

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 24 April, 1980.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE
AFFAIRS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Jim Galbraith (Dauphin): I call the committee to order. We are on Resolution 38, 5. (a)(1) — the Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister was raising a point this afternoon in discussion with the Member for Churchill and I would like to ask the Minister just what educational programs has the department prepared, or is it preparing programs for the education of the general public and especially our younger people, in order that these people who will be our consumers and producers of pollution in the world that they will shortly inherit, I wonder if the Minister and his department is producing, or has produced an educational program, say, for the school children.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): The Honourable Minister.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Yes, Mr. Chairman. In response to my honourable friend's question, the department has and continues to respond to requests from schools for speakers, to organizations and the like whenever speakers are asked to deal with either the general subject of the environment or specific subjects, and we respond to those requests as often as we receive them.

I might also say that I'm sure that the thought has occurred to my honourable friend that a more extensive program of public information should be made available. So it is our intention to add to the staff of the department an information officer that will attempt to correlate that kind of information and to attempt to provide an ongoing program of education and information about environmental matters to the public.

I might just add that in response to his request about requests for speakers, I'm advised that we respond to about 100 requests a month on various subjects relating to environmental matters.

MR. JENKINS: Would the position that is shown here under Environmental Management, Program Development and Review, a director vacant. Would this be where the Minister is intending to fill the person that he's talking about?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, before . . .

MR. JENKINS: And I don't want to get down to that.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, I'd like to respond to that question in this way. We have just begun a process

of reorganization of the department and part of that reorganization will be a directorate that will be responsible for information and education programs. So although it is not shown in the estimates as yet, the reorganization chart will show a change in that direction.

MR. JENKINS: This afternoon, the Minister was dealing with these guidelines and objectives. I am particularly interested in the field of noise pollution and I wonder if the Minister, before we leave the item altogether and I don't expect that they'll have it this evening, but I wonder if the staff could prepare what is the recommended guidelines and objectives of the decibels of noise as suggested or recommended by the Commission for, say, residential areas, semi-residential, light industrial, heavy industrial, agriculture, semi-agriculture, and especially the city streets of major thoroughfares, and if that sort of data was available it would be appreciated.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to have that information prepared for my honourable friend; I am sure it must be available somewhere.

MR. JENKINS: The storage of hazardous and toxic materials; do they come under this department, Mr. Chairman?

MR. JORGENSEN: I beg your pardon?

MR. JENKINS: The storage of toxic and hazardous materials which I think the province does store some at the Gimli Industrial Park; are they under this department — the control. I believe when we were dealing with the Government Services, he lead us to believe that while it was the physical property for storage that was under his department — the space, the control of that was under Environmental Management, and if that is correct I have a few questions for the Minister.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, we have the responsibility for determining what materials will be placed in storage at the storage centre at Gimli and I might add it's essentially, almost exclusively I would think, waste material from government departments. We don't store any private stuff in there; it's government departments waste that's stored at Gimli, hazardous materials.

MR. JENKINS: That is strictly government waste, hazardous toxic materials, that we're storing there.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, government departments and institutions, hospitals and the like.

MR. JENKINS: Yes. These storage tanks; how far are they situated away from inhabited areas — and what I'm thinking of in particular is Aspen Park Lodge, which is on the old airforce site. Does the Minister have any idea of how close or how far and

what precautions are posted in the area for the residents because I understand there might be some small children around there in that area?

MR. JORGENSEN: I don't know whether I have that precise information as to distances located from residential areas. I am advised that it's something like 700 to 1,000 feet away from the park. I'm sure my honourable friend is aware that the area is pretty thoroughly fenced.

MR. JENKINS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This afternoon the Minister was saying that when industry introduces new processes that may pollute the environment, what has been the record? Do companies that are, say, going to introduce a new manufacturing process that may produce hazardous or toxic waste, do they contact the Clean Environment Commission as a rule, or the department, to see if there are guidelines set out by the Commission in order to control the pollutants that may be discharged into the atmosphere? And what has been the record? Do we have some industries that do this or are there some that the department is not aware of?

MR. JORGENSEN: There is no requirement that they approach the branch. But it has been the practice, almost invariably, that they do appear before the department to attempt to determine what environmental regulations they may be subjected to, the level of emissions, etc., so that they have some idea of how to plan their operation.

I might add that the announcement that was made the other day about potash development, they've already approached the department for information regarding their development.

Again, there is about 100 requests a month from different companies enquiring about information, and they do this in their own interests, because I think they believe that it's in their best interests to know just what standards they will be subjected to and what regulations there is to live under.

MR. JENKINS: The hazardous materials that are being stored at the Gimli Industrial Site, how do we dispose of them eventually? Is this a responsibility of the Clean Environment Commission or what department of government determines where they will go to? And just how are some of these hazardous and toxic materials finally disposed of?

MR. JORGENSEN: A great deal depends on the particular material itself. There are some industries that can use some of the material that is deposited there and when we do have material that can be used by industry arrangements are made for them to take it away and use it. In other instances we have disposed of a certain amount of that material to the United States and more recently we have contracted with Kinetic Contaminants to move some material out.

MR. JENKINS: I just wonder if the Minister happened to watch a television program, oh I'd say three or four months ago, I'm not sure if it was on Prairie Public Television or whether it was on Channel 13, where there has sprung up, I think in the

United Kingdom, an industry that takes hazardous toxic materials and then reconverts them back into usable chemicals in many cases and sells them back to other industries. Does he know of any similar firms — I don't know whether there would be any in Manitoba but would there be any on the North American continent? Is the Minister aware of that?

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend speaks of an interesting subject, not only in England but there are such disposable facilities in France and Bavaria I believe is another one. Kinetic Contaminants of Alberta have applied to the environmental branch in the province of Alberta for the construction of a hazardous waste disposal plant. That plant, modelled after the one in Bavaria, will dispose of practically every hazardous waste without damage to the environment. We have, as one can probably readily ascertain, the big problem insofar as Manitoba is concerned, is the transportation of those products to the plant. Kinetic Contaminants have their own specially designed trucks that are almost accident proof, specially trained drivers who pick up the material and put it in storage at their storage plant in Alberta. More recently there have been, and I can't identify any particular process, but one reads from time to time of new processes that are being developed for the destruction of hazardous wastes. Now I have no idea how effective these new techniques are or whether they will ever be commercially acceptable. The rotary kiln device, which is the one that is in use in Bavaria and the one that Kinetic Contaminants have applied to construct will handle all types of hazardous wastes, as opposed to some of the others that will only handle certain types. So perhaps they may be the ideal way although it's albeit somewhat costly. They are intending, if their licence to construct such a plant in Alberta and the cost is somewhat high, something in excess of 20 million to build such a plant, if they are successful in their application to build in Alberta they then intend to construct a storage place in the province of Manitoba, where we can deliver our hazardous wastes at such a time as they come through with their truck to pick it up and haul it to the disposal plant.

I think my honourable friend can readily see that that kind of a cost, 20 million and up, of a construction of a plant, there isn't enough hazardous wastes in one province to warrant the construction of such a plant. So perhaps it is preferable, and we have had meetings of the five provinces, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. I attended a meeting in Edmonton a few months ago on this very subject with a view to determining the practicability of developing a system where a storage would be built in each of the provinces and the disposal plant be located in one province, so that you would have an economic system of disposal of wastes. When I say economic, it's by no means cheap, because the costs of transportation is fairly high but it would be an effective way of disposing of that type of waste. Now, that does not mean that all wastes will go in it; there's certain types of waste that can be recycled, as my honourable friend has suggested. There are other types of wastes that can be used in various forms; glass bottles, for example. Ways have been found of commercially using that

material; old tires and paper, as my honourable friend knows, can be recycled. That requires a system that you sort and classify the various types of wastes into different categories. Some of it can be disposed on the local level, some can be disposed of in a regional basis and others still can be disposed of on a provincial level.

The hazardous waste-type will, I think, necessitate a more regional type of disposal, such as I mentioned with Kinetic Contaminants in Alberta. So the question is to devise a system that enables you to collect these wastes and designate them to their proper recycling or disposal plants. In that way, one can get the best and most effective means of preventing the landfill sites of having to accept this type of wastes in areas where perhaps it is not as effective a means of disposal as the recycling method.

I think my honourable friend is aware of one instance, for example, in, was it St. James or St. Vital? One school in the city saved about 80 percent of their cost of heating that school by using waste material. It gives us some idea of how we can convert what is today a waste material into an energy resource, and what we envision as a waste disposal program is that multiple use. Rather than considering waste as a nuisance to be disposed of, it can be considered as a resource to be used for the benefit of mankind. That not only applies to the hazardous wastes, the old tires, bottles and things like that, but it can apply to effluent as well. In some countries it's used very effectively as irrigation, fertilizer, etc.

We have a long way to go to developing an effective waste disposal system but I think the objective is there for us to reach. I come back to a statement that I made earlier today when I said that it does require the co-operation of all groups in society. Unless there is an understanding of the reasons why you are carrying on such a program, there's not likely to be the kind of co-operation that one would like to see. When I say all groups, I mean that the energy or the waste generators have a responsibility and that includes not only industry, that includes the general public have a responsibility in assisting in an effective waste disposal program. I know perhaps it's a long ways away but it is a program that I think is worthy of achieving because it will result not only in a more effective use of waste as an energy source, but as a means of ensuring that our environment is kept reasonably clean it can be even more effective. So we attempt to move in that direction, but I tell my honourable friend right now that without the full knowledge of why you are doing such a thing and without the co-operation of everyone concerned, it's going to be a long way in achieving that goal.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I thank the Honourable Minister for sharing those thoughts with us and, basically, that was what I was leading up to when I asked if he was developing a program, especially I would see the program geared to our younger people, the young people who are now in the schools, that we impress upon them that they will be the consumers of the future. They will be also the polluters of the future

and it behooves us to make sure that they're aware of the environment and how we can protect it.

I'm very interested in the plant that the Minister tells me that is in the discussion stage, and I can quite realize that the one I saw on television was one that was in the industrial midlands of England. Of course, it was short hauling distances and they had the specially developed tanker trucks practically foolproof for hauling the pollutant materials, the hazardous toxic materials and, in fact, they generated their own energy from the waste materials. So it was in that respect I guess it was maybe not as profitable as they would have liked it to have been but it was working and I can quite see, with our scattered population, that it would have to be set up on a regional basis.

I thank the Minister for giving us the benefit of the negotiations and meetings that he's attended. I hope that he will in future make us aware if any changes and any developments come about because I can assure him, that I think we all, as members of the Legislature and the public in general, should be aware of and interested in seeing that this type of a program, which I think in the long run, especially since I heard the other day that now industry is becoming very interested in some of the, not precious metals, but some of the metals that are in short supply that they are now wanting to reclaim, because the mines that we have mined with gay abandon for so many years, some places are petering out and it may eventually become more economical to recycle.

I think there has been cases where they've had mercury recycling, they have found out that it had been cheaper, when they had put in the controls, to recycle than to buy some of the new materials that have been involved. So it is encouraging that governments and industry are becoming more aware and I hope and I wish the Minister well in his educational program and I hope that we will hear more of the program, especially of the production of a hazardous and toxic material reclamation plant that is being talked about.

MR. JORGENSEN: Thank you very much. There is one thing I should point out in this connection and it highlights, I believe, the necessity of making sure that the public generally are aware of what you are doing. It means, I hate call it an educational program, but perhaps I should say an awareness program. I recall a few years ago the city of Winnipeg endeavoured to get people to sort their garbage so that it would be easier to channel it into various means of disposal. The program was an abysmal failure because people just refused to do it. I think the reason it was a failure was because the public generally perceive this as just another bureaucratic order that was designed to relieve the garbage collector of a little extra work. That was not the intention at all. It was, I think, a sincere attempt to try to get the public to co-operate in a program that would enable them to dispose of wastes in the most efficient method.

I'm convinced that had there been a program of education or awareness preceding that order that it might have been acceptable. If people understand why you're doing things and the reasons why it's necessary to do those things, I believe you'd get that

kind of co-operation, particularly today, because there is certainly a greater awareness of the need for proper disposal of wastes than there ever has been before.

Now one other point before we leave this, Mr. Chairman. Alberta has, by virtue of the fact that the need is greater in that province because of industrial development, of course, has taken the lead in this whole question of hazardous waste disposal. They have now produced a film on this whole question. We have a copy of that film and we intend to be reviewing it and I would like to invite my honourable friends to that viewing if they would like to see it. We'll certainly make it available to the members and we'll let you know the time and the date of its showing. I'm sure you'll find it very interesting.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I thank the Minister very much for the offer and I'm sure that I can speak on behalf of my colleagues that we'll certainly accept with pleasure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I start I want to apologize in case I'm going to touch on something that's already been covered. The educational part or awareness intrigues me and I just wondered whether the Minister has already answered whether his awareness program is slanted towards industry or to the public in general, and what is its major thrust? Is it just for hazardous products or is it for all other environmental debilitating factors?

MR. JORGENSEN: I think, as I said earlier, we respond to all requests. We respond to whatever subject that the schools may want us to deal with. If any particular school wants someone to speak on any particular subject we will deal with that. We will also deal with the general subject of waste disposal.

MR. FOX: So it's on request, is that it? It's not . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes.

MR. FOX: The department does not have a program of its own aside from requests?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, as I mentioned earlier and I know my honourable friend is covering ground that has been covered before, but for his information I'll tell him that we are now in the process of a reorganization of the department which will have, as one section of that department, an information program. It is our intention to carry on a much more intensive program of public awareness on the whole question of waste. I think I should point out that the younger generation are becoming keenly conscious of the environment and they're the people that are, perhaps more than anybody, asking for more information. They are wanting to become aware of what the problems are. I think perhaps they hear so much about it and it's vague in their minds, they want to be a little more informed and we're happy to respond to that kind of a demand for information and we intend to carry out, as I say, a far more

intensive program once we have the reorganization of the department completed.

MR. FOX: Yes, I appreciate that and especially since I have a couple of children of my own at the university level who constantly tell me that we haven't done enough to save the environment for them as they're growing up. I tell them I hope they have more success than we've had in trying to get at this problem because it's not a simple issue.

In respect to effluents going into our disposal system, I recall Metro used to have a regular monthly monitoring of this and I'm not aware that it's still being done. Has this been discontinued? I know that a number of industries used to have a monthly monitoring as to the number of solids they could have in their effluents, the packing houses and other industrial outlets.

MR. JORGENSEN: You're speaking of the city of Winnipeg, I presume.

MR. FOX: Yes, but there are also plants outside of the city of Winnipeg, as well, so I would imagine the branch would be involved in that.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm sure that is a fact but I will just wait for . . . Every application for sewage disposal is approved by the department and we continue to monitor their effluent. In the case of the city of Winnipeg, they retain their own monitoring rights and so although they have the standards, they carry on their own monitoring program. So I suppose the response to my honourable friend's question is that, yes, that monitoring is continued on a regular basis.

MR. FOX: Is the standard set by the Environmental Commission or by the city itself?

MR. JORGENSEN: Not for the city of Winnipeg, no.

MR. FOX: Not for the city; so therefore there are no standards for the city of Winnipeg.

MR. JORGENSEN: The city of Winnipeg have retained control over their own water quality standards. They continue to retain that control. I might add that, as a part of a series of studies that are taking place in the various watershed districts, there will be hearings conducted this year on the Red River Basin, and individuals and organizations will have an opportunity to make presentations before that committee and that will include, of course, the city of Winnipeg. So those studies are scheduled to begin sometime in summer and fall, late summer and fall.

MR. FOX: I realize that there's an improvement in the Red River's quality because friends of mine who live along the river say that fish are starting to come back, but there still is a certain amount of disposal takes place between the border and Winnipeg. Can the Minister indicate as to whether there are any definite plans to eliminate that kind of dumping along the Red River? Because if we don't, it will never get cleaned up.

MR. JORGENSEN: The sewage disposal plants along the reaches of the Red River are pretty rigidly controlled and, as I say, they are monitored from time to time. It's not only from sewage disposal plants that the type of pollution that we find in the Red River comes from exclusively. There has been, as my honourable friend knows, a pretty marked change in the use of chemicals on agricultural lands which drain into the Red River.

MR. FOX: They leach into the river.

MR. JORGENSEN: And that unquestionably will and does and have some impact. It's one of the reasons why the series of hearings that are going to be held will be of some benefit because it will give us an idea then to what extent. The decision then as to what can be done or what needs to be done in order to improve quality then becomes obvious to all who use the river and it is hoped the public hearings, as they did in the Souris Basin Study last year, will be an education program in itself and will create a greater awareness of the kind of problem that we are facing with respect to pollution of the watershed.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, in respect to industry such as pulp mills in other areas of the province, how often are they monitored, if they are monitored, or do they just get standards set and that's what they are supposed to abide by, and maybe they may be monitored and maybe they may not; they may have to do their own monitoring?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, every Clean Environment Commission order that is given, and that includes the pulp mills, is monitored to ensure compliance.

MR. FOX: By the department?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, to ensure compliance with the order. There is an ongoing process of monitoring to ensure that the limits set by the Commission are not exceeded.

MR. FOX: There is one other area of environment which interests me and that is that there are small towns all around Manitoba. Do they all get a form of monitoring? Who does the enforcing in the various small areas? Do they all have to make application before they start operations or do they just go ahead whether it's hog ranching or whatever, feed lot operation, and so on?

MR. JORGENSEN: That's right.

MR. FOX: They all have to have permission.

MR. JORGENSEN: As my honourable friend is probably aware, hearings are held on every application and people in the area, who want to make a submission before the Commission, have an opportunity of doing so, and those submissions are then considered in granting the order. I might say that the hearings that are held in the different watershed areas, not only is it an education program but it's prime purpose is to come to some conclusions as to the setting of standards. What standards do the people in that area want for their

water. They believe that the quality of the water, in that particular watershed, is not high enough, but they want to see it higher. Then they have an opportunity of making that kind of submission and then they also have some idea of what may be necessary in order to improve that standard. So it is a two-way process, it gives the department an opportunity of hearing those submissions and at the same time it gives the people an opportunity of getting a better idea of the problems they are faced with. We all have an idea there is a problem, my own particular case along the Red River, I recall as a boy there was no difficulty in putting a diving board at the edge of the river and using it for swimming. After the initial breakup the water cleared up and stayed clear the rest of the year. Today you can almost float on it and I think a lot of people are concerned about it and I think a lot of people want to know just really what causes it. The purpose of those hearings and those studies is to attempt to arrive at that conclusion and to make sure that the evidence is made public.

Now my honourable friend asked questions about livestock production operations and I might say in that connection they are controlled by regulation. There are certain specific limits and standards that are set which they cannot exceed. In addition to that, of course, are the hearings if people in a given area object to the construction of a livestock operation in their area, and they can prove there is sufficient grounds for their objection, then those objections are taken into consideration.

MR. FOX: Well I thank the Minister for that information. The reason I asked is because there is also a possibility that some of these operations may not get into the rivers and streams but they will soak into our water table through leaching action and so on; because I recall a couple of years ago we used to have a problem out in East St. Paul in respect to bad tasting well waters because something had got into the system — I don't know whether they ever did trace where it came from but I notice that lately we haven't heard about it.

That brings me to another area that just recently — I can't recall exactly how long ago — there was a reported oil slick on the Seine River — (Interjection)— it was in today's . . . no I read it earlier; or sludge of some kind — and I just wondered what kind of detective work is done to determine where it came from and what is the enforcement that takes place afterwards because somebody or other has violated and dumped something otherwise it wouldn't be visible. Can the Minister tell the committee what the procedure is in this kind of an instance?

MR. JORGENSEN: When an incident of that nature occurs of course our department will begin an immediate investigation. What we endeavour to do is to trace it, we can't always do that. Sometimes it is very difficult to trace the source but where we can then we will take action to correct it; sometimes after it is discovered in an aquifer it is too late unless there is some way of preventing further leaching into the aquifers.

With respect to the particular problem that my honourable friend mentioned specifically, that oil

slick in the Seine River, I am advised that they have traced that back to —(Interjection)— we think, we better not be too definite because sometimes these things are a little bit deceptive in tracing; we think it is a result of some action on the part of the CNR.

MR. FOX: I see. Another area I would like to explore with the Minister, and that is, occasionally you read about some wildlife or fish being — whatever happens to them they die — not necessarily on this side of the border, but south of the border and yet debris and waste will come through to us because the stream flows north. I know we have an International Water Commission that regulates these things, but what does the Environment Commission do in that regard? Does it first of all determine what happened and then go to the International Board, or do we just turn it over to the board to begin with?

MR. JORGENSEN: As my honourable friend may know an international waterway comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government, and I am aware of at least one of the incidents my honourable friends refers to as sludge, or a slug they call it, that came from, we believe it was a sugar refinery at Grafton, North Dakota. I remember it coming through, we had word of it approaching Morris, and by the time it got to Morris it had dissipated somewhat, the effects were not as severe nor did they last as long as they were in Emerson. At the time they reached there it was impossible to use the water; they were hauling water for about a week into Emerson because they could not use the water that was affected by the slug. Those are problems that occur from time to time and they are dealt with on the federal level.

MR. FOX: So they are just reported to the International Joint Water Commission and they take it up.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, well there is a Red River Pollution Board of which we are a member and it is that Board that deals with those particular problems, and as I am told reports to the International Joint Commission.

MR. FOX: I just have one more area I would like to explore with the Honourable Minister and that is, I was interested in what he was saying about the fact that there was some study being done in respect to recycling of wastes and so on, that there had to be a greater awareness of it.

I do recall a number of years ago, not too long, in fact about three or four, I had occasions to visit the U of M, where a Dr. Gallop was doing — I believe that's his name . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Dr. Gallop.

MR. FOX: . . . was doing a tremendous amount of work into the recycling of waste as well as effluents. My question to the Minister is: To what extent are we following up on this kind of work that has been done, on a very limited basis as I understood it at that time because there were very limited funds; and secondly, in view of the fact that Winnipeg, because

of its large size and because of the amount of waste that is generated, if there had been any kind of cost-benefit study done to see whether there couldn't be utilized some recycling as well as some heat generation, because I understand that the two go hand in hand, and I would certainly appreciate if the Minister could enlighten me a little more on that. I know that the city of Winnipeg councillors did send a delegation over to Germany and Sweden, I believe, to have a look at it, but at that time or how long ago it was, about five or six years ago, they just didn't think that it would be feasible for the city alone to approach it. But in view of the fact that we are now becoming more conscious of the environment, more conscious of recycling and conserving and, of course, using regenerative sources for heat and other energy forms, I just wondered whether the province is it all interested and is looking at it to see what can be done.

MR. JORGENSEN: I am advised that the province shared in the funding of that particular project at the university, the Winnipeg Municipal Study. We are certainly interested in those projects. As a matter of fact, one of the energy research projects that had been going on at the University is the production of methanol. The Department of Agriculture is very interested in that type of program and has worked with the university a great deal in attempting to further develop it. We have co-operated, as a matter of fact, on all of these projects because we are concerned and interested in them.

I might say also in this connection that I've had some discussions with the University of Manitoba along these very lines. We are interested in working on a co-operative basis. They have a tremendous amount of expertise at the university, I was told by Dr. Campbell, they would like to make available to us on this very question. In my discussions with Dr. Campbell and part of his staff we outlined certain areas that we thought they may usefully make a contribution. So we have been carrying on these discussions. Dr. Bowen is actively working with them now in an attempt to define the particular areas that they would like to work in and to provide assistance to us. I think it's a very useful way of making that kind of expertise available to a government department.

We expect that we will have a great deal more co-operation in the research and development almost on a one-to-one basis on various projects with the universities. I look on this as a very useful way of bringing more expertise to bear on either what decisions we have to make or what projects we may be interested in working on. The wider the selection of expertise, I think, the more likelihood is that you will reach successful conclusions at an earlier date. We look upon this as another step in attempting to insure that we have the best expertise possible available to us.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister looking for the most and best expertise we can get but my specific question, and I will say it again, is are there any definitive studies, cost-benefit studies available yet? Have we gotten to any place where we can say, well we can sit down and have a look at it and say, well, this is what the costs are as

of now, either in relation to the city of Winnipeg or to any particular size?

MR. JORGENSEN: I can outline two in particular. The one project at that particular school gave us a fairly good idea, to the extent that we can utilize waste as an energy, and another study that was done was the use of municipal waste in the city of Winnipeg. We now have a fairly good idea of what the savings are but we also have a fairly good idea of what the costs will be . . .

MR. FOX: Are those reports available?

MR. JORGENSEN: My understanding is that McLarens were the consultants on this particular project. Whether or not that report is available for distribution or not, I will have to check. I am not sure at the moment.

I am reminded that there is a possibility we may require a city of Winnipeg approval for its release.

MR. FOX: I didn't hear the Minister.

MR. JORGENSEN: I say we may require the city of Winnipeg approval for its release because it was a joint study with the city of Winnipeg.

MR. FOX: Well, if the Minister has it, I would certainly appreciate having a look at it. I think that's all I have at the moment. Thank you, Mr. Chairmam.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Jim Galbraith, (Dauphin): The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: I had a question of the Minister with respect to what I believe to be a gypsum mining operation north of Morris. I was just wondering whether there have been any water pollution problems resulting from that plant over the past several years.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, this particular question would come under the Department of Mines, but I can tell my honourable friend, because I was fairly close to it, as he might suspect, there was no particular water pollution problems. That wasn't the difficulty. The difficulty was our mining inspectors had repeatedly told them that they were on the edge of an underground aquifer, and that it would be necessary to grout in order to prevent seepage into the mine from the aquifer and thereby lowering the pressure of the water somewhere down around St. Pierre and Otterburne.

As my honourable friend probably knows, there is a fairly active aquifer there of excellent quality water and it's the flowing type. When the mine began to leak, the water started coming up, the water pressure went down at the other end and the people who were using the water at the other end began to complain about lowered water pressure. Almost every farm made use of the water, as did some of the towns. Although we repeatedly attempted to get them to follow our advice to grout the floor of the mine, they didn't and then one night it just broke in and flooded, so the mine was just closed up for that reason.

MR. SCHROEDER: Are there now no difficulties with the water pressure?

MR. JORGENSEN: Not to my knowledge. I wouldn't want to be precise on that but I have heard no more complaints.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, and that's been several years.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, that was, I think, two or three years ago that the mine was abandoned.

MR. SCHROEDER: One other area that I was wondering about; I had asked the Minister about a month ago about an environmental impact study with respect to the area of Indian reserves, 39 and 40. I was just wondering how that's coming along.

MR. JORGENSEN: It is a federal project and they are the ones that are doing the study. We are involved because we are co-operating with them because it does concern the province of Manitoba and there is a possibility that we may have to intervene, but that study is underway. I'm not sure just how long it will be before it will be completed and the report made public, but it is being undertaken now.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, it is my understanding that this study is as a result of an application by the people at Indian Reserve 40 for sub-division into cottage lots of some property just to the immediate south of Indian Bay. I am just wondering whether that is the case and, if that is the case, I am just wondering whether the province has any legal right to put a stop on the application; that is through the entire sub-division process is there some way in which the department responsible for the environment can stop that development if it is deemed to be not in the interests of Manitoba?

MR. JORGENSEN: Our legal advice tells us that's a rather fuzzy area. They are not sure themselves as to whether or not we would have the authority of stopping it. We certainly have some concerns about it on behalf of the city of Winnipeg because it is from there that they draw their water supply and they naturally have a very active concern. Certainly, we will do what we can to insure that the legitimate interests of the city of Winnipeg are protected.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Has the department done any studies which would indicate whether or not there would be any problem with sewage or any other difficulties should this sub-division be approved?

MR. JORGENSEN: I guess our best hope at the moment is a federal environment assessment review process. That will perhaps give us a better idea than anything else that could be done.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, I understand as well that there has been an application by the reserve in Manitoba for a road connecting up from the reserve to Highway No. 1, and I am just wondering whether there is any area within that application which concerns the Department of the Environment.

MR. JORGENSEN: That matter really comes under the Crown Lands Department but we've advised the feds of our concerns and that should be incorporated as a part of the review process.

MR. SCHROEDER: My understanding is that currently the people on those reserves are residents of Ontario, as opposed to being residents of Manitoba, and that there is some conflict between them with respect to access and occasionally there are road blocks between the reserves but the road comes in from Highway No. 1 in Ontario, and this new road would give the reserve, which is partially in Manitoba, direct access to itself, whether or not the subdivision application is completed. But beyond that I'm just wondering, although it's Crown land and it would be up to the Crown Lands Branch to finally determine whether the highway would be approved, is it not the case that any subdivision of property or any change in land use is generally referred to this department to determine whether such a change in use is in the best interests of the people in the province?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes. The department is but one of the branches that are given an opportunity to make their views known on any application of that nature.

MR. SCHROEDER: Has the department done any studies with respect to costing, or have they even come anywhere near considering the cost of moving the aqueduct to another bay? Have there been any costs calculated on that?

MR. JORGENSEN: No. I am advised that there has been no studies along those lines.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Before going on to a new topic, I just had an opportunity over the dinner hour, to go through some of my files and have been continuing to do so during the discussion here. While looking for something else, I ran across some definitions that I would like to put into the record for the Minister's benefit if I can. They're from a Canada-Manitoba Accord for the Protection and the Enhancement of Environmental Quality and the province and the federal government entered into an agreement in 1975 in regard to this. In the beginning, as in most agreement or treaties, we have definitions, and I'd just like to read to the Minister the definitions of guidelines, objectives and regulations, so that they are on the record from a more noted authority than myself, if I can.

Guidelines, and I'm quoting from the treaty now, means recommended good practices to assist in achieving uniformity. Objectives means levels of environmental quality to be attained in either the short term or long term; and regulations mean any rule, order, ordinance, direction, by-law, resolution, or other instrument, (a) issued, made, or established in the exercise of the legislative power, conferred by

or under any statute; or (b) for the contravention of which there is a penalty, fine, imprisonment, or any other measure is prescribed by or under any statute. So I think that points out, in probably better terminology than I could use, exactly what it was I was trying to indicate to the Minister this afternoon. Not wishing to bring that argument up again, I would ask the Minister if he could supply us with a schematic of the proposed reorganization of the department, as well as a schematic of how the department was organized in the past, so that we can make the comparisons to see where the changes are being made and where the shifts in personnel are taking place?

MR. JORGENSEN: The reorganization chart has not, as yet, been finally approved by a treasury board, but as soon as that is done I'll undertake to insure that my honourable friend has a copy of that. There is no point in presenting it until he has it in the approved form so that he will know precisely that is the chart that will be used.

MR. COWAN: Could the Minister give us a tentative date, and I won't hold him to it, but just when we should expect, perhaps, the reorganization to take place? A ballpark figure, if he will.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, as soon as the plan receives final approval; I see no good reason why we wouldn't want to start almost immediately. But I cannot tell him when it will be approved by Treasury Board, given of course, the strictures imposed by the session being on, the time element that is involved. It is my intention to move in that direction as soon as we possibly can.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Just to pick up, Mr. Chairperson, on a number of comments that were taking place earlier this evening and this afternoon also. The Minister indicated that there is now an information officer, or will be an information officer in place, that will be responsible for providing the public with information, with details, with educational programs. I would ask the Minister if this is the same information officer that was taken out of the department in 1978 by the previous Tory Minister responsible for Mines, Natural Resources and the Environment?

MR. JORGENSEN: We will be advertising for that position. I must confess that I didn't even know that there was one that was taken out.

MR. COWAN: I think, Mr. Chairperson, the Minister got the gist of my remarks that were somewhat cynical, because at that time in the debates we had indicated quite strongly that we were convinced that was the wrong thing to do; that there was a need for . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, that shows you how persuasive your arguments were.

MR. COWAN: The Minister says that shows us how persuasive our arguments were. Unfortunately, they

weren't at that time and that was the reason why we went for a couple of years without an information officer, an officer that I felt had a valuable function to perform; and an officer which the Minister, at the time said, no, we don't really need, because the level of public awareness is much higher now than it was in the past and had arguments similar to that. I'm not bitter about it, neither do I want to gloat about it, but I do want to point out that there was a position for an information officer and it has been vacant for two years under his government, and that's too bad because it was necessary, and I can only say that I am pleased that they have now found that ought to be the case, and that information officer is being put back in place.

As one who would look at the sheet that the Minister was kind enough to give us at the beginning will notice, in the Environmental Control Department there was a substantial drop from the 1979-80 adjusted vote, compared to the 1978-79, and now we're going back up in the 1980-81 requested vote, but we still haven't reached the level of 1978-79 in staff person years; so that is another item I thought I would put on the record, that this department, even though it is an increase over last year, is not yet up to the level that it was in previous years. And I only hope that the Minister's involvement in this department will continue if it means that we are going to get more and more staff people to do the very necessary types of jobs, but again, we'll reserve judgement on that although we commend the initiative.

I would ask the Minister if he can indicate if a study that was being done on acid rain, and we had discussed in last year's estimates, has been completed yet. Let me just give the Minister some background information on it if I can. The previous Minister indicated that they were studying acid rain and they were studying it in this perspective: (1) to determine the effect on vegetation; (2) to determine the effect on the soil; and (3) to determine the effect on some biological organisms. And he had indicated last year that was the third year of the study and was most likely the last year. Now, in all fairness, he advised at that time that it might be completed within a year, and he made that statement on March 5th; so I believe it would be appropriate to ask if that study, which was designed — and I'm quoting the Minister from last year's estimates — which was designed to determine biological impacts of the discharge of contaminants from the plant, has been completed yet, and if the Minister can table it.

MR. JORGENSEN: That particular project, which was a joint project with the federal government, I think it was a three-year arrangement with the federal government, which ended last year. We renewed it again this year, so that study will be continuing. I'm not sure whether there is a report that is available for the studies that have taken place up to this point or whether they will be all inclusive. We can provide an interim report on that study if my honourable friend is interested.

MR. COWAN: Yes, I would appreciate that as soon as possible.

I had wished to talk about acid rain for a bit, but I'll ask the Minister if he can provide us, without the

report itself, but with some of the results of that report in regard to the acid rain problems in northern Manitoba, if he could fill us in on some of the details of what that report found?

MR. JORGENSEN: It would be difficult for me to outline the terms of the information that is available up to this point, other than to say the conclusion is that the acid rain problem in the province of Manitoba is not severe, largely because of the buffering of the limestone that is available in northern Manitoba; it acts as a neutralizer and somewhat negates the effects of acid rain in this province.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'll have to look for my copy of the Long-range Transportation of Air Pollutants Report, because I seem to believe, or recollect, that in that they indicated that the Pre-Cambrian Shield was an area that was susceptible, in many respects more susceptible than some, to the effects of acid rain; and I happen to know that we do possess some of that shield area in northern Manitoba, and I also recall looking at the maps, reviewing the maps that were provided with that report. Although that report was directed primarily towards Ontario and east of the border, the Manitoba-Ontario border, it did extend somewhat and it did show that there were some areas that we should be concerned about in Manitoba; and I would ask the Minister if that is not an accurate reflection of what the joint United States-Canadian report had to say was that Pre-Cambrian Shield areas are sometimes more susceptible than others, and that we indeed did have some of those areas, although it may not be extensive, but we did have some of those areas in northern Manitoba.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm advised that, because of the buffering action that I mentioned earlier, we do not appear to have any appreciable rise in the levels of acid rain in this province. The problem does not appear to be getting more serious, but as I say, the studies will be continuing and we will probably have a better idea when this next series of studies are completed. I'm advised that my honourable friend is right in one connection, that the Pre-Cambrian Shield is susceptible.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'm glad I had confirmation of that, because I couldn't find my report in the meantime, but I do recall reading that. I would just try to clarify something that the Minister said. He said that the problem with acid rain is not increasing in the province of Manitoba. It would appear to me that the problem of acid rain would be increasing because it is increasing worldwide but what the Minister was attempting to say was that because of the buffering action of natural limestone, while the problem is indeed increasing, he doesn't see a significant impact on a number of the lakes in the north although there will be an impact on some lakes, if I can put words in the Minister's mouth like that, I'm not certain I should try to do that though.

MR. JORGENSON: One point in connection with the comments that my honourable friend has, although the levels of contamination do not appear to be increasing, I agree that it does not necessarily mean that the acid rain problem is diminishing, and with increased use of hydrocarbons as fuel that could have a very significant impact on the increased levels of acid rain in Manitoba. I say quite frankly, we are concerned about that happening and as it appears to be going to happen, unless there is some way of reducing the amount of emissions of sulphur dioxide into the air, then we will of course have a great deal more concern.

MR. COWAN: Well again, I'll attempt to clarify what I am hearing so that I am certain that we are building on a strong base here and that is that the Minister said that the contamination problem does not seem to be increasing. I would ask if indeed that is the case. I would anticipate that the contamination problem is indeed increasing, although it may not have reached the level where it is going to be more influential than the buffering action of natural limestone. But if it continues to increase, of course, one could expect that the buffering action of natural limestone would become less and less and that the problem would then tend to aggravate itself, and that we would be caught at a stage where there would be a sudden change because we had used up much of the buffering action of the natural limestone.

MR. JORGENSON: I am advised that the federal government has considered the problem to be significant enough that it will become one of the subjects for discussion between the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States at their next meeting.

There is no question that there will be significant increases in the United States as a result of the increased use of hydrocarbons for fuel. Although we perhaps are pleased that the problem is not more serious at the present time in the province of Manitoba, it does not mean that we are without concern that the problem can become serious. Our continuing studies will give us more information on whether or not there is cause for even greater concern than we currently have.

MR. COWAN: I appreciate the fact that we are talking about a problem that does transmit itself across not only provincial boundaries but international boundaries, but we do have a problem in Manitoba and I would just like to read from some reports if I can, and seek the Minister's comments in regards to what we find in them.

This report is a report on air pollution and forest decline near a nickel smelter. The Thompson, Manitoba, Smoke Easement Survey 1972-74 by Mr. Blauel and Mr. Hocking is part of the National Forest Research Centre efforts of the Canadian Forestry Service, Environment Canada, and the file report is October 19, 1974. It was received by the Environmental Protection Agency on October 21st, 1974. If I can just read from page 13 of the report: Levels of sulphur and nickel on foliage resemble those near Sudbury, Ontario, where devastation of much of the forest is wide spread and complete. The current impacts on the forest near Thompson are

mostly due to the direct absorption of pollutants by the vegetation. This type of injury will intensify as emissions continue. Although toxicant levels in the soil — and now we've gone beyond acid rain and we're talking about the general problem of heavy metal contamination coupled with the problem of acid rain, to use a colloquial term, near emission sources. Although toxicant levels in the soil have not yet reached those near Sudbury, this is explainable by the strong chelating properties of surface organic matter. And the reference they make is to Whitby's study in 1974 in which levels are extremely high and increasing near Thompson. Continued emission of large volumes of acid producing sulphur dioxide will likely lead to release of heavy metals from the surface organic matter through conversion to soluble forms available to uptake by vegetation. And they go on at some length to explain some of the problems.

But I would like to jump now to a study by the same people entitled, Progressive Heavy Metal Accumulation Associated with Forest Decline near the Nickel Smelter at Thompson, Manitoba. And it's an Information Report No. NOR-X-169 from Environment Canada, February 1977, Northern Forest Research Centre. I would like to read from the discussion and conclusions in that.

The forest decline around Thompson was related in our earlier report to cumulative effects of the smelter emissions. Examinations of annual survey data indicated that the level of injury has developed progressively during the entire period of smelter operations, starting with initial signs recorded only two years after operations started.

They go on to say that, and I will have to apologize if I butcher some of the words because my enunciation of some of these terms is not exactly proper but it says, Pollutant-sensitive epiphytic lichens have disappeared from sites near the smelter and are in depauperate condition at sites up to 11 km. distance.

It goes on to say that these were formerly abundant in the area. They go on, on page 14 to say, Pollutant accumulation in the area is steadily increasing. Levels of nickel in the soil surface organic matter are similar to those found near Sudbury, by Hutchinson and Whitby (1974), where vegetative decline and erosion are well advanced. There are indications that the surface contamination at Thompson is being moved into the upper A mineral soil, although not yet being leached into the deeper zones. And that is something that we have to be very cognizant of and try to deal with very quickly.

They mention that cumulative copper was being found in the soil surface organic matter and they went on to say something I just learned this evening, that nickel and copper acting together have synergistic effects and I was not aware of that. The Member for Rossmere asked me, what effect? Synergistic, which means that two and two is twenty to put it in the simplest terms that I can.

They go on to say, and I quote, We have confirmed the presence of one of these, and they are talking about toxicants. They say, We have confirmed the presence of one of these: arsenic, an element known for serious effects on animals feeding near a smelter. Entry of many of these elements into the soil chemical and biological cycles initiates major site

degradation, because they cannot be neutralized or removed easily.

I am continuing to read from the report and it says . . . The Member for Rossmere asked me if that's like two cigarettes smelling worse than one. No, it's like the Member for Burrows and the Member for St. Boniface's tobacco smoke reacting together and smelling much worse than either one alone. We have now explain synergistic. Where was I? And if the Member for Elmwood is smoking a cigar, that is what we call a toxin. We are far enough away from the Chairperson's seat in the house that by the time the pollutant has reached us it has been diluted and dispersed sufficiently that we are below the odor threshold. It's dissipating nicely into the atmosphere, so to speak.

At any rate, all those asides, aside. I'll continue with the report and I quote, The contamination already present near the smelter is sufficient to seriously inhibit plant growth if the contaminants become available to the plants.

High contamination of soil with heavy metals is also like to affect the activities of microorganisms. And I am skipping around in the report now. The problem with these heavy metals is that their half life in the soil is very extensive and that it takes a long while for them to be leached out and into a diluted enough form not to present a problem. Then we are not certain where they are going anyway, if they are not accumulating at some other end of the chain. But it says here that Soil acidity has an important bearing on mobility of heavy metals, and acidity is strongly effected by sulphur dioxide, a usual component of smelter emissions.

They then go on to talk about the persistent problems that others have run across in their attempts to revegetate the soils and they say that in most cases in order to do that it requires, and I quote from the report, requires novel and heroic measures such as burying the contaminated layer under several feet of clean soil.

Towards the end of the report it says, The trend is clear: wherever uncontained smelter emissions have occurred, they have been associated with extensive and persistent vegetation injury and soil degradation. At Thompson, and this is where we may still have a chance, it says, At Thompson, at the head of page 17, degradation has not yet progressed very far. Soil surface contamination to levels resembling those that have led to persistent problems elsewhere extends at Thompson to a distance of only 2-5 km. from the smokestack. The installation of containment measures now could prevent or at least greatly retard further degradation. And I am certain the Minister will have something to say about that.

But it says, In conclusion, the Thompson area displays all indications of progressive forest decline and soil degradation through cumulative contamination with heavy metals. Elsewhere, this has always led to extensive and persistent devastation. If emissions continue unabated, such effects can be anticipated for the Thompson area.

Before going on to another area of the north, I would just ask the Minister if he would be prepared to indicate what is being done in this regard and to make some general comments on what I believe to be some very significant statements arising out of

those two reports done by the same people in a period three years apart.

MR. JORGENSEN: Those reports that were presented to the study group, I believe it was the Clean Environment Commission in 1977, and that submission that was presented to the Clean Environment Commission was the basis upon which a million dollar study was launched, of which the province cost-shared. I am also informed that the International Nickel Company, as a result of that submission, is now studying ways of converting sulphur dioxide into sulphuric acid. I am not sure just to what extent that process has progressed but it does indicate that submission has produced some significant action and generated some concern on the part of both the government of Manitoba and the International Nickel Company.

I am also informed that study and other submissions that were made enabled the Clean Environment Commission to set the levels of emission at the Inco plant in Thompson. So there has been some response, some reaction, to the submission that was made at that time by the Forestry Division of the federal government.

MR. COWAN: Is the Minister able to indicate if those orders have been complied with fully, or if there are periods of time when the emissions exceed the standard set by those orders? And I'd ask the Minister if he could also table those order, not this evening, I wouldn't expect it this evening, but before we get to his salary and also, perhaps a better way to phrase the question is ask him to table the number of times in which the levels have been exceeded?

MR. JORGENSEN: My advice is that, by and large, the orders have been adhered to; there perhaps have been one or two occasions when they have exceeded that. I'm advised that if it reaches the stage where those emission orders are exceeded, then the International Nickel Company would cut back on their emissions. With respect to providing my honourable friend with the order, that can be easily done, we'll made them available to him.

MR. COWAN: While on that subject, I'd asked the Minister the other day for a number of documents; I just ask him if those documents are ready for distribution? This was on the first day of his Estimates, I had indicated that we would appreciate having them if possible.

MR. JORGENSEN: Oh yes, they're available, we'll deal with them one at a time. That information will be made available, but our legal advice has been that they should be provided to the CTC inquiry first. And that also applies to the documentation between CNR and the department; and Dow Chemical and the department. I might add that we have gone through the files and we are unable to find any documentation, so my honourable friend may wait in vain for correspondence of this. At that particular time, I think my honourable friend will be well aware that there was no time to be writing letters; if there was conversation or there was communication it was almost invariably by telephone.

Yes, the third one, which deals with the question of environmental accidents being reported to me, as Minister, on a monthly basis. I have one problem with that particular request and I'm trying to figure out a way that I can provide my honourable friend with that information without violating a fairly standard practice; and that is that interdepartmental documents, and this, my friend must understand, is a report to the Minister. I will certainly see if I can find some way of providing him with that information without setting a precedent that would be very difficult to reverse. That has been a problem for some number of years and I recall on several occasions, even when I was in opposition, that I defended that particular principle on the part of the Minister, not wanting to table documents that were considered departmental by nature. I have no reason to change my mind on that, but the information, in my view, is innocuous enough that I will endeavour to find some way of doing it without breaking that principle.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, I would not ask the Minister to break a long-standing principle; I'm just trying to figure out how I got it last year, whether it was through official or unofficial sources?

MR. JORGENSEN: You probably got it through unofficial services. Now that has been known to happen. I don't think that my honourable friend got it through my office; it must have been before I assumed responsibility, but again, I wouldn't want to start that.

MR. COWAN: I'll have to check back on that, Mr. Chairperson, and see if I brought it up on last year's Estimates; I honestly don't know remember how it got in my file, but I know it's in my file and I . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: I know how certain things got into my file when I was in opposition, so . . .

MR. COWAN: I agree with the Minister that the material in it is definitely innocuous, I mean it is the type of material that should be public information. As a matter of fact, it is a material that is public information in . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: At the end of the year.

MR. COWAN: . . . at an end of a year report and I will just have to look back and see and I'll come back to this matter, which I'll attempt to do, perhaps, when one of my colleagues take over. But I'd ask the Minister, on the request for transmittal of documentation in regard to the MacGregor spill, on what grounds — and I'm not a lawyer so I'm seeking information here, although there is a lawyer on this side that can help me — but on what grounds have they been advised not to provide us with information that is going to become public in a matter of days anyway? I would anticipate that what's presented to the commission becomes public.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, our legal advice suggested that we wouldn't want to appear to be circumventing a semi-judicial inquiry and that was the judgement of the law officers of the Crown that it would be

advisable to present that information to the inquiry first. Now I'm not a lawyer either so I simply have to take the advice of legal council. My Deputy advises me that one other reason is that Dow Chemical undoubtedly have their own readings and there is a possibility that they may be different, or in conflict with readings that we've taken and if there is such a conflict it would best appear before the commission to straighten out, rather than have that information provided here. I regret that I have to decline my honourable friend's suggestion. I might say also, with respect to the tabling of those monthly reports, those report, those accident reports, I frankly can't think of any good reason why they have to come to me, as a Minister. I'm thinking very seriously of having those reports just simply made public on a monthly basis, rather than as a ministerial document.

MR. COWAN: Thank you. I'd ask the Minister to do that retroactively if he does.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, if I do, yes, I'll see that my honourable friend gets that information.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, on the other issue, I suddenly feel somewhat insignificant. It's not a feeling that I'm used to, but the fact is that the Minister is saying that he's not going to release the information to a member of the opposition who has requested it because he wants first to release it to the inquiry; and the legal advice is that is the proper course of action. And I, just for the life of me, can't fathom why we shouldn't have it before us during the course of these Estimates? This is a proper place to discuss this issue and we cannot discuss it unless we — well, we can discuss it but we cannot discuss it as competently without the information as we could with the full information.

And I would not ask the Minister for the reports of Dow Chemical's monitoring because I would hope that the provincial department's monitoring is as accurate, if not more accurate, and quite frankly, my own bias would tend to lead me to believe the provincial department's monitoring over anyone else's monitoring, knowing that they have a very competent laboratory and very good staff in this regard and that they should not have any vested interest in making certain that the levels appear either high or low. So I would tend to believe theirs if there was a contradiction, and therefore, I didn't even ask for any other readings. So I cannot see what possible problem there would be there because no one that I know of, outside of the inquiry, is asking for Dow's readings; so it'll be up to the inquiry to make the argument that those readings are contradictory. And, in fact, many of those readings have been made public and, in fact, I have a document from the Minister's department that was sent to me, through very legitimate means, that was promised publicly, which was a map of the readings in the snow; and the Minister was very quick to indicate what certain readings were in the Legislature and there were others who were very quick to indicate what certain readings were in the media. And now when I ask for the readings in this committee, which would be an appropriate place to follow through on the discussion, I can't get the

readings. And yet we knew there was an inquiry, even when we were making comments in the Legislature. The Minister was telling us what readings were and he knew at that time there was going to be an inquiry. I don't want to get sidetracked on this issue, but I just have to protest in the strongest terms the fact that we are not being given that information, which we have requested in a responsible way, and which I believe will enable Her Majesty's loyal opposition to better understand the problems that were occurring at the time; and to better provide advice to the Minister, which the Minister has assured me he is welcoming and does, from time to time, take into consideration to one extent or another; and therefore, I would, without wanting to get embroiled in an argument about it, ask the Minister to reconsider, ask the Minister to go back for a new legal opinion in the hopes that our arguments have been persuasive enough.

The Member for Rossmere says that he is going to give him an argument that he believes will be persuasive, that he can carry on to his legal counsel. While he is doing that, Mr. Chairperson, I would endeavour to go back to my office very briefly and try to come back with the monthly reports to see exactly what format they are transmitted in. So I would hope that the Member for Rossmere . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Before my honourable friend leaves, I just want to commend him, as he has commended me, for his powers of anticipation when he suggested that I should reconsider and go back for another legal opinion. That's precisely what I was going to advise him that I was going to do. I commend him for his powers of persuasion and assure him that it's not fallen on deaf ears; his argument is, in my opinion, a reasonably good one and I will undertake to go back and see if I can't get a third opinion. If I can get two out of three; let me put it this way, if two out of three still goes against my honourable friend, then I'll try for three out of five.

MR. COWAN: I just have to inform the Minister that we're with him all the way on this one.

MR. SCHROEDER: At any rate, these reports, it would seem to me, can be distinguished from reports which are ordinarily provided by departmental personnel to a Minister, reports which provide opinions, which are subjective. When you are dealing with a report which provides a reading, an objective reading of a circumstance, you're not providing an opinion to the Minister, you're not putting something out which in that sense is taking something of yourself, as an officer of the Crown, and putting it out to the Minister. I believe that, as well, when you deal with accident reports, I can understand the Minister being reticent about releasing reports which have opinions of officers of the Crown dealing with the accident itself, suggesting ways in which it could have been prevented, ways in which it could have been remedied, that sort of thing. But if the request is simply one of how many have been reported; then that is not something that is a subjective matter, it's not an area where there would be any logical reason why that shouldn't be made public.

And when we talk about specific reports on this particular accident at MacGregor and say that we can't deal with the information gathered by the provincial department, because of the fact that there happens to be an enquiry going on at the same time, I would respectfully suggest that that legal advice is rather conservative. Surely, for instance, if that hearing wasn't going to be held for several months, or if we weren't sure right now whether there was going to be a hearing, that very same lawyer wouldn't have said, no, during the Environmental Department Estimates we can't talk about that because maybe something's going to happen, or it will happen several months from now.

What we're now hearing in terms of advice from that law officer is that this legislative committee is to take a back seat to a commission at a time . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if I may interrupt my honourable friend. He's talking about two different things. On the one hand, he's talking about the accident reports that come to me, personally. That presents a different argument than the other one that he's talking about, the readings at the accident site. With respect to the accident reports that come to my on a monthly basis, I can tell my honourable friend that they do contain some subjective opinions that if they are made public perhaps would not contain. They're for my information so I can draw conclusions. Now, I am quite prepared to submit to my honourable friend the straightforward accident report without the subjective opinions that are contained therein. That poses no problem to me at all, and I will, very happily, reword the submission that I get and eliminate those subjective views and give him the information regarding the details of a spill or an accident; that poses no problem.

And what I suggested earlier is that I wouldn't object at all to making those reports public if they just contained the information regarding the details of a spill or an accident; that does not cause me any great hardship or problem, I think they should be made public, in any case.

MR. SCHROEDER: I guess we can agree on that.

MR. JORGENSEN: We can agree on that one; the other one poses a different problem, if my honourable friend wants to continue with his line of argument on that other subject, that's all right.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, yes, I would agree with the Minister on that first area, and appreciate his comments. Certainly if he was to take any subjective material out of those reports and provide the rest of it to us, it would seem to me that's all we're entitled to.

Dealing with the MacGregor spill — and please correct me if I'm wrong — my understanding is that there's some objective data which was gathered at the scene which my colleague from Churchill has requested. That objective data, it seems to me, can in no way compromise those hearings which are currently going on with respect to the spill. In fact, I would assume that Dow Chemical has all of those figures right now. Is that not correct?

MR. JORGENSEN: Our figures?

MR. SCHROEDER: Your figures.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, they have them.

MR. SCHROEDER: Well, if Dow Chemical has all of the figures, then it would seem to me that it doesn't make any sense whatsoever, in this entire world, that this legislative committee should not receive those figures.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could hopefully conclude this by saying that I'm more impressed with the arguments that I've heard here tonight than I am with the legal advice that I've been getting, although I can't disregard that legal advice. I am going to take this back again and get another opinion on it, and hopefully we can arrive at some satisfactory conclusion on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I just want to ensure that the Minister, when we are talking about the monthly report, that we were talking about, indeed, the same report and it would be a report under the Environmental Control Branch, Environmental Accident Summary, January 1978, February 1978, that is what the Minister considers to be an internal document, and I would hope, if that is the case, that he would reconsider and apply that retroactively, because . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, as I indicated to the Member for Rossmere earlier, from time to time those reports contain some subjective observations that are intended for the Minister. If my honourable friend is anxious to get the simple details of an accident I will most certainly make them available, and we can have that done. Just for this year, you want them?

MR. COWAN: No, I would ask for — well, let me see what mine goes up to, December 26, 1978 — so I would ask for 1979.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, 1979, you have it in the annual report.

MR. COWAN: No, I do not believe so. I believe in 1979 that we have an overall summary where you say there were so many accidents of a specific nature; whereas what I am asking for is details of each specific accident. I don't particularly care — well, I do care what the recommendations that were made to the Minister are, but I believe he is justified in saying that he may wish to not include those on there. I didn't find anything compromising in what I found, but if the Minister believes there could be, then I would prefer to have the general details rather than make an argument over the fact that I need that recommendation.

MR. JORGENSEN: Then, under those conditions, I will see that you get that information.

MR. COWAN: Yes. I would just like to then go back to what we were talking about before, and that was Thompson. The Minister indicates that these orders that came about in 1977 came about as a

result of this particular study that was done in regard to progressive heavy metal accumulation in 1974 and 1977, and that the orders had been, by and large, complied with, although there has been, from time to time, excessive emissions released at which point Inco cuts back their production which would result in the corresponding reduction in the levels of emissions; and I would ask for further details on that and hope that they will be forthcoming. I would ask the Minister who does the monitoring in regard to the levels that are being emitted by the plant?

MR. JORGENSEN: Is my honourable friend asking for a particular name, or . . .?

MR. COWAN: No. Whether it's Inco or whether it's the . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: It's the department.

MR. COWAN: I then would like to direct the Minister's attention to a report which is from Environment Science and Technology, December, 1979, incorporated by the American Chemical Society, entitled Atmospheric Fallout in the Vicinity of a Base Metal Smelter at Flin Flon, Manitoba, Canada. It's done by William Franz and Gordon McFarlane and Andrew Lutz from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Freshwater Institute in Winnipeg. And again, I would just like to speak to the conclusion very briefly, and it says, we have documented here, by two methods, the deposition of metals in atmospheric fallout in the vicinity of a base metal smelter. Comparison of the figures with those for other areas indicates that the Flin Flon smelter is a significant, and I underscore that, that's my underscoring, a significant source of airborne zinc, cadmium, lead, arsenic, copper, and possibly SO₄ to as much as 250,000 square kilometres of the environment in the vicinity of the smelter. That was the conclusions.

And then I refer to another report which comes from the Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment, entitled Environmental Report, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited, Flin Flon, Manitoba, and it's File No. 1095.2. And the report itself is not dated that I can see, but the letter from Larry Strachan, is dated November 27, 1979, and that's a letter to Mr. Stewart, the Executive Secretary of the Clean Environment Commission, and I would just like to read a couple of excerpts from that.

One is the estimated emission rates from the superstack at Flin Flon, the 825 foot stack. Before continuing on with the data from the report, I might just comment on the concept of superstacks, in that a number of years ago they seemed to be the method that was being anticipated as being a ways and means of dealing with some very serious pollutant problems; and a lot of money, time, engineering effort and hope, went into the superstack concept; a concept that suggested that you can, in fact, dilute and disperse; that you don't have to capture and contain, and capturing and containing being the more expensive of the two methods, for the most part was looked over for the less expensive method of superstacking, which does

not appear to have fully alleviated the problem, as a matter of fact, it might have exacerbated the problem in certain areas.

But we find, and I'm not a technician, I'm not an expert in this area, so I'll rely upon your experts in the area. But we find that the sulphur dioxide average emission rate in pounds for a 24-hour day was — and will someone correct me if I'm wrong, please — 1,300,000 pounds. What I have is a figure of 1.3 to 10 to the 6th power. Okay. That that was the average emission rate of pounds over a 24-hour day. An interesting sidelight that there was 2,970 pounds of lead emitted into the air also on a 24-hour day, which is over a million pounds a year. And these are readings from Environment Canada, or at least the sulfur dioxide readings were from Environment Canada and the lead readings were from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company. What we see is a substantial rate of emissions. It said that, and this must be the study that the Minister is referring to:

A current Federal-Provincial Vegetation and Soil Survey ongoing in the Flin Flon areas has indicated that:

—an inverse gradient of zinc, copper, and other heavy metal accumulations in soil and vegetation occurs distally from the smelter site;

—high accumulations (of heavy metals) were found on soil surface and vegetation targets to some 10 Km distance from the smelter;

—high levels of heavy metal contaminants were found in the mineral soil at 5 Km and closer distances;

—the native vegetation within most of the area 5 Km from the smelter had suffered severe deterioration;

—lichen and bryophyte depletions occur to 10 Km distance; and

—many of the symptoms displayed by the remaining forest vegetation within these areas were consistent with those caused by sulphur dioxide and heavy metal contaminant stress.

Ambient air monitoring for sulphur dioxide in Flin Flon has been conducted by the company and the Environmental Control Branch for several years.

What that would indicate to the concerned person is that we do have a major problem in the Flin Flon area with emissions and as we had a major problem in the Thompson area, and still do have a major problem; let us not suggest that by any means we have alleviated the problem in Thompson because we have imposed orders, that is not the case. We have tried to deal with it and that is sometimes the best that we can do on a short term basis, but we have not eliminated the problem. The fact is that we have a significant problem in Flin Flon and why I bring this forward is, I have received communications that have been copied to myself and directed to Mr. Stewart of the Clean Environment Commission addressing itself to this problem and they are from Dallas Mymko, who is the representative for the United Steel Workers of America in Flin Flon.

I would just like to quote very briefly from that letter. They have reviewed this report and, With figures like SO₂ emissions of 1,300,000 pounds per day in 1977, why is stack sampling done only once a year. Now I am not certain that is the case, but I would ask the Minister if that is the case, and if so, why? Why let HBM&S, or Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, wait

until 1981 to produce a report on SO₂ emissions for converter aisles and anode casting roof monitors.

He goes on to say they are a little concerned about the particulate matter emissions, he talks about them, and he says, At present there is no effort being made to control particulate matter emissions from roof monitors, anode casting stack, or zinc casting furnaces. No effort is being made to control SO₂ emissions, thus when the SO₂ enters the atmosphere, SO₂ and H₂SO₄ process still takes place and has a dramatic effect of its own — acid rain.

The explanation of the difference in HBM&S and Environmental Control Branch Stations — example; he wants to know why there is a difference in the readings. He says that it is not very clear to me at all, and the Saskatchewan Air Quality Standard for sulfur dioxide (0.17 ppm — one hour average) has been exceeded a total of 340 times in Creighton, Saskatchewan. This makes me shiver as, according to my interpretation of the report, the further you get from the smelter site, the lower the metal pollutant concentrate is. It talks about the effect that it is having on Flin Flon.

He talks about the super-stacks concept and is quite concerned, and he asks, Is our problem becoming someone else's? He goes on, On page 11 the report admits the hazards of arsenic, mercury and lead; it admits emissions of these metals from the complex, however, the impact on the environment of the Flin Flon area is not well documented.

Then it closes with the following statement: Due to these comments which I have drafted as quickly as possible to comply with your request, and without expert knowledge, I would request that you give serious consideration to holding a hearing in Flin Flon before renewing the licence for HBM&S stack. By so doing we would be able to prepare a brief with some expert assistance.

I think what we are seeing here is a trend that the Minister is well aware of, and that is that the workers, and I am very pleased to see this happen, are beginning to become concerned — I shouldn't say beginning — are showing increased concern for the environment outside the workplace as well as the environment within the workplace, because they know that their families and themselves must live and play in that environment. In the north that is very significant, because the people rely so heavily on the outdoors for recreational pursuits because they don't have all the recreational pursuits that city people have. So the lakes, while not more important to northerners than southerners, are perceived as being more important because that is one of their primary ways of recreation. They want very desperately to protect that. I know that it a fact, when there were hearings called in regard to Ruttan Mine last summer, I believe, I know the Steelworkers' Local 8144, a sister Local of my own, made a presentation in regards to that, and they were also concerned about the quality of the lakes in the area and also concerned about, not only the effect it would have on their recreational pursuits, but they expressed a concern over the effect that it would have on the traditional lifestyles in the area, re fishing and trapping, if the pollution was allowed to continue unabated. They are taking a very definite concern and trying to play a very active role in this.

I would ask the Minister if he can address himself to some of the questions that I have relayed to him through this meeting in regards to (1) what is happening to monitor environmental quality in Flin Flon, and (2) why let HBM&S wait until 1981 to produce a report on SO₂ emissions for the converter aisles and anode casting roof monitors, if that is indeed the case, if he can confirm it and address some remarks to that, and also in regard to a hearing in Flin Flon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, to deal with my honourable friend's last question first, the hearing has been scheduled for May 21st of this year, so anyone who wishes to can make submissions before that hearing, and perhaps it is the proper place to be directing questions that anyone may have with respect to HBM&S air emissions.

With respect to the question that he posed about monitoring that stack once a year, and as he knows and as he has indicated, it is a fairly high stack and it is not easy to get somebody to climb up that stack in the middle of the winter when the wind is blowing. He is quite right when he says that the emissions are monitored only once a year because of the very difficulty of getting someone to do the monitoring. However, the ambient air around there is monitored on a regular basis, where somebody can get his feet on terra firma, and the more firma the less terra, so that there is an effort to continue monitoring as best we can.

MR. COWAN: I hope the Minister has not challenged me to a pun contest because I don't do well at them, but I have my colleagues here, who assure me that they will go one on one.

I am pleased to hear the hearing is May 21st and I am certain that the steelworkers, if I can speak for them, because they indicated that they do want to present a brief or at least participate in some way at that hearing, will be there and will play a vital part, I hope, in the proceedings. Because as the Minister said, he is enthusiastic about getting the public to play a more active role in dealing with the problems and developing solutions for problems.

I have to indicate you wouldn't get me up there in the middle of the winter on a 825 or 850 foot stack; you wouldn't get me up there in the middle of the summer. I would not want to volunteer to be the one to climb the stack in the winter, but I am not certain that that is as viable a reason as one can up with, for the fact that it is only monitored once a year; perhaps monitoring could take place once in the spring and once in the fall. I am not even certain that it is necessary. I am not certain, because I am not an expert in the area, what would be served by monitoring more than once a year, but I am certain of the fact that someone won't climb the stack in the winter would not be enough of a reason not to monitor, if monitoring was necessary. I know HBM&S asks its workers to do lots of things in the winter that they don't want to do, and yet they do, although I would reserve the right to carry forth the grievance of that individual under The Workplace, Safety and Health Act as to working under unsafe conditions, if

one were to attempt to force such an individual to do that.

The fact is that we do have a problem in Flin Flon, according to this report, which is a recent report, and the point about this report is that it says that the smelter is a significant source for these different heavy metal contaminants and SO₄ to as much as 250,000 square kilometers of the environment in the vicinity of the smelter. We are talking about a fairly large area in regards to environmental abuse, and I would hope that the hearing will address itself to that, because we know now from the Environmental Control Branch data that the Manitoba air quality objectives for sulfur dioxide are being exceeded on a fairly, perhaps regular is too strong a word, but on, it looks to be the least consistent manner. The maximum acceptable level, which is 900 micrograms per cubic meter for a one hour average, or parts per millions, so that is being exceeded in 1979, for an example. We are only talking about January to July 19th inclusive. At the town hall site in Flin Flon, it was exceeded 11 times in regard to the one hour average and it was exceeded once in regard to the 24 hour average, but the fact is that in all 1978 it was only exceeded 12 times for the one hour average and it was not exceeded for the 24 hour average. In 1977, it was five times for the one hour and none for the 24 hour; in 1976 it was five and 15. The figures are somewhat similar for the Public Works yard in Flin Flon, that it is being exceeded on a one hour average on a consistent basis.

I think what is more alarming is we see that in Creighton, that the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company data shows that the number of times the emissions are exceedings the objectives. In 1979 — we are using January to September inclusive figures now — it was 11 also, and none on a 24 hour basis. At Phantom Lake we saw 16 on a one hour basis. I hope I am not misinterpreting the data, but the fact is that there seems to be a fair amount of excessive emissions. They seem to be increasing and not decreasing when you compare them to a 1974 figure, so the problem is getting worse and the problem does not appear to be getting better. As we all know, this sort of contamination cannot be allowed to continue without having the same type of effects that we have seen at longer — I shouldn't say longer, because I imagine the Flin Flon smelter has been in production as long as Sudbury, if not longer — but we see it other areas where production of this nature occurs.

I would ask the Minister if they are doing any monitoring of the environmental quality around the site, and if they have been doing so for a period of time so that comparisons can be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the member repeat . . .

MR. COWAN: We were doing the monitoring around Inco in Flin Flon. I'm sorry, we're doing ambient air in Flin Flon.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, we do ambient air monitoring around the stacks.

MR. COWAN: I would address my question then specifically to the concerns of the steel workers, and that is, when they ask, I wonder what effect the

emission would have on our plant and animal life, in our city and surrounding areas, not to mention the effect on the people who live and have lived in the Flin Flon area for the past 50 years. So what they are asking the government to do and the Minister to do, I believe, is to document the impact on the environment in the Flin Flon area, of this contamination. Is there documentation of that sort, as to vegetation, soil and biological organisms being affected by the pollution?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, I am advised that the results of the studies up to this point are available, but the studies are continuing. I'm advised that the report my honourable friend was reading from is the report.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would have to go over this report once again, to determine if there is any mention of what effect is being had on the plant life and on the animal life in the area. Does the Minister know if that is included? I do find one part, excuse me, if I can continue, it says: The effects of sulphur dioxide and heavy metals on humans, plants, animals, soils, water, materials, is well documented. It talks about the literature as background information, that these pollutants can have an adverse effect on humans and animals, can damage and kill plants and other vegetation, can acidify soils and water and can act as a corrosive agent on materials. It says it's well documented throughout North America and other countries. There are two basic similarities in these documentations:

1) The emissions of sulphur dioxide and heavy metal particulate matter; and 2) The effect is the degradation of surrounding environment.

But they then mention some of the vegetation and soil survey recommendations or conclusions that they have drawn; they don't mention anything about biological organisms. I would ask the Minister if there has been any study done to that and if he can provide us with more detailed background information as to how these conclusions that are on page 8 of the study were drawn.

MR. JORGENSEN: They were done by our Environmental Research and Development Branch, and they were presented to the Clean Environment Commission. So that would be a matter of public record if the steel workers would write to them.

MR. COWAN: Okay, I would hope that that May 21st hearing will take place, and that everyone who does express a concern and can make it there has ample opportunity to do so; I'm certain they will, because I know the hearings are fairly effectively and efficiently put together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a) — The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: I would just like to, by way of conclusion, say that I don't agree with the Minister; that acid rain is not a problem in northern Manitoba. I believe it is becoming more and more of a problem and I believe that, while it may not be as significant today as it will be five or ten years from now, the time to stop it, or the time to attempt to prevent it

from proceeding and getting worse is now and that we must make every effort by regulation, if I may, to ensure that the sources are curtailed from further pollution, so that we do not see the effect on our lakes in northern Manitoba that, say, perhaps Sweden has seen. And in all fairness to the Minister, I realize that we have to contain the pollution sources here, but this is a long-range transportation of pollutants problem in that we have to support our federal government, and I believe the United States government, in their efforts to come up with a solution to this problem, because it is going to become worse if we rely more on burning hydrocarbons for energy sources and, at the same time, don't implement some fairly extensive technology that will prevent the sulphur from escaping into the air.

I have noted the press releases that have come, not only from the Department of Mines but also from Inco, saying that they are trying to develop a process now, in Thompson, Manitoba, that will deal with that problem and that, I believe, that they have committed themselves already to some major funding, and I wish them luck. I am again commending their actions, although I believe them to be a bit late.

I believe that when one does go into the production of a smelter end products, that one should, right from the beginning, take into consideration the impact on the environment that they are going to have. I believe that the only reason they are doing it now and have not done it before - and this is a personal belief - is that it is now that public pressure has been brought to bear to such an extent, to convince them that they must do so, or suffer greatly in the media and also in the public's mind. I think that's a historical fact.

I know when they first opened up the smelter in Copper Cliff that they used to smelt right out in the open, in pits I believe, and that part of their process was that — I'm not certain of all the details — and that they've totally devastated an area around there, because of that and that was unnecessary at that age and day. One cannot say that the technology for other ways of dealing with the problem were not available; one can only say that seemed, at that time, to be a less expensive way than would be afforded to them if they developed extensive technology.

So I am pleased to see that the public impression of this problem is increasing. I received a number of letters from grade nine students in Leaf Rapids, as a result of some documentaries that were on T.V. about the acid rain problem in Manitoba, and I take great delight in reading them. As I was going down to get my files, I grabbed it and put it down to grab a cup of coffee and I didn't have a chance to bring some of the letters down to read to the Minister, because I think they provide us with a great insight. I know the Member for Logan indicated that he was pleased to see that the children were beginning to become aware of the problems and I know the Minister would have been pleased, and perhaps I'll have another opportunity to bring some of those to show him, if not to put on the record, because . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: How many would my honourable friend like us to bring from the department?

MR. COWAN: I would like to see them. The Minister has asked that, I think, in all sincerity and I'll take him up on it; we'll trade letters. Because I know, from reading those letters, that I developed a new insight and not a greatly different perception but a bit of a different perception. I realized that there were many people who were concerned because those children are sometimes expressing not only their own concerns but their parents and their neighbours concerns, and that gave me a good feeling to know that the awareness of the problem had extended to that great degree throughout the society, and with that awareness will come the solution, because when people realize that the problems are of a significant nature they will begin to demand that action be taken.

I think it was the Minister of the Environment for the federal government that said that there is a change in the public mood out there and he was speaking specifically to acid rain. He said, two or three years ago we couldn't have proceeded as quickly and as forcefully as we are now, because the public would not have allowed us; they would have believed the arguments that we would have imposed hardships on the corporations. And now they don't accept those arguments; they believe that if we don't do that, we're imposing hardships on our environment. And so there is a dramatic change, I agree with the federal Minister, although I don't agree on all things with the federal Minister. As a matter of fact, I disagree probably more than I do agree, but on that one I do sense that change also.

There are a number of other areas which I believe we should go through in this and I think we've had a very good discussion tonight. I would ask the Minister if he wants to continue on and open up another area or if he would consider the committee adjourning and beginning tomorrow afresh, on a new area? I have to mention . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if my honourable friend would agree, just so that I can satisfy myself that we've made some progress, agree to passing (a) and (b). Anything that he wants to say, I presume can be covered under Item (c). (Agreed) Then we can adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2)—pass; 5.(b)(1)—pass; 5.(b)(2)—pass.
The Member for Dauphin.

MR. JIM. GALBRAITH: Mr. Chairman, I move committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a motion that committee rise.

MR. JORGENSEN: We assume that (a) and (b) are passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. COWAN: I would, if I can, just ask the Minister if he can provide us with the staff . . . Well, I think we have the staff man years on that already. I would also, if I can, just clarify a situation; I'm not certain whether we'll be in committee tomorrow. We may well be, but the fact is that I have to be in Flin Flon

on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday and I wanted to make certain that arrangements were made to have another estimates come forward at that time, so as not to preclude participation of the critic in the discussion of the rest of the Environment estimates.

MR. JORGENSEN: I presume you've discussed this with the House Leader.

MR. GALBRAITH: I believe that our House Leader has discussed it with your House Leader, yes. Okay, I'll check.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. I would like to refer members of the committee to Resolution 77, Item (g)(1) — the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: I haven't too long to speak. I have a few things I want to finish explaining to my honourable friend from Rock Lake, and the Minister has gone to get some of the material that he needs, so during this time, Mr. Chairman, I think that before the dinner hour the Minister had talked about, again, repeated, the question of confrontation. I think I made a pretty good case, if he was listening, to show him that there wasn't any confrontation. I was talking about the MMA and I said that the thing that started the whole battle was that they wanted to contract out, and contract out meant it was the medical people in the field who were representing the medical doctors working for the department, and they wanted a clause in the agreement that the government could not hire anybody unless you went through and had the approval of the MMA. I think that anybody here will recognize that this is going a little too far, and it's funny, it was such an important thing then but I've never noticed that they try to get that; I'm sure that no government in Canada would have that in a clause where somebody in the private field could dictate to a government who they will hire. So that was the main thing, Mr. Chairman.

As far as the dental profession, and I'm going back to the Denticare program, there was a lot of negotiation. Finally, we said, there will some given. And I started that before dinner. There was a question of recognizing the dental nurses, which as I said, they said that one wouldn't be a problem, and we said, well, at your last meeting, there was a vote that said that it wouldn't be recognized and he said, the president told me at the time that could be changed, that's not a problem. Secondly, that on the initial visit, it would be sessional pay that they would get, and after that, referrals and so on, of course it would be fee for service. That was something they didn't like, but that is what they offered in their plan. That is what they are getting paid now, so much per student, so much for anybody that's eligible. And the third one, and a very important one as far as we're concerned, the work had to be done in the schools.

Mr. Chairman, nobody is criticizing from this side of the House, I haven't heard one single person criticize the work of the dentists. We recognize the work of today's dentists, we're very happy. And as I said, in fairness, in justice, nobody criticized from that side, I haven't heard anybody criticize, nor the dentists criticize the work of the dental nurses in their sphere, in their area of expertise.

So the thing is, the Member for Rock Lake says that we have criticized, talked about doctrinaire. Well, if anybody was doctrinaire, it is the government that was doctrinaire. You associate that, and you say, oh those doctrinaire socialists, but doctrinaire because their mind was made up, as I said, it was a sell-out to the dentists who wanted the control. And that is normal. At first when there was only the profession of doctors, they wanted the control. They controlled the nurses. And when you get a little stronger, you want to control somebody else. You're so afraid, and it's going to be the end of the world if you don't keep the control. The nurses themselves, who now are stronger, will not accept to be controlled by the medical profession, they want to stand on their own two feet, but they, in turn, wanted to control the LPN. That was one thing, they wanted to do away with the LPN, and I think that there is a role for these people, too.

Anyway, going back to the Denticare program, if the government feels this is what we want, of course we can argue back and forth. The only thing that I am criticizing is the way that it was done. You had a very good program, a program that was proven, a program that was just getting started nicely, and the decision was made that it would be turned over to the dentists. You call it co-operation. The Minister read the riot act, and he said, you have to hire those dental nurses. Now, these dental nurses, sure, some of them are hired, but how many in the plan? Some of them, in doctors' offices, as technicians, and I don't think this is what they wanted.

Then the Minister said, I deplore the fact that there is no nurses here. That is what got me, and this is the point that I don't like; this is what I call hypocrisy. It is obvious to anybody that has followed the debate and anybody that has seen the action of the government that the government and the dental profession are just marking time until the dental nurses have disappeared and are out of their way.

What we say, and I said it last year and I'll say it again, mark my words, this study, I'm not too impressed by that, because the decision was made before, and then you are taking part of the program that is being scuttled and you are comparing it against one that is getting all the chances. And what kind of comparisons are we doing? We're going to study that report, we haven't had time now before this debate, but it will be studied.

But what I'm interested in is to compare, in a few years, to compare not the true programs, one is being wound up, one is being destroyed, but compare this kind of program, and mostly utilization, not the work. I'd be the last one to say that I'm not satisfied with the work of the dentists. I've never said that and I won't say it. I'm talking about the utilization in the cost. You can't tell me, Mr. Chairman, that it's going to be the same cost, that you're going to have a situation where you are going to have professionals, and look at the fees, compare

the fees, and why would they work? You know, this is a government that will give them fee for service, and look at the fees that they're having now. They've gone up again, but on this, they are saying, we'll do this for a few years. And compare that to a dental nurse —(Interjection)— no, there's nothing wrong with that, but compare that to the work being done in that you're paying a dental nurse for a lot of the work, and you tell me which one is going to be more expensive? —(Interjection)— Who's guaranteed 16 grand?

MR. BLAKE: The dental nurses.

MR. DESJARDINS: The heck the are. I don't know of any nurse that was getting 16 grand.

MR. BLAKE: Fourteen?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, now you're going to guess. I'm not going to make a guess. There's nothing wrong with that; I hope they are getting 16 grand.

MR. BLAKE: You raised their expectations.

MR. DESJARDINS: We raised their expectations

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Just on a point of clarification, I just want to clarify, my understanding is that dental nurses were guaranteed 14,000 when they completed a two-year course, and this was creating some of the problems. Some of them maybe don't have full employment, that maybe the dentists aren't prepared to pay that kind of money because that's pretty good money for someone with really not too many years in the field and experience, and that may be where some of the problems are coming in.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, no this is not where the problem is coming, with the work that they were doing and I am not going to take a guess, I don't know. They were guaranteed a job; I don't remember that they were guaranteed a set salary; that would have to be checked. But of course if they are going to be used as dental technicians they shouldn't earn 14,000.00. But it wasn't us. We never told them that they worked for dental technicians. Look at the trouble we're having with nurses now. So we educated these people at our costs and costs to the government and we started the program. Now they are not needed any more but they are in a way. Oh yes, they are in a way in a partisan, in a political; the political situation was, what are you going to do? They were educated by the people of Manitoba and you're going to turn them out. The Minister said those that graduate they will stay as dental nurses, and they will get the same salary no matter what they do. But then the others, we don't guarantee them anything and then there is no more going. That's not the problem at all. Of course we trained them to do work in a program and if you say that's getting their expectation, it's the same thing as when you train a doctor, as when you train anybody, of

course. —(Interjection)— Well that is the question. What is your question that . . .

MR. BLAKE: You can sit down, then answer it.

MR. DESJARDINS: You'll answer it, all right.

MR. BLAKE: No, no, you answered it I said. That's fine.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to point out to the honourable members that we have some visitors up in the gallery on my left. It is the Scout group and there are 16 members of the 1st Kirkfield Scout Group under the direction of the Scoutmaster, Mr. Wheel. This group is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, and I would ask the honourable members to join me in welcoming them here this evening.
The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make a few comments on this particular program. It seems to me that the Minister has been receiving some abuse, especially from the Member for St. Johns, which was not deserved at all. I think that he is taking a very responsible approach to the whole area of dental service within the province and he is to be commended for this. I think that the Member for St. Boniface must remember very well that when they first embarked on the Childrens Dental Program and so on, that there never was a word of criticism from the opposition at that time. We recognized that there was a problem in remote areas especially and that type of service was needed where children would receive service through schools, so we did not criticize that program. As a matter of fact we commended the Minister on the program that he was carrying out at that particular time. But when we want to expand that program and when we come into the southern areas of the province where your population is more dense than what it is in the remote areas, then we have to take a different approach. We have to take a different outlook as to the whole program as far as dental care is concerned; we have to think not only of the children who are in school; we have to think of the adults and also of the senior citizens; we have to think of a small community. If you would take one third of the patients that they would normally see; if you would take away and have them serviced by somebody else then that small community certainly is never going to receive the services of a dentist. Yet if the dentist can look after the total program, then conceivably a dentist could establish in that particular area and carry out the program which we would hope that he would carry out in a much more efficient manner than if we fragment this. So we have to address ourselves to that particular situation, Mr. Chairman.

I understand that we have been very short of dentists, we still are short of dentists, especially in the rural area. There are a lot of them in the city, probably more than what they need, everybody wants to establish over here, but the rural area, by and large, is still short of dentists. And I understand

that there are going to be 28 dentists graduating within a very short period of time, and up to about a month ago only one of those dentists had been placed. Now, there's only one place really that they can look at, and that is to establish in rural Manitoba. So we have to assist these people in getting established, and hopefully these rural communities themselves are going to assist these dentists in getting established. I can only think of what we did in my own particular town where we purchased the equipment for the dentist and so on, and we gave him five years in which to pay back for the equipment; we set him up, in other words. We bought everything for him and we set him up, he's established over there and he's paid back everything that was lent to him at that particular time and he's very successful and everybody is very happy in the community, and I hope that more of these things would happen in the rural communities, and these will have to happen, because it does cost an awful lot of money for a dentist to get established in his own practice.

So I hope that these are the things that are going to develop. I hope that this is the direction that we will be taking, that we will be assuring that everybody, not only the children, but everybody in the community, are going to have access to dental care. There's another area though, and I would like to just point out, when the members are saying that we are really . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Just for clarification, not an argument. Is the member, did I hear him correctly, he feels that eventually everybody will be on Denticare, the Denticare that we have for children now will be carried over to senior citizens?

MR. BROWN: Eventually is a long time, Mr. Chairman. But I would say that for the present time certainly we could work on some kind of an arrangement where the program which is available in northern Manitoba, and those school districts that now are serviced by this thing, that we could carry forward that program, even if it was done by a dentist rather than by a dental nurse. There should be no problem there, we should be able to carry that program forward, there should be no problem. But when the members opposite are saying that we really are not doing enough as far as dental care is concerned, I would just like to point out one thing that appeared in the Speech from the Throne — (Interjection)— Well, we've been hearing the Member for St. Johns, for instance, blasting the Minister for not looking after the dental care, not promoting the program. But in the Speech from the Throne, the members opposite should recognize that it did address itself to a particular area, and which I did ask the Member for St. Boniface when he was the Minister of Health to address himself to, and that is the children with cleft palates, and so on. They were not covered and they will be covered now. I am very very pleased to see this, Mr. Chairman. Not many people are familiar with the problems of the children with cleft palates, work is very expensive. First of all you have to have your operation on the mouth, which

of course was covered by the Manitoba Health Services Commission, but your dental work was not. Your dental work, as a rule, would range anywhere between 1,500 at the low to up to 25,000.00; I've been made aware of cases where, to correct the problems, the dental work would cost up to 25,000, and the previous administration refused to cover these people. And it always seemed a shame to me, Mr. Chairman, that when the Member for St. Boniface was the Minister he would not pay attention to this. There is not that many children with that type of problem in the province that this could not have been done. We are not talking about a lot of money, but to those parents especially who have children with that type of problem this means an awful lot.

So the members opposite cannot say that we are not sympathetic to the problems of parents who have children with that type of problem, and indeed, as far as your entire dental problem is concerned within the province.

So with these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out that we are working in this direction and we have to take the total program into consideration. We cannot only think of the children alone; we have to take the concerns of the adults and also of the senior citizens into consideration.

Thank you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't intend to monopolize the floor and I won't be very long, but nevertheless, I want to make a correction and I want to make it fast. The member said that we did not want to listen, did nothing for those that have a problem with cleft palates, and that is absolutely wrong. This work was being done, we had a dentist, one of the best, not too many can do that, and they were operating with the St. Amant Ward at the St. Amant, and people were coming in. We've never refused, I don't know anybody that was refused that requested and that weren't given that. — (Interjection)— Well, you never brought it to our attention. It was never brought to our . . . — (Interjection)— And they were refused? By whom? — (Interjection)— If the member said they were refused, it was never brought to my attention when I was Minister. And before that, some of the work was being done, it was commissioned by the government, it was handled by the Faculty of Dentistry at the University of Manitoba, and there was some money in there; then they couldn't do it any longer, it was difficult, they couldn't get the people, and they stopped. And this was being worked at, so Mr. Chairman, it is very false to say that nothing was done.

The member talked about establishing dentists. I don't quarrel with that, but that has nothing to do with the program, the Denticare program which is only for children. I ask the member, is it the intention of the government to extend that, because he talked about extending the program to adults and he said, no. So I don't quarrel with what he said except that statement that he has made which was false.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments and

observations made by members on both sides of the committee in the examination of this particular service and this particular appropriation. I also appreciate the fact that both parties to the committee, both government and opposition, are certainly making positive and constructive efforts to assess and examine the estimates of this department in a constructive way and in a way that I think is much more positive and advantageous than perhaps has been the case in some Sessions past, and I appreciate that and I don't intend to delay the passage of this appropriation but I think I owe them some response to some of the questions and issues that they've raised. I'll try to keep my comments brief.

I don't intend to deal with all the political arguments that have been raised and I use the term political in a complimentary and in a sincere fashion. This is a political arena. Certainly programs in the public spectrum have an element of political orientation to them and in some cases political motivation to them, so it is by no means derogatory to refer to some of the arguments as having been political.

I think, though, that we have debated the ideology and the philosophy of the present government's approach to the Children's Dental Health Program and the previous government's approach to the Children's Dental Health Program at some considerable length and, I would hope to some considerable benefit, in terms of mutual enlightenment in past Sessions, and I am not going to take up the legitimate challenges of a political nature that have been put to me in the past few hours in the course of the remarks of some of the members of the opposition. They are entitled to their opinion. I presume they would grant the same to us and I think probably we could argue the ideology of this thing until the end of time.

What's important is that both parties to this committee, both parties to this House, and I must say all three parties to this House, I think, are interested in a good children's dental health program; one that delivers dental services and dental professionalism to, if possible, every child in Manitoba, but certainly to as many as we can reach and as many as are in a position socioeconomically to take advantage of that. There is obvious dispute as to how it should be delivered. The previous government felt that they had an exemplary model developed in the government administered program utilizing at a high profile level the concept of the dental nurse. We believe that dental services to children and to other Manitobans are best delivered by our dental professionals, that the design of programs determined and intended to deliver those services is best performed by our dental professionals, those persons, those men and women who have studied dentistry and who have devoted their professional lives to dentistry and I assume the twain will never meet on that argument.

I have some disagreement, of course, with the remarks of the Member for St. Johns this afternoon because I take some exception to his feigned surprise and his mock dismay at the position being taken by the present Minister of Health, myself, and my colleagues in government on this question and on our preference for a dentist-run program, all things being equal. We have never made any secret of that

position. I have said in this House and outside this House, on every occasion in which the issue has come up, that we, as a Conservative Government, as a Progressive Conservative Party, believe that the best program would be a program delivered by our dental professionals, not a program delivered by a government bureaucracy. We have never made any secret of that position and I do take exception to, as I say, the artificial posturing of the Honourable Member for St. Johns; I am sorry he is not here, but I had no way of knowing he wasn't going to be here, and I will leave it at that, just to say that those remarks really are the only ones that I take exception to.

I don't take exception to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Inkster; I don't agree with them, but I give him credit for being honest in his approach. He has categorized me as a saboteur where the Children's Dental Health Program is concerned. I categorize him, Sir, as a political enemy, not as a personal enemy, not as a social enemy, not by any means, but surely as a political enemy and surely that is legitimate in this arena. I say to him that one man's saboteur is another man's hero. I think he would concede me that point. When we are talking about sabotage and saboteurs, I think we have to be careful as to how broadly those terms can be applied. I would suggest that the course being followed by the previous government was a course that was doomed, doomed and preordained, whether they knew it or not, to sabotage of the dental profession in the province of Manitoba.

It depends on whose side you are on in terms of your approach to delivering services, Mr. Chairman. We believe we are on the side of the people of Manitoba who need their dentists and who need their dental profession and who do not want those professionals discouraged and frustrated and, in fact, encouraged to leave the province by a government program that did not admit of the expertise and of the involvement and the leadership and the initiative that they could bring to that program. I am not insisting that they weren't consulted, although the evidence, and we have had considerable of it, is that the consultations were mere window dressing. I know that the Member for St. Boniface doesn't agree with me on that and perhaps that is another point that had better be left unresolved because it has been debated in the past, and perhaps no useful purpose can be served by debating it again tonight.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that even if they were consulted, even if the Member for St. Boniface, when he was Minister of Health, embraced them, even if he hugged them, which I don't believe he did . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: That is going a little far.

MR. SHERMAN: Even if he went that far, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I am still straight.

MR. SHERMAN: Straight but lovable. Even if he went that far — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, that would have been a perilous experience for the dentists, I am sure. It is a question of the lesser of two evils, either to be embraced by the previous Minister of Health or to be ignored by him. I won't

venture a judgement as to which course was safer or happier.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, even if he did consult with them and embrace them, they were not encouraged in a meaningful way, they were not involved in a meaningful way, they felt shut out. That is the point, they felt shut out, and what was happening was a program was developing that was government oriented in its direction, its conception, and its administration, that designed and put in place a new dental discipline, which was seen by the dental profession as a threat to their professional parameters and their professional opportunities, and the outcome of that was a sense of frustration and discouragement on the part of the dental profession which was absolutely undeniably destined, Mr. Chairman, to rob this province and the people of this province ultimately of their creative, innovative professional input of the graduates of our Manitoba Dental College, of our dentists, men and women, who are available to go out and establish practices in parts of this province that need them so desperately, and who I believe will do so with some encouragement and some recognition on the part of the government that they count and that they are among Manitobans who count. That is what is at issue.

It is not the short-term benefit of getting a few dental nurses into some school divisions. It is the long-term objective of providing proper professional dental service to every region and, hopefully, to every community in the province of Manitoba. We believe, Sir, that in the consultations and discussions that we have held with the dental profession on this subject, that by involving them in the mainstream of the delivery of crucial programs of dental care in this province, such as the Children's Dental Health Program, that they will work strenuously with us and among themselves to place dentists in rural communities that now do not have dentists and dental services, to encourage their young graduates, the young people coming into their professional field, their professional community, to go out into rural communities and establish practices, and they are developing and designing projects for assisting them in that process. But they are not going to do it if they feel that the administration on Broadway, of whatever cast, whatever hue, is not interested in them as creative professionals in this province. That is the challenge that we have had to cope with.

Alongside that, I take into account the problems and the difficulties of those young people who took the dental nursing course, but I say again, Mr. Chairman, what I have said before. We didn't create that dental nursing course or that dental nursing category for them; we didn't encourage them to go on the promise that they would be dental nurses working in the field in Manitoba, and in fact my colleagues and my government have no responsibility, no responsibility whatsoever, for following through on a position on which we were compromised by a previous government. The efforts that are being made on behalf of those young people — and believe me, Sir, strenuous efforts have been and are continuing to be made — are being made out of a sense of morality and a sense of concern on the part of my colleagues and myself for those young people. Not because this government was committed, not

because this government could be compromised or committed by a previous government, and not because we owe them anything, except that they are young Manitobans and we want them here, and we want to give them an opportunity. From that moral sense and moral perspective alone, we are trying to find them employment in the field which they have aspired to enter, the field of dentistry, dental services, dental discipline, that is as close to being a dental nurse as possible, and is, in fact, a dental nurse, if that is possible.

We have tried to meld those two objectives together, keeping in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the key ingredient in this whole picture is the child out there in the under-served communities, where dental services have been lacking or near lacking for far too long, and we are proceeding as quickly as we can in refining and defining, and in fact finalizing the shape and format of a program so that it can be expanded in the future, and everyone knows where they are going and what the parameters are.

But it has not been easy and I don't intend to dwell on that. I know that the former Minister of Health would agree with me from his own experience that questions and issues of this kind do not lend themselves to simple solution. But I want to say, at the risk of being immodest, that the time that my former Deputy Minister and my present Acting Deputy Minister and I have spent in our responsibilities in the Ministry of Health in the two and a half years that I have been Minister has consisted of an enormous amount of time and energy on this problem of the Children's Dental Health Program and the future careers of the dental nurses, the graduates who came out of Wascana College. I would say and I think I can say without exaggeration, Sir, that we have spent more time on that one single issue than on any other one single issue in the time that I have been Minister and we haven't got it solved yet because we are up against perspectives and attitudes and we were all prey to them in our own particular walks of life and in our own particular communities and in our own particular professions, and they are not easily modified. They are not easily altered but we are making progress and I believe that we will be able to produce a program that delivers a better system and a better format and form of children's dental health care to the young people of Manitoba, while utilizing to the fullest our dental profession, which we believe is necessary and crucial to this province, and at the same time provide full employment opportunities for all of those young graduates.

I haven't given up on that by any means and I don't intend to give up on, and when the Honourable Member for St. Boniface says confrontation, I've laid down the law to the dentists; you're darn right I've laid down the law to the dentists. We want dentists and we want them here and we believe they can do a great deal for Manitoba but it's a two-way street. We want them to acknowledge that we feel we have a moral obligation to those young dental nurses and we want them hiring those young dental nurses.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's the course that we are on. The Member for Inkster gives me credit at least for having indicated quite clearly and without equivocation, I think, on numerous occasions in the past that provided cost efficiency, cost effectiveness

and health status are equal or nearly equal, we would prefer to go with a program run by the dentists, rather than a program run by government. We could not move in that direction obviously as trustees of the public's money until we could justify it. That's the reason for this review and I think that some of the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Johns are rather unpleasant implied criticisms of the integrity of that review committee. I just want to remind committee members, Mr. Chairman, that review committee was an objectively selected committee with equal representation from the private profession of dentistry and the government of the province of Manitoba and its dental directorate, with a neutral chairman from the University of Manitoba.

The Members of that committee, Mr. Chairman, and I think that this should be read into the record if it hasn't been up till this point in time, and I think it should be pointed out by his colleagues to the Member for St. Johns, the members of that committee are Dr. Arthur T. Storey, Chairman, who is head of Preventive Dental Science at the University of Manitoba; Dr. Neville Winograd, a private practitioner in Winnipeg; Dr. Wilf Feasby, from London, Ontario, with no interest and no ambitions one way or the other in political terms or social terms in Manitoba — Dr. Feasby a specialist in children's dentistry from the University of Western Ontario; Dr. Jim Leake, who was the director of our dental services directorate until he resigned to take a job at the University of Toronto a few months ago — since his departure he has been replaced by our new director of dental services, Dr. Cliff McCormick, who is sitting in front of me; and Betty Havens, who was the director of research in the Continuing Care Services Branch of the Department of Health.

Now, Sir, those are people who I believe possess: (1) integrity, (2) objectivity, and (3) expertise; and they are the people who have gone around the province and held meetings and received briefs and listened to presentations and listened to delegations and checked the records and had computer print-outs delivered to them in voluminous numbers and analyzed those and put together the statistics and drawn the conclusions that found their way into first the interim report, and then later the final full-year report on cost efficiency comparisons between the two programs that members see in front of themselves today.

One can raise all the questions they want, and the Member for St. Johns has raised some old and some hairy and some hoary ones, about the meaning of the findings of the review committee and about whether we looked at a particular question or a particular aspect, or a particular problem or not, and I say to him the answer in all cases is yes, yes, yes. The review committee is a committee of experts and a committee of committed people who took their job seriously, have done in seriously, and don't need to be patronized by the Member for St. Johns by being told, well, there are certain questions, such as for example, if you get the dentists to work like the dickens for the first year just to build up high utilization and high accessibility rates, what about the contrived and artificial effort that represents, will they be able to keep it up in the future?

The committee considered that. I considered that because the Member for St. Johns dragged up again

that deplorable letter that he dragged up last year. That was debated a year ago. —(Interjection)— Well it wasn't my letter. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, does the honourable member . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . there are people who say you want to run the program.

MR. SHERMAN: Does the Honourable Member for Inkster think he's telling me something, because I assure him he isn't.

MR. GREEN: It doesn't matter if I tell you. You won't listen anyway.

MR. SHERMAN: I stood in my same place last year and expressed as much distaste and unhappiness to that letter as he professes to feel. I was just as upset by that letter as he professes to feel. — (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. I think if we could have one speaker at a time so that it could be recorded properly in Hansard. You will have time to make your remarks after. The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, is the great, benevolent, democratic, all loving Member for Inkster who is seeking the leadership of his party going to . . .

MR. GREEN: I am the leader of my party.

MR. SHERMAN: Is he going to . . . Well he is the leader of his party, I stand corrected, but the official, the official leadership of his party. Is he going to sit there and tell me, Mr. Chairman, that because one individual . . .

MR. GREEN: Not one.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, one individual dentist who wrote that letter and who obviously was misguided and misinformed and certainly was in error in doing so, and I've had no hesitation about saying that to him and to the Manitoba Dental Association; is he going to sit there and say that represents the mentality, the attitude, and the approach of the dental profession in Manitoba, because if he is, I'm going to show him two or three letters and statements by lawyers and say to him that that represents the attitude of the entire legal profession in Manitoba, and I don't think the Member for Inkster is that narrow-minded or that stupid as to subscribe to that kind of a suggestion. So there was a deplorable and unfortunate letter written by a dentist, Mr. Chairman. This government does not believe that that's sufficient to tar and feather the dental profession of Manitoba en masse and universally because of one person's error. I wasn't happy with that letter. The Member for St. Johns dragged it up last year; he dragged it up this year; and you know what, Mr. Chairman — I'm keeping an eye on the clock, I said I'd be short — I bet you 10 tonight he drags it up again next year. It's been debated, rehashed, and it will be debated and rehashed again because it's the only thing that the Member for St. Johns has to contribute to this

debate, some poor, squalid, tawdry letter by a misguided professional who did not speak for the members of his profession with whom I have met, and met continually and regularly in my office. And I refuse to accept the insinuations and the innuendos from the Member for Inkster and the Member for St. Johns, which would have you believe, and this committee believe, that that does represent the entire view of the dental profession of Manitoba, because it doesn't. They were upset by it; I was upset by it; the opposition was upset by it. It was a mistake, and I told that particular individual that. But Sir, to get back to the point that I was making, does the Member for Inkster not think that this committee, that Dr. Storey, a reasonably intelligent person, that Dr. Winograd, Dr. Feasby, Dr. Jim Leake, Dr. Cliff McCormick and Betty Havens, all reasonably intelligent people, are aware of that kind of situation, or aware of that incident . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: I would like to ask the Minister a question. Can he tell me what representation the people who are now providing the service had on that committee?

MR. DESJARDINS: Not a damn bit.

MR. GREEN: Well, I'd like to know. You, the great democrat. The great libertarian.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Minister submit to a question?

MR. SHERMAN: Indeed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The floor is yours. The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I certainly can tell him. Obviously he hasn't been listening. If he does not think that Dr. Jim Leake, one of the architects of the Children's Dental Health program, a strong and stout defender of and advocate for the dental nurses, did not represent the dental nurses' perspective and the government designed children's dental health program perspective, then all I can say is, he knows nothing about the formation and the design and the creation of that program. Because, Mr. Chairman, I assure him that Dr. Leake would, I'm sure, attest to it, were he here, that he believed in that children's dental health program, that he believed in the concept of the dental nurse, and he certainly represented, as best he could, his faith in that program on this committee. —(Interjection)— Because Dr. Leake received, after giving great years of service to the province of Manitoba, an offer from the University of Toronto which he found extremely intriguing, and I suggest that we have a very adequate, competent and capable replacement in Dr. McCormick.

For example, Mr. Chairman, does the opposition think that Dr. Storey came into those hearings, those studies, with a bias or a prejudice? He represented the general, universal, public point of view, objectively, as he attempted to weigh the benefits of

the government program as against the professional run program. And Mr. Chairman, I must repeat that what is being said by the opposition is, I think, implied criticism, in fact it's gone beyond implied criticism, it's direct criticism of the integrity of the members of that review committee, and I deplore that, Mr. Chairman.

So what we have come up with is a report and a series of findings, and a series of recommendations which presents a direction and a course for this government to follow in the immediate future, and it is our intention to do that. In the meantime, we have not permitted any geographic expansion of the program, but we have permitted age expansion and we have achieved, as I have said before and I say again, a happy coincidence of being able to meld the two disciplines, the dentist and the dental nurse together in three more school districts.

And Mr. Chairman, it is my intention, and it is my colleague's intention, lest there be any continuing doubt over there, that on the basis of the evidence thus far, provided the health status survey produces the same kind of relatively equal and relatively competitive and comparable results, on the basis of that evidence, I would say that Manitobans can be sure that a review committee, in its studious work and effort, has found out for Manitoba, that a children's dental health program, delivered by the dentists, will be better than and superior to all things taken into account than a government-run program. And the greatest thing it will do, Mr. Chairman, is help us get dentists into rural communities that are now under-serviced. That's the biggest objective of all. We intend to do that, we intend to pursue that and achieve that and to look at the dental nurses in the process as best we can and to the fullest extent that we can.

But let there be no mistake, Mr. Chairman, that we are going ahead with the children's dental health program, and we're going ahead on the soundest and best professional basis, and thus far, the evidence points to the dental profession, which I think serves Manitoba well. I think we can be proud of our dental profession and our dental professionals. I don't think we need have any doubts about the quality of their work. They came out of a high calibre dental college with high qualifications and standards, and we can be sure that the quality of their work will be on a par with any in Canada or North America, and if the evidence continues to develop in the manner it's developed thus far, the future of the program will rest with that profession, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister's time is up.
The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Pass, well, you're dreaming up there. Well, you'll get it again.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister was at his best again. They are trying to set the rules, they are trying to set the style of debate, and they want, you know, closing, you wave the flag, tell us how wonderful the dentists are, and give the impression that we are attacking the dentists. At no time did we attack the dentists. At no time did we attack the work of the dentists

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not, the Minister again talked about ideology, in this program, the ideology came from one side and one side only. One side only. The Minister stated that if there was any negotiation, it was one-sided. But when he wants to say something, well, that's all right. Darn rights, I threatened the dentists that if they didn't hire these nurses, because it's a two-way street, but when we talk about a two-way street, we're attacking the dentists, Mr. Chairman. At no time did we criticize the work — this is not an issue here. You go back, first of all he said, this big bureaucracy, government bureaucracy, what about Medicare? Is that a government bureaucracy? Who runs that? What about the hospitals? What about the personal care homes? It's supposed to be something dirty if the government is administering something. And who says that the expert administrators are the dentists? They are experts in their field of taking care of the dental health. That's what they're expert at.

And Mr. Chairman, we had a government that tried to do, and I'm not suggesting — and I want to make clear, I'm not going to do like the Minister, suggest that he's the only one that's interested, but we had a government that was interested in providing as much care as possible. Maybe our philosophy, and I'm not saying it's good, we think it's good, maybe our philosophy is to do a little more for the people than a Conservative government. We believe a true Conservative is a person who feels the people should do for themselves. —(Interjection)— Yes, that's exactly what it is.

And Mr. Chairman, no, I didn't say that. I didn't say that. I'm not like you, I made quite clear, and I explained before that I wasn't saying that, I was just saying that we were trying to bring programs, and you know, the proof is there. The programs, they are stuck with the programs that we brought in. The other Conservative provinces like Alberta and Ontario, they don't have these programs, they didn't want these programs. They were very satisfied with block funding where they can spend the money where they want. I'm not even criticizing that. The question is that we felt, also, and this question of trying to bring more doctors in rural, we commend you for that, we wish you luck. We tried also, we did a little progress, not as much as we would have liked, and that is not a situation only to Manitoba. That's all over the world, you can look at countries, you can look at different areas of the province, and the doctors, these people, people like to live, it's easier, to live and work in the city than in a rural area. So you know, this is not something new and I wish the government luck in this.

But this is not the point that we're arguing tonight. I wasn't arguing, if he wants to argue, and I'm not faulting him for criticizing the Member for St. Johns, the Member for St. Johns had his say, I know that he would like to be here tonight, he can't because he is doing some of the work required by an MLA, but that's fair game. But I'm not going to be lured into that. My only complaint about the nurses and the Minister is right, they have a mandate to govern. And if they don't like a program that we have, they can change it. And they've changed some, and they've let some go, some of them, for political reasons, maybe, they can't do it all at once, and they wind

them down. And that's being done, especially in this field of health.

Mr. Chairman, the situation is that we wanted to educate the children, a lot of work went in that, to teach them how to brush their teeth, to take care of their teeth. Many of them never see a dentist, or most of them did not see a dentist until they might have been 18 or more. That was the situation. So we wanted a program that we can afford. It's not a question that we didn't think that the work could be done by a dentist, or wouldn't be done as well, or wouldn't be done better. That is not the point at all. We wanted to give a minimum to people, to make them aware, give them an education, prevention, and do the work immediately. If there was anything serious, they were referred to a dentist, not to a dental nurse, to a dentist.

It is a situation everybody from that side of the House, from this side of the House, in the field of health, everybody agrees that it is a problem because it is so costly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a government is not there to worry about a privilege or a special class. Because you respect somebody doesn't mean that you should bow to their every wish and forget everybody else that is not in the same level of influence. And if you dare say something, well, you're criticizing them and you want to get them out. You know, it's fair game to criticize a politician, it's fair game to criticize the President of the United States, nobody gets more abuse than the Prime Minister of Canada, everything is fair. But if you say something about a profession, not necessarily saying about their work, but of the way that they conduct themselves, and I have yet to see that a profession or a group of people or a nationality, or a religion, have all the good guys on their side. There are good, very good garbage collectors, there are good doctors, there are bad doctors, there are crooked lawyers, and there's crooked politicians and there are good politicians.

This government, though, would like to see that they have a monopoly, they're the only ones that like the doctors, they're the only ones that like the dentists. The dentists are not criticized. The thing is that we cannot afford, and this government will not be able to afford it now, this is the government of cost-first, need second, this is the government of restraint, and they will not be able to afford a dental care program by the dentists when in full swing. It's not that we don't trust the dentists, we feel that certain work can be done just as well, just a limited part of the work can be done by people that are trained for that, and in fact, yes, maybe a little better because they are expert in that field, that's all they do.

And those are not my words, Mr. Chairman. The Minister told us about all these great people, the integrity. Now, I say, do you challenge the integrity — and unfortunately, I mention it, it probably could be found, I can find that report, that study that was made in Saskatchewan. I think it was the Dean of the Dentistry School in Ontario, nobody, all dentists, every single one of them, not one of them from Saskatchewan, all the — well, not the best because I'm not going to slight anybody, but amongst the most respected people in that profession. And what did they say about this program? What did they say? And I just want to quote something that I quoted before. Now, they studied, because Ontario wanted

to see if that work was done. And this is what, not I, this is what they found. They found, when they investigated, that the work that was being done by the dental nurses, as compared to the dentists, unacceptable by the dentists, there was 21.1 percent by the dental nurses, 3.7 percent superior by the dentists, 16.5 percent by the dental nurses, 47.7 percent, Mr. Chairman. Adequate, 62.4 by the dentists, and 48.6 by the dental nurses. So I don't want to start arguing who can do the work, I think they can both do the work and they can do the work well. But a country, a government, and people who are trying to provide service and do it at a minimal cost, will have to be careful that this is done, and we will need the paramedical people to help, and the day that we wake up to that, that we don't educate people at a cost of over, in excess of 100,000 to the people of Manitoba for a certain profession, do we make them do work that somebody else can do cheaper, and somebody would want to do, especially when there is a shortage of that.

It would practically look like this government, their main reason of this government is to do something for the dental profession. And it was said during some of the discussions we had, you know, they would do the work, the dentists would have less work. Are we interested in that? Are we going to provide people, if we could stop all disease, would we say no? Would we say no, because the doctors won't have any work? Is that the duty of a government? Is that the duty of a government, Mr. Chairman? Not at all.

This program did not hurt, in fact it would help the dentist profession. Now, Mr. Chairman, my complaint, of course I would argue that this business that all cost, that the doctors, and if the Minister would carry, would be consistent, he would want the doctors to run the Medicare Program, and I am sure they would want that, but politically he knows that he couldn't do that, he couldn't change that. He would then have run and own their own hospitals, that is done in other countries, in this great country south of us, the country of free enterprise, that is done. They also have personal care homes. I personally have never had any hangups or problems as to who does the work, as long as it is done well, is done and is done where we can afford it.

The Member for Rhineland brought in all kinds of red herrings and something that we weren't even discussing at all, and he was talking about medicare. We would also like to see, and there are a lot of people that would like to see medicare, because the cost is prohibitive here, it is very very costly. We have no reason to believe that the people, if they are sincere when they set up those fees, will not be as sincere later on and demand the same kind of fees for the same time. This is what we are saying. This is all that we are saying, and there is no way, you can bring document after document at this time where the information came from a group, this information was handed to them, and it is a situation of what are we comparing? Certain areas were started, the work was done for a few years, and you are talking about the same work, when some of main work was done already. Utilization is compared for those eligible under one program and the others, those that have been treated, because that is all they have to go by, Mr. Chairman. This is it. I think they were being paid

so much for everybody that was eligible, even if they accepted the program or not.

I am not talking about now. To start a program it is always a little more difficult, a little more costly, there is no doubt about that, but the thing that I don't like, and that is the main thing — there were two statements made by the Minister that he deplored that there was a shortage of nurses. He didn't do anything, he had a commitment. Many of us would believe that it was a political situation that he was faced with. I will even give him the benefit of the doubt because I know that if he can help somebody get a job, he would like to do it, but, what kind of a job? How hard did they try? They figured if you don't look too hard that program will go away.

We are looking for nurses now, we are going all over the place recruiting nurses. We have recruited doctors, but we have dental nurses here, nobody has taken the trouble of finding out if they want to work in this program. We have chased this and we know, we have talked to these people, and just because they haven't got a PhD or a doctorate or whatever, they are just as honest and good people as anybody else. They told us the way they were treated; they told us that they couldn't open their mouth.

The Minister talked also about the Director, a man that was highly recommended all across Canada, who has had all kinds of offers. I happen to know why he left. It is not up to me to mention that he couldn't live in this situation at all, that he couldn't live, that he hated every minute of it, because he knew what was going.

Mr. Chairman, this is the situation now. The Minister is saying this is what the member from this side said. If the Minister is saying, well this is the program we want, we feel that the dentists are the only ones that can run the program, fine, but to say everything being equal we would prefer — how can you have something equal when you are destroying it, when you are building up a program at the expense of another one? If he really wanted to know, if he wasn't afraid of what he was looking for, if he wasn't afraid of the facts, he would have said keep on your program. They didn't have to give them any more, that's what the dentists were asking at one time. And he would have started from scratch another program by the dental profession in the comparable areas, give people part of the city, and then he would have looked at the cost, and then he would have looked at the result, and he would have looked at the utilization. In a few years he could have said . . . I am not faulting him for saying this is the program I want. I am faulting him for pretending that he wants the program, everything else being equal. His mind was made up way before these honest people prepared this document. We could read Hansard of last year, read Hansard when they were sitting on this side, Mr. Chairman, and this what I am going to say is fair ball. There is nothing wrong in promoting and helping a party. To promote a party, and a party to fight an election needs money and it needs supporters, and there is nothing wrong with groups of people, if they feel that our government is closer to their way of thinking, it is maybe interesting when you are in the upper brackets of maybe lowering taxes, of letting more people do for themselves. Of course, they are going to favour that government, and they can't criticize that government when they

criticize the other, it is very difficult. We have seen all kinds of examples of that.

It is no secret. If it is a secret it is not a very well-guarded secret that they were meeting and taxing the members of the dentist profession, taxing them to make a contribution to the Conservative Party before the last election. —(Interjection) It is not Ah, there is nothing wrong with that. Mr. Chairman, I think it is wrong when you sell out, and this is exactly what this government did. This government had its mind made up before, and that is the way it was going, nothing else, and this is what I criticize, the way it was done, the Minister pretending that he had no ideology in that at all, that it was just — he mentioned it today that he wants the dentists to run the program. To do the work in running the program, that should not be understood by the public either, misunderstood by the public. If you are talking about the people doing work, there was no way that I, as the Minister of Health, or anybody on my staff, or any of my colleagues, interfered with program at all. The thing was set up, there were doctors that were responsible in certain areas, there were dental nurses for certain areas, and then they were making referrals and the people could go to the dentist of their choice. That is what the situation is.

Let us not try to make a big communist program out of this or one that the Minister of Health would be extracting teeth, or that kind of stuff, or filling teeth. That is ridiculous. Not more than the present Minister of Health is caring for the people of Manitoba when they are sick. Mr. Chairman, this is the big difference, and all I can say is that when the thing was set up, when there is somebody, you know, that is being criticized, and that the dental nurses are afraid to open their mouth. Some came, they came over to see us, they were afraid to come and see us. Some of them said to hell with it, I can't live with this anyway.

We did something awful, because we started a dental — that exists in many countries — we did something awful because we encouraged people to be dental nurses, to be proud of that, to be efficient at their work, and to expect that they would be able to work as dental nurses. Mea culpa, mea culpa, we are guilty. That is exactly what we did, that is exactly what we did. In fact, we did more than that, we educated them ourselves to make sure that we had enough of them to work on the program, and we do not back down and we don't apologize. —(Interjection)— Yes, the Minister is also right. He has no legal responsibility to these people. They are in the way. He knows, he admitted today, the dentists don't want them, not as dental nurses. They don't want them, they want them as dental technicians or joe boys or joe girls, and that is what they want them for.

Mr. Chairman, this is the situation. I believe that the program that is being set up now will be a good program. I have no doubt, I have confidence, just as much confidence in the work of the dentists as the Minister, or the Member for Rhineland, or the Member for Rock Lake, just as much confidence in them. But I haven't got the same confidence or the same thing that the program will not be much more expensive in a few years when there is no turning back. There's no more when the last dental nurse has left Manitoba or is working at something else,

may be working at — well they might come back. The comparison will not be the document that we have today, where one government, where the people that control are ruining, are knocking down a program to build the other one and then make a comparison in robbing them of the things they want and keeping them with the things they don't want, they are not ready to take at this time, Mr. Chairman. But the comparison will be done with a province that has a certain type of program with another one, and I will prophesize again, Mr. Chairman, that it will be much more costly, and I will also prophesize that the utility will not be the same. Some of the dentists were saying, and these people that are running the — the Minister was embarrassed. You didn't have to tell us that. We are not that naive. We know you were very embarrassed, and we know that you would have wished, and this person that wrote it would have given anything to be able to take it back. We know that but the direction went not only in this letter, in seminars that they had, even if you have to neglect some of your other patients, make damn sure that there's utilization because you will be judged and you will get back on utilization, and that was said.

Okay, well then don't pretend. —(Interjection)— All right, I never heard you say that. You're saying it now. You are saying publicly that they are doing that. Well why did you rush into a study before they even had their feet wet and make a comparison that is going to judge? Why do you make a comparison if that is the rule of the game? Is that a true . . .

MR. SHERMAN: It's publicly that the question would be raised as to whether they didn't put on a one-year effort, and I was quoted by Francis Russell as having said it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Francis Russell quoted you on other things too that you don't mention, in fact you were pretty mad at her not too long ago. That's fine you can quote, I don't know what you're referring to. But I am saying that it is — and I'm not blaming the dental profession for that. If I wanted something I would bend over backwards to get it. It is human nature. It is natural. It is all right. There is nothing wrong with it. But that is something that has to be considered, and if you really want it, the comparison, it wasn't this document - that now you can say, well see, I was right, because your mind was made up before.

The thing is, why didn't you let them, and this is what I pleaded with you last year and the year before, leave them alone. Later in their program let the dentists open — there was lot's of room, a lot of people that weren't covered. Why did any new ones - leave them with what they had and let the dentists start from scratch in comparable areas and then if you are sincere when you are saying that everything being equal — you could have still said, well it cost a little more but I want the dentists and that would have been fair ball game. But don't pretend, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, don't pretend that you really want to see the true program work. You have so little respect for us that you think that we are that naive and when a program is being knocked down at the expense of another program, and the people that want that, that are shaping it the

way they want, that you can make a real comparison. Surely if you hadn't been afraid and you had the nurses - you had everything. They had bought equipment. You weren't blowing the money that was spent to educate them, which you did, which you are doing, as dental nurses. You could have had a comparison if that's what you wanted. That is what I am complaining of. That is why I am complaining, not of your choice. It is none of my business what you do. You have the mandate, we were defeated, and I accept that. I accept that, and the rule in this House is to try to get my ideas across the same as you; not to ridicule you. That's not what I am trying to do. But not to listen to the whitewash that you are — thank you. Not in listening to the whitewash that you speak, and if you want — everything is fair also. I have very little doubt that you continue, and your friends will continue to talk about the confrontation with the doctors and the former Ministers and the former government and the dentists. I have no doubt that you will do that because it serves your purpose. But it is not honest. —(Interjection)—

Oh, because they say. But what if I say that's not true. Why don't you look? I explained before — that's right. You don't believe me. You don't want to believe me. You don't want to believe me, and I am just as honest as any of you and just as honest as any doctor, and when I say to you that the confrontation was brought in for the reason that I told you before at this dinner, that's exactly it.

We had a situation where seven days, upon January 7th, of a certain year, a contract that had expired on the 31st of December had not been renewed. We had a big meeting with the medical profession in the Convention Centre and they were going to withdraw service. You did not sign a contract with them for how many months? Six months, eight months, we didn't hear a word. —(Interjection)— Could they? Could they? Oh yes they did, because we were the enemy, we were the socialists, although the same thing was happening in other provinces, and now they've got to shut up. I'm not blaming you. I am saying what the situation is. Did I say you had a confrontation with them?

MR. SHERMAN: No, but . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: But you say I had a confrontation with them . . .

MR. SHERMAN: But don't say that I'm the one saying there was confrontation. They're the ones, tell them.

MR. DESJARDINS: You are repeating it; they're not in this House. You have repeated, you said it this afternoon again.

MR. SHERMAN: Of course . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Make up your mind, did you say it or didn't you?

MR. SHERMAN: Of course, because the two professions have told us that, and that's right. They are right. They did . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, so you are saying, that's just — they are right. Any explanation that I gave you, any document that I gave you is not acceptable. Well that's fair enough.

MR. SHERMAN: No, I believe you think you're right.

MR. DESJARDINS: But they're right. I only think I'm right, but they're right. Well that's fair enough. I didn't expect much more than that from you. But when you add the facts and you purposely — maybe that's one of the reasons why the public doesn't respect the politicians. You take any lawyers, they fight each other and so but then they stand together, the medical, the dental profession, what does the politician do? You know we're not any better. But when something is said and if we know it, the best we'll do is keep our mouths shut instead of saying, hey, just a minute, you're going a little too far. That's nonsense? Can you tell me of an issue that you said no, that's not true? Did you tell the doctor that wasn't a confrontation, that when they challenge and they say we are going to withdraw — ? And you know the very important thing between a doctor/patient relation, it has nothing to do with the government. The government was only saying . . . One minute? What can a person say in one minute that hasn't been said already?

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say it is not the question. We are not too happy with what they are doing with nurses. We think the other program in the long run would have been better because of the cost and utilization. Only time will tell. We can argue every day like the Minister said, we can bring out the same letters and he can make the same speeches, nothing will be changed. But the fact that we deplore is that the Minister pulled out his handkerchief and cried because there was no nurses around. And then he said that everything being equal, he wants to give it to the doctors. And those are the two things that personally get my dander up. I'm not going to fight the Member for St. John's battle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, we've had an interesting discussion on this subject and an interesting exposition by the Minister of Health as to what constitutes a democracy, what constitutes fair treatment, what constitutes objectivity, Mr. Chairman. For instance, the Minister of Health has told us that objectivity will mean that when the new government comes into power, which will not be very long by the way, that a committee be set up composed of seven dental nurses to look into whether or not the dentists are properly supplying dental care in accordance with this program, and as a member of the committee there will be a member of the staff of the Minister's office, a medical man, let's say Dr. Ted Tulchinsky and then if anybody says, where are the dentists represented on this committee, the New Democratic Party Minister will get up and say, well, what do you mean? Here are seven dental nurses who know this work, who can examine what is being done and can tell us; and

here is Dr. Ted Tulchinsky — are you suggesting that Ted Tulchinsky doesn't represent the broad interests of the public which includes the dentists? And they will come in and they will make a report and the Minister will say it is a wonderful objective report and if you say anything bad about it you are attacking the integrity of Dr. Tulchinsky and the seven dental nurses who have looked into how the dentists have practised this dental program, and have come to the conclusion and, Mr. Chairman, there's the rub — because nobody has said what the Minister has suggested, nobody has said that any of these people have said anything wrong, nobody has attacked anybody's integrity. What are these people saying? Am I reading the same report?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, would the member tell me why on April 24, 1980 he's raising his objections now to the composition of that committee when we have been absolutely candid and honest with the opposition on this approach from the day it was launched. When I was asked in this House last year what kind of review committee we were setting up, what the membership would be and what the terms of reference would be and I disclosed that plus the membership to the opposition, at that time he had no objections. But tonight he's manufacturing an objection. Could he tell me why, Mr. Chairman?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, do you find one word in anything I said this afternoon or now objecting to the membership of this committee? Mr. Chairman, I ask you to tell me one thing that I objected to the membership of this committee. I asked, Mr. Chairman, the reason that I said that is that the Minister got up and started talking about the wonder of this committee. And when he started to extol how the committee was composed, I asked him whether it had any dental nurses on it, and the Minister said the dental nurses were represented by a member of the staff, a medical man in his department. So I am telling the Minister that when the new government comes in — and by the way, if it was me I wouldn't do it, but I've seen it done. I've seen it done, particularly by the Conservatives and the New Democrats did it too, but particularly by the Conservatives — that when the New Democratic Party government comes in, then the Minister will say that it is perfectly legitimate to have a committee of seven dental nurses, plus a member of his staff who is a doctor, who will represent the dentists, or let's find a dentist and I will find you a dentist who believes that dental nurses should supply this service. And that dentist, Mr. Chairman, will represent the broad interests of the public and therefore the dentists, and that committee . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Let me assure you I won't say that.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's what he says about his own committee, that's what he says about his own committee, he said, Mr. Chairman, that there are Dr. Neville Winograd . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Seven dental nurses you said.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, are we now saying that seven dental nurses are no good, four dental nurses, maybe three civil servants. What we know is that no dental nurses were on the committee, that the members of the committee were composed of dentists or agents of the government who had indicated they would prefer to see this done by dentists. That's who's on the committee.

Now, on the next committee, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection)— The Honourable Member says they are not agents of the government. Good, let it be written down now that the civil servants, the medical staff that we appoint, or that the New Democrats appoint to this committee, along with four dental nurses, will not be considered by the Minister of Health to be agents of the government. Because that is what he has now said and that's what will happen, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the worst of it, I have not said a bad word about any member of this committee, I've not said a bad word about this committee. I said this committee hasn't found anything. Am I reading the wrong recommendations? These are March 14, 1980. Is that the final report?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, where does this committee say that this dental program should be supplied by the dentists. Am I missing something? Mr. Chairman, am I missing something? You know what they say, Mr. Chairman? They say that they've looked at the sample program of the dentists and the program that was provided by the dental nurses through the public, and that the bureaucracy of the dentists is comparable to the bureaucracy of the public. That's what they say. Who expected them to say otherwise? Who expected — only a fool would expect them to say otherwise and the Minister is not a fool. And if he says that the letter is not meaningful, and that letter — he doesn't say, Mr. Chairman, that the letter states wrong things. No, he says, and he repeated it three times, the letter was a mistake — a mistake, Mr. Chairman. In other words it was a mistake to write the letter. Not that the content of the letter is wrong, but that the letter, Mr. Chairman, is a mistake. We don't need any convincing that the letter is a mistake, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, let's go to the future; when a dental nurse writes a letter to the other dental nurses saying we have to convince the Minister of Health in the New Democratic Party, or at least we have to give him information and we are now providing a program which is designed to fill these jobs with our people and have the dentists do other work, and in order to do this, to make sure they don't hire more dentists or get more dentists doing this work, work a little harder for the next two months. Make sure that you don't put in bills for overtime, make sure that you do your work a little harder, make sure that you, particularly for the next three months, so that the statistics that we can give the Minister will be used in the House to show that we do what the dentists, better, then we know in advance that if the member is still here — and he's one of the ones who, I don't like to build it up too much, but he's one of the ones who will likely be the last to go. In other words, we will win quite a few constituencies, the New

Democrats, before we replace him, so he's one of the ones who has a better chance of being here. But we know what he's going to say, Mr. Chairman, we know what he's going to say. He was going to say I have this letter written by a dental nurse that says that it is our job to screw the dentists and that we are not going to let them take these jobs and we're going to make sure the government stops paying them for this work, and therefore we have the following — we — and the term is used throughout, and contact the regional directors and if you need any information, contact me, and we have just seen the Minister. You know what the Minister is going to say about that letter? He said, well, I don't even want to bring this letter to the house and tell you that a dental nurse wrote this letter because this letter is a mistake, and it's really not designed in any way or will not be looked upon, or will not be used by the Conservative Party to show any discredit to what the government is trying to do. That's what he's going to say. You know why? Because that's what he says now. And it's just silly, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister at least says that he is forthrightly going to do away with this program, that I have the right to call it sabotage, he has a right to call my position sabotage. Granted that he is quite sure that the public cannot handle it as well as the bureaucracy of the dental profession can handle it. That's what he said. You see, he believes that when I phone for my appointment to a young person who is employed by my dentist, that person I speak to is not a bureaucrat. But when somebody phones a young person working in his office, that person is a bureaucrat.

Mr. Chairman, the private bureaucracy is as pervasive and more inefficient than the public bureaucracy will ever be and ever can get. The public bureaucracy is less pervasive and more efficient than the private bureaucracy is right now. Mr. Chairman, you can walk into the Royal Bank of Canada, my bank, the Member for Minnedosa's bank, our bank — we are not only depositors, but we are part-owners together, partners. You can walk into the Royal Bank on Portage and Main and stand there and there will be three people on the phone and no one will lift their head to look at you. You could think you were in the Minister of Health's office. That is a bureaucracy, Mr. Chairman, and the public insurance and the private insurance bureaucracy goes the same way. But, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member says we think it can be done better by the private dentist. Mr. Chairman, we have proof positive which the honourable members will not accept that it can't be done better by the dentists — proof positive. You know how we know? Up until the year 1976 the private dentists this man says he relies on, and knows they can do it better, didn't do anything. And I'm not blaming the dentists. I'm not blaming dentists — the public did not for themselves consolidate their position and use their resources to bring about a program. But that doesn't mean they couldn't do it, Mr. Chairman. They weren't given an opportunity to do it because all of the governments up until that time, and that included the New Democratic Party government for four years, did not give the public a chance to do it. In 1976 they did and the program, Mr. Chairman, what this report

proves is that the program was successful, not that it is unsuccessful — that the program was successful. I am astonished that the dentists, sort of being put on their notice, engaging, Mr. Chairman — and I say this advisedly and I do not say this as a criticism because just as the Member for St. Boniface said, they believe they are better, they believe it will interfere with the professional integrity of dental practice to permit these paramedical people to do this work. They believe that, and therefore they organized a campaign — and I will call it a conspiracy — and they said that we have to get together and do this work and produce good results in order to defeat the public program. Isn't that what they said? I mean, did I put it badly? — (Interjection)— Pardon me?

MR. PARASIUK: It was the president of the MDA.

MR. GREEN: Do you know what the Member for . . . the Minister of Health says that the President of the MDA is a liar. You know, I've not criticised the dentists, but he says that the President of the MDA is a liar, because throughout that note he keeps saying we; he doesn't say I, he says we. In other words he is doing it concert with other people. But the Minister says it's one dentist who made a mistake, Mr. Chairman — not one dentist who lied — who made a mistake and the mistake was to put down in writing details of the conspiracy of the MDA to undo a public program. That was the mistake. Just a mistake, that's all. What shocks me is having put on note, having gotten together, having made a concerted attack, having sort of marshalled all their forces, all they could do is say that we are as equal, not we are better, we are equal to a government bureaucracy. The dental profession has shown that giving it their best effort they can equate the efficiency of a government bureaucracy. That's what this report says.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't criticize this report; I didn't say a bad thing about this report. I have said that the Minister's allegations about the report are laughable. The report does not justify his position. His position is justified by his conviction, and I respect that. But if it is his conviction that is leading us into the program, then let's stop talking about the report, because, Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything bad about these people and Neville Winograd is a very good friend of mine. But all Neville Winograd says is that we've checked these costs which are costs that, Mr. Chairman, we've had an interesting example, these costs came about in the same way as it is suggested, and I don't even have to prove that some New York girl won the Marathon. She got in at the last mile maybe. I mean that's what's being suggested. These people have got in at the last mile, run a very short distance and they say, we have tied the person who started at Square One. That's what they say, so why should I criticize them.

I wouldn't do what my honourable friend has done. I haven't said that there's any wrong conclusions here. I say that the dentists, given the ground rules, should have been able to do much better than they did, much better. But when I was in government I can remember members on the other side — I really can't identify the Minister of Health — but they said

Dr. Hoogstraten was in a conspiracy; that W.J. Parker was in a conspiracy; that Tom Storey was in a conspiracy, a conspiracy to defraud the people of the province of Manitoba of 600 million, and that didn't bother them that they were talking about the integrity of these longstanding public people in the province of Manitoba. That didn't bother them, but when we say not that the report is wrong but that the ground rules were set up to achieve a particular purpose and almost didn't achieve it; I mean really, they almost didn't succeed even given the fact that the other person had his hands and legs tied behind his back. They couldn't even do anything. — (Interjection)— That's right; it's like fight fair, yes.

Mr. Chairman, the die is cast. What the Conservatives say is that they're going to do it that way and they have given an interesting list of criteria to justify their position. I would regret if a new government, which will be elected very shortly and which will reverse this procedure, will have to use that criteria. But, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Health of a new government gets up and says that we appointed four dental nurses; we appointed Ted Tulchinsky; we appointed the Deputy Minister; we told the nurses the dental nurses that they are entitled to practise a month or six weeks in which they will be able to show that they can do it better than the dentists, and that when the figures come in and show that the public bureaucracy is at least equal to what is being practised in the private sector that this will justify a change.

Mr. Chairman, at least he'll know that it will satisfy my honourable friend. It won't satisfy me; it won't satisfy the public of Manitoba, but at least we know that my honourable friend will say that I'm satisfied that you have done the right thing because you have employed the criteria which I have employed in dealing with in undoing the program.

Mr. Chairman, there's just one last point, again, which I want my honourable friend to remember when he is in the opposition. When he talks about the consultation that will these people, whether it was true or not, they felt uncomfortable under your government. They felt threatened under your government and therefore it is better to have done it this way. Are you inviting — because it could happen — are you inviting the Manitoba Federation of Labour to say: We feel uncomfortable under the Conservatives. We are going to stop working under the Conservatives. We think that there should be a strike of workers under the Conservatives in order to show that we are uncomfortable.

Will the government then say, oh, my God, these people are uncomfortable about us, maybe you people should go into power so labour will feel comfortable, Mr. Chairman? Are you saying, yes, okay, the president has said that? Does the Member for Rock Lake take the position that because those people have said that, the Conservatives shall go out and the New Democrats should go in? Because we're talking now about 300,000 people. We're not talking about several hundred dentists. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, not all the dentists are Conservatives; not all the dentists are Conservatives. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that there are many dentists who will agree with everything that I am saying and you know who proves that? The Minister of Health. He said that

letter by the president doesn't represent the dentists, so they must have different views. They must have different views and it's the same way, but does the Member for Rock Lake suggest that because these people are uncomfortable, the Conservatives are a bad government? Does he say, come and relieve us because the Federation of Labour is uncomfortable. No, that's not what he says. He gets up everyday in the House, says there's a strike; if they don't go back to work, put them in jail. That's what they say. They don't say make them feel comfortable. — (Interjection)— That's rubbish, Mr. Chairman. Why did Mr. Parrot go to jail. He broke the law. What was his breaking of the law? He did not work and what you are saying is that if the dentists say they won't work, change the government. If the workers say they don't work, put them in jail. That's what you say, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— Oh, Mr. Chairman, they're having a little bit of a problem. Mr. Chairman, they're having a little bit of a problem. You know, Parrot was a bad bird; Parrot was a man who would not let himself be a slave driver at the instigation of a group of politicians who said that we will make you tell people to go to work. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that Mr. Parrot did the right thing and he will not deny that he did the right thing, and someday he will be shown to have done the right thing. Because I assure you that the honourable members wouldn't let a government require them to work, that if the New Democrats passed a law that doctors have to go to work in the province of Manitoba if they threaten to go on strike, and that if the president of the Manitoba Medical Association doesn't send them to work the honourable people on the other side will not say, send them to jail, he's broken the law; they'd say get rid of the government, they are criminals, that's what they would say. That's what they would say, Mr. Chairman, that's what they would say, and that's what they have said in the past. So don't let fear this business. — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, there has never been any suggestion, other than as against an employed working man that you can get an injunction requiring anybody to go to work. And if any government tried to do it as against doctors, particularly the New Democrats, Mr. Chairman, all credit to the New Democrats. That's not what Mr. Lloyd did. When the doctors went on strike in the province of Saskatchewan, all credit to the Saskatchewan CCF under Woodrow Lloyd; they never yielded to the temptation of saying that these doctors who are not workers are criminals. That kind of legislation has been passed by all sorts of governments, unfortunately, but it has never been right.

I merely pass this on to my honourable friend who talks about people being discomfited. If the criteria of good government is that they don't discomfite the others, then I hope you will not eliminate that criteria when it's suggested to you by the representatives of the employees that we are uncomfortable with your government; therefore, move over.

Mr. Chairman, I rather think that when that discomfite is registered the Minister of Health will not give it nearly as much solicitude as he gives to the discomfite or the expressed discomfite. It really is interesting because I do not begrudge it to them, but this discomfite that he is talking about is

registered by people who are very much in the top perhaps 3 or 4 percent of income earners in the province of Manitoba. Their discomfite, and a very small number, is registered with much greater passion than the discomfite that may be registered by 300,000 people who may be in the bottom 40 percent of the income earners in the province of Manitoba. I really can't give credit to it either way. The government has to do what is right; the New Democratic Party government in Manitoba worked for eight years and had suggestions and protestations of discomfite from various types of people, but for the most part, Mr. Chairman, the people stayed and worked and performed useful services in our province. None of the work that was done by dental assistants in any way affected the integrity of the income of dentists in the province of Manitoba, and they never said it did. They said it affected the integrity of the profession and every profession tries to protect its professional integrity and sometimes goes a bit far. Like what the doctors said when they wouldn't permit the chiropractors to practise and, to the credit of most Conservatives, they said even though it discomfited the doctors, they said the chiropractors have a perfect right to practise, and we're going to pay them. That's right, a Conservative frontbencher was a chiropractor, but you're talking about exactly the same situation. You're talking about exactly the same situation, Mr. Chairman, and it has occurred in the past, it will occur in the future and what we do know is that the change that has been made is not a change reflecting pragmatism or efficiency; it is a change which reflects political ideology and it's good that it's clear. But that's why the change is being made because more and more, Mr. Chairman, the changes that will reflect political ideology will give a choice to the people of Manitoba and in the long run I have no difficulty in knowing what the outcome of that choice will be. It becomes clearer and clearer every day and the more we get this type of thing, the clearer it will be and then we will contest for the goodwill of the people of the province of Manitoba to see which they think makes more sense. That's the way the game is played and that's fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1) — the Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Rolling right along with this debate, I certainly do want to ask some questions. I wasn't here yesterday for the discussion when we got into dental care. I've had a chance to listen to the debates back and forth and, given the Minister's statements, I feel I have to rise. He tries to dismiss a letter, which is outrageous letter, by a very high-ranking official of the Manitoba Dental Association. Dr. Nowazek is not any dentist. When he wrote this letter he was, I think, the president of the Manitoba Dental Association. He certainly was president in 1976, '77 or '78. —(Interjection)— Okay, so he cannot be dismissed as just one dentist writing a letter as an individual and that this letter was a mistake. —(Interjection)— The letter, right, was a mistake, but it was a very definite set of instructions by the head of the Manitoba Dental Association trying to protect the monopoly position of the dentists. Because what the intent here is not the care

and quality of the children. No one is talking about whether, in fact, they'd like to expand the dental care program, be complimentary to the public program, have something going so they'd have more children cared for, that's not the thrust of this letter. The thrust of this letter is to cut the dental nurses off at the pass so they can never practise; so they could never act as a threat to the dentists. There was no concern for the children; no concern exhibited by the dentists for the children at all and I hold the dentists accountable for that. When people talked about dental care the thrust for the Dental Care Program came from the New Democratic Party and it came from the government. It did not come from the dentists saying we need a public program; the children have cavities; the children have bad dental care; that they can't afford dental care and somehow the dentists have to do something about it. They never said that at all. It was the government who said that we are going to fill a gap and provide dental care for children and at that stage the dentists got very nervous and said: If you want to do this, we have to control it, we have to control it.

People looked at alternatives that were looked at in B.C.; looked at in Saskatchewan; looked at in Quebec and the evidence indicated that a cheaper way of providing basically the same quality of care was using dental nurses under the supervision of dentists who ultimately are accountable to the public. When the Minister gets up and says what the NDP is proposing is a government bureaucracy run by dental nurses, he's wrong. He's setting up a strawman that is not true; it's not correct. Dr. Jim Leake was the person in charge of this program; he is a dentist; there were dentists supervising the teams and the dental nurses were carrying out work under supervision, but it was a means of introducing paraprofessionals into the area and it was done in a very logical manner. You took the dental nurses to the children who are in the schools, they're already there. It's a very good way of achieving utilization; it's a very good way of getting at all the people and it works quite well elsewhere.

The one concern that I have with the studies is that the studies document the public costs in detail, but they don't really document the private costs, the Manitoba Dental Association costs, because the Manitoba Dental Association costs basically signed a contract to do it for 100 a student and it could be a loss leader and no one has broken out the costs for the Manitoba Dental Association nor the dentist. So on a technical basis there are some problems with the comparison as far as I can see. I don't know if this report — and I haven't been able to determine it and I don't think it's in there — I don't think it takes into account an externality called transportation costs. When in fact you take the dentists and the nurses to the school where the children already are, because you have a public busing system that takes them there, and you work on them; you, as a society, save money. In contrast, if you then start shuffling them back and forth to dentists' offices, or if the parents do, or if they have to do that themselves, that is an externality to this program but it is not an externality to society and it costs society to pay for those transportation costs that haven't been included in this particular cost-comparison and that is the problem. It's the same way with suburbia, no one

ever takes into account the transportation costs of suburbia and no one's taken these particular costs into account here.

The thing that I find surprising about the Minister's defence and the defence of his colleagues of this very definite attempt to strangle the public program and to supposedly do it objectively, is that nowhere do you hear the needs of the children articulated. What we have heard today has been the needs of the dentists articulated. And what I find surprising, given their particular philosophy, is that why do they somehow have to have the public sector prop up the dentists, which is what they're arguing. You need a public program to prop up a dentist to try and correct the situation that the free market wouldn't solve in the 100 years of our history today, because dentists are maldistributed through the province, not because of government interference, because that's the way the free market's been operating. So that when we try and set up a system to ameliorate that problem in the most efficient way, using the schools where the children are, the dentists rise up in revolt and their instrument, publicly the Conservative Party, decides that they are going to undo that program.

It's not a matter of looking at both programs objectively because the Minister certainly has decided to kill one program. He is not allowing new recruits into the dental nursing program at Wascana. So if you have no recruits, you know darned well that at some stage there will be no dental nurses left and you know that you have, in a sense, killed the public program; this is exactly in line with the letter that Dr. Nowazek sent out and which the Minister tries to shrug off. He cannot shrug off a letter from a responsible official of the Manitoba Dental Association in the way that he has. It doesn't wash at all.

Secondly, there's another point of logic which just doesn't wash on the part of the Minister and that's that he says you can somehow have a more responsible accountable program if you have the private government do it as opposed to the public government; because what he is doing when he turns this program over to the Manitoba Dental Association with a contract is that he has turned over the governing and the responsibility and the accountability for the dental program over to the dentists entirely. He has no means of ensuring that the dentists will look at the best alternative mix of paraprofessionals, capital equipment, capital location, utilization where the children are, because that's not in their interests; that's what the public government looks at. But he's transferred authority over to the private government and that has been the history of socialized medicine in Canada to date, the battle between public governments and private governments.

I ask the Minister if he applies this logic to dental care, then surely he must apply it to medicare as well and surely he must apply it ultimately to the hospitals. So that we are going to reach a situation where, if there's any clinic dealing with women's problems — not just abortions but hysterectomies or other gynecological problems — the private sector will set up a private hospital to do it because the government won't act on that matter. And when you start transferring those types of responsibilities over to the private gills or private cliques without sufficient

public control, then you run into very serious problems with respect to cost controls; then you run into very serious problems with respect to appeals. The Minister has on his desk letters from a particular individual who has been wronged by a dentist. The dentist has admitted about 50 percent of the blame with respect to bad fillings and bad bridgework. He has appealed to the Dental Association and the Dental Association set up an objective committee of dentists — the type of objective committee that the Minister believes in totally — and the objective committee of dentists ruled that the partial payment for the damages was sufficient, even though this individual has two other dentists who claim in writing that the work done by the other dentist was wrong; but there was no appeal mechanism and he has appealed to the Minister and the Minister has shrugged that matter off indicating that it's a matter that he has no control over because he has not dealt with it to date.

If you in fact deal with it, then it shows a difference in approach to the professional organizations than you have to date; it shows a difference in approach that you have shown to date over the Owen Schwartz matter. And society has a genuine concern of monopolistic groups like a dental association or a medical association, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, which in the light of evidence like this letter from Dr. Nowazek certainly is justified and therefore they want the ultimate responsibility to lie with government, public government not private government, and the Minister in his own words said, we believe that the private practitioners operating on their own can do a much better job than a bureaucracy. Well, what do you think the private practitioners are going to have to establish? But what will be the lines of authority, responsibility and accountability? What are the lines of appeal with something like that?

The thing that I find amazing is that the Manitoba Dental Association comes along now and the Minister says, well, by happy coincidence he's able to give the Manitoba Dental Association three more school divisions. The Manitoba Dental Association doesn't say, well, look, we are really interested in the health of the children and we recognize that a great number of children in Manitoba aren't even covered by any children's dental program at all, therefore, we volunteered to take on new areas. That's not what the Manitoba Dental Association says. They said, we want to take over all those areas run by the dental nurses under supervision of government dentists. That's what they want to take over. I think the Manitoba Dental Association has some accounting to do for that particular position. It's a narrow, selfish position to date even though a number of dentists have said otherwise. But the position that they have taken is consistent with the position taken by Dr. Nowazek in this letter, namely, that they want to protect their interests, their monopoly-control position first. They have not said anything to date publicly about the need for dental care by the children of Manitoba. And when the Minister, who's already made up his mind, tries to use what he considers to be an objective study as a means of stalling the further implementation of a Dental Care Program across Manitoba so that it is universal and

accessible to all, then that gets my goat because this report to date isn't that objective.

It doesn't compare the same time periods; it compares different time periods. The interim report in fact had a set of percentages in it that weren't good enough — and I can understand now why the Minister didn't want to publish it — the first percentages showed the public program working better. The revised report, which I think allowed for more time and maybe allowed for this type of burst by Mr. Nowazek in contacting all of his dentists to say, push a few more through, contact them all, raise the percentages up, raise the percentages of utilization up for the Dental Association Program. It brought about a situation where the Manitoba Dental Association's utilization rate might be marginally higher; might be because it didn't take into account, this evaluation didn't take into account the fact that under the public program children did have access to treatment by dentists of their choice as well and that wasn't even measured or monitored in this evaluation.

But the evaluation is not the issue. The issue is the government's position. And the government's position is that they want, at all costs, to have a private program but they aren't being very clear as to whether they're going to extend it across the province. I say to the Minister that those children who are being bypassed, who aren't being allowed to have access to this Dental Care Program because of government procrastination over the last two and a half years, are suffering; that I can't understand why they have to suffer. They have the same affordability problems with respect to dental care as do children in those school divisions where either the public program or the dental association program operates. I think it's incumbent upon the government to establish or extend that program right across the province. We think it's incumbent for the government to do it as efficiently as possible. We know, from the experience in Saskatchewan and Quebec, that utilizing dental nurses under the supervision of dentists has been a very efficient way of doing so and we would, in fact, undertake to do that and that is our approach that we would take. What the Minister is doing though, he is cutting out any alternative. The Minister always talks about flexibility but he is taking away flexibility from his own arsenal. Why not have dental nurses trained? Why not have them practicing the program? It strikes me that if anything, they provided an excellent check on the Dental Association, because once you remove that alternative then you are caught in the monopoly situation where you only have one alternative, and the comments of my colleague, the Member for Inkster, are very true here. Why tie one arm behind your back when you negotiate with the dentists? That's exactly what you are doing here.

When you take away the dental nurses, the Doctor Nowazeks of the Dental Association won't have to send out letters saying, make sure your costs are reasonable, make sure your utilization rates are high. They won't have to send out letters like that because they've got it at that stage. —(Interjection)— No, he will do it by word of mouth. And the thing about this letter is, that if this letter was sent out by a corporation, the anti-trust people would take this type of letter and they would say that this is an

attempt to establish a monopoly, and even our weak anti-monopoly legislation and procedures would look askance at a letter like this, that the Minister shrugs off and basically gives these people the benefit of the doubt and attacks us for wanting to bring in what has been shown to be an efficient program in Saskatchewan and Quebec. We undertake that we would in fact want to bring back an efficient program to Manitoba and we would want to extend it across the entire province because we feel that children's dental care is needed and is needed by all children in Manitoba in every school division and that will be our thrust.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE: This is a little bit too important an issue just to let it go by at this time, Mr. Chairman. In listening to the debate, my mind went back to the first year I sat in this House, where the Speaker on behalf of all of us used to stand up and include in his invocation the phrase, by which kings rule and make equitable laws. The Minister's response to the points raised by the Member for St. Johns, the Member for Inkster, and the Member for Transcona; I am sure his response to the Member for Transcona would be along the same vein. But a couple of incidents have happened where the Minister once again underlines the philosophy of the Conservatives. I am almost tempted to give a speech parallel to the muffled cadence of the blue boots or something to determine. You know, they gave an impassioned plea a number of years ago. — (Interjection)— That was another one, a mistake.

Mr. Chairman, a rather obtuse point perhaps I want to make, is responsibility of this House for the provisions of services in the province to the people of the province, the continual search for better ways of doing things, realizing full well that self-interested groups are reluctant to change, and this kind of buffeting we have to subject ourselves to as the professional organizations entrench, and we don't want anyone encroaching on their terrain. I think we have made some inroads into this area. But nevertheless, once in a while we are reminded of the strictly doctrinaire position of the current Minister of Health and his government where he thinks for some reason or other they are an anointed group who know better than anyone else how, to whom, and under what condition the services will be provided.

The thrust in the provision of services by a professional, where we establish the two different standards, I believe if we say that as a society if services aren't provided then we will legislate that these services be provided. If that is a consistent policy, then that's one thing, but when traditionally it has been used against one group in our society, that's an entirely different thing.

Mr. Chairman, the idea that we're going to have people self-evaluate themselves, and if the government thinks that this is such a wonderful policy, then perhaps each particular union in the province should set the standards for the electricians, the carpenters, and everyone else should have set up their committees of seven — I believe it was seven that was on this particular

committee — to evaluate their services and make recommendations. But the difficulty in getting any of these self-interested societies to change — in another debate we were talking about a particular case that went to the College of Physicians and Surgeons and, Mr. Chairman, if I had had 3,000 spending money, I was tempted to take out an ad in a couple of local papers and ask everybody that had a complaint against their doctor to send me their complaint, because I am sure that anybody who has been in practice for a number of years in the province, there would be more than eight people that are dissatisfied with their services.

But a good example of the medical profession in general and perhaps the dentists specifically, in my lifetime I remember the efforts that were brought to bear to keep a Sister Kenny from making any inroads in the treatment of polio victims — this goes back quite a number of years now I guess — where the traditional medical practice for people who were afflicted by polio was to immobilize the affected part, and from my generation there are still people walking around with heightened boots because of the inadequacy of the treatment. But Sister Kenny — and she never made any claim that this was the answer to all the problems, but it should have been looked at. She was hounded out of several countries until she had enough backing by doctors themselves to cause them pause. But of course that problem was solved by continual research and coming up with Salk vaccine, which was a better solution to the problem.

But what I'm getting at, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rhineland, in his comments, emphasized what we're after is the problem. The problem is there; the provision of dental services and how we can best provide these services, and we could go all through the different provisions of professional services and find gaps and loopholes. A number of years ago in this House we were involved in debate about the optometrists and the difference of opinion between the ophthalmologist and the optometrist and the optician, so these kind of disagreements occur. I for one have suggested over a number of years that with our computer capacities and the legal profession, we should have tackled it long before this, because we can transfer land and land titles for a couple of hundred dollars in this day and age, but nobody is even looking at it yet because of the entrenchment of the legal profession in the transfer of titles. It's very lucrative to their business. So in the final line, this is really what we're after.

Mr. Chairman, as I said when I started, the rather obtuse point is the fundamental principle in law in our democratic society, and I think we should have economic democracy as well as political democracy. Every one of those statutes over there says that we did it, we did it, the legislator did it. Her Majesty by and with the consent of the Legislative Assembly here enacts, is the preamble of every law that's on the statute, including the establishment of the Act which governs the College of Physicians and Surgeons, including the Act which governs the dentists, including every professional organization in the province. And for the Minister to stand up in this House in 1980 and say, I'm not responsible, Mr. Chairman, to me as one citizen in this province of Manitoba, that's not good enough for me. It isn't

good enough for me. This is where the buck stops. We can delegate authority to anyone we choose in this House but never, Mr. Chairman, and I think that this is a principle in Canadian law as opposed to American Republican systems that we have to keep reminding ourselves and the people in the province, that in our system this is where the buck stops, that this is the responsible body ultimately. It isn't the physicians and the College of Physicians and Surgeons that is ultimately responsible; it isn't the dentists who are ultimately responsible, it is the legislators in the province of Manitoba who are ultimately responsible, and the people of Manitoba should be reminded of that. And we have to accept the responsibility of enacting laws and spending moneys; that's what we're talking about at this particular time, is the spending of moneys to provide as best we can the dental services which are required by the people of the province of Manitoba. It shouldn't be about perpetuating the Conservative Party in government because of the backing or support of the Dental Association as set forth in this particular letter that is being referred to at this present time, and it shouldn't be with that kind of support from any group, Mr. Chairman. The ultimate responsibility at the present time is the Minister and he is charged with it, looking for the best provision of services. I was more familiar with, because of my involvement in that particular bill that I inherited from somebody else in 1969, with the optometrists, but I think the case is still the same, that there are no ophthalmologists outside of the city of Winnipeg. So in the provision of that particular service, it is comparable to the provision of dental services, and the point was well taken by the Member for Transcona.

We were talking about the provisions of services where it wasn't provided. If the Dental Association had some alternative plan that they wanted to go where it wasn't being provided, I don't think there would have been that much criticism from members on this side of the House, but they didn't suggest that, they didn't want to do that. Mr. Chairman, the idea that the control of services which we as Manitobans require, is vested in the dentists in this province, or the provisions of medical services is vested in the College of Physicians and Surgeons; it is not. The authority is delegated to them, but the responsibility is the responsibility of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just mention at this time, because over the past few years we've had much said about the provision of medical services and dental services, and I for one would pay the doctors as much as they need, the dentists as much as they need, because academically I have a lot of respect for them because they subject themselves to a very rigorous type of training indoctrination, inculcation, whatever term a person wants to use, and in relative terms I would much rather pay a dentist more than the people who are on television chasing a piece of rubber up and down ice; I would. In relative terms, I think the health of the people of the province is much more important, but I don't think any doctor — well maybe that's not true, maybe some of the doctors do make more money than Bobby Hull made as a hockey player. And I have no bone to pick with Bobby Hull; if we want to pay him 3 million for

playing hockey, that's fine; maybe we should pay farmers 3 million.

So really I have no objection to them making money, but as a high school teacher, Mr. Chairman, for every medical student that is there, there is 50 who could be there; there's 50 that could be there. But I know that in getting recommendations for acceptance into medical school, acceptance into dental school, acceptance into becoming a lawyer, into law school, oh, my gosh, Mr. Chairman, listening to some of these people, you'd think that their admission to this particular . . . any one of these faculties, the three that I mentioned, I could go on and on and on.

The public wheel will never survive without them, and when they get their degrees, they're going to work their butts off in the public interest. That's all they're interested in is the public interest. And I know, I know a lot of these people, after after being out of education for 10 years now, many of the people who are involved are now out practising and I kid them about it. I said that the ink wasn't even dry on your certificate before you were taking a look at how much money you could make by going somewhere else. So anybody that thinks that dollars doesn't enter into it is not too familiar with what goes on.

I have suggested and it was used in other faculties, I remember that there was a shortage in Manitoba of professional teachers after Russia set up their Sputnik and I'm going to relate what I'm talking about, Mr. Chairman, to this particular point. The province of Manitoba couldn't get teachers outside of the city of Winnipeg in very great numbers. So they came up with bursaries, and forgivable bursaries, that if a person accepted this assistance that they agreed to go and teach somewhere else other than Winnipeg and that these moneys were written off as a public service. This kind of admission I always question. I feel an obligation for my education. Maybe that's because after the Second World War the public educated me; maybe that was a disservice in itself, giving me two books to read instead of the one I owned, or something. But as a veteran they came along and they said, here, you go to school and we'll pay for it. So I always kind of felt that I owed something for that.

A few years ago there was something in the paper, somebody was taking exception with the fact that in Russia, I think if somebody wanted to leave Russia they had to pay back to the state 35,000 or something, and I couldn't understand the criticism because I think that there's a personal responsibility to the public if you accept public assistance in this way. A doctor was being interviewed — this was in Vancouver, I just happened to notice it — he was being interviewed and he said he was leaving the province of British Columbia and taking a job down south because he was going to make more money. So the chap that was interviewing him said, well, the public has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars on your education, do you feel any obligation to the public? He says, no, that's the way it is.

So to get back to the provision of dental services, Mr. Chairman, I really don't know what the final solution will be, but I do know that it is incumbent upon the Minister to keep searching for solutions. One of the solutions that we had suggested and tried, the dental profession has admitted in their

report, as pointed out by the Member for Inkster, that the best that they can do is equate that program; they can't better it so far, all they can do is equate it. But, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we have to expand the facilities of the dental school to train more dentists and train more dentists who will be willing to serve the people of the province of Manitoba on the basis that there will be some personal benefit accrue to themselves but nevertheless that they have a debt to society also.

Maybe these are corny words, Mr. Chairman, in 1980, I'm not too sure. I may, in some regard, sound like a Conservative in this regard. You know, such corny things as duty, that's a horrible word in 1980, duty, responsibility. Where's the bucks? I guess we're all down to that. In fact, I see in the paper that we've introduced — I wasn't here yesterday, Mr. Chairman, — but I've seen in the paper that we've introduced a bill to give ourselves a 4,600-a-year increase. —(Interjection)— Well, I think it's built into the scheme of things if we get an automatic increase and now they're going to increase it another 2,600 or something on top of that.

But, Mr. Chairman, I know we can't roll back the hands of the clock, but nevertheless, I think we have to persist and insist that we, as legislators, and those on the government side for the day or two, remind themselves that the responsibility for the provision of these kinds of services still rests in this House and that the opposition has a responsibility also to challenge the Minister and show, as I think successfully they have demonstrated — they being the arguments made by the Member for St. Johns, the Member for St. Boniface, the Member for Inkster and the Member for Transcona — that the program established by the New Democratic Party was headed in the right direction. And for the Minister to have stopped that program, stopped it, and as pointed out latterly by the Member for Transcona, by not putting any more dental nurses into the training system, they have effectively killed it. And for the Minister to say otherwise is to mislead the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I sense that the debate on this issue is winding down and I did have a few questions for the Minister before we pass this particular item. The Minister mentioned early in the debate, sometime yesterday, when discussing the matter that the province is dental nurse poor, I believe was the expression that he used. I don't quite understand what he means by that, and he used the expression in conjunction with his remarks on the transfer of some three divisions in one school district to the MDA plan, mentioning that it was a happy combination of circumstances.

So the first question I'd like to ask the Minister, what the term dental nurse poor means? Does it mean an absolute lack of dental nurses in those school divisions that he mentions or does it mean that the complement is somehow reduced? Perhaps he could give us numbers as well?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Vital says he has a series of questions. I propose that he enumerate his questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was going to also ask the Minister if he could give me the answers to that question, whether he could also indicate what the other school divisions were that are presently in the government program and what the complement is for each and what the actual numbers of nurses are in each of those?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all to the Honourable Member for St. Vital on his first question. He says he believes I made reference to the fact that the province was dental nurse poor, or used the term that the province was dental nurse poor. That is incorrect, Mr. Chairman. I didn't say the province is dental nurse poor, in fact, I admitted quite candidly that there are lots of dental nurses around who aren't working in the dental field. What I did say was that the three divisions and the Sprague School District that are being turned over to the Manitoba Dental Association were dental nurse poor, in that we didn't have dental nurses in those divisions at this point in time.

In the case of Pelly Trail, in particular, the dental nurse or nurses who had been there had left and for some time Pelly Trail had been served by dental nurses who were transported in from other school divisions and the opportunity arose to turn the division over to a dentist who was prepared to hire a dental nurse. The same applies to the other divisions in the small group that is being turned over to the MDA. But the province itself is not dental nurse poor. On the point of the happy combination of circumstances, Mr. Chairman, which members opposite seem to have taken up as something of a rallying cry and as an opportunity for challenge and debate, and that's certainly their right, I repeat it and reiterate it and I have no embarrassment about using it, it's a happy combination of circumstances because it enables us to do two things: employ dentists in the Childrens Dental Health Program — to do three things, I'm sorry — employ dentists in the Childrens Dental Health Program; employ dental nurses with dentists, which is what we've been trying to do; and (3) which is perhaps the most important of all, provide dental service to the children in those three school divisions in that additional school district.

On the question of the other school divisions, Mr. Chairman, I could give the honourable member a list of the divisions that are in the government-run program: School Division No. 14, that's Seine River; No. 19, Morris-Macdonald; No. 20, White Horse Plains; No. 22, Evergreen; No. 23, Lakeshore; No. 25, Midland; No. 31, Beautiful Plains; No. 17, Red River; No. 32, Turtle River; No. 34, Duck Mountain; No. 38, Birdtail River; No. 39, Rolling River; No. 41, Fort Labosse; No. 42, Souris Valley; No. 43, Antler River; and part of No. 48, the Frontier School Division; and some others including special and remote communities which I have lumped together, as I explained yesterday at the beginning of the debate on this item, for the purposes of making discussion

easier, we talk in terms of 20 divisions that were in the government program and 10 that were in the MDA program. In fact it was 19 plus some special and remote communities in the government-run program but we sort of lumped the special and remote together and thus called it 20. And in that special and remote category under the government program are included Bay Line communities such as Cormorant, Jenpeg, Ilford, Pikwitonei, and Thicket Portage. And it had included the Sprague School District which is now transferred over to the MDA.

Now the honourable member will add that up to 17, not to 20, but that's because No. 16, Boundary; No. 30, Pine Creek; and No. 37, Pelly Trail are the three along with Sprague, which I just recently announced are being transferred over from the government program to the MDA program. So that the MDA list now totals 13, the original 10 plus Boundary, Pine Creek and Pelly Trail; and they also serve some remote communities and part of the Frontier School Division. They serve remote communities in the north including Gillam, Leaf Rapids, Cranberry Portage, Cold Lake, Snow Lake, Lynn Lake, and Sherridon. I can give him the MDA list if he wants it.

His other question had to do with the dental nurses, Mr. Chairman. I can't give the honourable member the specific numbers of dental nurses employed in each division but the total number of dental nurses employed in the dental field in Manitoba, that is of the 80 graduates of Wascana over the three years of the program, there are 45 employed in the dental field in Manitoba. Thirty-one of them are practising as dental nurses as full-time; 14 are performing other dental duties such as dental assistants, and of that number, 20 of them are employed by private dentists; some 12 to 13 of the remainder have applied to take the dental hygiene course at the University of Manitoba in 1980-81, and some 13 of the remainder have left the province and the other 22, if that adds up to the total — well, it won't, because for a moment, to the honourable member, let me say, ignore that figure of 12 or 13 going into the dental hygiene course for the moment. I've given him the 45 employed in the dental field. Of the other 35, 13 have left the province and 22 are employed in other jobs not related to dentistry and then, out of that group, some 12 to 13 have applied to take the dental hygiene course at the University of Manitoba this coming year.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the list that he gave me. He said that he doesn't have a breakdown by division with him. I would appreciate it if he could supply for me an indication of whether there is an authorized complement of dental nurses for each of these divisions and, if so, could he provide me with the numbers for each division and what the complement is, and can he also supply me with the numbers of actual dental nurses employed in each of those divisions.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we should look at the appropriation as it appears before us, Dental Services and the Salaries item. The Salaries appropriation includes funds for 76 clinical staff. This staff is based in the regions to provide public health services and the clinical services of the Manitoba

Children's Dental Program operated by the government. And of that number, 27 of those positions are dental nurses, 21 dental nurses are working in the government program at the present time and there are 6 vacancies. There are 32 dental assistants, 1 dental hygienist and 4 supervising dentists. There are 4 regional dental officers who provide the program direction and the regional direction and clinical services, and 8 support staff, for a total of 76 in that Salaries appropriation. But as I said, that 76 includes 27 dental nurse positions and we have 21 working in the government program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicates that there are 6 vacancies for dental nurses within the program at the moment. Does he expect to fill those positions in the coming year?

MR. SHERMAN: I hope so, Mr. Chairman. All I can say is that I hope to do so but, as I've said, the primary thrust that the department and my office are taking at the present time is to try to integrate the dentists and the dental nurses into the provision of this service. We would like to have dentists make opportunities available to dental nurses. But with respect to those 6 vacancies, yes, the intention is to attempt to fill them.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping to get a breakdown by division for a particular reason. I have been informed that Rolling River School Division and Birdtail School Division are without any dental nurses and have been for some time, although I have no details of that. I wonder if the Minister has available to him information which would indicate whether this information is true or not; if not, can he find out for me and if in fact there are vacancies in those two school divisions and the children are not getting dental care, can he explain to the committee what steps he will take to see that they do get adequate dental care?

MR. SHERMAN: I can check that for the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, but the way the program operates, each division is not necessarily served by one dental nurse. There is some overlap; there is some service to adjoining areas and it's possible that the two divisions that he mentions are served by dental nurses from other divisions but I will check that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (g)—pass. (h) Pharmaceutical Services, (1) — the Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I move committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise, agreed? Committee rise.