

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 8 April, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** The committee will please come to order. We were considering Item No. 2(a) Operations and Maintenance, Maintenance Program. The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman, before we adjourned we were discussing, among other things, the naming of a bridge - the Member for Roblin-Russell was. The Department of Mines and Natural Resources have an ongoing policy for naming various lakes, rivers, whatnot, after deceased servicemen of the last war, or the Korean War. There is a committee that is in charge of that, and it seems like a rather good policy that seems to work fairly well. I wonder if the Minister might consider this policy in the naming of bridges or various other structures in his department that may require names from time to time. It might assist and speed up the process. Apparently there seems to be some problem in arriving at decisions in various names for bridges. I wonder if you might care to comment on that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, there's no problem with arriving at decisions that fit into the longstanding policy with regard to the naming of bridges, and major structures across major waterways, such as, the Assiniboine and Red Rivers, the Saskatchewan River - is there a bridge named, yes. So, it's been in place, and perhaps the Churchill River is another one. The Nelson River would be a major waterway that would warrant the naming of bridges because of the major size of those structures.

But, as the member knows, there are hundreds and hundreds of smaller bridges on PTHs and PRs that have never been named, and I don't know that it would be that productive to go back and start naming all of these bridges with waterways, with rivers, and lakes and so on. I could see the difference there insofar as Natural Resources are concerned because they deal with mapping and all the rivers and lakes perhaps should be named. If we were going to get into a major expansion in the naming of bridges that might be one way to do it, the way the honourable member stated; although, in many cases, there might be requests from local communities to use a different criteria, for whatever reason. In the case that the Member for Roblin-Russell was talking about, I think it was a local settler or individual that had lived there in that neighbourhood and so, that was one of the reasons why it was being requested.

So, if we were going to have an expanded policy for naming, I think, we'd have to consider perhaps other

criteria as well. But that isn't a priority, I don't see, at this particular time, perhaps getting into a large expansion in that particular area. I'm not considering it at this time.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** It was just brought to my attention over the supper hour, Mr. Chairman, that PR 259 that crosses the Assiniboine River, for the centennial celebrations in that area, there is a Sproat family there, and apparently there was a bridge named the Sproat Bridge there with the unveiling of a ceremony on that particular occasion, and a plaque on the bridge renaming it after the Sproat family. I believe the former Minister took part in those ceremonies. It was a situation similar to the one that the Member for Roblin-Russell is referring to. It's their centennial celebrations, and it has some historical significance on that site, so the Minister might consider that maybe as a - what's the word I'm looking for - precedent has been established on the naming of that bridge on more than one occasion.

Just while I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, we've been talking about maintenance, and I know this is a difficult job because so many unusual circumstances come up. I know the one that I cite is not the only one. In my area, on 262 south of the Town of Minnedosa, is a surface road, but it's badly in need of repair. There are fairly extensive repairs needed each year on it, although you can drive down there with a car at 70 miles per hour - pardon me, 90 kilometres, because it's a 90-kilometre road - quite handily. But the farmers using it extensively with the grain trucks, it's almost impossible to run a grain truck down there at any speed. It's just continually like this, so they are using the other roads that are reasonably good gravel roads in the area. Of course, with the heavier loads, they're just pounding the devil out of those other roads, and maintenance becomes a problem on those as well as the hard surface roads. So there are unusual circumstances that require additional maintenance from time to time that the Minister may be getting some requests for.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I see that we're under the area of Operations and Maintenance. Under that particular heading there comes bridge design and support services in tendering; what is the policy of the Department of Highways in relationship to tendering? Are all projects tendered as far as the design work is concerned? Is that what this means, or what is he referring to in this kind of a statement?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The same process is in place with regard to tendering of major projects, this has been for the last number of years, at least. Over \$75,000 projects are tendered; \$10,000 to \$75,000 projects would have a simplified tendering system, maybe invitational tenders for them, locally tendered; and anything over \$250,000, of course, has to receive

Treasury Board approval; anything between \$25,000 and \$250,000 is precleared by the Minister.

So this is the tendering that we're talking about. It's not related to the design, if that was what the member's question related to. There are two separate segments or portions of this section of the Budget when dealing with design work, another dealing with tendering, and so on, and the member will see as we go through the appropriations that those areas are covered specifically.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that all work between \$25,000 and \$250,000 is left up to the decision of the Minister. Has all work in that range been tendered by this Minister?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** All the work between \$25,000 and \$250,000 has to be precleared, by the Minister, it has to be signed by the Minister, and of course, these are tendered projects, I believe, in all cases.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** So I understand correctly that all work done by the Department of Highways in the range of \$25,000 and \$250,000 are all subject to a tender process?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** That's to my knowledge and, with the exception of winter road contracts which are negotiated, in some instances, for the benefit of the local communities that are affected.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** So Winter Roads are not subject to the lowest tender, but they are negotiated with the department?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, they're negotiated between the department and communities involved in most cases where they supply the equipment and manpower.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Is the Minister satisfied that using public monies that, in all cases, the province or the taxpayers are getting the best deal without a tendering process on these?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, I would think that we're getting a reasonable price. Certainly, there has been no increase in the Winter Road contracts for the past three years. They have been negotiated at a zero percent increase for the last three years for all of the contracts in the Winter Roads, and that, of course, is cost shared with the Federal Government - those dollars, almost all of those. There are a couple, I believe, that are not cost-shared, but the remainder are, and of course that's in the next section if the member wants to discuss those in detail under Winter Roads which is the next section of the budget. But I do believe that we are getting a good price and, of course, we may be paying slightly more for the benefit of having those communities involved for creating employment in the communities that otherwise would not be the case, so there is a positive, and the training that they get, expertise that they develop in business and operating their business, so I think it's a positive aspect for the communities.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes reference to the fact that there hasn't been any

increases. Would there have been, in fact, some decreases because as I understand it, there is a surplus of people involved in the construction of highways and these kinds of works? Does he not feel there might even have been a reduction if it had been put out in the tendering process?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** You know the total - again we are only talking about Winter Roads here and that is the next section of the budget.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, he is talking about winter roads; I am talking about operations and maintenance, and it says "support services in tendering." I think that covers more than winter roads. I think this is a general process within the Department of Highways and if I'm not correct, then have the Minister correct me. I am not talking specifically about winter roads; I am talking about general practices of allocating work for the Department of Highways, and it says "support services in tendering." Maybe he could define what that means then if I am incorrect in my assumption of what it means.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe we are on 2.(a) Maintenance Program. Is that what the honourable member is assuming? If he's gone on to the next subappropriations of . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** No, Mr. Chairman, I'll read it out for the Minister in case he doesn't understand it. The title is "2. Operations and Maintenance. Provides program management and specialized functional support services in tendering, bridge design and engineering to the Department's maintenance, assistance and construction programs. Provides for the maintenance of Manitoba's primary and secondary road system, and winter roads. (a) Maintenance Program."

Is he tendering the Maintenance Program, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur read the description of all of No. 2 from (a) to (g).

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, I asked the Minister: is he tendering the Maintenance Program?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** So the member is asking regarding 2.(a), whether we are tendering in the Maintenance Program, and the answer is that the same system that has been in place with regard to tendering of maintenance work is now in place in the department.

I went over this to some extent before the break that certain works are tendered, others are put out on an hourly basis, on a rotational basis, for equipment rental that's needed on the maintenance work that's done. So it varies, depending on the availability of departmental equipment and the nature of the work that's being done.

The Maintenance Program has been expanded in each of the last number of years for the Member for Emerson, so there has not been any decrease whatsoever. There has been an expansion for inflation in the Maintenance Program, so there is as much going on and the same standards are being maintained as

they always have been maintained in the maintenance area of this Budget.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, if the Minister feels uncomfortable about dealing with the questioning here we'll wait until we get on to the next page, then maybe some of my colleagues have further questions in this regard.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's a better idea.  
The Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask a few questions that follow along the lines of those asked by the Member for Arthur with respect to tendering within the Maintenance Program. What discretion is left the district areas and, indeed, even the supervisors within some of the yards to tender out certain jobs in the area of maintenance?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the honourable member is asking about the equipment rental work that is done, and that is hired on an hourly basis for maintenance work. A lot of the work is done on an hourly basis, and that's why the department each year publishes a manual which prescribes for each different kind of machine the hourly rate that the department will pay. That has, up to this point in time, largely been left to the decision of the districts under the responsibility of the District Engineer or Assistant District Engineer, to monitor the allocation of that work.

I stated earlier that I prefer that this would be done on a rotational basis, because there are a lot of people who have equipment and would welcome the opportunity to be able to do some work for the department on an hourly basis, but sometimes they're not called. So I think the rotational basis would be the best system, however, that's not used in all districts at this particular time.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well to try and put some specific task to this type of work, are we talking about items like mowing of grass, moving of snow in the wintertime, those types of procedures?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the majority of the mowing, I believe almost all of it, is done by our own - no, the mowing is done through hourly work. The snow clearing is done with our own equipment, in most cases, although additional equipment is needed, trucks sometimes and loaders and so on, and that is then hired on the hourly basis.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister, first of all, is this ordered and hired by the district engineer, or is some leeway allowed to those supervisors within a yard district? What limits are they expected to work within and who sets these limits?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, unfortunately, under the last number of administrations, there has not been a set system, to my understanding, of allocating this work. It has been largely left to the districts to determine how they will allocate this work. That is an area of review; that is an area of concern to me to a certain extent.

As I indicated, my preference would be that there would be a rotational basis for this, that all those people who are capable of offering the service would have an opportunity to participate. I would like to see that system come into place in the department in all districts, but at the present time, as has been the case for the last 15 years or longer, 20, this process has been in place, it's largely up to the districts. Of course, even under the rotational system, I guess it would still be up to the districts, but there would be some system to it and a fairness to it.

The decisions have been left to the districts to make those decisions. It is one area that I'm having reviewed.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to get a better feeling for the procedure. The Minister says, it's left up to the district. Now there are various supervisory areas I imagine within the district and every one of these hourly contracts that are entered into by somebody within a region or within a smaller supervised area - under the present situation - does that all come before the district engineer?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** My understanding is that it would not necessarily come before the district engineer in all cases. The assistant district engineer may have responsibility for that area in a district. Perhaps in some areas it's delegated even further. But certainly the district engineer is the responsible person for this in a specific area. There are guidelines as well for work that's done for a particular job. There's a prescribed number of hours that should be required to do that job, so there are guidelines in that respect.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister can help me with the terminology to some degree. Are the foremen the same people as the assistant engineers? I would think not. But if they aren't, do the foremen, the people that are in charge of the yards that are scattered throughout the rural areas, do they have any discretionary spending power or the ability to enter into contracts on an hourly basis for the doing of any maintenance work?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I should clarify that the district engineer approves all of these through his assistant or himself, and they're all sent into central office, all contracts done on an hourly basis. So they are not just confined in terms of the agreements, the contracts on that basis, to the district. All of that information is forwarded on.

**MR. C. MANNES:** A final question, Mr. Chairman. Is the Minister sufficiently sure that all individuals who might want to tender on these hourly projects have sufficient information: firstly, that there are some type of operations in which they could find an opportunity on which to bid; and secondly, are they provided with the information that allows them to make an intelligent bid?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The hourly work is simply contracted on the basis of the rates that are published, so there should be no problem with people understanding what their function is or what their

opportunities are in terms of hourly work that they're assigned. They are assigned on the basis of the published rates.

Any contract entered into by the district, as I said, is then forwarded to the central office and is checked there to see that the rental rates that have been designated for that piece of equipment are the appropriate rates.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, on what basis up to now has one outfit been selected over another?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, as I said, in many cases perhaps past experience has dictated that the individual operator or the owner of the equipment has been reliable and has been able to do the work. Perhaps that is often - and is available on very short notice, that kind of thing, so maybe that is very often an important criteria. As I said earlier, my preference would be that there be more of a rotational system for this kind of work in the future, but that is the way it has been done in the past.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a) - the Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the Minister has given us some information on this hourly business. I believe, if I'm correct, you said that the decision may be made in the district office, but it is sent on to the central office. Is that for final approval, or is that a sort of an after-the-fact check?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The individual contracts for certain equipment are sent to central office for verification that the proper rate is being charged for the equipment that is designated. So that would be the case with all agreements.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** When it gets to central office, is that where it stops or does it get to the Deputy Minister's office?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** It doesn't get to the Deputy Minister's office or the Minister's office.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** So the control stops at the central office. Now who would the people be who would have the final say there?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The Director of Operations would verify that the proper rates were being charged for specific equipment. That's where the final verification would rest.

I should mention that the amount of work that is allocated in this way is only about 5 percent to 7 percent of the total maintenance budget, just to put it in perspective. We're not talking of the whole \$50 million or so in the maintenance budget, we are talking about 5 percent to 7 percent of that spread over, of course, the 12 districts across Manitoba.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, we're not talking about \$50 million. We are talking probably about \$2 million to \$3 million.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** That's right.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** \$2 million or \$3 million of work that is done. On that basis, it's all done on an hourly basis and the selection of the contractor who is going to do it, I want to again ask the Minister, is the choice of that contract left at the local level, or is it referred to the central office, or does the rate that applies the only thing that is referred to central office? Perhaps the Minister could give us a little more explanation of how it all occurs.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The case is that the central office does not approve or disapprove of the particular individual or company or business that may be undertaking the work. That is done at the district level. The only portion that is verified or monitored by the Director of Operations is that the rate that's being charged is appropriate for the equipment according to the manual that is set out.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, if the district office has four or five people that are all available and all immediately available for the work and they all would like to do the work, who does the district engineer go to for final approval of a selection of one of those contractors?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** At the present time and as has been the case, as I've indicated, for many many years he has gone to no one. If it's the district engineer who is making that initial decision or if he's getting a recommendation from one of his staff, the decision, as I indicated, rests at the district level. So he is not under the current system required to get approval for which individual he chooses to contract with at the present time beyond the district level. He does not have to get approval.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** If I heard the Minister correctly, he said that the final decision does not go beyond the district engineer's office, but I believe you also said it may not necessarily have to go to the district engineer, the decision may be made at a lower level. Is that correct?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I understand that in all districts the district engineer himself would have to give the final approval, but the staff that is assigned those duties could be making the initial arrangements.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Could the Minister indicate how far down in the pecking order below the district engineer you would go to have that discretionary power used? Would it be to a maintenance foreman? Would he have the power to make those kinds of decisions?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The supervisor or superintendent and the foreman do not, to my understanding, make those decisions in any of the districts on their own. They would have to get approval from the assistant district engineer and district engineer for entering into their agreements.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Well, the Minister is now saying that it is only the district engineer that makes the final decision. Is that correct? I think we're running around a bit here.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I think that I have been very consistent to what I've said, that the district engineers made the decisions. I think the honourable members can see that quite clearly, that the district engineer is responsible at the district level to enter into those agreements with equipment owners for work to be done.

The supervisors involved may be the ones who make the arrangements and the recommendations to the district engineers to who is available to undertake certain works, but the final decision in authorization is with the district engineers, as I have stated clearly and consistently here.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the Minister one other question. Is it possible, under the present system that you are operating under, for a flagman whose sole purpose is to wave cars through a construction job and make sure the traffic does not get balled up, is it possible that a flagman could make that kind of decision because his friend happens to have a machine that is readily available and is just the type of machine that they need for this few hours of work?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I think the member was being facetious at any rate with regard to that point. As we have indicated, it is the supervisors and the foreman in the area who would make those recommendations to the district engineer to make the decision.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, I was not being facetious at all, and I would ask the Minister to withdraw that.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** It would seem rather unlikely, let's put it mildly, that a flag person on a particular job would be responsible for the hiring of an individual's piece of equipment. Obviously, it would have to be approved, any decisions made with regard to equipment, through the district engineer, and I have indicated that.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, obviously, the Minister doesn't listen very well. All I asked him was, I said is it possible that such an arrangement could take place, and I would ask the Minister to answer that.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** It's a hypothetical question. I don't know what's possible.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister, anything is possible.  
Mr. Minister.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Thanks for the help, Mr. Chairman, but I have indicated that the process rests with the engineer in the districts for the decisions as to what equipment is engaged for work on an hourly basis.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am extremely confused, I am sure - maybe I am the only one - but I heard the Minister indicate that the decision to hire on an hourly rate came from central office; who would be hired came from the district engineer? Are there two levels of decision-making taking place when it comes to the maintenance work?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Would the member please repeat the question.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. If I heard him correctly, the Minister said that the rate at which the work would be paid came from the central office and who would get the job came from the district engineer, is that correct?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Is the Minister of Highways satisfied that fairness applies in this particular situation, that there isn't too much discretion left with the district engineer? Because, after all, when five people put the same rate in, central office would approve five rates, but the individual who is left in the final decision-making could hire his friend or her friend and the individuals who probably are justified in getting a job may not get it. Do you not feel there is too much discretion at a district engineer's level as to who gets the work? Is he satisfied that it's fair?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The Member for Arthur has made himself very clear. No, I am not satisfied, that's why we are undertaking a review of those processes. It's rather unbelievable, I guess, that the previous government didn't undertake that review. That process has been in place for an awful long time and I am not convinced that it's fair and I will be looking at ways to make sure that it is fair in the future.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes reference to the former government, what about the former Minister under his administration? Is he equally as critical of the policies at that particular time? Who is carrying out the review; is it an in-house review or is he having an external group of people looking at the policies?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we have had a committee working on the procedures, district engineers from across the province, to make recommendations as to ways that this could be allocated. In addition to that, more recently we have the Auditor and the internal auditor doing a review of those procedures as well. So we expect that we will get some good recommendations with regard to the process, and perhaps recommendations that we will be able to take action on very soon.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes reference to the fact that he is having the engineers do the study and the review as to whether or not they should continue to make the decisions or not.

Does he feel that that's a fair group of people, and will the Minister be prepared to table the report that comes forward from the committee of engineers?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I have indicated that there are two parts to it. I should point out that I had asked for this process to be reviewed some time back and that is the one that the district engineers have been working on, reporting to the

Deputy Minister on the recommendations that they may make to change the system to make it more fair and, in addition to that, more recently, the internal auditor and the Auditor have become involved to review the process that is in place as well.

So we have, as I said, two parts to that. One has been ongoing for some time and we should be at a stage to review that to make a decision very soon. We will not be getting a formal report that would be released with regard to the district engineers, that is internal work that is going on. I will be considering it with the Deputy Minister and making the appropriate changes that we feel should be made at that time.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister should be aware of the fact that he, as a Minister, gets a report from the department whether he calls it internal or not, it should be made available to the public and to the Legislative Assembly. I cannot see why he should be able to withhold that kind of information.

In fact, I have further criticism of the Minister. If he has now had to do an internal audit, have the auditor brought in, why did he not take action quicker? Did he not get an interim report from the district engineers? Why has he been sitting on this thing? He must have had some indication or some knowledge of reason to take action, and it's dragging on. He's had his district engineers preparing reports. He's not prepared to table them. Is it finished? Is it complete? I mean, after all he saw fit to have his engineers go to work and prepare a report. Well, Mr. Chairman, what I'm asking, is the internal report complete? Why is he not prepared to table it? Is there something that he has to cover up?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I've indicated clearly that over the past . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I'm asking some straightforward questions. I want the answers.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I think the member is suggesting that perhaps, and clearly, there is nothing to cover up.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well table it then.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** And of course he didn't mean to suggest, I don't think, that there was . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I didn't suggest anything. I'm asking a question.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I can say clearly, if the member is saying that I have been delaying over the last 20 years, this hasn't been changed in any substantive way. In the short time that I've been there, there have been some initiatives taken to make those changes and to undertake the review that would be required before making any changes to improve the system, and that is being worked on. I will certainly be making it a priority to ensure that any reasonable recommendations that come forward will be acted on as quickly as possible. So I don't think the member is on very firm ground when he talks about delaying. Certainly his colleagues, when they were in government, had an opportunity to review those procedures and apparently chose not to do so.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I have two questions: will the Minister be making available to the Legislative Assembly the report that the district engineers are preparing; and as well the internal audit that is being carried out by his department? Will he make them available to the legislative members, to the Assembly?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** As I have indicated, the recommendations would be considered from both the district engineer's recommendations, if we can call it a report, as well as the internal auditor and the Provincial Auditor in their work, and in combination their recommendations will be considered, and following that, a new policy will be put in place and of course I will make that public at that time, which I intended to do.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, that's not good enough, particularly when it comes to the Provincial Auditor doing a review of his department. Seeing as the Provincial Auditor answers to the Legislative Assembly, will that auditor's report of his department be made available to the Legislative Assembly, and if not, why not?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the member is changing the direction of his question. For the first while he was asking me whether I was going to make the report of the district engineers public, now he's asking me if I'm going to make the Provincial Auditor's report public, which is being done in conjunction with the internal auditor at the present time. We will consider that.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister can try to fudge and get around any corner he can to get defence. I ask him the two questions, but I am specifically asking him if he is going to table the auditor's report on the review of the activities of his department. The auditor answers to the Provincial Legislature. Is he now saying that he is not going to allow the Provincial Auditor's report to be made public? Is he not going to allow that, or is he going to table that report?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I didn't ask the question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I asked the Minister of Highways.

Okay, that's fine, if he wants to answer.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** I have asked to be recognized to engage in the debate in which the member has started. If the Minister chooses to answer — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my intervention is to clarify for a member who has been around here a few years, that he seems to be lacking a bit of understanding on the role of the Provincial Auditor.

First of all, I think the member should know it and if he doesn't, he's sitting there so smugly, he'll learn it tonight, and that is that the Provincial Auditor determines what he tables and presents to the House. No Minister can do that, and no Minister overrides the Provincial Auditor, and this Minister wouldn't . . .

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Your Minister of Finance did.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, now the member wants to bring in extraneous material like the fact that his Minister of Finance, two of them, couldn't get their accounts certified by the Provincial Auditor from 1977 to '81. We couldn't for 1982 until we cleaned up the mess they'd left and they were certified for the first time in 1983-84.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That's not true.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** That is true, and you know it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think we are debating an issue outside the item that we are considering.

The Honourable Minister.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, very clearly, the Honourable Member for Virden seems to be insinuating that somehow we would be, from our . . . — (Interjection) — Oh, it's the Member for Arthur. I apologize to the Member for Virden.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It's the Member for Arthur.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The Member for Arthur seems to be insinuating that somehow I as Minister and the department would have something to hide in regard to this review. That is the furthest from the truth. We want to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that proper procedures are followed and that there certainly is a fairness in all decisions that are made in the department.

That is a very strong belief of mine, and we will take what steps are necessary to do that as a result of this review. It's as I said, I think to the credit of this administration that we're doing that, and certainly one wonders that this wasn't reviewed previously if the honourable members feel so strongly that some steps should have been taken. We have taken those steps, and we will continue to take those steps and ensure that there is fairness and that proper procedures are being followed.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want the record to show that this Minister of Highways is not prepared to show the public in Manitoba a report that is done by his department on the expenditures of public funds, that he is not prepared to show the public that information.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I have stated, Mr. Chairman, clearly, that is not correct. The decisions that are made on the basis of the reports and information that we received from our staff and the decisions that are made will be made public. I have indicated that to the member. When decisions are made, I will make those new policy statements public.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I too join my colleague, the Member for Arthur, requesting that the Minister make public the report that will have been

prepared by the engineers. In view of the fact that the Minister by his own indication said that it is a policy that's been in place - I'm talking about the tendering policies - have been in place for 20 years. It covers the scope of various administrations. So quite obviously we're not attempting to place any blame or cast any aspersions toward the Minister at all. We feel it's a policy that has occurred over a number of years and when addressed within an internal review, should be shared with us all.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask a question specifically to: (a) the Maintenance Program. I don't know how the \$49-plus million is broken down, but can the Minister indicate what portion of that represents gravel? I can tell him that as a member representing a southern riding that two out of three phone calls that I receive at my residence during an evening are directed towards the condition of the provincial road network. Of course, a lot of that has to do with bridges and a lot of that has to do with the state of the grade in some certain portions, but also a lot of it has to do with the application of gravel on the provincial road network. Can the Minister tell me what portion of the program is being directed to gravel?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Under the normal maintenance section, which is about 50 percent I believe, of the total maintenance expenditures, about \$4.5 million in 1983-84 was directed towards gravel. Just under \$3 million was directed towards dragging; dust control was just under \$1 million; shoulders just over \$1 million; mowing about \$1.25 million; brushing about \$0.75 million; drainage and bridges about \$1.25 million; signs approximately the same; spring restrictions about \$0.75 million; bituminous work about \$5.5 million, that's the largest portion. That's under the normal maintenance expenditures, the normal Summer Maintenance Program that is undertaken, in 1983-84, just over \$4.5 million was spent on gravel.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister then indicating that of the appropriation, \$49 million that we are being asked to approve, that there is not an item breakout for the application of gravel, not in '83, not in '84, but in '85?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Certainly we can get the figure, but the proportion would be very similar to the figures that I just mentioned. I can get the exact figures, but the proportion of the total \$50 million is about the same as it was that I just referred to.

**A MEMBER:** Could that be broken down district by district?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes. There is a district by district. Now for dragging and gravel, District 3, by far and away the highest for maintenance for gravel, it is much higher than the average for other districts because of the nature of the roads and the soil conditions in that particular district.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to hear that the Minister can provide that information on a district breakout. However, I'm wondering if he'll provide

it for '84 and also the estimate for '85. The Minister makes reference to the proportions not changing significantly, but I would like to see the raw, actual expenditures by the district for those three years if possible.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, we can certainly get that information. As I have indicated, we haven't changed the standards at all in terms of maintenance work that has gone on during the time that this government has been in power in Manitoba. So if he's insinuating that perhaps there have been some changes with regard to the apportioning of this work, there hasn't been. It's a reflection of the requirements and the requests from the districts for their maintenance work, and the proportions generally stay about the same.

I believe we have some information for 1984-85, as well as the 1983-84 figures that I just mentioned to the member. The figure for 1984-85 was just about \$4 million for gravel - I have a breakdown for all of those figures - which is slightly lower than 1983-84 but generally about the same proportion. For the 1985-86, it's just being planned at this time, I don't know whether we have the figures in detail. It would depend on the circumstances during the year, but there would be a request in on those and we could have the detailed information on the plan that is being prepared for gravel activities.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister made reference to my insinuating something. I really wasn't then, but I'll make a statement now that this goes far beyond an insinuation, it's a stated fact. When we look at \$4 million being spent on gravel in 1984 versus \$4.5 the year previous and, of course, taking into account inflationary conditions to that point in our history, it is obvious then, when my constituents tell me that the state of the roads within my electoral division are totally inferior to what they were previous, obviously I will echo their insinuation or, let's say, their statement and their claim.

I would be interested, when possible, if the Minister can provide that same figure for 1985. That may not occur, of course, during the Estimates process but, if he can provide that to us sometime later on it would be interesting to see whether in fact that particular number is increasing.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I can indicate to the member at this time, in general terms, that the increase in the maintenance budget this year of almost \$2 million includes primarily two areas; one is the surface material, such as, gravel, and the other is shoulder restoration. So those two areas will be receiving priority attention for increases in the coming year.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Now may I ask in what districts, Mr. Minister?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The requests will be coming forward, or have come forward, from the District Engineers as to their requirements. That is done at that level with the Director of Maintenance, and is not considered by myself so I'm not aware of exactly which districts will be receiving specific additional amounts.

I can tell the honourable member, as I mentioned earlier, that District 3 gets by far and away the majority of the gravel, almost twice as much as some of the other districts, depending on their nature. So District 3 does get a greater percentage, a greater proportion of the gravel that is required.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Portage.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, a series of questions to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. First I'd like to start with Highway 430 it is, off of No. 26. It has been brought to my attention, Sir, that the CPR crossing just a half-mile north on 430 off of 26 is in deplorable condition. Apparently the crossing planks are anything but secure. I wonder whether the Minister is aware of this and if something can be done in the near future before there's an accident happens at that particular crossing.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** We will consider that individual request and that information that the individual member has brought forward. There are always difficulties with crossings with railways, and we are anxious to hear this kind of information whenever there are particular concerns raised. We'll look into that situation for the honourable member.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you.

My second question then to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, on the bypass around Portage la Prairie at the lights at 240. If you'll recall, Mr. Minister, I brought it to your attention that there have been a series of accidents, serious accidents, taken place at that intersection. It was suggested to me by the RCMP that something should be done to that before there are more lives lost at that particular point.

I suggested to you, Mr. Minister, at one time, that it might be a good move on your part to take and install, I would refer to them, as warning grids on approaching the traffic lights at that intersection. There needs to be some sort of a means of slowing the traffic down just prior to the actual flashing lights. I have been informed that they are referred to as speed bumps - okay?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, well in place at that particular intersection is a warning amber flashing light that indicates that the light is going to be changing, which is one method of signalling to the oncoming motorist that there will be a requirement to stop. But we have used those bumps in the pavement where an individual road is intersecting with another, and the person driving will have to come to a full stop. In this case, of course, traffic flows through at 70 kilometres an hour, unless of course the light is changing. So it wouldn't be good practice to apply them to that surface under those circumstances. So we have the advance warning that's in place at the present time which, I think, goes some distance to warning motorists that they will have to stop.

In addition to that, I can say that this area is a top candidate for a grade separation in the future, the No. 1 candidate I believe. It will be one that will be considered certainly if we are able to achieve an

agreement with the Federal Government with regard to upgrading the major interprovincial routes. This would be one that would be considered, the top candidate.

**MR. L. HYDE:** May I ask, for considerations for what?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** For a grade separation. Sorry, Mr. Chairman, a grade separation or an overpass.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, this is all very well, but I'm sure you are, and your department must be aware of the fact that there have been some serious accidents take place at that particular intersection. It is obvious to me, and I'm sure it must be to your engineers, that the flashing lights are not satisfactory; they are not doing their job. If it is the slow bumps, or whatever the heck you refer to them as, if they will be more effective, why can't they be installed?

**A MEMBER:** If I hit rumble strips at 70 with my car there'll be nothing left of it.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** They're just not applied on open highways where there is not necessarily a requirement to stop. Rumble strips are what I think the honourable member is referring to, and they do shake up the vehicle quite a bit, especially when they're travelling at 70 kilometres an hour which is the speed limit in that section. So I think that we should stick with the existing policy with regard to the use of those rumble strips, and look at other methods of enhancing the safety as soon as we're able to do so.

As the member knows, a grade separation or an overpass at that area would be many millions of dollars, and that's why we are in the process of discussing these requirements with the Federal Government to have some shared funding with regard to overpasses and grade separations on the TransCanada.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the suggestion by the Minister that there is consideration being made for grade separations there. I still am not convinced that something more couldn't be done toward the slowing of traffic in that intersection, because I'll assure you, Mr. Minister, that I will inform you very quickly should the next accident take place in that place and there are lives lost. I am bringing this to your attention, because you know very well that is a serious situation there.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I can assure the member that we will have the department look at every possible option with regard to increasing safety at that intersection. It has received attention in the past with regard to the advanced warning amber light there, and other options will continue to be looked at in the absence of the ultimate solution for that intersection.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a) - Mr. Minister.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I just want to, Mr. Chairman, mention that perhaps we have the discussion which could break down into the Winter Roads, Operations and Contracts, Bridges and Structures and so on through this appropriation, then we can get on to

Planning and Design where we can discuss various highways projects. That's really what the honourable member was just discussing here.

**MR. L. HYDE:** I appreciate it's difficult to separate the different programs in this, but I certainly did not want to miss my opportunity to bring that question up.

I have one more, Sir, that probably will come in under Design, where is that going to be, Mr. Chairman?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** That's three, No. 3 on Page 94.

**MR. L. HYDE:** No. 3. Okay, that's fine.

I also have one here, Mr. Chairman, regarding a problem that a constituent of mine has on 411, that's off of 430 out the St. Ambrose area. I brought it to the Minister's attention last summer, in the course of the summer and fall, that a man who has built a home on the northeast quarter of 36-14-5, he has not got an approach to his property.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Shame.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Shame is right. In order to get into his home he has to travel in through adjoining properties to get onto his own farmsite.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the name, I do seem to recall the correspondence on that from the member, and I believe that there was an approach authorized, unless we're talking about a different one. However, there was no approach that's been put in up to this point, but it has been authorized at that location.

**MR. L. HYDE:** You were right, Mr. Minister. You did give the authorization to this Mr. Trost, Alex Trost, for an approach to his property, but also it was going to be entirely at his cost, if you'll recall. — (Interjection) — It was going to be entirely at his cost, and I believe that the cost of a culvert alone, in order to meet the design and circumference of the culvert, would require a culvert something like the cost of \$600 to \$700.00. Mr. Chairman, are you not expecting a little much of an individual to foot that bill of a culvert and an approach?

**A MEMBER:** He should have applied to the Jobs Fund.

**A MEMBER:** They have lots of money.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the procedure is that where an existing approach does not exist that the department does not provide an approach. If an individual chooses to set up his residence at a new location where an approach does not exist he would have to consider, among his costs in setting up his dwelling at that location, the cost of his approach to his new place, so that is standard procedure. This person is not being treated any differently than anyone else with regard to new approaches, new locations.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Has it not been the policy of your department, Sir, that there is allowed, in a given distance on a particular road, X number of approaches, say it's

a quarter-of-a-mile, I don't know exactly what? But I believe through correspondence to this gentleman you suggested that there was one crossing not being used, which is something like I'd say a small quarter-of-a-mile up road from where he is located, that could be relocated to his position where he's needed it. Is that not possible that you could fulfil the needs of this man by removing that crossing and bringing it to his location?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, obviously that would not be a cheaper alternative to just putting in a new approach, and as I've indicated the department, when it is upgrading a road, it replaces those approaches that are there, but we do not build additional approaches, so there is no standard number of approaches on a particular distance on the highway system. So, in this case, the fact that there was no approach there is sufficient reason that the Highways Department should not be getting into funding additional approaches. We go by the number that has been there in the past.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister denying that individual an access to his property?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, quite clearly, that the individual had authorization to put in place an approach . . .

**A MEMBER:** At his cost.

**A MEMBER:** Of course.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** And maybe the Member for Portage will want to make that an election promise that he'll — (Interjection) — put it in for nothing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.  
The Member for Portage has the floor.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with what the Minister is saying, that he is going to . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There is a point of order. The Member for Arthur is raising a point of order.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. It is normal procedure that discussions are through the chairman. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, who should know better, is hollering across the table and should direct his questions through you, Mr. Chairman. I, Mr. Chairman, ask you to bring him to order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the same point of order.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, I would take this opportunity on the point of order to apologize to the committee for having followed the example so ably set earlier by the Member for Arthur.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Portage.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, have I got to notify Mr. Trost that this government will not supply him with a suitable culvert and crossing into his property?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, we can do that directly if the member would like.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.  
The Member for Portage.

**MR. L. HYDE:** It'll be on record that this Minister will take that notice to Mr. Trost that they will not supply him with the crossing.

**A MEMBER:** In writing.

**MR. L. HYDE:** In writing.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, we will advise - if there is need for further correspondence - the constituent of the honourable member that he is being treated in the same way that anyone else in those situations would be.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Unless he was an NDP.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** That is absolutely not true.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. The Member for Arthur is out of order.

Is the Member for Portage finished with this line of questioning?

**MR. L. HYDE:** No. No, I'm not.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Portage.

**MR. L. HYDE:** I just can't believe what this Minister is saying, and has just finished saying, that he will not supply a property owner with an approach to his property. I will not and cannot believe it. A person who puts up a \$30,000 home off a PR road cannot get an approach to his property. I just can't believe it.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the member is misrepresenting again what I said. It's not a case of him not being able to get an approach. He has received authorization to put in place an approach for his property, and that is the standard procedure. In cases where there is evidence that an approach existed previously and there is some dispute over that, we have investigated and looked at situations, and in some cases have put in place approaches because the evidence or indication was that perhaps an approach did exist and that the person had a case in that regard. But we have not put in place at the cost of the Department of Highways and Transportation new approaches that were not previously in existence in that particular situation. So this individual that the member is talking about is receiving the same treatment as any other person would, and if the member wishes to change that, of course, he can always campaign on that in the next election.

**MR. L. HYDE:** It's a certain thing, Mr. Chairman. I have personally driven to the area and I know exactly where the crossing that hasn't been used for years apparently is in place today. It's, I'd say, a quarter-of-a-mile further down the road. All I'm asking you, Sir, is that you

consider removing that crossing, pipe and all, bring it to the site of this here individual who has spent \$30,000 on a new home and with no access to his property. That's all I'm asking. Is that too much?

Mr. Chairman, it's all right for the Minister there to be laughing.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** A point of order now. I wasn't laughing, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Not you, Sir, not you. The Minister of Municipal Affairs. It's a serious situation in this particular area. There's a ditch in that particular case there, about a six-foot ditch, that this man has to cross over in order to get to his property.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just want to go on record as requesting that the Minister of Highways, if he accedes to this request, should also retroactively accede to my request for the same thing on the road on which I live and to that of every other Manitoban who has been denied the same thing for generations.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Earlier there was some discussion over the classification of provincial roads, and I am wondering about the classification of Provincial Road No. 340 between Stockton and Treesbank.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** A slight water hazard.

**A MEMBER:** A bridge will fix it up.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** It's before you get to the river that I am concerned about.

**A MEMBER:** There is a water hazard before you get there too.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, I don't have the exact figures. If the member would like that specific information, we can get that for her in short order. A call to the office would certainly get it, or we can get it to her.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Yes, I would like that because there was some problem over that road last summer. In fact, the road was in such poor condition that the council felt that they had to take it upon themselves to do the maintenance if the Minister will recall the correspondence from the Rural Municipality of South Cypress. So I was wondering what the classification of that road was and I would like to also know how often it is supposed to be maintained or dragged, whatever the term is.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Maintained is good enough.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** We will get that information for the honourable member. I have indicated what the classifications were and I believe the traffic would

probably be between 75 and 250, which would make it a Class 4, which would require 20 drags per summer.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Is the Minister satisfied that when the road, for instance, is classified in a certain way as to how many times it's dragged, is the Minister confident that it actually gets that much maintenance?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I would say, by and large, that would be the case, that they would receive that much maintenance. In certain situations it's possible that the district engineer would prioritize another road for additional dragging and would perhaps reduce on another road, it's possible. But I can't say with any certainty at this time that it is the case in that particular instance. It's possible that one is receiving more than its designated numbers.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** No, I don't think so.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I can see from the honourable member's points here that that is not the case and, therefore, we have to raise that with the district, bring that to their attention and see whether they can make provision for additional maintenance work to correct a serious problem.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** In the same area, Mr. Chairman, but on a slightly different topic, I wonder could the Minister indicate to me how much it costs to repair the Treesbank Ferry which was taken out of service late last fall because of its poor condition, shall we put it that way.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe \$29,000 was the cost of repairing that ferry.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Then could the Minister in this department tell me if he has commenced the purchase of right-of-way for a new bridge in that area?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The honourable member will be aware that again we are into the planning and design section in the program and of course it is in the program, as the member is aware, if she has had an opportunity to look through the program. We have placed that in the program for acquisition of property for the new route that would lead to the location for the bridge.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** But the only thing I could find in the program was an indication for an acquisition of right-of-way. Was there actually going to be any commencement of work on any building of a bridge this year?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, our intention is to proceed with the building of the bridge, but it doesn't make a lot of sense to have the bridge sitting out in the middle of nowhere. There is going to be a road that's required obviously, to and from the bridge. We are commencing in a logical and reasonable way to obtain the acquisition for that new route, and the bridge would be constructed at the same time as the road would be completed so that the new route would then exist. We are not proceeding ahead of time with the

construction of a bridge when there is no road leading to it.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Okay.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, under that same maintenance section, can the Minister assure us that the ferry will be able to fully accommodate all the traffic that is coming here, that its maintenance has been looked after and that it will accommodate the traffic that will be going across that section of the province?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can give the same assurances that the ferry will offer the same service or perhaps a little better since it has been repaired and as it has in previous years. It certainly should not be any less because it has received major repairs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a) - the Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Before we get off the Maintenance Program, there are two areas that I would like to ask a few questions of the Minister.

One deals with the Dust Abatement Program that applies on various gravel PR roads, and I would like to ask the Minister if there is any set number of times that calcium is applied in the sections in front of farmsteads, etc., where calcium has been used. How often do they apply it during the year?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I should mention to the member that this is an area of priority for the coming year. The current schedule is once per year in front of yards. However, we are looking at a rather substantial expansion to this program from about \$900,000 a year to \$1.5 million this coming year, so that should see a substantial increase in the number of applications, perhaps in the number of applications also in locations of those applications throughout the province, so we are expanding. But the current requirement is more standard; it's once per year.

I just want to indicate to the previous questioner, as well, with regard to the Treesbank Ferry I have some additional information; that is, that the department has provided the R.M. of Cypress \$40,000 - \$37,000 last year - \$40,000 projected this year for operating that ferry, and the hours of operation are from 5:00 a.m. till 1:00 a.m. which were the hours of operation in the previous year. So specifically in answer to that question in terms of the service that would be provided, it will be the same service and the operating grant will be provided by the department.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for indicating that there may be a change because I believe past experience has shown that the calcium chloride treatment and the policy that has existed up to now has been far from being adequate. In fact, if calcium was applied and a heavy rain two days later, that was it for the year, there was no chance of getting anything else put back.

So I welcome the Minister's announcement that there is going to be a change in policy, and I would hope that there is sufficient flexibility given so that those people living in the immediate vicinity of a PR road will have some degree of protection from the terrible dust that arises possibly from the oversupply of gravel that is sprinkled on the PR system from time to time, which leads me to the second question, that is dealing with the traffic gravel that is applied to your PR roads.

I notice from time to time that the government does let tenders for the supply of gravel to be stockpiled for various PRs in various areas of the province. The first question I would like to ask the Minister is: what is the classification of gravel that is used? Does it vary in any significant degree from other gravel that is used, say, in a highway construction program?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** There is a substantial difference between the gravel that is used in the construction of roads to that that is used on the surface, depending on the gravel. The gravel that is used in construction, of course, as an aggregate is often screened and, of course, has to be of certain specifications; the gravel that is applied to the surface can vary, does not have such stringent controls on it. It can vary with the amount of shale content, for example, the size of the aggregate from place to place in the province depending on what is available. So there would not be the same specifications on surface gravel as there is for use in aggregates used in the construction, I should say.

I did want to mention one other point regarding dust control that the member made a comment about, that we are also looking at the possibility of greater use of another dust palliative other than calcium chloride, that being lignal-sulfate which is a byproduct of the pulp industry and is also available. We want to do some testing with it, some has been done. There is also major testing done under ARTAP on the use of dust control products. We are going to be looking at expanding the use of that particular kind as an alternative to calcium chloride. Therefore, it may have certain qualities and others may have certain qualities that would make them stand up for a longer time in certain instances, in certain weather characteristics, better than the one that we use now, primarily calcium chloride.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** I've noticed over the years that there seems to be a changing pattern developing in the application of traffic gravel to the various PRs. Could the Minister indicate what the present rate of application is of traffic gravel on the provincial road system, or does it vary?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, there are standards that have been in place for the application of gravel over the years, and so it should not have varied considerably since the advent of the maintenance management system in the early '70s. That is that it's applied on the basis of cubic yard per two-lane mile. The road class, Class 3, would warrant 100 cubic yards per two-lane mile; Class 4 with less traffic would warrant 85 cubic yards; and the Class 5 would warrant 75. Those standards have been in place and continue to be in place.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that 75 yards is the minimum amount that can be applied to a PR road?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that is the standard that is used. This can vary, just as dragging could vary depending on specific situations in a district, but that is the standard that is applied to those roads, as I have indicated, on the basis of the classification.

It's rather close in comparison to the Saskatchewan standard as well. As a matter of fact, Saskatchewan would apply slightly less in terms of cubic yards. For a Class 3 road, they would apply about 90 cubic yards per mile as versus our 100. A Class 4 road in Saskatchewan would warrant 75 versus our 85. A Class 5 road would warrant 55 versus our 75. So the standard that is applied in Manitoba is slightly better than in Saskatchewan, but that is the standard that is used.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister telling me that standard applies everywhere, or is the district allowed to vary that?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The districts are allowed to vary that if the conditions warrant it.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** And what would the conditions be that would allow an engineer or a district to change that if it was downgraded?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I don't understand the question, if it was downgraded.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Chairman, I have had complaints brought to me by people that are in the gravel trade that say they can't even apply two truckloads to the mile. That makes it exceedingly difficult for the person applying the gravel to spread it that thinly. Two truckloads to a mile doesn't seem like very much gravel to me.

There is the added problem that, if there are telephone or hydro lines anywhere, it does cause a further disadvantage to the trucker if he is using a hydraulic lift box, rather than a belly dump.

But there are, I know in some areas, places where they're asking for 30-35 yards to the mile. As far as gravelling a road, I think it's just a waste of time and money to put that kind of amount on a road. I'm sure it doesn't doesn't improve the quality of the road at all; in fact, all it does is provide a few loose stones to break a few more windshields.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, certainly gravel is necessary to keep the roads in any kind of driving condition, and especially in certain soil conditions where there is a lot of clay, for example, additional gravel may be required. The amount of rainfall might determine how much gravel is required. Exceptional truck traffic or gravel traffic over a particular road may require that additional gravel is required.

We also have a system of using a machine called a sloper to retrieve gravel that has been thrown off the road so that it can be reused. That is brought back up on the road where it can be used and saves an awful lot of dollars each year on gravel, and we have to remember that we're talking about these applications being applied every year. So, cumulatively, if we retrieve a good portion of it each year we should be maintaining

a proper amount of gravel on the road. It is necessary to apply it though every year, or as close to that on a consistent basis so that it doesn't deteriorate.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister can tell us that they have their standards and that, but I know that the travelling public and the people of Manitoba know that the provincial road system is not improving; it is degenerating. There is insufficient traffic gravel being applied. Maybe you don't find it in the Red River Valley, but if you come into the western part of Manitoba where there is a large - I wouldn't call them boulders - but there are numerous stones used in the building of the roads. We now find that many of the provincial road systems, the travelling public is not travelling on gravel at all, they are travelling on buried boulders, and it is exceedingly hard on vehicles. So I would ask the Minister to seriously consider his maintenance program because it is proving that it is not sufficient, and I would hope that the Minister would do something about it because our provincial road system is slowly sinking into the mire of being an increasing liability to the public every day.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, just in response to that. Of course, the most expensive solution is upgrading all those roads and that is very expensive, requiring additional right-of-way and then building the road to a higher standard or restoring a road to the standard that it was at one time before it deteriorated over a number of years. However, I believe as the member does that as the road system becomes older, as it ages, that there has to be more effort made at maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing roads in the absence of being able to upgrade all of those roads. So it would seem logical that the standards should be reviewed for certain roads, and I think that flexibility exists in the current system.

But I am interested in determining, as well, whether we should be increasing the amount of gravel and dragging and other maintenance operations to meet the needs of the roads today as they exist because of the fact that there has been a lot of traffic over them over the years, and they are deteriorating because they can't be upgraded to meet the schedule that we would all like to see. So we will review those standards.

But as I have indicated, they have been in place for many years and we have not reduced them. If anything, this coming year we're expanding the area of surface gravel, as I indicated earlier.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll have to go back to my opening remarks and the remarks lately of the Minister. There is no question about it, in order to bring our roads back to an acceptable standard, it's going to require a fairly large expenditure. He's going to have to convince his Cabinet colleagues and the Premier that he has to have all of the money that a great number of the people feel is justly his out of the taxation revenue, plus any amount that he can convince them to put in there from the Jobs Fund in order to increase his budget substantially more than the \$2 million that we've got in it this year. It's going

to take \$20 or \$30 million a year more to bring the roads up to any standard.

But to carry along the remarks of the Member for Virden, the Minister mentioned on road maintenance the sloper that retrieved gravel from the edges of the road and brought it back into use. Also when that sloper is at work - and I'm sure there is one particular case in my area that the Minister has had brought to his attention very forcibly - it also retrieves all the broken beer bottles and places them on the road, and those farmers with rubber tired machines are faced with many hundreds of dollars in fixing their bloody tires when they're trying to get their machines to and from their various fields. That particular section of the road, and I'm happy to see that there is acquisition of right-of-way in the program, Mr. Chairman, it may alleviate an awful lot of these problems.

But on that same stretch of road, last year there was applied there 165 yards of gravel on three miles, that's just probably a little bit thinner than the application the Member for Virden was referring to. But that particular gravel caused more problems than it solved. The gravel was put on the road and immediately there was a fairly heavy rain, and that section of the road turned automatically into a grease spot.

There was a lady driving a van that very nearly went into the ditch, and there was a very steep grade there. It would have obviously overturned. She had two or three children in the van with her. It could have been a very very serious accident. The complaints were brought to me about that gravel, and it was taken from a stockpile. I had the gravel tested at my own expense. It was put on there as surface gravel and the testing came back that at best it was a base gravel that had been used, I think, in the previous construction of a road further down, it had been used as base gravel. That was applied to the road as surface gravel and could have resulted in a very very serious condition on that road. But there was so much clay in it, it automatically became just a greasy road when it got wet. It was just of no value putting the gravel on there at all. They might as well have saved their money as putting that particular gravel on there.

Now I don't know how many situations there are. I was going to bring it up under materials earlier, Mr. Minister, but while we're on this particular item we could maybe cover it here. On Page 32, I noticed under the budgetary cutbacks of the construction season necessitated a reduction of quality control, and indicating that it had been working about 50 percent. I just wondered how many tests are conducted on the various gravel that's being used, and how often are they done.

Just to carry on, Mr. Chairman, I know crushing is very expensive, but maybe in the long run the expensive crushing to provide a top notch grade of gravel in the long run may be a wise expense rather than using some of the particularly low grade types of gravel that we're getting, and I know in some areas gravel is very very hard to come by. I have one municipality that absolutely has no gravel in the municipality at all and it's becoming pretty much of an expense to them.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** First of all, this individual in the situation that the member is referring to can be looked

into and I am sure that every attempt is made to apply the proper gravel that's required. I am sure that the district would have heard about this particular situation after that happened.

My understanding is that when gravel and aggregate is being crushed that there is testing going on at the time that it's taking place to ensure that it meets a certain standard. I am sure, as well, that the aggregate is tested from a new source when the department opens up a new gravel pit area, but that is something that is done initially, and I don't know if it's done in each individual case, each truckload that is taken out. I could get that information and if it isn't tested frequently enough we will certainly see whether that is a problem, and yielding at least these conditions that the member is talking about.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I think in this particular case it was probably something that had to be done maybe fairly quickly and it was probably a bit of a quick fix to get that gravel because it was handy and use it and it just was terribly poor quality gravel.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a)—pass.

2.(b)(1); 2.(b)(2) Winter Roads: 100 Percent Provincial. Shareable with Canada - the Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Yes, the Minister can probably give us some comment on what was accomplished under this particular heading and then, if any of my colleagues have questions we can ask them after we have had the Minister's program under this item.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, there are approximately 18 separate sections of contracts that have been done under the Winter Road Program and the total cost of them was in the neighbourhood of \$2,300,000, which was 50 percent recoverable from the Federal Government. They involved sections that I could enumerate to the members if they would like to have that kind of detailed information, or if they want to ask me some specific questions.

I can say, though, that we had an excellent year for winter roads. We received a lot of good feedback on the early date that they were open in the middle of January and, in some instances, the Hudson Bay Company had indicated to us that they were very pleased with the fact that they were open early and they were able to get their stock in early and it reflected in lower prices to their customers. So I think it was a very successful year in terms of the Winter Road Program in Northern Manitoba.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman, I think we are interested in how many miles of winter road were put in and who the contractors were and how many miles each contractor had. How many contracts did the Native people handle this year, Mr. Chairman, and things of that nature we are interested in?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The major contract was let to the Norwin Construction Company and they do 831 kilometres valued at \$1.356 million, all of that on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. It involves a number of bands who got together to form the company, Norwin

Construction Company, that contracts this work each year.

It is composed of the Hollow Water Indian Reserve No. 10, the Bloodvein Indian Reserve No. 12, Berens River Indian Reserve No. 13, Poplar River No. 16, Little Grand Rapids No. 14, the Paungassi Indian Settlement, Red Sucker Indian Settlement and Island Lake Indian Reserve No. 22. They are all a part of this organization, the Norwin Construction Company, and they do sections that I could outline from Hollow Water to Bloodvein, Bloodvein to Little Grand Rapids, Little Grand Rapids to St. Theresa Point, and so on and so forth, right through to Berens River to Poplar River. So that is the largest contractor and that contractor looks after the whole area on the east side of Lake Winnipeg.

As I indicated, the contract prices for that have not increased for the last three years. However, we have applied, I believe, a .25 percent increase for the coming year, and reflect the fact that there has been no increase for the past three years.

There is also a contractor, Tom's Repair and Rental, who does the South Bay to South Indian Lake winter road, 13 kilometres, a total cost of \$18,000.00.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Who was the contractor there?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** It is Tom's Repair and Rental. The bid price is \$28,965.00. There is also one from Oxford House to kilometre 36, the contractor is Gilbert North; 36 kilometres of winter road, the bid price of \$54,000.00; from kilometre 36 to God's Lake Narrows was done by the God's Lake Narrows Indian Band at a bid price of \$92,000.00; the winter road from Cross Lake to kilometre 64 is a bid price of \$86,000 for 64 kilometres, the Pemechikamik Development Corporation; from kilometre 64 to Hayes River, 92 kilometres this past year for \$117,000, the bid price; Hayes River Crossing to the junction of Oxford House to God's Lake Narrows winter road, 50 kilometres, \$71,000 by the Oxford House Band Council; Gold Trail Hotel Ltd. does the Ferry Landing Mile 81 to York Landing to Ilford, 64 kilometres for \$88,000.00. The rest of it is Norwin.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** The contract with Norwin, it's not tendered, it's a let contract. How do you establish the price on that? You mentioned it hadn't gone up for some years, although with some variation. Are they able to perform the work in satisfactory order and make a profit at it? Is it a break-even situation where they provide some employment for their people there?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** It is set on a pre-unit basis, both kilometres and width of the right-of-way that is cleared, that is provided, and we have had varying success over the last number of years with it, depending on the amount of additional equipment that is required to be called in to assist, which is taken off the price that they bid if they are not meeting certain requirements, especially if it's getting late in the season. That wasn't necessary this past year, so they may have been able to make a profit on it, but they have had some difficulties in the past, and we're trying to work with them to assist them in ensuring that their equipment is ready and that they're able to undertake the work in a businesslike way. It's improving, especially this past year. There has

been a rather substantial improvement in the work that was done in terms of the supervision and the speed with which it was accomplished. So I'm not certain whether they are making a substantial profit, but they are putting people to work during that time.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Is there any government equipment used on this construction section?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** I believe that they do stage certain pieces of government equipment at certain times, depending on the situation as I indicated earlier. The department will come in with equipment to assist if that's necessary. However, they have purchased most of their own equipment.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** When the government equipment comes in there to assist, how is that charged out against the contract price?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** My understanding is that the work that is done is charged against the appropriation, and their price is reduced correspondingly if they haven't completed the work that was required.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** It would be on the going hourly rate for the types of machines then.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** They are paid on a kilometre basis to construct the road, and then they're paid to maintain it on a weekly basis, to maintain it thereafter. If they aren't able to do that, then the equipment from the Highways Department certainly is called in to assist on it and then that is deducted from the price.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** So there is a continuing maintenance charge over and above the actual cost of construction.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, that's in their entire bid price. It's included in the bid.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** It's included in the bid. This covers the yearly operation of that road.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Because the road obviously is going to disappear in another month or two. You start all over again next year.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** That's one of the hazards of winter roads.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** It's a little more costly to put a whole road in there. We would require a considerable number of bridges to put a road up through that particular area. It's a little easier to do it in the wintertime, I suppose, when you can wait till it freezes and slide along on the ice.

I suppose we're going to adjourn, Mr. Chairman, at 10 o'clock, are we? There are some other questions on . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** What is the pleasure of the committee? It's now 10:00 p.m.

The Member for Virden.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** The Member for Morris won't be here tomorrow, and there are one or two questions he would like although the House Leader suggested we quit at 10 o'clock. But if you wanted to carry on . . .

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Chairman, we can go - well, go ahead.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, I don't think there would be an objection on either side if there were certain items that members had questions on and they wanted to complete that questioning that we continue for a short period on. I don't think when we are in Committee of Supply that 10 o'clock is an alarm bell. It is certainly not our intention - and the House Leader in the opposition and I have discussed this - to sit until midnight or anything like that, but if there are a few questions that members wish to pursue we didn't view 10 o'clock as fixed. We certainly don't want to go late.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We can accommodate some questions, especially the member who will not be here tomorrow.

The Member for Virden.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have two questions of the Minister on the Winter Roads. Is the unit price that is used in these contracts consistent from one contract to another for the various pieces of equipment, and is that price consistent with the schedule that is used for all other contractors in the Province of Manitoba on hourly rates?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The unit price has been established as a result of experience over the last number of years. It varies between contracts depending on the conditions; a road over an open lake being somewhat different to construct than a road through hilly conditions or forested areas and so on and swampy areas that are very difficult sometimes. So it varies in terms of the unit price, but they are paid on the amount of work they have accomplished per kilometre according to the specifications that have been set out, the specified width. When that is accomplished, the progress payment is made.

Obviously, these prices don't correspond to the unit payments to contractors throughout the province because they're doing different kind of work. It is not done on an hourly basis for the machines used; it's a contract, based on the amount of work accomplished.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** A second question, when the Minister indicated that on occasions for maintenance purposes highways equipment has been used in the past, is that charged out at the same hourly rental rate as applies to the construction industry with your hourly rental rate?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** We use the same hourly rental rates, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't belabour the sitting of the committee. My questions are mainly directed towards the area of Design. If it is that the engineers within the Design Department are going to be present during the consideration of the Construction Program, then I can certainly postpone my questions until that time.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** The Director of Planning and Design is here tonight. We hope to consider all of the areas or most of the areas in the Construction Program under Planning and Design which is probably going to be dealt with tomorrow. I understand the honourable member has indicated he won't be here tomorrow.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. S. USKIW:** It is my understanding that when we deal with the whole construction component that the Design people will be here as well, so that will go beyond tomorrow though. I don't think we'll finish that tomorrow.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** If the assumption is that we would go past tomorrow on the construction program, then the member will have an opportunity.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I'll have an opportunity, I'm sure.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Wednesday is bills, I understand, so we won't be on Wednesday . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Can we pass this item now? 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2)—pass.

We will start tomorrow with 2.(c)(1) and 2.(c)(2).  
Committee rise.

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** The committee will come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 1.(c) - the Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I think before the dinner hour we were talking about research and planning, and it was the will of the committee and my suggestion that you allow quite a bit of latitude on this issue because, after all, we're talking about the direction the government is going in the planning and so on. I'll give the health critic of the opposition a chance to put his remarks on the record. I don't want to prolong this too much.

I think it's obvious that our understanding of planning is not the same as the opposition, and theirs, of course, is not the same as ours. I would certainly agree that there has been some exaggeration, but I won't limit it to the past when this side was on the opposition of some of the things that were said and some of the things that are being said, some of it by the leader, the point that I made. Now, that is exactly in the same vein. I choose to think that this was done with the best intention. I won't imply too many motives. There is always a bit of partisan politics, and the point that I made is that things change once you've been involved

in it, the same as the . . . , the former Member for Fort Garry, who became a different person in opposition in opposing as a health critic, he was before he had the responsibility. I think the same is true of me. The member was saying himself that I was the main offender when it came to some of the things that were said. And now, my friend, up to a certain point, is doing some of the same things. I think that he'll go through the same thing if someday he ever becomes the Minister of Health. So that is understandable.

I want to say also that at no time am I - if I give that impression I want to correct it fairly fast - crying the blues and saying people are not fair to me at all. I am suggesting that I will say when somebody is exactly the opposite of what I've said or something that is wrong, I think that's wrong, it doesn't matter who they do it to. That, to me, is trying to mislead the people and that's something the Member for Pembina seemed not to like at all, according to his speech in the epitaph that he used during his description of some of the members.

So, again, I had a paper that I was going to read, but at this time I won't. I can give the information of some of the work that has been done by the planning. There are many committees that are reporting now, and the main point. Of course, we have to look at the day to day routine, call it plan and call it strategy, but I am referring mostly of what are we going to do to preserve the good system that we have in Manitoba. And the Manitoba system four years ago was not falling apart during the term of the Conservatives, and it's not falling apart today. It leaves to be desired, and it always will be like that, but it's still one of the best, if not the best in Canada and amongst the nations of the world.

Now, I think that some of the provincial Ministers are pretty close to surrendering or saying that this is too costly. There's no way. It's too rich for us, that we can't keep it up. I choose to agree with them that it's a very difficult thing, it is very costly and there is no guarantee that we could keep on the way we're doing now. I chose, and I think in the presentation that I have made that my friend I think saw that I talked about the crossroad, and the decisions are very important that we could do what we're doing now, nothing more, nothing less. I think I gave the example that if we do nothing but what we are doing now, not even any increase in salaries, not even inflation, nothing like that all, just the formula for the beds and so on to take care of the same guidelines that we have now to take care of an aging population, nothing else, that alone would cost us .25 billion in the next 10 years.

Now as I said earlier, if we weren't going to raise anything, just what we are doing now - in other words, do nothing - or if we're going to keep on the way we're doing now, well then that would be 3.44 billion; that's also impossible and to cap it, that's not an option. If we capped it, it actually would be going down.

So that leaves only one alternative, to change the motivation of size starting with the consumer, then going with the providers of service. I think a formula - and that's where I was inviting the honourable member - it would be naive on my part to think that people are not going to make their brownie points especially before an election so I'm not suggesting anything that is not feasible, but I'm saying that in certain areas I think we could agree, no matter who it is.

It's true that in the past, not this party and the other party has done it, but I think that there is a signal going out that, what are we going to do? Do we want to keep on in this, or do we want to try to, together, safeguard a program system that is geared to the heart of the people of Manitoba? I think that at least we should make an effort. If it doesn't work, it doesn't work. There should be some kind - maybe that's what I meant when I'm talking about getting together - maybe some kind of a council of different people from different providers of services and so on to meet at least a few times, some conference or something, where we could put our thoughts on paper and see if we can get together. That is being done to a certain point.

There was a study promoted what we did at St. Benedict and called the different people in the administration. We also had Dr. Evans, not my colleague Dr. Evans who is well known in this field. The St. Boniface Hospital had a full day when both the Federal Minister and myself were there and the different invited guests and I'm suggesting that maybe that should be done with the two parties.

If there is a change in government, if there is a change the party then would know what was going on. It would feel part of it. It would feel that he would have something to do with it, not to cause all these four or five years of complete loss. It might be that certain things will be changed and all the work done for nothing, and we'd have to start all over again.

Unfortunately, that's what we seem to do in government. It seems that we have a mandate. It takes us two or three years to get organized, and then we're finally in full swing but not quite ready to act. There's a change of government and the government starts all over again and that to me, is not a necessity.

Still I'm sure there will be many many areas of disagreement. We'll have enough to suit us and be able to make a different presentation to the public of Manitoba, but at least on certain things I think we can and we should go in the same direction because I think we're both committed to protecting our system, at least in this province.

I haven't heard anywhere of any party that is saying, let's do away with this. I have heard it in other provinces, as I say. The federal parties have all pretty well been together on it, as I said before the dinner hour. So that is the suggestion that I make. It's not a scheme to try to get the people to go easy on me or anything like that, I don't expect that, especially knowing the Member for Pembina and the House leader, I know that won't happen. In fact, I would be a bit disappointed. We keep it honest, I think that we can have some darn good discussions, at least a few of them, and I would welcome that. But on some other area, I think that we should try at least. If it doesn't work, it doesn't work. What have we lost? Nothing.

So, Mr. Chairman, I will have other occasions to talk about the construction. We've talked about that. I don't think it would be proper for me to start answering that. Those were mostly the opening remarks of the member which certainly he was expected to make, and he certainly had all the rights in the world, but we'll have other occasions to go into detail, and I would like to follow the procedure like we did in the past and try to go line by line.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Over the supper hour I sort of reflected on some of the responses that the Minister of Health had given this afternoon, and in some regards I became a little troubled with some of the responses. Mr. Chairman, before I get into that, I think it's interesting to note that on Monday when the Minister indicated the reason, the rationale, for bringing in the new per diem user fee to the chronically ill and our mental health patients was that eight other provinces had the same kind of a fee in place, and Manitoba therefore was one of the last holdouts, so that justified bringing in that sort of fee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that becomes troubling because those are exactly the sorts of comparisons that the Member for Transcona and others, and I don't say the Minister of Health, because I think he did have a realization of the the heralds of the system and was maybe less vocal in what his caucus would have liked him to have been in opposition. But, now, in order to fund a system, which by the Minister's own projections that he laid out to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities back in November of 1984, the funding demands of the system as is are almost mind boggling. The Minister is searching, along with the department, to find new monies because he can't talk to his Treasury Board chairman and get the kinds of additional funding that he may want to have to eliminate some of the problems identified this afternoon so that we are down in the planning of funding, if you will, for the department now to searching out new sources of revenue.

One of them, and the Minister didn't have the answer, which was a little bit astounding the other day that a veteran Minister did not have the answer as to how many dollars the new chronic care per diems were going to raise. I realize you'll give that to me now, and it was skilfully unknown the day we posed the question to you. — (Interjection) — Well, you've been a veteran Minister of Health and you skilfully "unknow" quite a few things. When it's convenient not to have an answer, the Minister of Health does not have an answer. The Minister of Health did not have the answer as to what the dollar implications were of his introduction of the per diems, 15.25 per day, for those chronic care patients who are not panelled for personal care home patients and for mental health patients in institutions over a year.

But the problem that the Minister has with the system is a financial one in some regards. He has imposed that new form of user fee in order to try to overcome some of those financial problems. It is considered on this side with something of a jaundiced eye when the Minister justifies the imposition of that new fee on the standpoint that eight other provinces in Canada have a similar fee, hence it would be alright for Manitoba to have it.

But those eight other provinces, the majority of them I presume, will be provinces with Progressive Conservative administrations, something this New Democratic Party administration often decries for their policy direction. You often hear a great tirade against British Columbia, against Saskatchewan, against Alberta, against Ontario for their premiums, etc., etc., because these provinces don't run a clean ship in health like Manitoba does. But yet, to justify about \$3.5 million of additional revenue to the department, the Minister says simply well we're just doing like the other provinces do.

You justified your imposition of the per diems on the basis that eight other provinces have those kinds of charges to chronic care patients, and that justified the move in Manitoba. You can't have it both ways once again. You can't condemn Conservative administrations provincially for actions and then, all of a sudden when you're doing something similar, embrace them. Either they're wrong all the time, or they're right all the time.

Mr. Chairman, that wasn't really what I wanted to get to. What sort of troubled me this afternoon was the Minister of Health made a statement, and he'll correct me if I don't paraphrase this correctly, but basically I think the record will show that he indicated that he wasn't going to get into this position where he, as Minister of Health, was going to be blamed for all the problems that were in the system; that Bud Sherman as Minister of Health, he took it upon his own shoulders every problem there was and he personally wanted to try and solve them.

Well I find that a little bit strange because it seems to me that, when you're the Minister of a department, that's where the buck stops. If things are happening within the department, the Minister is the one that ultimately is responsible. If he's not responsible for his actions, either he shouldn't be there or the staff that brought the actions on shouldn't be there. The two can't co-exist.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister used this argument rather skilfully the other day, and it was in a question that I was posing to him about the negotiations with the Chiropractic Association on their fee schedule — (Interjection) — this is Planning. Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that the contract that was signed which it's alleged was broken by the government, the Minister conveniently fended off and said, oh no. That was signed by the Health Services Commission, and he didn't have anything to do with it.

The only problem is that his Deputy is also Chairman of the Health Services Commission, and his Deputy signed the contract. You know, if the Deputy isn't responsible for contracts he signs as Chairman of the Health Services Commission, then we've really got a system in disarray. The Minister can't avoid the responsibility of action in this department, and he can't criticize a person like Bud Sherman that took his department seriously enough that, when accusations were levelled, he got to the bottom of it. He wasn't afraid to shoulder some of the responsibility for actions that were happening in the Health Department by government decision. Mr. Chairman, no one can tell me that wasn't a government decision to renew the fee schedule to the chiropractors.

I just want to close with that remark, that I didn't very much enjoy the Minister of Health criticizing the former Minister for being too responsible for the Health Department and being personally responsible for decisions and actions that had taken place. That, I believe, is a role of a member of Cabinet, not something that one should be criticized for.

Mr. Chairman, I had posed a question to the Minister, and he might be able to answer it now. Of the 11 people in Research and Planning, could the Minister indicate who the director is and who the people are that are involved?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I'll start by giving the answer that I forgot earlier, and then I want to make comments on some of the things that were said.

The staff - there are 11, and one vacant. There's one director; one assistant director, one senior economist, one senior analyst/research evaluation, four program analysts, one administrative officer and two secretaries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that my gift for communication is not good. Either I misunderstood or my honourable friend is purposely pretending; he's giving me too much credit and he's more of an expert, and is purposely misreading what I said. What I said before the dinner hour, what I said last year, what I said to the former Member for Fort Garry, is that it's not a one-man operation. I'm not talking about the department. At no time have I not accepted full responsibility of all the staff. I accept that. That's the department. That is our responsibility. That's not what I was saying at all.

I was saying that when the Minister is saying, I'm going to stop this - this decision of a board of a hospital or a different group such as that - I'm saying that all these people are working together. And as with a school division, if you give a school division some responsibility, then you don't take them over; that doesn't mean you can't work with them. That doesn't mean that there is something radically wrong, that you're not going to try to change and talk to them. But I think that there was overreaction at the time that he was asked a question in the House. Right away, he's going to stop this without even first talking to the board. And I didn't criticize him; I just told him that I wouldn't be caught doing that; I think that would be wrong. There's nobody that can do that. I think he got in trouble because of that, things that were not his responsibility. That was what I am trying to say. If we say you've got so much money to run the hospital, I can't start dictating to them every single thing they're going to do. That is the point I was making.

Now my responsibility and the responsibility of my staff, if they make a mistake, I pay for it. They make enough good decisions and good advice then I'm the winner in the long run anyway. They've made mistakes. I'm not one that's going to sell my staff to protect myself, far from it.

Now, the fact that my friend is saying that I did not give the information. I've got the information now. There'll be \$3.5 million revenue and that is divided approximately 50 percent with the chronic and mental patients.

Now the point that I was trying to make is, it was immaterial. Of course, it was very important to get this . . . but the principle was right. I have no hesitation with that at all. It is not utilization fees as we know it in Manitoba at all. Utilization fees, we usually refer to utilization fees where something is as a deterrent. Some call it a deterrent fee, and something that will encourage people to stay away.

Now if you do that, for instance, in an acute hospital, that is a utilization fee. If you're saying, well it's going to cost you \$5 for every day in the hospital or in extra billing. It's not an ideology hangup that I have. It is dangerous, because it will not affect the Member for Pembina and myself. I will not stay away to save five bucks if I have to go to the hospital or go to see a doctor, I won't, but some people will. Some people and, believe me, there are some people that can't afford it. They will not go. Then it will cost the public even more money, and these people are not getting the same kind of service because they can't afford it.

I guess it's a bit like the private schools, at the risk of starting an argument with the people on my side. The same comparison, I guess. That is not the same thing at all.

Now we have charged, nobody's ever questioned that. We were the first province to ensure the personal care home. We were one of the first provinces, not the first, to bring in Pharmacare. There has been, technically the word - what is it? - utilization fees is correct. It is when you're using it that you pay for it, but the connotation that term has here in Manitoba, it is something that will keep people away. There is it somebody that you pay a certain amount. You pay in Pharmacare. There is a deductible. Then they pay 20 percent, and you pay the rest.

Now we could not charge in the past. It was not acceptable because of the method of financing the system. Now we're saying that somebody - and let's take those over 65 years old for instance. They are given by the public an old age pension and a minimum income if they have nothing at all. What is that for? What is the public, what are the people of Canada giving that pension to everybody? To guarantee that they will have at least a minimum to take care of their needs. The main needs of course are board and room and, in the case of sick people, the medicine that you need and the health care.

The health care is already taken care of, but we add a little more that anybody in an institution gets all their medical needs, the drug needs free of charge. They get their board and room. So what is the necessity? Why should the public, the taxpayer, make a contribution of a pension to these people when that is their home? That is the big difference between a hospital and an institution which becomes your home. Unfortunately, that's where you're going to spend the rest of your life.

So we are saying that we couldn't do it before. Now we can, because that formula was changed. We're saying that you have the same people who are over 65 who can't take care of themselves, either because of age - and besides that, they have more problems because they are mentally ill and they need care. Does it make any sense to say, the same people, the same age, are getting the supplement, they are getting the pension, but you don't need any mental care, you pay. Now you, you need all the care, plus mental care, and you don't pay. You know I am ready to defend that anywhere, anyplace, anytime, and I don't care if we do not pay.

I don't think it is fair. I think the people could protest if they are saying why do I have to pay for this person who is being giving him even more care. It's costing you more per day. It's costing at least \$100 a day and we are asking for \$15 now.

What else did we do? We said that you must be in the institution for a year before we accept that you won't be discharged and go back. If you do, then you start all over again when you come back. In other words, you want to make fairly sure that you are going to have to spend the rest of your life in an institution. Now we want, all of us, and certainly I want the best possible care for the people of Manitoba. With this money, we will be able to do something that we wouldn't be able to do this year. We will be able to move in the mental health field which for too long under all kinds of

government has been lagging. All across Canada it is a new science to a certain point and there are lots of problems; it is not accepted by everybody, but we have to move in that direction. It's going to be very costly and we are not getting any help from the Federal Government, our partner in this provision of services.

Then we said it is not the revenue of your family. We didn't want to see somebody 20, 30, mentally ill, a burden on the family where maybe the father was working, maybe the mother was working, but they had trouble making ends meet, then they would be stuck to pay bills for their child, their dependant. We said no, we are not going to do that. It has to be revenue from you. Do you know how many people under 65 will have any revenue? It would leave those that aren't covered by a third party; for instance, if they were injured in a car accident, then Autopac pays or there is a big settlement to help them take care of themselves. Why shouldn't they have to pay a small percentage of their way? So that is what we said. In fact, the former health critic and the former Minister during the Conservative years agreed with me on that. I know what my friend is going to say, but we were wrong.

Another thing I forgot to say is that they will be guaranteed to keep - those that have money - up to \$150 approximately, the same as the people that are in personal care homes. What expenses do they have in a month? Most of the time they don't spend it. You go to any personal care home and they'll tell you that it's an embarrassment for them because the money is accumulating and some of the children are coming with their hands out, they want that money.

Now the public is paying to take care of their father and mother with the best possible care, very costly care, and they are going to get a pension besides that from the Federal Government. They are not going to pay; they are going to give that to somebody else. It doesn't make sense. So I have no problem. That is why I didn't think it was that important to talk about the revenue.

The revenue is important. It was an option in years like this year, but as far as I'm concerned, if they didn't pay anything, the principle is right and we've got to make a lot of decisions like that. It's not going to be popular. In the next few years the role of the Minister of Health is not going to be popular because a lot of tough decisions are going to have to be made that the people won't like.

Now we dealt also with chronic patients. The chronic patients are the same thing, the people that will be in the hospital for the rest of their lives, in some rehab hospital. It's the same principle. They would have to be in the hospital at least a month and the doctor would have to say there's not much point, that person cannot be rehabilitated. If someday there is a change, fine, you would have to start all over. Again, we judge the people on their own revenue, not on family revenue, or those that have responsibility for these dependants. Again, they have a guarantee, if they have any revenue at all, to keep up to \$150.00. Of course, if they only have \$50 revenue, you don't touch it at all but if they have \$150 approximately - then they keep it. So I don't apologize for that at all. I don't think it is going backwards, that it's changing things at all.

Now, how else are you going to start getting a message across and how else are you going to talk to

the people if you don't say, look out, in 10 years, if you do nothing, that is what it's going to cost? You have a choice, and the people know that there is a responsibility to look at the moral issue. It is one of the main concerns of the people in administration and the people providing services now, the issues that the people haven't got the answers about yet. Sure, somebody can take advantage of that and say the Minister is saying that after a certain age you are not going to be able to have a heart transplant. First of all, at no time did I suggest that they couldn't, and I am talking about covering this with the taxpayers' money. I didn't give the answer and I made it quite clear that I didn't know the answer but I wanted to show the problem we had and eventually somebody will have to give these answers.

I can elaborate on that. There are some areas where one patient cost us \$300,000 a year. Can we keep on doing that? That is what I said when we brought in this program. We said that we are providing transportation but you are not necessarily going to get a Cadillac or a Rolls-Royce; maybe you'll get a bicycle. That decision will be more important than ever now because of what it is going to cost if we do just what we are doing now, without all this advancement in technology and all these new methods and all these new drugs and all this CAT scan that we never heard of. A few years ago at least you didn't have that problem. Now when you finish getting a few of these things and satisfying the hospitals that want them, they are practically obsolete and there's something new. Those are the problems.

I'm not crying the blues; I'm just telling the people that this is something that we will have to face, and I am admitting that I haven't got the answers and I can't get the answers alone.

**A MEMBER:** Excuses.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Oh, excuses. Well, there's the real clever fellow on the other side that calls it excuses. You don't want to accept this, that is your privilege, but at least I am going to try to do something to try to give the best service possible. Those are tough decisions.

My honourable friends are saying that you have your deficit, and then in the same breath are saying, what about my constituency; I need so many beds; I need so many of that and forget the guidelines, we need it. Those are some of the things that they'll have to look at.

Now the question of chiropractors because my friend brought that up again, I think we are jumping all over the place, Mr. Chairman, but you are allowing it and I hoped that that would surface sometime during the Estimates. I might as well answer it now. I am only answering the questions that I was asked or referring to the things that were mentioned before.

The chiropractors, and I take full responsibility - if it's a sin, I sinned - I didn't know of any signed agreement at all. I took it for granted that we discussed with the chiropractors, the dentists, the optometrists, we have discussed it many times during the fee negotiations. We have done that. The contract, by the way, was never signed between the government - you

keep referring to the government - there is a difference. I never signed any document. Yes, it was signed by the Commission and the Commission could only discuss something that is within their power, not a political decision that is made somewhere else.

Now the decision was very simple, and I think that's an anomaly. They are saying that they want to have full coverage. Well, to start that, you start treating people like individuals, and to say that those that are punished by what we did are those that suffer the most is the most assinine statement I have ever seen because it doesn't look at ability to pay. If somebody is single, they had \$102 of services. If they happen to be married, they can be the richest people and this single person could be the poorest guy in the world. This one that was married, his wife didn't go, well then, he can have 204, and I don't think that's right. I don't think that's right. If we're going to do something, we should make it more even.

This was a decision, and I won't hide the fact, we had different options to see if we could correct things that are wrong, save money in the process, improve the standards, and change the programs. That's the trouble with government, that we have a program and then there's no evaluation. You stay with it and then you have another program, and that's one of the reasons why we're faced with what we're faced today. We can't afford some of the things that we're doing. So, therefore, that decision was made.

Just as a question of courtesy, I asked the commission to get in touch with them and let them know what would be done. The president, who very conveniently doesn't say too much about that, the president was always somebody who I could get along with, very much of a gentleman, but he doesn't say that when he met with the commission that he said, well, some of the people might not like it, but we will not resist it. We will not fight it. We want to co-operate with the government, period. But I must talk to my executive. So, there was at least 10 days or so around that time, until they had the meeting with the executive. The next day, the associated director of the commission got in touch with him and he said the same thing again, and that was it. Two or three days after, all hell broke loose.

Now, I got a phone call that he wanted to meet with me within three days because they were having a meeting. I told him that was impossible. Within four or five days, I guess. Three of those days, I was away with Cabinet, we had special Cabinet meetings to look at the Estimates. Those things were being decided. I told him, in the meantime, the Deputy Minister would meet with him. Still don't know anything about a contract. So, he did want to see him. Then, I had a discussion with him. He came over to see me, and I asked him, well, why didn't you do that? If you knew there was an agreement, why didn't you remind us instead of criticizing after, and why didn't you say something if there was an agreement? And I'm not too sure. Certainly at that time, I didn't feel that an agreement was for changing anomalies, that is strictly a political decision of improving the situation, of making more it more fair. It stands to reason, nobody in his right mind providing the service will go along with that. On a thing like this it's a tough decision that I was talking.

And there's negotiation, and there's negotiation. There's negotiation with a group of people where you're

going to talk, and they're giving everybody a veto in this society every time there is something. That makes it even twice that hard to discuss or to advise on what you're going to do so they can get organized to fight. Well, I'm not that naive and gullible. That's being done, and I was on that side of the issue many times. I can tell you about the lottery thing. There was always all kinds of commitment made, and none of them were to . . . that, and the newspaper knew everything that was going on in the same day, except that it wasn't quite factual.

On February 22nd, I met with them, and I asked them why, after having said that they weren't going to fight it, and he said, well, everything was fine until two days after, I remember the agreement, and I got mad. And another thing - and it doesn't matter what I tell them, they don't seem to want to accept that - they're talking about it, and the main thing is very clear. He thought he could deliver his membership and he did, and I don't blame him for that. They were mad at him and so on. So, the easy way was to blame somebody else for that.

Then, the next thing that griped them so much - they're looking for recognition as the medical profession, I don't blame them. No, I mean the Minister of Health. In Canada to try to get them together I even invited both sides, the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Some representatives from the College, and the President and another couple of the chiropractors to see if they could work together to try to iron it out. I wasn't too successful, but I tried. But, then, they want recognition the same as the medical profession, and they said that I made a deal with the medical profession, and they were talking about extra billing. I made no deal with anyone. The extra billing was announced last year during the Session. It was something that was always party policy. I succeeded in saying to the party, it's not a big concern right now. Fine, I'm with you, but we don't need the fight because it's not an abuse here in Manitoba. But, then, when the act was passed, it was passed by the three parties in Ottawa, well then, fine. I announced that I would have legislation. That was announced to everybody. They said that I made an agreement that they gave up extra billing for a commitment of compulsory binding arbitration, and that's wrong. He announced that no extra billing was coming, but binding arbitration was something else that we said we'd go along, and we had some discussion, not at the negotiating. The agreement as far as the MMA, it's again the commission, and these were discussions between myself and the MMA, and we are closer, as I said before, than ever before, and we're working together to try to solve some of the problems that were mentioned before.

And then, again, you have the problem of binding arbitration, but then, when there are so many visits. So, I told them, fine, the commission could discuss that also if they wanted to. That it would be more difficult because we weren't covering the whole thing, and I also told them at the time, and some of the money that we had saved - I didn't try to hide the fact that we had saved some money by correcting this anomaly, but I said some of that could be put back in, and I asked them to present a brief to the commission. It was two weeks and nothing was done, and they were organizing at their offices and sending all kinds of letters and putting pressure, which is their right. That doesn't

mean I have to let everybody walk all over me. That's not negotiation, that you organize something and put the pressure and figure that you're going to push enough and then you're going to start negotiating. That to me is not discussion and negotiation, not my style anyway.

So the situation is that we did take some money, and we added 50 percent more visits. They're still not satisfied. Now, we also corrected another anomaly that if you had a large family, for instance, many of the Hutterites and the Mennonites would sooner go to a chiropractor than a doctor, and they were penalized if they had large families and if two or three or four were going to the chiropractors, they would only allow the same \$306, so, now everybody will have up to 11 visits.

Then the place to negotiate is still there. They answer that they had written a letter. During that exchange, about that time, they wrote to the commission two or three weeks after. They wanted to negotiate when a decision was made and was announced. I didn't know about it. So, I'm not too concerned about that. I still think we did the right thing on that. It's a game. The government is always to blame. It's always a game to start putting the pressure, fine.

They want to talk about binding arbitration, I'll discuss that with them also. But not binding arbitration when they're going to come in when the 11 visits are finished, and they're going to start charging more. If they want compulsory binding arbitration for the 11 visits, or whatever, and any other visits, I'll talk to them. I think that would be achieving something. I am one of the persons that is penalized with that because I go to the chiropractor. For awhile I was going two or three times a week, and I don't dare go as often right now, but I was going two or three times a week. I can tell you that I was using - my wife never went - and I was using that time also, but I think that was unfair and now I'll have my 11 visits like everybody else.

I am also on the record as saying that there should be a day - providing there's some safeguard - that maybe the people that are using it should have the same privilege as other health care, but I don't think that financially we can do it at this time.

I accept the responsibility of - I know my Deputy Minister since that time, I found out that he signed it, but it's pretty hard - I don't think I'm told every day and if I am, I certainly don't remember every action that is taken by the Deputy Minister over the period of the year, especially in this department.

The situation is it was a political decision to correct an anomaly. If a government decides and accepts the responsibility for that, I don't think the Commission can discuss too many other things, but there were an awful lot of things to discuss that we're still ready to discuss.

The thing is that they couldn't deliver at the time and the president was wrong when he told us that they were not going to fight it and that they were going to go along with it, because he didn't deliver. That's exactly the way it happened, so I'm sure that this will come up again, but now you've got the other side of the picture. I think that's all the things that were covered. I think I tried to answer the question.

There was another question that was asked during the question period . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The Honourable Minister's time has expired.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Okay, sorry.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister was going to answer a question. Can he indicate of the 11 staff positions, whether any are filled on an acting basis - whether any of the 10 positions out of 11 that are currently filled are filled on an acting basis?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, I think you got the message that there's one vacancy, and out of the ten there is one term, and the others are all permanent positions.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** There's none on an acting basis then?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, one term and the others are full-time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** In terms of the planning aspect of this group, can the Minister indicate whether the planning group has done any evaluation as to how the programs are delivered, so they know whether a given program delivery; for instance, home care as an example or any of the number of programs that are under the department, is this planning division responsible for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program delivery, so that they can theoretically identify problem areas and plan for their correction?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The Planning and Research certainly has a role to play in there, but their main preoccupation has been, as I said, long-range planning. And that situation is not working to our satisfaction as yet, but certainly the administration has a role to play in that also to see if we're hitting the target, and they've been working together and I hope they will continue working together.

I think there are certain things that have to be done by administration and then, of course, when you're evaluating and with the different information that you have in comparing programs, I think there is a role to play of getting the two together. That has been working, not exactly as well as we want it to work, because of shortage of staff. We haven't got the staff that we'd like to see. That has been working, but there has been some evaluation. Most of the programs were put in certain categories and that was the two groups working together, but that was primarily I think the function of the program director and the office of the administrator.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Of the nine permanent staff of the 11 positions, have there been any recent reclassifications of those staff?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Can I take the question . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes, sure. I understand the Minister is banking the questions, Mr. Chairman, so I'll continue.

The Minister mentioned earlier - or it wasn't the Minister - but in the last Department of Health report, there was mention made of a planning document called either "Medicare in Manitoba" or "Manitobans and Medicare," and I think the Minister received the report

late last year or early this year on the basis of a two-year study on the Medicare system in Manitoba. Is that report available for public consumption or is it an in-House document?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There is an in-House study that is being done now. It's nearly completed. I've never heard that reference, but is my friend referring to the work that has been done by staff and also by Dr. Bob Evans - Bob Evans, the economist?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes that's the one.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes there is. That is still going on. It's not quite finished as yet.

While I'm on my feet, there has been no reclassification on the staff.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Is Dr. Evans on staff or on contract with the department?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** On contract.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** What has been the value of his services to date to develop the consulting role within the Planning Department?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think it has a lot of value. Dr. Evans is a well-known economist. He's somebody that certainly initiates controversy and discussion. I think he's been looking mostly at the pattern of the bed utilization, the practice of physicians and there has been some information on that. We will know more. They're not quite finished and I think in two or three weeks, Dr. Evans, Mr. Pascoe and Mr. Roch from the department will be making a presentation to the Cabinet and I will know more at that time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Maybe the Minister missed the question. Could he indicate what per diem Dr. Evans is charging the department?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** We're paying Dr. Evans \$150 per day in expenses. The time that he has been there expires sometime in June and it will be approximately \$35,000.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the line on Salaries indicates a \$29,000 increase. Now that seems to be the pattern throughout the line-by-line. I presume that is just merit increase and reflects the zero salary increase per year. Is that a correct assumption?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, if you remember - well some of the members of the committee, maybe my honourable friend wasn't here last year - these positions weren't all filled, it took a while for us to fill them. We were looking for specific people and of course there were no increments, because we didn't have any staff. Now there's only one vacancy.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** So then the increase just basically reflects the filling of staff and any merit increments that are there.

Can the Minister indicate why the Other Expenditures for Research and Planning have more than doubled this year over last year?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The adjustment, we covered the Salary, was 29.2 for the adjustment and the increase information processing. Collecting the information, the processing and so on was \$136,000.00. That's under Other Expenditures.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Does that involve an expenditure on computer services and the installation of computers?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, it's data processing.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Could the Minister provide some information as to what sort of computer installation this division is planning to eat up that some \$130,000.00?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It's not a question that this branch has their own computers and so on. It is the charge levied against the branch by the MDS.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay, then is there . . . I tell you what, rather than us bounce up and down, how be I give the Minister three or four questions?

Is the Research and Planning involving themselves in any dimension of computer planning throughout the Department of Health; and within the other expenditures of \$254,000, are there any other consultant fees other than Dr. Evans, presumably within that figure or any other contract services that are within that \$254,000; and given that there is a fairly sizable amount of that money going to go to data processing and, theoretically, computer time for the processing of reports and information, will these reports and this information be public information for sharing with the House or is this going to be in-house study and in-house documentation?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, there is no thought of having a computer for that branch at all. It is the time services that they need and that will be delivered by MDS. The question of money for contract, certainly I hope there is, and there is, I think especially in this area, it's very easy to understand that it would be wrong to just hire all people permanently. There is, at times, certain information that you need or a certain specialist to do a certain job. It's a lot cheaper to pay him so much per contract and then get it over with that you don't have to have somebody that you have to keep paying as a fulltime, permanent civil servant. I think that in some areas that has to be done.

The question that has always been my personal preference to release as many documents as possible. There has to be an orderly way. I think first of all - and I don't think anybody would criticize that - I would want a report to be looked at, to be tabled with the Cabinet to start with. I don't remember any document that I kept from the opposition. There is certain work that is done internally and that might happen. I want to qualify that now; I'm not making a commitment that everything will be released. I think there's a place for in-house studies of certain things that would not be publicized,

but as far as I'm concerned, I can tell my honourable friend that I have no hesitation. I'll give him a copy of the Johnson Report. It was on looking at the MHO; it hasn't been studied by government yet. It's been released to the MHO and MHO has been asked to report within 60 days or so. I'll see that my honourable friend gets a copy.

The O'Sullivan Report on the nursing situation should be out within a few weeks, I would imagine. I will see that Cabinet sees it first and then make sure that I give my honourable friend a copy. I don't know exactly how the final form of the paper . . . that's more in-house study, but I'll see that there is at least some information in some kind of a content that the information should be provided to my honourable friend also.

I can't think if there's any others. If he can refresh my memory . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Does the Minister or his staff have the value - I understand that Dr. Evans has been working with the department for longer than a year. Can the Minister indicate what the total contract value has been to Dr. Evans to date?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, I can give that information to my honourable friend. I repeat, the value of the contract is for \$35,000 for the period he's been there. That's until the end of the contract some time in June and I think it will be well worth the money that we spent.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** My understanding is that Planning and Research is currently working with, I believe it's a 16 sub-committee group which are looking at all aspects of health planning from Manpower to Mental Health to geriatrics to gerontology, etc., etc. Can the Minister indicate what the planning framework is for that, whether there's a time in which he is expecting or is asking Research and Planning to table those series of 16 committee reports for perusal by the government and possible action?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think maybe it would help if I read. I've got a two-page statement here.

The activities of the Research and Planning Directorate, over the past two years, has focused around four main areas. They include Mental Health Services, medical manpower and health facilities, health services review committee and other studies.

Detailed information: Planning for the requirement for Mental Health Services began with the formulation of the Mental Health Working Group. This 13-member task force which has representatives from the Canadian Mental Health Association, the Manitoba Health Organizations and the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, met with senior representatives of government and over the period of a year produced a document which is entitled "Mental Health Services in Manitoba - A Review and Recommendation," commonly known as the Pascoe Report.

As a result of this document, the Deputy Minister of Health held public hearings and received over 50 briefs discussing the proposed direction for Mental Health Services as put forth by the Mental Health Work Group. As a result of this overwhelming support, the Cabinet

gave approval in principle to the document and its direction for Mental Health Services in November, 1984.

Since receipt of the document, our government has moved forward rapidly to facilitate numerous changes, some of which include the appointment of the Chief Provincial Psychiatrist who, for the first time, has a joint appointment with the University of Manitoba as a Professor of Psychiatry and holds down a position in Government Services.

In addition, the Mental Health Directorate is being staffed with an appointment of a directorate with a recruitment process currently under way. As well as these and other changes, the upcoming Estimates of the Manitoba Health will reflect commitment to enlarge the scope of Community Health Services.

The subject of the number of doctors that are required for our province and the number and type of health facilities that will be needed in the future is being reviewed by the directorate, with the assistance of Dr. Robert Evans, Professor of Economics at the University of British Columbia. This study by Dr. Evans and other members of the directorate will soon be reviewed by Cabinet, will become a public document in the very near future.

Approximately a year ago, approval was given to the formulation of the Health Services Review Committee, made up of individuals whose professional backgrounds are varied and whose organizations include representatives from the Manitoba Medical Association, both urban and rural, the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses, the School of Medicine - teaching and non-teaching hospitals, rural hospitals, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, social and preventative medicine, Manitoba Health and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. This Committee with such diverse membership is meeting to report to me on direction for health services provisions that will be required to meet future needs.

In order to undertake its work, the Health Services Review Committee identified 16 areas which require considerable review regarding the service delivery system that is in place today, and what with the expected shift in the population base over the next 10 years can be expected in the future.

Sub-committees established include the following topics: Administrative efficiencies, cardio-vascular disorders, community health services, elderly health services, emergency health care, gastro-intestinal disorders, Indian health care, intensive care, not for admission surgery, obstetrics, oncology, ophthalmology, outpatients, pediatrics, respiratory disorders, terminally ill services. I expect that the review of the Health Services Review Committee will be presented to me by the fall of 1985.

Other activities are also under way or have been completed by their research and planning directorate. These include the participation and evaluation of the demonstrated successful early-discharge program piloted out of the St. Boniface General Hospital. The study established the effectiveness of reducing the length of stay of obstetrical patients who had experienced an uncomplicated birth. As a follow-up to the study, evaluative activities are under way in co-operation with the St. Boniface General Hospital and the Public Health Division to treat expectant mothers who are experiencing pregnancy-induced hypertension in their homes instead of in a hospital.

Other review activities include a system-wide assessment of the adult medically ill patients who were in a Winnipeg hospital. This is to establish the nature and scope of medical activity to plan for future needs.

The study will also be undertaken of the day hospital programs in Winnipeg and Brandon to establish which type of patient is receiving this service and what the scope of day hospitals should be in the future.

A review is also to be undertaken regarding the scope of community clinics and what should be the nature of this type of delivery system in the future.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, P. Fox:** The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So then, generally you're expecting a report in fall of 1985?

Mr. Chairman, I presume that the research planning group probably developed some of the statistics that the Minister presented to the UMM. Just a small point, but on Page 8 of the Minister's speech he indicates that the numbers of those over 65 will increase from 12 percent in 1984 to 14 percent in 1995 and to 16 percent in 2006. I'd presume those are figures developed by your research and planning group. Would that be a fair assessment?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, this is from Statistics Canada. Of course, it's an educated guess because we're talking about the future, but it comes from Statistics Canada. One point that should be added to that also that the older elders, those in the 80s and 90s, will increase very much also.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The reason I asked that is that the Minister prides himself on his planning and research group and I've got an article in here from *La Liberté* from 16 March 1984 and it's coverage on the speech. I presume it's a speech delivered by David Pascoe to the Société franco-manitobaine. It's in French and I should send it over to the Minister so that he can check my French, but opening paragraph says, "Health is a dynamic system in constant change. On the one hand, it integrates technology which is changing regularly. Another part it is necessary to adapt to the changing needs of the population. Also, in Manitoba, in particular, the population is aging rapidly."

Mr. Pascoe indicated the number of persons over 65 years will double in the next 18 years. Now, the figures that the Minister is using here in his speech differ from the figures that his director of planning and research is using in the speech in March.

Now, for one or the other to be correct is necessary and the point I'd like to make that it is pretty easy to bounce a number of figures around to project costs in the year 2000 and year 2010 and get up to the \$3.4 billion. Surely, it must be incumbent that we all talk with the same figures. You and I, as government and opposition, but certainly, I think it would be incumbent that within your planning and research people that they use the same figures that they've given to you as Minister. If you take a doubling of the people aged 65 and over, in 18 years from 1984 takes us to 2004. Well, to double the population over 65 as indicated by your director of research in his speech would require either

our population to go up to about 1.75 million in that 18 year period or else one of the two figures is wrong.

As I say, it's important that we're all talking about the same kinds of projections, the same kind of figures. Otherwise, all of the planning effort that you might have put in and the \$650,000 that we're spending on planning and research aren't going to give us usable statistics and usable figures upon which you can plan for future direction in the Department of Health. It's not going to give you figures that are usable to the taxpayers to whom these figures are being given in speeches by yourself, Sir, in the end of 1984 and by your director of planning in March of 1984. Unless the people of Manitoba have reasonably consistent numbers coming from the Department of Health and coming from the research and planning, you're going to end up with considerable confusion.

Now, I'll have the Page take this over to you because I don't trust my French translation. If I'm wrong in my French translation, I'll certainly apologize, but if my translation is correct - it's in the first paragraph; I'll just mark it for the Minister. If it is in the first paragraph, if my translation is wrong and the numbers aren't to be doubling by the year 2004 as indicated, then I'll apologize. Otherwise, I think there's every potential for confusion where your planning and research are giving you one set of figures for a speech to the UMM and using another set of figures in a speech that he's delivering to a group in Manitoba.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly would agree that we should get the best figures available and we should be consistent.

Now, here what was presented to me is a report, of course, of a speech that was made by Mr. Pascoe. Now, he's talking about in 18 years, not 10 years. We were talking about 10 years and he's talking about doubling. Well, 50 percent, when you talk 50 percent, that's not doubling. I think that could be an error of the reporter; 50 percent is not doubling.

Now, we've been getting these figures. We might be talking about different years, but from 84. At one time, we were using up to 82 or 81. Now, we've got the latest from 84 to 95. I can make a copy of this and see that my honourable friend gets it. The 65 plus, all 65 was an increase of 24 percent. Of course, in my speech I'm talking about a percentage of total population. They're talking about an increase. — (Interjection) — Wasn't I? Well, there they are talking about 24 percent, but that's from 84 to 95, and I don't think those were the years that we're using and the French article is talking about 18 years, not 10 years. There again, I can give you this anyway that the 85 of what we were talking about, doubling is 80-84, not those over 65, not doubling. That is an increase of 50 percent. 85-89 was an increase of 50 percent. That is why just before sitting, I said there's more of an increase in the people over the 80s; 70-74 there's 21.2 percent; 65-69, 9.3, and the total 65 is 24 percent increase. Again, it's all ages, an increase of 7.6. So, I agree that we should try to get the right figures. I think it is impossible to get it dead on. I don't think that a small variation will make that much difference. I think that those will have to be adjusted and you'll probably see different figures as we go along. They'll have to be adjusted quite often.

The main thing is that we know that the population will increase some. We will know also that the fertility rate is going down. There will be less younger people and we also know that because the people live longer and that the aging population in this province will probably, if not beat the field in the increase in the aging population, be very close to the top probably.

We certainly will endeavour to get the figures to reconcile and to make sure we're talking about the same figures. Then, as I say, if you're talking about different time periods, different ages, different years, it's not the same.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The only point I make that if you take the 18 years from 1984, you get to 2002. In the Minister's speech, he says that in the year 2006 there's going to be 16 percent are over 65, so even take 15 percent. My figures doing a 1.1 million population in the year 2002, which is I believe one of the current projections, it comes out to 165,000 people over 65 and currently there's about 125,000. There's hardly a doubling there. Those kind of figures when people realize the costs that our senior citizens potentially are to the health care system can cause us to have undue alarm. If we are paying a lot of money for research, it would be most beneficial to all concerned - ourselves, the Minister, the government, and the people - to have us all using the same numbers and working from the same data base.

I think some of my other colleagues have some questions on this section before we continue.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Before doing that, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say that we have a copy of the article, thanks to the honourable member. We will translate it; we will look at it; Mr. Pascoe will look at his notes also; and we'll try to give you the information. It's obvious, I think, that the member would expect me to get my figures from staff and they will try to reconcile the statement.

If there's a mistake, we will thank the honourable member for bringing it to our attention and we'll admit it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I know that we have discussed personal care homes for awhile. As the Minister already noted

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, no, we haven't got there yet, that's to come - Planning.

**MR. A. BROWN:** . . . the planning and long research. As the Minister already noted I have been interested in that particular area for a considerable period of time. — (Interjection) — As a matter of fact, in 1973 when I was first elected, one of the first things that happened in my own hometown, and I would say that it was one of the good things that have happened in my own hometown, was the opening of the personal care home. The personal care home concept, as such, has proven to be a good thing in many, many instances.

Yet, I expressed a reservation at that particular time that there was going to be a time in which we would

not be able to meet the demand. Certainly, that time has come when we see that there is now a waiting list of 1,700 for personal care homes who have been panelled and to think that the panelling is ever so much more difficult now than what it was at that particular time. It's almost impossible at this particular time to be panelled for a personal care home. We still say that we have 1,700 people who have been panelled and who cannot get into the personal care homes.

Mr. Chairman, I would be very interested to see how the Minister is going to deal with this on a long-term plan. When he was talking about long-range planning, how they were coming up with long-range plans in some of these difficult areas, I would like to see what the Minister's long-range plan is as far as personal care homes are concerned, as far as the long waiting list is concerned, and how are we going to eventually deal with this, so that we can give the care to the people which they have been led to believe that they ought to expect. I would like to hear what this long-range plan is.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, it might be that the most important thing and the first thing we should do is change this expectancy. It might be that that is misplaced and is not something that should be encouraged.

I might say that that is what this is all about, that is what this research is doing. I think that I could tell you we haven't got all the policies. I can't announce today, but this is what we're working on and we hope by next year at this time to have pretty well a policy direction. We won't have all the answers, but at least a direction where we're going to go.

I can give you an aperçu of what we want to do. I think that there's no doubt at all. We want to keep people out of institution as long as possible. We're not going to start by building acute beds. That is not what we're going to do and then put personal care home patients in acute beds. That is not what we're going to do. It's been backing up all through the system.

As my honourable friend knows, there will be quite an important gerontology centre at Deer Lodge, which will be a big improvement, for all kinds of research and gerontology for everyone. This is a wish that is far from being realized, but I would hope that this might even lead to - because there's been some discussion with the university and with my colleague, the Minister of Education - this dream of mine. It's not government policy as yet. I think it's fair to say there's an inclination it's going in that direction that we would like to see a Chair in Gerontology at the University of Manitoba. With the population changing, I think it would be a good thing. That is a possibility.

Therefore, we're looking to keep people out of institutions. We're trying to, first of all, keep them healthy by prevention, to have the service that they don't have to go to the hospital, that they may have some kind of a community clinic where they would get some of the care. There's too many people going. Half the people that are going into emergency wards of hospitals in the city here should not be there, but that's the best way to get quick service. They go to the emergency and that is why they're so full all the time. That has to change. There has to be another type of facility. It

might be that you might have some nurse practitioners will do the first assessment, always working with doctors. That is a possibility. The situation is that we're looking for the definition of what we want in community health clinics.

We won't make the same mistake that was done before. I think we should learn by our mistakes. In the years of Tulchinsky, Tulchinsky was right on, but he scared the hell out of the medical profession with the word "community clinic", and so on. Now, we're working with them and they are accepting that themselves. Conservative Ontario is working to set up; they're not doing too badly. Quebec is also. We want to look at these facilities and it is not going to replace the doctor. That's for one thing.

What I'm trying to say is that in the past many aged people were not getting the service as fast as they needed it. They waited and they got progressively worse and they had to be put in an institution or in a hospital. So, these are the services.

Now, we're going to do like day care for the elderly and programs in different facilities; good housing. I'm thinking, first of all, of bringing the people together, for instance, that are living in attics and one-room suites or a small room somewhere. Those are the people that I'm concerned with. They're lucky, they're fairly well as far as their health is concerned, but I think you can die of loneliness, which is worse than many diseases. These are some of the people that we have to get decent housing for. Those are the people living in ordinary housing or with their relatives and so on.

Then, of course, home care is going to be a big thing. Home care is getting to be very, very expensive, but for the home care to be successful we can't keep on saying you just got to build more beds and add on to the formula; I think we've got to reduce that formula. We're going to reduce that formula by some of the other alternatives that I'm talking about - all kinds of community services, such as Meals on Wheels and the social programs that work with the elderly groups. Our gerontologist is working on that. We're also including provision for fitness and recreation for the elders; they're enjoying it. The Advisory Council on Aging is also quite active and we'll have a conference on aging in a couple of months. This is where some of the information will come from.

You will have also the senior housing with added services that might make it possible for these people to stay in those facilities longer. When they are first admitted to these facilities, people are quite happy and the relatives are quite happy; they're pleased; mom and dad are taken care of, but after a while they don't eat properly and they forget to take their medicine and so on, so these services will have to be taken care of also.

We have to realize that many of these people in those facilities and in hostels - we're trying to phase out the hostel as an insured program. There is a priority to take care of the people that need it the most, not necessarily in a hostel. But some of these hostels now, people have been there for years; they have to be taken care of. There are more people that want to go into these places and we must reverse that. We must have the programs that would just keep the personal care homes as the last resort.

We have to be able to move the people out of acute beds, hospitals, to get them into institutions also. What

I said earlier still stands. My only criticism of this government - and my honourable friend didn't say a word for four years and he's repeating the same speech that he made for the last three years, and I don't doubt his sincerity, and it was embarrassing for him at the time, but there was a freeze.

To say that that was an irresponsible program is not true and all you have to do is look at the five-year program that I had my first year as Minister of Health and other years, including '77, and you will see that the '77 program was frozen for two years and I don't think you'll find more than two of those things that are not constructed now and they were delayed that much longer and we're paying for it now.

I'd say it was a mistake, but it was done and it's very difficult to guess exactly when you have to do something and you have to do it right, because we were not doing it right before, but that is one of the reasons.

Now, this is the situation, this is in the direction that we're going. I think we will always have a waiting list because there are more people and we're finding ourselves that we have to accept more people - not necessarily the elderly - I'm talking about people who might be healthy but for some reason, they have nobody to take care of them.

So this is something that we certainly will have to look at. I can't give all the answers. I did recognize at times that I'm not satisfied with the waiting list. I think it is building, but it's certainly not because we're having less beds. There has to be a shift in the beds - and you talked about the projection. I'm talking about Levels 2, 3 and 4. The intention is to have, as of December 31, 1976, there were 5,485; between '77 and '81, there was an increase of 392; between 1982-86, there'll be an increase of 1,166; projected for '89 to '90 or so, another 1,413. So we expect that, by '90, we should have 8,456 beds. That's a projection.

The hostel beds will go down. As I was saying, I think that was a big mistake of this government to insure the hostel beds when they brought the service. It was too much and then we could never meet the needs because we were too low in filling these needs. That been going down, decreasing, starting in '77 also, as of December 31st, 1976, there were 1,775 and I think that you'll go down to 461. In other words, we're phasing these out. I'm not saying there are not going to be hostels but it would have to be something in the private sector, some area. I'm talking about insured programs now.

The extended treatment beds start at 9,337 and we expect that they will go to 1,278, so that gives you an idea. But it's not an easy answer that we just build, build, build. I think that before you start these programs of building acute beds, you're thinking the aim is to keep them out of there as much as possible. Of course, when you've got that decided, then you'll know what acute beds are needed also because there is no doubt that's a dangerous thing to say, but I think that most of the economists and so on will tell you we have too many beds. I'm not saying now that they're all occupied, but if we had every acute bed filled with a person that should be there - not a person that's been panelled - we'd probably have too many.

The pattern, and these are some of the things that we're going to get from this information and this work

being done by Dr. Evans. You will see the pattern that a bed is a bed and a bed will be filled and you will see that if they were emptied, how fast they would go. Every day they would be slated for operations. The operations would go up like this and that is not advisable. There has to be a check on that.

This is one of the things we want to discuss with the medical profession to see if they could be a different motivation. Right now these people are generating their own revenue. Some of these people need the hospital. Like it was said, there are not enough beds in Brandon. Brandon is serviced with a higher percentage than Winnipeg, but it's a different mentality; it's a different service. The doctors are using the hospital much more than they are here. So when somebody said that in 10 years, you've had a shortage of beds and there should be an increase in beds, they're right and they're wrong. There's no shortage of beds as far as people are concerned. You've got pretty well the same population that you had 10 years ago and you've got more beds, but there are many more doctors. There are 25 percent more general practitioners in the City of Winnipeg and that means they want more beds; they need beds; that's their place where they work, in the hospitals.

There's no doubt, we'll look at the Kaiser Permanente insurance system in the States and there you have doctors that are looking at different areas. They're paid to take care of these people. Then their motivation is different. They're keeping people out of hospitals.

We have a chart on that that will show the difference between the hospitalization - I'm talking about acute beds now - in Manitoba and in these places where they're under that system, that it's way down, as you go with older people. So I think you're doing a disservice to the people of Manitoba - we all are - if we just talk about beds. It is just like I mentioned other times, it is a large jigsaw puzzle and until we get every piece we won't see the whole picture and that is the work that's being done.

You're talking about Clinic; you're talking about using your practitioners better; you're talking about incentives. We have too many doctors. There's no doubt about that. There are less doctors, especially in the cities; there are not enough in the rural areas. There's nobody in remote areas. We have to find a system for that. Now you've tried, we've tried, you've tried, we've tried, over the period of time and the change of government and we haven't been too successful in that. Now whenever you bring in an idea - maybe the Human Rights group will bring in a solution - or not a solution - a decision that we have to start all over again, but I think there has to be a way.

You don't see people saying, well I went through - I'm an educator, a professor, a teacher, therefore I've decided I want to teach and I want to teach here. So it's the same thing. I think that if the government has a plan, I don't think we can ever say to somebody you can't be a doctor and you can't practice and you can't practice where you want.

I don't think we can ever say that, but I think that we can say to the people, in our plan, we need so many doctors and we will cover that. I think it will have to come some day, even some people in the States have been suggesting that you draft the doctors like they do in the army and you send them - you know the security isn't important. I'm not - remember I don't

want to see tomorrow that I'm advocating that - you know that I'm musing again and that's going to come that I'm advocating that. I'm saying that some people are talking about even that far-fetched an idea.

But the point is we have too many doctors and that is a factor and it is very much a factor. It's not the cost. It's not the doctor's fees. They're not overpaid - I'm talking in general. We've got a darn good bunch of doctors. But the point is the system and it is the way they generate their own revenue and so on, and the way they're motivated and they're human beings, the same as you and I, and that is what we've got to try to change. So we've got some of the answers and we think we're in the right direction, but next year at this time I think I can give you much more of a of a general direction, at least of where we're going, which will help I hope.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** The Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to see that the Minister is addressing that particular topic and that he is showing concern that this ever-growing list of the people who have been panelled for our personal care homes. I think however that he's going to find that once he's going to start phasing out the hostels, and so on, that most of the people in the hostels already are either in phase 1 or phase 2 of a level of personal care homes. So I cannot really see where that is going to free up all that many beds because the people in the hostels have been an aging population and most of them are needing either level 1 or level 2 care. So by phasing out the hostels, it's really just going to compound the problem that we have as far as personal care homes is concerned.

I wonder if the Minister has given serious consideration to private personal care homes. I know that the Minister has not been promoting them and there are reasons why you would not want to, I suppose, promote private personal care homes, yet they do serve a purpose. They do serve a purpose in that there was a place for the people that need this type of care, that they can find someplace, somewhere, somebody that's going to be taking care of them.

I'm sure that the Minister is well aware that there are some private personal homes which are doing an excellent job. There's possibly some private personal care homes who are leaving somewhat to be desired in their care and I suppose what it does take is a little bit of policing, extra policing, in order to make certain that they're providing the standard of care which we would expect for the monies that they receive.

However, this seems to me one avenue which we could be promoting. It certainly would save us a lot of capital expenditure if we were to promote private personal care homes. I think that maybe the Minister should seriously consider taking another look at private personal care homes, as I already said. It certainly would free up a lot of capital and there are people who are willing to provide private personal care.

As far as the home care program is concerned, in many many areas within the province they're doing an excellent job. People are getting good home care, yet what I have found is that the standards vary from area to area. This mainly is left up to the public health nurse

who is doing the panelling and it all depends on the public health nurse and what her attitude is.

I know of some instances where personal care is provided to people who live outside of town and they may have to drive out two, three or four, or even up to eight miles to make certain that the people are taking their medication and possibly make certain they are getting a good proper meal a day. Yet then we have other instances, and so on, where people have great difficulty getting along and still they are not receiving the home care.

I would like to see the Minister come up with some kind of standard and implement that standard for home care, so that we could have sort of a uniform system throughout Manitoba because certainly at the present time there is much much to be desired as far as home care is concerned.

The Minister mentioned that community clinics could possibly play a role and they referred to the previous Deputy Tulchinsky, who I know did scare the living daylights out of all of us on his concept of community clinics. But I'm wondering though, what does the Minister see, as far as community clinics, in today's concept, as far as community clinics are concerned?

Does he envisage that everybody would be a salaried person on working doctors - and nurses are salaried - but doctors especially. Because if we're going to have everybody under the Tulchinsky concept, that everybody is going to be a salaried person, that means that we're going to have doctors who are going to be working from nine to five, and if we are going to provide 24-hour coverage, then we are going to require three times the amount of doctors that we require at the present time.

So I would like to hear the Minister say just exactly, what does he envisage as far as community clinics is concerned?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There are three main points that my honourable friend covered: the community clinic; the home care; and personal care home. My honourable friend, first of all, is kidding himself if he feels that propriety nursing homes will reduce the cost that you won't be involved in capital because that has to be paid. These are all - I don't know if you know how these things are done. We're not paying cash now. These things are financed. It would be the same thing. It was a propriety nursing home, because in the per diem rate that would be covered, in payments and interest and so on.

No I don't go for it, propriety nursing homes, not an ideology hang-up. I think we've seen in the States what it is. I think there is an area that you've got to stop thinking only about materialism and measure success by dollars saved. It is too dangerous. Dollars saved might mean also cutting down on certain foods - some of the things we were mentioning before - that could become more than a joke. It could become serious and also the big spender in there is the staff and cutting staff by keeping people sedated or drugged and so on. I don't think it is a good thing to do.

But there is certainly and I am speaking for myself now anyway, I am talking about now in facilities. I'm not saying that a private operator can't run a good facility. I'm talking about where there is a monopoly

and then you turn it over to somebody which is a licence to print money, as far as I'm concerned. With the waiting list and so on it's quite easy to run a business like that.

Now I see where they're ensured that they should not be, it should be owned by the public. But there is certainly room for the private operators to work and I see when we're out of the hostel business, in these guest homes that we have. Remember, a while ago I said you will not see the complete picture until you get every piece of the puzzle and that's an important piece of the puzzle. We're having problems now.

Remember the time the media ran stories about these people that were in these guest homes and all that? Then we decided to license them and so on, but the Minister of Community Affairs was looking at this with some of our staff also and some of Housing Department to look at this and I think they will save an awful lot of money because they're not providing the same service; they're providing board and room and some help, which you'd have to pay in a home anyway, through your home care.

I was talking a while ago, maybe it will remind the people to make sure they take their medicine regularly and those kind of things. And I would imagine that they will be happy and it will be a true, private enterprise in every sense of the word. It will be covered by the public, but there's a lot of people that want this care and I can't see why they can't get it. They're ready to pay for it. Government can't deliver everything; can't pay for everything, and I've never advocated that at all.

My honourable friend also mentioned home care. He talked about uniformity and standards all over. There's nothing I would like better, the same as I would want to have the same standards, the same uniformity for what I mentioned just two seconds ago or a minute ago, when I talked about the doctors, the medical doctor, specialist, and so on that we need in all parts of the province. But that is not the name of the game. We haven't been able to attract the doctors in all parts of the province; we haven't been able to do that, not only for social reasons that they want to be in the big city. It is the method, and maybe this is another thing that will have to be looked at by the people that are in charge of the university. Are we training the doctors correctly?

Right now they're trained to work in a big hospital and some of them are practically lost if they haven't got all the facilities and everything and all the specialists in the hospital. Maybe it's the way to go, but it's not helping the people in the North and people in the rural areas and it is too bad that we haven't got - maybe we should develop more of a family practice for some of these people to do that, but they are . . . we're supposed to have universality and we're not giving the same services to these people. We recognize that, fine, in principle we are. We're willing to, but we haven't been able to and that's a chance, I guess, people that want to live for some reason or other in the remote areas, that's the chance that they take. But we must strive to give this care.

Home care's the same. We can't always get these workers, and you can just imagine, these are some of the people, many of these people, because we have homemakers and there's not only nurses and the situation is that we have some of those people in some

areas, we haven't got that many. Then there's nurses also, public health nurses. We've gone in that direction of at least trying to identify the program and let it stand on its own two feet and be able to tell ourselves to start with, tell you and the people of Manitoba how much home care is.

I remember my honourable friend was sitting pretty close to where he's sitting now, maybe in the third row, and I was sitting here as Minister of Health and we talked about the emergency and I was successful that year in getting, I think, 10 or 15 public health nurses. Lo and behold, where are they? The first thing I know, they're in the system, because they work in the communities and they were gone, providing service for home care and now we've separated that in some instances because we want both programs to work. We don't want home care to suffer, of course, but we don't want it to take over all public health nursing. Prevention and so on was suffering because it was at least misleading. We were misleading the House; we were hiring people for a public health nurse and we're putting them in the home care Program. So that is the system; I agree with them in principle. We agree; we're going to try and so on, but it's not always that easy, so we're going to develop the right people, try at least a short bit of education and so on, so they can deal with these people.

Now the clinic. You can see the danger of having - I'm asked an opinion - if I don't answer, I'm not interested. I'm not criticizing you for that. I'm just giving you the dilemma that I face. If I tell you what I think is possible, the next day, as I'm advocating that, so it is a difficult thing, but I'll try again to stick handle.

I'm saying that we are working, working on the community clinics. We'd have to define what a community clinic is. I feel that we're going to have more services if we involve the population of the area. Those are my thoughts, not government policy so far. For instance, we will take in consideration and discuss with the people in the area and we would be responsible for the financing, at least something like the school division. If they want extra service they'll pay for it, but we will finance the service. We will set up the standards and some of the conditions, but then it might be that instead of pushing and shoving a program down these people's throats that you might have an area where it's kind of a bedroom community where you had a lot of young people and children and so on and they might be very much interested in maternal and child care; whereas another area would say, that's not what we're interested in. We have an aging population and we need home care and personal care homes. What I would like to see is some kind of a board, not a board - you have to be so careful when you make statements like this because it comes out as government policy and you scare the hell out of some of the boards in the hospital because they think you're going to take them over.

I'm saying to enlarge that responsibility, instead of the government here saying all right, that's what you're going to do in your community, this and this and that, we let the people in the area prioritize what they want. We'd have to safeguard to make sure that the services are there, but as I said, it might be that they want more personal care homes but they will get that at the expense of another part of Manitoba. They would get

that in preference to another program that might be available.

It's just common sense, that a family would have to budget for what they want. They might prefer to give Joe a bicycle or the old man might want to keep it all and let the kids run around without shoes but drive his Cadillac. They have to take some of the responsibility. We have to go to the public and say, all right, it's you, you've got to realize what it is. We want to motivate you differently; we want you to work with the deliverers but we're giving you some kind of choice and responsibilities.

Some people were saying, divide the two, right in government. There should be a Department of Community Health and Institutional Health. I think it would be the biggest mistake in the world. Those are my views. I think you'd have to have a very weak Minister and a strong Minister or all hell would break loose, because there is no way that they would not fight for their community and you would have the same thing. The institutioner would say, hey, I need that and it is wrong if some dreamer thinks that today I can take so many million dollars out of institutions and give it in the community. That's ridiculous. You will have to do both. You'll have to maintain the hospital and provide this service and eventually it will pay off, but you're not going to save, you're not going to start closing beds. If you were going in the community and providing service, then you would have to build that many, but for awhile it might even be more costly.

This is the situation that you see. I'm not going to give you the definition of the community clinic, as much, but that is where you might get these services. Some of it might be the primary care, it might be done with a nurse practitioner if you haven't got a doctor, who'll do just as good a job providing there's a doctor that'll be available. They can refer to a doctor in certain cases, but you don't need to go to the top, the highest paid, the best educated person for everything, if somebody's got a cold or something. I think the whole orientation has to be different.

Now again, my own views, I hope I never see the day where all doctors are on salaries. That is my view. I don't think it will work. That's not government policy. I think in some areas you will see it, but I think I agree that the minute we do that, it'll be a heck of a lot more costly because then they'll quit at 4:30 or 5:00 o'clock. They won't work weekends and they will want pension and will want this. I think there has to be a mixture of that. I think in some area it lends itself to have people on salary.

For instance, if you want to service some areas where it is difficult, where people might not feel that there's enough, that has to be compensated because a person will want at least a minimum salary to go in Ste. Thérèse or some remote area or somewhere. I think certain people would like to work on salary. I think a certain group in the community probably would be on salary in a community clinic, but I'm not putting this at this time as a condition that everybody in the community clinic will be on salary.

It might be that further study should be done, the recommendation would be that, but I can assure you I've got no hangup on that. I don't think it'll make a better doctor. I think there's abuse in the system. I think it has to be re-directed, but I don't think that you

should go all the other way also because there is abuse in that also. I can tell you that we've had trouble finding the kind of doctors that we want to work for us. It hasn't always been that easy.

My answer might not satisfy my honourable friend because I can't give him government policy at this time, because quite frankly we're looking at that trying to develop that. I would think that many of these answers will be answers, but I don't want to be in a position to answer them alone. That's what I was saying earlier. I don't want to direct all of a sudden that I'm going to decide how a doctor will be paid or how much he should be paid or where he should be trained and so on, without them having an input in that at all. There's no way that I would get to first base and I recognize that. I think that we must take in as a partner and we must discuss that and I think we're going in that direction.

The nurses also are in a playing a pretty important part. There's a tendency of going to one extreme where the Canadian Association of Nurses wanted everybody on fee for services; that would be a mistake. I don't know one Minister of Health across Canada that would buy that. That is not what the Manitoba nurses are asking, but some of them are suggesting that maybe all the nurses should not have diploma anymore, but degrees. Is that really the case? Should that be the end of the LPN's? Those are tough things that have to be answered. The report that I will make public eventually - a report that I haven't got yet, the O'Sullivan Study that was done. I hope it will help us in that direction to give us some assistance in that also.

These are all again pieces of the puzzle that we're going to endeavour, with your help and the help of all the providers of services and the people of Manitoba, to put in place and then I hope we'll have the beautiful picture that we will all like to see.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Well, I'll be able to rest a little easier tonight knowing that the Minister does not necessarily think that everybody ought to be a salaried person that's going to be in a community clinic.

However, I would just like to continue on with the community clinic concept. Under the Tulchinsky concept, which if you had a problem and you thought that you needed to go and see your doctor, there was a process that you had to go through. First of all, there would be a panel sitting in front of you. They would try to determine, first of all, well do you really need to see a doctor. Is your problem, maybe it's a family quarrel or whatever, and maybe you should receive some family counselling. Maybe your problem is a monetary problem, or it could be a variety of problems. They would, first of all, try to determine what your problem is. Whereas the doctor saw this person coming across the street and he knew very well what the fellow's problem was, that his hemorrhoids were acting up again. He could have treated him in five minutes, yet we were going to have the type of a panelling where you had to go through 10, 12, 15 people before you actually got to see the doctor.

Now, if that's the type of concept that we're talking about in community clinics, then there's much to be

said for community clinics. I'm not knocking community clinics, but I'm talking about the Tulchinsky concept now, which was an absolutely disastrous concept as far as I was concerned. There's much to be said for community clinics and they could do a lot. They could provide an awful lot of services. If we're talking about that type of concept, then I still have great concerns.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, of course, I don't know where my friend got that definition of the community clinic. I never heard that you had to show your hemorrhoids to 15 people before you were treated.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think that's a community clinic at all. When you know what the problem is you might go to a specialist, but that there is some area that they will go. It might be, that is before they define or it was decided what kind of service that you need, it might be a different kind of help or counselling, or like you say some community services also, no doubt, a successful clinic would deliver some community service, I'm sure. I think that is part of health. It would be some service or some advice. We're not going to say somebody that knows the problem is identified and you say well then you have to go to this clinic. That's not what we're saying at all.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I can tell by Beverley's face that she's not buying this argument.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Who's not?

**MR. H. ENNS:** Bev's not buying this argument.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Who? Bev? Who's Bev? Well, you've got me all excited when you talk about Bev. — (Interjection) — I used to know a Bev years ago and I'm all excited now.

Mr. Chairman, this might be a good time to suggest we adjourn. I'm completely - I'll go home and think about Bev.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise.  
Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Fox:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow (Tuesday).