

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 1 May, 1980.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order. We're on Resolution 38, 5.(c)(1) — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When the committee adjourned on Friday morning I was asking the Minister a few questions about landfill sites and the problem of methane gas. I did have one or two further questions to ask him before we leave this subject. In the very last statement that the Minister made he said, and I will quote from Hansard: The municipalities are advised not to project uses of abandoned landfill sites, for example, landfill sites that have been filled, until we have cleared them, until we have declared by testing that they are safe, for example, for other uses. Can I ask the Minister to explain the clearing process by the department and what testing is done by the department in order to ascertain that those landfills are safe?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I'm advised that it's pretty much a matter of compaction to ensure that the material has been adequately covered. If there is any evidence of methane gas, then that can be detected. We can, by testing, determine whether or not there is any possibility of methane gas emanating from the site, in which case then the landfill site will be left until it has been properly decomposed, or other treatment done, to ensure that there will be no harmful effects.

MR. WALDING: Further to that point, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell us the nature of this testing for methane gas, whether it's by means of a hand-held meter that someone walks over the site and tests? Or is it a matter of putting down a probe into the site and to leave them there for a certain amount of time?

MR. JORGENSEN: The latter assumption is the correct one. There are gas probes that are placed in the site to determine whether or not there's any evidence of methane gas.

MR. WALDING: I'm glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask the Minister next whether his department is satisfied that it does have a list catalogued, however you want to term it, of all of the abandoned municipal landfill sites in the province.

MR. JORGENSEN: My understanding is that is currently being done now, a catalogue of the sites that have been filled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I understand the city of Winnipeg uses as a guideline 500 feet from any abandoned or completed landfill site when it comes to other buildings or construction. I am not sure whether they ban construction within the 500 feet entirely or whether they will only permit it under certain very rigorous conditions. I'd like to ask the Minister whether the department has any similar limit for municipal landfill sites and whether the department is of the opinion that 500 feet is sufficient. I have heard conflicting opinions on the 500 feet and I understand in some American jurisdictions it is 1,000 feet.

MR. JORGENSEN: I don't think the problem is as serious as it would be near the city because of the larger amount of space that is available in the rural areas. I'm not sure just whether there's any other restrictions as to . . . I am advised that there are no firm limits, that it depends on the hydrogeology and the water detection and things like to determine whether or not it is safe to build near the site. That's a determination that is made upon inspection.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister tell me what is the closest to any landfill site that the department has allowed or recommended buildings on.

MR. JORGENSEN: I am not sure whether I can give my honourable friend the answer to that question, whether there's any documentation as to how close. That information is not available at the moment, Mr. Chairman, I'll undertake to get that information for him. We'll have to check that out.

MR. WALDING: Let me take it one step further, Mr. Chairman, and ask the Minister whether he's aware of any approval having been given for buildings to be erected actually on top of an abandoned landfill site.

MR. JORGENSEN: Not without having been cleared, that is testing being done to ensure that it was safe. But I'm not sure whether there's any been erected right on top of sites.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, my colleague was referring to a rule of thumb of construction at a distance of 500 feet from some of these old landfill sites but my information, according to one article here, is that the city administration, at least a number of months ago, was calling for a ban within 1,000 feet — maybe the present is 500 feet, I don't know — but that they are calling for a ban within 1,000 feet. Given the fact that we had the disaster in the St. Boniface Industrial Park, where the city allowed and encouraged the

development of an industrial site and then had to compensate a number of firms for a number of millions of dollars, it seems to me that we should learn a lesson from this; and given the really disastrous effects of building on old landfill sites, right on top of them, right beside them or adjacent to them, I myself think that there should be a very hard position taken by the Minister. For example, the city now has to spend 800,000 in the next five years to determine whether or not methane gas is going to be produced in some 35 former garbage dumps. I remember hearing a fellow on the radio saying that he wanted to put in a rec room and he was told that he couldn't, that since it was in his basement and since he was near a site in the city of Winnipeg, that he could not proceed. As one of my colleagues said, maybe he couldn't smoke in his own house because of the dangers associated thereto.

So what I'm saying to the Minister is stronger. I think that there should be a complete ban in the sense of a long distance, whether it's 1,000 feet or whatever it is; if 500 or 1,000 isn't adequate, then it should be maybe a lot more than that. It seems to me that we've had instances of defined development of methane gas. Now we're playing with possible methane gas developing or probable methane gas developing.

In East Kildonan or North Kildonan there's a former landfill site, a huge mountain, where kids toboggan and ski and people in that area are asking me whether it's . . . they're worried about the effects of their development. There are some townhouses nearby. They're wondering whether they're in any physical danger. So I'm saying to the Minister, I'd like to ask him whether he's going to adopt a hard line on this matter or whether he's just going to sort of follow behind and watch what city council does. What is his present attitude or policy in regard to using former garbage dumps to build on top of, or how close to them does he think is safe as a rule of thumb or as some scientific guideline?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, my honourable friend will appreciate the city of Winnipeg has its own environmental branch and the decisions that they make with respect to landfill sites within the limits of the city of Winnipeg are theirs. Insofar as the province is concerned, as I indicated earlier, landfill sites are inspected by the department to determine whether or not they are safe, and as I said, I don't know of any instance in the rural areas where there has been buildings placed close to them. The problem is not as serious in the rural areas as it is in the city where space is at a premium.

My honourable friend raises a very good point. There are dangers inherent in the use of old landfill sites, and I would hope that the city would take due notice. And I'm sure they are, after the experiences they have had, but I should point out to my honourable friend that the instances he is illustrating were instances that took place, landfill sites that were filled before the coming into force of the Clean Environment Act. So in those particular cases, I suppose that one could say that mistakes were made, and the city will no doubt have benefited from those mistakes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Elmwood:

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I know the Clean Environment Commission has jurisdiction in the city of Winnipeg, because I recall a local fight in Elmwood over a foundry that was polluting for years and it was finally, only because of the Clean Environment Commission, that foundry was put out of business. So I'm just not quite clear what the Minister is telling us here. Is he saying he has province-wide guidelines, but the application does not apply to the city of Winnipeg; or is he saying — I'm just not quite clear how this works — does he have jurisdiction outside of Winnipeg here, or is he saying that the city enforces the provincial legislation?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, any of the newer landfill sites that are now being abandoned we do probe them for safety, we provide the technical information that the city may require as to their use, and we attempt to ensure that all the landfill sites that are going to be used for other purposes are going to be safe.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the city says they are going to spend 800,000 in the next five years to determine whether there is methane gas at these 35 sites. Is the Minister telling me that he is going to pick up the tab, or is he telling me that what he's doing is in addition to this expenditure?

MR. JORGENSEN: I believe the ones my honourable friend is referring to would be older ones that were in existence before the Act came into force, and they're the ones that have been giving the city the difficulties.

MR. DOERN: Is the Minister saying that he does not have a responsibility in terms of those older sites?

MR. JORGENSEN: The city has assumed responsibility for them.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the other question I asked the Minister and I don't know whether he can answer this — I'm looking again at an article in the Trib of — I don't have a date on it, it must have been a few months ago — and it says that city councillors are particularly concerned that the city may be liable for damages should the gas cause an explosion. And then Councillor Yanofsky is quoted as saying that the city does not know exactly what its legal position would be. Maybe I'm asking for a legal opinion, I don't know, but can the Minister express an opinion on whether or not the city council and/or the provincial government would be liable in the event of a gas explosion?

MR. JORGENSEN: I would rather not express a definitive opinion on that subject, Mr. Chairman. I think that's something that will have to be determined.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd end on this particular note, that there was a great trend in the last number of years — I don't know how long — to develop these landfill sites. This was the thing to do and the way to go. And although the Minister per se

is only one person involved, I want to underline and draw to his attention the Amy Street steam plant, which I gather is also under some threat from the Clean Environment Commission because they are polluters, and they have been extended a number of times, and I want to talk about the positive development of that plant.

I just wonder if the Minister could indicate the present status of that plant; the impression was created a few years ago that that plant had only a few months to go. It's been extended several times. Can the Minister tell us what the present status of that city-owned facility is?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the city has requested that we do not ask them to install expensive equipment to remove the problem that currently exists, because it is their intention to replace that with a new plant, and putting in the expensive equipment now would be, I think, an expense that would simply be wasted when they go about building the new plant. It would be better that they start construction of a new plant earlier rather than waste money in putting in equipment in the old one.

And that's the present situation of that particular steam plant.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, then the Minister is once again, as previous Ministers, giving them an extension and a period of grace. What I want to simply emphasize to him is this, that there's been talk for at least three or four years of developing that plant as a 50 million garbage-burning, steam heat generating facility, and you would therefore accomplish a number of things at the same time. For example, you would eliminate this concern about methane gas, which we have with this other technique of burying garbage or getting rid of garbage. You would also get rid of the garbage in the form of burning it, not by using gas and oil, but by techniques whereby somehow or other the garbage is made combustible without, say, using gas-fired furnaces. It's an amazing technique. So you would have the safety provision of no methane gas; you would also have a provision of eliminating garbage in the downtown area, off from the downtown area, you wouldn't have to be trucking somewhere outside; and you would then also be able to steam-heat 230 business which are now hooked up. And if you don't go that route, then each and every one of those businesses will have to install gas or oil or electric furnaces, which I think would be wasteful of certain forms of energy, and also more expensive, and would really be a sad conclusion, just as not too long ago, I think in the River Heights area, the homes were heated by central heating. And we have a central heating system in downtown Winnipeg, and I can see people saying ten years from now, just like they're now saying, why did we let those — I hate to say this with my colleague sitting beside me — but why did we get rid of those electric buses? And it was done at a certain point in time because it was more economical to go diesel. — (Interjection)— I'm referring to my colleague, one of his opponents made that suggestion lately.

And I'm just saying that we right now have a chance to convert that Amy Street plant and develop

it and eliminate a host of problems. There's a financial problem, there's a lot of money involved here, and Ottawa has not come through, although, given that last meeting, there seems to be a hint of some federal funding. So I would say to the Minister, as one member of Cabinet, and as the man who's largely responsible for the environment in terms of air pollution, etc., he should be supporting this very extensive and imaginative development in downtown Winnipeg.

And I would say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the technology is Canadian, the technology has been developed by, I think, the Dominion Bridge people; they have plants running in eastern Canada and in the eastern United States. And I think that the Minister should be a strong proponent of this form of energy conservation and protection of the environment.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, there is no disagreement. As a matter of fact, we enthusiastically support this whole concept of waste management. I think I mentioned that earlier during the course of this debate. There are many facets to this question, my honourable friend has mentioned but one, the use of waste as a resource. Notwithstanding the heavy costs that are involved, we believe that some early action towards the development of that kind of waste management program is necessary from two points of view, not only from an energy conservation point of view, as my honourable friend is aware, there was one school in the city of Winnipeg that used waste as a means of heating the building and cut down their costs by about 80 percent in the process. So as a means of using waste as an energy resource, it is useful enough in itself. But in addition, as a means of disposing of waste, it has the added benefit, so there is no disagreement with what my honourable friend has said and the government in that respect. We are supporters of the whole concept of waste management and have taken, well we have been in discussion with other provinces, with municipalities, because the question involves not just the two levels of government, it involves three levels of government, as well as the people who create the waste and the consumers themselves. So it is an ambitious program; it will be a difficult one to implement, but in the final analysis I think it will be essential and important that we move in that direction.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to add a couple of points, and that is, that some of these plants that have been developed have been highly successful, and one that I know of has failed. I just want to draw to the attention of the Minister that, in some cases, people have only looked at one part of it, they've said this is a way to get rid of garbage, and that's half of the problem. The other half is to sell the heat and the steam and the power generated, and where these plants are successful it's where they are feeding industrial plants, like near the city of Boston, and in East Saugus, they have a plant that feeds power to, I think, a General Electric plant, across the river, with 17,000 employees, and some other ones heat homes or heat businesses, or produce power for industrial enterprises.

So I'm just saying, you can't go into it with only half the picture. And here we have a captive market, we don't have to go out and start selling the power or selling the heat or selling the steam, it's pre-sold. So I just say to the Minister, he doesn't have to worry about whether you're going to be shooting all this expensive energy into the air, he has 230 customers there through the city of Winnipeg. And as well, there are techniques of capturing some of the materials in the everyday garbage that people throw away, metals, crushed materials — the Minister of Highways would be interested — I think, they sell a lot of the materials to the Highways Department and they use it in construction. Also, in a lot of these plants, not only would the city of Winnipeg say, be the prime user, but they could also allow and charge private contractors to drive in with their truckfuls of materials, and they would have to pay to sell their loads, rather than drive them out X number of miles and pay for gas and labour, etc.

I simply concur with the position the Minister is taking, and urge him to show some leadership here and promote it in Cabinet, and with the federal government in particular.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JORGENSON: I might just add, in connection with the last statement of my honourable friend, it happens to be one of the items that is on the agenda for the meeting of the Canadian Council of Resource and Environmental Ministers, which will be coming up next week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, while we are on this area of using waste products as an environmental advantage rather than a disadvantage, I wonder if the Minister could give us some idea of what other areas the department is working on or working with, or supporting, or at least following the study and investigation and experimentation in terms of using waste products to generate energy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JORGENSON: That is a difficult question to answer in specific terms. The general attitude that has been taken by, at least the western Ministers, the five western provinces, at meetings that I have attended, has dealt in general terms with the whole question of attempting to find a waste disposal program that is comprehensive enough to take in all forms of waste, sort and classify them. Some wastes can be recycled, as was mentioned earlier. Old tires can be recycled, glass can be recycled, plastic containers can be — the new coke bottles that are on the market can be recycled; not without some cost.

Other forms of waste can be used as an energy resource — paper, for example, crank case oil. I think more recently there was a plant set up somewhere in Ontario. I believe Shell Oil set up a plant just recently for the specific purpose of reclaiming used oil. Up to this point it has been thrown away. It is now possible and feasible and economically practical to recycle it, and my

understanding is that it is happening. As a matter of fact, there are on the market today individual recycling devices that can be bought by trucking companies, farmers, or whatever, and crank case oil that they drain out of their tractors can be put through this machine and pumped straight into the fuel tank and used as a fuel, mixed with diesel fuel, and thereby consuming it as a form of energy rather than wasting it.

These things are coming towards us, these things are happening, because I think there is now a general recognition, where there perhaps wasn't a few years ago, of the need to conserve all forms of energy first of all; and secondly, of the need to develop a waste management program that will enable us to use much of that waste as a resource rather than just burying it in landfill sites. That technology is with us. What is required, of course, is an understanding on the part of the public in general of what the system is intended to do in order to get the cooperation of everyone, and that becomes necessary; secondly, the cost itself, and the costs are fairly high. We have to make a decision as to how we can bear those costs, and if the public are prepared to bear the cost of installation of the equipment that is necessary, and the system that is necessary to dispose of wastes.

It is not a question of whether or not the provinces need to be convinced. I think the convincing has been done and the technology is there, it is a question of now finding the dollars that are necessary in order to make the program effective and function.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, is the Minister, through his department, directly involved in any of these research or experimental efforts at this time or is he just aware of them or is the department directly involved or does the department give assistance to anyone who is directly involved in this kind of research?

MR. JORGENSON: I'd like to answer that question by saying that the research is going on all the time. As a matter of fact earlier last fall I believe it was, or was it early this year, we met with the president of the University of Manitoba and members of his staff for the very purpose of determining whether or not the university would want to participate. Indeed, they asked us if they could participate in assisting in research measures to determine whether or not there are better ways that can be devised for waste disposal. We have that kind of co-operation with the University of Manitoba. But in addition to that there are other universities and other cities, other provinces, and other countries that have done a considerable amount of work, and have a considerable amount of technology that is already available to us that we can call upon, and indeed have called upon.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, some of this waste management that he's talking about requires in some cases public support or public input, that is in some jurisdictions they require people to sort their garbage. In Winnipeg there's been — at least in

Winnipeg, I'm not sure outside of the city of Winnipeg — been areas where you could deliver your newspapers, and some provinces have places where you can deliver your bottles for them to be taken care of. I am wondering sort of where the Minister thinks public attitudes are on this case right now, and is he looking at any of those forms where the public would have to participate, not in a financial way, but make an effort to assist in waste management. Mr. Chairman, I know that in the — for a while I was taking my old newspapers to a dump and then they took that dump away so I just put them in the garbage now, because that facility is no longer . . . and I don't know where the closest one is after that one. I wonder if the Minister would comment on that.

MR. JORGENSON: The technique of collection is perhaps the greatest problem. I think my honourable friend perhaps will recall a few years ago the city of Winnipeg made an effort to encourage residents of the city to sort their garbage. It turned out to be somewhat of an abysmal failure and I think the main reason for that was because the public perceived it as just another program that was designed to relieve the garbage collectors of a little more work. It was not intended to be that, and that's what I meant when I said that the public will have to become aware of the reasons why this is being done in order to get their co-operation. Even then, it may not be possible to get their wholehearted co-operation, but at least if the public are aware of the benefits and the need and the necessity of a proper system of waste management, then I think there is a better chance that you can have that kind of co-operation. Co-operation must also come from the people who create the waste; the companies that produce the products that are considered wastes.

In some jurisdictions, notably Germany and France, there is a rather sophisticated system of collection that everyone now has become accustomed to. And once you become accustomed to a system — I think the great problem is to get people in the habit of doing things that will lend themselves to the proper collection of this material — but once they become accustomed to it then the process is much easier. And I might say that in Germany the industries pay a substantial part of the cost of this whole program since they are the generators of waste. It is felt that they should bear a fair part of the responsibility in meeting the costs. Some of those costs, as I indicated earlier, are quite high, so high in fact that some industries now have developed their own disposal plants, so the waste is disposed of right in their own plants, thus relieving the state of the cost of picking it up.

Once the idea of the need for a waste management program catches on, and that will be the difficult part, then I think that we will have gone well on the way towards developing a proper waste management system. As my honourable friend is aware, as I said earlier, there are certain types of waste that can be recycled. Other types of waste can be used as a form of energy. There are other wastes however, the hazardous wastes, that have to be disposed of through highly sophisticated techniques, and it's not every municipality or indeed every province that can afford the heavy cost that is

involved in the construction of hazardous waste disposal equipment. So it is on that basis that our discussions with the other provinces were intended to fall. What we were attempting to do is to determine if it would be practical or feasible to develop one hazardous waste disposal plant in western Canada to which all the other provinces would then be able to send their waste. I think that is a practical way because the cost of one of those plants is prohibitive for one province to undertake, but five provinces together would perhaps, first of all, produce sufficient hazardous waste to make the plant feasible, and secondly would distribute the costs amongst five rather than just one province.

One of the difficulties, of course, in that type of a program is the transportation, but that's a hazard, I suppose, that one will have to face. And, of course, I think that one other obstacle that will have to be overcome is public objection. Everybody is anxious to get rid of waste; nobody wants waste around; nobody wants it produced. But even more vociferously, nobody wants it disposed of in their particular vicinity, and so experiences in some of the provinces, notably British Columbia and Ontario, have demonstrated the hysteria that can be generated when any effort is made to dispose of hazardous waste.

The government of Ontario wanted to try an experiment to dispose of PCBs by burning them in a cement kiln. I think that the program, according to the scientists who developed the idea, the program could have been very practical, but after the spill at Mississauga — the cement kiln happened to be located in the municipality of Mississauga — they passed a by-law forbidding that kiln to be used for that purpose. The government of Ontario then has the matter in court to determine whether or not they had the right to pass such a by-law.

So that's the kind of hysteria that accompanies any effort to effectively and finally dispose of waste. Nobody wants it. And there has to be some rationale approach to take to this whole question. If nobody wants waste, then the public have got to accept the fact that there is a means of disposing of it, and they've got to accept the fact that there are ways of disposing of it — ways that have been demonstrated, at least in the countries that have such disposal plants, and I refer again to Germany in particular, that are clean, that do not produce any wastes or any hazards, or any pollution of any kind. Once the public come to accept that, then we can really develop a hazardous waste disposal program, but the big obstacle is going to be public objection, and the hysteria that can be created, by the press mostly, because it sells copy.

Every time spills have taken place throughout the years, gasoline spills and other kinds of spills, they never received any notice at all. Today, a farmer overfills his tractor and dumps a gallon of gas on the ground, it makes headlines. So it obviously is a sensitive point with the public, otherwise the newspapers wouldn't play it up so much. And if it's that sensitive, then it's that much more difficult to bring some rational bearing on the whole question. There are going to be difficulties, and my honourable friend perhaps is aware of them as well as I am.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, the Minister was, in discussing the area of disposal basically, of chemical wastes as one of the serious problems, I assume he is fully aware of the accusations that are going on against his counterpart in Ontario where, in fact, Ontario has to send some forms of chemical waste to the United States, and therefore Ontario is not complaining about the pollution being caused by that particular operation, that it's affecting lakes in Ontario, because it's some of their waste that is being disposed of at the plant that is accused of, or being thought to affect the lakes in Ontario. The part that the Minister mentioned about the responsibility of industry, and industry in some European countries accepting more and more responsibility for waste disposal, I found those comments most interesting, and I wonder if the Minister sees any application then of the information that he has — what's happening in Europe, and it looks like a reasonable type of approach, a reasonable type of program — whether he sees any application of that approach in Manitoba.

MR. JORGENSEN: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the situation in Ontario is one that has developed over a period of years without, unfortunately, without them knowing the monster that they were creating, the problems they were creating for themselves. We haven't reached that stage in Manitoba. We don't have those heavy kinds of industries, we do have some, but we don't have those heavy kinds of industries that are the generators of pollution and waste to the extent that they have had in Ontario for a number of years, to the extent that they have in British Columbia, and to the extent that they now have in Alberta.

The government of Alberta commissioned a study to be done, and during the course of that study they visited the various plants, and particularly one in Germany, and there is a fairly comprehensive report available from the Alberta government, which I have read. And I think that if any program of waste disposal were to be adopted, that would be a fairly good model to use. We have one greater problem that they do not have in Germany, at least to the extent that we have here, and that's the distance that hazardous waste must be hauled. That poses a special problem for us that we have to come to grips with.

A company, and I've gone through this before, but I don't mind going through it again, a company in Alberta, has applied for a licence to build a plant, and that application is now before the Environment Commission in the province of Alberta. If built, that plant could handle all the hazardous wastes that we have to dispose of in this province. They pick it up in specially contained and specially structured trucks, specially trained personnel, and haul it to their storage site until disposal. Their plan did contain the possibility of establishing a storage place here in the province, from whence they could pick up material from time to time. It is one of the means whereby hazardous waste can be disposed of.

I'm not sure just exactly what stage the application has reached right now in Alberta —(Interjection)— I'm advised that the Environment Commission in Alberta are now holding public hearings on the whole subject. And the intention of the public hearings is

two-fold, first of all to use, as a means of informing the public of Alberta of the need of a waste disposal program, and secondly, to provide an opportunity for the public to make their views known before the Commission.

The program is at hand, depending as I said earlier on the acceptability of the public, and that is not something that can be guaranteed.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I appreciate the information that the Minister has just shared. I am not sure he dealt with the question I was after him to deal with, and that is, does he have any plans now, or how does he see ways to make industry in Manitoba more responsible, Mr. Chairman? I can just recall in another environmental matter that we were looking at many years ago was banning non-returnable containers for soft drinks, and anyone who made containers that didn't fit that category were immediately calling us up and wanting to persuade us not to bring in that type of legislation, because, of course, it would cost them.

I am assuming that the industry in Europe that has been willing to exhume more and more responsibility in terms of waste disposal, didn't decide on their own to go ahead and dispose of wastes, that the public acting through their government had to apply some regulation and some rules to get them to assume that responsibility. I wonder how the Minister sees that coming about in Manitoba, or whether he has any plans or any ways that he could implement this or get the industry to accept that responsibility here in Manitoba.

MR. JORGENSEN: As I pointed out to my honourable friend earlier, there are different stages of disposal, or different products to dispose of. There is a certain amount of waste that can be disposed of right on the municipal level, in the municipal landfill site, without any harm. There are other types of waste that can be recycled, that requires a different process, and perhaps can be done on the municipal level as well. Other types of waste, I suspect, can only be disposed of on the provincial level, and that involves transportation again, while the hazardous wastes, I feel, can only be disposed of at properly constructed plants in centrally located areas, which would involve a considerable amount of transportation.

It depends on the type of material that is being disposed. You mentioned the disposable bottles; they can be recycled, they can be shredded and pelleted and used for other purposes, that implies transportation. I don't want to leave my honourable friend with the impression that this program can be implemented without cost, there are heavy costs involved, but the necessity of such a program, I think, weighs very heavily in its favour, irrespective of the costs. Industry, quite naturally, will be expected to bear its share of that cost. I agree with my honourable friend it is not practical or it is not possible to expect that every industry is going to build its own disposal plant. They will have wastes to dispose and they are going to pay for the cost of that disposal. If that requires, as I believe it will, legislation to that effect, then so be it.

I think the important thing is to establish a system of waste disposal that is acceptable to everyone, that

everyone understands, and that has as its basic concept the two ingredients that I mentioned earlier: one, a means of disposing of the waste; and secondly, to regard it somewhat in terms of a resource that can be utilized for the production of energy in one form or another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for St. Vital was dealing with methane and building restrictions. It just brought to mind something that is occurring on the No. 8 Highway, north of the Perimeter Highway where there is a landfill site, on the west side of the divided highway. I notice that there is a new house in the process of being built in very close proximity to this landfill site, and I was just wondering if the Minister and his Department were aware of it since, I think, it's north of the Perimeter Highway and before you come to the St. Andrews drive-off to the airport, so I imagine it would be probably in the municipality of St. Andrews, which would make it come under the provincial jurisdiction, I imagine. I don't know what criteria or what regulations the department has developed. This, I don't think, is a landfill site that has been abandoned, I think that they are still bringing waste products there. Just the fact that the member was raising this issue and having been driving by there on a few occasions, I have seen this house in the process of being built, and it never occurred to me that they may be building in violation of provincial regulations. I just draw this to the Minister's attention.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, that happens to be what is referred to as a Class 1 landfill site, and by our regulation the gas probes are a requirement by regulation. That particular site has been probed.

MR. JENKINS: Are the departmental officials aware that a house is being built in the close proximity, and does it violate the regulations of the Department that they have set down?

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if my honourable friend could tell me, are they sewage sludge beds, or are they ash pit that he is talking about?

MR. JENKINS: Would there be any . . .

MR. JORGENSON: I am advised that it is an old incinerator site that has not been rehabilitated and it is classified as closed. My information is that there is no violation in building close by.

MR. JENKINS: The Minister also raised a very interesting topic when he was dealing with some questions from the Member for The Pas on the recycling of waste oil. It seems to me that years ago we did have a program here in the City of Winnipeg, where garages did store used crank case oil into pits and someone would come and empty them, and they did recycle the oil. I just wonder if that sort of a program had been abandoned. I know the railways, when they were using oil waste packing in oil boxes, they used to reclaim oil; they used to clean the waste and clean the oil, and much of the oil was reclaimed

and used. It seems that now they use a different type of packing, and, of course, they are going more and more to journal roller bearings, but there still are a considerable amount of cars that are still equipped with what they call friction bearings, which use a oil pad below the journal, or below of axle, and oil in there, but they don't seem to be cleaning the oil now like they used to. Both railways here in the city of Winnipeg had reclamation of used oil; they reclaimed the oil and reused it for lubrication of the journal boxes on box cars.

I am just wondering, it seems almost ironic, now that we have got into the age where we are having oil shortages and what not, we don't seem to be doing the things that we were doing a few years ago. I just wonder if the department is aware of these, and I would ask the Minister that if his department is aware, do they still collect used oil from garages and recycle it? Because at one time you could even buy it in garages, the recycled oil, but I haven't seen any of late, and I just wondered if the department . . .

MR. JORGENSON: My impression is, and I do recall from my own experience the kind of reclaiming process that had taken place, but apparently, first of all, there was very limited public acceptance of the program. The quantities were so limited that it was not really an economically practical program; and thirdly, the reclaimers or the refiners, who cleaned this oil, did not appear to be able to return it to its original viscosity, and thereby resulting in lack of public acceptance. Now whether or not Shell in Toronto have developed a new technique, whether there is a greater demand for it, or whether there is more of the product available, or a combination of all three, I don't know, but they have recently now gone back into the reclaiming of used oil.

I think the more practical use, however, is the one that I mentioned earlier, simply cleaning it to the extent that you can put it in the fuel tank and mix it with your regular fuel and just burn it. The savings are quite substantial in that you are burning — you can use up to ten percent of your fuel made up of used oil, and over a period of time that amounts to a considerable amount of money. I have the figures, I don't have them with me, but the manufacturer of the equipment has made some fairly substantial claims as to its practicability. I have sent copies of the material out to some of the people that I know to determine whether or not they would be interested in purchasing some of that equipment.

MR. JENKINS: I think, again it is acceptability of reclamation and recycling, the whole process, and know when we were discussing this topic before, the Minister said that they have developed a program that they are going to put out. He also said that they are going to get a film from Alberta, which they are going to give us an opportunity to view at a later date.

I do agree with the Minister that the implementation of any program that we are looking at in the future is one that we have to educate the public that it is necessary. And when I'm speaking of the public, I'm not just speaking of industry, I'm speaking of the public at large, because they are polluters as well — the bottles and the other things that we see thrown around with gay abandon.

I think one of the answers for why some of the programs in Europe maybe have gained more acceptance than they have perhaps in North American, because many of the countries we are dealing with are resource poor.

MR. JORGENSON: They ran out of landfill sites long ago.

MR. JENKINS: But in the recycling of materials there I can see — and not too long ago, I noticed in the newspaper here that some industries are looking seriously now at recycling some material, because the cost of getting at new resources are quite prohibitive, that we already have a resource here. And it'll come down, I guess in the long run, to dollars and cents, whether it costs more to open up new resource areas, or if we have the resource here. Again, it comes down to the cost of assembling it and in points where it can be picked up. Of course, that basically is a matter of education, and I don't think that the Minister, in his lifetime, or in my lifetime, is going to educate the population of North America that we have to. But the Minister stated before that their program is geared towards our younger generation, the children in the schools, and I think that is good, because I think these are going to be our innovators, our users, our consumers, our polluters of the future. And if we can convince these young people today that they must preserve the environment as we have it today, because the environment has suffered tremendously, especially since the end of World War II, the innovations, the things that we have seen, in our own short lifetime. And perhaps what our children will see within the quite foreseeable future.

If someone had told me in, say, 1939 or 1945 even that we were going to put people up on the moon and things like this, you know, that was Buck Rogers. We saw that 25 A.D. But the technology that we have developed, unfortunately, in many cases, has been a boon to mankind in some respects, but it also has been a bugbear because we have, with that technology that we have developed, we have unfortunately polluted some of our rivers and streams and land. But it is possible — the city of London, the River Thames, has been cleaned up. At one time there were no fish in the River Thames. Today there are fish in the River Thames. Birds are back on the river nesting, so it is possible.

Again, it's going to have to come, if it doesn't come by education, then it's going to have to come by government regulation. But I say to the Minister that he has a monumental task on his hands to convince the public at large, and I look forward to, as I said before, you're the Minister that is also in charge of Information Services, so you have an in, you can at least get some of your message across to the newspapers, to the general public. And perhaps the Minister should even be looking at visual ways — you know, if we want to reach the public today, the best medium of getting to them is on what I call the idiot box, TV. There's where you get at them. People don't like to read newspapers, they are very selective. But they'll watch many things on TV. — (Interjection)— Well, question period, I don't whether that would come under pollution or what, but nevertheless, people do watch it. And if you can get

that message across, that is the big problem that we face today. I wish the people who are in environmental control all the luck in the world because you're going to have to work hard and long hours at convincing people that we must preserve the environment as we have it today, and make it better than it is.

We are fortunate, as the Minister says, here in Manitoba. We are relatively free of some of the pollution that you will find in some of the industrial areas. All one has to do is go down to the Golden Horseshoe or triangle in southern Ontario. What isn't being torn up and covered with asphalt, tarmac and cement is being killed by the pollution coming from the smokestacks of the Hamilton area. Talk about acid rain, there's a classic example. When they give you the weather in Toronto, you get the temperature, you get the humidity, and you get the pollution and the heat inversion, all these things that are part and parcel of modern technology.

When one goes down to one of our last large fruit-bearing areas in the Niagara peninsula in the St. Catharines area and you see, from what it was 35, 40 years ago, and to what it is today, just from the pollution and whatnot that is coming from industry. That is a tragedy, because we, unfortunately here in Canada, while we have a large land mass, we don't have that much agricultural land. When you stretch it out from sea to sea here, I doubt that you would have a strip of agricultural land here in Canada more than 50 miles wide if you stretch it from coast to coast. I know that towns and cities and villages were built, primarily on the most efficient means of transportation when this country was being settled and colonized. Water was the method, and that's why we have most of our major cities and thoroughfares and whatnot located on these areas. There are much better places where the city of Toronto could have been built than on Lake Ontario. When you go up to the north and you find all the wasteland, as far as agricultural use — I don't mean it's wasteland, but I mean it's not the type of land that is suited to agricultural means. I am quite serious when I say that —(Interjection)— well, our own city is not as bad. We don't have the heavy type of industry that they have down in the east and on the eastern seaboard of the United States.

I know a few years ago, they did a study down in Ontario and I think it was something like 30 minutes an acre of prime agricultural land was disappearing under tarmac, asphalt, building sites and whatnot. It's something that I think is not as prevalent here in western Canada, but it could happen in provinces like Alberta and Saskatchewan where there is more industry, more natural resources, and as the costs of energy increase, then of course the proximity of the product to a manufacturing plant will take place more and more.

I say to the Commission in Alberta, I wish them well with their project of dealing with hazardous materials. I think it is one that is needed; it's absolutely needed in this country, especially here. I don't think that one province alone could handle that sort of a process, and if it's a joint venture, which I understood from the Minister before, they were talking about the four western provinces and perhaps Ontario going into a program such as this and I think that is one method and I look forward to

the department itself being innovative and coming up with some new ideas. I think the Minister has given us some of his thoughts and I'm sure his departmental officials will be working very hard as well.

To sum up what I have to say, I wish the Minister and the department well in their endeavours in the field of environmental control. I know it's a tough one and it's one that is going to be with us for many, many years to come.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Lloyd G. Hyde (Portage la Prairie): The Honourable Minister.

MR. JORGENSEN: I just want to thank my honourable friend for his comments, and I will be looking forward then to what he has been saying, the co-operation of all members of the Legislature in attempting to at least sell the idea of this program so that we can get general acceptance. I don't think that implies that you're going to have agreement on every specific detail, but if we can get agreement as to the need to implement such a program, it will go a long way towards realization of what we feel are the proper objectives.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, my colleague was talking about the public education and publicity and educating the public in terms of environmental concerns to make sure that they are sympathetic to what the Minister is trying to do and what members of the House are trying to do in terms of protecting our environment, and I wonder if the Minister could give us a little bit of an indication in terms of, are there specific public education efforts and what are those specific education efforts?

MR. JORGENSEN: Primarily, at the present time, directed at the schools. I think I advised the House the other day that we are holding approximately 100 meetings, about 100 requests a month for speakers to speak at our schools, plus other organizations as well, and we try to make the staff available to as many of these as we can possibly do.

That's the one step that is being taken now, and I think it's a very important one, as it was mentioned earlier by one of the members over there, that the younger generation appear, at this stage, to be very concerned. The number of letters that we get from younger high school students and under would indicate there is a keen interest in the whole question of the environment and its preservation. Given that attitude, then the rest is a lot easier. Once people accept the idea that there have to be some environmental measures taken in order to preserve our environment, then it's just a question of attempting to point out to them what those measures are and how they can help and contribute and co-operate. So we are moving in that direction.

One hesitates, at this stage, to go much beyond that until we are assured of general acceptance. I am constantly reminded of the experience that happened in the city of Winnipeg, and I think the program was a failure simply because there was not an information program accompanying it, it was simply an edict that had been issued from the city of Winnipeg and people were expected to comply, and comply they didn't. And I feel that had there been

some reason given for it, an education program carried out in advance of it, there would have been much greater acceptance. So that's the stage that we're at now and we hope we can progress beyond that very shortly.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I understand what the Minister is saying. I wonder if he could give me some real specific detail, like, do they send speakers from the department out, or do they just send printed materials out to the classes, or exactly what is this educational effort.

MR. JORGENSEN: We do send speakers, but we send a great deal of literature. In many cases, students are asked to write essays on the question of pollution, so they contact the department for background information, which we happily provide for them. That's pretty much all we're doing now. I admit that it's not a great deal, but hopefully we can progress beyond that and carry out perhaps some of the suggestions that were made here by the Member for Logan, take to the airwaves and do some TV work and other types of work that we feel may be necessary in order to reach as many people as we possibly can.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, one of the ways that — and the Minister has talked about it in terms of dealing with young people and that there is a concern with young people — one of the things that was done before under a Student Employment Program, I believe, was to have students involved in some type of garbage clean up or whatever area they could devise. It looked like a reasonable learning experience then to have some public benefit or some public good attached to it. I can recall even before that program was in existence, when I was a legislative assistant to, I think it was the Minister of Resources at that time, I attended a couple of meetings with a group that was co-ordinating students cleaning up along the Seine River in Winnipeg. And one of the people on the committee was a school councillor and was making sure that the students got a lot out of it rather than just going down there and earning a couple of dollars, but that they learn quite a bit from doing it. I wonder if there continues to be any of that kind of effort, I suppose to get people in at the ground floor or at the mud creekbottom level or whatever, to get first hand experience with what's happening and with some things that can be done about it, and to take the basic motivation that's there and increase it and make it into a learning experience for them.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm not sure to the extent that we go into that other than the employment of students from time to time to carry on some of the work that the department is engaged in, studies and things like that. As a matter of fact there are four students that will be involved during the summer months on a waste management program that involves the five western provinces and the Yukon and the federal government all contributing a part of it, and in the province of Manitoba our department will be hiring four students to work with them on that program this year, and there are students that are

hired for other purposes as well within the environmental branch.

I want to also say that it was my expectation — and I mentioned this the other night too — that there will be a reorganization of the department which will provide for an information officer. What we hope to do with the information branch within the department is to embark on a full-scale information program which it will be intended to acquaint people with every facet of the department's work, to ensure that when there are environmental problems that develop that the public are readily apprised of what the implications are and what the problems may be so that they have a greater appreciation of what is going on on a day-to-day basis. I am advised that under the STEP Program that there are 31 students that will be hired for a period of 16 weeks and one additional one for eight weeks, so there are a number of young people that are involved in this kind of a program. But other than that we don't go beyond or to the extent that my honourable friend was mentioning under the labour training program.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have an idea what those 31 students will be specifically doing, or . . . for the whole department, whether they are for the environmental section and whether it will be the kind of a situation where they would learn something . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: No, they'll be in the field. There will be some in the labs. There will be some doing water testing, some doing work in the acid rain situation in the northern areas, and programs of that nature. There are a number of ongoing programs that they become involved in but it's mostly practical work.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairperson, it seems like these people that the Minister is talking about are basically university people with a little bit of technical background or a little bit of university training in this area. I suppose I'd still be concerned in terms of high school students and even younger people developing that sort of consciousness that makes them defenders of the environment, that makes them concerned that spaceship earth is able to keep flying for quite a while and not be polluted out of existence. There was something on the radio today separate from government, a group as part of a fund-raising campaign was going to be picking up garbage in the city I believe, and somehow raising money by doing that. I'm not quite sure how they were going to do that, but I would take it then from the Minister that there isn't anything specific aimed at the younger high school students or even elementary school students.

MR. JORGENSEN: They come from three areas, university, Red River Community College and senior high school.

MR. McBRIDE: I would urge the Minister to look at the possibility in terms of high school students and local programs on a community-by-community basis that could be part of the student employment program and to consider ways to make those programs worthwhile.

I'll switch back, Mr. Chairperson, to earlier on the Minister talked about the transportation of hazardous goods and I want to very specifically first of all ask about the chemical tank car leak that we had at The Pas in April and ask the Minister if and when and how he was informed of that situation and how involved his department was in that particular leak of the chemical?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, we were involved to the extent that we were notified of the spill and one of our people in The Pas was on site. As usual in these cases, Emergency Measures were notified first, and they notified our staff. But in the meantime a team from International Nickel had been sent down and they were a team of experts in this particular field. They were sent down and effected the repairs on the valve that had been found leaking. I might add that the car was an empty car. It was not full of the material. When these cars are returned there is something like a couple of hundred gallons left in the tank on its return. Don't ask me why that is, why they don't empty it completely, I expect there is a reason for it.

MR. McBRIDE: Pressure.

MR. JORGENSEN: Perhaps, I'm not familiar with it. That was the extent of the problem. I think my honourable friend knows that the car was moved out from the inhabited area so all through the experience there was very little danger by anyone in the area.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairperson, I guess the concern that I have and the concern of people in The Pas would be similar to that of any other communities in the province in terms of protecting, first of all their own immediate safety and then protecting the environment as well. In this case the particular gas has an odour so people were aware of its presence. I'm assuming that there's a number of chemical commodities that are moved that people wouldn't even be aware that they were present in the environment and in the atmosphere. As a result of this and because of the other MacGregor situation etc. the government has announced through the Minister of Northern Affairs that there would be further meetings in northern Manitoba to discuss this kind of situation.

There's a number of concerns, one is the concern right within The Pas because we do have the rail line going right through the middle of town. We do have No. 10 Highway, which is the only access to the north, going right through the middle of town, and there is a considerable movement of dangerous materials that are used further north in the mining industry. So one, I suppose, is to put all those things in place that the Minister talked about in terms of MacGregor, to have an evacuation plan, to have emergency plans, to take measures to avoid this happening. I don't know whether they have hot boxes or not located — or detectors located near The Pas.

The other aspect, and I am sure this will come out in terms of the MacGregor hearing as well, but there does seem to be or has been up to this point at least within the system, some lack of knowledge and some lack of ability to deal with the situation should it

arise. The train crews are aware but not very specifically. The train crew — there's a sticker on the car that says such-and-such a chemical is contained. Prolonged exposure to this chemical can cause death and in case of any emergency telephone the following CN number. I think I mentioned before in the House, but I'll repeat it here because it relates to this situation, is that one previous incident at The Pas, in town, they suspected a leak and so they ran out and got the telephone number from the car and phoned that number in Alberta, in Calgary, I think, and the person said, Oh, you're lucky you caught me, I was just going home. What's the problem? In that case there was not a real danger or a real accident, it was only a suspected problem, but had their been an emergency at a later hour, I don't think they would have known who to call or what to do. The situation in the States that was discussed during the MacGregor situation, is that they have at least one main hotline number that can start setting all the gears in motion. And I'm assuming that these are the kinds of things that will be discussed and the people will be made aware of during these meetings in the north in terms of what are the exact steps you can take, and what are the dangers of the specific chemicals that are moving in our particular part of the province? Maybe the Minister does have that information, or his staff now, the nature of those particular commonly carried dangerous substances that are travelling in through northern Manitoba now, and I assume that most of those will be related to the mining industry.

The other thing, Mr. Chairperson, that affects the knowledge of the train crew, that they don't have that much more information than the fact that it is a dangerous chemical and what to do, whether it lies to the ground or whether it rises up, or whether it's very flammable, or those kind of specific details.

I'm not sure what would happen if there was a derailment in the bush. What I would do if I were train crew, whether I would take off into the trees as fast as I could go, or whether I would lie on the ground, or stand on top of the caboose, or whatever would be the safest course of action, or run down the track. So I wonder if the Minister would care to comment on those questions and those concerns.

MR. JORGENSON: My honourable friend has raised some very pertinent questions in connection with this whole question of hazardous material transportation. I'm sure he's aware that a bill was introduced into the House of Commons during the last parliament and it died on the Order Paper because of the dissolution of parliament. My understanding is, that bill is being re-introduced, and I might say that Manitoba, and more particularly, members of my department, have been very much involved in the drafting of that legislation. It's been a co-operative effort on the part of the provinces and the federal government.

All of those problems that my honourable friend has mentioned will be dealt with, or hopefully dealt with in that legislation, so that the transportation of hazardous goods will carry with it regulations that will ensure that, for example, such things as train crews knowing what is being carried, making sure that certain types of safety equipment are available, making sure that they know the

procedures that are necessary for a train crew to take until expert help arrives. They can do the preliminary things. I should mention that the Minister of Government Services, I think, indicated when his estimates were before this committee, that he was revising The Emergency Measures Organization Act to provide a more co-ordinated response to emergencies of this nature, which will involve, in the first instance, the municipalities or the local government district, or the town, whichever is involved. They will become the first people to become involved. Emergency Measures will certainly become very much involved as soon as it's possible for them to do so. If it's an environmental problem, my department will most certainly be advised.

And I might say — I haven't said this before, I believe I have once, but I should say it again — that there is a tremendous amount of expertise right in the Department of the Environment that is available. There are something like 3,200 chemicals, and we have them all catalogued. The response can be fairly fast if information is required on any of those chemicals that are being transported throughout this province. There may be other emergencies that will require other departments to become involved, and the whole intention of the legislation, or the regulations that will be brought in by the Minister of Government Services will be to provide for a sequence of participation that will take place, depending on the circumstances, depending on the nature of the emergency, and depending on what kind of an accident there is to consider. If it's a matter that takes place on federal government property, for example, then it's a federal government responsibility. I know that sometimes we get hung up on whose jurisdiction a certain matter falls under, but that's the way that has been, and in the case of an accident taking place on, say the CNR, the top CNR official is the one that automatically takes charge. He will have the final say as to what measures are taken to ensure the safety of, not only his train crew, but to a large extent, the people in the surrounding areas. We become very much involved, of course, because we are concerned about the environment.

But because the spill is located on the federal property, the federal environment people then become the first advisers on environmental matters to the CNR. We act in a support role under these circumstances. If it takes place on a provincial government highway, then we become involved, Highways Department are very much involved, the environmental people are involved; if necessary, the water control people, depending on, again, the nature of the accident. But the intention is to provide a well defined sequence of participation by various departments. There may be occasions when it's necessary to phone experts in other areas, but I want to remind my honourable friend that we have a considerable amount of expertise right in our own department that we rely on very heavily for initial analysis of the situation and an initial judgement to be made.

That has been going on for some time, and it has been reasonably successful in meeting the requirements of any given situation. That does not mean that we can't call upon further expertise, and indeed we do, but for an initial, fast response, I think

our department is quite competent to handle any given situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(c)—The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I thank the Minister for his response. There are a couple of things that he spoke of that relate to the shipment by rail that are sort of out of the Minister's jurisdiction, but it seems to me that sort of a couple of simple, immediate things could be done. One of the questions I asked the Minister, if he was aware of, or his officials were aware of, what were the sort of predominant dangerous materials that were handled in northern Manitoba, what are some of the common goods that are shipped in northern Manitoba, in the province?

MR. JORGENSEN: I have a list of some of the more common hazardous materials that are shipped through the province. If my honourable friend wants the list here, carbon dioxide, liquified petroleum gas, propane, butane, chlorine, tetraethyllead, which is an anti-knock compound, gasoline, sulphuric acid, acetone, alcohol, toluene, naphtha, methanol, isopropanol, hexane, caustic soda, hydrofluor clyic acid, zinc chlorine, ammonium nitrate, ammonium phosphate, ammonia, and hydrogen sulphide, which was the material that . . .

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get the chance to write them all down.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'll provide you with this list.

MR. McBRYDE: I was wondering, more specifically, I'm assuming that there's two or three predominant chemicals and dangerous goods that are handled in northern Manitoba, and I suppose what I was thinking, sort of as a simple, immediate step, and I don't know if anyone's done it yet, is just to provide information on those materials to train crews for a starter, because they have time to read on the job, I understand, and they could just make themselves familiar with what they're handling.

MR. JORGENSEN: If that is not done under The Transportation of Hazardous Goods Act, then we certainly intend to do it. But I suspect that that is going to be one of the provisions of that new Act. I am just advised that that's one of the things that we are insisting upon be in the Act, and I expect it will.

I agree with my honourable friend, I think that's a very important part of being able to deal with any spill that takes place, knowing what the spill is likely to be, and then having the proper equipment, if it requires respirators, or if it requires equipment of any nature to deal with it, that that equipment is on the train and that you have some people there with some knowledge of what to do, at least as a first measure until more expert help can be brought to bear.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, at this particular time, there is no gear carried at all on those northern trains.

MR. JORGENSEN: That particular car was on a siding, was it not? It had been returned from

Thompson and was sitting on a siding, and some passerby detected the odor and reported it. I believe that is the sequence.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, but this is a regular shipment. That car goes back and forth and back and forth, and I'm assuming that there are a couple of other chemicals that go back and forth as well.

MR. JORGENSEN: I don't know whether I could identify any others that go there on a regular basis, but perhaps Mr. Bowen could. This list that I read out is by no means complete. Liquid petroleum gas, propane, chlorine, some sulphuric acid, that's a partial list of the things that could be going up there.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I have other questions but different subjects, so maybe I'll step down. I think some of my colleagues might have a question and I'll give them the opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of points. Earlier, the Member for Logan had asked some questions, and I'm just not quite clear where the Minister was talking about a mix of certain substances with gasoline, and that's what I wanted to talk to him about. For example, I don't know whether he was talking about experimentation with methane and hydrogen in terms of propelling automobiles, but if so, I just wanted to mention, in passing, that I talked to one engineer about one of these gases, I'm not sure which one, and he said, sure you could use it to drive a car, but you'd need a gas bag or balloon 15 stories high, which seemed to be a limitation on the practicality of that particular mode of transportation. You've got to think big.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister whether he has any involvement in gasohol. He was talking earlier about experimenting with different substances mixed with gasoline, I just wanted to ask him, in his capacity as Minister here, whether this is the area where experimentation with gasohol is being looked at, or is that under some other portfolio like Economic Development?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, my department is not involved in the process itself, other than just keeping in touch with the university and other institutions in the United States who are experimenting with this particular program. We don't have any direct involvement in it.

MR. DOERN: Is it Economic Development?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, I suppose that will depend on how it can compare, can compete with the price of petroleum products. At the present time I don't think so, but one has no assurance that present prices are going to be maintained.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I also wonder whether the Minister has any information on the pollution aspects of gasohol which would interest his staff, or on the K-cycle engine, whether these two types of — well, the engine in one case and the fuel in the other — whether these are both less polluting and less dangerous to the environment, and therefore

possibly should be encouraged on that account alone.

MR. JORGENSEN: The alcohol component of gasohol is reduced to carbon dioxide and water. Insofar as the K-cycle engine is concerned, I think my honourable friend may be aware that is one of the features of the K-cycle that makes it such an attractive design. Its longer power stroke enables it to burn up all of the fuel mixture in the conventional internal combustion motor. The power stroke is no longer than any of the other three strokes, and the mixture has to be rich enough in order to ignite, and being that rich it is considerably more than is necessary to drive the piston. Under the K-cycle that stroke is so much longer that the mixture has a better opportunity of burning, so there is no emission, there is not even a muffler on the K-cycle. There is no emission and it is one of the features of the K-cycle that is so attractive.

There are other variations of the — and I don't know what the hell I am doing talking about this subject because I have nothing to do with it, it is an engineering subject and I am no engineer, but you are relating it to pollution and in that sense, perhaps, I can comment on it. There are other variations of the internal combustion engines. I am thinking particularly of the Honda Civic, which started out as an anti-pollution motor and not only achieved that goal, but also the second goal of doubling the number of miles per hour on a gallon of gas. The method that is used in that particular motor is the attachment of a small cylinder alongside the main cylinder into which a rich mixture is injected and ignited by the spark plug, and the flash from that small cylinder then ignites the much weaker mixture in the main cylinder. The burning is so complete that there is very little emission in that motor as well.

So there are finally, after heaven knows how many years, some advances being made on the original concept of the force of the internal combustion four-cycle engine.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of more questions here. Is the Minister saying that there is, in fact, no pollution at all, in other words zero, or just some . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Negligible.

MR. DOERN: . . . negligible amount. So therefore, you are talking in effect no pollution and you also say you wouldn't require a muffler in fact, and you wouldn't require a catalytic converter either?

MR. JORGENSEN: Definitely not, no.

MR. DOERN: So there would be so many hundreds of dollars worth of equipment that . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: I invite my honourable friend to contact Haakon Kristiansen at his plant, I am sure he would be happy to give you a demonstration of the K-cycle, and also they have some material on it so that you can have some understanding of the principle upon which it operates.

MR. DOERN: The Minister of Highways is adding that there is a weight saving in terms of the vehicle with the absence of this equipment.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, the K-cycle is one-third the weight of a regular internal combustion motor, one-third the weight of a motor of the same power. It is one-third the size and one-third the cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just have two or three questions and I think that we have agreement that we will go on to something else, but it deals with the fact that the Minister was saying that his department had some input into the proposed legislation that is going to be re-introduced in the Federal House.

One of the things that happened before when they brought some regulations on the transportation of toxic and hazardous goods, the regulations were left with the Canadian Transport Commission, one had to do with speed of trains through highly-populated areas; and after representations from industry and the transportation industry itself they abated this speed regulation through built-up areas. What I want is assurance from the Minister — and I realize he can't assure me because it is going to have to be passed federally — but I do hope that the legislation when it is brought in, that these regulations are tough and that they are not going to be able to be set aside by the Canadian Transport Commission just for the sake of speed, because that is one of the problems of dealing with the transportation of these hazardous materials.

I was glad to hear that the Minister said that if the federal legislation doesn't deal with the making aware of train crews how to deal with some of the potential emergencies that may arise with the transportation of these hazardous materials, that he was going to bring something here in Manitoba.

I would just ask the Minister also if his department is working in close concert with the — I realize it is another Ministry, but it is dealing with the same topic. We had some discussion with the Minister of Government Services on his proposed revamping of the Emergency Measures Organization, and I would hope that your department would be having some input into this to be able to identify when a potential disaster is imminent, and make sure that people go there prepared with the right equipment. It is no use sending a fire department there if it is a chemical fire and they haven't got the right equipment to fit a chemical fire.

Another thing in the legislation, perhaps the Minister can enlighten me — was there any mention of making train consists, and you know train consists are just a list of cars that are added to the running crews, and in many cases they have to just check what is on the cars themselves, because the train consist itself doesn't tell you what boxcar A or tanker A is hauling. That is one of the problems that I think, unless the train crew itself has visually inspected those cars, and sometimes the flammable placard boards where these hazardous things are listed sometimes get torn off, so in some cases they don't even know what they are hauling. I think that it behooves the transportation companies — in this

case we are talking about railways, but it also would be for land carriers, who are also transporting hazardous and toxic and flammable materials — that the person hauling this stuff is made aware of what he is hauling, because I am sure in many cases train crews are not aware of just exactly what some of the hazardous goods are that they are hauling.

Luckily in the Mississauga affair, I guess the train crew was aware of it. The front-end brakeman was the guy that should get a medal, because he went back there and hooked off, I think, seven or eight LPG tank cars, which are, in my estimation, just like an aerosol can on wheels, because if they are punctured or ruptured the material is under tremendous pressure and it is just like — people will tell don't throw aerosol cans into a fire, because you know what the hell is going to happen — but I would hope that the legislation would be in that respect, that it would include a program that transportation companies must make their train crews and the crews that handle these things aware of how to, and equipment must be available on the train, to be able to do some detecting.

Also that the legislation should be tough enough that carriers, common carriers, of these hazardous materials, when they have train consists, or consists of lists of materials, that it should be on the consist that is handed to the train crew that they know what the hell is on that God damn train that they are hauling. That kind of legislation would help considerably. Especially, it is very hard for the train crews if they don't know what they are hauling. You know, you can see trains going down the railway track here with 40 or 50 tank cars on them and they could be hauling anything, from gasoline to anhydrous ammonia. I would hope that the Minister when his department had that input that they had these things in mind.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, all of those items that my honourable friend has mentioned contain the package and the part of discussions that we have been having. We haven't seen the final package yet, but we are anxious that it does contain the provisions that he has mentioned, plus heaven knows how many more. They won't all be in the legislation. What is not contained in the legislation, I think, and some reasonable assurance can be covered by regulation.

The intention is to have a package that will take into consideration the number of environmental spills that have occurred and measures to ensure that accidents of a similar nature and others that have not even been considered will be contained in legislation that will ensure the least amount of damage, either to the environment or the people in the area, will occur. That means spacing of cars and many other things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it has been agreed that we will leave 5.(c)(1) and (2) and go on, and leave that one that will cover the whole field for the Member for Churchill when he returns. That is mutually agreed and we will go on to 5.(d)(1) — the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to also leave (g) if it is alright.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)?

MR. McBRYDE: (c) and (g).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alright.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I also have a couple of questions on this before we pass (1).

MR. CHAIRMAN: On which? We are going to leave (c).

MR. McBRYDE: I can ask the question under the next one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am flexible, but if we are leaving it we might as well leave it and go on to our other items I would think, or else we are really indeed not leaving it then if we want to . . .

5.(d)(1) — the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: My question relates to the next section, Mr. Chairman, if that is the one we are on, 5.(d)(1), or it could relate to that at least, and it is with respect to the proposal for an underground waste disposal project in Lac du Bonnet, or waste disposal testing at least, in the Lac du Bonnet, Pinawa area, by the Atomic Energy Commission. I'm just bringing to the Minister's attention, something which he's probably aware of, that there is a group of concerned citizens in the area who are concerned about the proposed testing, since they suspect that the atomic energy of Canada do not intend to simply test on the site, but in fact intend the site to be a nuclear waste disposal site.

They are concerned about this, because of potential dangers to the residents and also, Mr. Chairman, the potential damaging effect to the area from the loss of tourism dollars if the area becomes known as a nuclear disposal site. They note that the project is only in a feasibility stage; however they claim that they have evidence that land and air surveys and road building work has commenced in the area and they are suspicious that, although the actual work for a test site has not officially started, that somehow work has already started. I would ask the Minister what control his department has over this? I expect this is Crown land that we are talking about and I would wonder if his department has the authority or jurisdiction to control any such work in the province of Manitoba, and if Atomic Energy of Canada has to come to the department and the government of Manitoba to obtain permission to do any testing. Furthermore, would they have to obtain permission to undertake the work leading up to this testing, if it's the land and air surveys and road building work that the people in the area are alleging has already commenced? Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering what sort of monitoring the department would have over a project of this nature. Would they be able to assure the residents of that area for example, that this will only be used as a test site, and that no nuclear waste will be stored there without the permission of the Manitoba government?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, in response to my honourable friend's question, he's right in that

the lease for the drilling was provided by Crown lands, and that lease provides for testing the underground formations and the water formations in that area, and that's all the lease calls for. That's all they're permitted to do. Anything else is not going to be permitted. I don't know where the concern arises. I suppose that's a legitimate thing, and it deals with the very thing that we were talking about earlier — about people developing hysteria over certain things and then no amount of rational argument can be brought to bear to change their minds. The fact is that the lease that was provided by Crown Lands was provided for the drilling and testing of underground formations and water movements. I don't want to go any further than that. We will be monitoring it. We will be keeping an eye on it and we will be in constant touch with Atomic Energy of Canada to ensure that the provisions of that release are maintained.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: During these tests, Mr. Chairman, will there be the use of any nuclear waste of any kind in order to do these tests; will there be any nuclear wastes involved?

MR. JORGENSEN: No.

MR. BOSTROM: All right, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is indicating no. I would ask the Minister furthermore then for the concern of the citizens of that area, could he indicate to them the government's intentions with respect to further application by the Atomic Energy Commission. I suppose it's a hypothetical question, but one which the people in that area are concerned about, would the Minister be amenable to giving the Atomic Energy Commission permission to actually store nuclear waste on that site, or has the government arrived at a policy decision with respect to that issue at all?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, there has been no application for permission to do that. I presume that their application for testing is all that they are interested in doing, and that's all the permission that has been given to them. We have no intention of granting permission for underground storage of waste.

MR. BOSTROM: I take that as a firm position of the Manitoba government at this point, that they're absolutely opposed to providing any such permission to Atomic Energy Commission or any other such agency to store nuclear waste materials in Manitoba in any location?

MR. JORGENSEN: I can't speak for future governments. I can only say at this point that certainly is the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)—pass. The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I thank the Minister for his reassurance on that nuclear waste management experiment proposal. Right now it is, as the Minister says, only a testing of the possible

conditions. As members of public and members of the Legislature we get all kinds of information, most of the detailed information comes from Atomic Energy of Canada, and I'm not sure it's completely objective in all the material that it presents. We received a mimeographed sheet from the group that the Member for Rupertsland was talking about in terms of their concerns, that nuclear waste would be disposed of in that area. In the news about nuclear waste, a bulletin of March 15, 1979, it says they are test drilling the rock formation at the Whiteshell Nuclear Research Establishment and the information from these investigations and ongoing laboratory research will be used to prove the safety of the disposal concept. Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if that could be called a scientific experiment, when you already have your conclusion before you start to do your experiment. The nuclear industry seems to be sort of a self-generating, self-justifying industry, and because they are experts in that particular field the rest of us are left somewhat in the dark in having to rely upon them for information.

I as a citizen and as a member am very concerned about the development of nuclear power, about nuclear waste and especially because of the nuclear waste management problems that is produced. I'm concerned, Mr. Chairperson, not just with the proposal that my colleague raised, but also with the plans in terms of Manitoba for nuclear development, period, and Manitoba Hydro's investigation, now slowed down or stopped, but nonetheless them seeing as a government agency, nuclear energy as the next source of energy for the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairperson, when I first came into government, I was concerned that time about the effect of Hydro development in northern Manitoba, having dealt with a number of communities that had been directly affected by Hydro development and the environmental damage caused to the environment in northern Manitoba by Hydro development. Mr. Chairperson, I think at that time I was probably wrong in my concern, in my opposition basically to some of the things that were proposed to go on, because Hydro development seems to be now, with the energy situation, the cleanest, most effective type of energy that we have access to. But nonetheless at that time in 1969, we as a new government were basically locked in. There wasn't that much adjustment that could be made to plans that had been made many years before, at least from 1966.

When we talk about nuclear energy and nuclear waste management, you can't talk about disposal, Mr. Chairperson, you talk about management, because you just don't dispose of nuclear waste. So one of my concerns now is that the government will find itself eventually locked into nuclear energy. Because when the time comes that we are in need of more energy sources, Hydro will come and say, we have this plan all ready to go, we have all the preparations, we have the sites chosen, and if Manitoba isn't going to go short of energy, you have to proceed with these nuclear plans. Mr. Chairperson, the preliminary citizen opposition we are seeing now to even testing the site to see if it would be suitable for waste management, and certainly the opposition that would be there if they were going to actually use the site for nuclear waste

management, I think is sort of the tip of the iceberg in terms of public concern. Under this particular section that we are dealing with under Research and Development, I suppose the question to the Minister is, what is the role of his department in terms of both the development of nuclear power in Manitoba? If further development takes place, then we will have a waste management problem to deal with, and I don't think we will be able to send it off to Alberta, because you don't dispose of this kind of waste.

Mr. Chairperson, that's a real concern of mine, that I sort of not leave that kind of legacy from my inaction as an elected person in Manitoba. To just let Hydro proceed, just let the gears begin to roll, let the snowball begin to build, or the landslide start, and then in eight or ten years from now, everyone will say, well there is nothing we can do, we are now locked into nuclear power for Manitoba as our next energy source. I wonder if the Minister could comment on the role of his department in future developments and if he just wants to make any comments on the statements I've just made.

MR. JORGENSEN: At the present time it is somewhat difficult for me to comment on something that is not before us. My guess is that nuclear power development in this province is many years away and I would not want to project my thinking that far ahead. Until there is a proposal, and I am quite sure that if there is a proposal for nuclear power development, it will be preceded by some fairly extensive public hearings throughout this province, where the public will have an opportunity of voicing their opinions. I hope my honourable friend doesn't expect me to commit future governments the years in advance, because I'm sure it will be future governments and future generations that will be dealing with this problem, not us, because the development of nuclear energy in the province of Manitoba is some years away. I share the concerns that he has expressed, but I hesitate to make a commitment for somebody many years ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d). The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, the situation that exists now, and I guess it's an unfortunate part of our psychology and the way we operate, is that something very immediate has to be going to happen before we'll take action on it. So when there's a proposal that there might be nuclear waste management in the the Lac du Bonnet area, then a group of citizens get concerned because it's sort of an immediate type of thing. My concern is the situation of elected people 10 years down the road, 15 or 20 years down the road, that in fact Hydro will proceed to a certain stage, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited will proceed to a certain stage, where the decision-makers are in a sense going against the whole apparatus to try and stop it at that late stage, that there becomes that feeling that, well we've invested so much money, we have all these plans ready to go; if you're going to change this, it's going to cost 2 billion to the people of Manitoba now, and how unrealistic are you as an elected person, elected people have to take those kind of things into consideration. So that's a real concern of mine. I don't expect the Minister to solve it this evening, but

I feel better getting it on the record, that in the future, people are going to find themselves locked into nuclear development without actually thoroughly discussing it or making a decision. Someone in Atomic Energy Canada and someone in Manitoba Hydro will make a decision that in effect will have us trapped into their decision in the future, because it will be too expensive to do something different or to turn back the clock.

The other question I wanted to raise with Minister — if it has been raised already, I'll just let the Minister pass it by — I wonder if there has been any discussion yet, since it's that time of the year, on the mosquito control proposals, aerial spraying, and ground fogging, etc., etc. I got my first mosquito bites the other evening.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well treasure it, it may be the only one you'll get this year. If it's going to be as dry as it is, there's going to be very few mosquitos, at least in this part of the country.

MR. McBRYDE: So what people in the city want is not what the farmers want. The farmers want some rain, and the people in the city that don't like mosquitos should pray for dryness, is that it?

MR. JORGENSEN: At the moment the city is winning.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is saying then that the Clean Environment Commission hasn't had to make any decisions because of nature, so far this year.

MR. JORGENSEN: There have been no applications, and it is unlikely that there will be if the dry weather continues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)—pass; 5.(d)(2)—pass; 5.(e)(1)—pass; 5.(e)(2)—pass; 5.(f)(1)—pass. The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, one more question so we don't have to go home too early this evening. Maybe I should have asked it under the Research Section, but I'm sure the Minister will deal with it, and that is in terms of the updating studies and providing public information in terms of Garrison. The position of his government and our government is about the same in opposition to diverting of any waters into Manitoba, and I'm wondering if there's ongoing studies and ongoing assessment of the Garrison Diversion Project and if there is material available, readily accessible to the public that outlines the problems that we see and the concern that we have with Manitobans about that project.

MR. JORGENSEN: May I advise my honourable friend that the Water Resources Branch is the department that is handling all the Garrison information or details. It's the Minister that's in charge of the Water Resources; I have no knowledge other than what he has already provided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(f)(1)—pass; 5.(f)(2)—pass. I believe it's agreed that we leave also (g); 6.—pass. The Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, just so we can have some information on it, perhaps the Minister could give us a list of the projects proposed under that acquisition construction item.

MR. JORGENSEN: It isn't a very long list. It's the purchase of an argon plasma spectroscope to supplement the present one in the Environmental Control Laboratory of the Environmental Management Division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: I am not going to try and pronounce that word, but is that going in the new environmental lab?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes.

MR. JENKINS: Where would the acquisition of the facility, what goes into the building — are they covered elsewhere?

MR. JORGENSEN: Government Services.

MR. JENKINS: That would be covered under Government Services?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass. Committee Rise. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 100,000 for Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment—pass.

SUPPLY — HEALTH

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Robert Anderson (Springfield): Order please. The Committee will come to order and I direct members' attention to Resolution No. 79, Item (b) Personal Care Home Program—pass — the Honourable Minister.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, this afternoon a number of members in the opposition raised some questions and challenges and made a number of comments with respect to the Personal Care Home Program and their views and their concerns, and I would like to take a few minutes to attempt to respond to them at this juncture.

First of all, let me say that I appreciate the comments that have been made and the participation in the examination of this important item by the Honourable Member for Transcona, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, and also the questions raised by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

Perhaps I could deal first with the two specific questions that were put to me by the Member for Ste. Rose and the Leader of the Opposition, because they are confined to individual specific issues, and then I would like to comment on a number of the points raised by the other three members who made major contributions to the examination of this particular appropriation.

The Member for Ste. Rose asked me the status of the situation with respect to the new personal care home in Winnipegosis. Tenders closed for the PCH in Winnipegosis in the latter part of April, the second half of April, and the bids have been opened and are being examined, Mr. Chairman. Indications are that the successful bid will be approximately 200,000 lower than the lowest bid we received during the first bidding process last winter, and would appear to justify our feeling at that time that a better bid and a more acceptable cost could be achieved by going through a retendering process. I expect the contract for the personal care home in Winnipegosis will be awarded on or about the middle of this month, the month of May, perhaps a little earlier than that, but certainly we are on the threshold of approving the acceptable low bid at this point in time.

The Member for Selkirk, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, asked me about the case of one Annie Hoydalo, a resident of Selkirk and a typhoid carrier who has been paneled for admission to a personal care home. I can confirm, Mr. Chairman, that Mrs. Hoydalo could be admitted to a personal care home on the judgement of Dr. John Waters, who is our Acting Director of Epidemiology in Public Health in the absence of Dr. Manny Snell, provided specific treatment and nursing procedures were followed to ensure that there was no danger to other residents emanating from her condition as a typhoid carrier.

The nursing homes in Selkirk have expressed concern over the amount of care that would be required by Mr. Hoydalo and the amount of care that would be required to maintain protection against any threat of infection for other residents, and at this point in time, Mr. Chairman, they have not accepted Mrs. Hoydalo for admission. This is consistent with the authority vested in personal care homes since the beginning of the Insured Nursing Home Program. They have the right to refuse specific admissions to their homes if, in their opinion they either could not provide the appropriate care or the specific conditions were such that they posed a potential hazard to other residents, which they could not guarantee defence against.

Obviously there is a difference of opinion between Dr. Waters and the nursing homes in question as to the placement of Mrs. Hoydalo and the acceptability of her as a resident in a personal care home. At this juncture all I can tell the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is that the case is being reviewed by my department. We are aware of the division of opinion and we are aware of the difficulties facing both Mrs. Hoydalo in her present circumstances and perceived by the nursing homes in Selkirk to be facing them should they agree to accept her. The case is being reviewed and is certainly a matter of concern in my department and to the Commission. It is receiving attention and we will try to resolve it in the best interests of the nursing home residents in Selkirk and in the best interests of the Hoydalo family.

Mr. Chairman, a number of suggestions and comments and observations were offered this afternoon by the Members for Transcona, Fort Rouge and St. Boniface, in that order, and as I said I want to thank them for their participation in the debate and for their observations. I agree fully with all those comments that turned essentially on the

principle that quality of care and quality of life for our elderly citizens, particularly those requiring attention in the health sphere, is a single measure of the quality of a society, of the compassion of that society, and of the values that that society places on life and on its citizens.

I agree with all those suggestions that turned on the principle that says we must do all we can, we must attempt as responsibly and reasonably as we can to expand our capacity and capability to serve our senior citizens, our elderly, with the best spectrum of health care and attention and compassion that we can muster. I disagree with those comments that suggested that the present government has either been in default in that responsibility, or that decisions have been made and judgements entered into that diminish in any way our capacity to meet those objectives to which I've just referred, to which the other members referred, and to which, as I've said, I subscribe.

On the contrary, I believe that we have moved as responsibly as we can to address the legitimate needs, the rightfully deserved needs of our elderly, whether it be in the personal care sphere or any other sphere of social care and attention. Members opposite may not agree, obviously, with the judgements we've made, with the courses of action that we have determined are prudent and necessary to follow, and that's a legitimate disagreement and a legitimate difference of opinion. But that's all it is, Mr. Chairman, a disagreement and a difference of opinion.

It does not, I suggest, have validity as fact, because I believe that we can demonstrate, and have demonstrated, that we are moving to accommodate and recognize and involve the elderly persons who are resident of Manitoba, the elderly citizens of Manitoba, in the mainstream of our society, in the mainstream of care, to a greater degree than any of our predecessors in office.

We have established recently the Manitoba Council on Aging, which is charged specifically with helping the government identify those areas for opportunity and for action which will enable us to refine and adjust and adapt our programs, policies and institutions to meet the changing age demographics of Manitoba population. We recognize, as no government in office before has recognized, in Manitoba, that we face a major social change in terms of the demographic makeup of our population; that we have an expanding component of elderly that will produce, within the next 20 years, a population in which, on the basis of current projections, one Manitoban out of every five will be age 65 or over. Today that figure is about one out of ten, or one out of slightly more than ten. That is the social revolution, the demographic revolution in population terms that we face. We have recognized that, and we recognize that there is much to be done to adapt our institutions and develop policies and programs to deal with it. And for that reason, Sir, we have established the council to which I have referred, we are charging them with the specific task of helping us identify those areas that require innovation or adaptation, or replacement with altogether new approaches, and to develop for us the kinds of programs that help expand awareness within all Manitoba adult age groups, not just the elderly, but

within all Manitoba adult age groups, awareness of the aging process and its ramifications. And we speak, not only of the need for health care or personal care homes by any means. We are talking about the impact of that demographic change on our programs, policies and institutions in the field of shelter, in the field of pensions and income and income support, in the field of education, in the field of retirement, in the field of employment, and perhaps more importantly than any of those, in the field of dignity, in the field of self-worth and quality of the individual.

We want to provide opportunities for as many of our elderly and as many of those citizens who, given good health and the grace of God, will become elderly, to remain in the mainstream of Manitoba life for as long as they want to be in that mainstream, to be important, to be recognized, and to be involved.

These are integral parts of a health care approach, too. They are abstractions in comparison to the pure mechanics of attempting to put the necessary personal care, extended care, and acute care beds into place, but they are not abstractions from the point of view of the individual and his or her self-esteem.

So that, Mr. Chairman, I suggest represents a major and all-encompassing initiative in this area which has been addressed, both in general terms and in specific terms, by some of the speakers on the opposite side who offered their observations this afternoon on this particular appropriation, the Personal Care Home Program. Because what's involved here is something that goes far beyond the Personal Care Home Program. What is involved here is the individual and his or her self-esteem and self-worth and his or her right to be important and to be involved in life as long as he wants to be. If he wants to remove himself from halcyon activity at the age of 60 or 65 or 70, that's of course, his or her prerogative; but if those citizens want to remain involved and active, we want to have the policies, programs, and institutions in place that can enable them to do that.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Transcona asked me a number of questions about the Personal Care Home Program itself and the principles of the program, and I would just note for the record that the program includes the following services: accommodation at the standard ward level; meals, including special therapeutic diets; necessary nursing services; routine medical and surgical supplies; prescribed drugs, biologicals and related preparations approved by the commission; physiotherapy and occupational therapy in personal care homes approved by the commission for such services; routine laundry and linen services and other goods and services approved by the Commission. Each person in a personal care home pays a residential fee unless they are on social allowances, in which case the public pays that fee for them through the provincial treasury, and the resident per diem is 8.25 per day. The benefits of this program are available after residence in this province for 24 consecutive months, unless the person had previously lived in Manitoba for a total of 30 years, in which case coverage is available on the date he or she returns to reside in Manitoba.

The average per diem paid in the personal care home spectrum in 1979-80 — and this is averaged out to account for the different numbers of personal care beds and extended care beds, the different categories of care as to Level 2, 3 or 4 — was approximately 35 a day. The residential per diem during 1979-80 was either 7.75 or 8.00 per day, depending on the date of the year, and obviously, Mr. Chairman, that means that the per diem provided to the personal care homes by the government was approximately 27 per day. That ratio is maintained in the new budget, the new funding level, in fact if anything, the amount paid by the province will now represent a greater percentage of the total than has been the case in the past.

On the nine percent budgetary increase for personal care homes, we are looking at an average per diem — again, I say average, because that's the only figure for conversational purposes that I can provide — of about 38.50 per day. The new average per diem will rise by about 3.50 and so the government's share, or the public's share through the government, will be about 30.00. So that we're looking at a funding arrangement that involves the government's participation or input amounting to about 77 percent of the total cost, and the residential per diem accounting for about 23 percent of the total cost.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to get a note or two here, because I had taken notes on questions that arose as the Member for Transcona and others were talking. The total number of personal care beds in the province as at March 31, 1980, was 7,480 beds, of which approximately the breakdown as between non-proprietary and proprietary is about five to two. Non-proprietary beds total 5,269, and proprietary total 2,211, for a total of 7,480. Now, the Honourable Member for Transcona expressed some confusion with respect to figures and totals announced by me and articulated as commitments in terms of additions to the spectrum, and I want to make sure that he understands, and the committee understands precisely what I have attempted to say, and what it is that is being done with respect to this personal care bed spectrum.

We have, since becoming government, approved the net addition — I'm talking about a net addition here, approved the net addition of 397 non-prop beds to the spectrum. They include 10 beds at the new St. Joseph's personal care home, and the new St. Joseph's opens a little later this month. It's due to open within a very few days. I believe it has 104 beds or 106 beds, and of course the old St. Joseph's closes when it opens, so it's a 104 or 106 bed facility that's going up, but it only adds 10 beds, net, to the spectrum, because the old St. Joseph's comes out of existence, comes out of operation. The new St. Joseph's was approved during the 1978-79 fiscal year, and as I say, it opens a few days from now. — (Interjection)— No, it was approved by this government during the 1978-79 year, and at that point in time, the board of St. Joseph's told us they had no approval. They had no approval; they wanted approval.

MR. DESJARDINS: It was announced right in the House.

MR. SHERMAN: In 1979-80, the government approved the construction of 132 non-prop beds. Again, I'm talking about the non-proprietary beds. In the 1979-80 capital program announced by me, there were 132 non-proprietary beds, net. In the capital program announced for 1980-81 a few weeks ago in this House, there was a net total of 255 non-proprietary beds, 165 in points outside Winnipeg and 90 in Winnipeg, for a total of 255. That is a total of 397 non-proprietary beds, net, approved for construction by this government, all of which are either in the planning, design or construction phase right now. This year, three of those, St. Joseph's, I've just mentioned, Pilot Mound and Flin Flon, will open, and the others are either in the planning, design or construction stage, and they will open in 1981, many of them, and some of them in 1982. That's a net addition of 397 beds to the spectrum, all non-prop.

Now, the members opposite have talked about the 390, the figure 390. That refers to the proprietary beds which we approved, and it would amount to a net increase of 282; 390 would be the total that the proprietary operators had asked for, and that we have approved in Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie. If those beds are built and opened, 108 beds currently operated by those proprietary operators would be taken out of operation, so it would be a net increase of 282. That figure was arrived at as a result of starting from a total of 302 proprietary beds, which we addressed in the last two months of 1977 when we first became government, 252 of them in Winnipeg and 50 of them in Portage la Prairie, many of which were time-expired . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. SHERMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman . . . many of which were time-expired and which we felt could not be permitted to continue operating. They were in homes that required replacement, and of that total of 302 beds, 194 were closed in the winter of 1977-78. Those residents in the main were moved into the new wing of the Tache Nursing Home and the new Meadowood Manor in St. Vital and the new Lion's Manor in Portage la Prairie, so that left 108 beds that those proprietary operators are still operating. They would come out of service when the 390 new beds that they have applied for were built, for a net addition of 282 beds.

The Selkirk Nursing Home, another private operator, has received approval to build a 104-bed home to replace an existing 72-bed philosophy, so that would be a net increase of 32 beds. We are looking at a possible net increase of proprietary beds totalling 314.

Those are the two figures that we are dealing with, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— Yes, net increase beds, because 390 would come on in place of 108, and 104 would come on in place of 72, so the net increase in proprietary beds would be — in beds in the spectrum, but they happen to be proprietary beds — 314. We are looking at 397 non-proprietary beds approved for construction now, all of which are under way in one form or another, and 314 net new proprietary beds, which we have approved, but which the proprietary operators have not begun construction on yet because of financing difficulties.

If they were built, the combined figure would be 711 beds; the potential total that we are working on in terms of the chunk of beds to be added to the spectrum is 711, but 314 of them are proprietary and pending resolution of the financing problems that face the proprietary operators today, those 314 are not under way yet. I hope that they will be under way this year, but we have to resolve that question with them and the opportunity, if it is going to be made available to them, to coexist with non-prop operators in the field has to be a viable opportunity, and it has been a complex question to work out.

Let me say in that respect though, Mr. Chairman, that these proprietary operators, with the exception of Selkirk, these proprietary operators are all operators who were in the field before, who cooperated with the government in the winter of 1977-78 in either closing down or phasing down their existing facilities because of the time-expired quality of them, and also because of the Public Health legislation, and they have demonstrated their earnestness and their interest in rebuilding new facilities if they are permitted to get back into the field. This does not include a broad approach to proprietary operators in general. It is those operators that are involved in this package; we are still working with them and trying to solve those financing problems, Mr. Chairman.

I note from the clock that my time has expired. There are other questions that I haven't addressed yet, but doubtless members on the other side have some questions too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: I can appreciate that the Minister didn't have enough time to cover all the issues, because I think he really has left the major issues alone, and unfortunately we have to get back to them because the critical issues facing us are whether indeed we are going to have a viable Personal Care Home Program in Manitoba.

The only part that seems viable is the public non-profit program, that is the only viable program, and yet almost half of this program is the proprietary program. 314 net proprietary beds, in gross terms we are talking about 494 proprietary beds, almost 500 nursing home beds that haven't been built. That is the problem, they haven't been built, and so then we have to ask, what does that cause, what does it create? It creates tremendous constipation throughout the entire health care system of Manitoba, and puts horrible pressures on home care, the existing personal home care system, and the existing hospital system. That is the problem.

We are not talking about huge extravagance on the part of the government. After three years they are committing, they haven't built, but they have made commitments and announcements relating to less than 10 percent of the existing total of personal care homes. We know that the population above 65 has increased more than 10 percent. We know that we have backlogs in hospitals and on the waiting lists. The Minister says that this government has done more for the elderly than any other government, and that must have just rankled my colleagues, the former Ministers of Health sitting in the front row there, the Member for St. Boniface, the

Member for Seven Oaks. The Minister's position is sheer nonsense. Who abolished Medicare premiums? Who put nursing home care under Medicare? Who built about 7,000 senior citizens' housing units? Who established Pharmacare? The New Democratic Party Government. Who froze nursing home beds? Who froze or cancelled senior citizens' housing projects? Who increased the per diem cost of personal home care to the elderly by 40 percent? The Conservative Party, that was their particular addition to the needs of the elderly.

The elderly have spoken out quite clearly and graphically in their voting patterns to date on how they perceive the government's cutbacks to them. There has been little done for the elderly. In establishing this year, after announcing last year, a provincial Council on Aging is cosmetic at best. The Minister announced the council last year; it has taken one whole year for the Minister to pursue this high priority of his; it has taken one whole year to draft up terms of reference or guidelines — I don't know if he has tabled them, perhaps he can. We could look at them before we get into the Ministerial Statement. He may have added one staff person to this, I think Betty Havens has been added to act as an Executive-Director. There is really no staff support for this group to do any research. I don't know if any money has been budgeted anywhere within the budget to allow this Council for the Aging to conduct hearings across different parts of Manitoba, so it really exists as an exercise in tokenism. Yet I believe that the Council on Aging is a good idea if pursued rigorously and systematically and not on a token basis. I think it would be very dangerous to the elderly if in fact you set up these smoke screens without any real intention of doing anything.

The issue clearly on personal care homes, is that the private sector has been given the allocation of 494 desperately needed nursing homes beds and they have not built one. They haven't built one. The Minister when he makes these announcements says that it is expected that the building of the new beds will cost more than 10 million, to be paid for entirely by the private sector. That is the biggest con-job going. The Minister just indicated to us that the government pays the per diems, the government pays 70 percent of the per diems, the patients pay the rest.

Tell me how the private sector is paying for these homes. The private sector is bridge-financing something that the government is guaranteeing repayment of, and guaranteeing a return on investment, and the Minister still has not been able to get access to the books of these proprietary nursing homes. I would like him to tell us what is the average rate of the proprietary nursing homes, and has he looked at the individual books to determine whether it is a return of 15 percent or 20 percent? Is it a return on the gross cost of operation of these nursing homes, or is it a return on the equity? Because often when private companies get involved with government programs, they start talking about a return on the gross costs, and the return on gross costs may be something in the order of 15 percent, but the return on equity is something in the order of about 200 percent, because right now if you get a guaranteed market, a guaranteed demand as the government is doing, if you can guarantee payments,

and that is what the government has to do, and there is a waiting list of 2,000 people waiting to get into nursing homes, it doesn't require a private financial wizard to go out and borrow money on the basis of that; the private sector could borrow the money, but they don't feel the per diems will give them a sufficient profit.

Yet the Minister is not in any position to tell us what the average profit of any of these proprietary nursing homes is, even though the public is paying 70 percent, the public is paying 100 percent of the costs of operations of these private nursing homes. He can open the books and get access to the books of the non-proprietary nursing homes. They have nothing to hide, they have nothing to hide, they are prepared to show the government everything, and they have, but the private proprietary nursing homes, who aren't in a competitive situation, because the demand exceeds supply by about 2,000, so therefore they shouldn't have anything to hide from competitors or from the government. They won't open their books, that automatically creates suspicion. Why is that? Does this have to be some type of shell game between the government which funds Medicare and funds nursing home care and private companies? Is that the type of system that we are trying to build? Is that the type of system we are trying to encourage? Is that the type of incentives the Minister says is required in our health care delivery system in order to make it work? We disagree with that 100 percent, we don't think that is the type of incentive that is needed in health care.

When the Minister starts talking about where we are on the basis of gross terms, he is trying to imply that there has been more non-proprietary nursing homes committed and allocated than private ones, and on a gross basis that is not true. On a gross basis, according to the numbers he gave me, it is not true. On a gross basis, the effort is still more towards the private sector, according to the figures he gave me, and it hasn't worked. That is the problem, it hasn't worked, they haven't built any. The Minister cannot get up and tell us whether in fact one private nursing home bed has been built.

What do you say to all of the people who are on that waiting list, desperately trying to get in? Do we go to them and say, well, the Minister is trying his new-fangled experiment of trying to get private entrepreneurs involved in this, even though the religious groups want to do it, even though the community groups want to do it. No, he wants to go back and he wants to try and promote the private sector in this particular area. He is becoming indeed not the Minister of Health, he is trying to be the Minister of Economic Development. He is even going so far as to say that if a per diem isn't sufficient, if a guaranteed occupancy isn't sufficient, if a guaranteed rate of return isn't sufficient, I am going so far as to speculate about providing special per diems or special extras to private people so that they can make even more money on it, and make it more profitable and make it more of an inducement for them to build these homes. They don't have to offer these inducements. They don't have to, they can go to the same financial institutions that the private sector will have to go to; these non-profit entities can go to them, they can get good loans at slightly lower interest rates than the private sector; they are

prepared to do so. They have the experienced staff at hand; they have the volunteer efforts behind them, and they are prepared and want to do it. They recognize that the need is great. They are going out, they are doing the canvassing, they're probably doing more work trying to ascertain the need than the government is. That is certainly the case in my constituency with Park Manor Nursing Home. They have been the ones going out surveying to determine need, and they know that the need is out there. That is the same with other non-profit nursing homes, because they understand that the need is there, they believe in meeting the need, and as I said before, they do so because of their love of fellow man.

We have the Minister turning his back basically on these groups and promoting, inducing, buttressing, doing whatever is possible to try and promote this other group that first isn't necessary, is more expensive and hasn't performed over the last two years. It is inexcusable for the government to be continuing that position so doggedly and so determined. It just doesn't make any sense at all and it just doesn't wash.

When the Minister says, well, you know, these private homes, they are of a time-expired quality; that is a great new term, time-expired quality. We all develop these new types of jargon, it is like Nixon saying that certain things were non-operative anymore. We have the term time-expired quality and you have to ask why do we have time-expired quality? Do you have time-expired quality because there was no reinvestment of profit into the maintenance, into the upgrading of that facility, which is a normal way in which these things operate? Did they put aside any funds for reinvestment? They claimed depreciation on income tax. Did they put aside the funds for reinvestment, or did they indeed claim depreciation and run down the facility? And that's what happened, the latter case is what happened.

What are we having right now in terms of industrial relations? We have a strike taking place right now that only is at the negotiating stage because the Minister said that if the owner didn't come to the bargaining table he may in fact take the licence away. The had a first meeting with the owner there and the owner has stated that this is a pot of gold to him. He went on to be fairly flexible that first night and then that evening, at the Golden Door Geriatric Centre two nights ago, the rest of the private nursing home owners had a meeting. They didn't invite the non-profit nursing home owners and operators, they invited the private nursing home operators and the people on the picket lines said that all the cadillacs rolled in and they had a conference.

I hope the Minister has been reading reports of his conciliation officer because the next day the attitude hardened. The next day Mr. Pollock said he was under great pressure from his colleagues and it's understandable if in fact he's paying two to three dollars less an hour for his staff, if he has fewer staff than the non-profit nursing homes, of course he's squeezing out the extra money that way. Does the Minister condone that type of approach? Is that what he's trying to promote? Is that the type of system he is trying to set up with those types of incentives? Is that the type of society our health care system is reflecting? Is that the type of society the Minister

wants to try and refurbish? Is that what he's getting at, because we don't approve of it? We don't agree with it at all. We think that there are other ways, proven ways, tested ways, of doing it that have worked, that are working right now.

The only thing we say is that the operations of the non-profits have been squeezed somewhat because the increases for operating costs have not kept pace with inflation always and there have been decreases there. If those non-profits have been caught in the squeeze because they are doing it for the love of fellow man, what's happening in the private homes? How much squeezing is taking place. The private homes that I have seen, that I have gone to, indicate that a lot of squeezing is taking place.

Mr. Pollock, the person owning the Golden Door Geriatric Centre, has an application in for a fairly big expansion at the Mayfair Personal Care Home. I ask the Minister if the group that owns the Selkirk Nursing Home, which again is a decrepit disaster, isn't the group that's also applying to build other personal care homes? Is it in Portage? Is that the application? What's the Minister's attitude towards that? No rhyme, no reason to it, it's not working. Why doesn't the Minister admit that is the wrong way to grow? Why doesn't he call in the non-profit organizations that want to proceed with the provision of personal home care. Call them in and say we want to fill this gap that's grown over the last two years because of our mistakes and our wrong approach; we want to meet this need; we want to fill the gap; are you prepared to work with us? I know they are. He knows they are and we can meet the problem, we can meet the need very very quickly. That is the fundamental issue facing us with respect to personal care homes. It's a fundamental issue. It's one that is not only one for today, it's one that will effect us in the future.

Because the Minister in his statement on August 31st, 1979, said that operators of proprietary personal care homes will be encouraged to maintain facilities that they have established. Well we know the history of those that they have established to date. The Minister says they are of a time-expired quality. We know their record to date in that area. But he goes on to say that if they wish to pull out of this deal this will be possible provided the new operator meets MHSC licensing requirements.

What he means here is you can start selling personal home care like a business. When you sell a successful business, because if you have a guaranteed occupancy, if you've got guaranteed payment by the government, do you then start selling this successful business for good will? How much good will do you start wrapping into the price of one of these personal care homes, if one of them starts peddling from one investment group to another investment group? How much good will do you build in? How much refinancing are we going to pay for, because each time they sell they will sell for capital appreciation and for capital gains, and is that the type of system we want to encourage and promote in the health care system? We say no on this side and the Minister is avoiding this whole set of issues.

We indeed are going to change that particular approach, Mr. Chairperson. We don't believe that the private profit motive — that profit has a place in the provision of care for elderly people. We feel that just

like hospitals, health care should be provided publicly on a non-profit basis. And when the Minister makes this extravagant exaggerated case for private personal care homes or nursing homes, then he is surely building a case within his colleagues and within the Conservative Party for private hospitals. My colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, pointed this out very accurately. If you apply that logic to nursing homes it applies to hospitals as well, and if the Minister is telling us that private hospitals are justifiable, if he is now looking to the American model of health care, if that is the system that he wants to encourage, again we say we want no part of it. We're against that. We stand for something different and we will go to the public and fight on this particular issue of personal care homes. We will go to the public and we will fight on the issue of private versus public nursing homes. We will go to the public and we will fight on the issue of private versus public hospitals and we will debate that issue any time, any place with the Minister; any time, any place with the government. We know that the public will rule on that issue completely against what the Minister is saying because it is inexcusable and it can't be justified.

It is interesting to see that the Tribune, for example, the other day came out with an editorial saying yes, maybe we should pursue private nursing homes. That was one editorial. The Minister must have seen that. It raised a whole set of problems with it and said yes, maybe we should pursue that. They also came out with another editorial which said maybe a private clinic dealing with women's needs is a good partial solution. The Minister must have seen that as well because when you make the case for private nursing homes, you make the case for private hospitals.

We are against that position, clearly and categorically against the promotion of new private nursing homes and the development of any private hospitals. Clearly, categorically we are against that. The Minister's position is in favour of private nursing homes and fuzzy at best with respect to hospitals. — (Interjection)— Not at all.

The Member for Crescentwood would like to take the word private and have the public completely buttress it. The Member for Crescentwood would like to take a private entrepreneur, give him a guaranteed occupancy, the government paying all the per diems, and he'd like to call that private. He would like to go further than that, he'd like to have them refinance it and he'd like to have the Minister arrange the mortgage too, and pay the extra costs. He would then like to turn around and call that private enterprise. I don't call that private enterprise. I would like to build new, non-profit nursing homes, clearly and simply. Clearly and simply.

The Minister still hasn't indicated if there are any differences in per diems between private nursing homes and non-profit nursing homes, and whether indeed, there will be, in the future, those differences that he has said that he will. And will there be monitoring to ensure that there is the same service? And will he ensure that investment groups aren't doing things with the nursing homes which will be of benefit to other businesses they have, like laundry costs? Because that has been intimated in the case of one of the institutions that's privately run.

I'd like to know whether we're going to establish an Act and a set of regulations covering nursing homes or personal care homes, so that you can establish standards which are monitored. If they exist right now, fine, are they in any more formal form?

We have not heard about the waiting lists for personal care homes. What is the waiting list in Manitoba? What is the waiting list for Winnipeg?

Again, another question, specifically, how many people are occupying beds in hospitals that are waiting to get into personal care homes? I think a few weeks ago, the Minister said there were 800 such cases in Manitoba, with 70 in the Health Sciences. I know for a fact that 70 in the Health Sciences is not true, that the number is closer to 150 people. —(Interjection)— That's right, not panelled. In hospitals though, in hospitals, the Minister is trying to say that they can be in hospitals, that they can be in acute care beds, in hospitals, under doctor's supervision, requiring care, but he won't panel them to keep his panel list low, is that what he's saying?

MR. SHERMAN: Be consistent. You're talking about panelled people waiting for personal care admission. So either talk one or the other.

MR. PARASIUK: I'm asking, who's on the waiting list? I didn't say, who was panelled or not panelled, it's the Minister who brought that in, which is proving my point that the administration is playing games with the panelling process.

MR. SHERMAN: How can you be on the waiting list if you're not panelled?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. I'm asking, on the waiting lists, I'm saying, how many people are waiting in hospitals? And the Minister is saying, there are only 70 panelled people, when the doctors are saying there are closer to 150 elderly people waiting to get into nursing home beds who could get into the personal care homes, and should be in the personal care homes, and should be freeing these acute care beds. So I'd like clear numbers on that. Because the doctors themselves, are interested in that; the medical community is interested in that, because they know that the great number of elderly plugging up hospitals is a critical problem facing us in Manitoba.

I think the Minister has to come back to the Selkirk case, because it's a fairly clear, graphic case. Can we expect construction to begin in June, as the Minister promised, and said in a headlined article in the Free Press, June start promised on Selkirk care home; or will indeed that be like many other promises that the Minister has put forward and haven't indeed, been met. Because each time he made announcements about personal care homes, people in Manitoba assumed that those personal care homes would be built and they haven't been built. And the Minister has to accept responsibility for that, the Minister has to accept accountability for that, and the Minister has to accept the fact that we do have problems in our hospital system, our personal home care system, because of the freeze,

because of the cut-backs, and because of the fact that 494 personal care homes that were needed have not been built, and I think the Minister has to address that fundamental issue on personal care homes; it's critical, and he should address it.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Transcona began his remarks by saying that I had avoided several questions that had been asked me. I want to make it very clear that I'm avoiding no questions that have been asked me, and I don't think that that is a fair and reasonable charge. There were a great many contributions to this debate this afternoon which I did not interrupt, and a great many issues and challenges were put, and it was not possible to deal with all those that were put to me in that first half hour this evening. I am attempting to address the questions that have been put.

Let me also say, with respect to the remarks just made by the Member for Transcona, that I do accept responsibility and accountability for the condition and quality of the existing health care system in Manitoba since October 1977. I have not ducked that responsibility, or that categorical accountability. I do accept responsibility for it, and we are attempting to proceed, as reasonably and responsibly as we can, to meet the legitimate needs of the people of Manitoba in this field. But when he says to me that I make a charge that I can't make stick, when I say that this government has done more for the elderly of Manitoba than our predecessors, I want to tell him that I can make that charge stick, and 33 Conservative members of this government can make that charge stick, and 49 percent of the people of Manitoba who voted for the government can make it stick, because the member obviously has a very — I won't use the term low because I don't think he has a low opinion of senior citizens at all, but I think he has a very undeveloped opinion of senior citizens. If he thinks that the senior citizens of this province don't know the depths of deficit financing and debt to which this province was being driven under the eight years of our predecessors, then he's got a lot of education coming.

And when I say that we have done more for the senior citizens of Manitoba than that government did, you bet your boots I can make it stick. Because we would have been so far in debt, so far into bankruptcy, that the whole health care system would have been in threat. So let him leave no philosophical, abstract observations and concepts from the ivory tower of his caucus room on the record here, or in this arena, or in this debate, that obscures that fact. The fact was that we inherited a province that was going bankrupt due to eight years of wasteful spending and lack of accountability opposite. What we had to do was save the health care system. What we had to do was save the province, and it took some time to do it, Mr. Chairman. It took some time to do it. — (Interjection)— I said, wasteful spending by that government for eight years. And that put the whole health care system in threat. —(Interjection)— You will have your turn. That put the whole health care system under threat.

So let us not obscure that issue under abstract philosophizing by somebody who doesn't understand that the senior citizens of this province, who built this province, probably understand more about the health care system and what they get and what we have in this province, than he or his ivory tower thinkers in the NDP caucus room ever will. They understand that you can't do it all by just throwing money at it, you can't do it all by taxing or spending your province into interminable debt; they understand that, and if he doesn't understand it, he should go out and talk to some senior citizens who recognize the kind of condition that the province was getting into and who recognize what we've got here in the way of a health care system, that is continually being denigrated and downgraded by members opposite for the purpose of making political yards. Mr. Chairman, that's point No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Transcona is highly exercised over the fact that we should consider allowing proprietary operators into the personal care home field, because in his view, only those in the non-profit sector of life have any love or compassion for their fellow man. Well, Sir, that represents a difference in philosophy as between night and day, and long may it live, because we don't say, for one instant on this side, that only government and only non-profit operations possess the quality of love for one's fellow human being, compassion for his fellow human being, and commitment to service to his human being.

What the member opposite is saying, is that all those groups in the private sector, including all the service clubs, all the auxiliaries, all the volunteers, all those in the private sector are just out for a dollar, they don't care a whit about their fellow man. He is saying that the medical profession, which certainly operates on the basis of profit — I have a son in medical school, and I expect him to be well paid when he graduates — I don't know of very many doctors in this province or on this continent who don't expect to be well paid, because they deserve it and they earn it. He is saying that all those people, all those people lack the quality of human love and — that's what he is saying — he is saying that only the non-profits, only things done by non-profit organizations or by government possess that quality of love and compassion. He is saying that; read his remarks; listen to him; the Member for Transcona. —(Interjection)— I'm pointing at you because you're talking to me. The Member for Transcona is saying that.

He is saying that the private operators don't possess that quality. Well, I challenge him to show me that they don't possess it. I know of many private operators, proprietary operators, and I've known of many people who have been in proprietary homes, who have received just as much tender, loving care, just as much attention, just as much compassion, as those who are in non-profit homes.

He raises the question as to the fact that these homes were time-expired. Of course they were time-expired, because the previous government was determined, and it was their right, they were determined to close the private operators out of the nursing home business, so the logical result was that there was no development, no building, no initiative or effort aimed at investment in new property, why

should they? The previous government was not sympathetic to private operations in the personal care field. That's fine, that's their philosophy, but don't then try to point to them and say that the Conservative government is addressing a situation where the Minister, by his own admission, says that private operators were operating in time-expired premises. Of course they were operating in time-expired premises. If you're going to be frozen out of a province, you're not going to spend much time, effort or energy, re-investing in your property.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Transcona may not know it, but the previous government kept the private operators in business for a considerable number of years and they didn't close one substandard bed. Not one. So don't talk to us about what we have done in working with the private operators, who were extremely co-operative in helping to close down beds in premises that had become time-expired and substandard, due to the reasons that I've just mentioned, and in ensuring that we could get their operations down to scales and down to sizes that enabled the kinds of environment that met the regulations and legislation that they are obligated to meet. They were extremely co-operative in that transition, which was a very difficult transition, and which was undertaken by this government, not the previous government, and those operators demonstrated in their years of operation that they gave good quality service, they gave the necessary tender, loving care and compassion to their residents. Those operators who demonstrated that were told by us, and I have no compunction and no difficulty in admitting it quite candidly, they were told by us that we had no ideological or philosophical hangup about private operators in the personal care field, and that they would be allowed to get back into the field if they wished to do so, at such a time as it was possible to allow them back in, and they were ready to go on facilities that obviously met existing standards imposed and monitored by the commission.

And on the basis of that kind of arrangement, that kind of understanding, and indeed that kind of moral undertaking, we have been holding continual discussions with them as to whether they now want to get back into the field. If they don't, we'll turn to non-proprietary operators, but they have a right to have the opportunity to get back in if they want to.

The Member for Transcona makes considerable about the so-called subsidy that would be paid them through their per diems in order to enable them to meet the capital costs of construction and mortgage financing in the building field today. Well, I think he has the equation the wrong way around, Mr. Chairman. It's not the proprietary operators who are subsidized, it's the non-prop operators who are subsidized. The non-prop operators get CMHC money, as the honourable member knows, CMHC money from a fund which is developed from taxation revenues, drawn from the taxpayers of Canada, which permits them to borrow at very low mortgage interest rates. And I asked the Member for Transcona who was getting the subsidy? They're the ones who were getting the subsidy. What the prop operators would have to do, because they can't qualify for that CMHC money, because they're not non-profit operations, what they have to do is go into

the regular market, borrow at existing competitive rates in the market, and finance their construction and their operations and their mortgage that way.

And that calls, Mr. Chairman, in this day and age of volatile interest rates and volatile money markets, that calls for considerable care and caution and, I might say, considerable entrepreneurial courage, unless there is some sort of reasonable per diem that makes their operations viable. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the members opposite, in their doctrinaire opposition to private operations, the members opposite scoff at fairness, they scoff at such things as moral obligation, they scoff at such things as co-operation, they scoff at such things as reciprocal participation with people who have helped get difficult jobs done in this community, because they are private operators. So that makes them an anathema to members opposite, because they don't know anything except how to make a dollar. They're not interested in offering care and in offering compassion.

I can tell members opposite from my own personal experience, from members of my own family, that private operations are just as compassionate as . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of privilege.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Yes, on a point of privilege. I wish the Minister would stop making these general remarks when he's talking about members opposite us, the statement that I made, because I made very clear that I wasn't accusing anybody. And we can look and study Hansard together. You are not saying, the Member for Transcona, you are saying, the members opposite us. I made it quite clear, you just read Hansard, what was said before dinner, and you won't be making those statements anymore. You're misleading the public when you talk like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on the point of privilege.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if the Member for St. Boniface wants to divorce himself from the philosophy of the New Democratic Party, he's welcome to. We would welcome that. When I say, members opposite, you bet your life I mean members opposite, excluding the Member for St. Boniface, who divorces himself from that philosophy. And that's fine. He's divorced himself from that. But I've been listening to this drivel from the Member for Transcona and others on that side, excluding the Member who has divorced himself from the New Democratic Party, the Member for St. Boniface, for some considerable time about the money-grubbing attitude of the private sector in the personal care field and those who say it, the Member for Transcona and others, excluding the Member for St. Boniface, who has divorced himself from the New Democratic philosophy, have no evidence for that kind of charge whatsoever.

They can cite individual cases where they feel operations have not measured up to their high qualities in terms of principle. We can cite individual, they and I, all of us can cite individual cases of that nature right across the spectrum of life, right across

all operations, private and public. I have no hesitation in saying that my experience both as a private citizen and as Minister of Health with the private operators is that they do have compassion, they do have an interest in the care and well-being of their residents and they run good operations, and if they hadn't been forced into virtual decay through eight years in which it was made quite clear to them that there really wasn't going to be any place in the future for private operations, many of those plants would be in much better physical condition today.

Mr. Chairman, I am serious about making those comments about private personal care operators because that has been my experience. We do have an obligation to see whether they can deliver, whether they can operate viably and whether they can deliver. One has to concede, and I don't suppose that many on the New Democratic side will, but I think most fair people would have to concede that it's a very difficult — it puts persons trying to operate in this field in a very difficult position in a market like today's when you are competing with a funding principle that enables your competitors in the field to obtain financing at anywhere from 12 to 14 percent less than the financing you can obtain. So those —(Interjection)— I said that enables your competitors to obtain financing at anywhere from 12 to 14 percent that you can obtain. That puts them in an extremely difficult position.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One speaker at a time.

MR. SHERMAN: That is why we are pursuing the course with them that we are to enable both sides to determine whether or not private operations can be viably launched in this field at this present time.

Mr. Chairman, the private operators and the private operations are pretty good citizens, not only private citizens but pretty good corporate citizens of this province and this community. They're pretty good corporate citizens of this province and this community. They pay school taxes. They pay federal sales taxes and they pay income taxes, none of which are paid by the non-prop operators. They also serve as a valuable check and balance in terms of the field as a whole because there certainly are opportunities for efficiency, not only care efficiency but cost efficiency of operation in the personal care field that can be identified when there are competitive categories of personal care homes operating.

No one can tell me that a system in that field which draws as heavily as it does on public funding is immune to some inefficiencies. We're not at all convinced that to have a system that is all public and all non-profit, is the most efficient way to operate. The proprietary homes are paid the same median per diem at the present time as the non-prop homes are. They have received no special consideration whatsoever up to this point in time in their operation. What we are trying to resolve is whether or not it is viable financially for private operators whose track record has demonstrated to us that they can deliver a service to be enabled to operate at this point in time. I repeat that they are good corporate citizens and they contribute a good deal of revenue to the provincial economy, which can't be said for the non-

prop homes. So it is not all a one-sided story, Mr. Chairman, by any means.

Let me deal with a couple of the questions that the Member for Transcona raised. He asked me about the situation at the Golden Door. Well, I think it would be impolitic at best to comment on that situation at the moment, Mr. Chairman. Let me say that I have been kept aware and informed of the situation. I don't need the instructions from the Member for Transcona to read the reports of my conciliation officer. I am satisfied that meaningful consultation and discussion is taking place at that home at the present time, and I would suggest that it would be helpful to the situation if neither side of this committee, or neither side in this Legislature, indulged in particular polemics either pro or against the union or the operator. It takes two parties to make a dispute and I was extremely concerned that two conditions be met and be met without delay and without equivocation. One, that the residents in the home be cared for properly at the usual standards of care and staffing — that has been guaranteed and that is in effect; and two, that the operator sit down and enter meaningful negotiations in the collective bargaining process with the certified bargaining agent. That has also been accomplished and we will continue to monitor the situation on a regular basis through the commission as we are doing, and I can guarantee the Member for Transcona and members opposite that the staffing levels and the quality of care are being maintained at their usual high standards in that home. The collective bargaining process will be permitted to run its course at this juncture, but I repeat that there are differences of opinion and there are difficulties and misunderstandings on both sides and it's not perhaps as entirely one-sided as the Member for Transcona believes it is.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked me about the situation at the Municipal Hospitals for one, and about the respite care question, respite bed question for two. We are spending 2 million at the Municipal Hospitals this year for particular renovations that will enable rationalization of the use of space over there to eliminate and reduce overcrowding, not only at the patient level but at the administrative and service level. And the main project that the Member for Fort Rouge is keenly interested in, the necessary regeneration of the Municipals plus the possible development of a personal care home on the site is certainly very much in the thinking and planning of the department and the Commission for the early future.

There certainly has been no turning away from the recognized need for physical improvements and expansion at the Municipal Hospitals. This year, as I say, the project that's going ahead now deals with the immediate problem of space and space requirements for ongoing operations, but the Municipals are very much in the plans of this government for capital redevelopment as soon as we can do it, and I hope that will be soon.

The respite care concept is an extremely good one and one that we are trying to expand and develop as fully as possible. We have established a Respite Care Program in personal care homes that provides a two to three week accommodation for an elderly person

so that both the elderly person himself or herself and that person's relatives receive the necessary regeneration period that is so valuable in many individual instances. It enables the relatives to get away from the care of that particular individual, and also enables that individual to benefit from some of the programming at the personal care homes themselves.

At the present time, Mr. Chairman, there are, at a variety of nursing homes, a number of respite care beds in operation. We hope to develop that over the next two years to a total of 65 beds, which would permit something in the neighbourhood of 1,000 admissions per year for respite care.

As the honourable member well knows, we also have an Adult Day Care Program in place attached to some 23, 24 personal care homes in Manitoba which provides 200 day care spaces, which is another program which has had excellent results and effects thus far and will be expanded this year and in future years.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked me about the total waiting list of those who had been panelled for personal care. The total waiting list for Manitoba as of December 31, 1977, 1978 and 1979 I can give him, but I just want to check as to whether they . . . These are not all panelled on this list, I presume. The total waiting list of those panelled for personal care in Manitoba at the end of 1977 was 2,417; at the end of 1978 it was 1,934; and at December 31, 1979 it was 1,928.

There has been continual response to personal care applicants from our Home Care Program, as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface knows, and the waiting list for personal care admissions has reduced accordingly. Of those who are in hospital . . . The figure that I gave the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is the total number. Those in acute care beds who are panelled for personal care homes were, at the end of 1977, 192; at the end of 1978, 175; and at the end of 1979, 190. In addition, there are 200 in extended care beds who are waiting for admission to personal care, panelled; 200 in extended care beds, I guess you have.

I don't know what other questions I can deal with in the time remaining, Mr. Chairman; I think my time is virtually up and so I will yield the floor, but I can respond further as the occasion arises.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the comments by the Minister disclose a gross ignorance of the situation that is before us. The Minister refers to a situation which occurred in October, 1977, in which he indicated the province was on the verge of bankruptcy and, due to the province being on the verge of bankruptcy, his government had to undertake certain actions. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was an instance of gross distortion, that is it. It is his government that has added 800 million to the total debt of this province since 1977. If we were near bankruptcy by his standards in 1977, Mr. Chairman, the province is now in a state of bankruptcy, thanks to the present government in the province of Manitoba.

We have added, by way of debt to Manitoba, an additional 700 to 800 per person — per person — since 1977. So, Mr. Chairman, we have heard such drivel from the Minister this past half-hour that I am sure that any but those that sit across the way can recognize the transparent misrepresentation that the Minister has attempted to perform this evening on those of us that are sitting in this committee.

Mr. Chairman, it was the government across the way that saw fit to freeze the construction of hospitals and personal care homes in the province. It was the government across the way that permitted situations involving personal care homes to fall into worse and worse shape, rather than permit nursing homes that were in need of replacement to be replaced, and there are many instances of that. It was the government across the way that saw fit to increase the Pharmacare deductible from 50 to 75, and now has the audacity to suggest only two days ago, after increasing the deductible by 25, that they are now considering eliminating the deductible. Why don't they make up their minds, Mr. Chairman, in which direction they are proceeding?

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we witnessed the increase in per diem charges to the elderly and ill in our nursing homes that are just short of a completely soulless and cruel approach insofar as the elderly and the personal care in these homes. Well, Mr. Chairman, they are prepared to restrict their increases in costs. At the same time, they impose additional per diems to the extent of 24 percent and more per year insofar as our elderly and senior citizens are concerned in personal care homes.

Mr. Chairman, we have a situation whereby this government, I believe, has totally and completely failed in its obligation to provide an improvement insofar as the stock of personal care homes in Manitoba in relationship to, as the Member for Transcona indicated, the increasing proportion of population in excess of 65 years of age, and we witness the ever-increasing lines insofar as those who are awaiting entrance to the personal care homes in Manitoba.

I would like to deal at the same time, Mr. Chairman, with other areas where I do feel that this Minister, in particular, has demonstrated incompetence. It was on May 31, 1978, that the Minister, in response to concerns which I have raised with him in regard to the state of a proprietary nursing home, indicated, and I wish to read from the Minister's letter, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the present Selkirk Nursing Home is badly outdated as to fire and building standards. I understand that conditions outlined in the 1976 written Fire Report preclude economic renovation to meet code requirements. Some safety requirements have been met. The owner is aware that major steps are necessary in order to ensure the safety of the residents. The owners have been in touch with the officials of the Manitoba Health Services Commission with a view toward replacing the building. May 31, 1978.

But this Minister was aware, Mr. Chairman, this Minister was aware on May 31, 1978; this Minister acknowledged the state of that nursing home on May 31, 1978, four months after this Minister saw fit to cancel the other plans which had been put into operation to build a new nursing home to replace

this decrepit nursing home. It is that Minister that must bear responsibility for his actions. He cannot shrug that responsibility off.

Mr. Chairman, then there is a revelation as to the state of that nursing home, in early 1980, a revelation, Mr. Chairman, that describes the state of that nursing home as being one in which there was a lack of fire drills for at least three years, as well as hazards such as frozen, jammed or roped fire escape doors; fire extinguishers last inspected 1977; light switches from which sparks heat the walls. — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to assume responsibility for exposing that Minister's negligence, near criminal negligence, after two years. I'm prepared to do it, and I don't care, Mr. Chairman, whether that Minister accuses it of being orchestration, but that Minister was given 20 months to deal with what he acknowledged was a major fire situation involving a personal care home in the province of Manitoba, and he neglected to undertake any action. —(Interjection)— The action which he did undertake — I wish to apologize to the Minister — was to freeze the construction of a personal care home that was going to replace that personal care home that was a fire hazard.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but when the facts were revealed as to the state of that nursing home, the Minister appeared on a radio program, and I want to read the transcript from that radio program and the Minister's answers pertaining to questions that were placed to him.

CBC on February 8, 1980. The interviewer, one Mr. Brian Blomme, questions the Minister of Health. His question was: When the Portage Home for Retardates in Portage burned down and seven children lost their lives, your government, when it was in opposition demanded — and I think the public properly supported you — demanded immediate action to upgrade the standards and wondered why the New Democratic Party had been so lax in letting the standards lapse. What is the difference here, Mr. Sherman?

To which the Minister of Health responded: Well, the fact of the matter was that reports had come in with respect to and recommendations had come in with respect to Portage, to that government, calling for certain steps to be taken. No such thing has happened in this case of Selkirk until yesterday's story — until yesterday's story — in the Winnipeg Free Press. Now I am prepared to investigate that 100 percent, and we are in the process of investigating it, but no such reports of that kind had come in until yesterday's story in the Free Press. Further to that, you are dealing with two different situations.

Mr. Chairman, May 31st, 1978, I received a letter from that Minister acknowledging that there was, again, a situation involving the Selkirk Nursing Home, badly outdated as to fire and building standards, and recognizing that major changes were required in order to properly insure that that nursing home would meet those standards as major problems were involved. The Minister has a copy of that letter. Now either the Minister attempted to mislead the province as to his awareness of the situation involving that nursing home in February 1980 or the Minister was incompetent, having receiving information 22 months earlier as to a serious state involving a nursing home

containing some 80 residents, not taking any action, because no action was taken, Mr. Chairman, in twenty-some months, no action was taken, except to freeze construction of a replacement home. — (Interjection)— The Minister says, not true. I would be interested in the Minister standing to his feet and undertaking some itemization for us as to what steps were taken by him to update those fire code infractions that he acknowledged existed back in May 31st, 1978, rather than simply to monitor.

Mr. Chairman, what we have unfortunately — (Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Chairman, again I advise the Minister, lack of fire drills for at least three years, hazards such as frozen, jammed or roped fire escape doors, fire extinguishers last invested in 1977, light switches would spark and heat the walls. That's his action, that's the action that he tries to claim that he did something in the space of the twenty-some months in between.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the Minister suggests that we are ideologically bound to the public direction insofar as the provision of nursing home care. Mr. Chairman, our concern is that profit be removed from health care in the province of Manitoba, just as we removed profit from the school system in the past century, just as we removed profit from hospital care many many years ago, and Autopac in 1970 in Manitoba, so many other areas. Mr. Chairman, the opposition is committed when it forms government to remove profit from personal care home activity in the future in this province. Let those, Mr. Chairman, that are committed to providing loving care, tender care, without thought of the profit motive ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Order please.

The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Let those, Mr. Chairman, provide the personal care home care for elderly and our ill in the future in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, we are moving backwards under this Minister, under this government. There is improper response to situations involving the state of repair in respect to the question of fire hazards in nursing homes in this province. There is improper monitoring. Mr. Chairman, on top of it, when complaints are filed with the Minister, he rushes in reports saying, all is well, within the space of a few days, without giving those that are concerned, after his receiving notice, indeed that they would like to provide him with additional information. — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Minister says, nonsense. He knows the letters are on file. He knows the letter is to him requesting a meeting with his office. —(Interjection) Mr. Chairman, again I say that the Minister can call it orchestration, but in every situation in which we find a nursing home on this standard, a nursing home in which residents are not being properly protected by this Ministry, we expose it, and we make no apologies for exposing it. And the Minister can denounce it as orchestration. There may be many such orchestrations in his mind within the next year, Mr. Chairman. We will make no apology for exposing each and every situation in which there is a fire hazard, in which there is improper care and treatment of the elderly and the

poor in our nursing homes. We will not be intimidated by the Minister's comments that it is orchestration. We shall continue to expose those conditions in the future, Mr. Chairman. — (Interjections)— Yes, Mr. Chairman, we were on the verge of building a nursing home to replace this particular nursing home when this Minister cancelled those plans and was advised of the ramifications of cancelling those plans, wrote a nice letter, and then sat and done nothing at all for twenty-one, twenty-two months.

Mr. Chairman, just by way of conclusion. I trust there are not too many such cases, but if there is an ideological bent, the ideological bent is this Minister, his Ministry, his government, committed to a situation by which profit will continue to form a major part insofar as future personal care home construction in the province of Manitoba.

MR. CHERNIACK: He looks for happy circumstances.

MR. PAWLEY: He calls it a happy set of circumstances, Mr. Chairman. We don't agree. The lines, I think, are clearly formed as to the philosophy and approach of his party, his government, and the opposition in the year ahead in respect to this issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time that this Minister be exposed for what he is, just a sham, he is misleading constantly, he has done that for four years, double talk, statements that he knows are not correct, he has been a trouble maker, tried to force a battle with everybody. He has done it with the doctors, he has tried to do it with the dentists, now he wants to do it with free enterprise. Yes, you forced a battle with the doctors. Did you give them what they want? Did you give them no contracting out? I have never seen that. How long did it take you to sign a contract with them? Seven days. No, you don't see anything. I know you don't see anything. We are fed up with this double talk, this business of, you have my personal commitment, and I will look into this, we are studying that. The Minister has been on every side of every issue, and the best example is earlier when he talked about the proprietary nursing homes. The proprietary nursing homes, the policy of this government is that the first responsibility in this field is the health of the people of Manitoba, it is not the Department of Industry and Commerce, it is not there to try to promote businesses at the expense of something else.

The Minister stated himself that he wants to be fair, you know, get the same rules. The public can get a better rate when they borrow, but he is saying that is not fair, give the rate to the private entrepreneurs. Well, what is private enterprise? I don't think that the members who stated that they are so much for private enterprise know what it is all about. Somebody gave me this dictionary and it says here, the compensation accruing to entrepreneurs for the assumption of risk in business enterprise as distinguished from wages or rent. That's profit risk, and there is not one single risk to people in the proprietary field in personal care homes, not one.

They are guaranteed that they will meet their budget, the mortgage and they will make a profit.

Is it a question of ideology when we say that there is no room in there? We are not, and it is not true that we are saying on this side that everybody in that field is crooked. When the Minister doesn't know what to say, there he goes, he starts this class distinction, and he makes all kinds of accusations, things that were never said. In fact, we took trouble to say that that wasn't the reason, that wasn't the case at all. There is no way . . .

Then the Minister even made an — I guess I can't use the word lie, but he stated and he placed the non-profit organizations in the same category and our policy was that those are the people that were building the personal care homes. Look at Meadowood, is it Meadowood in St. Vital? Look at Tache and look at all these areas. He is talking about the management. Can he tell me that the private entrepreneur can run a personal care home better than the Grey Nuns, I challenge him on that. Are they wasting money, throwing money away? Because this is what the Minister is saying.

What we are saying is that if you are going to have profit in there, it is going to increase the cost. The Minister said himself it is going to cost them more money, they are not going to have the same rate when they borrow. But there is no risk at all, there is no risk, it's a universal program and it is an insured program, and the premiums take care of everything, the whole budget, even refinancing when they sell at a big profit to somebody else. Because we say that, does that mean that we can never in this House mention anything like that because we are accusing, we are saying that somebody is trying to make a profit and they are dishonest. There is nothing wrong with trying to make a profit, but we do not need middlemen in this area where there is a captive market, where it is covered by the public. That's not a risk, that's not a risk at all. They get it in their budget, they get everything in there; there is no way that they are going to go belly up, because if anything happens you could not afford to lose those beds with people in there especially, so the government would take it over, the government would bail them out, would buy them if they were in trouble.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister is constantly saying that we are wasting and he made the monumental statement, false statement, that they did more for the senior citizen, this government, than the previous government. And that is so ridiculous. What have they done? In four years . . . and there is no Minister that has more press conferences than him, and what's new? They have increased, for instance, there is about two or three things, one of them is the day care for the elderly, which was a pilot project we had. Of course, we didn't have as many places, but we had it in two or three different areas and now they are increasing it. It was all set, it was the same program that they are continuing. What did they do? What did they do? What government stopped the premiums on health care? What government brought in the question of home care? Look at the other Conservative provinces, how many of them have home care? This is something that they are stuck with and they can't let it go, they are reducing the program all the time and they are changing the

ground rules. This is what is being done in home care.

Personal care homes, the same thing. Pharmacare, enriched senior citizens' home, which was just starting, all of these things and he is saying . . . And what are their new programs? They started a program at St. Boniface Hospital, but the St. Boniface Hospital had to pay out of their own block funding. It was announced in the Throne Speech last year, something in psychiatry, that was in the books. Of course, that wasn't approved, you know you don't approve things for fifty years in advance, but this was something, the direction that we were going and the Minister knows it.

You are saying that we couldn't run a peanut stand and we threw money away, and I challenged him time after time to show me where we threw money out of the window or where we threw money at programs in this department and his answer is always the same, not in this department. Well, we are now looking at the Estimates of the Department of Health, nothing else.

Mr. Chairman, let's look at facts, not a diatribe like we had in general and accusing the socialists again and trying to have a battle between a certain group and the socialists again, because we are looking at the public and we are studying the Estimates of the Department of Health, and trying to do something for the health of the people of Manitoba.

First of all, the plan was announced, it was announced in this House, the Minister has that in his files, and he can see all the personal care homes that were supposed to be built. There was an amount of money for the five years, gradually, a certain amount from each column for all these things.

Now this government froze everything, and they were so fortunate that there are certain things that they could not stop. Can you just imagine, if the Tache Hospital, with its 120 beds or so, had not been started? It was too far to go back. And now he's always talking about what they did with those beds. Those beds, he had nothing to do with them. But he's taking credit for some of those new beds. And the one in St. Vital, the 90 bed one in St. Vital, and many, many others.

Mr. Chairman, where there's a situation where we're recognizing that there is more need than ever, a bigger percentage of older people, and in 1976, that's not when we left, that's in 1976, there were 7,161 personal care beds. The Minister, his own figure today, it was in 1976, gave us 7,480, and as I said, many of those came after, they're not included in there.

Now, the first question that I want to know, how much did it cost the public of Manitoba for the freeze? There was a situation where — and it stayed the same way it is now, you borrow and then it is amortized over a 20 to 25 year period. Okay, the 75, we were at the 75, 1975 dollars, and then every year there's a freeze that costs more money. Costs more money, and then, after that, what about borrowing also. Look, we are now faced with the worst situation, where now it is so costly that even the private entrepreneur cannot build at this time, it's too costly to borrow the money, and this is the situation.

Now, the Minister has got a council. That was his claim to fame, a council, and he discussed with old people. Sure he wants to appease them, and nothing is happening. Nothing is happening. If they didn't have these programs, they would have nothing at all, Mr. Chairman. How much would it cost, how much will that cost, and we're talking about somebody that is careful, that is a good manager, how much did it cost just because we had that freeze? And in the meantime, look at how many people were deprived of the services that they needed. If we figured that out, we would see.

And then his construction program, it is the same program, with very few variations, the one in Lundar, which was strictly a partisan decision, they were the ones that were announced that were going on, that were announced in the five-year plan. Practically everyone, including the Minister, says what did you do in these last eight years? Well, first of all, personal care homes were not covered, were not insured for the full eight years. This was something that was brought in in 1974 or 1973 — (Interjection)— the fall of 1973. And let's take the example of Selkirk. The Selkirk one was announced in this House, there was money in the budget for the first year, and it was going ahead, and that was one of the areas that was frozen. Mount Carmel was the same. There are many of them. But the Minister feels that by making a statement, of course, he's going to bring, this is brand new, nothing has been done. This is the statement that was given on August 31st, a press release, the news service, August 31, 1979, and that's where the Minister announced that he had from 370 to 390 beds. And I still didn't understand his explanation because here it says, of the beds approved, 194 will replace beds taken out of service in February; 108 are replacements of older personal care beds that were left in service at that time that will be closed, and some 70 to 90 represent new beds entirely. Just 70 to 90, not the, I don't remember exactly the figure, but he had a much higher figure than that. I'm not reading my press release, I'm reading his.

And it says here, the same old malarkey, it is expected that the building of the new beds will cost more than 10 million, to be paid entirely by the private sector. And the beds will provide 175 to 200 jobs in the health care field on completion. Well, those jobs aren't there, Mr. Chairman. Those aren't there because the beds aren't built. Construction of the new facilities would also stimulate employment and activity in the construction industry. And that wasn't done, Mr. Sherman said. These beds are an additional step towards meeting the demand. Well, the demand has not been met. You have approximately the same number of beds now that you had in 1976. That's true. The Minister did close certain beds. That's absolutely true. It was a decision that he made, it was something that we wrestled with for a long time, I admitted that, in here we had such a demand for beds, that wasn't done, maybe it was dangerous, but where do you send these people? We didn't know, so that's why we came up with this five-year plan. We didn't think that was throwing money problems, we thought that it was doing what was needed, and these beds were being closed as the new ones were coming in. Not in the private sector, the Minister is absolutely right, and I've never

criticized him for that decision, it was a decision that he made, as I say, it was a tough one, but in the meantime, it never should have been done when there was a freeze. You know, you start by closing beds and you don't replace them. That is definitely wrong. That I'm criticizing him for.

The Minister has always said, for a number of years he said, cost, and then need, and then he makes a statement like this, and then he washes his hand, well, all right, there's 390 beds, because there's a sheet that proves it. I gave the okay to the private sector to build these beds, so that's finished. Well, it's not finished, and this is a question that I asked him earlier. Did you say to them, you have your licence to build, providing you build now? The Minister says, this is an additional step toward meeting the demand for personal care facilities for the elderly in Manitoba. He is recognizing himself that there is a demand. That was in 1979 and those are not built, he tells us. And what guarantee do we have?

Now, the next thing that they were going to start in June, and those are the facts, Mr. Chairman. This is what we're told, you know, whatever they say, he's got a good, everything, he agrees with everything. He approves everything. But a reasonable, we do this reasonably and respond with responsibility. And that ends it all. You know, we can't manage anything on this side, but when the Minister gets up and says, in a responsible, in a reasonable way, and that's it, that closes everything, just close the book and that's it.

Well, what is responsible? Is responsible freezing something, and then having to build exactly the same thing, years after, you don't meet the demand, it costs you an awful lot more money, and that's reasonable? Because they decided that they wanted to freeze, when there was a need? This is what is responsible government?

The Minister agrees with everything. He has made more press releases, and this one, of course it will be, it's brand new, I guess he can make the same one, he's probably got a bunch of those extra pages and he could use it next year and the year after, well, the year after, he won't be there to make any changes. And I can tell the Minister that he better take his files with him because there will be an investigation of all these things. And there will be all these press releases together. And there will be, the Minister will have to account to some of these platitudes that he's made and some of these promises and some of these misleading statements that he's made repeatedly.

—(Interjection)— Well, you'll just wait and see.

The Minister said, well, the people know, there are 37 people that know that we did more for Health. That's another thing, closed the book again, the Minister said, and the government said, well, the 37 know that we have done more for the senior citizens. If these programs were not in place, we wouldn't have these programs now. And we were the socialists, and we had the same member that's not sitting in his seat, that a couple of nights ago told us he had to be careful, that he shouldn't spend too much money. Well then, why haven't they got the guts to say, home care is not a good program, you have too many personal care beds. But you want your cake and eat it too.

You've got to be responsible. We'll do it very responsibly and very reasonably. How can you argue with that? How can I argue with that? Are you in favour of this, yes, are you in favour of this, yes, are you going to do that, yes, no, maybe. They've got everything covered. Everything covered, but there is no action, Mr. Chairman. There is nothing done. And this is the best example in this case. And we are going to talk about home care.

You can talk about these lists, but if you don't panel people, of course they're not on the panel list, because it says the waiting list, the only one that you look at are the people that are being paneled. There are more people that need to go in personal care homes now than ever before. And I challenge these lists. Of course, you can always prove figures, you can play all kinds of games with figures. How can the Minister say that the list is reducing, when the people are growing older, there is a bigger percentage of older people, and there is less personal care beds. And then all of a sudden, the people don't want them. I don't believe it, not more than I believe the statement and the whitewash that we have had on the dental program, and that is not finished either. We'll be looking at that one. Not this year, we'll be looking at that.

Mr. Chairman, this government has — of course, I'm not going to say they have no compassion. I've never said that. I never feel that I, or anybody has a monopoly on that. I've never said that. But I mean, when they say that we are bleeding hearts, that we are interested in only a certain class of people, well this is wrong. And you can't say, you can't talk good business, you're trying to build a personal care. These people here can get a rate, can borrow the money at a lower rate. These people here, it'll cost them money. These people here who have more experience, and boy I could put the Grey Nuns and the Salvation Army and all these people any time, and if you've got the guts to stand up and say they are wasting money, they are throwing money away. And there is no profit, and they are dedicated people. That doesn't mean that the one that's making money likes to see somebody suffer, of course it doesn't mean that. I hope that there are no people like that. But the temptation is there. The main thing, it is profit-oriented. And the Department of Health is not there to promote businesses, to give a fair try in competition to somebody that's not taking a risk at all. That's not what the Department of Health, it's trying to get the best, and we are all constantly saying how costly health care is anywhere in the world. And with these programs that we had, and we're saying they're good, but somewhere you've got to try to plateau and you've got to be careful, because eventually you can have all kinds of good intentions, they say that health was made with good intentions, but it's going to bankrupt the province. And I subscribe to that.

But all of a sudden when it is a question of a privileged class of society, that nobody should mention, you want to bring a program to be able to please that certain class. If we say that we are against proprietary nursing homes, it means that we're against people making money. I have been a businessman, I try to make money, and I'm going to try to make as much money as I can, and I don't blame anybody that tries. But it is not the role of the

Minister of Health to try to equalize the opportunity to have a certain group compete and make profit. And the temptation is there, it's pretty ironic that the Minister said, tender, loving care. That's the name of the book that exposed the problems and the abuse in personal care homes that are owned by private operators. And there are some good ones and there are some bad ones. And there are some people working as nurses who are no good and there are some good ones. There is no doubt. Let's get that clear.

But the element of profit is there. And either you're going to have a government that will subsidize you, and yes, it is a subsidy, because the Minister said two groups. Well, that other group is the public, it's them, the public. Should they throw somebody, another group, they say, okay, compete with us? Is that what we want?

The thing is, what are you going to do? It's not only the per diem rate. It was often said that a private entrepreneur can make money, more money than a government, and that is true. But we still don't want it in the service field, in the health field, because undoubtedly, the service will suffer. You will want less staff, so you'll keep the patient doped or tied in a chair, and that's being done in certain areas. And that's going to reflect that you're much more efficient because you've done the same thing with less staff.

And you're going to have other people, for instance, we talked about death awhile ago. I don't think, whenever possible, I don't think anybody should have to die alone. It's not going to cost that much money, but there are some staff, there are volunteers, and some of the people that I'm talking about, the non-profit organizations, there is not a cent they're devoting, the Minister is all for volunteers — they are volunteers, and they're doing their work and there is no better example than the Grey Nuns, they are in my constituency and all over, and I am not ashamed to say it, I'm very proud, because nobody runs a hospital like they do, nobody. They are dedicated people. If I say they are dedicated people, does that mean that I say that a private entrepreneur has no compassion at all? No. But there is not that problem that they have to make money, and if the government, the people that are providing the money, they have a responsibility, and say okay, that's it, because even the good ones, those that are compassionate will want to spend money and there is a government that will say this is what you are going to get. That's accepted. That's accepted. Where do you draw the line? That's going to be difficult. But that is accepted. But the point is that the people have to hire the same people so what are they going to do? They're going to try to get people working as cheaply as possibly, that's one thing. That's not compassion. That might be compassion to the people in the bed, but what about those that are cleaning up, that are giving the service? That's not compassion. And then they're going to have less staff, try to make them do more, and that's the great free enterprising system. And it's a good system in certain areas. It's a good system and you've got . . . the real free enterpriser are the people that are taking their chances. It is their money just like the Hunt that tried to corral all the silver there was and he fell flat on his face; he gambled. Mind you it's

criminal the way he did that. He was trying to take over, there was greed. And what the hell did it do? To all of us, to the United States and to Canada, those are the actions. But nevertheless he gambled and he lost. But there is no gamble in personal care homes at all, Mr. Chairman.

I am practically finished my time, I understand but I would still like the Minister to tell us what the percentage increase will be for the budget of personal care homes; I don't think that was given yet. And I would also like to have the waiting list for those that are panelled because that's what we go by. I would like to have it broken down in Winnipeg also to see what the waiting list for the same year is that we had, and there'll be other questions that we'll have. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I didn't get all the debate from both sides of the House, I was in the other committee for a while, but I did hear a few moments of the Minister giving a response, I believe, to the Member for Transcona, then I heard part of the response from the Leader of the Opposition and now I did hear pretty well the entire comments from the Member for St. Boniface.

Mr. Chairman, I couldn't help but wonder, I don't know how the Minister of Health could even make any response. It seemed to me that the Members of the Opposition, as we've been coming into this House in recent days, seem to be waving a red flag and they are flying a warning that they are really concerned about their own situation.

It amazes me, Mr. Chairman, when I listen particularly to the Leader of the Opposition, who had a full responsibility when he was on this side of the House as a member of the government, of the front bench, and I would like to share a little bit of the history which I think I have just some knowledge. I don't have exact dates and figures. But, you know, Mr. Chairman, it goes back in my constituency where there were some problems about the health care of the hospitals and the personal care homes pertaining to the towns of Crystal City and Pilot Mound. And, you know, Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the Member for Springfield who was then the Minister of Health, for a time, and the people had come to an agreement; there were problems years before but the people had come to an agreement in that area, they decided to form an area, what they called the Rock Lake Health Association, and the people of the two towns and the entire community agreed they were going to establish a health facility between the two towns. And, you know, Mr. Chairman, the then Minister of Health agreed to that and they spent considerable amount of money in establishing a site, as I am given to understand from the members who were then the chairman and so on of the board. The then government of that day and the Minister of Health had agreed to establish an area and the people in that area had an organization where they had raised some money locally, and they'd established a fund of so many thousands of dollars, and I was informed by the chairman of that then board, Mr. Chairman, that the people had spent about 9,000, and I don't want to be held right to the dollar, but somewhere in the neighbourhood of

9,000, to take part in trying to establish a personal care home and upgrading of a hospital.

And you know, Mr. Chairman, it went on for a number of years — 1974-75, I believe this is when it started — and in 1977 after the elections were over in October of 1977, the chairman and the vice-chairman of that board came to me and said, Henry, we've got problems here. And we have a Minister, or was a Minister who is now the Member for St. Boniface, had taken over from the gentlemen who was the Member for Springfield. In order to get this thing on its way it required the signature of the Minister for the regulations pertaining to that whole operation, the personal care home and the upgrading of the hospital in Crystal City. They had a hospital then in Pilot Mound.

Mr. Chairman, the then chairman and the vice-chairman of that Rock Lake Health Association came to me after we became government — it was in November, I believe of 1978 — and they said that the regulations had been on the Minister of Health's desk. The Member who was the Minister of Health then, is now the Member for St. Boniface. They were there for signature in June, July and August of 1977, as I am given to understand, Mr. Chairman, and they were still there on the desk of the then Minister of Health and with the previous administration for signature in October when he turned over the reins of his responsibilities to my colleague who is now the Minister of Health, and they still were not signed, Mr. Chairman.

But before that, Mr. Chairman, the chairman and the vice-chairman of the board came into to see the Minister who is now Member for St. Boniface, when they were negotiating this, and he said to them — I'm only taking their word for it, Mr. Chairman — the then Minister of Health who is now the Member for St. Boniface, said look, gentlemen, I have broad shoulders; what happened with the previous Minister of Health I am going to throw out completely. You are not getting your facility between the two towns and I'm not going to sign the regulations, and he said if you want a personal care home in Pilot Mound you are going to have to close your hospital. That was done by the then Minister of Health who is now the Member for St. Boniface. In November of 1978 those regulations were still not signed and in order for us to get anything done I had to go to my colleague who is now the Minister of Health in order to get that done.

Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is that the Member for St. Boniface now, had no compassion whatsoever where roughly 9,000 of a volunteer fund that the people in the community established, was put into the operation or the site that was supposed to be established under the previous Minister of Health, under the NDP when they were government. And, you know, Mr. Chairman, it amazes me when I see the Leader of the Opposition stand up and irate, the Member for St. Boniface stand up and irate, and chastize my colleague the Minister of Health for his irresponsible attitude; that's all I could get from it tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I remember over a year ago when we came in here, we weren't in very long, when the people came on television, Snow Lake, telling the people of Manitoba about the horrible situations in their health facilities in Snow Lake, and it wasn't very

long, Mr. Chairman, when my colleague the Minister of Health went out there to investigate to see what he found. Mr. Chairman, I am given to understand that they now have a facility in Snow Lake and, Mr. Chairman, they talk about the freeze that we had to put on.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Johns was supposed to have given us a true picture of the financial situation when we took office in this province. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, my apologies — Seven Oaks. I don't why I seem to have a problem with the — I respect him, a fine gentleman and all the rest of it, but Seven Oaks is the constituency he represents. I recall he gave us a picture of the financial situation in Manitoba. But not being the financial expert that I profess to be, we found out, Mr. Chairman, when we took office that the financial situation was a tremendously lot worse than what the Member for Seven Oaks led us to believe, Mr. Chairman. It's a far cry from when then they took office in 1969, when they had a surplus, I believe, of somewhat in the neighbourhood of 45 million. It's a far cry, Mr. Chairman, from when they took office when we left, and when we had to take over. That, Mr. Chairman, is one of the reasons why we had to put a clamp on spending the taxpayers money. It wasn't our wish. It wasn't the wish that we wanted to, Mr. Chairman.

And you know, Mr. Chairman, they stand up in the House here and they talk about how we have accepted our responsibilities and they chastize us for not accepting our responsibilities. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I think we have come a long way in rectifying the financial situation, the debt that we have today and what it was in the fall of 1977-78, fulfilled the promises that we said we were going to carry out, and, you know, Mr. Chairman, I've been here for quite a long time and these honourable gentlemen — I don't know how they accept their responsibilities as representatives of the constituency from where they come. For the eight years they were in power I can think back of phone calls I would get from my constituents, who had a senior citizen, could have been a friend of theirs, could have been a relative of theirs, who entered a hospital for medical reasons and having had the time spent in the hospital, received the medical attention they required and then that was no longer necessary, on a number of occasions they had no place to go. That was when the NDP were in power, Mr. Chairman. I can think back about a number of occasions. They didn't provide any personal care homes for those people.

But, Mr. Chairman, it was then and it is still today, I would suggest that they be honest about this matter, and say that those people, and I can say a number of them, I say to the doctor or the health nurse, looking into the particular situation of that person, that elderly citizen who may not have had anybody, any member of a family to go to. So the doctor would have to keep that person in the hospital until such time as they found a place where they could go into a personal care home or place.

MR. DESJARDINS: What do you think is being done now?

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not denying that. The Member for St. Boniface says it's not being

done now. Certainly it is being done now. But it seems as though, the tenor of the debate that I have heard this evening, Mr. Chairman, is that nothing like that is being done now. They are chastizing us — (Interjection)— You know, Mr. Chairman, we froze the beds the Member for St. Boniface is saying. Mr. Chairman, I say thank God. If the NDP had gone back into power in the fall of 1977, we still wouldn't have had an upgraded hospital in Crystal City; we still wouldn't have had increased personal care homes in Pilot Mound. The Member for St. Boniface can talk all he likes. I don't believe him. I don't trust him, because I know how he operated when he was the Minister for the short time of Health.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say, and give my particular situation, that I think I know most about, and to indicate to honourable gentlemen opposite, just how responsible they were when they were in power. —(Interjection)— Pardon me, I didn't get that.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Johns asks me why I'm not accepting full responsibility . . . Oh, all right, well . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. One speaker, at a time.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. John's saying why don't I get a doctor in Notre Dame des Lourdes. That's right, Mr. Chairman, it's my constituency. But we have a hospital board there, we have an administrator there, we have the Manitoba Hospital Organization as well that operates in this province, those are elected people, and the Minister of Health has said on more than one occasion it's their responsibility, and sometimes there's problems. —(Interjection)— That's right, and I'll tell you, . . . Mr. Chairman, if we are supposed to take care of every problem of that kind, then what the Member for St. Johns is saying to us, we should forget about and say to the local boards that are elected, you are no longer needed any more, the full responsibility you can put on the member. You know, Mr. Chairman, that's what the Member for St. Johns is saying. I suggest that's what he's trying to tell me, that we should not have any boards to operate our local communities. Mr. Chairman, it's an attitude of complete dictatorship as far as the NDP were concerned; they wanted to have complete control and dedication. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Johns is having fun now. He's having fun now. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the church is still in Notre Dame, but you know if there was a church that the Member for St. Johns can go to I don't think he'd use it anyway. So he's asked for that and I'm giving that comment to him. Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to make a few comments in regard to the comments that the honourable gentlemen made tonight and to indicate to them that I suggest that we, under the circumstances when we took over in 1977 the reins of government, that we have come a long way in doing what is necessary to provide health services and provide housing for our senior citizens, both in the senior citizens' housing and in the personal care homes. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the NDP can use all the kind of propoganda they like because, Mr. Chairman, in all the elections they've been entered in, both

provincially and federally, they have gone around in this province — maybe the individuals didn't do it themselves, the members that are sitting here, but they had their workers go round the province — and I had some senior citizens tell me that if you vote for a Conservative you'll be out of your home. That's what the NDP were telling the people, the senior citizens of this province. Mr. Chairman, that to me is the most incredible situation and I suggest to you, sir, that when I had that experience in dealing with that kind of an election campaign, how can I trust my fellowmen who are my opposition members on this side of the House in this Assembly? Because I don't think those senior citizens would be going around spreading idle gossip. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I'm defending the Minister of Health. I think that he has done a tremendous job under the circumstances of the financial situation as we found it when we took office. The Member for St. Boniface can stand up and do all the ranting he likes but I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for St. Boniface did not accept his responsibility when he was Minister of Health.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, a press release April 27, 1976, . . . Crystal City. Renovations to improve various hospital functions to allow for closure of Pilot Mound Hospital. 24 new personal care home beds at Pilot Mound. Pilot Mound, additional of 24 personal care home beds to existing care home. That's 1976. —(Interjection)— That's right. That's right. It didn't materialize, it was frozen. And in 1979, listen to this, 1979 after some of the money was frozen —(Interjection)— I just finished telling you, the revised thing in 1976 when it was announced, and approved. I just finished reading it to you. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me finish, there's some good stuff here. Mr. Chairman, then in 1979 . . .

MR. EINARSON: No, 1977-78.

MR. DESJARDINS: You made your speech in that year, I'll make my speech about '79. 1979, a press release by Mr. Sherman, the Minister of Health. Pilot Mound-Crystal City, addition of a new 24-bed personal care home to the existing Prairieview Lodge at Pilot Mound. It seems I've heard that before. Major renovation and expansion of the Crystal City Hospital to accommodate the closure of the Pilot Mound Hospital. I rest my case, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I haven't heard all the debate although I've heard it for the last hour and 10 minutes, or what have you. But it seems that, among other things, we're debating the principle of to what extent government should be involved in the health care field and I had thought that argument was settled long ago. I thought that the people of Canada, in fact all parties, had more or less come around to the conclusion that it was to the benefit of all Canadians, of all people of our province for fundamental health and medical programs, and indeed other social programs, to be financed through

the tax system as opposed to being financed through the marketplace and we seem to be getting into a debate about the merits of private enterprise and socialism and so forth and so on. I would say that I would line myself up with some of the remarks made by my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, and say categorically that we on this side are not against private enterprise per se. I can say that categorically and remind members opposite that for eight years-plus the former NDP government worked very hard to help small business enterprise in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to read some principles, I think, that are pretty fundamental to the debate that seems to be occurring at this time. This is a quotation from the Debates and Proceedings of this Assembly in 1970 and it's on page 1880. As a matter of fact I'm quoting some principles that were enunciated at that time by our leader, principles that were pretty basic to whenever you get involved in the question of to what extent should government, or to what extent should the public, be involved in certain social and health legislation and programming. I guess these principles are brought up by those who opposed Medicare in the first place; perhaps they were brought up by those who opposed the Canada Pension Plan because, let's face it, Mr. Chairman, the Canada Pension Plan is a very vast public life insurance pension program; and it's brought up of course when we brought in Autopac into the province, the public automobile insurance. But some of the assertions that are made were made against Autopac and I think I detect some of these coming up in the debate here tonight.

(1) That is should be left to private enterprise, this activity, since public coverage would remove the enterprise and competition of individuals.

(2) If public funds are utilized political bureaucracy will be rampant. These are the common arguments that are used against public involvement in various health and social fields, Mr. Chairman.

(3) A scheme of universal coverage by the state is socialism.

(4) A universal coverage will destroy initiative and ambition and there will thus be a premium for comparative idleness to be taken out of the pockets of the laborious and the conscientious people.

(5) It's suggested that the standards will be lowered because of public involvement as opposed to private involvement.

(6) Governments should only concern themselves with coverage for the needy and the creating or sustaining of such coverage for all classes is beyond the province and the power of government.

(7) Governments cannot provide for the necessities of people.

(8) Universal coverage is foreign to our country.

(9) Requiring people to pay under universal coverage is dangerous and there is no confidence in compulsory equalization.

Those are the nine principles. These seem to be principles that crop up or seem to surface in some of the remarks at least made by the Honourable, the Minister of Health. I say that they were brought up when Medicare was first introduced; they were brought up when the Canada Pension Plan was introduced; indeed they were brought up when Autopac was introduced into this province; and, Mr.

Chairman, those principles and those statements that I read are ultimately from an article that was published in the Philadelphia National Gazette in the year of our Lord, 1830; 1830, these same arguments were used and they were used at that time against what, if you please? Against the institution of public education, of universal public education.

A MEMBER: By the Tories of that day.

MR. EVANS: By the Tories of the day of 150 years ago. Those were the same principles that we hear today, the principles that were used at that time, 1830, the same principles. The Minister of Agriculture endorses the views of the people in the United States in 1830 when they fought against the public school system which we take for granted today.

Well, I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether one gets very far in talking about philosophy because I really wonder whether there is a double standard at work with this government, because it seemed when we were getting involved in equity and business it was dirty socialism and it wouldn't work and so on. But now honourable members opposite are announcing equity ownership in possible mines in northern Manitoba and the possible potash development in western Manitoba. I'm just saying I'm becoming a little disillusioned because I really thought that there was some sort of philosophical integrity about the Conservative Government of Manitoba; that they were pure private enterprise and no way would the government invest in industry, in manufacturing, in mining and so on. But now what is it, the worm has turned, or the screw is turned, or whatever the expression is, the fact is that — the worm has turned, okay, I won't go beyond that.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I believe that there is some very fine private operators in Manitoba. I agree with the Member for St. Boniface when he made that statement. There may be some very bad ones but I know of some very good ones and I know they're trying to do a conscientious job. But I think, in principle, we, on this side, stand for the extension of non-profit institutions in the field of personal health care and I think that's what the people of Manitoba want. I think it's regrettable for the Minister to consider putting in place programs that would expand that segment, that element of personal care institutions. I was a little amused at the Honourable Member for Rock Lake when he was lamenting about the size of our debt, and so on and so forth.

Point No. 1, I'd make, of course, just about all of that debt is backed by assets, the biggest of which of course is Manitoba Hydro. And I think it's a principle in business that you have certain liabilities and you trust that they're backed by assets; and I think in our case the bulk of that debt is certainly backed by a very valuable assets. But I would remind the Member for Rock Lake when he talks about debt, that the debt is higher today than it was in 1977 when the province was supposedly going bankrupt according to the Premier of this province, or the then . . . —(Interjection)— Well, inflation is pretty great but it's not that big. Inflation is not that great. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, when the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Premier of Manitoba, got up on his feet before the people of

Manitoba in the 1977 election and said, the province is going bankrupt under the New Democratic government because we've got this debt. — (Interjection)— Well, the figures were there for everybody to see. But incidentally, I repeat, most of that debt is backed by a very valuable asset so I'm not too unhappy about it. But the Member for Rock Lake seems to be exercised about this matter and I just want to remind him that debt he's so concerned about is, I think, roughly 800 million higher today than it was in October or the year 1977, when you took office.

So I'm waiting and wondering where you're going to — because this was a major plank in your platform — that you were going to work on that debt and you were somehow or other going to reduce it and so on and so far all I've seen has been deficits and there's been no payoff of the debt whatsoever. So we've got more debt today, and you should tell your constituents in Rock Lake that they've got even more debt today, thanks to this government, than they had in 1977.

But I want to repeat, I'm not too concerned about it because the bulk of that debt is backed by some very valuable assets. But the Member for Rock Lake, and I know some of his colleagues are very very upset about this debt situation —(Interjection)— At any rate, Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that our society is changing and I think this is a good thing. People are able to live longer; the life span is being extended; and that a large percentage of our population is among the elderly. I think in 1979, and maybe the Minister used this figure, but the number I have, people 65 and over in 1979 constituted 10.8 percent of the population. And indeed, a good number of those are very elderly; 10 percent of those almost, of the 65 and over population are indeed 85 years of age and over, and it's projected — I think this is sort of common knowledge, those people who do projections — in 1996, those people who will be 65 years of age and over will increase to 12.1 percent of the Manitoba population. Well, that's the forecast, for whatever forecasts are worth, but the point is that the question of adequate personal care homes is going to become a more important question as time goes on because we'll have more people, I believe, who will be requiring this. Now, of course, if recent population decline trends continue, maybe we won't have that problem in 1991 or 1999 or whatever it is, because it is a fact that our total population has dropped by 5,000 people which is a serious drop; the only province in Canada which is showing a decrease in its total population level.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister now, to get away from the sort of philosophic debate, about a very specific matter in the city of Brandon and that is with regard to the Salvation Army facilities. I want to say at the outset that I am not an expert on physical structures; I'm not an engineer, I've not talked to any engineer or so on, but I am aware of the statement made by Major Raymond Stratton, the home administrator of the Salvation Army's Bulloch & Booth Nursing Home, which is located on Princess Avenue in Brandon. Here is the administrator — this is not some wild-eyed agitator, these are not some dissatisfied workers, these are not some radical unionists or what have you, Mr. Chairman, this is the administrator — saying about

the home that he has responsibility for that it should be closed down and replaced because it is run down and an inadequately outfitted firetrap. Now that's the observation I understand that Major Raymond Stratton has made. He goes on to say that it's an old building and actually, to be truthful, it's probably the worst that is run by the Salvation Army across Canada in the condition such that it is. He was transferred to Brandon a year-and-a-half ago, and he said, When I first came to Brandon I used to go to bed at night, dreading to sleep in case a fire broke out. Okay, well, since then, the province has put in, I understand, 30,000 worth of expenditure on such things as fire alarms and maybe some other things. But as I understand it, the building is still very inadequate. The building is three storeys in height; it has three sets of narrow stairs. There are no elevators and there is only one front and one back entrance.

The Salvation Army runs four nursing homes in Brandon; I'm sorry, two nursing homes, there's the other one. I shouldn't call them nursing homes although they are referred to as nursing homes by some, I think they are probably more in the category of hostels. This is a matter that I'd like the Minister to give some attention to. He has been made aware of this. As a matter of fact, the Minister has publicly stated that he admits that they are old personal care homes or old facilities and he is quoted as saying publicly that, The government has no definite plans for the 1980s but they may well receive attention in the next year or two; I cannot give a target date. This is a quotation in the Brandon Sun of February 16th of this year quoting the Minister of Health.

The Minister went on to say, at that time, that private owners should be encouraged to reinvest in new homes. One possibility, I understand, is the setting up of a special loan fund to permit people in the health care field to borrow money at low rates of interest. Then he refers to the CMHC loan possibility at the rate of 2 percent. With all due respect, I don't think the encouragement of private owners to reinvest in new homes is the way to go. I know the Minister, if he will give me the courtesy of responding to this matter, will probably get up and say, well, there's probably more personal care beds in Brandon than anywhere else in the province, or that WestMan is better endowed than elsewhere in the province. But I would like to point out to the Minister that these facilities that I am referring to, I suppose are more in the category of hostels and the people, many of whom are from the Brandon Mental Health Centre, in one building I know; there is the other building that they run, the Eventide Home on 6th Street. I think both of them are probably more like hostels than nursing homes but the fact is that the people in them need some care; they need to be fed and somebody has to keep an eye on them. Many of them had been former residents of the Brandon Mental Health Centre. I think the Salvation Army is doing a good job but the fact is, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that they do not have the funding to replace these.

Now, what I would like to like the Minister is if the government is prepared to assist the Salvation Army by providing a facility of some type, maybe some sort of enriched housing that we've often talked about, enriched public housing, which could take

care of, at least, the residents in this Bulloch & Booth Home that I referred to on Princess Avenue. As I said, the figures on nursing home beds are inflated because of the personal care beds that are included. There are a lot of personal care beds, as I said, and I mentioned two Salvation Army facilities. But I think if you take those off, you find that the ratio is not necessarily out of line. But, you know, so much for ratios, so much for rules of thumb and so on, the fact is when there are people, whatever the community, in the north, the south, the east, or the west, or in the city, or in the country or wherever, the fact is if there are people out there, whatever age but who need some type of care and unfortunately cannot get it with their family and have to get some assistance through public housing, enriched public housing, or through a nursing home, or through such a home as that run by the Salvation Army, that as long as there are people there, I say there is some responsibility on the part of government to cooperate with organizations such as the Salvation Army to provide adequate facilities.

I think the Minister should not be complacent about this. When you have the administrator saying that it's a firetrap, I think it's deserving of your attention. It's deserving of some pretty quick action and I would like to think that the Minister can give me some positive response to this. I think to say that, well, we may create a fund and people can borrow from it or that we will some day, somehow, a few years from now, we'll consider it. I think it's something that is deserving of more immediate attention than that and I wonder if the Minister would care to comment on that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to some of the comments made by the Minister. Now the Minister has a very expert capacity at dodging an issue and, when pressed, he performs a bit of a shuttle which is very good debating style; it detracts from the issue and he has a manner and ability I would say — it is an ability — to sort of turn an accusation thrown at him, or a criticism, into an accusation on his side. I'm thinking of the fact that he said the private personal care homes are not subsidized, that it's the non-profits that are really subsidized. Why? Because they enjoy lower interest rates whereas private, of course, have to go to the private market and they don't enjoy that lower interest rate and therefore, ergo it follows that they are subsidized. He totally ignores the fact that the privates will get every penny back, including the money they owe the banks. The banks will get their money back and they will get it all because the public is going to pay for it. So that sort of subsidization is all right with him. A lower interest rates paid through CHMC, that, he claims, is subsidy. The subsidy which the private operator gets because everything is paid by the public purse to the private operator; including his 12-14 percent interest on his mortgage; including the profit on his rate of return; including the dividends to the shareholders, all that is paid by the public. But that, he turns aside and says, the privates are not subsidized; no, it's the non-profits that are subsidized.

Then he says, you need private for healthy competition. In other words, you need the private to keep the non-profits honest. You got to keep them honest because if you have the privates operating and the non-profits operating one against the other, you will then keep the non-profits honest. Using his logic, because you see when we say on this side that we do not agree that there's room in the field, there should be room in the field of the social service, a health service such as this, for the private entrepreneur, he says you're saying you on that side have it in your minds that the privates have no compassion, that they don't care for people. Because we say we don't think they should have any place, they shouldn't be allowed to operate, therefore we say they have no compassion.

By the same token, using his logic, I now accuse the Minister of Health of saying tonight in this House by implication that the people that run the non-profits, the churches, the social service groups, the municipalities, are just a bunch of thieves; they have got to be kept honest by the private entrepreneur. That's what he is saying, because he's using that same kind of logic when he accuses us on this side of the House of being critical of the private sector and is saying, because you're critical of them being in this field; because you're critical of the government that's sponsoring them, that it's encouraging to get into this; because you're critical of them for that, we are being accused of saying that anyone in business has no compassion. Using that same screwy logic, and it's screwy, but using that same screwy logic, that Minister of Health got up tonight in this House and said that the non-profits, the Salvation Army, the Grey Nuns, the Holy Family Home, Sharon Home, that whole bunch of them are just a bunch of thieves; they got to be kept honest. The way to keep them honest is to bring the private guy into it, subsidize him, pay his mortgage, pay his wages, pay his profits, pay his dividends and that will keep the non-profits honest because they are not really very honest. That's all that I got out of tonight's discussion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it's a disgrace; we didn't get an adequate explanation of why the devil the government is pursuing this policy. We got the same old hogwash about what the NDP did in the past and how we threw money around, and how we went wild about things. That same government has made about-turns in a half-a-dozen areas in the last three months. The Property Tax Credit is a universal program now; their whole White Paper on taxation was based on the evils of universal programs. They were scrapping it. It's in the shredder because they can't revive it, they just blew it. The dead hand of government in private business is a terrible thing — potash mines are in; copper, they're in; and now they are giving us hogwash that the private sector has to be in health care, personal care homes, to keep the non-profits honest because they're dishonest. That's the only explanation. If one is right then the other is right. If we, on this side, are accused of saying that all private operators lack compassion then it follows that all non-profits are dishonest because they have to be kept honest by a private sector entrepreneur who is going to be making money, not by virtue of anything, because he is guaranteed a return. You know, the greatest investment on the American

Stock Exchange for the last 10 years has been private personal care homes. Did you know that? It's succeeded only recently by oil. That's the greatest return on the New York Stock Exchange, they've sold and resold a dozen times. The dividends have been spectacular and that's what he wants to bring to Canada. Would he turn the hospitals over to the private sector, why not? Keep the public hospitals or the existing hospitals honest, why doesn't he say that? Because he doesn't dare. They should be competed with, why not? Because it's nonsense and he knows it.

Mr. Chairman, if the privates get back into business on a big scale in Manitoba the public of Manitoba will simply be paying for it, in spades; they won't give better service, they can't. Any moneys that the non-profits get are plowed back into that facility. They are not paid out in dividends to somebody, some shareholder whether he lives in Winnipeg, Toronto or New York, or to some trust and loan company or bank, because they are not in the business of making money. An investor has to make money or he's not going to invest. Darn it all, we are not at the point in Manitoba where we have to seek out investors to provide care for elderly; nursing home care. I'm proud of the fact that this government, our government, the NDP, finally brought in legislation which resulted in the fact that every individual, rich or poor or middleclass or whatever, had a right to access to personal care homes. We did it, they didn't do it and they never would have done it. We did it and with that came the move to the elimination of the private sector, as it did many many years ago in the field of hospital care, yet it still hasn't in the United States and in education in many other areas. And this Minister is now trying to defend the position of sort of being half in and half out of something, that's a lot of nonsense; and if, Mr. Chairman, the Minister wants to fight the next election on this issue I'll gladly debate with him anywhere, any place, any time on this issue, and only on this issue, and damn it all, he will back down as his government backed down on half a dozen things in the last three months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Transcona:

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I believe that the Minister is going to make a statement and before he does I'd like to just have three simple, direct questions answered. I don't want to make another statement myself. I'm wondering if we could get the waiting list for Winnipeg for 1977, 1978 and 1979. He provided numbers for Manitoba of 2,417, 1,934 and 1,928 and I wonder if he has the breakout for Winnipeg. He doesn't have to give it to me right now, he can send it over or he can just raise it. That's one.

The second question, because I've asked it before and I've been listening closely to the Minister's comments to statements made by people on this side this afternoon and this evening and I still haven't been able to ascertain from the Minister if the private nursing home in Selkirk is going to be started in June as promised by the Minister on February 8th, 1980. I think a very clear yes or no is sufficient there, but certainly a start to the nursing home was promised in June.

The third question is, has the Minister provided for his special subsidy to proprietary owners to help them pay for interest charges in these estimates. He's talked about it, he's said it is a necessary requirement in order for those 494 private nursing home beds to be built; we know that the need is there, and unless some type of subsidy like that is provided for in the estimates it won't happen. So that's the third straightforward question.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, again I have to plead the exigencies of time. There have been a great many questions asked and I know that some of the questions asked have not been answered yet but I haven't wanted to take any more than my fair share of the time in the examination of this appropriation. I've been interested in what members opposite have had to say and have had to contribute and the concerns that they have raised.

So let me try to deal, without prolonging the issue any more than is my usual custom, deal with the questions that haven't been answered yet.

First of all, perhaps I'll work in reverse order and deal with the three questions just posed by the Honourable Member for Transcona which were asked earlier, I concede, but I hadn't got to them yet. I think I can give him the answer to his question on the waiting list for Winnipeg. Let me give you the whole comprehensive picture as I have it in front of me in my House book and I trust that will answer your question. If it doesn't I'll get further information. Let me just repeat; the waiting list for personal care admission for the province of Manitoba, total as of December 31, 1979, which is the figure I gave the honourable member earlier, it is 1,928. Now the number of panelled persons who are in acute hospitals in Winnipeg, in 1977 as I told the honourable member was 192; in 1978, 175; at the end of 1979 it was 190; they're part of the 1,928. These are the persons panelled for personal care home admission who are in acute hospital beds in Winnipeg, 190. Now to that figure —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon.

MR. DESJARDINS: We're trying to think what the 800 figure you used a couple of days ago, that is what's got . . .

MR. SHERMAN: This I think I can explain. That's the number panelled who were in acute hospital beds in Winnipeg. We're looking at the so-called block beds problem in total here and I want to build to that total so it explains how it's made up. To that number that I just gave you we have to add 150 patients who are panelled for personal care and who are, either in acute beds or extended care beds, in hospitals in rural Manitoba. I can't tell you how many of them are in acute and how many are extended care but they're in hospitals in rural Manitoba, 150. To that number we have to add 240 patients, panelled for personal care, who are in extended care beds in hospitals in Winnipeg, 240 in extended care hospital beds in Winnipeg; and to that number we have to add 100 to 110 persons who are in acute care beds and are awaiting transfer to extended care beds, or to an extended treatment facility. So the total we are looking at is made up of 190, 150, which is 340, 240, which is 580, and 100 to 110, call it 110

which is 690. The figure I concede that I have used generally has been 800 and I've certainly not intended to mislead anybody by using that figure. It has been a rule of thumb figure that has been used conversationally among my officials and me, in the same way we often talk about 10 percent of our doctors being opted out and you find out it is fractionally less or fractionally more.

MR. DESJARDINS: So long as we know. That's part of that 19.

MR. SHERMAN: That's part of that 19. It's 690 actually in that category and they're part of that 1,928. —(Interjection)— Oh wait a second, I'm advised that the last 110 I gave you are not panelled so they are not part of the 1,928, so there are 580 who are panelled and who are part of that 1,928 on the waiting list. The other 110 are not panelled but they are in acute beds and they are waiting to get into extended care beds or an extended treatment facility. So that actually constitutes part of the so-called block bed problem, so we are really looking at 690 block beds; and we're looking at 580 who are panelled and in one type of bed or another waiting for personal care admission who are part of a total waiting list of 1,928 for personal care admission.

MR. DESJARDINS: And a total of approximately 2,000, a little over 2,000.

MR. SHERMAN: Approximately 2,000 that's right.

MR. PARASIUK: If I can just get clarification on this, you gave us the panelled waiting list for personal care admissions for Manitoba, 2,417 in 1977; 1,934 in 1978 and 1,928 in 1979. Do you have a breakout for how many are panelled awaiting admission in Winnipeg itself? Just to clarify it.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in 1977 the total of 2,417 included 1,238 for Winnipeg and 1,179 rural; in 1978, the total of 1,934 included 988 for Winnipeg and 946 for rural; on December 31, 1979 the total of 1,928 for Manitoba included 892 for Winnipeg and 1,036 rural.

Just before I go on . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Excuse me, I wonder is it possible to itemize the Brandon situation in those same figures?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In 1977 the total for Manitoba was 2,417, the total for WestMan, it's only broken down by region, the total for WestMan was 571 of that 2,417; in 1978 out of a total of 1,934, WestMan was 470; and in 1979 out of a total of 1,928 the WestMan total was 566.

MR. EVANS: This is those who are waiting outside of institutions plus those who are panelled in various hospitals? That's the combined figure?

MR. SHERMAN: That's the total waiting list of those who are panelled and waiting for personal care admission, some of whom are at home and some of whom are in other forms of hospitals.

Just before I answer the other two questions of the Honourable Member of Transcona, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I have never disputed that there are block beds in considerable numbers. I am very aware of the block bed problem and the block bed issue. It is not by any means unique to Manitoba, it's a problem that faces all jurisdictions across the country with the advancing age of the population. Quebec solved it very simply, in a rather cynical way, by simply decreeing that 20 percent or 15 percent, I think it was 20 percent, from such and such a day forward, for all hospitals 20 percent of their beds would be considered extended care beds and then once they passed that legislation there was no more problem on paper. There weren't any more block beds, those 20 percent of beds in every hospital were simply extended care beds. That doesn't solve the problem but it solves it on paper. We certainly do not intend to do that but I simply cite that as an example of a situation that has developed in society as a result of the aging of the population and we're all wrestling with the block bed problem. We hope to be able to provide considerable relief for that problem. Can the Member for Seven Oaks hang on for a minute or two because I wanted to address . . . We hope to provide considerable relief for that problem through the extended care beds that are going to be available at Seven Oaks Hospital and also through a, hopefully, provided the Legion is in agreement, through a consummation of a takeover of Deer Lodge Hospital. That would make a substantial difference in the provision of beds and the availability of extended care beds and would have considerable impact on this problem. But no one is denying, least of all me, that it is causing some considerable frustration to the medical profession, the medical staffs of certain hospitals, particularly the Health Sciences Centre. And it may be that we should be looking — I hesitate to suggest it because I don't particularly want to read it in print tomorrow — but it may be that we should be looking at certain configurations relative to the Health Sciences Centre with respect to some plans for bed configurations that honourable members opposite are familiar with. I don't wish to say any more on that subject because none of this has been worked through the relevant medical staff. But we have to take whatever steps are possible this year to reduce that so-called block bed problem.

The Honourable Member for Transcona asked me is the private nursing home in Selkirk going to be started in June? If the private nursing home can't be started, Mr. Chairman, then we will turn to a non-profit organization, a non-proprietary operator to get such a home under way. I can't answer that question in any other form than that but it is certainly our firm intention that a new nursing home be started in Selkirk this season and we will certainly go the non-proprietary route if it's not possible to proceed with a proprietary operator whom we firmly believe has given good service in that community and deserves the opportunity, if an opportunity is viable.

The Honourable Member for Transcona asked me whether the subsidy, as he calls it, provided for the proprietary operators is included in my estimates for this year. Without accepting the terminology, the provision for that per diem is not included in my estimates for this year, Mr. Chairman, nor does it

have to be because it's a payment that is commenced once the home is in place and in operation and thus it wouldn't be paid, it wouldn't be built into any budget until the homes were constructed; but it certainly has to be built into future budgets.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Transcona earlier asked me about categorization of persons in personal care homes and he suggested that we had changed, or he felt that we had changed, the categorization procedure so that it made it more difficult for people to be admitted. We haven't changed that categorization, Mr. Chairman. There is a prioritization and a categorization but it has been in effect since the inception of the universal program. It calls for three priorities: emergency admissions — these are admissions on medical or social grounds at any of the levels of care, that's priority (a); priority (b) is the urgent admission that is urgent but less so than the emergency admission that I've just referred to; and priority (c) which is the lowest priority, and these are persons who can remain in the community temporarily with home care assistance and that classification and prioritization is pursued and represents consistency with past practice. There has been no change in that, Mr. Chairman.

The Member for Transcona also had some concerns about the numbers of prop operators and the numbers of beds that we had approved for construction that would be beds in the prop operator field as against the numbers in the non-prop field. At the present time, looking at the total spectrum, the breakdown, as I said, is approximately 5 — 2, non-prop to prop; 5,200 to some 2,200; about 30 percent of the total personal care beds are prop operated. The previous government certainly had no difficulty in going along with those prop operators from the time the universal program came in until the government was changed and there really has been no change in that ratio, although certainly in the numbers that we have approved for this year there are as many prop beds that have been approved as non-prop beds. But once again, without rehashing the philosophical argument, we feel we need the beds and we feel that we have an obligation to give those particular prop operators who were phased down or closed down — we're not talking about the general spectrum of potential proprietary operators — but those particular ones the opportunity to get into the field if they want to be in it; and the total proposals that they have made happen to come to a total figure that is certainly roughly equivalent or almost equal to that figure that I provided earlier on the non-prop beds approved. That is not necessarily, nor is it even likely, to persist in future years. This is a specific problem that I think we face at the present time.

I don't think that at this point in time it could be argued that the prop-operator operations are more expensive than the non-prop operators because they operate at the median rate paid to the non-props. That is, that there is an average median struck between the non-props that are paid X-number of dollars and the non-props that are paid Y-number of dollars and the proprietary operators are paid in that median level, and there are lots of non-prop operators who are getting more of a per diem

than the prop operators are; it depends on the levels of care in their homes. But the truth of the matter is that when prop operators come into the field or come back into the field, if they do, they will still in many cases even if there is a financing formula worked out that enables them to compete with those who have access to cheaper money, there still will be many non-prop operators who are receiving a per diem equivalent to whatever the prop operators get, because many of them right now —(Interjection)— yes, it depends on the level of care. Many of them right now are substantially above the median. The median is precisely what it purports to be, a median.

I'm not sure whether I have covered most of the questions raised by the Honourable Member for Transcona, Mr. Chairman, but I have attempted to. He's asked about standards and there are specifically laid down prescribed standards for staffing, for biologicals, for menus, for care, in all personal care homes, whether they be proprietary or non-proprietary, and no prop operator retains his licence, and none will get a licence, and none will keep a licence who does not meet those standards.

There is a Personal Care Home Program Administrative Manual, which is in print and available and has always been in existence with the program, that provides those guidelines and procedures and recommendations for personal care home operation. There is a formula to establish the required number and mix of nursing personnel to ensure that the care needs of the residents are met; there are guidelines for pharmacy services to the personal care homes; diet and therapy guidelines and the like to ensure that the standards and quality of care that are desirable and that I think all sides of the House subscribe to are maintained, whether it be a prop operator or a non-prop.

And that is why I find it difficult to understand one of the criticisms that members opposite have of the concept of the prop operator. I appreciate some of their criticisms and it is a legitimately held difference of opinion but I find it difficult to understand why they feel that prop operators are going to be able to cut corners and going to be able to effect savings by scrimping and by reducing service to their residents when they have to, as a condition of their licence, meet these conditions, meet these regulations. They are as susceptible to ongoing review and ongoing continuing reports to the standards division of the Health Services Commission as are the non-prop operators.

The Member for St. Boniface said that when everything else is swept away the danger remains that when you get into the non-prop field the element of profit is there and the temptation is there — that is a direct quote from his last contribution in the debate — the element of profit is there and that's the temptation. He suggested that the prop operators could effect savings by coming corners to ensure that they make a profit; such as tying people in chairs to cut down on staffing and subjecting them to medication and drugs to keep them contained and under control. Well, it can't be done under the standards that are in place in this province.

I appreciate what the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks says about the condition of the nursing home field in some jurisdictions in North America; I'm not unfamiliar with some of those evils. I've been

in a number of American states and looked at their problems there, too, just as he has done and those are problems devoutly to be avoided here in Manitoba. And there's no person on this side of the House, just as there's no person on that side of the House, who would countenance some of the irresponsibilities and some of the flaws that exist in some jurisdictions in the nursing home field in North America. But we have here, Sir, a Health Services Commission and a standards division of that Commission and a universally insured nursing home program, with these conditions and guidelines and licensing standards that I've referred to, that are the protection against that kind of operation, whether proprietary or non-proprietary. So I can't really understand the concerns that members opposite raise in that area.

The Member for Seven Oaks said that I said that we need the proprietary operators to keep the non-prop operators honest. Well, I dispute that and I'll reject that, Mr. Chairman, but the Member for Seven Oaks said that I said —(Interjection)— no, no. He said that I said that we need the prop operators to keep the non-prop operators honest, and I never used the term honest. —(Interjection)— No, no, but, Mr. Chairman, he can check Hansard tomorrow; he said honest and he said it several times that I said that we needed them to keep the non-prop operators honest. —(Interjection)— And I reject that out of hand, Mr. Chairman; I never used the term honest. —(Interjection)— I never used the term honest and I never questioned anybody's honesty or integrity in the personal care home field. What I said was that a mixed system provides the checks and balances that can produce efficiency, the kind of efficiency that I think we all subscribe to, that we all want in our system. And I did not for one moment reflect on the honesty or the integrity of the operators in the non-proprietary field; absolutely not, absolutely not.

The imputation and the inference of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is quite dishonest, Mr. Chairman. I never used the term honest; I never impugned or reflected on anybody's honesty. I was talking about efficiency. I was talking about the checks and balances that are available, and he can't sit there and tell me that there is not some advantage to comparisons; comparisons that can lead to better operations among the prop operators because of what is being done in the non-prop side of the spectrum and vice versa; comparisons that can lead to better operations on the non-proprietary side because of clear efficiencies, both in terms of care and cost, demonstrated on the proprietary side. All we were saying is that check and balance has some value plus the contribution that the proprietary operators, as corporate entities, make to the community, to the province as a whole. So I want to clear that point for the record, Mr. Chairman, because it is a distortion of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Selkirk, the Leader of the Opposition has hit and run and unfortunately —(Interjection)— well, that's fine, but unfortunately he makes accusations and leaves them on the record and he's not here at the time that I have an opportunity to speak or respond so I have to respond anyway. I don't like to do it in his absence but, again, I think that there are some pretty crass

and dishonest accusations and inferences contained in his remarks.

You know, he talks about the situation of the Selkirk Nursing Home. Let me tell the Honourable Leader of the Opposition . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East on a point of order.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order for clarification, the Honourable Minister said he was going to answer the questions in reverse order and he started with the Member for Transcona, which was the last, and then I think I had asked some questions and I had spoken after the Leader of the Opposition. So if you're following your procedure, I presume you're going to answer my questions before you answer on Selkirk.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East is next, Mr. Chairman. On my page of notes, he is the next item, Mr. Chairman.

You know, the Leader of the Opposition deplores the situation of the Selkirk Nursing Home. Well the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that we inherited a situation in which there are a number, a considerable number, of personal care homes in Manitoba which have outlived their time in terms of the physical structure and the physical accommodation. There one or two in Brandon among and we intend, during the 1980s, during this decade, to replace all of those personal care homes, but I think we've conceded in this debate earlier that one has to work on the basis of priorities and on the basis of what one can do in a given period of time. We have, as I pointed out earlier, moved on old outdated personal care homes in Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie. We are the first and the only government to do it, and we are going to move through the remainder of the province in that same vein. Selkirk is not the only time-expired personal care home in Manitoba. Let me assure the Leader of the Opposition of that fact.

Some of the newspaper comments that he cited which emanated from an initial newspaper story based on a program and a press conference and a press tour that he staged, orchestrated and put in place have been responded to; both the home and the fire chief's office and my office responded to many of those accusations a day or two after they appeared. Many of them were exaggerated, many of them were in the process of being acted upon and many of them were stimulated by discontent on the part of certain individuals. The Leader of the Opposition very skillfully knitted that discontent together, as the MLA purportedly speaking for those individuals, and I give him credit for orchestrating a very cynical and very successful sensation.

The fact of the matter is that it is largely a sensation, that it was highly exaggerated and that we went to the staff of the home itself and to the director of nursing at the home and obtained refutations from them of some of the charges that had been made. There were certain people who felt that it would be useful to make particular complaints and make particular charges. It was interesting to

note, Mr. Chairman, that all of them demanded and got anonymity; none of them was prepared to be identified and we, in pursuing the situation through the Health Services Commission, found that many of the personnel there, including some of the senior personnel, disassociated themselves completely from the charges that had been made. That is not to say that the Selkirk Nursing Home does not need replacement; it does need replacement.

But I have considerable contempt for the whole episode that was skillfully manipulated by the Leader of the Opposition to cause political embarrassment for political gain, to cause anxiety and worry and concern in the minds of relatives of residents in that home. I think that kind of exploitation, Mr. Chairman, is contemptible and I regret the Leader of the Opposition is not here because I do not wish to make those remarks outside his presence but I have very little alternative in the circumstances.

He talked about the debt situation. I'm not going to get into that. That's a debate for the Minister of Finance but that is the biggest red herring of them all; when he talked about the per capita debt, the 800 million debt that we now have in the province of Manitoba. We have it, Mr. Chairman, and everybody in Manitoba knows it. We have it because of the Hydro debt that was accumulated by the strategies and the ill-considered policies of the previous government that saddled us with that kind of debt. That is why the debt is now 800 per capita. It has nothing to do with the attempts that have been made and have been successful by this government to bring fiscal programs under control and to effectively, Mr. Chairman, effectively balance the budget in terms of outflow against income.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say to the Member for Brandon West, he asked about the facilities in Brandon, specifically Bulloch & Booth, one of the two Salvation Army hostels there, and the charges made by the administrator, who has been there for a year, I believe. Well, those accusations were responded to in similar fashion by the nursing director at the home. In fact, Sir, Salvation Army officials here in Winnipeg spoke to me about the comments of the administrator of Bulloch & Booth. They were most unhappy with the rhetorical and declamatory and emotional comments that were made.

Certainly Bulloch & Booth is time expired. I admit that. I would hope that the previous government admitted it because it didn't become time expired in 1977 or 1978 or 1979; it's been time expired for ten years and it will be one of those homes that will be replaced as we work through this list, which takes time and takes effort and takes considerable planning, but it will be one of them, because it does need to be replaced. But insofar as the immediate current safety of the residences concerned, all possible safety precautions are taken and monitored. I don't sleep at night myself with respect to some of these facilities because they are old and because there is always that lurking danger. But what can be done in those circumstances is done in terms of supervision and in terms of access and egress and in terms of warning systems.

Furthermore, most of the people, in fact, I think all of the residents of that home, are ambulatory. They're not patients; they're not patients in a medical or health problem sense so that it is possible to put

in place and keep in place evacuation plans and procedures. Those are simply stop-gap measures and I concede that, Mr. Chairman, but once again, I look at a member who was a Minister of the previous administration for eight years and stands up here and asks me what we're doing about a hostel in his constituency, when he was a member of the Executive Council for eight years and presumably had some opportunity, as did the Leader of the Opposition, to do something about them. We are going to do something about them. We have the list; we have worked part way through it and we'll get through the rest of it between now and the mid-point of this decade.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't intend to prolong the debate this evening but I would like to have an update on the status of the Lakeshore District Health Board and what is precisely going on with respect to that board, if the Minister can give me that.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Lakeshore District Health Board has been advised that their resolution, which was arrived at at a meeting convened by my office with the Health Services Commission approximately three or four weeks ago, about a month ago, has received approval and official approval has gone out from my office and through the Health Services Commission to the board approving construction of a juxtaposed personal care home in Eriksdale; a juxtaposed personal care home in Ashern; and a free-standing personal care home in Lundar; plus repairs to the roof of the Eriksdale Hospital; plus medical clinics in Lundar and Gypsumville. They have received that official approval and presumably those who still have to go through the design stage either are in the process of hiring their architects or have hired them and those who have completed the design stage can call tenders and proceed. We have told the board that all those projects that I have just mentioned can go ahead and are to go ahead as quickly as they can move them.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you. I appreciate the comments that the Minister has made. Have any of the homes been tendered as yet, as I understand that the Ashern and Eriksdale homes, the architectural drawings were completed and in fact Ashern had been tendered in 1977 and was pulled back. At this point in time, is the Minister aware whether tenders have been called for on either those two homes, as I understand that Lundar itself is to begin their design stages and the like.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have no information that either Ashern or Eriksdale have gone to tender but I'll get that information for the honourable member. However, they have been advised that they can go to tender as soon as they wish to go. Ashern could begin construction by mid-July, according to my information, and Eriksdale could begin construction by August. Now whether they have actually called tenders at this juncture, I

can't confirm. But if they haven't, once they feel they are ready to do so and wish to do so, they have a green light to do so.

MR. URUSKI: I thank the Minister for that information as well. Could the Minister indicate whether there will be, or are there any surveys to be undertaken with respect to the requirements and needs of the region with respect to the 20 additional beds that are now going into that region as well. I questioned the Minister some time ago in the House with respect to what additional costs would be borne by the government or the district health board in operating a free-standing 20-bed personal care home in Lundar. Are those kinds of costs available to the Commission? And the Minister at one time undertook to bring those costs, and then at another time he indicated that there were no additional costs. Can the Minister undertake to provide those figures to us?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There certainly will be additional costs because the previous concept, I believe, involved the juxtaposed personal care homes at Ashern and Eriksdale and the medical clinics at Lundar and Gypsumville; and to that has been added a free-standing personal care home in Lundar. So there's certainly additional costs. A 20-bed personal care home in Lundar, in terms of capital costs, would cost three-quarters of a million dollars; in terms of operating costs, well, we're looking at 10,000 a bed per year; so we're looking at 200,000 a year to provide Lundar with that personal care home. We're also serving the needs in Grahamdale, but no decision has been made on any facility for Grahamdale.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister provide the studies that were undertaken to satisfy the government that the need existed in the region for Lundar as well as the other two? Because I presume a decision had to be made on the basis of the requirements and the needs of the region. While I understand that the province as a whole has a bed shortage, and there's no doubt that a need exists within the province, maybe the information that I'm asking for is not normally sought, the process that is gone through to establish the criteria that a nursing home be built. Can he give that to me?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, normally the process is one of co-operation between the community or communities in the region and the Health Services Commission; the Health Services Commission does a survey in concert with those local officials on the population in that so-called catchment area based on the number of person aged 70 and over and the number of persons aged 65 and over. The prevailing guidelines in the province specify that for reasonable and adequate service to a given region or catchment area one should be looking at a provision of approximately 90 personal care beds per 1,000 residents, persons 70 years of age or older; and that was the criterion on which the Manitoba Health Services Commission based its original recommendations for Ashern and Eriksdale with the medical clinics in Lundar and Gypsumville.

I found that there was considerable discontent among certain members of the Lakeshore District Health System. I must say, and I know the Honourable Member for St. George doesn't necessarily agree with me on this, but I found that the community of Lundar and residents in that area felt that they had been ignored; felt that their legitimate concerns had not been recognized; that they deserved as much consideration and attention — not purely because of the social demographics of their community but because of ongoing competitive ambitions between communities, they felt that they had been shuffled out of the game, shuffled out of consideration and there was considerable unhappiness and discontent. The government's decision was to respond in an attempt to keep everybody in the Lakeshore District Health System happy, or keep as many happy as we could. I cannot blame that decision on the Health Services Commission and I don't think I ever had. It was a decision made in Cabinet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5. (b)—pass.

MR. SHERMAN: Is 5. (b) pass, Mr. Chairman? Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.