

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Monday, 5 May, 1980**

**Time — 8:00 p.m.**

**CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY**  
**SUPPLY — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE**  
**AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden):** I call the committee to order. Resolution 38, 5.(c)(1)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** I would like to bring the matter up of the dam that was constructed in order to provide water for the town of Grandview. There has been some environmental problems there for quite some time that have been longstanding. Studies were made in regard to this.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** I wonder if my honourable could tell me again where that dam has been constructed, and for what town.

**MR. ADAM:** For the town of Grandview.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Grandview.

**MR. ADAM:** Reports on the impoundment of water from the Valley River, I believe, to provide water for the town of Grandview; nobody objects to the town of Grandview having an adequate water supply. There has been some problems associated with the dam, however, in regard to farmlands being flooded out. There have been some problems because of the dam. Lands upstream are being flooded and the flooding really got started after the height of the dam was raised.

They have been given a licence. The licence states that the elevation at the top of the works shall not exceed elevation 1397.0 feet at any time. A spillway not less than 10 feet in width shall be cut through the midpoint of the works. The overflow crest elevation of this spillway shall not exceed 1395. That is, I guess, the 10-foot wide cut would be two feet lower than the top of the dam. During the period from April 1 to September 1 of any year, in my opinion, and I am reading from a copy of a letter from Mr. Moffatt, the engineer . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The engineer?

**MR. ADAM:** From the Water Resources, a regional engineer.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I wonder if my honourable friend is raising a Water Resources problem and not an environmental problem.

**MR. ADAM:** I am going to get to that. There are two problems: One, the environmental problem that we are flooding land.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That is not an environmental problem. That will be a Water Resources problem.

**MR. ADAM:** Okay. The second problem is definitely environmental, because every year they raise the level of the dam. They are allowed to increase it from April to September.

The Minister says, In my opinion, if the dam was 1395.0 feet for the entire width of the structure, levels upstream would be lowered significantly. Now, the problem that this raises is that every year they keep adding dirt onto the dam, that extra two feet, and then one either . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I wonder if my honourable friend could get to the environmental portion of it.

**MR. ADAM:** Well, this is the Environment; they keep putting dirt on it every year and every year it gets washed downstream into the water.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** It's still a Water Resources' problem.

**MR. ADAM:** But it seems to me that the Environmental people should be interested in what's happening to the riverbed, that it's filling up the riverbed, and they keep putting dirt on every year.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That still, Mr. Chairman, is a Water Resources' problem. It is my understanding that this matter has been handled by Water Resources. It's even gone as far as the Ombudsman.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, it has.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** We haven't had anything to do with it in the past, other than providing advice to the Water Resources' people on Environmental matters.

**MR. ADAM:** That's right and this is one of them.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** But I still don't see where you have raised an environmental question. I don't want to preclude you from raising a legitimate environmental issue, but I would like to know what that issue is.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, well, there is a paragraphing here that mentions the environmental problems. They refer to it as environmental problems, the Water Resources' people do.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** And they are?

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, they refer to the problem of the washing out of the dirt every year is going to cause serious environmental problems unless they find some other method of holding the water that they require, or make some different designs and that. They do say that this is going to be a serious environmental problem in the future. Mr. Chairman, if the Minister says it's not an environmental problem and the Water Resources says it is, then we have a dilemma.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Only to the extent that if an environmental matter is raised, then we are consulted, but the silting of that dam is still a Water Resources' problem and has been dealt with as such.

**MR. ADAM:** Perhaps they haven't raised it yet with the Environmental people, I don't know, but it's time that it was raised and that's why I'm raising it here, because I know that it is mentioned in the reports that there is a problem and there is going to be a serious problem of silting on the river if this is allowed to continue.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I thank my honourable friend for raising this matter. We'll look at it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(c)(1) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is prepared to look into this . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I've just said so.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, okay, thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. George.

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to raise an issue in this connection — it's about two years old — that deals with a community in my constituency of Fisher Branch, where there happened to be a gasoline spill which contaminated the waters of the community; in fact, so much so that residents of a home within the community of Fisher Branch had to be evacuated for several weeks as a result of the gasoline flowing into the sump area and posing a danger to the family.

Subsequent to the cleaning up of the spill — and I think that's been the problem — it never has been determined who or what was the actual cause. They know what the element was, and that was namely gasoline, but from from which tank because there were a number of tanks within the community that were found to be rather not quite up to standard, I believe, but it was never mentioned to the residents of the community whether the department determined the source of the pollution and whether the department was able to recoup any of the costs that it undertook in terms of the cleanup of the spill within the community and what actions subsequently were taken by the department. I would assume that the department was actively involved in this, that a determination would have been made of the cause of the spill and which tank was involved in the spill. However, was the government able to collect some of its costs incurred in this area? What has really happened since that time?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, I'm just attempting to get the name of that particular service station that we have found, and I might say that their court cases are pending now. We have laid charges.

**MR. URUSKI:** You have laid charges?

**MR. JOGENSEN:** Yes, in an effort to collect the damages. It is now before the courts so I can't comment any further on that.

**MR. URUSKI:** I see, okay . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would like to recognize each member in turn. When we're jumping in, I don't know how the recording machine can . . .

The Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Likely it's the service station that was very close to the residents involved. I am making that assumption because that's where most of the activity was undertaken by the department. If that's the case and it is before the courts now, I will desist in . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(c)(1) — the Member for Churchill.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Before the break we were just briefly discussing the lead and ambient air survey that is going to be conducted this summer in regard to the pollution that has been found in some areas around lead smelters. I would ask the Minister if the only two sources that are being checked are Canadian Bronze and North West Smelting. Am I correct in that assumption?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Three.

**MR. COWAN:** Three, and Canada Metals would be included in that?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes.

**MR. COWAN:** The Minister, Mr. Chairperson, indicates that Canada Metals would be included in that and I am aware of a report that was done by a student at the University of Manitoba last year in regard to testing lead and soil surveys. I would ask the Minister if he has been advised of the contents of that report?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes, the department has been advised of the content of that report.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, the Minister will realize that some extremely high levels were found in the vicinity of Canada Metals in regard to lead in soil. Has the Minister sought any opinion as to whether those levels represented a hazard to people either in the area or who had use of that area?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes, two authorities have been contacted by the department, Dr. Stopps at the University of Toronto and Dr. Schmidt in British Columbia and they were questioned on it.

**MR. COWAN:** Can I ask the Minister then as to what their observations were in regard any attendant health hazard as a result of this high level of lead in soil.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** On the basis of the levels that were indicated in the report they did not regard that

as a serious problem, except of course, on the immediate property, immediate area of the lead smelters.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, we are going to have a disagreement on this and it's a technical disagreement and I'm not certain if it would serve the purposes of this committee best to get into the details of that, except I feel it is incumbent upon myself to put into the record the fact that there is some disagreement among the experts as to what levels should be considered safe and what levels should be considered unsafe. —(Interjection)—

I'm sorry for the interruption, Mr. Chairperson, the fact is, there are some authorities who would consider levels that have been found in the vicinity of lead smelters to be unsafe and they have done so on the basis of studies, scientific and medical studies, as to theoretical as well as practical results of that sort of exposure and so I can only suggest the Minister make use of all the available experts in regard to different levels so that he may have as wide a perspective as possible, as to whether a specific level is indeed hazardous or not hazardous.

It is dangerous to make categorical statements that they either are hazardous or that they are not hazardous but I believe when we are dealing with lives — I don't mean to overdramatize the issue — but when we are dealing with the health of our citizenry and the health of our children we can never be too safe and I always have a tendency to accept the lowest level as being the one which I personally, personal observation and opinion, regard to be safe. On the other hand, I know there are other just as qualified persons who accept a different opinion and I will argue long and hard for the reduction of levels to the greatest possible extent and I will argue just as equally long and hard for the analysis to be made on the basis of the lowest possible safe readings that are commonly accepted among the expert community. That is not to say that there can be one that is extremely low in comparison to the others and may be due to a technical error in experimentation or an error in theory and, in that sense, one would find it difficult to accept that. But there's usually broad ranges in this area that you can accept and I suggest that the Minister look towards the lower levels because, as the evidence becomes more and more available to us, we find that the detrimental impacts of lead contamination on individuals becomes more and more apparent at lower and lower levels.

I recall during the debate on the MacGregor spill the Minister went through the whole process of describing how the standards were set for vinyl chloride and that they were originally set at 500 parts per million some 40 years ago — excuse me that's wrong — that when they were first set they were set at 500 parts per million and then they had decreased down to where we have a one part per million TLV accepted by the Occupational Safety and Health administration in the States. Well, the reason that that TLV kept dropping is that as they did further and further experimentation they found that the results or that the detrimental health impacts were being experienced at lower and lower levels. And we have found that if one is to make an assumption — and that's always risky — but make an assumption

based on past evidence, we have found that the lower levels seem to carry with them their own dangers and their own hazards, which may not be as visible right from the start but when we do start dealing with levels that high we do find that there are some inherent health hazards. So I would hope that the Minister would do a number of things in this.

No. one, I would hope that the Minister would ensure that local people in the area, who may be growing gardens, know full well of the hazards that they may face as a result of eating the vegetables grown in a garden near an area where lead pollution is significant. That's very important. I believe the only way you can probably do that is by a door to door canvass and I don't believe that the expense or the time necessary to do so is too great when we come to talking about protecting people from health hazards that we know are present, or have great suspicion to believe may be present. So I would hope that is done and that the Minister uses every available method to communicate with persons who are growing gardens in the area.

I would also hope that the Minister would communicate with persons in the area who may have small children, who because of their habits may be eating soil, may be picking up soil on their fingers and ingesting it and are much more susceptible — or at least we are led to believe they are much more susceptible to the impacts of lead in their system — at lower levels than are adults. That's for a number of reasons but the primary reason being that their nervous system is developing and any sort of attack on that plays a much more significant role than an attack on an already developed nervous system, and that stands to reason.

So I would hope that they would make an effort to communicate with parents in the area. Now I know you held some meetings at the school. I attended one myself. I believe there have been others that have been held and I know that the department has been in communication with certain groups in the area that are concerned about this. I can only hope that at those meetings they are getting the full and complete data that is available at the time; that they are having that data explained to them in as unbiased a manner as is possible; and that they are provided with access to all the differing opinions on the effects of lead, because at the meeting I was at there was some suggestion by some at that meeting, and not all of them who were representing the government, but there was some suggestions by some that, well, we have much more severe problems in other areas so don't worry about the problem that you have in this area, it's not that severe. Well the fact is there are experts who are concerned about the levels that we're finding in that area both in blood samples and in soil and vegetation samples, Needleman being one from Harvard University, and his results are showing that the effects of lead on the central nervous system are being experienced at lower levels than we had ever imagined they would be experienced.

So I believe that the department has a responsibility to provide to those individuals, who show an interest, that information. At the same time, they can provide to them other studies that say, well, we've looked over Needleman's study and we believe that these are the imperfections in his study and we

believe that these are the imperfections in his theory, but they should have access to both. They should not have their opinion formed for them by the government.

Also at the time, and I know it's a matter that the Minister is not directly responsible for, but I would hope that he would use his good office to talk to his colleagues in regard to it, and that is that some of the parents expressed difficulties in finding doctors and medical personnel who would deal with them on this issue. I would hope that the Minister would make a long list available to those person, of people who the department considers to have some knowledge and some experience in lead. But that's an aside and I throw that out only as a suggestion, if I may.

Again we talked about the smaller communities this afternoon and the fact that when researchers go into a community to do research or to do studies, the whole community is abuzz very soon with the information as to what's being done. Well, there are small communities within our larger community of Winnipeg, also, and I would suggest that a public meeting be held in much the same way before the studies are put in place this summer, so that the people can understand what those monitors are doing, where they're at. I know that I had employees who worked at the Weston Shops come to me and say, we think we have a lead monitor on top of our building and what does that mean; are we in danger? Well, the fact was that I believe there was a lead monitor there and it was part of an overall process in trying to determine the ambient air lead levels. Well, it is important that those workers are also invited to these meetings so that they know and can understand, and they will provide, also, input back to the Minister as to some of their frustrations and concerns in regard to this and they will play, I would hope, a valuable role in the whole study. So again I just take that speech and present it to the Minister in a different context, that there should be public meetings before and after.

The last point I have to make is, I was somewhat concerned last year, and I did write to the Minister in this regard, that the testing that was done, the ambient air lead survey that was done, started at a period when the activity was low — and there was a period in there I'm not certain, I believe it was at the start, when the plant was not even operating — and then it ended on a period of high activity. Let me be more specific but I'm certain the Minister will recall the letter I wrote to him: That for the first week of testing the levels were at a certain point. The second week of testing, because of the fact that the plant was shut down — it was shut down for clean-up operations; it had been closed, I believe by the government at that time, in order to be able to deal with some of the major lead contamination problems within the plant — we saw the levels decrease and then we saw them stay about the same in the third week. In the fourth week we saw them stay at the same level; and then in the fifth week we saw them start to go up again. In the sixth week we saw them go up even higher, and on the last day of the testing, which was August 25, 1979, we saw the highest reading of the whole series of testing as a reading from the Weston School area, I believe.

So what we have in fact is problems with credibility again. Someone who sits down and reads this says,

well, my goodness, it started and it went down a bit because the plant was shut down for awhile and then it started to go up and the testing was stopped. Well, I know the Minister has explained to me that the time parameters were determined on the basis of availability of summer students who were performing that function. But the fact is that I believe it is an important enough test to be ongoing and that we should not stop it at a period when the levels are increasing.

Now, in all fairness to the Minister, I know that he did not realize that the levels were increasing at the time they stopped the test, because there's a time lag between the last results becoming available and the testing itself. But the fact is that there was a general upward slope also and it does take away from the credibility of the study when you have that sort of a mistake — and it was a mistake — that sort of a mistake occurring and people question the validity of the survey. I happen to believe very strongly in these surveys. I happen to believe that they are one way of us taking a snapshot of the environment in which we live and applying our knowledge to that in trying to improve that environment. So I don't want to see these sorts of mistakes. I don't want to see the credibility of these surveys detracted from because of errors.

I would only hope that the Minister would take into account that criticism when designing the new tests; so it can be over a longer period of time; so it can be more complete; and so that there might be some way of determining whether or not there are trends that are occurring so that the testing can be more readily accepted by those who have to accept it. I'd ask the Minister if he would wish to discuss any of that before passing on to the next area of concern.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, I want to correct perhaps one or two impressions that my honourable friend might have had in the statement that I made when I said that in our consultations with Dr. Stobbs and Dr. Schmidt that they said the levels weren't dangerous. I did not want to leave the impression that we felt that there was no problem and that we were going to become complacent in any way. If that were the case, then we would not have decided to continue on with the testing, as we have. Not only are going to continue on testing, there's going to be a greater variety in the kind of testing we are conducting under differing circumstances, in order to try to obtain as complete data as possible so that we can learn more about this particular problem.

If all the information were complete and we knew all there was to know about it, I don't think there would be that much difference of opinion amongst authorities. It's because of the absence of definitive data and information that there is disagreement, but we hope that through testing, as my honourable friend has said, that we can gain more knowledge into the whole area of lead and perhaps finally learn what we feel is necessary for us to learn in order to deal with the problem effectively.

We're going to continue testing and my honourable friend's suggestion that we contact the people in the area is one that we had planned on acting upon. We want to make sure that they are informed as to what is happening as we go along so that there can be no doubt about our concern about

the problem in those particular areas. We will continue to keep in touch with them; we will continue to carry on our testing program in order to learn as much as we possibly can.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Testing has to lead somewhere, too, and that's the important point that has to be made now. There have been levels found in the city that, had they been found in Toronto a number of years ago, this top soil would have been removed because it would have been considered a significant enough contaminant to cause health problems. These levels were found, I believe, at least by the student from the University of Manitoba studies, and I'm not certain, because I don't have the exact figures before me, but I believe also similar levels were found in the vicinity of Weston School.

We also know that there is lead pollution coming from gasoline containing lead in the emissions from automobiles and other vehicles and that it is a very significant environmental problem. So I would not suggest that we concentrate only on the schools but that we also try to determine an overall strategy to deal with an overall problem. But at the same time, there is going to come a point in time where the Minister is going to have to make the determination that either we are going to live with those levels of lead in the soil or we're going to remove the soil because they constitute a hazard. And then the question becomes who pays for the removal of the soil. Is it the public who pay for the removal of the soil? Is it the individual who is having the soil removed who pays for the removal of the soil? Is it the company who pays for the removal of the soil? Which brings me back to my super fund concept, which we talked about a number of days ago in regard to assessing companies for possible pollution that they may cause.

So those are all —(Interjection)— The Member for St. George says options. They're not really options because the Minister is going to have to face them and confront them. Those are all the things that he is going to have to confront and face as time goes on, in regard to this problem; what to do. The testing will show, undoubtedly, that there are high levels of lead in the soil. It already has, so I'm not telling the Minister anything new. Then the Minister is going to have to determine at what levels he deems action should be taken. It has to be a Ministerial judgement in this case because we don't have any guidelines or objectives and we don't have any regulations. So unless the Minister is preparing those now, we're left up in the air and the decision must remain his. He must make that decision on the basis of the evidence presented to him. I just point that out, without wanting to pursue it too much further, but did want to put it on the record.

I would like now, Mr. Chairperson, to discuss the MacGregor vinyl chloride derailment in some length although I don't hope to overstay my welcome in this regard, but I do feel it is an important experience in recent months in that we should peruse it to some extent. I'm going to be rather harsh in my criticisms, not out of malice, Mr. Chairperson, but because I believe the criticisms to be valid and I believe the criticisms to be constructive and I believe that they must be categorically stated, otherwise we are going

to skate around the issue and dance around the issue and never come to any sort of positive conclusion as to what we should do in the future. So I just make that point that they will be harsh but it is not out of malice and it is not intended to embarrass, nor is it intended to confront. I'm giving you my personal opinion, which I hope you value, for whatever it's worth.

I think it's important to examine incidents such as this that capture the media's attention. It is important because it provides the society at large with an example. It provides the society at large, the people who are affected by the media, with an insight into areas that they don't normally have an insight into. The more media attention there is, the more focussed the attention becomes on an issue, the deeper we get into an issue, and therefore the more insight that we would expect to gain from that.

If there was one failing alone — and I believe there were more than that — but if there was one failing alone in this issue, I would believe it to be the failure to inform fully, adequately, and properly. I believe that there was a failing on the part of the major actors in this incident to inform the workers as to the hazards they faced and also to inform the public as to the hazards that might be associated with exposure to vinyl chloride if such exposure were to take place. Workers and the general public have the right to know — the Minister agrees with me on that issue, I'm certain, because we've discussed it. But they have a right to have all the information available to them so that they may make informed and responsible decisions as to what part they are going to play in an accident or an incident of this nature.

We know that the MacGregor incident, although it is unusual in the fact that it did capture so much attention from the public, is not an isolated incident. I don't have the exact figures before me but I could get them if necessary to show that there have been numerous derailments in that specific area over the past number of years. I believe it was 25, but I may stand corrected on that, because I read the article very briefly and didn't have time to commit it to memory; but the fact is that there have been a number of derailments in that area. We also know from the CNR President, Mr. Lawless, that it is expected that the volume of transportation of hazardous goods will increase in the near future in western Canada. On March 9, he told a meeting of the Western Transportation Advisory Council that the four western provinces are expected to account for about three-quarters of CNR's total volume growth during the next five years. The interesting point that he made was that much of that growth would be potash and petrochemicals. He said that rail travel was remarkably suited to the transportation of those two commodities and so it is. So what we know is that we have had derailments in the past; we know that transportation of those commodities will increase in the future.

We also know, according to a study done by a Carleton University professor, and I'm not going to attempt to give you the gentleman's name because I don't think that I could do justice to the proper pronunciation of it, but he did state in a recent study that derailment rate in Canada today, calculated in terms of traffic volume, are approximately double what they were in 1960. He also stated that during

the 1960 to 1977 period railway maintenance staffing levels have been reduced by 60 percent. So there would appear to be some correlation between the reduction in staffing and the increase in accidents, although one could not make a categorical statement that the two went hand in hand. We know a lot of derailments are due to poor track condition, as well as other reasons, and therefore we can assume that a reduction in staff would result in more derailments if there were not other factors that were brought to bear that would tend to ensure that track conditions do not deteriorate. The study further concluded that between 1972 and 1978, there was an average of 8 major and 18 minor accidents involving dangerous commodities in Canada on a yearly basis. We know that this problem is not confined to the province of Manitoba; we could have assumed that. We know that it is a problem that will probably increase so we must develop the proper mechanisms to deal with it now; we must develop them before we have to go through another spill such as the one that occurred in MacGregor; we also know that according to a press report railways are spilling approximately 1 percent of all the chemicals they are transporting. The problem in MacGregor is not an isolated incident; it is just one that is of unusual significance to Manitobans.

I'd like to point out to the Minister a statement that was made in the Science Council of Canada's Policy and Poisons Report in regard to the sequence of events that follow environmental and workplace accidents. I'll read directly from the report if I can or I'll read a direct quotation from the report and would like to apply the rest of my comments to the statements that are made in this particular paragraph. The media published an account of the problem with some magnification of the severity and the extent of it. The first response of public officials in some instance is to deny that there is a problem; then they deny that there is a problem of any severity; and then they devote a great deal of energy to establishing that some department, or jurisdiction other than their own, was primarily or jointly responsible. In some instances there has been an effort by participants in the dispute to discredit the evidence and/or those that have produced it. The spectacle of official confusion, with the initial denial followed by later general corroboration of the initial report, leads the public to believe that the matter is not being treated openly. This suspicion (usually justified) necessarily fosters the belief that the actual problem is probably much more extensive than was initially reported in the media (a belief that may or may not be justified).

I believe if one takes that sequence of events and applies it to what occurred in the MacGregor incidence one will find some very strong parallels; and I'd like to go through those very briefly. I do so to point out that the reaction to the MacGregor incident by this government was not an unusual reaction, the reaction to the MacGregor derailment by CNR and by Dow Chemical and by the federal government was not an unusual reaction, that it is part of a pattern that has built up over a great number of years. I'm not certain when this report was written but it was written a number of years ago; so we know that this pattern has been in effect for quite some time. They have based it on a historical

perspective, I am certain, otherwise they could not have categorically stated that sequence of events would occur. The reason that I mention this is that I do not wish to cast any unnecessary blame on the government for its actions in regard to this bill. They were reacting in a commonly accepted manner. The fact is it is a wrong way to react. It creates credibility problems; it creates information problems; it creates problems all down the line. I'm certain the Minister can confirm that statement much better than I can because he was the one who had to deal with many of those problems. But the fact is that this reaction sequence must be broken; that we must break out of that pattern; that we must deal with these derailments; that we must deal with these problems in a different way. I believe, to the credit of the government, that they are attempting to develop new mechanisms. We had this discussion or a similar discussion with the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures Organization and he has assured us that they are developing new mechanisms to deal with emergencies. The Minister has assured us that they are developing new mechanisms to deal with these sort of accidents, the reporting of spills. The Minister has assured us the first thing next time he's going to have an information officer in place which, if used properly, will aid in the entire government action to inform the citizens properly but also to make certain that they have access to the government so that they can provide input as well as accept output.

The pattern that I talked about, that the Science Council of Canada laid out, was prominent right from the start.

According to a Winnipeg Free Press article under the headline CN Tanker Leaks Dangerous Gas Near MacGregor there was a following introduction to the public of what was happening at the MacGregor spill and this I believe was in one of the first articles in regard to the spill, and I will quote from it, A dangerous chemical continued to leak from a derailed Canadian National Railways tanker car near MacGregor this morning but railway officials were down-playing the seriousness of the problem. The chemical from one of these cars is dissipating nicely into the atmosphere according to experts at the site, said Jack Skull, CN's public relations officer. Now we see a headline which magnifies the severity of the problem CN Tanker Leaks Dangerous Gas Near McGregor; we also see a government official, or an official of the major actor in this incident, the public relations officer for CN, saying that the seriousness of it is not what one would anticipate and that the chemical is dissipating nicely into the atmosphere; a statement that of course would come back to haunt him in future days.

The fact is in that article also there's a brief description of vinyl chloride but that was hardly alarmist in its content or its delivery. It said, and I quote, Vinyl chloride used in the production of polyvinyl chloride is a highly flammable gas which can have a narcotic effect. It can also irritate and burn exposed skin. Prolonged exposure may lead to liver damage. So the fact is that while the headline may have been somewhat sensationalist in its tone and its tenor, the article itself did not appear to be. In spite of that, we have officials and major actors trying to down-play the seriousness of the problem.

At the same time and in the same article, we have a comment by a woman in the area, who said, and I quote from the article, She is angry CN officials didn't bother to tell area residents that the cancer-causing chemical was leaking. This quote is from her: The fact that I have to get my information from CBC really puts me off, she said. What really puts me off was CN kept saying there is no leak. And the Minister is well aware of that problem at the beginning of the MacGregor spill, that there was initial confusion as to the extent of the leak; as to whether there was a leak; as to whether one or two or three cars were leaking; as to whether it was vinyl chloride or chlorine. There was a fair amount of confusion and the public was being quite put off because they didn't seem to be able to get the proper information from the officials, they had to rely upon the media.

This did two things. Number one is it made the people rely upon the media for their information and, number two, it tended to destroy the credibility of those people who are supposed to have credibility in dealing publicly with these sort of matters. This same woman continued, and I quote again, she said secrecy surrounding the derailment has made her uneasy and she wants CN officials to inform them of what's going on and the intervention of an environmental official to look after the area residents concerns, quote, I think the expert (Dow Chemical experts were flown in this morning by CN) will be most concerned with looking after the CNR. She added, He's going to say exactly what he has to and nothing more.

Well again, we're following the scenario laid out by the Science Council of Canada and based upon historical perspective of how these problems tend to develop and how these incidents tend to develop. There is a great deal of confusion as to the actual fact. There is some bitterness already on the second day as to the fact there seems to be a secretive nature about those who are most accessible to the public. The Mayor of the town of MacGregor is quoted as saying in that article he was assured by a CN inspector that the tanks were not leaking, when told of a slight leak he said Well, you can pick or choose your story. And that's the unfortunate part is that you could pick or choose your story. There were enough stories going around that one had to pick and choose. It was not a matter of choice; it was a matter of the fact that you had to pick and choose whichever story best suited your own perception of what was happening.

They were looking, or at least the one woman who was quoted in this article was looking to the provincial government for guidance and for protection because she believed, as I believe, that the provincial government had a neutral role to play; that it could play a role that would be as unbiased as was possible; that they were concerned primarily with the protection of the environment, primarily with the citizens of Manitoba, and therefore they had no axe to grind, they had no vested interest other than our environment's protection and our safety and health.

It is also important to note also at the beginning that there was confusion as to what was actually leaking. I'll read a quote from a statement made by the Minister responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization in the House, I believe it was on

Tuesday. He said, There was some concern at that time expressed by CNR that chlorine was involved and a possible leak of that substance might be expected. Further checks by an officer of the Emergency Measures Organization, who immediately informed the RCMP, and upon further checking with the CNR as to the actual contents involved indicated that the substance was not chlorine but vinyl chloride product which, while inflammable and dangerous from that point of view, did not have the danger associated to the environment and/or citizens in the immediate area that chlorine gas has.

Now, that is true but the fact is that by getting into a mind set about chlorine . . . And this was due to no fault of the government; most likely any person would have fallen prey to that mind set because we have the Mississauga example and we tend to base our perceptions of what's happening today on our memories of what has happened in the recent past and that was a very strong memory in the fact that it was a very major incident and that it was very recent. So we don't blame anyone for getting into the quarry and mind set but we do have to acknowledge is that once they got into that and they viewed this as a problem with an inflammable gas, it tended to take away from the other health hazards that may be associated with vinyl chloride exposure. That went for government officials, the public; it went for myself because I fell into that same perception at that time. I knew that vinyl chloride had carcinogenic properties, I talked about them in the Legislature to a certain extent, but I was assured by the government there were no problems and I believed those assurances because I was being a participant of the same process that they had been in regard to Mississauga. Although in all fairness to myself, I do have to point out that while I did not feel free at that point to comment on the relative dangers between vinyl chloride and chlorine, I said that the substance that is actually involved, because it is indeed a very serious health hazard and a very serious environmental hazard, must be dealt with very carefully.

When the Minister returned to the Legislature that afternoon, after visiting the site, he talked a bit about vinyl chloride and I believe the Minister attempted also to down-play the hazards involved and I don't believe he did so intentionally, I believe he was acting on the advice given to him and I think there was a problem in that advice but I do believe that when he did say I was advised however that, given existing wind conditions, any potential hazard is minimized through harmless dissipation into the atmosphere, he in fact was relating to the Legislature, in all good faith, the information that had been given to him, perhaps, and I don't know, but perhaps by Jack Skull, who we know was quoted as saying it was dissipating nicely into the atmosphere, or perhaps it was given to him by other people in the area, but the fact is that information was put on the record. He talked about the greatest danger being a fire hazard in regard to the vinyl chloride spill and in the beginning that certainly was the greatest danger at that time was the fire hazard, and there will be no argument about that. But the fact is that, as the fire hazard reduced, other dangers became more prominent and those dangers were specifically to the workers, as we now know, but could very well have

been and may, in fact, have been, we won't know for some time, dangers that might be experienced by residents of the area.

So we see in that first full day of public debate, we see a number of patterns being followed, that is a downplaying of the seriousness of the situation, some confusion; we see the media reports, not sensationalizing the incident, but we certainly see headlines that are pointing out the more dangerous aspects of the incidents. We see the NDP opposition taking a role that we can expect them to take and that is perhaps not 100 percent correct but we certainly like it, and we all got trapped into roles that we felt were historical roles that we should play.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I might draw the member's attention, he has approximately four minutes left.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Chairman, on the basis of that, and I thank the Chairperson for jelling my thoughts at this moment. I would ask the Minister who was providing him with the advice that this material was indeed dissipating harmlessly into the atmosphere; that there appeared to be no danger either in the worksite or in the general area.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That was not my statement. That was the statement of the representative of the CNR, I believe.

**MR. COWAN:** I believe, and I have my files here with me so I can check, I believe the Minister did make the statement that some spillage has been noted and small pockets of gas have been located in the immediate vicinity. And at the same time you said, I was advised, and that's exactly what I said was that you were acting on the advice of others. However, that given existing wind conditions, any potential hazard is minimized through harmless dissipation into the atmosphere, and that was a statement that you made in the House on March 11th, I would believe upon your return from the site itself.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** As far as the town of MacGregor was concerned, that statement was a fact and it was the residents of the immediate area that, as my honourable friend will appreciate, was my immediate concern.

**MR. COWAN:** Would the Minister not agree that a statement like that, if read by workers in the area, might tend to lead them to believe that there was very little risk involved in the work activity that they were asked to undertake in regard to cleaning up the spill?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** My honourable friend has earlier raised the very point that seems to have been either ignored or glossed over, and that is the areas of jurisdiction. He did mention that the railway was the prime actor in this role and the hearings that are currently going on the CTC are attempting to determine if the CNR fulfilled the role in the protection of the workers. I did not regard that the workers on the site were the responsibility of the Minister of the Environment. They were directly under the control of the CN and being advised by

Dow Chemical. I perceived my role as one that was intended to ensure that the safety of the people outside the immediate area, the immediate spill site, that their well-being was not endangered. Under circumstances such as this there is a normal pattern of lines of responsibility. In this case it happened to be the CNR with Dow as an advisor; Environment Canada as a prime environmental advisor, with Environment Manitoba playing a supporting role.

Under different circumstances the roles would be reversed, as my honourable friend perhaps will recall, during the flood in Morris it was a provincial responsibility. We took complete control and had the authority and the legislation to give us that control. Other environmental accidents will be different again. I don't want my honourable friend to make the mistake of assuming that this is a pattern that will be religiously followed in all succeeding accidents because it won't. A highway accident will have a different sequence and a different chemical will have a different sequence. If the dangers are obvious, as it was in Mississauga when the material was burning, nobody needed to tell them that there was a problem there. It's when you get into these grey areas, such as it did in MacGregor, where the people in the area were not sure just what the dangers were, or indeed if there was a danger, that I felt there was a lack of communication and a lack of information being provided to the people in the area.

As I indicated earlier that if I were to do it over again the one thing that I would do different, having regard to my responsibilities in the matter, would be to ensure that there was an information office set up so that the public would be informed and that we would ensure or attempt to seek the co-operation of the prime actors in the drama; that they would provide the information that was necessary and the information that was asked for. I don't think it was of great concern, for example, because they weren't directly affected and were not in any danger to the people of the city of Winnipeg. The information office should have been located right in MacGregor where the danger was and where the people lived that would have a legitimate concern. So these are things that, as my honourable friend said, we have learned from this one experience. He has already pointed out to the reorganization of Emergency Measures, it's another step, that I might add had started before the MacGregor incident, that process was going ahead in any case.

The third point of course is the transportation of dangerous goods. Now as the honourable member is probably aware, a bill dealing with this particular matter was introduced into the House during the course of the last parliament and then died on the Order Paper when parliament was dissolved and that bill now has been reintroduced into the House, has received second reading, and the provinces have had a fairly substantial input into the drafting of that legislation. So our experiences in this incident may now serve as an opportunity for us to have further input and to ensure that the bill meets some of what we consider to be the deficiencies that existed at the time of the MacGregor incident. So we learned from those experiences.

But I just want to make the point that the next accident may be an entirely different set of circumstances and the same rules may not

necessarily apply, so we have to judge each situation as it arises and that is the purpose of the new structuring of Emergency Measures. It is to enable us to provide that kind of flexibility that in a very short time we can assess the situation and deal with it as effectively and as efficiently as possible. We're never going to be perfect and I doubt very much if we'll ever stop making mistakes, but if we can learn by those mistakes, as I think that we have in this particular incident, then we can progress from there and that's what we hope to do.

**MR. COWAN:** I thank the Minister for his comments and I believe it's important that we have this sort of free-flowing discussion in regard to this and this is one opportunity to pursue it without the usual constraints of the House, which sometimes get us locked in the postures that are not always most productive to the analysis of an incident such as this.

But I will mention to the Minister that again he is pointing out that there is another jurisdiction that had responsibility for this. In fairness to the Minister, the Minister didn't develop the other jurisdiction; the Minister had very little to do with developing the splits in responsibilities that come from jurisdictional disputes because of the history of this country and because of the way in which governments are set up. But the fact is that we're always a bit quick to say, well, that's the other person's problem. Now we have to do that in some instances because in fact we have no responsibility or no avenue of recourse to solve that problem, in which case we don't want to accept any responsibility for because we can't do anything about it in the first place. But in this instance, in this instance I believe that we can't say there was another jurisdiction. Even CTC and Labour Canada don't know whose jurisdiction it is. Maybe I can read to the Minister from a letter to Terry Sargeant, April 11th, 1980, from the Honourable Gerald Regan in regard to the spill, and he said, We share your concern with respect to the hazards associated with exposure of vinyl chloride. Although the authority for occupational safety and health provided by Part IV of the Canada Labour Code does extend to some railway employees it does not extend to those employees working at the site of the derailment. Authority for safety and health in this matter is provided by The Railway Act which is administered by the Canadian Transport Commission, CTC. Then they go on to say that instructions have taken place over a long period between officials of the CTC and Labour Canada concerning the difference in coverage of occupational safety and health by Part IV of the Code; in general orders issued pursuant to The Railway Act. Labour Canada's view is that Part IV should apply unless the CTC provides equivalent protection under The Railway Act. This has not been done and so we see the jurisdictional dispute, not only between federal governments and provincial governments and municipal governments, but we also see it between the different levels of government and it works to the detriment of solving these problems in a most efficient way. That's the point that I'm trying to make; that's the point that they make here, that we're too quick to say, That's the other person's problem, let them take care of it. While that other person is saying, at the same time, Well, that's their problem, or You have this little

segment of the problem and we have that little segment of the problem and we have this segment over here, and nothing ever becomes resolved. — (Interjection)— Yes, we can't deal in that way. The Minister, if I heard him correctly saying it will never work, and he's absolutely correct. So let us not say that the problem was not the Minister's jurisdiction or it was not the federal government's jurisdiction; let us say that we have to develop better means of co-ordination in the future. That's another problem that we found from the MacGregor incident. We have to be able to pull these different groups together and to make them work as one unit instead of trying, as the Science Council says, devoting a great deal of energy to establish that some department or jurisdiction other than their own was primarily jointly responsible.

There was a problem; it was not the Minister's problem alone. Goodness gracious, it was everybody's problem and they're still arguing about it and they're going to be talking about it tomorrow and for weeks to come and, unfortunately, they will most likely be talking about it after the next incident. But if we can work towards a successful resolution of that problem then I think we are well on our way to solving some of the problems. But I'm not even certain that given the jurisdictional disputes that we can absolve the government of their responsibility in this regard that easily.

I would like to read from a material safety data sheet put out by Dow Chemical, Midland, Michigan, dated October 5th, 1978, product named vinyl chloride inhibited. And what that sheet says is that several actions should be or must be . . .

**MR. JORGENSON:** I wonder if my honourable friend would read that, vinyl chloride, what was that other word? Inhibitor?

**MR. COWAN:** Inhibited, yes. Certain actions should be taken in the event of a spill of vinyl chloride. Section 4, entitled Spill, leak and disposal procedures, says, Action to take for spills: (Use appropriate safety equipment, remove all sources of ignition, supply ample ventilation and allow only properly protected personnel into the area. Do not allow vinyl chloride to enter the sewer system because of explosive hazard.

Disposal method: Incinerate in equipment with the hydrochloric acid scrubber according to local state and federal regulations — remember this is from their Midland branch in the United States. Contact Dow Chemical Company for additional help.

It also says that the inhalation, under the category of inhalation, it states OSHA standard, time-weighted average, one part per million in 1977; maximum average over any 15-minute period, five parts per million. Effects of over-exposure, cancer-suspect agent.

Finally, under the heading of 'Special Handling Information' there's several criteria listed for ventilation, respiratory protection, protective clothing and eye protection.

Of particular significance in light of what happened at MacGregor is the following recommendation. Respiratory protection: NIOSH-approved respiratory protection required. In the absence of environmental control for emergencies, a self-

contained breathing apparatus or a full-face respirator as approved by NIOSH, which is the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, is recommended.

I bring that information forward to make a couple of points. One is that the accepted method of disposal is incineration, and that is a question debated frequently in the House and outside of the House, but I want to point out that Dow Chemical in their own safety data sheet says that the accepted method of disposal is incineration and also provide for the one part per million, time-weighted average, and also talk about respiratory protective equipment. So I think it is important to note that if that spill had occurred in the U.S. and Dow had been involved, those would have been the recommendations they would have had to make there.

I'd ask the Minister if, in this case, Dow made any recommendation that the vinyl chloride should be incinerated or if it was their recommendation that it should be allowed to evaporate?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I couldn't tell whose recommendation it was, I can only presume it was Dow's, made to the CNR, since Dow was the advisor on this matter to the CNR.

**MR. COWAN:** So here we have an enlargement of the jurisdictional problem into, you know, different things are done in different countries and of course that's accepted because different countries have different ways of dealing with problems and are also at different levels of development in regard to how they treat these incidents, and also have different motivations and different pressure groups which bring about different types of legislation. But the fact is it is another jurisdictional dispute we have to be aware of, although I don't bring it up as a major part of my thoughts this evening, just as an aside.

I'd ask the Minister if he, in future incidents, would rely . . . Perhaps I should approach it from a different angle. I'd ask the Minister who the Department of the Environment relied upon for advice in regard to the clean-up operation of the spill and the reduction of any environmental hazards?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, my prime advisors in this whole matter, as my honourable friend should suspect, were my own departmental officials. I'm sure my honourable friend knows that Dr. Bowen is perhaps as good an authority on the subject as anybody in this country and that's one of the reasons why he is holding this position. I have some hesitation, depending upon the information from people I have no control over, people who come in from other parts of the country or other jurisdictions, or people that I do not have under my jurisdiction. I prefer to take advice, and I presume and in this case I know they have, consulted others before passing advice on to me but my prime advisors in this case, and I think properly so, were my own departmental officials.

**MR. COWAN:** Well perhaps I could ask the Minister, then, who they were relying upon for advice as to the best methods of disposal for the spill of vinyl chloride.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** There were a number of people contacted, their names I may not be able to recall but the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States was one of them; Dr. Gehring, Chief Toxicologist at the Dow Lab. in Midland, Michigan; Dr. Plaa was the third one. We tried to get as wide a selection as we possibly could of people who, we felt, had credentials in this particular area and I felt the department was doing their utmost to ensure a wide variety of opinions were sought.

Now since the accident we've had discussions with the University of Manitoba and, as a result of those discussions, they have offered to set up a team and we happily accepted that offer. In the event of another situation such as this, we will be in consultation with them as well. So we intend to broaden our line of contacts so that we have as wide a selection of people as possible but, at the same time, I will still continue to rely upon my own departmental officials, knowing they have consulted the best authorities they can find.

**MR. COWAN:** If I recollect correctly, Mr. Chairperson, the content the Minister talks about in regard to the University of Manitoba perhaps was brought about by a report in an article from a Dr. . . . I'll have to find his name; he was Associate Professor of Biology . . . There's also a Dr. Hymie Gesser, who also made public statements in regard to the fact they believed the department had not contacted local people in the area for their advice and they were somewhat concerned about that. If I can just find the proper area here, I can indicate to the Minister exactly what it was that had been said. Yes, it's in a March 19th article in the Free Press, Dr. Hymie Gesser is quoted as stating I'll tell you that people at the University are upset because the government is paying out salaries and they should get benefits from our knowledge. He added, We're well prepared, if advantage is taken of the facilities that are available. Then he continued on The first thing they should have done was get some people from the University together, Dr. Hymie Gesser said yesterday. In five hours, I could have had a portable gas chromatograph at the accident site and started a technique for analyzing active quantities of gas.

And then Dr. Samoiloff said that testing should be done by universities because it would provide more publicly acceptable information. His quote is Everything would have been open, everything would have been done by an impartial group, if the university had been invited to monitor the train derailment and spill. At that time, they talked about pulling together a prairie province team that would have equipment available to it and would be then able to respond very quickly to these type of spills. I would ask the Minister if that is the type of team they have in fact pulled together with the assistance of doctors from the university.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I couldn't tell you the personnel that are involved —(Interjection)— Yes, Dr. Gesser, I believe is one of them; Chow is another and I believe the other is Charlton.

**MR. COWAN:** Well, I've heard of two of the individuals and they come very highly qualified. I'm certain the third one does also, it's just that I haven't

run across him in any of my work or any of my studies, but that doesn't mean he's not more than qualified for the job that confronts him. And I'm pleased to hear that because it is a serious responsibility the Minister has and it's important he does use every available resource in dealing with these. I would just ask the Minister to confirm, then, that they did not at first contact the university or contact these individuals in the university. As a matter of fact, it must have been after March 18th because that's when the interviews for this article were taken.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The contact with the university with respect to this clean-up, to the MacGregor question, came after the incident but prior to that we had meetings with Dr. Campbell and some of his staff with a view to setting up a team at the university that could help us with a variety of problems. At that time accidental spills of chemicals were not even contemplated. We were discussing other matters relating to environmental concerns, waste management among them, and ways in which the university could be of assistance to us. So this was just a logical extension of that initial meeting, dealing with a specific matter, such as my honourable friend has mentioned.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, but that original contact was before the MacGregor spill and the next contact didn't come until after there were public statements . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I believe it was before Xmas some time.

**MR. COWAN:** Now the Minister indicated that his department and his Deputy Minister had been in contact with a number of personalities, Dr. Perry Gehring, Toxicologist and Director of Health and Environment Research with Dow Chemical, Midland, Michigan; Dr. Nuttall, Environmental Response Team with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Dr. Gaby Plaa, Professor of Pharmacology at the University of Montreal. I believe there's also a Dr. Gehring with Dow Chemical.

I would ask the Minister when first contact was made with these individuals. Well let me specifically say when did they first contact the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** It was the Friday afternoon.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, that would have been then Friday, March 14th? Is that around March 14th, Friday? 15th; that was after the visit of Dr. Stellman to the Minister.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That was the same date.

**MR. COWAN:** I would ask him when he contacted Dr. Gaby Plaa of the University . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** They were all contacted that afternoon.

**MR. COWAN:** The Minister says they were all contacted that afternoon and we know why they were contacted that afternoon. We also know that

the decision was made to allow the chemical to dissipate into the atmosphere and the decision was also made, according to the Minister, to spread the contaminated snow out, so that it would dissipate more rapidly, before that. When we ask the Minister who had suggested that was a proper procedure, he indicated at that time that his department officials had informed him that in fact was a proper procedure. I'd ask the Minister who was advising the department at that point when they made that initial decision because that was announced by the Minister, I believe on March 12th in the House, on the Wednesday, I believe, the Minister indicated . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That wasn't a departmental decision; that was a decision of the CNR. I was simply communicating that information, that statement that was made by CNR to the House. It wasn't a definitive plan of action; it was one of the options being considered at the time.

**MR. COWAN:** If I can just take one moment, Mr. Chairperson, the question in the House was, from myself, further to the question from the Member for Portage, who had asked if there was any danger to the residents of the area due to the recent CNR derailment in and around MacGregor and resulting chemical leakage that is reported, the Minister answered him. Then I said, further to the question, can the Minister indicate exactly how much leakage during the entire episode? In other other words, what quantities have escaped? At that time we didn't have a figure but the Minister said, I'll read the whole statement so that I'm not taking it out of context. At that moment, that has not been determined, — this is the Minister speaking — and will not be determined until the car is set upright and can be accurately measured. My understanding is that once a car is set upright they can measure accurately the amount of seepage. It is not anticipated that it's a great deal. Further to that, Mr. Chairman, it is the intention of the railway officials to remove the snow which contains the contamination and spread it over a fairly substantial area so it can be dissipated into the atmosphere as soon as they are hit by the sun's rays. Now the question that followed from that — and we have to get the whole sequence to understand the full context — I asked the Minister. I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, as to the last statement. Has the Minister checked with other authorities in regard to environmental waste management and transport of hazardous chemicals as to the advisability of taking a known carcinogen and a known pollutant and spreading it out so that it may dissipate into the environment at large? Has he checked with other officials and other experts on this area to ensure that there is no inherent danger in subjecting our environment to this sort of abuse? And the answer of the Minister was, In response to my honourable friend's question, Mr. Chairman, officials of the Environmental Branch have assured me that this is the proper procedure to be taken and they have done so with the concurrence of our Environmental people. So the Minister informed us at that time that the Environmental Branch — now that may be the federal or the provincial because he didn't clarify it — had made a statement that was the proper procedure to follow and also, when he

says the concurrence of our Environmental people, I would believe that he is talking about his own department, who was advising his department in regard to the appropriateness of the plan to spread the snow out into the general area?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That advice was coming from my own officials and Environment Canada.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. What I'm asking is, who was advising the Environmental Department as to the advisability of that particular course of action? In other words . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, if my honourable friend is asking who was advising the CNR as to what the course of action should be, I would suggest it would be Dow Chemical.

**MR. COWAN:** I would imagine also that it would be Dow Chemical. I'm certain that would come out in the inquiry, but the question I am asking, because the Minister says that this action was being taken with the concurrence of our Environmental people, had the Environmental people in the province contacted the Environmental people in the federal government or contacted Dow or contacted these other people that the Minister indicated that they had contacted later on? In other words, where did the province go for its advice?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, we were in constant consultation and discussion with the federal environmental agency, as well as the clearers on the site, Dow Chemical as well as the CNR.

**MR. COWAN:** That's a point that I was trying to get at, Mr. Chairperson, and I would do it so that I could make a suggestion, if I might, and that is in future incidents that we go immediately to the local people, which the Minister has assured me we will, because there is going to be a response team that is set up by the University and I would hope that they would be called up in all these instances to deal with the problem. But also that we make certain that the input we're getting comes from a varied enough source as to not be specifically that of persons who have vested interests in determining how that spill is presented to the public. I know why a chemical company would want to downplay a spill of their chemical; we know that they have to sell that chemical and if that chemical gets a bad public image that they will have trouble selling that chemical because the general public would say, we don't want that chemical around here; it's a harmful chemical. I know why CNR has a vested interest and they would say that; we have to transport chemicals, we want to continue our business, we want to increase our business and therefore we don't want it to appear that we're spilling dangerous chemicals all over the area. So I would only hope that in the future the Minister does take advantage of the many sources of information that we have in the province that are very capable in their own fields, and I'm certain he will.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Let me make this point very clear, Mr. Chairman. I have no hesitation in seeking

as wide an area as possible of information on any given subject, but I want to make it clear that in the final analysis — because I do have control over them, I can fire them if they are wrong, in other words — I depend on my own department to give me my final advice. I'm confident because I've worked with them enough to know that they will seek as wide an area of advice as possible, but I must rely on my own officials, otherwise I should not even have them.

**MR. COWAN:** No argument from myself, Mr. Chairperson, except that he must also assure that his officials are relying upon the best available information and the most information that they can possibly pull together in short notice on how to deal with these problems. I still to this day, and it's a matter of opinion, don't agree with the concept of diluting and dispersing known pollutants, known health hazards. There is two ways of dealing with them: capture and contain; dilute and disperse. My personal opinion is that you capture and contain whenever you can. The Minister indicated in his statements that was indeed a possibility because he said was we're going to gather up all this snow, so we have captured; but instead of containing, he said we are going to then dilute and disperse. Now that's capture and dilute and disperse. I would say that once you've captured you contain, and that should just be a general practice. The smokestack in Flin Flon is another example, do you capture the sulphur coming out and contain it, which has its own problems? We were talking about what Inco is going to do with all that sulphuric acid that it's going to be manufacturing as a result of trying to save the environment from some excesspollution. That's a problem in itself, so I'm not saying this in a simplistic sense unaware of some of the other problems that are created, but in this instance, we know that it could be captured — the Minister indicated that it could be captured — I believe that it should be contained. I would only ask the Minister if, as a general policy, it is the policy of the department to follow the course of action commonly termed capture and contain or is it a general policy, and I realize that there would be specific instances where this policy will not be followed entirely, to dilute and disperse?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, we follow the practice of containment wherever that is practical and possible. It's not always possible and in some instances it may not even be practical, but that certainly will be a policy that will be followed first when it is practical and when it is possible.

**MR. COWAN:** We'd only argue that if they were going to pull the snow together in order to spread it out that it was possible to capture it. Now I don't know about the containment procedures, perhaps there are problems there that I'm not aware of, but I would assume that once you've captured it you can contain it fairly easily. I'm pleased to hear that in the future that course of action will be followed.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, it's been followed in the past on many many spills that we have; we contain and remove if we possibly can.

**MR. COWAN:** No argument there. I would ask the Minister if Dow ever advised, to his knowledge, either his department or the CNR, the carrier, that the spilled vinyl chloride should be incinerated in equipment with a hydrochloric acid scrubber as per their instructions on their material data sheet? Was that advice ever presented to them?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Incinerated on the site?

**MR. COWAN:** No, no, it would have to be captured, contained, shipped and incinerated.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I'm not sure if that was one of the options. It seemed like a very remote one. I'm informed that it was not one of the options that were put forth.

**MR. COWAN:** I only mention that because I believe it would have had to, by regulation in another jurisdiction, been put forward as an alternative suggestion and one with a very heavy recommendation.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** If my honourable friend is reading from that initial paper that he presented here, and that's the reason I asked him that question about the inhibitor, then that would pose somewhat of a different situation.

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps the Minister can clarify why it would impose a different situation.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Prior to the process that has been by Dow Chemical for a few years now, there was an inhibitor placed in vinyl chloride to prevent it from polymerizing and the new process of manufacture now does not require the inhibitor. The inhibitor in those cases was a phenyl.

**MR. COWAN:** Well, I'm not an expert in the area but I don't see the significance as to why that would cause a major contradiction when it does go on to name ingredients, the ingredients that they are specifically dealing with in this instance are vinyl chloride. In this instance, they talk about vinyl chloride vapours; they talk about vinyl chloride itself; they talk primarily about vinyl chloride and they give the same fiscal data as for vinyl chloride that we have been given in the past. So I would ask the Minister, according to his expert advice, if that would make a major difference in how to handle the spill of vinyl chloride.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I don't think it would have made any difference in this particular instance since a spill was of a nature that was somewhat difficult to contain.

**MR. COWAN:** I've been in some conversation with people who have been in conversation with the department in regard to soil samples and they have indicated that soil samples are being taken by Environment Canada, and that the results should be gotten from them. Is the Minister aware of the levels of vinyl chloride that are being found in soil samples coming from the area around the vinyl chloride derailment?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I haven't seen them myself.

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps the department then is. Is the department aware of those samples?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I might add that we're doing our own sampling right now.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Does the Minister have the results of that sampling yet, any results at all?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, no, we don't.

**MR. COWAN:** Then does the Minister have — I'd ask him if his department has the results of the Environmental Canada sampling?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Apparently not.

**MR. COWAN:** The member is indicating that they are Environment Canada's property and that is a fact. I'm just asking if Environment Canada has shared with the department the test results?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, I haven't seen the results. It appears as though the department haven't seen them either.

**MR. COWAN:** They have not. If I can, I'd like to tap some of the experience of the Deputy Minister in this regard and run a theory by him, through the Minister and through yourself, for comments from him. I have to preface my remarks by saying that I am not an expert in this area. I have discussed this with people who do consider themselves to be experts in this area, but I have not come up with a firm consensus, although there seems to be a general consensus as to the potentiality of the theory which I'm going to describe. We know from data given to us by Dow Chemical that the levels of vinyl chloride in the air did not exceed 200 parts per million at the site of the spill on the day after the spill, in other words, when we would expect fairly high levels if the material was in fact evaporating. That's a matter of record, I believe, both public record and the record of the Legislature. We also know that we found fairly low levels throughout the area outside of the spill area and that we found levels approaching 5 and 20 parts per million right around the general area where the spill had occurred. We also know that towards the second week, when testing was done, that if the testing was done and still there, that there was a very low reading and that if the snow was disturbed that the reading would go up as a result of the disturbance of the snow.

We know also that vinyl chloride has been used as a refrigerant or has refrigerant qualities and properties about it. Let us assume that the spill occurred on that evening and that the liquid ran out and formed — because it was very cold that evening, I'm not certain of the exact temperature but it was below the boiling point of vinyl chloride, which means that some of it would evaporate but that it wouldn't evaporate at a quick pace or a quick pace in relationship to a hotter climate — formed pockets underneath the snow, perhaps one large pocket, perhaps smaller pockets, but formed those pockets. As it evaporated it of course cooled off the

remaining pool, as we do on a hot summer day when we go swimming in the water and the breeze evaporates us afterwards and we get cooled by that action. Well, the same action may have occurred in regard to the vinyl chloride. So that would inhibit further evaporation. The fact is that it would inhibit it to such an extent if it was insulated by the snow and it was a refrigerant factor, except that it may have had time to seep into the soil in large quantities. We would be led to believe that because if — and this is where the Deputy Minister may be able to correct me — if there was a large scale evaporation taking place, we would anticipate high readings of vinyl chloride in the air because what we would be measuring in fact was the evaporation process.

So I would ask the Minister if that theory could be — and I know we're talking about a theory and so I don't expect him to make a categorical statement — but if that theory could in fact have transpired and that there may be large quantities of vinyl chloride in the soil as a result of the very unique circumstances that were experienced because of the climate and the weather conditions at the time of the vinyl chloride spill outside of MacGregor.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has raised the very reason why we're testing. We're currently conducting our own testing right at the spill site. We're drilling and attempting to determine the extent to which the vinyl chloride penetrated through the soil. The purpose of that is to determine whether or not any trace of that vinyl chloride penetrated into the underground aquifers and that drilling and testing is going on right now and we do not have the results of all that testing.

**MR COWAN:** So in fact there may be some conjecture and the Minister is concerned at this point that the vinyl chloride never did dissipate nicely into the atmosphere but in fact that, because of the properties of the vinyl chloride and because of the climate in which we live, that it did make its way into the soil.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I would not want to comment on that definitively because that's what we want to find out. It won't be until we have done the testing that we will know. But we are carrying on this drilling program in conjunction with the CNR, in an effort to determine, because it may be important for us to know whether or not the vinyl chloride did penetrate into the soil and reach the underground aquifers. We will know as soon as our drilling and testing program is completed.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. When would that be? Is there any proposed timetable as to the testing to be accomplished?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** My impression is that the drilling will be completed soon. The testing is being done both by ourselves and by Dow Chemical. They are taking cores from the drilling that we're doing as well. Dow are taking the same samples and testing them, as well, in order to . . . They're doing that for the CNR.

**MR. COWAN:** So in actuality the province is doing its own testing and Dow is doing its own testing.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes.

**MR. COWAN:** I'd just ask the Minister for my own curiosity, does that theory in fact have any basis for consideration as to the refrigerant qualities in the fact that we were not seeing high levels of vinyl chloride in the air in the surrounding area outside of the actual derailment site?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, it's because we don't know that we're doing it. What we're endeavouring to do is to find out. I'll be able to inform my honourable friend a little better sometime later, when the testing is completed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(c) — the Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you. I just wanted a second opinion on my theory. So perhaps we can discuss it at another time, but I thought it was worth putting on the record because I had discussed it with numerous people and they have indicated that it might, in fact, be a problem. As a matter of fact, I talked to one of the Environmental Canada people and their comments were that they had done some testing of the soil and they found some very high levels and they'd found some not so high levels and they were concerned that their testing methods might have been contaminating the samples; and they were concerned that they weren't doing the testing methods properly; and they were concerned that it was new ground and what we finally came to the consideration was that we are treading on new ground here, we're breaking path. Because to the best of my knowledge, there has not been a vinyl chloride spill of this nature under similar circumstances upon which we have available information to make conclusions and to base our actions, so that we are breaking new ground in that respect. Perhaps our experience will not only help us develop better response mechanisms but will help other persons who may undergo similar experiences.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That's the reason Dow are doing the testing, as well, on the same samples.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(c) — the Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'd ask the Minister if they are finding any levels in the air, in the ambient air, directly at the derailment site now.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, the information was already provided to the Leader of the Opposition, I believe. No, there are no levels detectable there at the present time.

**MR. COWAN:** According to the map that was given to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I would assume that the testing was done outside of the actual site itself. Is there anyone testing the actual site, itself, now?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Not the air. We're now doing soil samples in there.

**MR. COWAN:** Is that because we went through a period of time where there were no concentrations discovered in the air or did they just stop testing?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, I presume it is because the results of the testing indicated that there was no vinyl chloride detectable and after a period of time they decided that there was no point in continuing the testing.

**MR. COWAN:** I'm going to try to tie this up. I could go on at some great length, and I'm not so certain that it wouldn't be appropriate to do so, but I think we're into an area now at a level which the Minister and his aides and myself are finding interesting. I don't want to bore the rest of the committee except to say that I do believe that the situation was badly handled. I believe that this government handled it badly; I believe that the federal government handled it badly; I believe that the CNR handled it badly and I believe that Dow Chemical handled it badly in the sense that we were not receiving full and complete information from unbiased source in an unbiased way. The Minister himself at one time indicated that 5,000 parts per million was an acceptable TLV and we know it was not. The fact is when we pressured him as to who had given him that statement, he said that his department had given him that figure. Well, the Minister is shaking his head no, but it's all a matter of record and it's easy enough to find.

On Friday, March 14, we asked him where he had arrived at a figure of 5,000 parts per million and he said that, That is a danger level of prolonged confined exposure. All I can say is that the level of 5 parts per million is far below any danger level expressed either in his terms or in terms of other people who had expressed opinions on the subject. So the Minister was using that figure of 5,000 parts per million and I know it was a mistake, and it was an honest mistake. I don't believe it was a mistake that was intended to mislead or deceive, it was an honest mistake.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I suppose it indicates that the honourable member is not the only one that is not an expert on this subject.

**MR. COWAN:** The Minister is absolutely right and I have to substantiate what he said because I'm not certain it got on the record. And he says, it only indicates that I, myself, am not an expert on this matter and I've said that as many times as I believe to be necessary to get people to believe it. And I, in fact, was using wrong figures in the beginning, although the difference was not in the level of figures but I had attributed my figures to OSHA and in fact they were ACIGH figures, which was a mistake. We have all made mistakes in this area because we weren't experts, because there's no real experience in Manitoba to draw upon in regard to vinyl chloride. It's just not a substance that we're familiar with because it's not used in production here to any significant extent.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** It only passes through.

**MR. COWAN:** The Minister says it's only passing through. But the fact is that those sort of mistakes do . . . —(Interjection)— I'm sorry?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Churchill has the floor, to my knowledge, unless the Minister . . .

**MR. COWAN:** Okay. I would just ask, in that instance then, ask the Minister why it is that — and he may not be able to answer this, perhaps it's better directed to the Minister for Emergency Measures Organization — but I'd ask him why it was that CANUTREC was never called in to provide the department with information in regard to this? It's a federal facility that is developed especially to deal with these sorts of incidents and accidents and I would have imagined that, had it been called in, we could have avoided some of the mistakes such as we have seen on everyone's part.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I'm not sure whether we've contacted CANUTREC, but we did contact Chemtrec very early in the process and they advised us to speak to a Dow Chemical expert, so we were back where we started. I am advised by Mr. McLeod that CANUTREC was called by us and they referred us to Dow.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. We have on the record statements that CANUTREC was not contacted, and that was by the Emergency Measures Organization. So perhaps it was not contacted by the Emergency Measures Organization but was contacted by the Department of Environment, which shows that we probably should have a more closer communication and co-operation, which I'm certain we will have, having learned from this experience.

I do not want to belabour the point except that I'd ask the Minister a question in regard to his press conference of Sunday. I'm not certain of the date but I believe there was only one press conference on a Sunday during the incident and that was a press conference during which his Deputy Minister indicated that, to the best of his knowledge, workers at the site were wearing respirators. And I know during a press conference there is not always time enough to examine in detail either the questions or the answers that are given because they're coming at you from all directions, but I would just ask the Minister if that was in respect to workers working right in the derailment area itself or workers generally at the site?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** To the best of my knowledge that would be referring to the people that were working right on the site.

**MR. COWAN:** That would have been Dow Chemical workers then, for the most part, officials; not CNR workers?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(c)(1)—pass — the Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** In closing, Mr. Chairperson, I believe it was on the first day when the Minister responsible

for Emergency Measures Organization, and I'm not certain whether it was him or the Minister — I think it might have been the Minister for the Environment as a matter of fact — I could look through my files and find out but it's not really necessary, said that fortunately this was not an incident of extreme significance and that we could learn from the lessons, perhaps we could use it best to learn lessons from. And although I may disagree with him as to the significance of the incident and I don't want to paraphrase him unfairly but I do believe that is the intent of what he said. I, at that same time, said that, yes, perhaps that is the best course of action to learn from this experience and it turned out to be more than either of us had thought. I think we have learned, as individuals; I know I've learned and I know the Minister has learned and the department has learned. I think we've learned how to be more effective in our roles because I was a bit less than vigilant for a period of time there in regard to perhaps the questioning that I should have been pursuing in the House. I was caught up in the chlorine mine set as was everybody else, the Mississauga experience, and was not delving as deeply into the subject as I should have. I won't make that mistake again and I'm certain the Minister won't make the mistake of . . .

**MR. JORGENSON:** You think you won't.

**MR. COWAN:** . . . of being caught unawares like that. One can't knock themselves too hard on this. I think I was bringing out some of the carcinogenic properties right from the start and trying to get the discussion to that level but I was not as vigilant as I would have wished I had been until being jogged by someone into greater action and participation. But the fact is that we have a lot to learn from this. We have learned a lot but there is a lot yet to learn and it is my hope, and my sincere hope, that we use this experience, not so much to cast blame although that's part of the political process and I will defend my right to do so and I know the Minister in similar circumstances would defend his right to do so. That is part of it and that is an essential part of the process — I don't mean to belittle it, but we also must learn how to build a better society and build a better world, safer, healthier; that we are confronted as legislators, opposition and government alike, with some very serious problems, problems not of our own making and problems many times not even comprehensible to us, problems which we have trouble dealing with, problems which are exotic to our own experiences, problems which are going to cause us a great deal of consternation and concern, but we must deal with them.

The Minister has a different approach than I would on this. I believe that approach is reflected in the two different political philosophies from which we originate, that his political philosophy has one approach that has been standard and historical and ours has a different approach. And we will argue that, I am certain we will argue that more in the future. We have discussed it over the last couple of days.

But we must never lose sight of the fact that we are dealing with a concern, with a subject that is very important to the people we represent, whether we represent a northern constituency or a southern

constituency. The Attorney-General is here and I have to at this point just say that I was somewhat bothered, and I hate making that admission because he may in the future try the same tactics, but I was somewhat bothered when we called for the emergency debate and he said, that's just a political gambit on the part of the Member for Churchill to get votes. I assure the Minister that it was not; I assure the Minister that my concerns in this and the concerns of my colleagues and I know the concerns of his government, are in fact in the best interests of the society at large.

I assure the Minister that when we do bring these matters forward that we do so because we want to develop a better system; because we want to place on the floor some of the problems which we face so that we can have the interchange, so that we can have a discussion, so that we can develop better mechanisms to deal with these sorts of problems that do confront us. So as an aside I mention that, but I don't want to use it to create a confrontation because I think one of the major achievements of this estimates proceedings is that we have been able to avoid a confrontation over this issue; because I believe it is an issue that is not best suited by confrontation tactics and I am certain the Minister believes that, and I know we have both gone out of our way in order to avoid that confrontation; that we have not risen to the bait when sometimes it was difficult for us not to because we understand the importance of the subject and we understand the importance of co-operation and mutual discussion so that we can benefit from each others knowledge and from each others thoughts.

I would hope that we will continue in that way to discuss these, to have this open discussion on these problems. I know, and I don't believe that it's wrong, that we will from time to time get trapped in the more political aspects of it, that's part of our nature as political beings. But I assure the Minister that even when we do that, and even when we are wagging our fingers back and forth, and even when we are using terms such as inept and bungling, we may believe them, we are doing so because we believe the problems to be serious enough that we give it our full effort and use all those methods that are available to us to encourage the Minister to act, to give the Minister the benefit of what little knowledge we do have but also to give the Minister the benefit of the great concern that I know we all share.

So there will be times in the future when it will look like this co-operation may be breaking down, that this interchange and discourse may be breaking down, but the fact is we are doing so in what we believe to be the best interests of all our constituents in our province because our province is part of a very small world that is becoming more and more deluged by these sorts of problems and we must act together and we must act immediately so that we can forestall some of the major impacts that could result if we were to allow conditions to go on continuing to exist that need not exist and that certainly should not exist.

So I look forward to criticizing; I look forward to suggesting; I look forward to these sorts of conversations and interchanges. I hope that when it's all over and when the dust is cleared and the

samples are all in and the story has been told over and over again, that we have made it a little bit better world to live in, and as long as I am certain that we are working towards those goals, I am certain that our efforts are not in vain and that what we do is probably the highest calling for any individual in my opinion and that is we seek to save the future. And I only hope that we continue and that we are successful in that regard.

**MR. COWAN:** 5.(c)(1)—pass; 5.(c)(2)—pass; 5.(d)(1)—pass; 5.(d)(2)—pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 4,875,400 for Consumer, Corporate Affairs and Environment — pass.

We shall return to Resolution 34, 1.(a) Minister's Compensation. The Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this has been, for me, a fairly enjoyable experience. I want to thank the Minister for being as frank and having the conversations that we've had with him on the various topics. I must say that when we go from Consumer and Corporate Affairs into the Environment we are really crossing quite a wide spectrum. —(Interjection)— I'm not going to repeat what the Honourable Minister of Highways just said to me but I do want to say to the Minister that I've enjoyed his frankness and I want to reiterate what the Member for Churchill has said, that while we may not always be in agreement, and I guess that's part of the political process, but I think we all do feel that the estimates procedure is one of the means by which we can examine the estimates and the philosophy of the Minister, and I'm not talking in a political nature as much as his philosophy, with the result I think I have learned a few things about the environment that I didn't know before. As I said when we started these estimates I certainly didn't consider myself to be an expert in any of these fields but I do want to thank the Minister for the patience that he's shown with us and when we next meet again to discuss his estimates, well, we'll hope that we will carry on in the same fashion.

There is one item, it slipped my mind when we were dealing with the Queen's Printer, and it has to do with the contracts because the Minister said that the Queen's Printer, Management and Brokerage was the brokerage firm for all departments and I'd just like to find out the government's contract re policies. Will Manitoba firms be given preference if they were not necessarily the lowest? I mean, has the department a policy or has the brokerage firm a policy in that, or say if an out-of-town printing firm could do printing cheaper than a contract of a Manitoba firm, would a Manitoba firm, if they were in a percentage range, be given a preference over out-of-province firm?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I know that other provinces take a pretty firm view on that subject. Very little outside printing goes to anybody outside their provinces. We don't take such firm positions but we do if the discrepancy is a narrow one.

**MR. JENKINS:** Say within about five percent?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I think it would depend on the size of the job. I have not set any firm figure but if the discrepancy in the bidding is low we feel that preference should be given to a firm in Manitoba who employs Manitobans. So that's certainly not breaking new ground in that area because other provinces take very firm positions on it, positions that I think are wrong, but they are doing it so we feel justified in at least giving some preference to Manitobans in that context.

**MR. JENKINS:** Fine, thank you.

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

**MR. ROBERT G. WILSON:** Mr. Chairman, I unfortunately had to go to another committee and there's a couple of items that I wanted to discuss. One is the general consensus of the right of the public to know. I know when I attended the Parliamentary Commonwealth Conference with other provincial representatives, the Alberta contingent and myself had a chance to discuss the approach of consumerism and the protection of the consumer. It was felt that we would be better to have laws which would protect the consumer and allow the free flow of business rather than have the jackboot of government or government control over the different industries. It is for this reason that I seek with amazement a couple of questions and observations.

I had a talk with the Attorney-General during his estimates and I've attempted a number of times to get the legal profession to publish a schedule of fees. While it would be just a general guideline to the public, it would be something on which the consumer would be able to ascertain whether he is being given a fair shake. I notice that it's only when somebody has the wherewithal and the imagination to be able to take a matter to the courts that a judge like Judge Allan Philp reduced one legal bill by 12,000.00. I'm wondering why, to the Minister, why is the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Environment not have any say in the particular section dealing with the particular Law Society and requesting that they give some guidelines and some direction to the general public pertaining to the establishment of a schedule of fees? They do have a schedule of fees printed, which I have read. It is very vague. It is not precise and it deals with only one or two areas.

I believe in the collection of bad debts they are allowed to charge something like 25 percent, also in the area of some mortgages dealings they have general guidelines but it is not printed in a booklet form. There doesn't seem to be any way the general public can be given an opportunity to examine. Even curtailing, I notice that one or two lawyers are beginning to advertise which I welcome and they're advertising 75.00 an hour, well, I think that at least gives the public a general view that this particular firm is 75.00 an hour. I also look with amazement that at one time there used to be a tariff of 25.00 an hour — I believe that's the legal aid schedule — but as soon as a chap gets annointed a Q.C. he then is able to charge 100.00 an hour and I wonder what great power of the marketplace determines that anyone that is annointed with a Q.C. can all of a sudden charge four times what his colleagues can

charge? So what I'm saying, I think the consumerism at some point in time, and I appreciate Manitoba never seems to lead the way, but I at some point in time, if other provincial people do read Hansard, maybe Ontario or some other place will take the lead and have a schedule of fees printed.

The other area, now that we're into the law aspect, is under the Minister's portfolio, under The Consumer Protection Act under 102(1) the Minister has a very very encouraging and interesting chapter. It says: If the amount has been paid by the debt or recover from the creditor an amount equal to three times the amount of the charge as a debt due to the debtor, I find that this section is most encouraging except I personally, myself, have taken three or four people to court and each time had it thrown out by a judge. I'm wondering if the Minister, at any time in the future, could give me a sample where this particular section has ever been successful in the courts; or was it put in with so many loopholes that it becomes a section where lawyers can make a good deal of money because in most cases the person going to court has to pay almost that equal amount in legal fees? I wanted to just draw that to his attention. I would more than welcome if he could give me an example where somebody has been successful under this section. One particular judge said it doesn't apply to contracts; another judge says it does not apply unless a statement of claim has been issued. I throw those out, whether they're accurate or not, these are my recollections as that particular section dealing with The Consumers Act.

Not wanting to hold up the estimates I did want to again, now that I've finished with the lawyers, want to talk about the insurance companies. At one time under the former government, the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department had to administer a good deal of bonding requirements for the small businessman and the used car dealers and so on and so forth, within the provincial boundaries. The whole idea of government requiring a bond was so that the insurance companies would go out and investigate the individual, make sure the person had financial stability, honesty and integrity, and met certain standards and was a person of good standing within the community. But now the insurance companies have all either fled or opted out of the bonding section and the government has imposed a 5,000 bond, which means that upon payment of a 5,000 bond anyone can get into the particular industry. I, myself personally, was favoured with a bond by a large insurance agency called Reed Stenhouse since 1958 and due to the media coverage of myself, I guess, my bond was yanked and I now am required to put up the 5,000 cash. I have no quarrel with this, this is the insurance industry's choice except that I find that I'm probably in a better position today than I was in 1958 to be able to cover the 5,000 with the assets that the corporation has, as compared to the assets it had in 1958.

So I would wish the Minister would consult with the insurance companies and ask if this is going to be a practice, and maybe the government is going to have to hire a staff person so that we can do the role that the insurance companies were doing, i.e. investigate the people that we are giving coverage to. To turn around and increase the cash requirement for a

person starting out in business would be very harsh and probably is not really the whole idea behind the bonding of individuals.

In the area that I know about under the financial and credit community, I find it amazing that the government only bonds the corporations and they do not bond the individual. So what you have is an almost unfair situation where a person and the human failings of the individual gets caught up in one of these sometimes clear and sometimes very vague sections of The Consumers Protection Act and also interpretations of lawyers versus civil servants and charges are laid against the corporation. And as each charge is laid the fine doubles and triples and quadruples and in the meantime the aggrieved individual starts up his own company, or moves to a competitor and might indeed be the very person that is the cause of all these particular infractions under three or four different companies that he may work for within the industry.

So I would like to see a bonding requirement for the individuals and that the infractions committed under the different statutes which this Minister is responsible for; be the sole responsibility of the individual who commits the infractions with some sort of record made of the corporation to which this person is working for. I think it makes sense because, after all, it is the human being that is in the forefront and is dealing with the individuals. I can think of, say in the business of collection agencies, possibly 25 to 35 collection agencies, somewhere thereabouts, in the province, each training individuals, some like Financial and Allied and they have staffs of 20 or 30 individuals; and as each one of these personalities runs afoul of the Act, if they were bonded and licensed in such a way that if they continued they would then run into a situation where the government could indeed protect the person who, through hard times or what other, under circumstances sometimes premeditated, has a large debt to the community and should not have to put up with the harassment of an individual who may have some sort of mental shortcoming and would be better off out of the industry.

I'm sorry to put this altogether but the Minister is closing and if I at least put them on the record, then at some point in time one of his staff people may be able to comment. And just to close, I realize this is probably a federal responsibility, but I'm now after the food people, the warehousing people. I found with amazement and I have a lid here — I talked about our little canine friends — I think possibly one of the major scandals that is on in the city of Winnipeg right now is the spiralling costs and increase of pet foods. I guess pets are probably a luxury of good times but it still doesn't call for people such as — this one here is from Safeway — having a product called Puss 'n Boots Tender Moist Cat Food on their shelf at 85 cents on a Saturday, and on the Monday morning it's 95 cents and then they put it on sale the following week at 93 cents. I would suggest at the size of their warehouse that they must have had a great deal of stock because very conveniently Loblaw and Dominion Stores and all the other big five or six very conveniently, simultaneously, put the food prices up almost identical. You cannot convince me that a product that was selling 4 for 1.00 and is now 41 cents a tin

was not stockpiled somewhere in a warehouse and that some means has to be devised through the provincial and federal governments, either through serial numbers or through some form of computerized identification so that these huge profits from old stock are, at some point in time, checked or possibly questions raised so that the consumer, the purchasing public — and in many cases it is the elderly who have these pets, it is large families, ones with many children, that have a pet; there are a few areas of the city where they call them doggie areas where there's probably a greater number of pets per home than other sections of the city but I would suggest that if a study was done that it is not just the wealthy that have pets, both cats and dogs; I would suggest that it is the elderly, the lonely and those with large families. I think it is absolutely most questionable that this type of increase, right across the board, is there and it is not, believe it or not — well the most expensive brand is Dr. Ballard's — it is these other unheard of brands who tested the market with the 5 for a 1.00 and the 4 for a 1.00 and now they're 41 and 47 cents a tin. I just think 10 cents over a weekend is far too great a price and I would hope that by putting that on the record, some federal government person dealing with price fixing and combines would look at this particular area. What I am suggesting is that there is some combine, there is some area of price fixing that causes these prices to be almost identical in major shopping centres throughout the city of Winnipeg.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Fort Rouge.

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Unfortunately, I had to miss part of the estimates because I was in the other room and, if I repeat things that have been brought up before, please let me know and I'll read the answers as they appear in Hansard.

First of all, I had some questions and comments on the Queen's Printer part of the estimates and I know there have been one or two questions. I don't know that these particular — is there something wrong with that?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I might just need some guidance here, but I believe my understanding, when we get back to the Minister's Compensation, it's an overall comment. I don't think we go back into the questioning any one item in the estimates that have already been passed. It's just a general comment and an overall, as I understand it, and I could be wrong; I need some guidance.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** All right. I'll commend him for the excellent job he's doing and then go on to ifs, buts and maybe's, but, after the first semi-colon, but, Mr. Chairperson, you may very well be right. What I have been listening to is people who talk on the general subject of the Minister's Salary but they refer back to their concerns in certain areas. This is what I'm going to do. I understand that there's a great deal of discontent, frustration in the Queen's Printer's Branch because of certain changes in salary for the position, for instance, of a gazette clerk, which was formerly paying 26,000 a year and the Civil Service Commission is reducing the salary to

16,000.00. Staffing vacancies have led to written complaints from provincial judges and the incapacity to bill departments for use of the service will, no doubt, eventually be identified by the Provincial Auditor. I wonder if the Minister wants to comment on that.

The salary for a gazette clerk, I'm told in Saskatchewan, yields a salary of 36,000.00. All seven managers, I'm told in the Queen's Printer section, have filed complaints with the Manitoba Government Employees' Association on their reclassification reviews and this has been referred to me because they just don't feel that they are getting very much consideration from the department or from the government.

I'm told there is no mechanism or procedure to distribute or print the statutes in French. The Queen's Printer was told not to worry about it and who is going to do this printing, if not the Queen's Printer? Have other plans been made or how has the Minister instructed his staff to deal with the distribution of Manitoba's statutes in French?

There were complaints — I believe this question was asked by the Honourable Minister for Logan — a question asked about the tendering system and whether there has been an official or unofficial direction given to not to use Manitoba over Canadian firms. I understand that the Minister's reply to that was, only if the extra cost is minimal, and I take it that there is a percentage over which you do give preference to Manitoba firms.

There was a question raised about the concern on the part of employees that the method used in the estimates of costing new equipment over one year instead of seven years is intended or is likely to inflate costs to departments, and their concern that it may lead to a possible contracting out of the work, instead of it being handled through the department. So if the Minister can give us any information on that, I'd appreciate it.

I asked a number of questions on rents in question period, and I've also asked some under the estimates in this Minister's estimates. I must say that I am extremely concerned, and my constituents and many leaders in the community are extremely concerned over the apparent lack of concern by this government for the increases in rents that are expected after the controls are taken off in June. I have many many questions from the community on that. We just have received ineffectual answers on any questions that have been posed to the government on the whole matter of rent controls, and what's going to become of those people on fixed incomes after the 31st of June. The Minister indicated they could move around from an apartment block to apartment block, taking advantage of vacancies. Well, you know, we might as well put an elderly person into a personal care home and then they won't have to worry about it. The taxpayer and the province will have to worry about it, because these people just can't chase around empty apartments looking for breaks on rents and that's a totally unrealistic and unacceptable attitude, as far as the community is concerned, Mr. Chairperson. I hope that sometime, in the next month or so, that the government will come forward with some positive program to protect the consumer in this area; to protect the elderly on fixed income; to protect the

people who are not quite elderly, between 50 and 65 who are having serious difficulties, many of them, in finding jobs, in holding their jobs and sometimes those people are worse off than the elderly people, and of course the working poor, the single parent families and these various groups that do need the protection and the concern of government and are not getting it, I'm afraid, Mr. Chairperson.

I want to make a few remarks on the MacGregor railway spill. I believe that the attitude of the Minister during that crisis — and I imagine he will question that word — I believe his manner and attitude were deplorable. The concentration on the experts at Dow Chemical as the source for his assurance that there was little or no danger to the residents of the community of MacGregor was ludicrous, in my opinion. I just do not understand how you can accept the word of the perpetrators of the condition and take them as your experts. This Minister, who is in charge of the Environment, why he didn't even call the Minister of Transport as soon as the accident occurred, in order to have the benefit of the assurances and the expertise in his department who were available to the Minister, why he waited until the Saturday following the Monday on which the accident occurred to call the Manitoba Minister to obtain his intercession in this matter which built up into a very frightening incident in Manitoba. That was because the politicians and the public did not accept the assurances of the Minister because he didn't really seem to be totally in control of the situation and he didn't seem to be totally frank with the House or with the public on what was really going on out there and what the dangers were. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Axworthy wasn't involved with the MacGregor spill, and that's what I'm talking about. The intervention, Mr. Chairperson, leads me to say that I find it strange and amusing that everytime anyone raises a voice in this House or in the committees, if the NDP raise a voice in criticism they are told it was worse when you were in power, if I raise a voice I'm told what's Lloyd Axworthy doing on some totally different subject. Frankly, I'm not here as an apologist for Lloyd Axworthy or for the federal government, I am here representing the Liberals who vote in Manitoba for a provincial representative.

To get back to the subject that I was on, I have to say that I was disappointed altogether in the complacency of the Minister in this whole spill that whole week following the accident because I found that, in itself, frightening. I was accused of rabble-rousing, of scaring people by asking questions such as, is there any danger to pregnant women. The screams from the government benches were incredible. That was a legitimate question and nobody ever answered it. I said in the House, is there a danger to the elderly? I was considering those who have respiratory diseases. Is there any danger to newborns? Those were legitimate questions, Mr. Chairperson. It was suggested that I was the one that was trying to frighten the public. The public was already afraid because they weren't getting the answers.

It seems to me that the residents of MacGregor should have been told at the outset of the possible danger, or the lack of possible danger, in the frankest possible terms and by Environmental people

who were not the employees of Dow Chemical or the employees of the CN, by independent environmental experts. Why should they have had to come forward days later and ask what the dangers were? I still don't know; I don't think anyone knows yet whether the evaporation of the substance, the natural evaporation, was the correct method of handling the spill or not. I don't think we're going to know until the Transport Commission concludes their inquiry.

One of the statements we had, the statement on Sunday, March 16, said the CNR official on-site will be the officer in charge; all site activities will be under his direction. He said today at the CTC that he didn't know anything about vinyl chloride and he had to depend on Dow Chemical for his information. An information officer was in place in MacGregor on Sunday, the 16th; that's six days after the accident. Why couldn't that information officer have been put there by Tuesday or Wednesday afternoon? Why on Sunday, when he was in place, did he have no telephone, so that the residents of the area could get in touch with him? I find this very difficult to understand.

The further matter in connection with this whole environmental spilling of chemicals, the thing is that very soon after that we had methanol spilling in the CP Yards in Winnipeg. That led to a decision by the City Council, for the first time, that they would go for railway relocation instead of an overpass in the yards and that was brought about by the fear of this sudden thing that has come up in the past year in Ontario and here with chemical spills and the relationship of the railway yards and the railway lines to the inner city of Winnipeg. All of a sudden the City Council decided that they would go for an overpass, which many of us had been urging for a number of years, against an overpass and for the relocation. In the meantime, several years have been wasted that could have been spent in the development of an appropriate plan.

There was editorial in the Tribune on the 9th April, they had been asking why the freight marshalling yards shouldn't be moved from their location and they had been pointing to the chemical spills and they were claiming also that they were being scoffed at because of their suggestions and they concluded the responsibility for any tragedy and the accompanying grief will rest upon those who ignore the warnings of danger. The warnings have been frequent; they have been articulated well by a number of agencies and a number of informed people, Mr. Chairperson, and we all hope and pray that there won't be any continuing dangers but I'm afraid we cannot continue to approach possible dangers to the public with the sort of complacency we experienced in the MacGregor situation.

That's really what I wanted to say on the subject of Minister's Salary, I hope it's been general enough. Quite specific in some items but I have the feeling there is just a general feeling on the part of the Minister that these questions are a nuisance; they're a nuisance when they were about rent and they were a nuisance on the MacGregor spill and that everything would be in much better condition if we who ask all these questions would just go quietly away and forget it. I wasn't sent here to go away quietly and forget these matters that are of concern to the community.

I had phone calls about the MacGregor spill; I have a number of phone calls about rents, people are in a real panic over rents; I have people coming to me because they don't feel their positions in government are being protected and fought for, and they don't know where to turn, so I brought them to this committee and I hope that we'll get some answers from the Minister, Mr. Chairperson.

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

**MR. WILSON:** There are a couple of items I wanted to mention. One is, a constituent of mine one day took me around to several areas in the city of Winnipeg and pointed out with amazement that the event of the closure of all the service stations within the basic core area of the city, and of course you see a lot of it along the thoroughfares like Grant and practically everybody is self-serve. We find that the major food chains and most of the corner stores are all selling petroleum products and what you're finding is that practically everybody is getting under the car with a wrench and dumping all the oil from their cars in the Grant Park Shopping Centre, in a number of other areas, especially at 25 cent car washes, where all this particular old oil and that, which is not only going into the sewage and water system or basically seeping into the ground, but you have the fact that it could have been, had the government made these people change their oil at a particular do-it-yourself or service station. In other words the food chains, in my opinion, should not be selling petroleum products, they should be available at the service stations because these petroleum products are being literally poured on the streets, on the parking lots, on the vacant lots and even in people's own backyards, which is a very rare case. But it seems to me this do-it-yourself oil phenomenon, this constituent was very very sincere, I thought he was kidding at first, he also pointed out that there was very little in the way of air pumps available for people to pump up their tires. What he was saying was the phenomena of owning a car in the '80s is that everything is mass-produced and available in the food stores and then the person becomes the very person that we, through countless thousands and thousands of dollars of educational dollars, have tried to say don't be a litterbug and yet we have basically made it, through the lack of government education or lack of consultation with the industry have been able to do something about this almost unbelievable phenomena of people dumping their old oil and petroleum products into the sewage system, drainage system and in some cases the water system, in some cases destroying the vegetation we have.

The other matter I had was one of which basically is something I'm a bit interested in, is that I would wonder why, I guess probably like The Liquor Control Act, this Minister has the availability to constantly be making changes and I wondered if in the future some of these changes were to be made in consultation with the industry, or like on City Council whenever they wanted to put a particular industry into a community they called it an 'environmental impact study' but in the area of the once proud service station industry they used to have a Garage Keeper's Act or garage keeper's lien and the price was raised

from 1 to 5 to register a lien and then many changes to that Act were made, including the filing of the documentation and it has been a general suggestion most people that are mechanics and run a service station may not be accountants, may not be lawyers and we should try to make the registration of a garage keeper's lien . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I wonder if we're not getting out of this particular item really.

**MR. WILSON:** Are we not on the Minister's Salary?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes, we are but really we're getting into a field of the Attorney-General in my understanding of our list of estimates. The Liquor and the Garage Keeper's Act is really not within this Minister's . . .

**MR. WILSON:** Well, might I, with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that any changes to the Act emanate from the Consumer's Minister and/or his staff.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I don't believe so, to the honourable member but . . .

**MR. WILSON:** Well, if I could be given this . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If we could get back on the Minister's Salary then I'll . . .

**MR. WILSON:** All right. What I'm suggesting is that somebody made a change this year which said that if a bank had a registered lien against a motor vehicle unit, and it was at Dominion Motors, that someone changed the Consumer Protection Act to say that you could not go and repossess that particular unit unless the debtor was present; and yet the Act clearly states a person in due care and control, an adult person and I wondered where this particular new phenomena originated from. I will just put that on the record that speaking for the chartered banks and credit unions and speaking for all the lending institutes that have an interest in a particular motor vehicle and/or motor cycle and/or semi-trailer, whatever, they feel they should be given the opportunity, if they are able to locate their chattel, to be able to pay off the garage keeper's lien and take that security without the amazing interpretation of someone within the government, who has all of a sudden made it mandatory that the debtor be present. I just wanted to put that on the record and if it is not correct I would be most happy to inform the banks and credit unions that the information they have received is incorrect.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(a)—pass; 1.(b)(1) the Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, in closing I would like to take the opportunity to speak on the Minister's salary for one moment. I'll begin by saying I believe, having reviewed environment estimates for previous years, that these estimates have probably been extensive as any estimates that this House or this Legislature has seen in regard to examining the activities of the environmental

department. I would imagine the Minister would agree with that.

I believe that our increased attention to this department, and by our I include the Minister in that, is a reflection of increased public awareness of the problems that we all face, is a reflection of the growing concern of the public who have become more aware of the problem, are thereby demanding more action and more attention to those problems from their governments. I also believe that it is evidence of our personal concern, and the concerns of others around this table and in this House, as to the problems that confront us, our concerns as Legislators with responsibilities which we must live up to, and as citizens of a small world who must live with their successes as Legislators as well as live with their failures as Legislators. How we treat the environment, how we protect the environment, will impact upon us personally and we must live both the success of our efforts and failures of our efforts.

So that I am not misunderstood, and I do this because I was once previously misunderstood in regard to a speech of the same style that I had made previously, the New Democratic Party does not question the motivations of the Minister. We believe the Minister to be concerned with the environment; we believe the Minister to be trying to deal with that to the best of his ability; we believe that is the case, we do not question motivations, although from time to time we do question the motivations of his party and that's a different matter altogether and it would be a dull session if that were not the case, I'm sure the Minister would agree; we do believe that his philosophical framework that the Minister has to operate within will fail him, in spite of his good intentions, in spite of all his efforts, in spite of his abilities. Times have changed, be there no doubt about that, and if I can be partisan for a bit, the Tory party is an old party and it carries with it its own excess baggage. As we have seen in the past few weeks in these Chambers, remarkable changes in the Progressive Conservative approach to government and I need only mention the change in their involvement, their opinion of public involvement in the mining industry, we've seen, what I would term, remarkable turnabouts in that regard; the fact they have increased tax credits, we have seen them turn their back on their own philosophy. We will also see, I believe, the Minister have to turn his back on his philosophy of operating with the least amount of regulations and legislation. We will see him soon come to the realization that his guidelines and objectives policy is not going to work; that he needs teeth behind it; that he needs some sort of mechanism and a statutory mechanism to impose his good intentions and his goodwill and his motivations on those who may not share his concerns. We will see that will become more and more necessary and as we saw the public involvement in mining, as we saw the increased tax credits, we will see his government turning to more and more regulations, to more and more control because that is what is demanded and we will see the Minister make those changes if I can be so foolish as to prophesize.

The fact is in order to deal with the situations that confront him he will have to do so. So we will continue to pressure the Minister to make those sorts of changes; we will continue to criticize when

we believe criticism is necessary; we will continue to bring forward matters that concern all of us very much and we will continue to debate them in the finest tradition of this House when it is necessary. As a specific I would just indicate to the Minister that we are going to be pressuring him very hard to impose that ban on 2,4,5-T which he indicated he is looking at; we are going to, as a party, attempt to convince him that his first reaction, that his first thoughts, or his first statements were indeed the proper statements and that we supported him in that ban and we are hoping he will act upon it. He can't stand on the edge of the water and test it all the time. He is going to have to take action, he is going to have to do it by regulation and legislation and by very strong action because the problem that confronts him is a very major problem.

The other point that I wish to make is that perhaps these estimates can be noted not for what we did discuss and as I said we have discussed many subjects, probably far more than in the past, but can be noted for what we didn't discuss, what we didn't have time to trade opinions and suggestions on. We have not done so because we believe the problems to be insignificant, but because we believe that it is not necessary that the Minister and ourselves direct our attention to those, we have done so because we recognize the limitations of the estimates procedure. But we will in the future, in the near future, I can assure the Minister, be bringing forward to him, many items, many items that he is concerned with, that we are concerned with, that the public are concerned with, and we would be doing so in the strongest possible terms so as to use what influence we can to encourage the Minister to move towards what we believe to be the proper course of action, and may our logic and may the strength of our arguments have some affect on him. I am certain it will as long as he keeps an open mind and he has not shown us that he is doing otherwise. He has shown us that he is in fact willing to listen. We commend him for that and we reserve judgement again upon what he does with that information that we provide him with, but that we will speak out very strongly and harshly when necessary so as to assure that the Minister does the most capable job possible in order to protect this world that we have to live in.

So having served that notice on the Minister, I do thank him for all the co-operation that he has shown in these estimates. I said that I wanted to put that on the record publicly and I believe this is probably the appropriate time to do so. The fact that the Minister did make allowances for some of us being away and did change the schedule shows that they are interested in discussing these items and we can only hope that they are interested in discussing the items because they value our input, as we value the conversations that we have had, and that they will act upon that input, and they will do all that they can with our encouragement, our support, our criticism, and our prodding when necessary to protect this world in which we live.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass. Resolution 34, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 394,600 for Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment—pass.

Committee rise.

## SUPPLY — HEALTH

### MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson):

This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 61 of the Main Estimates, Department of Health. Resolution No. 79, Clause 5. Manitoba Health Services Commission, Item (c) Hospital Program—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before the 5:30 adjournment I started by welcoming the Minister to 1977; I couldn't say 1980 because he is behind. Mr. Chairman, I know it's 1980 but what we heard really was the Minister's exposition on everything that existed in 1977 and we'd have been a long way down the line if he and his wisdom hadn't frozen things as of 1977 because, if I shut my eyes listening to the Minister and the Member for St. Boniface and if I hadn't known by the voices who was speaking, I might not have been sure because I've heard it all before.

The Minister says the Health Sciences Centre is a priority. I've got news for him; it was a priority in 1977 too, after extensive study and discussion with the Health Sciences Centre board, with everybody involved, approval was given for the rejuvenation, if you want to call it that, or redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre. As that was going to take place, a decanting process was going to occur as well; because you tear down a building you can't simply create a vacancy with nothing to replace it, and the Seven Oaks Hospital was going to play a role as part of the decanting process.

It's interesting to hear the Minister now talk about some of the approvals that were given in the fiscal year '78-'79 and he said that one of the approvals was the Seven Oaks Hospital. I'm wondering how many times that hospital has to be approved. It was approved. The funds were decided upon. The sod-turning ceremony was in June of 1977. Construction started and continued and it's my understanding — I can't say, if the Minister denies it; I'm in no position to substantiate it — but I believe it was so that in fact the government would have loved to have been able to put a stop to Seven Oaks Hospital, but they couldn't. It was too far gone and the costs of trying to stop it would have been so great that they could not have done it with any sort of grace at all, and even without any grace; that in fact Seven Oaks Hospital therefore was preordained, it was as I say, down the road and they couldn't stop it.

Looking at the amount spent in that year we talked about, there was 14.9 spent prior to '78-'79 and 22.8 spent in the year '79-'80, with still 18.4 million to go for a total of 55 million, which was the amount of the capital anticipated to spend; and that of course we know included Seven Oaks Hospital. But to say that it was his government that approved Seven Oaks Hospital is just so much nonsense. In fact, of that 55 million, I think all of it was either in process, actually under construction, and therefore naturally continued until it's going to be ended. So really the expenditures were preordained as far as this Minister is concerned.

Even in the next stage when he announced the Health Sciences Centre Phase 1, that Phase 1 sounds very much like Phase 1 of 1976-77. Sure, you may have decided to move on one particular building before another but I think you referred to materials handling building and I too, when I first heard that as one of the major priority buildings, I too was surprised because I didn't think that the materials handling building was all that important. I was soon advised how wrong I was and I remember distinctly agreeing that, well, the materials handling building is essential. Although as a layperson, and I think like the Minister, I would have thought that it probably could wait, but it couldn't. So as I say, when I listened to the Minister and the things that are happening and the objectives that he has and the goals that he has, they are a re-run, literally, of what has occurred in the past.

I can't really be all that critical because what has happened is a recognition by the Minister that certain things have to take place and that in fact they are taking place, that they have to be taking place within the context of something and it's obvious, even though there was a change in government, the bodies most involved, the hospital people, the HMO, the expertise within the departments, in the Health Service Commission, obviously they were giving the same advice to the present Minister as they gave to the former government. I am pleased to see that the this government did not scrap everything and that this so-called freeze was a temporary thaw, and that in fact what we're witnessing now is a regurgitation of the programs that had been approved years earlier.

But what bothers me, Mr. chairman, is in that delay of 24 months that the costs have gone up. The problems haven't eased; they've become more acute. There aren't more beds. There isn't a greater rationalization that might have taken place in that 24 months. We could have been farther down the line. He talks about the Concordia and how it makes sense to add beds to Concordia because the structure when it was designed was designed for a larger hospital. It was determined to go for the smaller one. At that time that seemed to be as far we could or should go, but we had enough foresight to recognize that in building into the building the capacity to add was being very dollar-wise at that time because, as the Minister himself admits, that if in fact they go ahead with Concordia, it would probably be the cheapest beds in Manitoba to put in now because that infrastructure is there: the steam room, the plant, the foundations, etc. We won't have to do there what we had to do at the University of Winnipeg which is piggyback an existing building because it wasn't designed to take any additional floors, so they had to piggyback it with stilts to the other side of an old building so they could build on top of it. The Concordia is not going to have that problem. It was designed for a bigger facility and, if the government goes ahead, it's all ready to go.

But certainly in the Health Sciences Centre what we are witnessing is pretty well the implementing of a plan that was agreed to in '76-'77, and the announcement by my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, that the Seven Oaks Hospital will open this October — I think it's October, that's what the target date is unless something happens, those things you

never know — but if it opens in October then it will pretty well be on target with what was originally planned except for the delay which occurred because of the strike in — I forget what year it was — '78, which tied it up for a number of months and delayed construction.

I believe also, Dauphin and Selkirk, were also within the plans that the Member for St. Boniface I believe will corroborate that they were part of the plans for that year, and again, what we're witnessing therefore is a continuation of the plans. So the spending patterns that we've had read to us today, of the 55 million, the total of 200 million, which are projections because we haven't spent anything like that kind of money at all, and I can understand why. You can't spend all that much money in that short a period. The hospital is started and it may take three years to build, and the cash is needed in three installments or even more. Certainly, you don't make the final payment until after the hospital is turned over to the owners of the hospital, which in this case would be Seven Oaks Hospital. In the case of Dauphin or Selkirk, whoever the board is.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt at all that what this government did when it came to office is to declare loud that they were going to resolve the problems, that money had been spent unwisely and they were going to get a handle on it and out of the savings they were going to be able to do all the things that haven't been done. Now we see that isn't quite so. The fact is they've received more money from the federal government in the last prior two years than ever before, more than they had anticipated, I think more than the federal government had anticipated originally, so there was a good flow of funds, there was no shortage of funds.

But what they've done is this, Mr. Chairman. In the last two-and-a-half years what we are witnessing is that this Minister and this government have beggared the hospitals. They've made beggars out of them. They've forced them into budget restraints which are Draconian, to say the least, so that you have a situation where today the hospitals — and I have referred to this I think it was in April of this year — where at an HMO conference I think the chairman or the vice-chairman of the organization urged the hospitals to go after funds, saying that the hospitals should consider public fund raising campaigns to offset the rising operating costs similar as had been done prior to 1957 when hospitalization first came into Manitoba. So what you're forcing the hospitals to do, what you've done, Mr. Minister, is forcing them to go back to the '50s and the years prior to that, looking for funds from private sources, from the public, fund raising events, to raise money for operating expenditures, for new equipment, for replacement of equipment, because in hospitals as you know, Mr. Chairman, they constantly require new equipment, whether it's to replace worn out equipment or obsolete equipment. And this is a field which is very dynamic, where this year's model soon become obsolete, as the wonders of science develop more and more esoteric and sophisticated equipment in the entire health field and it's very exciting, but it's very costly. But this government has literally starved the hospitals by giving them targets for budgeting far below the cost of inflation, far below the wages, the wage costs which they are faced with and the

inflationary cost of the supplies, the equipments that they must buy. Much of that equipment comes from the United States or from Europe, so that to talk in terms of 8 or 9 percent or 6 percent inflationary costs for those items is totally irrelevant. You're dealing with increases in costs to hospitals, over and above what they have paid for the previous equipment, of 30 and 40 percent in many cases, a combination of inflation, a combination of exchange rates. And yet, that's what the hospitals are being asked to do. Mr. Chairman, I think the government has made a mess of this in that they curtailed programs; they curtailed instruction; they didn't resolve any problems, they simply aggravated them; they forces hospitals to cut back. Now the Minister gets up and says, I don't understand why, I couldn't foresee it, but there is a nursing shortage but it must have been cyclical. Mr. Chairman, I suspect that if in 1977 the climate created by this government, if that hadn't taken place, then more people would have gone into nursing because they could have seen it as a career, but in 1977 any young person seeking nursing as a profession thought more than once, thought three times. And I agree with the Minister when he said the other day that at the schools the guidance counsellors suddenly decided that perhaps they shouldn't advise the student seeking their advice shouldn't guide them or counsel them to go into nursing because they could see the writing on the wall, too. They could see a 2.9 percent increase in budgets for hospitals and, therefore, the hospitals are going to have to cut and hospitals are very labour-intensive. The bulk of their operating costs are labour, whether it be professional labour, paraprofessional labour or caretaking staff, housekeeping staff, what have you, it's labour, very intensive.

When hospitals are forced to introduce measures whereby they don't necessarily have people — somebody phones in sick, they don't call in somebody to replace them, they ask others to cover off. When the working conditions, therefore, of nurses and other paraprofessionals becomes very uncomfortable and very difficult; when nurses are being asked to do the work which orderlies or nurses' aides were doing before, then it does not become an attractive profession, they will think twice about going into it. So, I think they just simply did not enrol because that was the climate and the mood created by this government. They did it openly and publicly as a matter of policy. They said, we've got to cut and they said they were cutting fat. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe they were cutting fat; I think they were actually cutting on the ability of hospitals to deliver to the people of Manitoba a first-class service. What they're ending up with is a second-class service. Now the Minister may say, well, that's not the end of the world. You know, it's still pretty good. Well, maybe it's still pretty good, but I tell you, it's not as good as it was. I think that the people of Manitoba want the best that they can get, are entitled to the best, and it's a public program which I think gets general agreement, is of a major priority, is of a high priority.

So I think they did a disservice to the people who run the hospitals, to the people who work in the hospitals, to the public of Manitoba that looks to these facilities for when they need it — people don't

go unless they need a hospital — and, to my mind, the proof of it and the ludicrousness of the situation that in 1980 an official of the HMO has to get up at a convention and urge and advise the representatives of all the hospitals and personal care homes in Manitoba to get out there and go after funds; that there's money out there is you approach the right service club or if you get the right activity going you can raise funds. Surely we've passed beyond that stage. Surely health is not something that can depend on the goodwill of an individual or a group of individuals. They always try to raise extra funds but those are for little extras, for something that is over and above. Now they're fighting for funds, not for fat but for bone and muscle, because they haven't been able to maintain the kind of service which they want to maintain in the hospitals. You know, the Minister can argue, well, they're still pretty good. Well pretty good is not good enough.

In Manitoba our services in the field of Health and Social Services, I think, were second to none in Canada, and I'm proud of that. I'm proud of that. We're ahead in many areas from the rest of the country, and why shouldn't Manitoba be ahead in something? So we're slipping and now the government's saying, well, now, we've thought it through and now we've got programs, now we've come up. And what did they come up with? It's the same programs they had before, that they froze. It's what we heard in '76 and '77. Health Sciences Centre, Seven Oaks Hospital, Dauphin, Selkirk, Misericordia — now we haven't heard as much, we've sort of gone a little farther than what I heard today from the Minister but I'm assuming Misericordia we'll hear about soon; we'll certainly hear about it before the next election — Concordia, we'll probably hear about that before the next election, but all those things are in there. The only difference is that he now can come up and say, I have approved them. Instead of saying, I'm continuing with the former approvals, he now can say, I have approved them. And why can he say that? Because he froze them, he didn't cancel them and there's a distinction. He didn't cancel them, he froze and that's a very astute way of handling them; because if he'd cancelled he would have had to cancel Seven Oaks Hospital and he couldn't do that, so he simply froze them. He didn't even freeze Seven Oaks Hospital; he simply sort of said, we're looking at it. As you were looking at it, construction was going ahead full blast; now it's continuing. The moment the strike ended, they went ahead and until the day of the strike they were building, all through the fall and winter of '77-'78, until the strike.

Mr. Chairman, what we are witnessing is an attempt by this Minister to announce programs as if they were a new thrust by this government. Well, the thrust is the same as was announced by the former government. The newness — it's new — the newness is in that he's changed his tune. In '78 there was the freeze, cut; in '79 there was the freeze, cut; in 1980 it was . . . now we're going to go ahead, and they lost two years. In those two years, prices will have risen, as we know, in everything. Money costs more, we know that; it costs more than in the '77s certainly, in the '78s, it costs a lot more. So whatever you do today in the way of construction, it's going to be more than it was if you're going

ahead in '78, it's got to be that. And in the operating, he's still applying the squeeze because now he says this year it's going up a considerable percentage, 12.6 or whatever it is, but in fact as I understand it, he's notified the hospitals that they should consider only an increase of 8 percent. Now he's going to answer and say, well, that's 8 percent on the average; some will go up more than 8 and some will go up less than 8, and there can be a variation between a rural hospital and the hospitals like Health Sciences Centre.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is coming off years where the increases were also low and it's becoming cumulative. How long can you put off maintenance, repairs, replacements? You can't put it off indefinitely. You can stall it for a year. You can stall it maybe for two years but you can't stall it for longer. Now what we have on these estimates is an increase in dollars but he knows and I know that Seven Oaks Hospital is going to start in October. Now to the extent that it doesn't start in October and goes in November, the government is going to save money. Well once that's opened, there is no doubt there is going to have to be money flowing to Seven Oaks Hospital and it's expensive, of course it is. So that what we see here is in totality more dollars but insofar as the individual hospitals are concerned, like the Health Sciences Centre and St. Boniface and Misericordia, or Grace or Victoria, they are going to be held to a pretty minimum amount. I don't think they're going to be able to settle with their employees for 8 percent. I know they're not going to be able to settle the nurses for 8 percent, not in light of the two-year with a 38 percent in Alberta. Manitoba nurses I think now are below Alberta and faced with that two-year agreement the Alberta government announced of 38 percent in Alberta, there's no way Manitoba nurses are going to settle for 8 percent, so that the squeeze is still on. And while that squeeze continues, even though the figures may appear high, the squeeze is on because the existing hospitals are going to have to try to provide services while at an income level which is not in any way related to the true costs.

And so you have a situation where again they are going to raise funds for this from somewhere else; they're going to cut corners; they're going to use staff in as many different ways that they can so if you're a nurse and if you can help with the bedpans, please do so, and if you can help clean up, do so as well, and if some staff phones in sick, well then, cover off, never mind bringing in somebody else to replace them, whether it's a nurse's aid or an orderly. It's not a healthy situation and it's not one that's good for the hospitals and it's not one that's good for Manitobans.

Mr. Chairman, this government, by its policies, discourages nurse recruitment. It didn't say to the prospective nurses, don't enrol; no, it just by, as I say, creating an atmosphere they have discouraged people from going into nursing. Now I don't doubt that as a result of what's happened this year there will suddenly be a great movement of graduates from Grade 12, first year university, to go into nursing, because they can see it's needed and if they can't get a job here they'll sure as heck get it somewhere else. But remember, we can't measure things in the same way as is happening in B.C. or Alberta or

Saskatchewan. They have a growing population and there's a shortage there but at least they're growing; we're not growing, we're diminishing, so that if we had just held our own we'd have been all right, but we didn't. We lost. And the fact that nurses are being recruited by other provinces and other states across the line, sure, it's always been the case and it always will be the case. And when the Minister talks about in Illinois they lose two-thirds, I think it is, of their doctors, only one-third remain, it comes as no surprise to me. We've always had an outflow; more left I think than stayed. And that's happening now in other fields too.

So when you're faced with that you don't pull in your horns, you don't cut, cut, cut; you don't freeze, freeze, freeze; you try to make it as attractive within their own province. Because by and large people would rather stay than pick up roots and go unless the loss is so great, or they can't get a job within their chosen profession, and then they have to leave.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister talked in terms of the standards being established in some areas, or is being talked about as a standard for the bed ratio per thousand population of four, that four is the magical figure. You know, four would be the magical figure if every bed, that is being counted by the Minister, was in fact an acute care bed, but it isn't. If you were starting from scratch and you were designing a hospital system, nothing existed, a brand new community was building up, you could design acute care facilities on the ratio of four to a thousand and you call them acute care, you don't clutter them up with anything else. But our hospitals grew up over the years and so you have extended care in there and you've got convalescent, and you've got rehabilitation, you've got any number of kinds of beds and very often they are used in the calculation of acute care. I doubt really whether we have truly 4,000 acute care beds. But you know, even that four per thousand is not engraved in stone. Over the decades, different fads of development — I call them fads because today it's a school that comes forward and says it's got to be four per thousand and a few years ago it was the school that said it's got to be five per thousand, and at one time there was a school that said, forget about a bunch of little hospitals, build one massive edifice and let everybody go to the hospital, it's more efficient, it's cheaper. Then there was the growing realization that bigness of itself was not the answer and for the health of the people involved it was better to put something as close to their neighbourhood of where they lived than having the family traipse to see a sick patient, a sick father or mother, somewhere in the centre of town.

And I agree with the Minister, the Health Sciences Centre is too large. And the plan was that as it's redeveloped and it's buildings are torn down and rebuilt, that Health Sciences Centre would shrink in size from its present 1,200, 1,200 and some odd, that it would be reduced, as it should be reduced, because it's too big. It's the biggest in western Canada; it's one of the biggest in the continent; it's far too big. And that's why it made sense to have a Seven Oaks and that's why it makes sense to add to the Concordia but to do it as part of a program, so that as you remove certain facilities at the Health

Sciences Centre, others have been built to replace them. It's a decanting process that takes place.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make those few comments to the Minister and to indicate to him that what he has announced is not new, it's old hat, it's a repeat of what has been said in the past, and all he simply has done, he simply delayed the implementation of programs which should have been continued and had he continued them we'd be that much farther down the road today and we'd have had that much more built than we have today and it would have been at far less cost than we're going to be having to pay tomorrow.

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

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I want to speak for a moment about the Lakeshore District Health Board and the agreement that they had with the Health Services Commission for a clinic at Lundar, 20 bed addition at Eriksdale, 20 bed addition to Ashern Hospital, and a clinic in the Gypsumville area. I asked questions about this a couple of months ago in the House and I find the way that district health board was treated, deplorable, Mr. Chairperson. At the time I asked the Honourable Minister of Government Services if he had intervened and asked for the change to be made and in his inimitable way he didn't quite answer the question. He talked around the question, around the answer, that the Honourable Minister whose estimates we are now considering, admitted or agreed that the United Church which owned the Eriksdale Hospital had in good faith relinquished ownership to the government of the property, as required by MHSC, had sold the nurses home, put in a sewer line, turned over the doctors residence as part of their commitment. They had been told that any 20-bed facility could not be a free-standing building, it had to be an addition to an existing hospital and an attachment to an existing hospital, a free-standing building had to be a 40-bed facility. Then the change was made to the effect that the 20-bed facility which was agreed to go at Eriksdale would go instead to Lundar and be a free-standing facility.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services, when he was asked if it was because of his intervention that this change had been made, merely said, I have never suggested that a facility should not be built in Eriksdale. He did not indicate that he had not put some sort of pressure on the Minister or on the Cabinet to have the facility go to Lundar, knowing full well that in the period of restraint that we have been enduring in the past two-and-a-half years, something else had to go. And I think that the way that the Eriksdale people were treated in that is deplorable and I just can't let the estimates go by without referring to it.

Much has been said about Seven Oaks and I want to just refer for a moment to the Seven Oaks facility and the fact that the number of beds at the Health Sciences Centre — the Minister, on several occasions has said, it has always been understood that 175 beds would be off-loaded into Seven Oaks from Health Sciences Centre. Well, always is a long time and the beginning of time was not, for some of

us, when this government was elected, Mr. Chairperson. It might have been for the Minister but this Seven Oaks Hospital was first approved by the city I believe, in principle, some time in the 1960s. In 1970 or '71, in the old city council, approval was given again with a commitment to approximately 1 million that was going to be the city's share, under the rules existing at that time, for construction of hospital beds. That was changed later under the former government. But when that commitment was made by the city, there was never any question of other beds being closed. This was an addition to the bed situation in the whole city of Winnipeg. The new Seven Oaks Hospital was to be an additional facility, not an off-loading and taking away from the Health Sciences Centre, and that has to go on the record. The Minister says it has always been the understanding; he means since his government took office, since he became the Minister, since 1977, that is not always.

I asked the Minister a question last week, and somehow he missed answering it and I'm sure it was a mistake. I asked the Minister, I mentioned that I had read in the paper that Mr. Pollock had stated that he'd made a proposal for a renewal, rebuilding of the Nightingale Nursing Home on Mayfair and asked if the Minister could make a statement on that confirming, since Mr. Pollock had stated that he was waiting for a statement from the Minister. Could the Minister tell us what the situation is as far as the old Nightingale Nursing Home is concerned?

The Children's Hospital, I felt that it was a mistake when that stopped being the Children's Hospital and became the Children's Centre, part of the Health Sciences Centre complex. I felt that something went out of the old Children's Hospital when they lost their board and their board became integrated in the Health Sciences Centre board. I've spent a great deal of time in that facility in the 26 years that I've been a mother. The last time was just last Christmas, and that once proud facility — (Interjection) — No, my child is older than that but circumstances required that she be in that hospital last Christmas. But something went out of that hospital, it seemed to me, when it just became a wing of the Health Sciences Centre. I think that it was a more satisfactory entity when it was the Children's Hospital and I'm anxious to see it go back to that.

I wanted to ask a question or two about Deer Lodge — I've also asked some questions in question period — about one of the discussions we were having a number of years ago with the New Democratic government and the Municipal Hospitals. At that time, there was a committee established to talk to the federal government, a committee of Deer Lodge and the federal government, Manitoba Health Sciences Centre and there was a representative of the Municipal Hospital Board also on that committee, and there was some discussion about having one board to administer both hospitals. It seems to me that that suggestion did not come from me but I think there's some merit to having one overall board, an umbrella-type board, to look at extended care beds and to advise the Manitoba Health Services Commission, advise the government. I'm not trying to think of another salaried board; I would suggest it be a volunteer board such as we have now at the hospitals. So that instead of having competition for

extended care money, competition in the decision of where new extended care beds will go, a board would look at the overall scene, a board with particular expertise in this area of extended care, and make some decisions for future expansions of extended care bed facilities, Mr. Chairperson.

The Deer Lodge Hospital, it is of course essential that the veterans continue to have some part of that hospital that remains exclusive to veterans. That is a commitment that was made to them many years ago and all of these commitments that we made to veterans, even though unfortunately there are fewer and fewer all the time veterans in the province and in the city, that commitment must be honoured for all time and as long as there is even one veteran.

I spoke on an earlier occasion in these estimates of my concern for the youthful extended care patient and the need for a separate wing or a separate facility in extended care hospitals when we're considering the long-term youthful patient. I think I talked about that under a part of the estimates that was not where I should have been talking about it, but I just make reference to it now. You'll be glad to know I don't intend to repeat my whole speech.

The Minister, I understand, has made a statement to the effect that there are nearly 700 acute care beds with patients who should be in personal care or extended care beds and it seems to me that we go in a very backhanded way about our provision of hospital care. The efficient way — this is very simple and probably simplistic but to me this is the efficient way — to cope with bed shortages. First of all, to provide enough personal care beds because that is economically sensible. The cost of personal care beds, both the capital cost and the ongoing cost, is just so much lower that as long as there are any personal care patients occupying extended care beds or as long as there are any personal care patients occupying acute care beds, then we have an inefficient and unsatisfactory health program, hospital program. As soon as the waiting list appears for personal care — and we have to decide whether they have to be panelled for personal care or whether the request of their doctors is sufficient, and that sort of thing — but as soon as a waiting list appears, then we should proceed with construction of a new personal care facility, or an extension. Now we seem to be going, first of all, at providing the acute care beds and we still have people awaiting personal care beds.

I referred last week to the fact that somebody I know has been sent home from St. Boniface Hospital, who should be in a personal care facility, and they can't find a bed for her. This is a stroke victim who has paid her dues to our city and our country over nearly 80 years of her lifetime and now she's in her failing years and there's nowhere for her to go. But as long as we have vacant beds anywhere, I suggest those should be acute care beds, that we should be continuing to add personal care beds until, in fact, there is no need for personal care patients to be occupying other beds. The major cost of health care is in acute hospital beds.

I am told that in rural areas there are six acute care beds per 1,000 of population, compared to 4.2 acute care beds in Winnipeg. That's making some adjustment in the Winnipeg figure to take into account non-resident users. And while one can

understand the desire of rural communities to maintain their own hospital facilities, it seems obvious that there is a thrust in the rural areas for extended care and nursing home facilities, rather than for more acute care beds. So I would hope the Minister can assure us that that will be the thrust there.

I'm told that in the Faculty of Medicine 100 students per year are admitted and yet we still have great difficulties in supplying a sufficient number of doctors to serve the rural areas of Manitoba. Strangely, the rural area has more hospital beds apparently than needed and less doctors than are needed. A couple of years ago, a government commissioned report recommended that the number of students admitted to the Faculty of Medicine be reduced but that, to provide doctors for the rural area, one-half of these should be admitted from the rural areas, even if some reduction of standards is the result. I must say, Mr. Chairperson, that the Liberal Party opposes these recommendations. The way to provide a sufficient number of physicians in rural areas is not by reducing the number of students or arbitrarily allocating positions to rural students in the hope that they will return to their hometowns. The provision of sufficient medical services in rural areas requires incentives to graduates to settle in rural areas, along with the prospect of developing medical centres where doctors can practice in proximity or in partnership with others in their profession. The incentives should take the form of equipment and suitable premises from which to conduct a medical practice, Mr. Chairperson.

Much has been said about the shortage of nurses. I don't know that I can add much to that. I would like to ask the Minister when we can expect the changes in the Registered Nurses Act to come forward. I understand that we are to receive them this time. I'm wondering if the proposals of the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses are to be incorporated in that bill, whether an advisory council will be established to consider, for instance, mandatory continuing education for nurses. I understand this is opposed by the Manitoba Health Organizations, but it is a priority of the Nurses' Association, and also that one-quarter of the board should be made up of patients. I hope the Minister will give us some information on when we can expect those changes and perhaps he can tell us what we can expect to receive.

There certainly seems to have been some poor planning in the whole matter of nursing and I don't want to lay this at anyone's door, particularly. It's obvious and this has been referred to by the last two speakers on the opposition side that a few years ago, when there was a . . . , young women were being advised not to go into nursing. There won't be any jobs, they were told. I know young women who have come and told me this, there won't be any jobs, you will have to leave the province to get a job. Now, we're finding that the people who are suffering from this poor planning, of course, are not the people who perhaps could have been nurses but those people who should be occupying the hospital beds.

This year, I understand, I am told the Health Sciences Centre is graduating the smallest class of RNs since the depression, because three or four

years ago there was such a big scare on about having too many nurses. Now it should be possible for government officials to project tendencies so that this sort of thing won't happen. I can't see why it's so impossible for us to get accurate predictions so that an appropriate number of students will be entered into nursing schools, so that we won't be seesawing back and forth encouraging too many nurses at one stage, and then three or four years later, discouraging them again and having a shortage a couple of years after that. I think somebody has to give some really serious thought about this whole seesaw, this cycle of too many nurses, too few nurses and the reduction of classes. This is unrealistic.

Somebody said recently that perhaps men should be encouraged to go into nursing and, for the life of me, I can't see why that was even newsworthy. I thought it was perfectly obvious and a perfectly simple thing. I thought men were, in increasing numbers, entering the nursing profession. I think, perhaps, it's high time that they were. — (Interjection)— Women are finding that . . . Sometimes we get the most intelligent remarks from around this room that it boggles the mind, Mr. Chairperson. I'm sorry, I lost my place; I'm not used to it yet. I hate to think one of these days I'm going to get used to that sort of thing. —(Interjection)— Yes, right. I didn't finish educating him before I sent him out here. —(Interjection)— Sure.

Mr. Chairperson, these are some of my thoughts on the hospital needs. I think that they are straightforward. I don't know if the Minister can answer them. I'm sure he will feel he can't answer them all satisfactorily. I am very concerned about — I want to come back to this again — the contempt that was shown for the Lakeshore District Health Board. This is possibly happening in other areas as well, and this just is not good enough. These are volunteers who come forward to serve their community and then they are treated in this contemptuous fashion by the government, which is also supposed to be serving the people. I don't suppose the Minister can answer that any more satisfactorily than he did when it was brought up earlier in the House, but I think this Minister and this government should be aware that that sort of treatment of volunteer boards is not acceptable to most of the people of this province.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Chairman, there were two or three questions asked of me by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that I had not had a chance to answer in the periods when I was participating in the debate earlier in the day, and I would like to try to answer them for him now.

He had made some reference to the Health figures, Health funding figures, that I had used and have used consistently in defence of the government's health spending and in defence of our budgets, not only in the context of the debate, ongoing debate on EPF block funding as against cost-sharing, but in the ongoing debate on Manitoba health funding in general. I want to assure my honourable friend that

in every instance, inside and outside this Chamber, I have used the same categories for Health funding in comparing the spending of the current government and the proportion that represents of the overall provincial budget, as I have done for the spending of the previous government right back to 1971-72, right through the complete decade, Mr. Chairman. So there has not been, at any time, an instance of comparing apples with oranges; in each case it's been a consistent comparison.

We say that health embraces far more than hospitals and medicare and even personal care homes. We say, in identifying the Manitoba health budget, the amount of the public dollar that goes into health care in this province, that there is a whole spectrum of identifiable health services that we certainly identify as health services and health needs; that in our view, EPF and block funding was intended to enable us to identify and support, and I give credit to the previous government for the same kind of identification in any figures that I use. For example, when I say the Manitoba Health Care budget in 1979-80 was 570 million and in 1978-79 was 525 million and when I take the figures that were expended by my honourable friends when they were government and give their figures, in each case I'm using the same categories of spending, including everything from hospitals and Medicare and personal care homes to medical public health, to psychiatric services, to dental services, to community health centres, to mental health, to medical supplies and home care equipment, in every case I've used the same categories. So the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and I may debate till the cows come home whether or not EPF block funding is better or worse than cost-sharing and whether or not, in his view, Manitoba is spending its health dollars properly and effectively, but I want to assure him that I have never compared categories that have not been applied consistently across ten years of government.

In comparing those categories I can demonstrate that in the last year of the previous government which was 1977-78, that was the budget which we inherited, that using those categories, that 31 percent of the provincial budget was expended on health care and that in 1979-80, the last fiscal year, 32 percent of the provincial budget was expended on health care. I'm not making a great issue out of that one percent. All I'm trying to show is that there is competitive and comparable expenditure on health care in terms of the amount of the dollar in Manitoba that Manitobans spend on health care between this administration and the previous administration and any argument to the contrary is faulty, Mr. Chairman. And I also suggest, in looking at comparative spending across Canada, that Manitoba can lay claim to a record that is duplicated by very few, equalled very few, very few other jurisdictions, virtually a full third of our dollar goes on health care. When I use the term pure health, the reason that term got invented was because, as my honourable friend well knows, it was formerly the Department of Health and Community Services and so I was separating out the health items from the community services items, such as child and family services and income security and employment services which were on the other side of the department budget, so that is why in the past I've sometimes used the term pure

health, it is not necessary to use that term anymore because it is just health now.

Another question the Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked me but I had not answered, Mr. Chairman, was a question with respect to the number of nurses graduating and becoming available in Manitoba at the present time and comparisons with some previous years. We expect this June, Mr. Chairman, that 402 RNs will graduate from various Manitoba schools of nursing, some of them hospital-based of course, and some of them college-based; that includes those who will be graduating from the Baccalaureate Course at the University of Manitoba, 68 of that 402 will be Bachelors of Nursing, graduating from the BN course at the University of Manitoba, the other 334 will be graduating from the Brandon General Hospital, the Grace, the Health Sciences Centre, Misericordia, St. Boniface and Red River Community College.

Now as I stated in the House some time ago, the number of graduates is down from immediately preceding years, and I think I gave approximate figures in the House some time ago, but in answer to my honourable friend, the total number of RN graduates in Manitoba in 1976-77 was 488, in 1977-78 it was 487, in 1978-79 it was 380 and in 1979-80 because that's the academic year obviously, not the fiscal year but the academic year, with the current academic year, with the class graduating this June, 402 as I said. We have, as I advised all honourable members the other day, through refresher courses now in place at Red River Community College, at Assiniboine College in Brandon, at Thompson and at the Health Sciences Centre, I believe, and projected for later this summer and early this fall at Red River Community College, a number of nurses returning to the field from retirement or from other areas of occupation, the figure I gave honourable members the other day was 91 but, as I pointed out to them at the time, new applications were coming in every day and it now looks like that figure can be adjusted upward to 110 and hopefully it will continue to rise gradually so that in addition to the 402 graduating in June we're looking at upwards of 100, hopefully considerably upwards of that, but I can't promise that obviously, upwards of 100 coming out of refresher courses, to be available for the nursing mainstream by this autumn.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface suggested, in response to my identification of one of my priorities, as the improvement of the climate for doctors, the climate for medical practice in Manitoba, he suggested that the climate is worse now than it was and that there are fewer doctors now than there were, that is not correct, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— I stand corrected, I thought he said there were more leaving the province, I thought he said there were fewer doctors now than before. Just for the sake of the record, Mr. Chairman, there are, as of December 31, 1979, which is the latest month I have statistics for, registered with the Manitoba Health Services Commission a total of 1,598 physicians. The comparative figure a year earlier was 1,568. The comparative figure a year earlier was 1,568. The comparative figure at December 31st, 1969, the year that the government last changed hands, was 1,235 and there has been a steady increase from that year, 1969, through to

1979, Mr. Chairman, with one exception, 1978, when the numbers dropped off temporarily but then rebuilt again to their present figure. Of that total, 6.9 percent are opted out. That I think is a record that is something of the envy of most other provinces and most other Health Ministers in the country. I don't wish to leave that on the record in any way that could be misinterpreted. The credit for that goes to the medical profession and to their sense of co-operation and service. —(Interjection)— Well, and the legislation and the efforts of the government, but I want to acknowledge the co-operative spirit that has been demonstrated by the medical profession of Manitoba in meeting their responsibilities under Medicare and under the legislation and in serving the people of this province.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that covers most, and hopefully all, of the questions that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked me. If it does not, I certainly invite him to remind me of any that I have missed.

I appreciate the comments of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks in his participation in the debate. I must say I don't agree with him but I doubt that he expected me to. He says that the government has beggared the hospitals in Manitoba through their budgets and I want to assure him that is certainly not reflected, not reflected, in our conversations with the hospitals or with the Manitoba Health Organizations.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, our original budget increase for hospitals in 1978-79 was 2.9 percent, as reported by members opposite, but to that was added 1.75 percent for the first three months of the year when we converted from the calendar year to the fiscal year, so that the effective rate of increase was 4.75 percent. In 1979-80, the budgetary increase was a median 6 percent. There was a base line adjustment that provided an additional 2.3 percent so that the effective rate of increase was 8.3 percent and that was equal to or greater than general increases in hospital costs across Canada. Just for comparison's sake, Mr. Chairman, alongside our 8.3 percent, the B.C. increase was 7.5 percent; the Alberta increase was 8 percent; Saskatchewan was 6.5 percent; Quebec was 4.83 percent; New Brunswick, I don't have the details; Nova Scotia was 6.3 percent; Ontario was 6 percent; and Newfoundland was 10 percent.

In 1980-81, the fiscal year we're in now, we have instructed hospitals that we're targeting for a median 8 percent. I don't have the comparisons from all the other provinces, as I do for 1979-80, but the comparable target in — in fact, I don't know that it's a target — the fixed budgetary increase figure in Ontario is 7.8 percent.

I think it is essential, Mr. Chairman, in defense of the health system in this province and in the interests of maintaining the confidence of Manitobans in their excellent hospital and health care system, that members opposite and the media and the public know that Manitoba's budgetary increase in health care, budgetary increase in hospitals, is competitive with or better than is the record of other jurisdictions in this country. We don't have to take a back seat to anybody in terms of our health care budget increase or our hospital increase. An effort has been made all across this country and

in fact all across this continent to ensure that sufficient cost efficiency techniques and fiscal responsibility is brought to bear in the health care field to guarantee the maintenance of our health care systems. In pursuit of that objective, all jurisdictions have applied very careful budgetary increased calculations for the past two to three years. Those efforts are repeated again this year and reflected in the budgets of our sister provinces and Manitoba stands at the top of that list, equal to any of them and better than most.

Mr. Chairman, there was also a reference to the equipment depreciation item by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks during the course of his remarks, and the impact that he felt it had on hospitals during the early months of this administration. There is no question that in the first year of our administration there was a freeze on capital health facility construction and equipment depreciation. No one has ever denied that. That was a one-year freeze, a one-year pause that was necessary for us to catch our collective breath, as a province, to see where we were going, to bring our expectations under control and certainly to bring our spending and our accountability under control. We don't apologize for that but that freeze was a deliberate one-year strategy and it served its purpose and was lifted at the conclusion of that year. With respect to equipment depreciation, in 1979-80, Mr. Chairman, there were two years of depreciation given in one year to make up for that freeze, so the Member for Seven Oaks need not labour under the delusion that hospitals have suffered from a squeeze on equipment depreciation in financing or funding. That has been accommodated in the two-year lump funding given to them in 1979-80.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Seven Oaks deplores the challenges from the Manitoba Health Organizations to health facilities to go out and seek participation and support and funding from the private sector. He suggests that the MHO has said, and I think quite rightly and quite correctly, there is money out there in the private sector; there are Service clubs; there are private organizations; there are private philanthropists; there are private research foundations, go out and tap that source. And the Member for Seven Oaks deplores that. Well, that represents a pretty clear, a pretty vivid dichotomy between his approach and the approach of his party to health care services and health care funding and participation by the population, generally, in the improvement of their services and the position that we, in the Progressive Conservative Party and Progressive Conservative government, hold on that subject. We believe that there are opportunities and opportunities wilfully proffered, wilfully made available for just that kind of support and funding. I would just cite one example to my honourable friend for Seven Oaks, the most recent experience that I have had in that connection is an experience with Holy Family Nursing Home, which is certainly one of the great nursing homes, one of the great non-prop health facilities in this province; and through their auxiliary, through their board and through their fundraising committee, specifically designated as a fundraising committee, they have done wondrous things at what was already an excellent facility. They have added wondrous improvements and additions and

extensions to that facility because they have said, look, the people of Manitoba, all of us together have combined, through our own resources, to provide the basic quality needs here for the residents who come to this home and we can now go out through our own efforts and our own contacts and the efforts of others, even give them more, even do better for them and they have done a magnificent job.

I know that Tach Nursing Centre is another example of that kind of activity and I salute the attitude of the MHO. I salute the attitude of the MHO because that is the attitude of this government and I think it's the attitude of most Manitobans; that they don't expect themselves, as taxpayers, to pay for everything through their taxes and to produce a system that is totally egalitarian. They are happy and willing and ambitious enough to want to achieve particular benefits and particular services that they think they're entitled to achieve through their effort and through their giving and we support that view. We think that is one of the basic bedrocks of our society in western Canada and if it can reflect itself in a better health service then that is all to everybody's good. So I can't share the dismay of the Member for Seven Oaks that the MHO, or somebody else, has challenged the facilities to go out and try to make use of that great resource in the community.

I want to also assure the Member for Seven Oaks, Mr. Chairman, that he misinterprets me if he thinks that I say, in response to any criticisms that he may have of our system, if he thinks that I say, well, our hospital system is still pretty good, which is the terminology he used. I've never said our hospital system is pretty good. I don't say it's pretty good. I wouldn't be satisfied if it were only pretty good. I say it's one of the best in North America and continues to be one of the best in North America. And I can tell him, he's forgotten because it's so long since he was Minister of Health . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can tell him, or remind him of his communication with other Ministers of Health and other representatives of other jurisdictions in North America which surely was his experience when he was Minister and is my experience today, that most of those other health Ministers and health commissioners are mightily impressed, and indeed envious, sir, of the system that we have here in Manitoba. We tend to lose sight of it here in Manitoba. We tend to take it for granted. It's one of the greatest health systems in the world and we are determined to maintain it at that level of greatness. And I believe, sir, that we are not only maintaining it at that level of greatness but we are ensuring its continued excellence through the kinds of strategies and the kinds of approaches, in terms of accountability and in terms of responsibility that have been reflected through our government programs in the last three years. And notwithstanding that effort to achieve cost efficiency alongside care efficiency, accountability and responsibility alongside the other two; notwithstanding that effort which takes effort on the parts of everybody in the system, we still have produced a health care budget which is better and

higher than most of those in the rest of Canada and North America on a provincial or state basis.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks says he thinks we're in trouble with the nurses. We're not going to be able to do it because of the competition in terms of wage increases in Alberta and B.C. Well, he may be right, he may be right, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest that we don't create those fears and manufacture those scare headlines before it's necessary to do so. If he's right, when the time comes I'll admit it. But I believe, sir, that just as we have achieved a happier climate with the doctors, that we will achieve a happier and more productive climate with the nurses and with the other health workers in this province than was the case before we took office. I believe that and I suggest that we wait and see whether we can do it or not.

I will be the first to admit that I've failed, if I fail. But we are not in negotiations at the present time with the nurses. We know what's happened in Alberta and B.C. We're hoping that we can effect an agreement that will acknowledge the professional compensation that our nurses deserve and that will reinforce the effectiveness of our health care system. I suppose, sir, that only when we get to that point, in terms of contracts down the road, will either the Member for Seven Oaks or I be able to determine which one of us is right.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I know I'm racing the clock, I want to thank the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge for her comments. I have dealt with the Lakeshore District Health System and the different component projects that have been approved, to go into that spectrum. I've also dealt with the Children's Hospital and with the Deer Lodge question and if the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge doesn't mind, I would refer her to Hansard transcripts of some of our debates during my estimates, during these past few days.

Just let me, though, clarify her contention with respect to the 175 beds that are going to be taken out, and I emphasize, that are going to be taken out of the Health Sciences Centre when Seven Oaks Hospital is on stream. She says that was not the case from the beginning of time and that the beginning of time was not the election of the Progressive Conservative government. Well, I don't think this is the moment to debate that point, Mr. Chairman, but I want to assure the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that she was in another arena when those kinds of determinations were made in this arena and certainly the projected changeover of those 175 beds was part of the Clarkson-Vayda Report and certainly from the day we took office we had made it clear that kind of shift of beds was part of the planning with respect to those two facilities. I hope she's under no illusions about that. It has certainly been part and parcel of the provincial planning in my experience and in my memory, both as a member of the opposition and as Minister.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. R. (PETE) ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder just how many hospital beds are occupied on a revolving basis by patients who have respiratory

ailments. I would venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that more work days are lost because of respiratory ailments than perhaps any other disease.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, speaking to one of the administrators in the hospital in the Parklands region and I was advised that 80 percent of the patients who came into the hospital, the majority of the 80 percent had respiratory ailments, and of course the other ailment was enteritis, or something to do with stomach ailments. Of course this suggested to me that it was either poor housing and poor water or poor nourishment, but nevertheless, respiratory ailment is a major problem. You know, I don't know all the different ailments that there are but I do know of some of them: Asthma, bronchitis, hay fever, emphysema and so on. But I do not believe that we here in Canada — and I'm not singling out the Minister in Manitoba for any criticism — I do not believe that we have made the advances in this area that other countries have made. I know that there is a tremendous loss of work, days work, because of colds, respiratory, coughs and influenza, and so on.

For instance in Poland, they have a hospital specifically for respiratory diseases. Every patient in that hospital has a respiratory ailment of some sort and the rate of cure is extremely high. I'm not sure just how permanent these cures are but I know the success rate is extremely high. Mr. Chairman, this hospital in the town of Wieliczka in Poland is in a salt mine underground, about 400 feet underground. I'm not sure exactly how many beds there are. My Polish colleague says 100, over 100 beds, which deals specifically with respiratory ailments. They're not sure just what the cause is, whether it's because of the salt environment in the mine. The mine is still operating as far as the salt mine is concerned. It's a full-fledged mine and it's operating but there is a hospital in there in conjunction with the salt mine, Mr. Chairman. I'm not suggesting that the Minister go out tomorrow and start building one but I suggest that if we look into some of the statistics, we will find that it may be very worthwhile to keep people on the jobs and keep some of those other hospital beds open; it may be a better thing. I know there is another hospital of similar type in Russia so they have also found in Russia that there was some benefit to have a hospital underground in a salt mine.

Now the Minister perhaps or some of his staff may have information on this but I have never heard any information in this regard, but I do know that there are a lot of respiratory problems. I know people go to Mexico to try and get cured, to try and get assisted; I know that there really is no cure, as far as I know, a permanent cure in Canada, so maybe we should be looking at some of these things to find out what has happened in this area. I hope this doesn't catch the Minister by surprise but I throw this out for his information. I don't know whether he was aware of this but in any event I put that in the record for whatever it's worth.

In regard to relieving some of the hospital beds that we seem to be having a problem with and a shortage of nursing care beds, I would ask the Minister if there has been an application for additional personnel care beds to be added to the Gendreau Memorial Nursing Home in Ste. Rose. I understand that there is some talk of 28 additional

beds and I'm just wondering if there is any validity to that suggestion.

I would ask the Minister, as well, to advise when the construction of the nursing home addition to the hospital in Winnipegosis will get under way. As we all know, that there have been very long delays in construction of this facility. I know that I shouldn't be talking about specifics on the health care in the Nursing Home section but, since this is tied in with the hospital I would ask the Minister now that the tenders have been closed, I believe the end of March or February, and if he would advise me when we're going to proceed with this and if he could give me the savings, the costs, that the present facility is going to cost, in comparison to what was proposed last year.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and perhaps the Minister wants to comment on what I have said. I have another comment to make but I think I'll wait for the Minister's Salary.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the Minister a couple of questions. He referred in one of his answers to the Member for St. Boniface, who referred to a study prepared over the last ten years of the percentage expenditure in Health as compared with the entire budget, and he read to us the figures from the last three years. I wonder if he'd be prepared to table the ten-year figures which he said he had had prepared for him and also to, if possible, show us the categories from which he gathered them together, such as the dental or the Medicare or whatever.

Finally, I would like to know whether he took into account the variations in presentation of the estimates such as in certain years there may have been a netting out and in other years there may have been gross figures shown, for example, in the Property Tax Credit Plan or in some Medicare and health services themselves; I think there were changes in the last ten years where certain figures were netted out and in other years they were grossed. I would like to know whether that was taken into account and I would like to know if he would file with us a copy of these ten-year calculations.

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

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDIN:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some comments following those made by the Minister. He talked about the climate again; he brought this in and I guess we can argue forever on that one. I might say that the climate does not only — I want to repeat does not only — take one group and he's talked about, he's made no secret that there was supposed to be a confrontation with the doctors and I might say that the main complaint of the doctors seem to be in their fees, and in the years that I was there there was no control, they always got the maximum allowed under the law. So I don't think that is the only thing.

One of the things, you don't hear as much maybe although you do hear, is the working conditions, even of the medical profession, who some of them are

leaving, not because of the fees but because of the drastic budget cut in the hospitals and in the facilities that they have.

Also we've talked about the nurses. We have the situation of the nurses who, when we had a surplus, we were graduating a hundred more than they did the following year. So this certainly has something to do with the climate. Because we worry about everybody in that field. We worry about the people cleaning up and so on and go on and find out what the climate is, what they think of the climate with these people. But as I say and the Minister said the same thing, we can argue until the cows come home and we won't solve this. We each have our own opinion on that.

The Minister also tried to say that the policy of the NDP party was that nobody should try to raise funds in the health field. That's not the case at all. And the Minister talked about certain areas where that's being done and that had been done and was being done for years, such as the Tache Hospital. They had a committee there who has worked for years and years. There was a Tea yesterday at the St. Boniface Nursing Home and there was a meeting with the parents to explain the situation. But what we're concerned about is that the basic, what the government is saying that they will accept as their responsibility when you have to raise the money to cover that because that is being done, that is the concern that we have.

There's an awful lot of things that the government will not do and the government should not do, and that is being done in many instances. The Minister and I assisted at the same opening of a facility the Grey Nuns had at the St. Boniface; three or four programs, with no participation from the government. That is good and that should continue. You certainly need the volunteers and you need anybody; you should never refuse money when it comes to that. But we were talking about the basic and that is the important thing, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister also here again, I won't argue with him, the Minister says that we've got one of the best health programs there is, and I say, certainly, we agree also and we state that the Minister inherited that, in the years . . . The Minister not too long ago said, well, what can you do in this field in so short years. Well, look at what was done in eight years, starting with the premiums that disappeared completely that were not adequate. The 10 percent that the municipalities had to pay for any construction of these things. The Pharmacare, the Northern Ambulance Program, the Day Care, which is not exactly, what do they call it, I think, pure health but I think it is in that field. The Dental Program for the children. We wouldn't have any of these now. Many of the other provinces don't have. They're looking at that and that's why they envy Manitoba, because of all of these programs, Mr. Chairman. The Day Care for the elderly now. Granted, the government has gone that after a pilot project but that was one of the things that was started also. The money that was put in the clinics. Earlier this afternoon the Minister was very pleased because of the work that they were doing in preventing suicide at the Health Sciences Centre. The clinics have done all kinds of that and then you compare the cost of the clinics and the cost of the

private clinic where these things aren't done, so you can't compare these things, Mr. Chairman.

Now the Minister is saying that health is not only hospital and Medicare. Well, I don't think you have to be too intelligent to realize that. I don't think our definition of health is that much different, if it is different at all. That is not the point. And when he's talking about the total cost, he might be comparing apples and apples, that was never denied, that wasn't the point we're bringing at all. Of course he's going to spend more money. For instance, it's going to cost much more money when there's another hospital when Seven Oaks opens; and all these personal care homes that were built around there, they didn't exist before and they have to have a budget. Of course it's going to be costly. That is not the point that we are making at all. The point is that that is something, that is the responsibility, it has always been the responsibility of the provinces and that is why some provinces, it is not a national, a countrywide program, that is why so many other provinces don't have these programs and they don't want these programs. Especially in all the meetings that I've had, you can always see the Conservative provinces, such as Ontario and Alberta, they didn't want that, they felt that the people could do for themselves. But now the Minister is giving the seal of approval on our program and he's proud of this program and so are we. But the comparison — when we said that he withheld funds, Mr. Chairman, the policy of the government for years, when they started these programs, they only started hospitalization and they started Medicare, those were the two programs that were national and they paid, it was a cost-sharing arrangement, when that was discontinued, we compared the money, they received much more money, the money that went into that and the money that was spent for the hospitals and for Medicare, it was never felt that all that money, that all of a sudden the federal government had accepted the responsibility for all health care in the provinces; that was never done. So if you are going to compare, that is where the Minister is comparing apples and oranges. Where you're comparing the way the financing was for Medicare and hospitalization. And that is the area — for instance, if you take that in, there was a certain amount of money under CAP for personal care homes. In 1976-77, the last year of the cost-share formula, the federal government paid 26 percent, approximately 26 percent of the cost on personal care homes, and any funds that came in, to be honest with the government, not to charge all the funds to hospital and Medicare, I deducted that, I took 26 percent of the total cost as defined by the Minister, and there were more and more of these personal care homes, and I still continually took 26 percent and deducted that from the total amount received from the federal government.

Well the federal government, including that 13.7 million that it paid under CAP, replacement for personal care homes, the share of the federal government for hospital, medical and personal care homes in 1976-77 was 185,100,000 and the share for those three things of the provincial government at the time was 191.2 which was in excess of 6 million more than the share provided by the federal government. In 1977-78, and that came after the election, we did know the amount and although we

had provided for quite an increase, well then the share of the federal government increased by 17 million, 17 million, the share of the Manitoba, what we had budgeted for when we were responsible for the budget before the election, our share was 196.6, an increase of over 6 million. Then in 1978-79, and if you look at the deductions, and I am just going to deal with hospital and medical now and remembering that I took 26 percent out of the total amount from the government, and in fact the amount that I have is not the correct amount, more money came after that, a few million dollars came after that, and then the share for hospital and Medicare from 198 in 1977-78, the federal government share went to 230, and the Manitoba share went from 152 to 132. And we certainly would not have taken all this money and dumped it in the hospital and personal care homes. There's no doubt, because you have to allow for new facilities and so on. But we wouldn't have gone down like this government did. And I asked repeatedly what was the rationale for 2.9, I was never given that. The Minister that first year said we'll give it to you during the estimates; at estimate time he said well they asked for 13 percent or 14, whatever it was, we had a chance to give no increase at all, we decided on 2.9. And the Minister said it was more than that, but with the point that he covered with the equipment depreciation, it cut down to 2.2 percent, and that was the freeze, he said, well the next year we'll give them for two years. But that is it, that is not good management at all, it is the same hot-dog play by the premier of this province, who the first year froze the salary of the MLA, for no reason at all it was attached, you were taking into consideration the inflation factor, and the cost of living and all of a sudden, this year there going to increase that and more than if this thing was allowed to go, so I understand. All right, maybe there should have been an increase. That never should have been touched, it was a hot-dog play, it was a show-off play to show we're in control. And this government did not know where it was going in that year, and the recommendation did not come from the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health was told by the Minister of Finance who had no idea what was going on in this department, and his share was 10 million that they were supposed to save, they never did it; and that was made public with the first interview that the newspapers had with the present Minister of Health. This is what he was told.

What were they based on? They said well that was good management but there were problems somewhere else, we had Saunders and all that. So you took it out of Health, that's what we're saying, you took it out of Health to pay something else. I'm not saying that there were that many scandals in areas, that wasn't my . . . collectively yes, but my main responsibility was the Department of Health. I challenge the Minister, tell us where all these scandals, where all this money was going to waste, no that's not in this department. But money was taken from this department to pay somewhere else, and when the Minister said that he wants to compare us with other provinces, that is false. When he's saying that there is only six, eight percent in a year for other provinces, he forgets that he had six percent but following a 2.9 percent. You've got to take the two years together. You know, if you're

going to stop at one thing . . . it doesn't mean a thing, because they had eight percent of what? of the budget and maybe another eight percent before, that's 16 percent, more than 16 percent because the second eight percent is on the original thing plus the original eight percent. And that is not the case here at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we have a system, and if I could continue, 1977-78, well then the hospital budget, and I took my honourable friend's figure, if I've got this correct, was 264 million, and even if you just look at the total of the hospital, not the share of the federal government, in 1978-79 it was 260, does that make sense in a period of inflation? And Mr. Chairman, this terrific management, this responsible — (Interjection)— not 69, 79, 78-79 for hospital, I'm going by the same figure that was requested during the estimate with the adjustment and all my figures are the same, I'm not playing games, I took the same figures, I can't compare one and change the next year. And that was a reduction, and then their share, if we go on with the share, I'm talking about the share with the arrangement with the federal government, you know, and that would have been, Mr. Chairman, this 260, if that had been 50-50 it would have been what? — 130 for each. And then the same thing with medical; and then the medical the increase, the majority of the money that was spent — and I'm not saying they had any choice — was in larger increases to the medical profession. And that's all right, when you combine it together it looks good but what have you done in the hospital, what have you done in a hospital, and the service is going down. If you're looking even at that as a total thing, it was 362, should have been 181; well the share of the federal government was 230 and the provincial government 132. So that is what I'm talking about when you make the comparison. When he wants to look at the total field, of course he's spent more money and of course we've had approximately one third, and of course there were more hospital beds even though there was a freeze, there were more beds in production and it's no use building these things, a Minister can't say, this is what you paid that year, of course we would have had to pay the budget for those other places. The 2.9 percent, what actually is a 2.2 percent if you take into consideration the equipment depreciation, and that's an important thing, and of course they couldn't live with that.

At no time, this is the first time that I heard the Minister say this was supposed to be for one year only. When he was questioned in that year he never said that, because he was questioned that year, that wasn't that at all, nobody knew and the hospitals didn't know and I asked, where are they going, what can they expect and that was never said, this is for one year only.

You know you're supposed to continue the work, you're not going to stop all the wheels and shut the fan and the motors and everything, everytime there's a change of government. This government has said, and they want the people to believe, that we weren't responsible, all over, in the Department of Health and everything and they had to shut the fan, shut the motors and everything and look to see what was going and that was what we're paying for now. I've repeatedly asked the Minister, how much did your

freeze of personal care bed construction, how much did that cost us, because we were talking about 175, 1975 dollars and now we're talking about this year 1980 dollars and there's a difference in that, not only with the inflation factor but also in the cost of many of things and also for the question of borrowing money which is an important thing, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister has been throwing these figures, and I'm not saying that it isn't right but it gives the impression that, capital program for 97,000 last year, 50,000 this year and . . . we found that 70 million last year wasn't spent yet, it will be spent over years because you don't do it in one year. Of course, but that is a point that should be made clear also; it wasn't 97 and 50 and so much next year; and that is why it doesn't mean a thing when a government, any government will talk about, I'm not saying that shouldn't be done, you have to look at the future, but when you are making an announcement of 175 million, you're throwing these figures in ten years, or 200 million, it doesn't mean a damn thing, Mr. Chairman, because that can be changed so fast, and the proof is that we did that in 1976, we gave the approval to these hospitals and that was frozen and in some areas like in Eriksdale and so on, that was cancelled.

The government has the main responsibility to go ahead and see what it's going to do during its term of office, until the next election. I'm not saying, don't misunderstand me, I'm not saying that you can't plan, of course you should plan, but when you are sitting down and deciding what has been done, and that is what we're talking about, when we're talking about there's going to be 390 more beds of proprietary nursing homes and there's not one done yet, that's going to be announced next year and the following year; and the same thing for personal care beds. And the situation is so different now, you know, if we had people in acute beds, if we had people that didn't belong there, and we had some, because we also did not have all the room. I had to smile when the Member for Fort Rouge said, build all the beds until there's no need. That's impossible, in personal care beds. Now the reason why this was done, and you can't fault this government not more than our government, at one time, it was build, build, build and it was always acute beds. You know the main reason why? Because it was cost-shared and the others weren't. So if you can get 50, if you only pay 50 cents on a dollar well then it made sense to build these kind of beds, and it encouraged that and that is why the ministers of the different provinces and Manitoba were presented when we met with the federal government, we tried to have some kind of an exchange and to have them recognize personal care beds, because it was ridiculous, you were building at the top and then you were filling in with the . . . In our days when we tried, because of the cost-share agreement and personal care wasn't covered, Mr. Chairman, if people were in St. Boniface Hospital or the Health Science Centre and if they had been paralysed to be in a personal care home, and they didn't have any beds available and they had to stay there, we couldn't charge anything, and this government, and quite rightly, they did the right thing, we tried and the federal government said, no you can't do it. Now they are getting 8.25 a day for those 960 people that are in these beds. That

adds a little bit, Mr. Chairman, so the thing when we were saying that the money was kept, it is that there was much more money coming from the federal government and the government decided, and the Minister said we had the freeze thing, it was only one-year deal. We had to know what we were going but the money was coming in. He wasn't saying to Ottawa, keep that money until we know where we are going. They took that money, you can just imagine now that the total debt is for every man, woman and child in the province is 800 more than when we left government. You can just imagine — (Interjection)— I beg your pardon. No, not for that reason, no, definitely, because if it had been that you would have kept on. What you should have done, not freeze everything and say everything has got to stop when you got a new government, and we have got to see what we are doing. We don't approve any of these things, freeze and cost money, because we were talking about 1975 dollars and so on and if they didn't have this money, it would even be more. You know, they weren't delivering a service and that isn't what the argument is all about. They were cutting down on the budget and I've asked the Minister repeatedly. I don't give a damn what they do in other provinces; I want to know what they do in Manitoba and I want to know how you can stay on a true budget increase of 8 percent for a hospital, especially after coming after 4 percent and 6 percent. How can you say . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** That's all I need, Mr. Chairman. How can you say, Mr. Chairman, that 8 percent is a realistic figure when the wages are going to go up more than that and that's — what — roughly 70 percent in this field are wages, where the cost of x-rays, food, and some equipment is gone 20-25 percent or more. Mr. Chairman, it can't be done but the Minister argued that the standard is not going down. He's saying I'm spending as much money. We're not talking about that; there are more facilities here, you're spending less money. You've got more beds than you had and you have to pay for that. There's more construction and that will have to be paid. It is a very difficult situation.

Mr. Chairman, before I forget, if I've got a few minutes. The Minister and I know that he knows that, but I want to make this correction to make sure that all the members of the committee realize, the Minister said that the guideline was roughly, I think he said four beds per 1,000. Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not that simple. There is a lot of other factors. You have to take in the area; you have to take the aged people; you have to take even the cultured, for instance. There's certain people like some of the native and so on, you will in an area if they were all native, the 1,000 people, they need more beds. The other facility, I guess, even their financial status has to be taken into consideration, so it's not that simple that you are going to divide the people and say, there's a 1,000 beds. The aged people — we are going closer and closer to a more senior population in Manitoba. It might be that we'll have to save somewhere else but this is not the time to save in this. When we were saying that they would have

funds, they did exactly that, and they can say what they want — that they put the total — but the total was not cost-shared. There two programs cost-shared, where the government said we were going to bring in a program and they were the ones that started hospitalization. Mind you, it was started in Saskatchewan and other places but across the country, it was hospitalization and medicare. They say it's a universal program; it has to be in all the provinces. You have to accept certain things and that was accepted by all the provinces. At one time some of them were talking of staying out and that was cost-shared and then they replaced that. That's that money and now the Minister feels that share should pay for half or a portion of all the healthy. Of course, all these things that are mentioned are part of the health care but many of those were the responsibility of the province or the provinces, and that is one of the reasons, as I said, that you haven't got these programs in all the other provinces. Manitoba felt — and that's the difference between the two parties, I guess — that was high priority. You know, it's not necessarily the richest country in the state. It's a disgrace; in the United States they haven't got a program of hospital and medicare and you know what it does to certain people. They could be ruined if they have sickness in the family, because when you have sickness, if it's your child and so on, you don't give a darn. You will lose your business, your reputation and everything, to help that child, especially if that child dies anyway, you are stuck with a bill that you can't pay for the rest of your life.

Here in Canada, we got a darn good life. It could be criticized by some; it could be criticized that even the medical profession are making. The medical profession were always saying that in 1970 they would have no increase. But if they went one year previous to that and, when it was decided to go in this, there was an increase; there was an average increase per doctor of 10,000 per each doctor and that was a lot of money in those days. That was all money collected where before that they weren't collecting a large part of the money. So I'm not saying that they should not have an increase, but let's look at the true picture. If they want to compare between an accountant, well then they should take the 10,000 and go back where they got a big jump all of a sudden because of medicare. Because I dare say, that medicare made it a lot easier for them financially but that's not their only complaint. They have some concern and when you have a program that is universal, there is some problems, there is some abuse. I recognize that, Mr. Chairman, but I wanted to make this point that we are not debating, we are not contradicting the Minister when he says health care is more than hospital and medicare. We know that but when he is talking about the contract, the agreement, that the Government of Canada had when they started this program that they were going to cost-share these programs. Then the system was changed and that is the money that we're looking at in this area.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I owe the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge a response to two or three questions that I didn't have enough time to cover when I was last on my feet. The member made several comments with respect to the

approximate total of 700 active treatment beds in Manitoba currently being occupied by personal care patients and observed that personal care beds are better because the cost is so much lower. No one is arguing that personal care beds are necessary for people who need them and there are obviously some 690 patients in that category or 580; 110 are candidates for extended care beds, but the approximate number cited by the honourable member does certainly represent patients who, in the main, are categorically in need of personal care beds. But I don't think that anybody should be left under the illusion that personal care beds are better because the cost is so much lower, Mr. Chairman. The argument that supplying personal care beds for those particular citizens of Manitoba would represent a cost saving, should not be a consideration in the determination of whether we need personal care beds in the first place. But given that argument advanced by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge — and it has been advanced editorially once or twice in the media — I want to deal with it briefly. That is a myth; that is an inaccurate assessment of the situation. Those who argue that way argue that you're taking a 150 a day active treatment bed and replacing it with a 35 a day personal care bed or a 50 a day extended care bed. The fact of the matter, Sir, is that you're not taking a 150 a day active treatment bed to begin with. The costs of beds are composed of far more than the capital cost of building them. It's the operating cost of staffing them; the equipment that is necessary to service active treatment patients; the diets that are necessary, the special biologicals that are necessary; the specialized nursing care that is necessary — that's what makes them active treatment bed cost 150 a day. Those who are in them, unless they are acute care patients — if they are there as personal, essentially personal care or extended care patients — are receiving the kind of staffing, the kind of infrastructure in terms of support and equipment that is consistent with personal care and extended care. Therefore, what you're looking at is a bed that essentially costs precisely, in terms of what it takes to operate it, what a personal care bed or an extended care bed would cost. Now, I repeat that I don't think that — and I don't think the Member for Fort Rouge is suggesting that this should be a consideration in terms of personal care bed needs anyway, but I want to correct that mythology, not only for the benefit of any of us in this Chamber who may be labouring under it, but for the benefit of some editorial commentators who are labouring under it.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge addressed the question of the supply of doctors to rural points in Manitoba. I appreciate her comments and it's certainly a challenge that is uppermost in my mind, and foremost in the considerations of the Health Services Commission, the MMA, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and officials in my office and myself. Once again, I must say that it is a virtual universal challenge in North America; the pole of urbanization has made it difficult for most of us in most states and provinces to staff our rural communities with professionals in the manner that they deserve. We are trying to cope with the various attractions and blandishments of urban life by

offering other enticements and inducements that will level that equation out a little more effectively. That is one of the primary challenges facing the standing committee on medical manpower.

Certainly there are some interesting initiatives that have been attempted in some jurisdictions but some of those initiatives, to use the term of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, are somewhat Draconian and if one is forced to resort to them, then, one is forced to resort to them such as the stipulation that graduates of one's medical school must repay the jurisdiction for the benefits of their education by serving a certain period of time in rural or remote communities. We haven't found it acceptable to proceed along those lines yet, Sir. Unless there be any incomplete impression left with anybody, I want to state quite clearly that we're not contemplating that kind of action, but certainly it has been tried and utilized in the state of Kansas and a number of other states and jurisdictions in North America that have had that difficulty and continue to have the difficulty to some degree. So those kinds of ideas have been proposed to us, but we're not looking at that sort of thing. We're very hopeful that there are other forms of support and inducement, such as those mentioned by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge in terms of helping the young practitioners to establish their practice and providing educational leave opportunities and providing opportunities for group practice so that they are not faced with 24-hours-a-day, seven-day-a-week commitments and that type of thing. I appreciate her comments.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge also spoke about the nursing shortage and she said, I can't see why we can't get some accurate projections so as to level out the supply. Well, I intreat the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge to give me some ideas and give me some suggestions. I need her help. I sat with the President of the University of Manitoba, the head of the School of Nursing at the University of Manitoba, the Dean of Medicine, the Dean of Pharmacology, the Dean of Dentistry and two or three other academic leaders the other day. It's not the first time I addressed this very subject and it is a baffling social fact that the nursing supply is threatened cyclically by shortages. Whether that results from the fact that, as I suggested the other day, that our pattern of life style and tradition in the western world finds the married woman often devoting her efforts to the home, where the married man does not and remains the breadwinner, or from some other reason. I cannot advise the honourable member. She probably knows the answer to that much better than I do and probably has much deeper insights to it than I do, but I can assure her that if she's got the solution to the cyclical shortage of nurses, which is endemic in the profession and endemic in North America generally, then I would ask her to cross party lines at least for one half-hour and give me that miracle solution, because the President of the University of Manitoba and the Dean of the School of Nursing at the University of Manitoba don't have it. We are attempting to develop some methodology and some documentation that will give us some answers that will have some effect in reducing the impact of that cyclical supply. None of them has suggested to me

that there is any answer that will level it out even, but we are hopeful that with some research that's being done into the subject now, that we might be able to produce some initiatives that will minimize it in the future.

I say for the benefit of honourable members opposite once again, that Manitoba is not the only jurisdiction in North America that is either in the midst of an incipient nursing shortage, or facing a potential one, and some of the reasons are profound and linked to substantial evolutionary changes in our patterns of life, in our society and in our career patterns as they affect and relate to men and women. But the Schools of Nursing are addressing that. The counsellors in nursing are addressing it. The consulting committee's working with my office on the subject, and the administrators of the various hospitals have recommended the establishment of a Standing Committee on Nursing Manpower, which would complement the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower and we intend to move quickly in that direction, Mr. Chairman. We hope that we can find some answers to the long-term cyclical problem. It's not just a matter of meeting immediate needs but we would like to find some answers that will minimize that kind of phenomenon in the future.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Boniface has made considerable and repeated reference to the current funding format and program in effect in the health care field since April 1, 1977, and the obligations of the province is, as he sees them under the EPF contract, and he has said, unless I've misunderstood him, that personal care homes were really not a part of that concept of federal funding. But I think that the record demonstrates that they most definitely were, Mr. Chairman. The 20.00 per capita that was included under the EPF formula was precisely to replace the Canada Systems Plan funding for nursing homes. And, Sir, I believe the documentation is very clear on the record in the words of the Prime Minister of the day, Prime Minister again, but the Prime Minister of that day, the Health Minister of that day and the Finance Minister of that day, the Right Honourable Pierre Trudeau, the Honourable Marc LaLonde and the Honourable Donald MacDonald, that precisely in the area of rationales and reasonings for EPF and support and justifications for EPF was this recognition of the legitimate right and the legitimate good reason for provinces to have some expanded and relatively unlimited control in determining what their health care needs were and where the health care dollars directed to that province, could most effectively be spent. That documentation is clear and on the record. —(Interjection)—

And we have pursued, or I certainly have pursued the principle that what matters to Manitobans is that the Minister of Health of this province obtain every reasonable dollar that he can, out of the global provincial budget for health care spending, for health care services. And, Sir, I stack my record up against my predecessors and against my contemporaries. I don't think that in that respect I have to take a back seat to anybody. I have secured and obtained, as I've pointed out, a full one-third of the budget for health care in Manitoba, and that compares favourably with anybody and better than most.

The other questions, Mr. Chairman, were from the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. I dealt with the question of Winnipegosis and the new personal care home the other evening. I wonder if the honourable member would mind referring to the records in Hansard on that subject. I think he can expect a construction start on that personal care home very shortly. With respect to the Gendreau Nursing Home, we had preliminary discussions only. We have not yet received a formal proposal from them.

He offered some interesting advice and commentary on respiratory hospitals, respiratory facilities, and one in particular in Poland which certainly was a helpful addition to the debate. I want to assure him though that we have a very high quality, a very highly recognized respiratory unit here at the Rehabilitation Hospital which is fairly typical of the way in which these services are organized across Canada and which is in fact recognized in its own right as a leader in this field in Canada, so that I think we can take pride as Manitobans in what we've achieved thus far in that field but certainly his comments are important in the context of health care examination, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (d)—pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** I just wanted to ask the Minister whether in his comments the other day, did he talk about the price, the costs of the present structure and the previous tender that was unacceptable. I'm not sure whether he put those figures into the record.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, I did, Mr. Chairman. I advised committee at the time that it looks as though the new contract will be approximately 200,000 less than the original tender last winter.

**MR. ADAM:** I thank the Minister for that answer. In regard to the respiratory situation in Manitoba, I can say to him that as far as I'm concerned it's not that good. He may think it's good. It may compare favourably with other jurisdictions in Canada, but I say to him that there are thousands of people who cannot receive treatment — they receive treatment but they don't get cured. I can speak for myself, I can speak for my brother, I can speak for hundreds of other people. There is just absolutely no cure; they can't cure it. You know, they may be able to cure some of the . . . they can relieve, but they haven't got the problems solved. Maybe there isn't sufficient research. But I know that I have a brother that's living in Calgary; he left Manitoba because he couldn't live here. He went to Calgary because the climate there was more acceptable to him, but he has to go to Mexico every year to get drugs because he can't find those drugs in Canada. They're not here; they do not exist in Canada. I know that one of the Ministers, the former Minister of the Saskatchewan government, Mr. Thibodeau, I think his name is, he goes every year to Mexico to get assistance there.

Mr. Chairman, we don't want to go to Poland. We hope we don't have to go to Poland to get assistance, but that's the way it is now. And for the Minister to say that we have a very good system

here, no, we do not. We have absolutely nothing as far as I'm concerned. I can speak for myself personally and I can speak for others that I know, and I think it's time that we do make some, because we do have all kinds of environmental farm lungs. You have chemicals that the farmers are using that are hazardous and are exposed to it, not adequately protected, anhydrous ammonia and formaldehyde and mercury to treat grain, all kinds of dusts that they use to treat their grains for seeding and all that; there's a host of problems, and it's recognized, but very very little is being done. I say there is absolutely nothing in Manitoba or anywhere else in Canada for that matter.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c)—pass; (d)—pass. Resolution No. 79—pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 545 . . .

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I think that the understanding was that Hospitals would be passed and that we adjourn and keep Medicare and the Minister's Salary.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the honourable members, if there is understanding, I wish they would let the Chairman know.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** That's what I am doing now; you were a little fast.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think under discussion I had allowed some latitude and I thought that possibly Health and the Hospitals were being discussed at the same time, so if it's . . .

**MR. DESJARDINS:** You mean Medicare and Hospitals.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well then, there is only one item left, and that's Medical Program after (c), so we pass (c) and I will go to Medical Program. Medical Program—pass.

The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I move committee rise, Mr. Chairman, on the passage of (c), the Hospital Program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's fair enough. Committee rise.