fact will recognize that you need, I think, a pluralistic approach in the health care delivery system, that you need a number of different ways of getting at people, of getting at some of the preventative measures that my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, talked about. I think you need a number of different programs in place, especially outreach programs, to get at some of the concepts raised by my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks. I'm just afraid that we are somewhat narrow and that we may in fact be pigeon-holing health in too narrow a pigeon hole really to deal with it adequately.

I want to put a number of questions on the table for the Minister and I'll give him an opportunity to answer some of them, and also tell me which ones he feels best can be dealt with in particular sections in the departmental estimates. I do that in part for myself in order to expedite the process but also we have two committees operating. There are people who are in-

terested in Health estimates. They have particular concerns that they want to raise. I would like to give my colleagues the opportunity to come in here at appropriate times, raise particular issues and to the degree possible, avoid repetition of questions that I think occurs, not because people are ill-intentioned, but rather because they have to serve time in the other committee. So I'll lay a number of these on the table. Some of them I think you can deal with at present and some, I believe, he could refer to some later stage in the estimates process. And if he would do that, I'll go through them fairly slowly, I think the staff can take them down and he can respond to them.

I would like the Minister, if he could now or at some stage, to tell us how much extra has been paid to the province over these three years by the federal government, that was greater than the amount expected and projected in 1977. I was at the Hall Commission hearings when the Minister of Finance staff told the Hall Commission that the province did receive more money from the federal government than it had expected to receive, even allowing for guarantees. That was a statement made by a very senior person in the Department of Finance and it led me to, in fact, make my charges earlier that the province, at a time of receiving a type of windfall gain from the federal government in the way of health care funding, had indeed put a freeze on health care funding at the very same time. So I think it would be fair and proper in the light of the finance official statement to the Hall Commission, with respect to health matters, to provide us that information as to what was expected and how much did the federal payments exceed that which was expected. That's one question.

I think it would be important for the Minister, possibly at this stage, although it does overlap with the other Minister, to indicate to us who would determine the estimate requirements for, say, the regional operations of Community Health and Social Services. If you look at that department I think you'll see that it's that branch, or that section of the department, that provides the delivery of much of what the Minister is talking about when he talks about the implementation of the health programs by the government.

I guess to reinforce concerns of my colleagues and myself in this respect, if in fact you have a group in your community health directorate, or I assume possibly the Acting Deputy Minister of Health, or whatever group, or even your Cabinet committee, establishing some priorities, establishing some thrusts, they only will make sense if you have the pieces in place for implementation. We can plan all we want, but planning really isn't serious unless you implement that which you plan. The concern that we have is that you cannot have a group in one particular body developing these plans unless there's a very good system in place to ensure that the estimates actually reflect the plans. Furthermore, to ensure that not only do the estimates reflect the plans, but in fact the estimates that reflect those plans are approved coherently and systematically in such a way as to ensure the implementation of those plans in the Cabinet estimates process. Because often one particular vital component of a health care plan or an educational thrust can, in fact, be cut out in another department at the Cabinet level of the estimates review and that, I think, causes tremendous problems and leaves one with a rhetorical program, not a real program.

I ask as well — and I think I have a list of some questions here that I think are fairly serious ones that possible don't have to be answered right now — I'd like to know what estimate covers the relationship between the government and the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses. Somewhere there is some relationship between the government and those bodies, because I know that ultimately those bodies do relate to the Minister. It could be by some regulation, but there must be some authority. I don't want to squeeze it in sort of surreptitiously under the table, but surely in estimates process, that is the time to ask the Minister questions pertaining to that. I give him sufficient lead time so that he can say, well yes, we can do it now or let's do it at that particular stage.

Again, some of my colleagues are interested in some of these questions. They just don't relate to the College of Physicians and Surgeons; they relate to some questions that have been raised by nurses and by other people relating to professional organizations. There are some others as well, like chiropractors and some other people. I think at some stage it would be useful for us to discuss what the government's relationship to those somewhat self-governing bodies is. Because I think the relationship may in fact be somewhat different between the government and the College of Physicians and Surgeons than that between the government and the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses and the chiropractors, and other people like that. I think it's important to determine what that relationship is and why the differences exist, and if in fact there should be differences.

I do want to also serve notice that the whole question of abuse has been raised by a number of people in submissions to the Hall Commission, but I'm sure the Minister as well receives some complaints about supposed abuse from certain people. I would like to get the government's position or view on the whole question of abuse of health care. Do they think there is abuse of the health care system? If so, by whom, by the patients or by the doctors, or both? I've already stated my tentative position on this, from the information that I have at hand, which is frankly more subjective than objective; and that's that I have yet to see patients be able to set their own appointments with doctors; I've yet to see patients be able to admit themselves into hospitals; I've yet been able to have the patients set the return appointment up with a doctor. All of these appointments and draws on the health care system are in fact determined by the doctor.

So I get very upset when I see doctors going forward, complaining about abuse in the health care system, when they in fact are the point of control. —(Interjection)— My colleague, the Member for St. Boniface says that some doctors may in fact be criticizing their colleagues and frankly I would be, at this stage, somewhat more in agreement with them because my own, again, more subjective experience has been that the doctor is the point of control, in terms of admitting patients; in terms of setting appointments. Most appointments, indeed, are set by phone. Someone phones a doctor and says, what do you think, come in and see me or go to Emergency. Those suggestions are not suggestions; those directions are given by your doctors. So I think the government's position on that, I think it's an important one; it's a question that I think should be discussed seriously.

I'd like to get the government's position on deterrent fees. I believe the Minister — I'll have to check back; he made a number of statements — I believe the Minister did say that he believed that deterrent fees don't work and the government is not in favour of them, but I would like to get that clarified again. I'll have to check through the rough drafts of Hansard tomorrow. I don't want to ascribe positions to the Minister on that, but I do think the government's position on deterrent fees is important to a rational discussion of health care in Manitoba.

What is the government's position on user fees, because I think there is a difference between user fees and deterrent fees? We will get to Community Health Centres; I expect at that stage I will get a clear statement from the government on his position regarding community health centres. Possibly at that time, but I leave it open to the Minister, has the government considered capitation payments? If you look at literature regarding alternative means of looking at health care costs, that is one that is put forward. It's been tried in some private clinics that operate in the United States. I think the Kaiser Permanente Institute in California is probably the most famous in this respect in terms of having capitation payments paid to the clinic per patient with the onus on the institution then to ensure that sufficient health care is provided within the parameters of that capitation payment. Now, generally, that makes some sense. I don't know the impracticalities of it but I certainly would like to find out what the government's position on that is. I'd like to know what the government's position is regarding what I'd call the ideal state of comprehensiveness of health care systems, and then I'd like to get an indication from the government as to what it thinks might be achievable with respect to health care comprehensiveness over the next period of time.

You know, we talk about things like dentures for older people, talk about things like eyeglasses for older people. I know there have been improvements made under the New Democratic Party government administration, under the Conservative government administration, in terms of providing certain things. I think that's a move in the right direction. I think you've got the hearing testing facilities; those are good moves, but at the same time I believe that we still have a long way to go in the provision of health services to people so that they would, in fact, be able to achieve health care on the basis of need and not on the basis of ability to pay. Because there are a number health care services and aids that in fact are not provided on the basis of need but are, indeed, available to people on the basis of their ability to pay. Unfortunately, many of these aids are needed most by those people who don't have the ability to pay.

I pointed this out before, but at some stage I would like the Minister to give us the government's position on the role of doctors, nurses, para professionals, orderlies, in the health care delivery system. I commented before that I felt that the Minister emphasized doctors far too much. I frankly believe that nurses are a tremendous point of personal contact between patients and health care delivery system, that when doctors complain that they in fact feel that they've lost some status over the last 10 years, in my estimation, they haven't; in my estimation, it has been other people within the health care delivery system who don't have

sufficient status and respect by people — nurses are one category, orderlies are another.

When I, in fact, toured nursing homes over the last two years when they were complaining about cutbacks, one of the first comments I was getting from people is that we missed the orderlies; we were having orderlies helping to turn us over; we aren't turned over as often right now. Those were the comments that they were giving us. I wonder about the role of para professionals as well. When I talk about doctors, I know that they have a very strong association. At the same time what role can para professionals play in the delivery of health care? I know that undoubtedly the Minister has a number of acquaintances who are doctors as I do, and when we talk about some of these issues, I find that the doctors do raise the question of status. But at the same time they don't raise the question of status in relation to the other people on the health care delivery team because surely we're talking about teams of people who provide health care delivery. I think sometimes because of the system as it exists, where a lot of nurses are directly under doctors, and where the doctor sees himself as a businessman having a staff below him or working for him doesn't have the same appreciation of these other people who are very important in the provision of health care. I think some of them then, some doctors, tend to think that in a sense they are somehow responsible, and going a bit further than that, somehow providing the services of other people. I think that para professionals can do a number of things right now that doctors are doing — very well, possibly more inexpensively, so that we save doctors' labour for that which is really required. I know that in talking to a number of doctors, many of them point out that they do spend a lot of time dealing with matters that possibly they are over-trained for. I feel that there is that middle ground of para professionals which I think offers room for exploration.

The one thing that never ceased to amaze me is the fact that I think there are virtually no people who in a sense have career paths and have career development within the health care delivery system. It strikes me that people might start off as nurses aides and should be able to work on to become nurses through on-the-job training programs through some programs which in fact could combine some type of apprenticeship of some type of formal training program with on-the-job training. I think the same thing holds true with nurses as well. You know, when you look at a lot of the professions, they started off almost in a guild sense or a craft sense with someone working with someone else who was skilled and passed on that knowledge through on-the-job training through on-the-job experience to someone else. Now we find it very rigid and very compartmentalized, so that people have very rigid academic requirements, some of which possibly aren't necessary to the profession, in terms of doing the tasks at hand but, indeed, may in fact be requirements set up as constraints to limit the possibility to enter that particular profession. I think that doesn't hold true just for doctors; I think it holds true for other people. I think that is something I would like to see what the government believes in this and whether in fact there is some room for this.

Again, I notice that a very good friend of the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. Again, I notice that a very good of the Honourable Minister's, namely Monique Begin, has in fact indicated that we have to establish suitable standards across the country. I think one of the difficulties is trying to determine what suitable standards are, because there hasn't been much agreement on suitable standards. Everyone can talk about it, and I think at some stage, those suitable standards have to be made objective and concrete, rather than just talking about them in terms of, well, suitable standards are only relative and we really can't define them crisply. Because we can never monitor that which we are providing unless we have some clear standards. When I raise the question of standards, I might point out that I believe hospitals have some very clear standards. I am hoping the Minister might indicate that. I am not sure whether there exists anywhere in legislation or regulation a comprehensive set of standards for personal care homes in Manitoba. I know that Ontario has some legislation and regulations, The Nursing Homes Act of 1972, with Ontario Regulations 196-72, which, in a pretty large document for something like this, spells out the standards for personal home care. Again, I am wondering whether we have anything like that in Manitoba. We also relate it to health care and we relate it to mental health care, and other care relating to health.

I have given the Minister a fairly long list of questions. He doesn't have to answer them right now. I don't think they are petty; I don't think they are the type that get into whether in fact this half-staff man year is better used here or somewhere else. I do think they are very important in debating the issue of health care clearly. I am just going to take a couple of minutes — if I have a couple of minutes left — to point out that I think we need to plan better for the special needs of northerners. I think accessibility is a critical problem here — accessibility to health care. I think that a \$40,000 grant to the MMA won't solve the problem of getting health care more accessible to northerners. I think the problem is much more complex than that; I think it is much more complex than that in rural areas. I note that Benito, I believe, still doesn't have a doctor. I am sure the Minister must have received letters on that particular issue. It is just not a matter of getting a doctor into many of these places, it's a matter of getting that public health outreach program into a place.

We have the Air Ambulance Program operating in northern Manitoba, but that only deals with the crises. It's not dealing with prevention; it's not dealing with immunization; it's not dealing with that normal set of activity that I think should take place.

I think there are special needs of people living in the inner core of Winnipeg, who I think are alienated from those large bureaucratic institutions. I think they are somewhat intimidated by a large institution. Again, I think that that's a special area that has to be addressed by what I would call the executive function of this particular department.

I am going to hold off on another one, but I will just raise it, just to serve notice. I believe that the special needs of women who don't have access to a full range of medical facilities and services, even though they are provided by law, is a problem that this government has not addressed itself to, and is one that will have to be debated.

Although the Minister mentioned this, I think above all, the real crisis and shaping phenomena facing health

care in Manitoba are the special needs of an aging population and the type of stresses and pressures that this will put on our entire health care system. I just point out that the outer edge of the baby boom will reach 40 in just six years and at this age, the use of the health care system by males increases dramatically, followed by a more gradual increase among females. Having failed to plan for the baby boom through the public schools, universities and house building by stages, we must not extend that failure to the geriatric health care stage. There have been enough studies over the last 10 years and I think we need action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member's time is up.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Transcona has certainly covered a wide spectrum of subjects and subject areas. I am certainly prepared to deal with them during examination of my estimates, but I would seek direction from you, Sir, as to whether we should be dealing with them under 1.(a)(2) Salaries, relative to the operations of the office of the Deputy Minister, the Assistant to the Minister and Deputy Minister and the support staff in that office, plus the general office costs associated with that office operation. I can certainly indicate to the honourable member where some of the questions that he has raised should be dealt with. I would suggest that the vast majority of them should be dealt with under the first item on the first appropriation, which is the Minister's Salary, when we come to discuss the ministerial salary appropriation, with the wide latitude that it provides for examination of the whole field of the department and departmental operations and the government's objectives.

There are some specific questions he has asked that relate to the Manitoba Health Services Commission, which is covered in Appropriation No. 79, Vote 79 on Page 61 of the estimates.

When he asks me, for example, how much extra has been paid to the province in the past three years by the federal government under EPF over what was expected, I would have to refer him for his answer to that question to the Department of Finance. I can tell him what Manitoba received in cash and tax transfers, the total amount received for Health in cash and tax transfers under EPF in 1979-80, which was \$281.2 million, 1979-80, and our total pure Health budget that year was \$570.3 million. For the coming year, or the year we are in now, 1980-81, the total for Health, cash and tax transfers under EPF, will be \$308.7 million, and our total pure health budget will be \$642.4 million.

He asked me for the last three years — I don't have 1978-79 in front of me, but I can certainly get it. It was approximately \$248.4 and the pure health budget for 1978-79 was \$525 million, approximately. So it was \$248.4 against a total Health budget of \$525 million.

I can't tell him to what extent those figures exceeded original projections. He will have to ask the Department of Finance that. But we are assured, and have indicated before the Hall Commission, before the Federal-Provincial Conference of Health Ministers in Ottawa, as other provinces have indicated and have not been challenged and have not found that position disputed by the federal government, that expectations and projections for the flow of cash and tax transfers to the prov-

inces under EPF in the first three years of EPF were significantly below reality, that the amount that did flow exceeded the amount that was expected to flow because of the national economic picture, and that the reverse trend is setting in now and projections are that the reverse trend will prevail for at least the next two years and, depending on inflationary pressures, may well prevail for a number of years.

The honourable member asked me about the estimates that cover the relationship between the government and the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the relationship between the government and the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses. There is, in fact, Mr. Chairman, no estimate that covers those relationships, unless one wants to consider Appropriation 75, 1.(a)(1) and (2), the Minister's Salary and the office of the Deputy Minister, because the relationships with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and with the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses and other such self-governing professional bodies, are purely relationships of consultation and discussion and liaison between my office and my Deputy Minister's office and the presidencies and executive directorships of those associations. There is no funding involved; there is no vote that is required. They are professional, communications, consultative relationships.

The honourable member asked about Community Health Centres. That, of course, is a specific Appropriation, 2.(f) on Page 59, and can be dealt with under that heading.

He asked me about standards and suitable standards. Mr. Chairman, that really can be dealt with in about three different areas. Certainly it can be dealt with under the Minister's Salary, but it would also be dealt with under the Manitoba Health Services Commission appropriation because there is a Standards Division of the Commission and standards are drawn, defined and applied in the health facility and health services field, and that subject can be examined there.

The honourable member referred to the special needs of the aging population. That is something that we have recognized. We do see it as a major challenge for our society and, indeed, a major challenge for all societies in North America. The demographics are clear. The horizon is identifiable. Forty years from today, on the basis of current projections, one Manitoban out of every five will be over 65 years of age. The comparative figure for today is one Manitoban out of every 10. That is what we are headed for. We have recognized that through the establishment of the Manitoba Council on Aging, which is going to be charged with specific challenges, specific initiatives by the government, specific subject areas to search out, evaluate and to develop for the formulation of policy proposals and program proposals for the government, so that the province can adjust its lifestyles and its institutions and its attitudes and its services to those changing demographics.

The other subjects covered in the questions raised by the honourable member, I believe, Mr. Chairman, fall essentially under the appropriation for the Manitoba Health Services Commission, except in the case of those that are perhaps more general in nature, such as those that refer to the special needs of women and the nursing situation and the government's attitude towards health care generally, its objectives for health care, its position on so-called user and deterrent fees, its position with respect to abuses of health care. I think, Sir, they can for the most part be discussed

under the Commission appropriation, and if not, they certainly can be examined in full under the appropriation covering the Minister's salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like clarification. The Minister, perhaps I didn't hear the figures correctly, he was saying that in 1979-80 the EBF accounted for \$281.2 million, and he said out of a pure health budget of \$573 million. Am I correct in those figures so far?

MR. SHERMAN: Out of the pure health budget of \$570.3 million, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: I wasn't worried about that slight discrepancy. And the \$308.7 million, out of the total term pure, is \$642.4 million. I am wondering whether the Minister could explain what he means by pure health budget and how does this relate at all to the printed estimates that we have before us? I don't want to debate this now, I just want to know if we are using the same book, because I can't relate it to the printed estimates insofar as what he calls the pure health budget is concerned.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, for the most part when we use the term pure health and the pure health budget what I am referring to and what we're referring to are those subject areas of service that we consider to be health services, services that have been initiated and developed by the province of Manitoba, under one government or another, independent of any kinds of directions or directives laid down in rigid funding formulae applied by the federal government.

In that category, Mr. Chairman, we include virtually all the subject areas and the topics that are presented in the estimates book for the Department of Health as it appears before the honourable members of the committee at the present time, but it also includes some services that are on the community services side that are health in the sense that they relate to specifically identifiable health problems and were so classified when the department was a combined department. The list is certainly no secret, Mr. Chairman, I can give it to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. It includes, obviously, the Manitoba Health Services Commission, which embraces the hospital, medical, personal care home, pharmacare, ambulance and northern patient transportation programs; and these other categories of programs and services we include in what we call pure health services — institutional mental health, institutional mental retardation, home care, rehabilitation services to the disabled, dental services, psychiatric services, medical public health, medical supplies and home care equipment, health education films and publication, community residences, community health centres, the Winnipeg Health Unit Grant, general purpose grants, the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, MHSC Administration and the field operations administration's directorates.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear to my honourable friend for Seven Oaks, that in any debate in any comparative figures that I have used in this House, outside this House, in Ottawa, in debates with my honourable friend, in front of the Hall Commission, I have included all those categories in every reference that I have made

over the past decade. In other words, looking at what the previous government did and comparing it with what the present government is doing from 1971 right through to 1981, I have used and we have used the same range of categories. So that whatever percentages and comparisons we've ever been using have always been percentages and comparisons of apples and apples or oranges and oranges, and that has been a conscientious and deliberate and I think necessarily an honest and direct approach. So that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks may have some dispute with the categorization of some of those services in pure health, but then if that is the case then we've got to go back to square one and start debating all over again from 1971, because I've credited the previous government with the same categories in pure health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister gave me the answer but he went beyond the answer which forces me to make a few comments. What the Minister is busily doing here is trying to justify the position he is taking publicly in his fight with the federal government vis a vis how he has handled federal funds under EPF and his justification for the way he's handled them. Legally he is correct, but the fact of the matter is that EPF replaced funds for hospitalization and medicare, very specifically, and in calculating these we also figured out how much was received in the past for personal care homes, so that was included as well, but when he gets up and says in the broad field of health and he talks about pure health, that he includes the dental program developed in Manitoba, the home care program, the medical library, the medical supplies and equipment; these were Manitoba programs, developed in Manitoba with perhaps a few dollars of support from the federal government, very little, it might be perhaps under Canada Assistance Plan for social service recipients, but by and large they were funded by Manitoba dollars. What the Minister is now saying is, because he includes them in the broad description of pure health, that therefore it is fair-ball to take all funds from Ottawa and use them for these programs, thereby diverting what was formerly solely a Manitoba cost, diverting the Manitoba funds for other purposes. I have never said that what he did was illegal, but it was recognized, and I always knew that what he was simply doing is diverting a cost that Manitoba had paid in the past, through the public purse, diverting it for other purposes and using the heavier flow of funds from Ottawa to pay for services which, from its very inception, some of these programs, like home care, were the responsibility of the provincial government; we accepted it, it was part of the health package for Manitobans. It was not part of the federal provincial agreement under the old hospitalization and medicare programs. So there is a distinct difference between our positions, and I am not suggesting that we go into a long debate about it because I am not going to change the Minister's mind or his presentation because he has to follow that procedure, he has to follow that presentation, he is now stuck with it. He took funds that came in from Canada and instead of applying them only to certain areas and then matching to enhance the programs he simply took the funds and because there was more than he needed for those narrow programs, he then covered other programs which had never been covered federally and he said that's also in the field of health so it's fair-ball, by doing so he was able to salt prov-

incial dollars and they were simply diverted somewhere else. So I know he never actually took federal money, Ottawa money and used it for some other purpose, but he freed up provincial money for the use of other purposes. So I just wanted it clearly understood that I know what he is doing, and I think he knows I don't agree with him, but this perhaps is not the place to argue it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2—pass. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: At this particular stage I want to raise on other area that I think I've raised consistently now over the last three years, and I just want to get the Minister's material on it. That mainly is to ask the Minister whereabouts in this entire estimates' package relating to health do we see the group that really is developing any affirmative action program of employment within a department that has 2,137 employees, which is a very large number of government employees. I think the Minister will recall that I raised this when he first became Minister. I said that those departments where one could really mount an effective affirmative action program were the Department of Health and Social Development, which is now the Department of Health and Community Services and the Department of Education. Those were large departments. At that time the Minister said, give me time, I've just become Minister, I want to try and work on this, I certainly believe in this program, and I think now is an appropriate time when we are at the Deputy Minister's salary to ask for an indication of the government's affirmative action program as applied to the Department of Health, one of the largest employers of people, and one that I think is conducive to affirmative action programs for women and for other groups.

MR. SHERMAN: I have endorsed the concept of affirmative action in the past and I continue to do. My office does not play a direct role that is independent of, or any different from the general role, the general thrust that is developed through the Civil Service Commission for the Public Service as a whole, where concepts like affirmative action are concerned. The Personnel Management Services Branch under Financial and Administrative Services, under the Department of Community Services and Corrections plays the role for Health and Community Services necessary to ensure that the concept of affirmative action is observed.

The initiatives for the department are taken at that level in personnel management services, and we in the Department of Health certainly subscribe to those initiatives that can be taken, and that are taken insofar as they are practical and insofar as they can be implemented on an on-going basis, but we don't have a specific initiative or a specific role, we participate with our fellow departments in government in the overall approach directed by the Civil Service Commission so that there is no specific appropriation under my estimates for that category.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I would like to comment at this stage that I am very disappointed in the Minister's response on this particular item. I believe that unless concrete action is taken at the departmental level with respect to hiring of staff and with respect to providing career patterns, paths for women, that the

affirmative action program will remain nothing but rhetoric. I think that I've pointed this out before and I've received some assurances that something would be done at the departmental level over the last three years, and when I raise this time and time again I find that there is no concrete response, only generalities; when I raise this item in the review of the estimates of the Civil Service Commission again, just a lot of general empty rhetoric, and the point is that there is discrimination against women in the hiring and promoting of staff. I think that the reports and studies that have been done within the planning secretariat, and by management committee secretariat staff about four or five years ago indicated that that situation existed. It may in fact have been unintentioned, and there is a term for that, it's called institutional discrimination. It exists because of a set of somewhat traditional, historical circumstances. It may not be the result of any malicious act or thought or intention on the part of anyone. But the statistics would indicate that there is a disproportionately high percentage of men occupying a number of positions that could just as easily be filled by women. When groups talk, or when a body like the Civil Service Commission — if it still does — raises some concerns about affirmative action, nothing will happen unless departments are asked to put forward some concrete plans, through their estimates process, for this. I know that the Civil Service Commission staff complement had within it a group working on affirmative action in 1976-77 that had used some oral suasion, some persuasion, something a bit more in certain instances, to get some departments to put forward concrete plans and proposals for affirmative action within their departments — and I know that the Department of Health and Social Development was one such department. I know that that body has been torn apart in the Civil Service Commission, and I think that what's happened is that there is no central group like a planning secretariat, no central group like a management secretariat, to provide any monitoring of this. I think as a result the whole thrust has dropped between the department and the Civil Service Commission with the consequence that nothing is happening. Nothing is happening.

I tell the Minister that he has a golden opportunity in his department and that the Minister of Community Services has a golden opportunity within his department, to be a bit more aggressive and to be more positive in this respect. I think it's possible to point to very clear, concrete examples of success in affirmative action. I think if you look at the New Careers Program, if you look at the New Careers Program at the Churchill Community Health Centre, there is some very definite concrete success. That success predates this government. It exists in Leaf Rapids and each time I think we've had a display of, again, what I've called the bleeding heart Conservative, the Minister gets up and wrings his hands and say, yes, I agree with you; I have concern; I have the same sympathy as you; we share the same objective. But frankly, with affirmative action for three straight years, the bottom line has been cut back. That is from a Minister who I think played a bit of a positive role possibly in some discussions, going back to Family Law Reform, and played a bit of a positive role with respect to changing maintenance procedures, and I think was giving the impression to the general public, that he was actually sympathetic to this general thrust. But frankly, his performance has been very very dis-

appointing in terms of that department over which he has specific control. I think the Minister has some explaining to do as to why he hasn't developed any type of positive program after three years as Minister, with respect to something that he says to me, that he shares the same sympathy.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can't allow that unfounded misdirected criticism to remain on the record unchallenged. If the Honourable Member for Transcona wants to criticize the lack or shortage of career opportunities for women, I suggest that there are many areas that he can begin to look at, not necessarily within the public service — one of them is his own party, one of them is his own caucus. I know that they have made attempts to elect women to the Legislature, but obviously there has not been sufficient support, sympathy or empathy for what the honourable member calls affirmative action within the followers of his party to make any concrete progress in that area. Now apart from that, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to criticize government departments for affirmative action and employment opportunities for women and employment of women, I suggest he look somewhere else other than at the Department of Health and the Department of Community Services.

Those two departments have an enormous professional force of women, and a much needed one, and a very honourable one. The manpower, or perhaps I should use the term womanpower, in the Departments of Health and Community Services amounts, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by my officials, to approximately 70 percent of the total manpower of those departments. So that when he attempts to make the case that neither the Minister of Community Services nor the Minister of Health are interested in promoting opportunities for women in their departments, he's talking utter hogwash, absolute hogwash.

I can assure him that some of our key administrators, many of our key administrators and many of my key office personnel including top assistants, are women and will continue to be, as long as women qualify for those jobs, as they obviously demonstrate that they are capable of doing. I make no choice on the basis of sex whatsoever. What we are looking for is talent, and we have a great deal of female talent in the department. We have a great deal of male talent, too, but it happens that the female talent outnumbers the male talent by about approximately 7 to 3. So he had best look elsewhere and perhaps within his own caucus room, had best look inward before he makes that kind of totally insupportable criticism.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes. In fact I am looking inward and we are going to make tremendous changes. I will expect that we will have a great number of women MLAs in the next caucus and they will, in fact, form a very vital part of the next government of Manitoba. —(Interjection)— Form a very vital part, a very vital part.

When you turn to the area of affirmative action within the department, when you in fact look at the administration and the Minister says, well 70 percent of the employees are women and some key people in my office may indeed be women, what he is saying really then, is that he is satisfied with the present situation as it exists. He is satisfied with the fact that the people at the bottom end of the income scale, at the bottom end of the responsibility scale within his department,

are women. And that those people at the top, those people administering the programs, are preponderantly men, and that he in fact has stated for the record that he is satisfied with that situation. We aren't satisfied with that situation. We've asked sincerely and specifically and objectively for three years running on this particular matter.

I believe that the government could have done a number of things here and it didn't. It's not just a matter of saying, well, we select on the basis of competence, because if you look at the history of the way in which people have been selected traditionally for promotions, unfortunately it hasn't been on the basis of competence. Unfortunately, many women have been bypassed specifically because they are women and they still are being bypassed. The only way in which you break that down is with a program of affirmative action. The Minister basically, when he starts saying, well, we aren't looking as to whether in fact an applicant is a woman or not, we want competence; we will follow the path of least restraint; and in pursuing affirmative action I want to tell the Minister that it is not the path of least restraint that has to be followed; you have to follow a more difficult road but the rewards are worth it if, in fact, you have commitment. I don't believe the government's doing that. And the Minister, trying to deflect the issue by pointing at how many MLAs may be women in this party or that party, is what my colleague was saying, a blue herring. It's certainly not a red herring, it's worse than that. I think the Minister hasn't defended that position at all and ultimately comes down, as I said, when you look at the bottom line, the bottom line is cut back with respect to this particular area, for three years running.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (2)—pass; (3)—pass. Resolution 76, Item 2. Operational . . .
The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I have one question. Yes, on Other Expenditures, here I wonder if the Acting Deputy Minister is on staff or is on contract.

MR. SHERMAN: He's on staff, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass. Resolution 76, Item 2. Operational and Support Services, (a)(1)—pass — the Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: This is the office of the Assistant Deputy Minister, Dr. Tavener, I presume. Is this the office you were referring to before?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (a)—pass. (b)(1)—pass; (b)(2)—pass. Under which item?

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson. Yes, I'm wondering now, since we're moving into something that really is quite specific and quite programmatic in a line manner, whether in fact this isn't an appropriate time to move that we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For clarification purposes, we are under Item 2. (b)(1).

MR. PARASIUK: Well, I move that Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion, Committee rise. All in favour? Opposed? The Nays have it.

2.(b)(1) — the Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Okay. Well I guess that if one tries to establish a system of going through estimates, I think, rationally and objectively and trying to cover off certain blocks of areas without —(Interjection)— Yes, I was saying that. In fact I moved that twice already. I think that we've tried to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I move Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. All in favour? Committee rise.