

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 5 May, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James)** introduced Bill No. 56, An Act to Amend The Child Welfare Act.

**MR. GARY FILMON (River Heights)** introduced Bill No. 58, The Interior Designers of Manitoba Act.

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson)** on behalf of Mr. Warren Steen (Crescentwood) introduced Bill No. 54, An Act to Grant Additional Powers to Charleswood Curling Club Ltd. and Bill No. 46, An Act to Amend an Act Incorporating The Regent Trust Company.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed with Oral Questions, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left where we have 30 students of Grade V standing from General Byng School under the direction of Ms Bissky. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. In view of the fact that there is some confusion in northern Manitoba pertaining to satellite reception and broadcasting systems in northern Manitoba, can the Minister advise whether or not his government has prepared a specific policy in regard to the provision of expanded television services in northern Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, the government has a general policy of encouraging and indeed hoping for the transmission of additional television services throughout the north as rapidly as possible. Part of the frustration of that general policy and part of the difficulty encountered is the rather laborious and long drawn-out meetings that involve the federal regulatory body CRTC. The question that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refers to

was dealt with at the Public Utilities Committee meeting last Tuesday and Thursday at which time the position of the government and the Manitoba Telephone System, I believe, was reasonably explained.

**MR. PAWLEY:** A supplementary to the Minister: Can the Minister advise whether he will be presenting a submission to the CRTC outlining the province's position re expanded television services in northern Manitoba?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the positions of the government have been before CRTC and will continue to be before CRTC through the offices of the Assistant Deputy Minister of telecommunications, Mr. Doug Smith. These are a series of ongoing meetings. We were hoping to perhaps culminate in some final decisions with this respect that a Minister of Communications Conference scheduled for Vancouver in June of this year, in other words a month from now.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, by way of final supplementary to the Minister, can the Minister advise that he will be prepared to meet with any interested parties pertaining to the government's position in regard to clarifying the province's position in providing television service in northern Manitoba?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure, just as are the members of the opposition, we are meeting with and have met in the past with interested parties in pursuing this service, not only in northern Manitoba but in other parts of the province of Manitoba. Just recently our caucus and our individual ministerial offices received such indication on the part of one interested company, and I am sure the same is true with members opposite. The direct answer to his question is, certainly we are always prepared to meet with people who have the need for clarification or who have problems where government may be of some assistance to them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAM USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he can indicate today just when he intends to bring down the Budget.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I will advise the House within a day or two of the exact time, probably some time early next week. — (Interjection)— Never know.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a supplementary.

**MR. USKIW:** No, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of, I believe it is Municipal Affairs whether or not he is in a position to indicate just

when elections are going to be held in the LGD of Alexander?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. DOUGLAS GOURLAY (Swan River):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That decision hasn't been made at this point.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that it hasn't been made, but is he in a position to tell us just when it will be made.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Very soon, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education, and ask him in view of the new social planning analysis of the city of Winnipeg which was released last week, whether he is prepared to reassess the provincial position in view of the staggering rates of unemployment, high welfare, crime, etc., in the city of Winnipeg, and whether he is willing to reassess the provincial position vis-a-vis funding for special needs and special programs in Winnipeg School Division No. 1 to combat these serious social problems.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I think the particular report that the Member for Elmwood refers to has information that is relevant not only to my department, but probably to my colleagues in Health and Community Services as well. I can assure the member that we will certainly take that particular report into consideration in our deliberations.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister, who is, of course, famous for being the master of understatement when it comes to problems in the core area, whether he would consider bringing in a special warrant, if he were persuaded of the necessity as indicated in that report, to properly fund Winnipeg School Division No. 1 programs?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member is aware that any move of that nature would be undertaken by the government by the Treasury Board.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether he concurs with the position of the Mayor of Winnipeg who recognizes that when schools close in a core area it leads to further deterioration and further problems and is in effect the beginning of a vicious circle? I wonder whether he has seen the Mayor's statement and whether he concurs with that view.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Whether a Minister concurs or not, in my mind does not really add to information in this particular question period. Would the member care to rephrase his question?

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister whether he recognizes the problem being confronted in Winnipeg School Division No. 1, where they are considering closing schools because of a falloff in population of school children, which then in turn leads to a further moving away of children, of parents with families, and a further deterioration in the core area, whether he sees that as a vicious circle and whether he has any solutions or words of wisdom for school trustees confronted with that problem?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, certainly we are well aware of the problem, and of course it is linked to declining enrolments and linked to declining birth rates in this province, I would say to the member — not only in this province, but in the country as well. If there are some solutions that he would like to put forward, I would be very pleased to hear them, because there are no ready or pat solutions to that problem that we see at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a fourth question.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister whether he does not appreciate that where a declining population results in the closing of a school, that the result is that fewer children move into that area, older people do, transients do, and you have a deterioration of that program, so that the aim of the government must, to a certain extent, be to maintain schools even where there is a declining population of school children, even if it is at some extra expense, because the social costs will be greater still than the education costs.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we are starting to deal with what is possibly a hypothetical situation to some extent. The member talks about social costs, he talks about educational costs, and without referring to any absolute figures at all. I would say that this is something we have to weigh and measure rather carefully as to balance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister provide us with information on the federal Hog Stabilization Program?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the member for his interest in the hog producers in the province, something that we very seldom get from the members opposite. The federal government did make an announcement today and there will . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please.

May I suggest to the honourable member that he stick to the subject of the question and provide the information necessary.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The federal government did in fact make an announcement today to help the situation that the hog producers are facing today and there will be a payout of some 2.46 per hundredweight, which figures out to about 4.10 per hog. There are some approximate 4,000 hog producers in the province of Manitoba, so it means something in excess of 4 million that will be received by the producers of Manitoba.

The farmers who have been producing hogs have seen somewhat depressed prices and I am sure this will be a welcome announcement. Although some of the particular details of the announcement or the formula used might not be of satisfaction, at least the moneys that will be coming, I am sure, will alleviate some of the immediate problems.

**MR. BROWN:** To the same Minister, I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether there will be any subsidy for producers who produce weanlings only.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, the program for The Agricultural Stabilization Act is for slaughter hogs only.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether or not he can advise the House as to whether Canada is a net importer of pork and beef, or pork or beef, at the present time?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, at this specific time, no, I can't give him the details but we have been in fact an importer of meats over the certain period of the past year or two, but specifically at this particular point I would have to get the update on that particular information.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, could the Minister advise the House whether or not in the year 1979 Canada was or was not a net importer of meat?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Again, Mr. Speaker, I would take that question as notice to get the specific figures on the status of the Canadian import situation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

**MR. VIC SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister in charge of parks. I would like to ask him whether the Provincial Parks Nursery at Birds Hill Park will be planting young trees again this year in the same fashion as in the past and if not whether those trees will be planted elsewhere in the province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM:** I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that International Mineral Corporation earned a pretax profit of 24 million in its 1979 tax year on the sale of some potash property in New Brunswick which it had explored in a fashion similar to its exploration proposal here in Manitoba, can the Minister advise as to whether the Crown in its agreement with IMC has negotiated for a right of first refusal by the Crown to repurchase the interests of IMC in that potash property which it is currently beginning to explore?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps that part of the agreement is yet to be dealt with. The present agreement calls for the rights of IMC to do the exploration work pursuant to the final feasibility study. So that sort of thing is not yet dealt with in any potential agreement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a final supplementary.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Finance, I understand that part of the agreement hasn't yet been completed, but has another part of the agreement been completed with respect to the province of Manitoba giving IMC a right of first refusal to purchase its share or interest in this venture?

**MR. CRAIK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, but the undertaking from the province to IMC that deals with the other part of it, any other obligations would not be spelled out until any final agreement was entered into.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a final supplementary.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Finance, can you advise as to whether there has been any agreement entered into with IMC dealing with the price of any of this potash that might be sold, in view of the fact that IMC in all likelihood would be selling it to its parent corporation making fertilizer in the United States?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, those kinds of details have not been dealt with.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Northern Affairs. My question is, in view of the fact that the situation in the Local Government District of Alexander arises solely as a result of the lack of a quorum and that the council had been proceeding normally up until that time, would the Minister assure himself that there are no substantial

changes with regard to the operation of that municipality, and would he assure himself that the present administrator will not revoke decisions that have been made by the duly-elected council pending the election of a new council?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't quite hear what the member said, half-way through the question. I would if he could just re-ask that question, please.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Local Government District of Alexander is not operating under a duly-elected council simply because of the lack of a quorum, and since the Minister's administrator is now in charge of council activities, because of this lack of a quorum, would the Minister see to it that the status quo remains, that is, that decisions made by the previous duly-elected council are not revoked by the administrator because of the hiatus in terms of elected councillors for themoment, and that the status quo remain until elections are called, unless there is an urgency of some kind.

**MR. GOULAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the honourable member for rephrasing that question. I can assure the member that this will be considered.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's affirmative statement, would he see to it that certain equipment that was bought by the duly-elected council is not sent back, because I understand the administrator is talking about revoking the decision of the elected council with respect to certain municipal equipment.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the House that some decisions with respect to the purchase of equipment has already been decided upon.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, may I receive the assurance from the Minister that the administrator has not revoked the decision of the duly-elected council. May I also, Mr. Speaker, ask the Minister whether it would not be prudent for the administrator to consult with the reeve of the council, who was elected, before any substantial changes are made in the council's operations, since the council ceases to operate simply because there was not a quorum.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the case of the grader, the fact remains that the acceptance of the grader took place some three of four months ago. High interest payments had accumulated and the decision had to be made with respect to the grader, and that has been made.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster with a fourth question.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, may I then understand whether the administrator has taken it upon himself, in spite of the decision of the previous council, to

undo the purchase of a grader, which was made by the previous council, and that the status quo which the Minister indicated would maintain until an election took place, has in fact been disturbed by the administrator, against the decision of the duly elected council.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That decision was made by myself, not by the administrator.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** I would like to direct my question to the Minister who would be most responsible for dealing with the social problems in the city of Winnipeg. I expect that would be the Minister of Community Services. I refer to the two studies that have been released recently by the Winnipeg School Division and the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, which have clearly pinpointed the serious problems in the central area of Winnipeg, which seems to be expanding now. Rather than calling it the core area, I refer to it as the central area. I would ask the Minister if he and his department, or in co-operation with Cabinet colleagues, is attempting to bring together a comprehensive training and employment programs to deal with the scandalous levels of unemployment that are faced by the people that are living in that area, and I refer to the Winnipeg School Division report which ranks the schools by the unemployment levels of their parents, and they're as high as 55.8 percent unemployment in some areas.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I have not seen that report myself as yet. I'm sure my department has. And as the honourable member is aware, being a former Cabinet Minister, we have a cabinet committee called the Community Services Committee and I'm sure that will be a subject that we will deal with at that committee of cabinet, which is made up of the Minister of Health, the Minister of Education and myself, and one other Cabinet Minister.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this report was prepared in December of 1979 from data collected from the Winnipeg School Division, and this is up-to-date data, I would expect the Minister would be dealing with this by now and not just merely expressing hope.

My second question, however, is to ask the Minister if he, in his departmental responsibilities, intends to introduce or improve the social programs that would be required as a back-up to deal with the special problems faced by families with single parent head of household, and I would refer especially to day-care programs and programs of that nature in that area of the city where a high proportion of the families seem to be single parent families.

So I would ask him if he is actually attempting to do something and not just simply saying that he hopes that it will be done.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, we have increased the number of spaces in our day-care program this year, and the majority of the day-care spaces in the Winnipeg area are in the inner core area, and so they will have the opportunity of increasing their spaces by ten percent with the program that we have proposed this year.

In addition, I will gladly discuss the other programs that are presently in existence under our portfolio in our estimates which we believe may be started this week sometime.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland with a final supplementary.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the study reveals that 63.2 percent is a high statistic regarding the number of families that have students coming from single parent families, I would ask the Minister if he feels that a ten percent increase of the nature which he is proposing, which is, in effect, an increased cost to the parents as well, is adequate to deal with this very serious situation. I simply feel that this is not adequate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MR. ROBERT G. WILSON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Would the Minister confirm that no member of the legal profession, or an individual is exempt, automatically, from prosecution regarding the laws of Manitoba?

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I believe I can confirm that no one is exempt from the laws of Manitoba.

**MR. WILSON:** In addition, Mr. Speaker, while I personally have the greatest respect for the law enforcement workings of the RCMP, the recent MacDonald Commission, it has brought to my attention that one or two members of the RCMP have been involved in dirty tricks, and my supplementary question is, where would a lawyer or an individual file these charges?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the recent publicity from the MacDonald Commission revolved around something called Operation Checkmate, and I have received assurances from the Solicitor General of Canada that none of those activities took place in Manitoba within our jurisdiction.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley with a final supplementary.

**MR. WILSON:** If information was available regarding dirty tricks within the province of Manitoba, and suggesting such things as polygraph tests, where would the lawyer or individual file these charges?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that they could be filed by contacting our department or the appropriate police department.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Government Services. Can the Minister indicate what action his department is taking in regard to the Minister of the Environment's concern over the ordering and purchase and use of the chemical 2,4,5-T in the province by government agencies, and specifically, can the Minister indicate if he is prepared to direct his department not to purchase 2,4,5-T in the future for use in the province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, the Department of Government Services, co-operating with the Minister of the Environment, in collecting the necessary data that he asked for as to those departments and those services of government that have in the past, purchased those chemicals.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to know, from the Minister, if it is his intent to direct his department not to purchase 2,4,5-T for use in the province of Manitoba from this period on.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, when the department has received specific instructions from the Department of the Environment, then I suppose that that will be a matter that will be passed on through to the different departments, but my understanding of the position of the Department of the Environment at this point is that we are collating or bringing together the various amounts and the different departments that have, in the past, used this chemical, and for what purposes. There will then be an assessment of whether or not that should carry on.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. As there is some suggestion that 2,4,5-T is also being used by Manitoba Hydro, can the Minister indicate what quantities are on hand, what quantities are now being ordered for purchase by that department, and can he further indicate what actions he has taken in regard to preventing further use of this controversial and hazardous chemical in the province of Manitoba by his own department, Manitoba Hydro.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the details, I think that the member would be better advised to direct that to the utility when it appears before the committee. I will inquire as to whether or not the chemical is under current use and attempt to gain that kind of information for him.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Education. I would like to ask the Minister whether he is in receipt of a new enrolment projection report.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**MR. COSENS:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital with a supplementary.

**MR. WALDING:** I would further like to ask the Minister whether such a report is now being produced.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can explain a little more clearly to the member. My department is continually updating the enrolment statistics, so when he asks me if we have a new report, my answer is no. I can assure him that we are constantly keeping the statistics we have up to date.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital with a final supplementary.

**MR. WALDING:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister then if his department has issued an updated, modernized version of the enrolment projection within the last few weeks and if that is the case, would he make a copy available to the opposition.

**MR. COSENS:** I would be quite prepared to make any copy of a projection of that type available to the honourable members, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Agriculture: In view of the fact that the Minister was encouraging increased hog production in the province a couple of weeks ago, what programs does he have, what programs does Manitoba have to help those hog producers who are now going into bankruptcy? What does he plan to do about that?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think it has been stated many times over that our position as a government is that on nationally produced agricultural commodities, that the federal government would be the best government that should administer and provide the kinds of programs that he is referring to. As far as the production of hogs in the province of Manitoba, because we make up something like 1 percent of the North American hog population, that in fact Manitoba could play a greater role as far as the production of hogs are concerned with the amount of packing house industries that are available, with the spinoff to the

other agriculture producers, the feed grains industry, that in fact it is important that we expand our hog population. I also stated at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, that it should be done under sound business planning and on a longer term projection rather than just a year.

I would also like to state, Mr. Speaker, that this has been the first time since 1971 that we have seen a depressed hog price where in fact the producers were losing substantive amounts of money.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a supplementary.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the province of Quebec is providing massive assistance grants to encourage hog production in Manitoba, what is this Minister going to do in order that we do not lose that production that we now have in place?

**MR. DOWNEY:** I guess, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have indicated to the hog producers of this province is the fact that we would have to look at what alternatives would serve the hog producers' long-term interests, and one of the things we have said we would do is to encourage the federal government to continue to update and to make changes to their Federal Stabilization Program that would in fact help the Manitoba producers. We have been meeting with the federal government.

Number two is to look at the tools available to the department, and that of course is the Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation, which has funds available for lending money to young and family farms, that in fact there may be some ability there to lend money to the hog producers.

At this particular time, Mr. Speaker, those are just some of the alternatives that we have available to us.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a final supplementary.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that probably Quebec will be asking for a market share, once they have achieved the majority production in Canada, we'll be caught without our share, our production. I would like to ask the Minister whether or not he has discussed this with the federal government, in this regard, and we will be forced to go into a market share with no production in Manitoba, the way this Minister is handling his department.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised to hear those kind of comments come from a particular party that believed totally in supply management, that in fact you can regulate the agricultural industry so that it in fact only produces a certain amount of supplies, of goods for the domestic market.

I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that in our discussions with the federal Minister, that we in fact indicated to him that a meaningful producer participatory contributory type stabilization program was in the best interests of the Manitoba hog producers, that we did not support a national hog supply management program, which in fact the

federal Minister has indicated he feels would be the answer to the problems. We do not support that, Mr. Speaker, and in fact feel that the stabilization method is the best method, allowing the producers to take advantage of the domestic and international markets that are available to the Manitoba producers.

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance, who on April 3 agreed to accept a verbal Order for Return dealing with a tax refund discounter. He renewed that undertaking on April 24.

Can he undertake to see to it that we have that Return before his Estimates?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I will check on that immediately. My apologies to the Member for St. Johns; I expect it should have been back by now. It is probably an oversight on the part of the office.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the Attorney-General and ask him if he is now prepared to make a report, which he undertook to do on May 1, dealing with the censorship of books on newsstands.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** I am not prepared to make that report today, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister indicate whether there are any prosecutions being considered by the department dealing with the material which his department had taken off the stands.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I can only indicate that I understand through the newspaper that a complaint has been received.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns with another question.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** You are right, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Attorney-General whether he has received and can make available to the Legislature a copy of a report of a study which was launched by the Federal Department of Justice over a year ago dealing with user fees and Legal Aid.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the Legal Aid Society has received a draft report which the author has acknowledged is lacking in a number of areas. My understanding is that the Legal Aid Board and the author of the report have been considering different considerations and different facts and different proposals. When that is completed, a report will be finalized. I believe now the author of the report is somewhere in the United States doing further studies on another matter and that may be the cause of the delay in producing the final report.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**MR. MINAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some time ago, the Honourable Member for Wolseley raised questions on how a social allowance recipient could make use of taxi service. This is the information relating to a provincial recipient, not necessarily a municipal recipient.

I would first like to advise the House, Mr. Speaker, that at no time do we issue vouchers directly to any social allowance recipients for taxi services. They are there and available primarily for medical and emergency needs. In the case of a district office, the person requiring the medical service would phone into the district office and advise that they required such transportation and then the person in the office would decide whether in fact the transportation was required and would make note of it.

In the instance of after-hours, there is an emergency available that allows a similar decision to be made if they have to go to a hospital. In the rural areas where after-hours' emergencies occur, it is required by the recipient to get the signature of a medical officer at the time of receipt of the treatment and then the bills are considered at that time. In the instance of the rural area, the same exists. If they have to go to a hospital where there is no district office available for phoning to concur that the trip is necessary, then the signature of the medical doctor is required to show that in fact the visit was necessary. At the end of the month all taxi bills that are received from taxi companies are scrutinized and those that do not correlate with the approved ones are not paid until they are verified that in fact they were required for medical services.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MR. WILSON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Minister might be able to tell me the combined cost to the taxpayers. If provincial cost is over 450,000, if you add the federal costs — in other words, his answer was only pertaining to provincial policy, and if you add the municipal costs, would he be able to give me a figure of the federal, provincial and municipal use of taxis? And can the Minister confirm that Mr. Ziprick the auditor agreed with with the suggestions and is conducting an investigation at this point in time?

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the honourable member to check with the federal counterparts and municipal counterparts with regards to the dollars of moneys spent on taxi transportation last year. I do not have those figures. With regards to his second question, I understand that possibly the provincial auditor may be investigating the use of taxis at the present time, but I have not confirmed that is in fact the case.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, time for question period having expired, before we proceed with Orders of the Day, I should like to draw to the honourable members' attention, 80 visitors in the

gallery. These are wives of delegates to the Canadian Labour Congress and on behalf of all the honourable members welcome you here this afternoon.

### COMMITTEE CHANGES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some changes to make on the Public Utility Committee, substituting Mr. Enns for Mr. Craik, and Mr. Orchard for Mr. Ransom.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are those changes agreed to? (Agreed)

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister for Government Services that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and the Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

#### SUPPLY — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden):** I call the committee to order. We are on Resolution 38, 5.(c)(1). The Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. In light of the information that has become public over the weekend, perhaps we should ask the Minister what he has done in regard to effecting his intended ban of the use of 2,4,5-T. We now know that certain government agencies, Government Services, has been reported as ordering it in for purchase. It has been reported that Manitoba Hydro is using it and, of course, there is always the question of how many individuals and companies within the private sector are using 2,4,5-T.

I would ask the Minister if he can advise us as to any progress he has made in regard to making certain that this chemical is not used in the province, and bring us up to date generally as to the status of his efforts.

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Chairman, no decision has been made, as I indicated on Friday. I am awaiting responses from the various departments that I have contacted and until I have

received those responses, I will be making no further decisions.

**MR. COWAN:** Am I to understand then, Mr. Chairperson, that it is perfectly acceptable now for a government department to continue ordering the purchase of 2,4,5-T for use in the province of Manitoba.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Until a decision has been made, Mr. Chairman, there is no change in what has been the practice of past years, until a decision has been made to the contrary.

**MR. COWAN:** Just on that point, then, I don't know as if there is too much use in pursuing it further if the Minister has made up his mind to the fact that there will be no restrictions placed on the ordering of the material even though there is considerable controversy surrounding the material and even though Manitoba is one of the jurisdictions that is continuing to allow that material to be used in light of the evidence, the best available evidence, I might add.

I would only protest the Minister's inaction on this and to suggest that we hope that that material which he hopes to compile is done so very quickly and that this ban is imposed. We would like to see the ban imposed now, of course, because we do believe the chemical to be of that significant enough hazard, or potential hazard, as to severely restrict the use of the chemical in the province and therefore would like to see the ban imposed immediately. But if that is not the case, we can only hope that he will proceed with all due haste to adequately determine what purchases are being made and where it is being used, so that the ban will be imposed in the near future. But that is second best, clearly second best in the opinion of the opposition. We would wish to see those restrictions go on immediately.

If the Minister is to allow government departments to continue to purchase and to continue to use 2,4,5-T, in light of the evidence, then he is presenting an unfortunate example for the private sector. They will not be predisposed not to order the substance. They will not give the credibility to the Minister's concerns that I am certain the Minister would wish to be given to his concerns in this matter. They will say, and justifiably so, that if the government is allowing it to be used, then why can't we use it? If the government is allowing it to be purchased, then why can't we purchase it? If the government is allowing it to come into the province, then why can't we bring it into the province. And for all the arguing that we might wish to do, for all the dissuasion that we might wish to do, and those were the intentions of the Minister, to dissuade people from further use of this chemical, in the light of all that, they will still bring it in because the example, the very concrete, specific example, that is being given to them by government is that it is perfectly acceptable to use this substance.

The Minister has some concerns, but there's no ban, therefore, why should we have to suffer through not using this chemical when government itself will not take that responsibility to restrict its use within its own departments.

So we do protest that action, we are concerned, we just believe that the Minister's intentions, while

they may be honourable and decent and good, are not being followed through in action, and that concerns us very deeply in that all the good intentions are worth very little, if in fact the concrete example that is being given to people is that they may, and that they should continue using this substance. So we do protest the Minister's lack of action on that, and we can only hope that he will see his way clear to imposing that ban, as have other jurisdictions, at the earliest possible moment. Today wouldn't be too early, in our opinion.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I have to thank the Minister for presenting to me the monthly summary of environmental accidents, and he was very prompt in getting that to me and I do thank him for the consideration. However, in the letter to myself, he does indicate that the company or the individual involved in each incident is named in the report, and he asked me not to — he suggested that it is not the practice to publicly identify those individuals or companies, because that public identification may well, in fact, deter them from voluntarily reporting incidents in the future. And the suggestion there is that I not release that information publicly, also, although I don't believe that it's spelled out. And I can only assure the Minister that I don't intend to betray the confidence at this time of this report until we have had such an opportunity to discuss this in further detail. I don't imagine that we will be able to do it during these estimates, but by correspondence and by conversation over the next little while, but I do want to speak to the issue.

And the issue is two-fold in this instance. No 1, we have talked in some great detail over the past few days in this department's estimates about the right of the public to know. The Minister has recognized that right by imposing an information officer, which was taken out of the system by the previous Minister shortly after the change in government. The Minister has recognized the importance of the public knowing; he has indicated that there will be courses going into schools; they are doing all that is in their power to make certain that the public understand the significance, understand the details, of the environmental concerns that we all have. This is an important part of the process. And if you will recollect, Mr. Chairperson, you will note that we have supported him very strongly in that process, that we have agreed that it is integral to the whole success of his operation, that the public know specifically and fully the details of the hazards that they face.

We have spoken to it in the context of the workplace, we have spoken to it in the context of the environment, and yet we have a statement of policy by the Minister that they do not want the public to know full details as to environmental accidents and environmental incidents, because it may deter the individuals that must report, or should report these, from voluntarily reporting such in the future. So what that does, in fact, is it allows a company that may, on three or four or five occasions, and I haven't had time to go over this report in detail to determine if that is the case, so I'm speaking in a hypothetical sense now, but it may allow that company to continue on with sloppy work habits that may be

resulting, or sloppy work practices that may be resulting in spills, without public pressure being brought to bear on these particular companies, or individuals as the case may be, because the public doesn't know.

Now, I'm certain that the Minister is bringing pressure to bear on these, and I again will commend him in those actions. I am certain he is sitting down, if there is an instance of one individual or one company, or one industry, creating many of the problems that are listed in this report, that he would sit down and say, you have to clean up your act. There is a problem here, I have a responsibility to the environment of this province, and therefore I am recommending very strongly that you put in practice such mechanisms as to forestall and prevent such occurrences in the future.

But without the clout of legislation, without the clout of regulations, without the clout of some statutory mechanism to do that, the Minister is at a disadvantage. We have talked to that subject, also. But if the Minister had the public behind him on this, that would provide him with additional clout. That would provide him with an additional pressure that he could place on individuals, corporations and companies that may be, in fact, not following all the proper procedures all the time.

So what I would suggest to the Minister is that he review his policy of not making these names public; I will be corresponding with him, and until such a time as we have reached an impasse in our conversations and transfer of correspondence, I will not make those public. I'm not saying when that should happen, but I do believe that there is a responsibility upon the Minister to allow the public full access to information such as this, and will try to encourage him to make that decision on his own in the future.

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** If I may just make one comment on the member's statement. I think that if he carefully reviews, if he hasn't already, I'm sure he will, the list of accidents, he will indicate, although certain companies are mentioned quite frequently, it is the franchised dealers that to a large extent, it is on their premises to a large extent that the accidents have taken place, and in most cases, I would venture to suggest that the accident was a result of human error.

Much as we would like to, it seems very difficult to presume that one can correct that by legislation. We hope that the losses — and indeed there certainly are losses every time there is a spill of that nature, to the individual and the company involved — will caution them to make sure that more adequate precautions are taken during the normal course of the delivery of the product, or the storage of the product, or the transfer of the product.

We trust that that lesson alone is sufficient alone to discourage or to minimize the number of accidents, but in addition to that, as I have pointed out to my honourable friend, we are bringing in amendments to The Clean Environment Act this year with a hope that perhaps we can further minimize the incidence of spills and accidents.

**MR. COWAN:** Again, Mr. Chairperson, we commend the initiative and reserve judgement on the actual implementation of that initiative until such a time as we have had opportunity to review it and examine it.

On the report — and I won't mention the name of either the community or any other specifics — there is an environmental accident report in July of 1979 in regards to two 5-gallon cans of a herbicide being spilled in a village within the province. Can the Minister indicate if he knows what herbicide that was and if it was 2,4,5-T or a similar substance?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, I couldn't answer that question. If that accident took place in the farming area, in all likelihood it was 2,4-D, or 2,4,5-D, which is a variation of 2,4-D, which is not considered a dangerous chemical, because that is the chemical that is most widely used in the rural areas as a weed control measure.

**MR. COWAN:** I will just assure the Minister that we are trying to pass through as quickly as we can these estimates, so that we can go on to other estimates that are coming before the House, and also at the same time assure the public that if we do not mention a specific item or a specific concern at this time, it does not mean that it either takes less prominence in our own minds or that we do not intend to pursue it in the future. We just wish to point out that there is only so much time that we feel that we can expect of the Minister in any one department. We will continue those conversations on privately, as the Minister knows we have in the past.

I would ask a couple of other questions. One, I would like to go back to a statement the Minister made in regards to sampling of the stack at Flin Flon. I believe the context of the statement was, the staff representative for the United Steel Workers in Flin Flon had written a letter to the Clean Environment Division and they had asked, why is it that the stack is only sampled once a year, and I asked that question of the Minister one evening during the estimates. The Minister came back that the fact was that the stack is a tall stack and happens to be 825 feet tall, and that there was difficulty in getting people to sample that stack.

I would just ask the Minister, at that time I had very little knowledge of how that sampling takes place, but in the meanwhile have been able to determine, through my trip to Flin Flon and asking people there, that there is in fact an elevator that takes people up to the stack. There is an outer shell and an inner shell, and it is in between the inner shell, and that electricians, say, go up that stack on an average of once a week, or a couple of times a month in order to check out lights, in order to check out other installations that may be necessary to run checks on. Why is it not at that same time other individuals are going up so that they may monitor the stack? Is there a technical problem in regard to that, since it is obviously not the problem with getting people to climb that stack, which both he and I had thought at that time.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, I have just been advised that we do have a position open for a stack sampler right now and that competition has been

running for some time. We are unable to get any applicants. So it would seem to me that it is not the kind of position that people rush to fill. It may be necessary to add some incentive to that position in order to get somebody to do it.

**MR. COWAN:** What the Minister poses is then a difficult problem but the fact is that corporations and governments alike have been able to get people to do some fairly onerous tasks from time to time and I would suggest to him that it is indeed within their ability to hire a stack sampler. I am not commenting on how they should do it, but I would hope . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** We just simply advertise.

**MR. COWAN:** I would hope that they would do that very soon and that sampling would take place on a more regular basis than once a year in regard to especially that stack and other stacks that may be emitting pollutants into the air.

In last year's estimates, the Minister at that time indicated that there was a study being done on arsenic contamination in the Snow Lake area. I would ask the Minister if that study has been completed and if it is available for perusal by the opposition.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The member raises a question that has not been brought to my attention. I will have to get the information on it. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that we hope to have that particular report ready by the end of this summer.

**MR. COWAN:** Can the Minister indicate now if they have found high levels of arsenic in the area.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Suspect, I am told.

**MR. COWAN:** Would those levels be from the gold-mining operation that has ceased operation in that area several decades ago?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Chairperson, that would tend to indicate that either there was widespread contamination of arsenic at the time, or that there is still arsenic in the area that is being stored and that may be seeping into the water system. I would ask the Minister if any research has been done to determine if arsenic is being stored in the area, and if so, under what conditions that is being stored. The reason I bring this up is that we are all familiar with the Yellowknife arsenic instance and the fact that there is some concern now that arsenic will be stored in abandoned underground mine sites at that area, mine shafts and drifts and stopes, and that there is some concern that it may eventually work its way into the ground water system in that area.

I would ask the Minister if we are faced with the same potential problems in the Snow Lake area?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I am advised that we are not aware of any arsenic being stored at the site, but we are concerned about the tailings and it is in that area that we are concentrating our investigations.

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps it is premature but I will ask the Minister at any rate now, and we may have to discuss it at next year's estimates, or at a time when that report becomes available, but can the Minister indicate if there has been any consideration given to removing the tailings or to neutralizing the tailings so that they will not erode off into the water system.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, we will await the report, which should contain some recommendations, before we make a final decision as to what we will do.

**MR. COWAN:** Will the Minister make copies of that report available to residents of the area who have expressed a concern to me?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I see now reason why we can't. I can think of no good reason why the report can't be made available.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of course, I would appreciate a copy, if possible, so that we can go over it.

Is the Minister's department now conducting surveys of a similar nature for either arsenic or other chemicals that may be entering the environment as a result of mining operations in the province?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The monitoring that is being done is being done with respect to the tailings that are being produced by the mines, and it is in that area that the monitoring is being conducted.

**MR. COWAN:** I would ask the Minister if monitoring is being done of areas like God's Lake where there was a mining operation, a gold-mining operation, in fact, a number of years ago, a similar situation that has occurred in Snow Lake where there may well indeed be arsenic contamination of the area as a result of that gold-mining operation in the 1930s, I believe. It was God's Lake Gold Mine that was at least partially owned by Sherritt-Gordon Mines at the time, who had closed down their Sheridan operation because of low copper prices and had at that point gone into gold mining and had built and operated a mine in the God's Lake area. I am not certain whether there will be an arsenic problem there but I would ask the Minister if his department has attempted to determine if such exists and if so, if there is a report available on that?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Not as yet, Mr. Chairman. There is a bit of a backlog and we are attempting to catch up to it. It is on the list of those that we intend to do some investigations. We intend to do all of the mines, whether they are currently in existence or have been abandoned. It may take a little while to get around to all of them.

**MR. COWAN:** I would just ask the Minister then what process is being followed in regard to these surveys. Are they taking water samples; are they taking samples of the tailings; are they in fact taking samples to determine if the arsenic has worked its way up through the food chain to human beings in the area and, if so, in what concentrations?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that all of these things are being tested, the effluent, the tailings, and the water itself.

**MR. COWAN:** Then finally I would ask the Minister if there are tests being done on residents of the area to determine arsenic levels that they may have encountered as a result of living in close proximity to potentially contaminated lakes and rivers?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I am advised that up to this point, we haven't uncovered any reason to conduct that kind of an investigation. If my honourable friend can bring some evidence that it may be necessary, we could start conducting those kinds of tests.

**MR. COWAN:** While I don't have evidence that there is in fact contamination of human beings as a result of living next to arsenic-contaminated sources, water sources in particular in Manitoba, we do know from examples and experiences in other jurisdictions that if you do have high levels of arsenic present in the environment, there is some suggestion that those may make their way through the food chain and through direct contact into residents of the areas.

So I would suggest that without my having to bring forward specific information, it would be incumbent upon the Minister, in light of that experience and in light of the problems that have been encountered in the Northwest Territories, etc., to conduct those studies, to initiate those studies on his own initiative so that we can then be assured that there is no problem rather than having to first prove the problem before we do conduct the survey into how extensive that problem is.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, if our surveys indicate that we are reaching hazard levels in any given area that, I think, would be a fairly natural corollary and we would then certainly undertake to conduct tests on humans.

**MR. COWAN:** I would ask the Minister then if any surveys have indicated that those levels might be present or that those levels are suspected to be present in any of the areas in Manitoba.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Not so far, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Well we are jumping around a bit and I would just, in hoping to conclude that portion of the discussion unless my colleagues have something else to say, is to indicate that we see a need for these sorts of surveys to be conducted. We see a need for them to be conducted in all due haste because of the knowledge that we have gained over the past number of years in regard to experiences of this nature in other jurisdictions. I would hope that the Minister would expand upon them as soon as is possible and I understand or I would suspect that with their new laboratory they may well be able to do that, to push more samples through in a shorter period of time, so I would hope to be able to discuss a number of these areas at next year's estimates.

In the meanwhile we can only suggest that the residents be made aware of the survey results as a matter of course because they do find out that the surveys are being conducted, especially in the smaller communities in northern Manitoba. It's hard to have a person come in from a government agency and do testing and sampling without most people in the community knowing what it is they are doing. It's hard to keep that sort of information from them and I don't believe that we should attempt to. So what I would suggest happen is that when the Minister is conducting surveys in the area, that perhaps they call a town meeting to suggest that they will be conducting the surveys and why they are conducting the surveys and allow the residents an opportunity to voice their concerns. You may well find out that they are experiencing difficulties that may be associated with the contaminate that you are dealing with which would help you no doubt in your survey. You won't find out unless you ask them specifically and you should ask them at some point or another to determine if they or members of their families have shown these sorts of symptoms.

I would suggest that when you go into a community or an area to do the sampling that you hold a hearing similar to a Clean Environment Commission hearing. Say we are in here to do this survey; please don't become alarmed; please don't become overly concerned, it's part of a normal practice, although we do believe that there may be a problem here. We are trying to determine the extent of it and we will be reporting back to you at such and such a date, so that they know full well that they can expect the results from you.

The Minister knows full well what I am talking about in light of the MacGregor incident, that communities can get wrong information, can get correct information, can get all sorts of information that they don't have the ability as a collective community to deal with because they haven't been tied into the process at the right time or right from the start.

I would only suggest that those public meetings become a matter of course to serve a number of purposes. One is to allay any fears that may be created; No 2 is to advise a community of when they can expect the results; No 3 is to involve the community in the test results because many of those communities have long-time residents who may be able to provide you with information that you would not get from other sources.

I had opportunity when flying back from Flin Flon to sit next to the environmental director from Inco, and in our discussions with him he suggested that Inco was now doing a very extensive survey on the sintering plants in regards to determining the carcinogenic properties of nickel. The problem that they've found is once they went back ten years the records became very few and far between, that the record keeping a number of years ago was not comparable to record keeping today. What they had to do was then go around to each individual worker who had been there during that period of time and say, what were conditions like? Was it this dusty or was it that dusty or was it dustier than that? And they had to build up a case file going back three or four decades on the basis of personal opinions of workers who had worked in the plant.

The reason I bring that forward is you may indeed have to build up the same sort of case file in regards to how much of the contaminate was released into the environment — was there a pipe running straight into the lake at such and such a time? The workers who had worked in those plants and who are still long-term residents of those communities can be able to provide you with some very extensive and detailed information just from their memory, so you tie them into the process in that way. And, of course, we are both in agreement that the public should have as full and complete data as they can on the hazards that they may face, so that is of course another reason for having them involved right from the start. And I can suggest that at the end of the investigation or at a point during which the investigation seems to be passing from one stage to another, that the community also be called in to discuss the matters that may have been found and to provide input as well as output in regards to the study.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, having been raised in a small community myself, I understand what my honourable friend is saying about not being able to have a government inspector of some kind moving in there without everybody in town knowing what he is doing. I thank him for reminding me to practice what I have been preaching to my colleagues about holding meetings in areas where government projects are being undertaken so that the full and complete knowledge of the nature of that project can be given to those people, and I most certainly, since I do believe in this practice, will insure that is carried on in the future whenever we move into an area to do tests. I think it is an excellent idea because the thing that can happen, as my honourable friend has pointed out, is that if wrong information gets around and one rumor starts building upon another one then you have a completely distorted picture of what the objective of the exercise is and it is far better to have that straightened out right at first so that everybody knows exactly what is happening. I thank my honourable friend for reminding to do that.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would like to talk a bit about what is happening at the Pinawa Station in respect to reports that may be coming to the Minister in regard to environmental accidents. I had asked him the question in the House during the question period and had not pursued further in that particular instance awaiting this opportunity to discuss it during the estimates procedure. I would ask the Minister if he can indicate if the department does in fact have in its possession reports of accidents and incidents involving radioactivity or involving other environmental hazards that have occurred at Pinawa and what is being done with those, and does the Minister intend to make them public? If not, why not would be the following question, of course.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The publicizing of a report of accidents within the confines of Atomic Energy property themselves, that is their responsibility. We

do have continuing meetings with them in which environmental or accidents, whether it takes place inside or outside are discussed. But the ones that we do get a report on are the accidents that take place which involve the environment outside the area comprised of Atomic Energy and we are then completely informed and there are reports on those particular accidents, but that's the only ones that we do have.

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While we were talking about that Whiteshell plant, has the Minister heard any complaints from the company or from any of the workers with respect to health problems incurred by any of the workers who are at that site?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** At the Pinawa plant?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, I wouldn't be the one to be receiving those reports. If they were reports dealing with health problems of the workers in that area, I would presume they'd go to the Workplace, Safety and Health people in the Department of Labour.

**MR. COWAN:** They would actually go to the federal Department of Labour in that regard, and that's something that I would dearly love to discuss with somebody, but I don't think this is the appropriate time nor place to discuss it. But any workplace incidences, accidents, or concerns would go through the federal department. As a matter of fact, for the information of the Member for Rossmere, there is a cohort study that is being done in regard to determining any adverse effects of low level radiation on the workers at Pinawa. I'm not certain whether it's tied in to studies that are being done at other nuclear establishments, but I do know that they are doing one in specific regard to Pinawa, and we should expect those results 20 years from now, because that's what they have to do in that particular instance, to allow for the time lag between exposure to low level radiation and potential hazards that may show up down the road at some other time.

I would ask the Minister, what is the flow process for a report that comes to him from the department, and I'll speak in specific terms now, because it was a matter that we had addressed to the previous Minister during the estimates procedure and during the question period in the House, and that is, there was an incident that occurred in regard to the spillage of some radioactive contaminated water outside of the confines of the plant, although there is some indication that it was kept on the property itself, it did not enter the public system. I asked the Minister, in the question period, I believe, and I'm not certain whether I followed it up in the estimates procedure or not, but I know I asked the Minister in the question period whether or not he was expecting a report on that, and he indicated that yes, he was expecting a report on that, and that in fact, they were expecting reports on other incidents that may have occurred, if such did occur. In other words, what they were asking for was a detailed, compiled list of accidents that may have occurred at the

Pinawa stations, so that they would have a better knowledge of exactly what was happening there. I would ask the Minister if he has received that yet, or if the previous Minister has received it, and if it is in his files.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, we were advised of that particular spill, as I have indicated, and our people were there, as they are in every case that a spill of that nature is reported to us, and a report is compiled. My understanding is that Atomic Energy will be releasing a report on that particular matter very soon. I'm not sure just how soon is, but my honourable friend has been in politics long enough to know that.

**MR. COWAN:** Just so that I am straight in my own mind, and the record is straight, that would be the spill that took place in regard to radioactive contaminated water that made it into a drainage ditch system within the . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That's the only one that's taken place since I assumed this portfolio. That's the only one that I'm aware of, because that's the only one that has taken place, to my knowledge, since I assumed the responsibilities for this portfolio.

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps we're not speaking about the same incident then, because the incident I'm addressing myself to occurred when the previous Minister was in the portfolio, because he was the one whom we directed questions to during the question period, as Minister of the Environment. Has there been one since that time that may have occurred during the Minister's own experience and portfolio?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** There were two accidents. One was in 1977, and that involved a coolant; the one that my honourable friend is referring to, he is right, it did not occur while I had the portfolio. It occurred when the previous Minister was responsible for this portfolio. That was in May 1979. It's on that particular accident that the report will be made available shortly.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, I would ask the Minister if, to his knowledge, and again, just so the record is certain, have there been any other incidents that would have resulted in potential possible or actual exposure to radioactive materials or contaminants to the general public at large, as a result of activities that were carried on either at Pinawa operation or that were carried on as a result of the Pinawa operation being where it's at?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** None that I know of that would have created a problem to the general public. There have been problems inside, but they occur from time to time and they are handled internally by Atomic Energy. They are sort of housekeeping matters.

**MR. COWAN:** As the Minister may have guessed, or anticipated, because he is good at that, I am thinking of some specific instances that have been either reported in the press or have been suggested to me by individuals who prefer to remain anonymous. One of course, is the incident where a tour was going through the facility, and a number of

school children, or one school child, I'm not certainly exactly of the details, picked up some radioactive contamination on their clothes, and those clothes were then confiscated, he was given other clothes to take with him outside the plant, and those clothes were sent back to him at a later date. Although it did happen within the confines of the Pinawa establishment, it was exposure to a person not normally associated with the workings of that establishment.

I would ask the Minister if he can confirm that. There was a public press report as to that, and also indicate if he knows of any actions that have been taken to ensure that such incidents do not happen in the future to tourists.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I don't know if my honourable friend has been through the Whiteshell research establishment, but as one goes through from one area to another, you are constantly monitored by machines to determine any radioactive material, and I believe it was on one occasion, and I've been through there several times, that one of the people in the party did have a positive response on his shoes, and he had to remove them. So that is not an unusual thing, I think that's a pretty regular thing that is done, monitoring to ensure that people who are leaving a particular area are not carrying with them some contaminated material.

**MR. COWAN:** In this instance, Mr. Chairperson, if I recall the report correctly, and I don't have it before me, so I may not be 100 percent accurate in my recollection, but I do seem to remember that this person picked up a substance, that it was not a matter of something attaching itself to his shoe, but he had actually handled it and was in the process of either carrying it or had put it down and left it there, but had contaminated himself. Is that an accurate reflection of what had happened in that particular incident, according to the Minister's . . . ?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I have no knowledge of that particular accident, but I suppose that that is possible. I think it would be highly unlikely that people would be picking things up, but I wouldn't want to make any comment as to whether or not that's a regular thing or not. I think not regular, but I suppose that under circumstances, it could happen.

**MR. COWAN:** There's another incident that was not reported in the press and that I have no way of substantiating, except by asking the Minister if he has any knowledge of it, and asking him to check into it, and that involved a steam clean operation at a facility in the community that was using equipment from Pinawa. They had a hose there that was capable of handling the pressures that were necessary, and there was some fear that that hose might have been contaminated and was brought out into the general environment. Now, I would put a strong caveat on that statement, because I have not been able to confirm it either with conversations with individuals other than the person that explained it to me, or with conversations with others who might have reason to know. But I would ask the Minister if there has been any report of such an occurrence that has come through his office.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that we know nothing of that particular incident.

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps the Minister could take those sketchy details, which I have just presented to him, and ask if that was indeed the case — whoever the appropriate authority would be in this case, I don't know — but if he could ask and report back to me, either by correspondence or by the vehicle of the House, I would appreciate it.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** We will just take that particular question of my honourable friend's as notice. It will be in the record and at our next meeting with Atomic Energy we will see if we can't identify the two problems that he has raised.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Further to that, Mr. Chairperson, I would ask the Minister to, in those conversations, also to try and determine if there have been other incidents which we don't know of, because from time to time you hear a story, and that is exactly what it is, a story, and when you are dealing with subject of radioactivity, there is a fear that is sometimes justified, sometimes not so justified, but is always present, and one has to try to work with the knowledge that the stories that you are getting may in fact be elaborations and may be manifestations of that fear. It is important also that we know all the facts, and that is why I bring it forward to the Minister, that is why I hope that he will bring it to the proper authorities at the station and will determine as to the correctness of the report that was given to me by an individual.

It has also been noted that the station has in its possession, and I am not certain that I am using the proper terminology, but it has been referred to as a hazard report. That report would be a report that would indicate and outline specifically what would happen in the case of a major problem at the plant, in the case that there was a total breakdown, or that there was a very large scale emergency. I would ask the Minister if his department has been made aware of that report, and if they have a copy of that report, and if they are under orders not to present that report, as I believe the facility itself is.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I am told that we are in the process of developing what are termed contingency plans with Atomic Energy, together with Emergency Measures, which my honourable friend is aware is now in the process of re-organization. That process is not completed, so I am unable to report with finality as to the nature of those plans, that will, I hope, await further developments until they are completed. I might say that report will be made public.

**MR. COWAN:** In regards to the specific report though, the colloquial term for which I understand to be the hazard report, is the Minister's department in possession of that? Has the Atomic Energy Commission made that report available to the Minister so that they know what the ramifications of a major accident would be for the Manitoba environment, and can therefore devise on their own, as well in conjunction and cooperation with other agencies, specific measures to deal with such an

occurrence if in the unlikely incident that it might happen?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, at this stage I am not aware of the existence of that report, there may well be. It may be made available to us or we may be made aware of it before our discussions are finalized on the overall plans.

**MR. COWAN:** Is the Minister's department involved in any way in the discussions and the meetings that are going on in regard to the use of mine sites or the use of the Pinawa area for disposal of radioactive wastes?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, we are not involved in those discussions, because we, as I said earlier, we agreed to the rental of the Crown land on the explicit condition that it be not used for storage of radioactive waste material.

**MR. COWAN:** Perhaps I missed that discussion while I was in Flin Flon and I don't want to go over ground that we have already covered, except to ask the Minister, are we talking in specific about the experimentation that the Atomic Energy Commission is suggesting might be done in the area?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The area in question was leased by Crown Lands, and it was leased by Crown Lands on the condition that it was going to be used for experimental purposes in determining rock formations and underground water formations in that particular area. The condition that was attached to the lease was that it was not to be used for storage of waste material.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand, following our discussions on Friday on 2,4,5-T, at which time the Minister indicated that he was considering a ban on the purchase of the product and since then there have been reports published to the effect that government departments had in fact on order a fair quantity of the chemical to be used in highway brush spraying and the like within the province of Manitoba. Has the Minister indicated what his position will be, now that the province has on order this chemical, in view of his statements of last week?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That matter was dealt with before my honourable friend came in. It was dealt with at length by the Member for Churchill.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A few years back we had a problem with pollution of drinking water in the Birds Hill area. There was considerable research being done; they couldn't seem to find out what was causing this pollution, and I wonder if the problem has been solved and if the department has been able to ascertain just where the pollution was coming from and what is the present status of the drinking water situation in the Birds Hill area?

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I am advised that particular contamination resulted from the underground storage of gasoline and it led to the development of the regulations that, to the best of my knowledge, has now corrected that situation.

**MR. JENKINS:** The Minister says that they have established regulations for the storage of gasoline. Would this be for service stations or where, say, a refinery is involved?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Everybody.

**MR. JENKINS:** On the underground storage of tanks. How often are these tanks inspected, then? Are they inspected by the department?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The tanks, as my honourable friend knows, are inspected regularly by inspectors and through the measuring of quantities in those tanks, they can tell whether or not there is a leak. And if there is a suspect leak, then action is taken to correct it.

**MR. JENKINS:** Through you to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is it the department that does the inspection? Is it the Environmental Control inspection staff that do the inspections?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, the individual himself does it with a dipstick and they have to keep records, which are then inspected. The dipstick method will tell him, if he knows much he has sold or used, the dipstick will tell him if there is any that has leaked out. That is then reported and steps are taken to correct it.

**MR. JENKINS:** How often do the service stations report to the department; is it on a monthly basis, every three months, six months?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Every day, on a daily basis.

**MR. JENKINS:** On a daily basis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Also, a couple years ago, we seemed to have a problem in East Selkirk with the drinking water in that area. It never seemed to be able to be tracked down, whether it was a feedlot operation or whether it was sewage from a school. I wonder if the Minister could bring us up to date on that situation and whether the problem there is still the same as it was, or has it been ascertained where the pollution is coming from?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** There were a number of areas that were suspect. The school was one of them; the feedlot was a second one; and then some drainage was suspect. We believe that the major source of contamination results from the proliferation of private sewage disposal sites in the area which are contaminating the underground supply. As you know, there are quite a number of homes scattered throughout that district. Their sewage fields are located throughout the entire area. There has been some corrective action taken with respect to some of what we considered to be known suspects, but this is a little more difficult one since it involves private

property. I expect that unless we are able to redesign all of the sewage fields and to correct that situation that exists in that area, the problem will not be completely eliminated, but it has been reduced considerably.

**MR. JENKINS:** It would probably be a dual jurisdiction, but what I am thinking about is, in new cottage areas that are being developed, what is the criteria and regulations that the department — I imagine it would be Public Health as well — with the installation of septic tank fields now, is it tighter than it was a few years ago and are we working towards the holding tank idea where the sewage is not spread out over an area and the emptying of these tanks periodically to make sure that the ground water in those areas are not being polluted.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** If my honourable friend has ever talked to someone who attempts to get permission to install or to build a cottage in one of those areas and to install the sewage equipment, he will know that the regulations have been tightened considerably. I constantly get complaints from people who feel that they are too stringent.

In addition to that, of course, the land use policies are going to make it more difficult to build in those areas to the extent that they have been building in the past. There are quite stringent regulations and I am sure my honourable friend can find them in the regulation book if he chooses to look for them. They are contained in Manitoba Regulation 272-76. They deal with regulations under The Clean Environment Act respecting private sewage disposal systems. If he cares to look that one up, he will get a fairly complete idea of how stringent the regulations actually are.

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

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, a few minutes earlier when I asked the Minister about the issue, the reports that departments have been purchasing 2,4,5-T, the Minister indicated to me this was extensively dealt with by the Member for Churchill when he was questioned by him.

I spoke very briefly to the Member for Churchill and I still have some comments to make with respect to the government's and the Minister's position in this regard. On Friday, on initial questioning from myself, the Minister gave us the impression, or at least he left the impression that the government was moving very swiftly in this respect. They were intending to ban the use of the chemical because they felt that in light of the controversy . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, if I may just make one . . .

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** . . . correction here. I thought I made it reasonably clear that I was planning to recommend to Cabinet the action. Cabinet has not been involved in this at this stage. It has been my activities up to this point.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, while the Minister says Cabinet has not been involved, that it was his activities, that's right. The Minister, upon furthering questioning during the period of our discussions, did move away from what I would have considered at least a fairly firm position that he took with respect to the banning of the chemical, and then started backing away even further, saying that before he would do anything, he will write a letter to his counterparts in the various Departments of Agriculture and the Minister responsible for Hydro and Highways, to see what kind of chemicals were in stock and that they should not be purchasing.

I understand from news reports over the weekend that in fact there have been tenders placed by the Minister of Government Services and the government as a whole in purchasing quantities of this chemical for use this summer. Unless my information is wrong, from the news reports, if the Minister has clarified that, but if they are in fact accurate, then the Minister's statements really didn't mean very much on Friday, or there is certainly a lack of communication between himself and his colleagues within Cabinet who have jurisdiction over their various departments who, in fact, do purchase chemicals such as this for brush control.

The Minister indicated to us Friday that he would be recommending that a ban be placed and that his statements of Friday would, of course, lead distributors in Manitoba to get the hint that likely they should not be ordering any more quantity into the province of Manitoba, that certainly his statements of Friday would be enough direction to those distributors and users that likely the Government of Manitoba would be putting a ban on the product.

It appears that the government position, as it now stands, to the public is saying, Do as I say but not as I do. The Minister can get up and say, I, as Minister of Environment, am opposed to the use of this chemical because of the controversy that is surrounding it, and I am telling the people that I intend to put a ban, but I am not saying anything to my colleagues; let them tender it and let them use it. Does it give the impression to the public of Manitoba that this Minister has the concerns of the entire population at heart or is he merely saying, Well, it would be a nice thing to do but now that I have backed off that statement, maybe we should allow another year to go by.

I think there has to be some clarification given to us by the Minister of the Environment as to, really, what does he mean? He started from a very firm position on Friday, pulled away from that, reports that the government still is tendering and purchasing the product, and now he says, I was going to write letters to my colleagues.

Is the Minister prepared to take any firm action now to rescind those tenders that have been called for by the government, to hold back. We were given the impression on Friday that all that was going to be used was what was in storage, the stocks that were there. Certainly, if tenders have been called for, is it not incumbent on the Minister, after his statements earlier on Friday, that this matter be pulled back and not gone ahead with. I would like the Minister to give us some clarification on it.

It gave us the impression that there was action on behalf of this Minister of the Environment but, you know, we haven't had action. It appears that we have really gone backwards from his position on Friday.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** My honourable friend seems to be laboring under the impression that there is a considerable amount of this chemical that is being used by the private sector. There isn't. The major users of the chemical are government departments. I have asked those departments that I feel are maybe using the chemical to give me a report on what the present status is. Until I have received the answers to those questions, I intend to take no further action. I intend to take action or intend to make a decision after I have received those reports from those departments. Up to this point, I haven't received them.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister can say that he will wait for those reports. Is he not prepared, after making his statements on Friday that he is prepared to ban the use of the product — after reading the reports, can he not pick up the phone and check with his colleagues whether the Department of Government Services, on behalf of various government agencies, has in fact tendered for the chemical. If they have in fact placed tenders, does the Minister not feel that only one phone call would do the advice and get the message across to his colleagues and to the departments that there is the intent of his department to recommend to Cabinet to ban this very chemical, that they should not even be ordering this chemical this year, let alone use the chemical that we recommended should be shipped back to the distributors on Friday.

That's the action that he gave us the impression he was going to undertake, that he would in fact see what stocks were available. He gave us the impression that, look, he would be in a more difficult position if he in fact would not use the chemical that was already in stock rather than trying to find a place to dispose of it, that may be a greater problem. That's what he indicated to us on Friday. It gave the impression that he was very firm in his position.

Is the Minister now denying that the government has not placed tenders for the purchase of the chemical? If they have, what is he intending to do about it?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** As I told my honourable friend, I don't know whether the departments have placed tenders. That's the reason I sent out the communication. That is the reason I am asking them, to get that information.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, surely there must be a much easier or simpler method than writing a letter to a colleague whom he sits with in Cabinet to ask him whether his department is in fact tendering for the product, and if the department is in fact tendering for the product, is the Minister prepared to say, No, in terms of the controversy that is here, we are not prepared to use it. Recall your tenders and stop the purchasing of this product. Is the Minister prepared to do that?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The Minister has, in his communication with the department, has already advised them not to place any further orders until the matter has been decided upon.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister indicating now that the present calls for tender will be rescinded and there will be no further purchase of the product, other than what the Minister gave us on Friday? The Minister told us on Friday that he would look at the stocks that were presently there and see what action he would take on what was in stock. Today he is moving even away from that position. He is already saying that there shall not be, or may not be any more tenders beyond what is already called for. Or is that what the Minister is saying?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I have told my honourable friend what I placed in the memo to the Ministers, and I have asked them to provide me with certain information regarding their intentions. I have asked them, if they have not placed orders, to withhold orders until the matter has been decided upon.

**MR. URUSKI:** Maybe I misunderstood the Minister. I just want to understand him quite clearly. Is the Minister telling us that there will be no tenders for any products of 2,4,5-T that we have discussed, any purchases made by the government at the present time?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I'm not sure yet, and I won't be sure until I have replies from the various departments as to whether or not those tenders have been placed already, or have they been received, or have they yet to go in. That's the information that I'm seeking.

**MR. URUSKI:** Can the Minister give us the assurance then, that in the event that the tenders have been called for and have not been opened, in fact the deadline has not been reached for the opening of the tenders, that the whole process will be aborted, that there will be no tenders called for and there will be no purchases made?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** As I indicated to my honourable friend, a decision, as yet, has not been made on this matter, and when the decision is made, then I will communicate with my honourable friend.

**MR. URUSKI:** Is the Minister then indicating to us, to myself, that he will in fact be purchasing the product and spraying, and using it in the province of Manitoba this year through governmental agencies? Is that what the Minister is telling me?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** My honourable friend is using his own language. I have simply told my honourable friend the action that I have taken, and we're waiting responses from the departments to make a final decision.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it appears that the Minister certainly either is reluctant, has received some kind of marching orders from someone down the line over the weekend, because he certainly has moved away from his original position and the assurances that he gave, as I understood that he

gave on Friday, in my mind in any event, that he would be recommending a ban and that there would be no further purchases made, and he would be reviewing government's position with respect to stocks which may be on hand in government agencies; that was the extent of his investigation, that there would be no further purchases, and upon our urging, he would be reviewing what the governments would do if there were large stocks in any of the governmental agencies that were using them, namely hydro, highways, or water resources and agriculture.

Now he is saying, well, we've called for tenders, we are in effect not sure when we're going to do it, and we may be spraying this year. Well, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the Minister is really waffling on this issue. I thought that he was concerned with the controversy that has surrounded the use of this chemical, I thought he was sincere, and maybe he still is sincere if he clarifies, may be my misimpression that I have gotten from him, but it appears to be that he certainly has waffled on this issue, and he's backed right off. And the reason, I'm not certain what his reason is now. He felt, and he said on Friday, if there is some doubt, he would rather be on the safe side of the issue, and rather be, I think if I recall the impression that he left, was that he would rather be safe than sorry, and that he would not use the chemical involved if there was any danger of its use. And that's the impression that he left. And now it appears that he has no intention of living up to those statements. He intends to move away from what he originally said to going ahead, since some departments have likely called for tenders and the use of that chemical will be continued.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, I can assure my honourable friend that my department will not be ordering any of the chemical.

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

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, dealing with hazardous chemicals, there is one other that has come to my attention that I would like to discuss with the Minister at this time, and it is formaldehyde. It appears there is some evidence of incidents of formaldehyde poisoning. An article appeared in the Saturday issue of the Regina Leader Post dealing with this matter. Formaldehyde poisoning, caused by foam insulation. Foam insulation, Mr. Chairman, in the homes. Now, I realize that at this particular point, in view of the fact that formaldehyde has been used as an insulator for quite some time, that the problem may have reached a level which is beyond this Minister's control, and may perhaps have to involve the Ministers of Health, Labour and others, but be that as it may, it certainly doesn't absolve this Minister from shouldering his share of the responsibility.

To acquaint the Minister with what has been discovered, apparently there was an incident in Saskatoon of formaldehyde poisoning. A family was forced to leave its home because three children, ages nine, six and three, were entered hospital more than 50 times due to exposure to formaldehyde fumes from the insulation. And the article goes on to

state that among the problems resulting from formaldehyde poisoning are respiratory distress, extreme swelling of lymph nodes, skin rashes that can cover the whole body, birth defects, cancer, irritation of the eyes, nose and throat, headaches and nausea. And this apparently happened in a home which is more than 20 years old and insulated last December.

Apparently some of the symptoms reached the point where a doctor suggested taking out some of the really enlarged lymph nodes in the children, and since this exposure to fumes started three or four or five months ago, the children have been taken to the hospital emergency department more than 50 times because of the symptoms. And apparently there is medical evidence to indicate that illnesses of this kind can be attributed to the inhalation of formaldehyde vapour. There has also been another case in Saskatchewan where a similar case was discovered, and that was in a school gymnasium where formaldehyde insulation was used to insulate it, in some community east of the city of Regina.

Now, although it may be true, Mr. Chairman, that at this point there may not have been too many cases of formaldehyde poisoning being uncovered, but that doesn't prove that the problem doesn't exist. It may only indicate that at time we are not aware of it, but that the problem may be of much larger proportions than we know it to be.

This morning, I spoke to an insulating contractor, one who claims he does not use formaldehyde in insulation, but he uses something else, and he tells me that this could happen, it could happen for a number of reasons — (1) improper application, and particularly in the application of formaldehyde in very old homes where there might be cracks and what-not in the walls, and upon contact with air, and I'm not a chemist, and I want to apologize to you Mr. Chairman that I cannot really explain the process that happens in accurate, scientific terms, but anyway, something does occur which does cause the formaldehyde to evaporate, to convert back into a gas and escape into the environment.

Now, this contractor also told me that there is a danger in using old formaldehyde. Whether it causes exactly the same problem or not, I don't know, but he did tell me that the formaldehydes are date stamped, and there is a date beyond which it is not recommended to use it. I want to stress the point that I don't know whether the date limit is for health reasons or for some other reason, but he seems to think that there might be some health factor connected with putting the date deadline on it. And he tells me that it's not uncommon for many contractors to use formaldehyde beyond the prescribed or the set safe useage date that may be stamped on the drum. And usually they are smaller contractors who buy a franchise to go out and insulate homes, and the deal normally is, you buy the equipment, and you buy a certain stock of formaldehyde. And they are, of course, given the assurance by the franchise seller that because of the popularity of the program, because of the fact that governments have recognized the value of insulation from an energy conservation point of view, that the stuff virtually sells itself and if one were to go out knocking on doors this afternoon, by dinner time you will have enough customers to insulate all the homes,

to use up all the entire stock of formaldehyde that you buy with your initial purchase. Of course, it doesn't quite happen that way.

So some of the contractors are stuck with several drums of formaldehyde beyond the date marked on the barrel, and they use it. So he tells me that it may be the use of old formaldehyde which contributes toward this problem.

Now, as I've said, Mr. Chairman, I know that we have not heard of too many cases of formaldehyde poisoning, but that, in itself, doesn't prove that the problem doesn't exist, but it may be that there might be varying degrees of poisoning in the milder form, but the occupants of the homes themselves may not be aware of what their real problem is, and hence aren't doing anything about it. Or in other cases, they may go to a doctor and the presence of formaldehyde in the walls of the home might be the last thing the doctor would think of and might diagnose the ailment somewhat differently, or attribute the symptoms to some other causes, and prescribe a treatment that doesn't really solve the problem.

So hence I would urge the Minister to enquire into this matter to satisfy himself and satisfy the people of Manitoba that, on one of a number of points, either that whatever formaldehyde was used in the insulation of Manitoba homes had been applied in a safe manner and that the occupants of those homes are in no danger of any hazard to their health, or in fact, life, or if the Minister should find that there is some evidence of formaldehyde poisoning or a risk of formaldehyde poisoning, then I would urge the Minister to take the appropriate action to discontinue the use of formaldehyde in the insulation of homes in our province.

The Minister may say that that may be somewhat beyond his scope of authority, that the chemical was federally approved and given its blessings by the federal government, well, in that case then, I would urge the Minister to take the matter up with the federal authorities and do whatever he can to discontinue the use of this chemical.

I want to tell the Minister that if he were to pursue such a course of action, that he certainly would not be alone. Apparently the use of formaldehyde as an insulator has been banned in some of the states of United States of America, a few anyway, and I understand that there are about 14 or 15 others that are considering banning it, which does make it a significant number.

Then I would also want to point out to the Minister, if he is going to give us undertaking that he will do that type of a check to determine whether or not there is any risk to our health being caused by the use of formaldehyde as an insulator, not to overlook other buildings which are high in the formaldehyde content, namely, mobile homes. Apparently formaldehyde based glues are used on plywoods and wood veneers, which by and large constitute 90 percent of the structure of a mobile home. I am advised that formaldehyde based glues are used in large quantities, as one could well imagine, in making a sheet of plywood must be a fair amount of glue that is used in gluing the plies of the woods. There, too, there might be some cases of either defective construction of plywood or whatever, which may lead to formaldehyde poisoning to some degree.

I would urge the Minister himself and perhaps in conjunction with his colleagues, because he might want to involve the Minister of Health in this matter, to check into the matter to see whether there is any significant level of formaldehyde poisoning. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I shouldn't say significant level, because I don't think that any level of poisoning of any kind should be tolerated. I would suggest to the Minister that if he should find even the slightest shred of evidence of formaldehyde poisoning that he should then exercise whatever authority he has to put a stop to the use of this chemical which, on the basis of medical evidence, appears to be poisonous.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, as a result of the publicity, and I'm not sure if my honourable friend missed it last fall, given to this subject, we had a number of people, and we invited people to phone us if they felt that formaldehyde was suspect in any change in their health. We did have a number of calls, about 26 in fact, people called and we tested their homes, and in only 2 of those 26 cases did we find any minor amounts of formaldehyde, and our health authorities indicated to us that they were not considered to be hazardous. In all the other 24 cases, there was no evidence of formaldehyde poisoning, so there were other things that were causing the problems other than urea-formaldehyde.

The matter has been looked at, there is a program. If people feel that there may be a problem, all they have to do is to contact our department and we will have someone out there to test to make sure that there is no problem as a result of the use of formaldehyde insulation.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, I am not convinced that approach or that course of action is really good enough, to simply invite responses from the public, in other words saying, look, there is formaldehyde insulation being used and if any of you are suffering from the following systems or feel that your health might be in some way adversely affected by the presence of formaldehyde insulation in the walls of your home, contact us. Because, in the first place, with some of the people it might be too late, the damage might have reached the stage at which it is irreparable. Secondly, I am not certain that every individual might be able to detect the effect of formaldehyde gas on his system early enough.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister really wanted to satisfy himself that there is no danger in the use of formaldehyde as an insulator, and I want to remind the Minister again that it appears that there are many states that are concerned about it, and I am sure that the respiratory system of the people living in those states is no different from the respiratory system of the people living in Manitoba. Therefore, I would suggest to the Minister that he take a more aggressive approach to the matter to satisfy himself as to the level of formaldehyde poisoning. He knows or his colleague, the Minister in charge of MHRC, could tell him which homes have been insulated. From that point he can determine which homes have been insulated with formaldehyde.

There are various ways and means that the Minister can resort to. He could ask the people, he could ask the contractors, he can get a list of all the

homes that were insulated with formaldehyde, and he could have a check done on those homes, particularly older homes. I am thinking of homes in the core city area, many of them owned by absentee landlords, a lot of them are older homes, not in the best of shape, rented out to people at a very low income level, and those may not always be the people who will be the first in line to come forth and complain of whatever. They are the last ones to speak to the authorities to complain.

The Minister knows which homes they are and do a check, and I am sure that our technology has advanced to the point where a person could do a check of the air within a home to determine the level or the quantity of formaldehyde contained in the air. I think that that would be a more effective initial approach to the problem, rather than just simply saying to the people, it has been drawn to our attention that there might be formaldehyde escaping into the atmosphere of a home, and if any of you think that there might be formaldehyde in your home and that you have been adversely affected, let us know.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would just go briefly through the Environmental Accident Summary and noted the predominance of the environmental accidents in the rural areas, in the northern areas, and the fact that there were very few that were reported in the Winnipeg vicinity. Most of those that were reported in the Winnipeg vicinity were either reported by the Winnipeg Fire Department or by Manitoba Hydro. In other words, there were very few private industry reports of spillages and environmental accidents in Winnipeg. One would naturally assume that there would be more in an industrial area than there would be in a non-industrial area, yet we see quite a few being reported up north, in the rural area, and not so many being reported in Winnipeg.

I would ask the Minister if that would indicate that there might be a failing in the reporting mechanism right now, and if that is one of the reasons for which they are beefing up, so to speak, their reporting mechanisms, or they have directed that they might be beefing up those reporting mechanisms in their upcoming legislation.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No necessarily, Mr. Chairman. There is the possibility and I think the probability that in the rural areas there is a great deal more of the transfer of the material than there is in the city of Winnipeg. What I mean by that, the material is brought in to the Bulk Stations, and from the Bulk Stations it goes out to Service Stations, and then out to individual farms. Each individual farm has a tank of his own, and so, with the number of transfers, one could, I presume, logically expect that there would be more accidents in the rural areas as a result of that.

**MR. COWAN:** Again, a brief perusal of the report would seem to indicate otherwise. Most of the accidents are not transfers, but that they are some vehicular accidents, and one could expect those to occur in the rural areas, but also to occur within the city in that there are also a number of accidents that

are as a result of some sort of reportable incident other than the accident itself. In other words, a vehicular traffic accident is reportable regardless of what is being carried by the vehicle that does have that accident, and so one would assume that perhaps that is why we are getting a preponderous of those sorts of accidents reported here.

I would ask the Minister if he is satisfied that we are getting full reports in regard to spillages and accidents in the city of Winnipeg by private industry?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** One of the reasons why we are bringing in amendments is to ensure that we get a more complete reporting of accidents. I don't think that we anticipate that we are getting a full reporting, either in the rural areas or in the urban areas.

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

**MR. COWAN:** I believe there is enough time to go very briefly into this. I don't know whether we have to go into it in more detail or not, that will remain to be seen.

The Department of the Environment did do a number of studies in regard to the lead pollution emanating from Canadian Bronze last summer. I would ask the Minister if it is intended to continue those sorts of studies this summer, and if so, what mechanisms have been put in place to ensure that they are carried out in what I would hope to be a more satisfactory manner than last summer.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, we are going to continue the program that was done last year, and if I may, I have a summary of the program, if my honourable friend would like me to put in on the record, I will do that. There will be four ambient air monitoring stations located around each of the secondary lead smelters. One ambient air monitoring station will be established at Lord Nelson School; the south air monitoring station around Canadian Bronze Company Limited will be at Weston School; background ambient air monitoring stations will be established at existing NAPS stations, 70118 and 70119. All ambient air monitoring stations will consist of duplicate monitors and sampling frequency will be one 24-hour sample, five days per week.

The 1979 Soil Survey will be repeated in 1980, with sampling to be taken at two-inch depths. Vegetation sampling on vegetable species in the western area and tree foliage at selected sites will be undertaken. Soil sampling will be conducted on transects away from each emission source. A snow survey will be implemented on existing sites. Stack sampling at each emission source will be conducted.

**MR. COWAN:** I would ask the Minister, if in his opinion, the results of soil sampling that were compiled by the department last year represented a hazard to persons in the area, and if the results of vegetation sampling represented a specific hazard to those who might be growing gardens in the area and eating the food from those gardens. I bring this to the Minister's attention, as I have in the past, because last summer I made a foot-trip through that area and noticed that some houses in very close proximity to the Canadian Bronze Smelter were indeed growing gardens in the back, and therefore

might be producing food vegetation in specific, that was contaminated with lead from the emissions of the plant. I would ask the Minister, if in his opinion, there is necessity of concern on the part of the residents in that area as to their garden produce.

**MR. JORGENSON:** As my honourable friend may be aware, last year we didn't conduct any samples on vegetables, we did on tree foliage, and that is why

## SUPPLY — HEALTH

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 61 of the main estimates, Department of Health, Resolution No. 79, Clause 5, Manitoba Health Services Commission. Item under discussion is (c) Hospital Program—pass. The next item is (d) — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** On Friday last the Minister in his remarks was quite candid. He expressed a concern, a problem, and stated that he didn't have all the answers. Now he suggests that many others if they were candid, would agree with him, feel that if the 690 beds in acute care hospitals were now occupied by either personal care homes or extended treatment patients, if they were all released, these people, if they were all made available for acute care; also if those beds that are closed now, if they were all open and made available; and as well, take into consideration the beds in the rural area, and the acute beds of course that are not occupied because the occupancy is less; he felt that if this was the case, they'd all be filled in no time.

I certainly agree with the Minister, but having said that you can carry this quite far. You could reduce them by another 500 and say, well if these beds were available they'll all be filled, that is true. So I think that what we need is leadership in the long-range policy of this government, which it is not doing at this time. That is to determine — I was going to say, once and for all — not once and for all, because it has to be, I think, considered every year, every so often it has to be continually looked at. But I think it has to be determined by the experts, and the guidelines, and by taking into consideration the beds available in other jurisdictions, then we must decide how many acute beds we will have, and then we should go from there.

Now the Minister on one hand is saying — what he is saying is true, that they would be filled, but it seems quite obvious that the Minister is not too unhappy about this situation, to see these beds there. There is no doubt that by the actions of the government it will lead to this also, because there is no personal care beds built, or very few. Some were authorized, but they haven't been built. There's a large waiting list so there'll be people there, and then with the budget allowed to the hospital, it is certainly not keeping up with inflation, so that would mean that there would be a tendency to close beds. The different hospitals have to work within a budget that they can't possibly live with, so they are going to try to do anything, in fact close beds at times. Anybody

we are doing it on vegetables this year, to get a better reading on that. With respect to the soil samples that were undertaken, our medical people tell us there is no serious hazard. There is no question that the presence is there, but at this point they don't consider it to be a hazard.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think I will call it 4:30. I am leaving the Chair for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m.

that understands the situation knows that it is much easier when you are short-staffed to have people that are exactly personal care patients and you can get away with lower staff. That is exactly what is being done.

I think that the Minister should determine how many acute beds we are going to have and go from there. The Minister is saying or hinting anyway that there might be too many, but that is the trouble — I have been accused many times by the Minister and members of the government of wanting confrontation. I think I am starting to understand now that there is no confrontation because the Minister is on the side of everybody, and there is no decision made, there are no policies announced. Sometimes you have to say no, sometimes you have to be firm when you have done all the research and when it is arrived at the policy or a number or something that will be done, it should be announced, and then I don't consider that confrontation. At least the people would know where they would stand.

The Minister on one hand is saying that there are too many of them and then I was reading the other day, looking at some of the clippings, and there is one from The Tribune of February 29th, 1980, and the heading was Concordia Says Facility Plugged and I am not going to read the whole thing, but it says here, Hospital staff and administrators complained about the overcrowding last summer to Health Minister Bud Sherman and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Both admit. . . — that is the hospital and the Minister — . . . both admitted Concordia problems and said the hospital needs another 160 beds for fundamental primary care. If the Minister, on one hand, who can't say no, who is encouraging people, who wants to be on every side of the situation, that is easy, that is easy to be popular like that, but that is not leadership, and that is not announcing any kind of a policy. If on one hand you say that you have too many beds, and then you are happy and the problem would be helped when Seven Oaks opens, or then you admit or you seem to admit, according to the report, that more beds are needed, so we have to make up our minds. We are not going to start building more beds at acute hospitals, it doesn't make sense. At Concordia, for instance, if there is 900 or 690 beds in present general hospitals or acute hospitals that are occupied by somebody else.

I kind of suspect that this is exactly the way the government wants it, it saves money, it is all backing up in the system. The long list of waiting people in the personal care beds, no construction of personal care beds, the short staff because of block funding — you know that is another thing, the Minister keeps on saying that it is block funding and they'll determine, but the least little thing he is going to tell us, well, I am not satisfied with this, I am going to do

this, I am going to do that, I give you my personal commitment, my assurance. It doesn't mean a damn thing, Mr. Chairman. If it is block funding then he has no business interfering, they are doing their best, they are telling him that they can't live with a budget that doesn't even keep up with inflation.

I am sure that this case could be made so easily, when the first year there was an increase of 2.9 percent, which is ridiculous. Mind you, again that wasn't the whole picture, because they were fooling around with the base line, with the line, that was changed, I don't why, I don't know how you can get away with that. Last year and this year they are talking about 8 percent, when the wages are more than that. Just wait, Mr. Chairman, they are negotiating on different contracts now, different wage agreements and it is going to be more than 8 percent, when the nurses are finished and when everybody else is finished, it is going to be a lot more than that, Mr. Chairman.

The case is if the Minister says it is block funding, then he shouldn't interfere with them. If they can't live by it, it is no use saying, well, I will make sure. If the government is responsible they shouldn't try to blame the hospitals, Mr. Chairman.

We have had a situation that has created exactly these problems. The Minister talked about problems and he said, I haven't got the answer and I sympathize with the Minister, except that many of these problems were brought up because of his actions. He stood up here in this House last Friday and told us that the nurses are very happy, that there is no problem as far as the morale is concerned. That is not what they tell us. Remember the first year the then President of MARN asked to see us, it wasn't the other way around, they asked to see us, and they told us that the morale had never been that low. The Minister was told at the time he inherited a surplus of nurses and the conditions were so bad that if somebody was sick they weren't replaced, they were short-staffed; if somebody was away on a maternity leave, they wouldn't be replaced, and they cut the staff, and the nurses had to do all kinds of work, not only what they were trained for. There was a panic in the nursing profession at this time, they were looking for jobs, they had to leave the province, they were chased out of this province, because of being short-staffed.

All of sudden, we are saying now we are going ahead. We are not looking back, I mean this has to be brought up, because the Minister asked for these problems, but now, of course, we sympathize with him, and of course we should do everything possible to get some nurses back. If the Minister wants to say that we are going to try to get more of the male nurses, if possible, fine, that was done before. There were very few of them, because for some reason or other it was this business of the female was a second-class citizen, they didn't need pay, they were all going to be dedicated to that, and the pay didn't mean a thing, and at one time, of course, there was cheap labour by taking the — the students were working on even broken shifts at night and so on — they were subsidizing the hospitals as far as I am concerned. It is not the same thing and now they are in the driver's seat, Mr. Chairman, and just wait until this contract comes in, what they are going to ask for, because you can't make a statement and

deplore the fact that the doctors are leaving. Supply and demand — we have created the short supply and now the demand is there, and it is going to cost us a pretty penny, Mr. Chairman.

The situation was that we try to save. The Minister repeatedly stated when challenged that no, this department was well administered, there was good staff and the programs were good, there wasn't one program that was not, but the Minister says, well, it is the overall, the problem was the overall, that the past government left us, we inherited from them a mish-mash, a bad administration. Well, there was at least one-third of the total budget that was in this department and if this department wasn't badly administered, why try to save money in this department now to pay for the mistake, if that is the case, to pay for something that was wrong in other areas, and to withhold money. There was never as much money received from Ottawa as we have received now, and the Minister can say what he wants. The government did withhold — I am not talking about legally that they didn't have the rights — but they held back the money.

The Minister misleads, wants to mislead, and I think he misled the Hall Commission on that too, because he is talking the overall in Health. We are comparing, we are talking about at no time did the federal government accept the cost or share in the cost of, for instance, personal care home, I am not talking about welfare recipients for the universal program that we had or for pharmacare or for the dentists. This is not done in home care. This has never been paid by the government. And when we are talking about money that was held back and the Minister is saying now that yes they put it in health, in all these problems that are the responsibility or have been the responsibility of the provincial government and the fact that the only responsibility of the federal government was in the program that they started themselves, that's hospitalization and medicare. We'll have occasion to talk about that and see the reduction and see the money that was withheld.

The money was coming in, it was withheld to try to reduce the debt and of course it wasn't such a success because every man, woman, and child now owes 800 more than they did when this government came into office. All the scandals that we've heard and all that would have been right. I guess the Minister meant it when he said cost first and need after. If you are going to say that this department is well run, the programs are good; during the campaign of the election, the Conservative government said that they will keep on with the program and now these programs are suffering. The Minister will always deny that. We can always argue. But doesn't make sense if things were well administered when you are going to increase a budget by 2.9 percent that somebody is going to suffer? Either it was a real scandal and money was thrown out of the window, money was thrown out in this department; if they can now live with an increase of 2.9, we are not keeping up with the inflation.

There has been suffering all over, Mr. Chairman, and this has been this Minister, I doubt his credibility now. We've always had trouble with him because he appears to be so sincere and so honest but he has been misleading and I say that he is purposely

misleading the public in many many instances, Mr. Chairman. For instance, I would like to find out, I would like this as a question that I now ask the Minister; I would like him to refer the statement of last year where it said 15 million more in health care capital projects will be spent. I'd like him to give us a progressive report of all those that were announced and tell us how much money was spent that year. And now this year on February 29th, there was another press release, 50 million for hospital and personal care homes, and it states that this year this money will be spent. There again, I want the Minister to be candid, as he was last Friday, and tell us how much they expect to spend this year because that is for the complete program, complete capital costs — all those that were announced. Some of them last year we found out that weren't built; that some of things weren't built and of course in the private sector also. The private sector, well that again is passing the buck. You make an announcement that you've approved so many beds. This is a big story in the paper that's used time and time again, not one single bed has been built.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a position; we had less beds than we have now. The Minister closed some as soon as he came to office which was probably a good — as I said previously I can't fault him for that. That was quite a decision to make but it certainly was wrong to close them when you are freezing construction of personal care beds. If he hadn't had these beds that were built we'd be in more trouble now in the hospitals and we'd have even less personal care beds if we hadn't had Tache Hospital and some of these other areas. I remember when I was on the opposite side of the House, the Minister, it was Frank Johnston, the Minister was saying that you have to treat the older people, try to get them to stay in their community and so on.

One of the problems, it's another problem, when the Minister closed these beds he filled the Tache Hospital for instance with those people and that was supposed to cover an area of the city that had no personal care beds or very few on that side of the river but they come from all over the place because they were closed in some areas and some of the other people then are on the waiting list because that is — I think if at all possible it is important to keep these people with their own, their culture, their language, their religion. It is even more so, more important when you are older. A lot of people who might be religious would wish to be in a place where they can at least be served and be able to practice their religion in their last few remaining years and that unfortunately is a real mishmash now because there are so many on the waiting list and there are so very few beds.

The Minister also criticized Quebec because they designated beds and he said that was easy, just by one act. That's not bad in itself. Once you determine how many beds you are going to have, it's not the end of the world. In fact it has been demonstrated and I tried to demonstrate it today, that you can run a hospital with lower staff if you had some of these people. If we had too many beds, I'm not saying we had, I mean too many acute beds, if we have too many of them, when it's determined what we are going to go with and the government has the mandate and the right to determine that, well let it

be known to the public, to the medical profession and others, and then if we have some of these beds in the hospitals, there's too many, instead of closing them and leaving the place empty, there is nothing wrong in having a few personal care beds. You can designate some. That in itself is not wrong once you determine what you are going to do and once you know where you are going. This was done in an area and in other areas and it took a hell of a lot of guts. It was in Ontario where the then Minister of Health, Mr. Frank Miller closed hospitals, especially in the rural area. Mind you he had to back down and it nearly killed him and I think he had heart attack not long after that. That's going to be difficult and politically it might be practically impossible but at least you don't start playing politics like was done in Lundar this time and build a hospital and give them more when you are talking about such a restraint and priorities and you neglect a place like Mount Carmel and so on that you'll be able to give twice the number of beds that should be needed; strictly a partisan decision at Lundar, Mr. Chairman.

There is nothing wrong. There are different ways of doing that. You can do like Quebec and say some of these beds will be personal care beds, or will be other beds instead of building another place and having this place empty, but I am not suggesting that this should be done if we need some beds. Right now if you read the different press releases and the statement of the Minister, you don't know what the government thinks.

On one hand they are saying there's too many. It's quite generous even if you take into consideration those beds that are now occupied by other patients or those that are closed or those that are just not used in rural Manitoba, but on the other hand when there's somebody there, they'll want to hear something. You tell the people of Concordia, yes you need another 120 beds for acute reasons.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask — well the question, I hope that the Minister will prepare something on, this capital program — he could I guess in a strict sense of the word, he could just decide to give me the one on hospitals because we passed personal care homes, but then I served notice on him that I'll ask that during the Minister's salary. It would be easier I think to come up with all the programs that were announced in different years that those that are held back — I'm not blaming the Minister for all of them. I think Winnipegosis was approved quite a while ago but they came in too high and they were sent back and they were asked to bring in another plan, to stay within the limit or the guidelines, but I still want to know how much money had been spent and what has been done.

I have other questions that I want to ask here, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know if the rationale for the difference of the 8 percent increase in the 1980 funding of hospital and personal care homes, and is the 12 percent overall . . . Now, I am not sure, I think I have the answer. The answer might be that then there are new ones coming onstream and so on and that would be the reason why you have a 12 percent increase but only 8 percent average for the others.

The rationale also for the 8 percent approval, considering the budget approval, considering the supplies such as X-rays, utilities, an increase from 10

to 20 on wages contracts, I would like to know how the Minister can really justify 8 percent and how he can justify 2.9 percent. We have never got this explanation in the last three years.

Also, the Construction, the big construction of a 130 million Health Sciences project was to start and I stated that that could take years and that doesn't mean that much. In the first phase, how much has been committed and has it gone to tender? There seems to be a delay. Why is there a delay at this time and when is that going to be finished, Mr. Chairman?

I would like to know also the number of nursing students who graduated in 1976, 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979, and what is projected for 1980? I think the Minister gave us part of that information. It seems quite odd to me, because the nurses were treated in the lowering of the budget, the increase in budget not even to keep up with inflation, that we are paying for it now, Mr. Chairman.

I guess that I have enough questions for now, Mr. Chairman. I will wait for the reply.

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

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I will try to deal with them as best I can. I may have to ask him to repeat a couple of the questions that he asked at the conclusion of his remarks, but I think I got most of them.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface suggests that the government has no plans and no direction defined in terms of health care needs and objectives in the organized future. I want to assure him that that is most emphatically not the case. I think I have stated my priorities and my colleagues' priorities on a number of occasions. Admittedly, while there is a field that includes a wide range of priority choices for this government, just as it did for the previous government, and all previous governments, it is nevertheless a field which can be prioritized and if one is to achieve any progressive success and achievement, it must be prioritized. There will always be differences in priority choices, so that I don't look for necessarily endorsement of the priorities that we have identified and chosen to pursue, but the priorities have been made and we have moved on them as quickly as we could in the limited time — and I say limited time because two and a half years in the health field is a limited time — in the limited time that has been available thus far.

I made no bones about the fact, and have never avoided the fact that my number one priority in coming into office, after the obvious priority of attempting to achieve a grasp of as much of the system as possible in a complex system such as this, my number one priority, given the principle that we all subscribe to that we want the best general level of health care for all Manitobans that we can possibly achieve; given that, I have always made it very clear that my number one priority was redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre. That is not new. I am not suggesting that these were spectacular new inventions necessarily, but they were objectives. The priorities that I cited then and I am

citing now were and are objectives that must be clearly defined and agreed upon if one is to move toward them. Whether they are new or not is another question entirely.

My first priority was and is regeneration of the Health Sciences Centre because I believe that as the Health Sciences Centre goes, so goes health care in Manitoba. I do not offer that as a cliché. I think that we have to recognize the importance of the Health Sciences Centre as the central focus of our health care system in that it is not only the largest hospital in Manitoba — and it is by the way the largest hospital in western Canada and really one of the largest hospitals on this continent — but not only is it the largest hospital in Manitoba but it is our major referral centre, our major tertiary care centre. It is one of our two major research hospitals. It is one of our two major teaching hospitals. It simply stands to reason that an enormous amount of our quality and competence and capacity in terms of delivering health care to Manitobans rests on the viability, the efficiency, the technology and the continuing improvement in delivery capacity of the Health Sciences Centre. Unless anyone should have the mistaken illusion that that represents a narrow focus that ignores much of Manitoba while concentrating on Winnipeg, I know that my honourable friend from St. Boniface agrees with me that that is not the case. One-third of the patient load at the Health Sciences Centre, Mr. Chairman, consistently is from points in Manitoba other than Winnipeg. And when one considers the teaching and research capabilities that are maintained at the Health Sciences Centre, I think one can appreciate that we are talking here about a service for all Manitobans, not just for Winnipeg. If it were not so, I would not promote the Health Sciences Centre to the degree that I do because I don't believe I am the Minister of Health for Winnipeg; I believe it is my privilege to be the Minister of Health for all of the Manitoba. The Health Sciences Centre is the centre of that Manitoba spectrum.

I have made no bones about the fact that a second priority of mine was to attempt to develop what I perceive as a need for a better climate for medical practice in Manitoba. —(Interjection)— Including nurses. I know that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and I will have some differences of opinion on that point, but one is entitled to one's opinion. My perception was that a major job needed to be done. It is difficult to do in the context of the highly valuable and highly necessary medicare system that we have, but let's face facts, it is difficult to do at the level of the general practitioner, within the context of that system, and that system must be maintained and reinforced at all costs and will be, as long as I am Minister and the doctors know that, to attempt to build a better climate for medical practice here in Manitoba and for health care, and that includes, of course, the other health professions and health occupations.

But one, I think, in dealing with priorities, again must be consistent, and the first requirement, Sir, was one which lay in the area of the physician, of the doctor himself or herself. Obviously, we face major challenges now with respect to the nursing profession, but the first identified horizon on which I

felt I had to move and wanted to move was that horizon involving the medical practitioners, the doctors. I think we have made considerable headway there. I don't wish to be immodest about it, because the headway that I think we've been able to make has been headway that has resulted from the co-operation of a great many people, and I'm very grateful for that co-operation. But I think it should be recognized that we have got, at the present time, a two-year agreement with the medical association which I think, in general terms, has been accepted by them as being reasonably good from their point of view. I think it's extremely good from the point of view of Manitoba health consumers.

It has protected the medicare system that we are committed to protect, it has recognized the difficulties of practice in the north and remote parts of Manitoba, it has recognized the fact that in a number of specialties and procedures, our physicians and surgeons had fallen behind the income-earning levels in comparable disciplines achieved by their counterparts in other jurisdictions; and it has, at the same time, acknowledged what I've often said I feel is important to acknowledge, their entitlement to a very good, if not an excellent level of compensation for the years of training that they put in and the years of service that they subsequently put in and for the important role that they play in the health care system generally.

We are in a highly competitive market, obviously, where doctors, where medical practitioners are concerned, Mr. Chairman. And we are not alone in trying to address the dynamics of that competition. I don't live in a vacuum, as Minister of Health, any more than my predecessor did. I have the opportunity to be in fairly close contact with my counterparts in other provinces, and also due to my position on a Canadian-U.S. joint legislative committee, I have very helpful contact with health legislators and health commissioners in the United States, and this is an extremely competitive field.

The competition to keep and retain your doctors — there are some jurisdictions that of course don't suffer from the competition, they benefit from it, as a result of external factors — but by and large, most provinces in Canada and a good many states in the United States are finding it necessary to face up to this severe competition.

I noted in the recent medical journal that the state of Illinois, and this is only one example, it occurs all the time, the state of Illinois retains only one-third of the graduates of their medical school. Two-thirds of them leave Illinois almost immediately within the time of their graduation. We, probably over the long haul, are in the same position in Manitoba if one looks at our graduates over the long haul. Our immediate retention rate is fairly good, it's about two-thirds of our medical graduates who stay in Manitoba, but if you measure it about ten years down the road, we, like many many other jurisdictions in North America, like many many other provinces in Canada, probably have lost a further one-third who have been replaced by other practitioners coming into the province.

I found it interesting, I took no pleasure in it, but I found it interesting that the state of Illinois, for example, which is not an impoverished state, by any means, and which contains at least one, and in fact more than one major urban centre with all the

superficial attractions that go now with urban living, is having that kind of difficulty in retaining its doctors and in withstanding the blandishments of the Florida's and the Arizona's and the Southern California's. So that, I always felt, was a major priority, and I believe we've made some progress in that area.

I wanted a better status for the Children's Hospital at the Health Sciences Centre, formerly the Children's Centre, formerly the Children's Hospital. Now the Children's Hospital again. What's in a name? Well, there's a fair amount in a name in terms of morale and in terms of pride. I think that's demonstrated in many walks of life, I think we all take pride in the designation MLA after our names; I think that members of the Armed Forces have demonstrated what pride they take in their particular individual units; I think that this is an obvious feature of extreme importance in the athletic world; it's demonstrated everywhere. There's a great deal in the name of Children's Hospital. That's one step that's been taken over there, but there are some other steps being taken in that connection. I felt that I inherited a situation in which there was a very severe problem, a morale problem at Children's that desperately needed to be rectified.

Another priority that I identified from the very first day that I was asked either by the media, or in the House, was the urgent need for more psychiatric beds and facilities in Manitoba generally, but particularly in metropolitan Winnipeg. I know that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface had plans in place to establish a juvenile psychiatric facility, which I think was to be located on the campus of the Health Sciences Centre, and I give him credit for that. I think that is, was, and continues to be a very necessary unit and component in our health care spectrum which is missing at the present time, and that's why I was pleased to be able to announce that that is approved in our current capital program, and we have a search committee looking for a site at the present time.

But we have moved on that need for psychiatric beds and facilities, and I take particular pride, Mr. Chairman, in a ceremony which I was very pleased to participate in a week or ten days ago when we opened the new emergency psychiatric unit at the Health Sciences Centre. You know, you can spend a lot of time in our job here, the Member for St. Boniface and the Member for Seven Oaks, when they were Ministers of Health, and in my job, and you feel that in many ways that you're trying to grope your way down alleys and avenues of frustration and complexity, not just frustration, but enormous complexity, and enormously competitive self-interest groups, and not achieve very much. But once in a while you do get something achieved that is really tangible and measurable and that was a great achievement. We started, Mr. Reg Edwards, the Executive Director of the Health Services Commission, the Chairman of the Board of the Health Sciences Centre of the day, who was Mr. Bill Gardner and my Acting Deputy Minister, Dr. George Johnson and I started on a hot night in July 1978, in response to situations at the Health Sciences Centre which were very serious, to put in place an emergency psychiatric unit that could accommodate people off the street and save potential suicides, and

it took some considerable time, effort, cajolery and diplomacy and pressure, as well as some dollars, but we've got it. And that's in place.

That, added to the McEwen residence on the St. Boniface Hospital site, and to the psychiatric beds that are scheduled for Seven Oaks Hospital and to the new psychiatric unit redevelopment at the Health Sciences Centre, will produce major new achievements and major new service capacity in this very important field. And as I have said, we are looking for the site now for the juvenile psychiatric facility, which would be about a 25-bed hospital for inpatients and chronic juvenile psychiatrics. That was a major priority.

New insured programs under the Manitoba Health Services Commission have been a major priority, including the co-insurance for mastectomy patients, requiring breast prosthesis, and including the hearing aids for children, and including this year, the rheumatology and immunology and cleft palate and lip programs and the high-risk newborn transport program, which we announced in the opening statement that I made on my estimates, and also during the Throne Speech debate. Those are all programs and needs that I, through the help of those who counsel me and give me valuable advice, identified as major priorities.

Now, more personal care beds and more extended care beds are also major priorities, and we have approved, as I have said, and I won't repeat it to the point of exhausting members opposite, we have approved 397 non-prop personal care beds since we came into office, and all of them are in the process of construction right now. They are either in the design or the actual physical construction stage, and some of them, three of them, will be opening this year. As members know, we have also approved 314 in the non-prop sector, but I don't want to revive that debate. We're probably not through with it yet, we'll probably be dealing with it on my salary, but in combination, that would add 700 personal care beds to the spectrum within the next two years, in terms of physical completion.

Now, we need extended care beds, we're trying to close a deal with the legion and the federal government on Deer Lodge, and we certainly recognize the decision and will be honouring the decision that will find 120 new extended care beds in the new Seven Oaks Hospital. Also, in the reconfiguration that we're going through at the Health Sciences Centre, there will, I believe, be opportunities for extended care beds there, and we have, at least on the middle burner, if not right on the front burner, the whole question of regeneration of the Misericordia Hospital, which would include extended care beds.

So those are the — and there are many other priorities, obviously, but those are the initial priorities that we have attempted to move on, and throughout all this, the Health Services Commission has been under request from treasury board and from my office to produce a ten-year overview of demographic projections of Manitoba society, and health care and health bed and categorical bed type needs to meet those changing age demographics. So there is a considerable amount of concerted, purposeful planning going on in terms of identifying the directions and the pathways for us and moving

us along those pathways. Whether it has been apparent to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface or not, it is there, Sir.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface says that the Minister says that I am going to do this and I am going to do that, and I make commitments but they don't mean anything because we haven't followed through on any of those commitments. I disagree very sharply with that, I think the record demonstrates otherwise. I won't recap the priority items that I have identified, but we have moved on a great many of them, and one of the biggest was that first one.

And this leads into another question that he asked me, the question of the regeneration of the Health Sciences Centre. That, Sir, or part of that is part of the 200 million capital commitment in health facility construction that this government has made in two and half years, and that total of dollars in capital construction of health facilities for that period of time is unprecedented in Manitoba's history. That 200 million includes the first phase redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre, which is a 75.6 million project. In total, the 10-year redevelopment plan, all of which has been approved in terms of modular construction and phasing, amounts to 138 million, and the first phase of it which is approximately a 5-year phase, accounts of 75.6 million of that, which is included in this 200 million of capital commitment which we've undertaken and given in the last two and half years.

He asked me how much we've spent in capital in 1979-80 and how much will be spent in 1980-81. I can tell him, Sir, that the capital program that we approved in 1978-79 amounted to about — just a minute, Mr. Chairman. The capital program that was announced in 1978-79, that included . . .

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That included our approval of the Seven Oaks Hospital, which was a 32.4 million commitment, but the capital program approved for that year was approximately 55 million, 55.6 million. The capital program approved in the following year, which was 1979-80 and included the first phase redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre amounted to 97.2 million. Then there was slightly over 50 million approved this year. So we are looking at 1978-79 approximately 55.6 million which included Seven Oaks; 1979-80, 97.2 million which included first phase redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre of 75.6 million, and then slightly over 50 million approved this year, 1980-81 which accounts for the 200 million program in total.

The honourable member asked me how much we have actually spent in each of those years. I can calculate that, but I will have to do that while he or the next individual member of the opposition is speaking, because I have to take the figures off the spread sheets which show the total cost of the projects, the amounts spent in each of those years and the amount that remains to be spent in subsequent years. But there have been substantial millions, for example this year at the Health Sciences Centre in that 75 million redevelopment phase one,

Mr. Chairman, 10 million of cash flow construction financing will be spent, and that is independent of some of the other things that are going on at the Health Sciences Centre. For example, the service distribution of 3.2 million; the interim redevelopment of the Women's Centre, a 2 million project; those are not included in the 75 million redevelopment operation of which 10 million will be spent this year.

One other point in the two minutes remaining to me, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface said that there were fewer personal care beds now in Manitoba than when we came into office. I noted a reference to that in a newspaper story the other day too, and that is not correct, Sir. There has been some misunderstanding or faulty communication of information and I don't know who is at fault, it might well be me, but that is not correct.

There are fewer personal care beds in Manitoba at the moment than there were a few months ago because of the closure of the Canadian National Institute for The Blind, which was 32 beds, and the Greenland Home in southeastern Manitoba which was partially destroyed by a tornado and which hasn't rebuilt yet; that took 22 beds out, so that where we a few months ago had 7,534 beds, if you take the 32 out of the CNIB and the 22 out of Greenland for 54, it reduces the total in service at the moment to 7,480. The new St. Joseph's Residence is coming onstream any day now in northwest Winnipeg. It's due to open within the next few days. Pilot Mound will open this year, and Flin Flon will open this year and in total that will add a net of 64 beds to the spectrum. It will add a gross of 158, because St. Joseph's is 104 beds but replacing the old St. Joseph's with 94 beds.

But, Sir, just for the record, the figures in December 1976, personal care beds in Manitoba totalled 7,260; in 1977, 7,336; in 1978, this is December 1978, 7,532; March 1980, 7,534, which drops as I say on the final reconciliation to 7,480 because of those closures. So I don't want that left on the record, Mr. Chairman. There are more personal care beds now, and there have been each year, than there were in preceding years, but we did take 194 beds out of service when we closed or phased down those proprietary-operated homes in the Fort Rouge area of Winnipeg and in Portage la Prairie in the winter of 1977-78.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his words. I can't say answers, because he didn't answer too many of my questions. He did at the very end, made a statement about the beds, but he didn't answer the questions, but that will come.

I found the words of the Minister quite interesting. I found that he was reaching quite a bit. He evaded the problems and the questions that I asked him in certain areas, and he was arguing with himself, Mr. Chairman. I listed as priority — first he said he had to do something about the Health Sciences Centre. There is no debate there; we were doing exactly that. We had brought in somebody that looked at the Commission; that looked at the setup there; the

Clarkson-Vayda report that I am sure is still being used. We made some announcement and then we left it. At times we were accused of trying to steamroll everything, not to take the people into consideration the way you'd planned, and of having this confrontation. We brought this board and they had their battles. It was quite difficult to get all these people together, and we said give us your priority, exactly what the Minister said. So he is just one or two years ahead of what we were. There is no doubt that every time there is a change of government, certain policies have been determined and they are carried on. If the Minister wants to take credit for that, fine, but let's not put it in a situation — in fairness, the Minister said they didn't say that this was a new thrust. It wasn't, and it shouldn't be something that a new government initiated, because there is no problem there at all. There is no discussion at all.

Then the Minister talked about the better climate. There hasn't been any improvement, in fact it's gone down. There wasn't one bit of legislation that was brought in while we were there legislating in medicare, not one change at all. The confrontation was a group of people who do not share our policies, or some of them anyway, for many reasons. Even some outside and predominantly those outside of the health care, the tax, and the situation; the high tax maybe the higher tax that we have and so on. Now in that the Minister and the government has been a complete failure. We waited seven days to sign a contract, or the MMA waited seven days and then they called a meeting. The Minister waited six or seven months, and they were criticizing him but they didn't dare say it too loud, because where could they go? Where are they going to go after criticizing the socialist government.

I'm ready to admit that the Minister is right, that there's other jurisdictions that the Minister — the doctors are educated here and they leave. I tried to say that on the other side, but no, nobody would listen. We were chasing them out of Manitoba. There are more doctors that have left now than in those days. Some have come back because they realized that money wasn't everything. But where the failure has been, is that it is not contrary to what a lot of people think as a group. They are certainly ahead of many other groups and they are not that greedy; individual ones, some of them are. But what they don't like is the climate to work, and this was told to me many times in the last few years. Some of them were leaving because they couldn't stand it because of the reducing of the budget, or not the increase — well actually it was a reduction because we weren't keeping up with the inflation business. These are some of the things that they didn't like. They couldn't work here, it was these conditions.

The Minister said that some specialties — well there was an adjustment. That was done continually. There's a committee at the Manitoba Health Services Commission that worked, that they want to do it themselves. The MMA wanted to do it themselves and any recommendations that they've done we've gone along with them. It's not something new.

Now the Minister in one thing — you could say he pulled a fast one. He said there was going to be an increase of 6 percent, but after we've given a million dollars or two million dollars to adjust that. It was an

overall increase of 8 percent, and that was the first question the day that he made that statement in the House. I asked him what the total was, I compiled it and got the figures and it was 8 something percent. So there is nothing new in that at all. Now there was an advisory committee at the commission that we set up. We tried to work with them, unfortunately we were there at the time that the control came in. Another thing, I don't see where we had offered 14 percent in one year for catch-up and then the control came in. And I don't see the things that we were fighting about like, no contracting out, no hiring out. I don't recall the Minister saying that they gave that to the MMA. I'm sure he wasn't, but like the Minister said, we could argue forever on that.

But the climate is worse than it has ever been. Not only with the doctors, but with the nurses, with the staff at the hospitals, and everybody counts. There is not only one profession in that, there's all kinds of them, and you need the co-operation of all of them.

The Minister said that he has worked with other provinces —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon. All right, well then we should not put all our eggs in one basket and worry about a privileged class in society, we should worry about all of them. This is what we were doing and this is where the present government is weak.

The Minister said that he has worked with other provinces, that they meet, and that is true. I saw a report where the Ministers themselves — and I didn't see anybody wanting to divorce themselves from that statement — they wanted to go further in this thing, to increase the participation, if anything, in this case. I don't see that has been done.

The Minister said a better status for the children. I don't know if he means by that the changing, going back to the old system at the Health Sciences Centre, which might have some good points, I don't know. It was something that I inherited; it was working well. It was getting the people in the health field to work together. Mind you, we saw that no matter what, people are fighting for themselves and it is always difficult. If they don't want to do it and the government asks to do it, then it's confrontation. When you try to get these people and say work together, there is some type of block funding, give us your priorities, they had problems. The MMA had problems when we asked them to give some advice because there were internal politics, and the Minister knows that. If you work with them, then, you know, things aren't moving because of their internal politics, and if you do it yourself, well then there is confrontation and you know better than anybody else, when you try to run everything yourself.

Psychiatric beds — the Minister did recognize that we had a place — now he is saying he is exactly at the position we were in 1976, that he has a committee. He has got the approval; we had the approval during the session for some of the money anyway, during the estimates. There's a search committee that is going to try to find a place and it has been very difficult, so we are back in the same situation. I am not criticizing the Minister; I know it's a difficult thing. There is no fight there concerning some of the things that we have done. The McEwen, that's something new, especially as McEwen. But the concept was going ahead or it wasn't. The Minister said, well, this was going on, that it was being

developed. I had a meeting with the people at St. Boniface Hospital and I told them to go ahead. I don't know if we received that just at the end or if it was just before the election, and nothing was done. You know, the Minister is advancing on that but it's not something new, it's some of the priorities . . .

I didn't say he had no priorities. I said that he is in favor of everything. He is going to do everything but nothing — not nothing — but very little is done. He said that the there has been the largest commitment ever in this province. That's true; it is easy to make commitments for 10 years, for five years, and the first phase is 75,000 and that's going to be for five years, I think the Minister said, and so on. But what is being done? Those things were being done anyway, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister talked about these hot days when they were working. Well, I'm not going to comment on that. I think we all work during hot days.

He talked about the new programs, Hearing Aids, Cleft Palates. This was a better organized program, maybe, but the work was being done and the needs were met, because we had one of the best dentists that we can have, if not the best, the most qualified for this kind of work, who was doing that out at St. Amant. They were inpatients also. He was working in this area and that was being done. If he is going a little further, fine, but those things were being done. There is not a new thing. The high risk, that was something that the members of the MMA and the urban members couldn't quite agree on at that time and they were developing it and it took time and they asked us to wait because they had to get things approved and we had asked them to get approved, and now it's starting.

I am not criticizing the Minister for this. There is no fight; there is no fight in these priorities at all. This is not what I was talking at all about, Mr. Chairman.

He talks about the beds. Well, I did say that there were less beds and I did take it from the newspaper. I was surprised. My report was approximately what the Minister said about 100 or 200 beds, but it wasn't a statement by myself or any of my colleagues. It was something after following the press. It was either a misunderstanding or something and I accept the Minister's correction because those are the figures that I had. I thought that maybe something else had happened.

Those beds, if the Minister wants to be honest, those beds, he has to remember, where did they come from mostly? They come from things that he has proven . . . The Minister had the nerve to mention — he blushed a bit when he mentioned that and there was a kind of an embarrassed smile when he talked about Seven Oaks — the Minister did everything to stop Seven Oaks but it was too far gone. The freeze couldn't catch Seven Oaks; the freeze couldn't catch the Tache Hospital or the personal care home in St. Vital. The Minister talks about 55 million in 1978-79. He had no program in 1978-79. Everything was frozen except the things that were too far gone. Those were commitments that we had made. Of course he had to carry on. We weren't there; we couldn't sign any more cheques, but it was too far gone and it was part of our five-year program. If he wants to take credit for that, fine, I'm happy, because it is obvious that he liked our program, that he is going ahead. He didn't back

down . . . They froze many of the programs and they have cut down on some of these things, but they didn't come out and say this is not a worthwhile program.

Then the Minister said, I know what was announced. That doesn't mean a thing to me. You can announce every year that the propriety group, nursing homes, will build 390 beds, but if they are not built . . . That's what I want to know, what actually is done, not commitments and promises and I'm for this, and I'm for that, and I'm for everything. Where I thought that there was no policy, because that's just it, there is no one thing that they said, Oh, no, we're not going to have that. The only thing is, We're doing it as responsibly, you know, the other group was a bunch of irresponsible people. But he has taken our whole five-year program and that is in there.

He is talking about the commitments. Well, we had made a commitment at one time of — I don't exactly remember what it was, 120 million and so — but now, that was in 1975 dollars, what would they be now? That's another point I made, that because of this freeze, because of waiting, then it's costing you more money for the same thing.

In those that he has announced over the years, I find two or three that we didn't have. One of them was Lundar, which was strictly a partisan approach; and then the other decision, then there was Reston and a few little ones that might have gone on, I don't know. They weren't in those that were announced.

The Minister is talking about these beds that he has added. We built these beds; we started these beds and it was too late, they couldn't back down, or we wouldn't have these beds now; we wouldn't have them at all, Mr. Chairman. That's exactly the point that I am making. Seven Oaks, they did everything; they wanted to stop it. He talked about Misericordia. Misericordia, we had approved. That wasn't part of the amount that I mentioned. That was approved; that was going ahead.

What did we do for children? We took over the Shriner's Hospital for children and that was going to stay in that field, to work. The final decision wasn't made but definitely the commitment was to keep having that service for the children, Mr. Chairman.

Deer Lodge — Deer Lodge has been going for a long time. The Minister has very carefully said it is three that has to make the decision and if I say anything contrary, then he is going to bring that up later on and say, You want a confrontation. I say the main responsibility is to make sure that people that were getting the service in this area, the veterans, would be taken care of. That's his main responsibility. I'm sure that the Legion, once they get this assurance, should go ahead. In any case, the Legion, nor any other group should be able to veto anything if it is for the welfare of Manitobans, providing that service is there. That is the main thing. There are less and less veterans and these hospitals were set up before you had hospitalization and medicare. Now everybody should be treated the same. I'm talking about veterans; I'm a veteran, Mr. Chairman. I'm talking about those that were at Deer Lodge. No, I don't think it's that wonderful; I think there are many of us that were veterans.

I respect that and I would want them to take part in the negotiations and to assure themselves, to farm

out and say, How would this be? But I don't think they should for no other reason than they want to hold back because, you know, you get this fear by some of the old veterans who can get in any time and say, you know, they shouldn't take Deer Lodge Hospital. If it's going to help the rest of Manitoba, why not, and especially if they are not going to suffer. That is my point. My words will probably be turned around and say that I want a confrontation with the Legion. So be it, Mr. Chairman; that is not what I said at all. These are the things.

The Minister hasn't answered any of my questions about the nurses, about what is the rationale — (Interjection)— In all fairness, he stated that he wanted me to repeat some of them. But he hasn't answered any except that he has made the statement about the beds, to correct a statement, not a question that I made, and I accept that. He told me what was committed. That's not what I want; it is what was spent. I know what they committed, the private sector, to build so many beds and I know that this wasn't done. I know some of things that go on. The Minister — there's an example — for 1978-79, he talked about 50 million and he certainly didn't announce anything in the 50 million. That was the thing that was carried over from other years. Actually that money will be spent, but it is not spent this year. When you talk about 50 million, I will bet 5.00 to a doughnut that there's not going to be 50 million spent this year because they can't finish all these things, Mr. Chairman.

These are the things that I wanted to get an idea of what was being spent. Also, the Minister said that in 1979-80, there was a first phase of the Health Sciences Centre. How far has that gone? Not the extras. I know some of the work was done and also some of this work was done in our days and that wasn't in the five-year plan; that was some of the things that were going ahead, the normal repair and miscellaneous. That's not what we are talking about.

How much was done on this Phase 1 last year? That was announced. The Minister said there was 55,000.00. How much of that money was spent? Those are the things that I want to know.

When I said the Minister had no policy, it is a fact that whenever he has a press conference or he is talking to somebody, he agrees with everything. But what is he going to do? Not say, well, we are going to do it, maybe in 20 years, in 52 years. That's not what I am talking about.

The Minister didn't answer my comment, or my question: What is their policy about beds, about acute beds? I respect the decision that they are going to come with because I know it is going to take a lot of guts. If you have these guts and if you stand up and say so, but if you say on one hand and when you are discussing with the Commission and your staff, I think there are too many beds there. You know, we are quite generous and we're doing all right when we compare to other jurisdictions. Then if you turn around and tell the Chief Medical Officer at the Concordia Hospital that, yes, you recognize that they should have another 120 beds, that's not a policy; that's not knowing where you are going and that's misleading the public. You can't have it both ways, Mr. Chairman.

I would be one that would have a lot of sympathy and support the Minister if he came out and said

certain things. On certain things, of course we might have a different set of priorities or our first priority might be the tenth on their list and their first might be our tenth; that's possible. That's not only with different parties; I don't think there is that much difference with the parties in this field. When you have got people that are trying to certain work, certain things, certain people want to do it a certain way and you would have the same thing every time you changed Ministers, even in the same party. Or if you go into Cabinet, I'm sure that the Minister now meets with his colleagues and he has different priorities. Like Lunder came right up. But the same Minister that wanted Lunder has got Mount Carmel right at the bottom, and we know why. That's normal. I'm not talking about that and I'm not trying to criticize the Minister just for the sake criticism. But I want us, when he is talking about confrontation, I am starting to think that he feels that anything that is a little bit leadership, he will say it's confrontation. Therefore, he is on every side of every issue.

If I want to take the trouble, if I am challenged on that I can take the trouble, because we can find these clippings and these press releases and so on and find out exactly that, that they are in favor of everything. But what is being done? You have got to say what you are going to do, and then long-range plans, and then you have got to be able to say, and we all say it, we would like to see that when we can afford it. All right. But when we can afford it might mean different things to different people. I have never seen the Minister talk about these things that he used to say at one time, that he might forget it with time, but in any press release and so on that he would say, No, the people have to do that for themselves. They have the same programs, the same ideas; they pay lip service to the same intentions that we have.

When the Minister starts talking about his priorities, he was arguing with himself in most cases. This is not what I was after. I am talking about a clear-cut program and policies and we go from there. These are the examples that I said, when he says that there might be too many beds that will be filled anyway, and then he tells the people of Concordia, well, yes, it is recognized that you need another 120 beds. He was criticizing us for that and that is what he is doing, he is giving these people some kind of confidence or some kind of a dream that yes, that he approves that, and as soon as they can, some kind of an approval, even though it is not done this year. He has not intention of doing it if he is sincere in saying that there are too many beds.

I think that the first thing you should is release these beds if at all possible, and that would be done by increasing instead of going down on the home care and also by increasing personal care beds. I have very little to argue with the Minister on his set of priorities. I agree with him and I congratulate him, but this is not actually what I was criticizing him for earlier, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the honourable member asked me about the cash flow and the borrowing authority approvals on a year-by-year

basis in our capital programs relative to the overall 2 million capital program in total that we had announced over the past two-and-one-half years. The capital program announced for 1978-79 totalled, as I told him, 55.6 million and in 1979-80, the year just ended, 22.2 million was spent or 22.2 million worth of construction was done. In other words, the borrowing authority was invoked. 14.9 million had already been spent prior to 1979-80 and the amount to be invoked and applied this year, 1980-81, is 18.4 million, for the approximate total of 55.6 million — 22.2 million spent in 1979-80, and 18.4 million to be spent this year. —(Interjection)— Well, they are fractions. For example, it is 18.49, it's 22.284, and 14.925, which was prior. I was just giving it to him in round figures, Mr. Chairman. That was the capital program announced in 1978-79, the approvals given in 1978-79.

The capital approvals given in 1979-80, which totalled 97.2 million, and which included the first phase redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre. Of that, Mr. Chairman, 7.2 million was spent in 1979-80.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Is that part of the 22?

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, we are now looking at another year. I just gave you the capital program for 1978-79, and I gave you what was spent in 1979-80, it was 22.2 million and what was spent prior, which was 14.9 million, and what will be spent this year, which is 18.4 million. That is the capital program in 1978-79.

I am now giving you the capital program for 1979-80, which is 97.2 million in total, which I had given you earlier. You asked me what are we spending each year. In that program, the 1979-80 program of 97.2 million, 7.2 million was spent in 1979-80, the year just ended. 225,000 had been spent earlier, prior to 1979-80 — 225,000, .2 million, had been spent prior to 1979-80. This year, 1980-81, 19.3 million will be spent, including approximately 10 million in Redevelopment Phase 1 at the Health Sciences Centre, and that leaves 67.3 million to be spent post-1980-81. Most of that will be, in fact virtually all of it, 62 million of it is the first phase redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre, which is phased over about five years.

In the new program, in the capital program of 50 million announced for 1980-81, we announced approximately, I think it was about 32.5 million in hospital regeneration and redevelopment, much of which was related to the Dauphin and Selkirk hospitals, and about 16.5 million in non-prop personal care homes, and some 2 million in fire upgrading and then contingencies. That is the 50 million capital program announced in the 1980-81 program, and I don't know that I can give the honourable member the breakdown on that. Just a minute.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** . . . to the end, what is spent on that?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Oh, okay, thank you. On the 1980-81 capital program, 10.5 million is scheduled to be spent this year, 1980-81, and approximately in total 1 million has been spent previously, prior to

1980-81. Post-1980-81, future year spending in that program will be 39.7 million. So it is 10.5 million this year with a million spent previously and 39.7 million to come post-1980-81. There again the big item is the, the big items plural, are the Dauphin and Selkirk General Hospitals.

On the Health Sciences Centre redevelopment, the honourable member asked me for a picture of what was being done there. Phase 1, Mr. Chairman, breaks down into renovation or new construction in a number of major areas, and those areas which were identified and prioritized and are all included in Phase 1 are the Ambulatory Care area of the hospital; Diagnostic Services; the Children's Hospital; Support Services Operations Area, that is medical information, pharmacy and central processing; the Psychiatric Unit, Psychiatry, including Outpatient Clinics, a Day Hospital, and inpatient accommodation; and the Materials Handling Building.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** How much have you done so far?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I will give the honourable member that. Up to this point, not related to Phase 1 redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre, as the honourable member knows, the new dialysis facility just adjacent to the Health Sciences Centre campus has been opened and is in operation; the expansion of the Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation premises is nearly finished; the new Cadham Lab is nearly finished; the new parkade is finished and half-open; and we have engaged in a major upgrading of the steam lines at the Health Sciences Centre — that is the Service Distribution Project. In addition, there is considerable interim regeneration being done at the Women's Centre. The overall cost of the steam lines and service distribution project is 3.2 million and the capital cost of the interim regeneration of the Women's Centre, pending the eventual emergence of a virtually new Women's Centre through redevelopment, the interim regeneration is a 2 million project. Those are all under way and in fact the Cancer Foundation expansion and the Cadham Lab are virtually completed, and as I say the dialysis facility has been in operation for some time. Those are all independent of first phase redevelopment. The first phase redevelopment, the 75.6 million package, embraces those projects that I listed for the honourable member a few moments ago.

Planning is under way in all of them and it is expected that the Materials Handling Building will be tendered this spring. The cost of that building is expected to be 3 million. That is a major and necessary first priority, Mr. Chairman, before we can do virtually anything else. Obviously, until there is a proper place for the housing of necessary material and the consolidation of them and their removal from various pockets and corners of the entire Centre, we can't —(Interjection)— It is not glamorous but it has to be done, as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface says. That is right.

The other items are all being organized and readied for necessary renovation or new construction work through a general reorganization and redeployment of services and capacities in the Health Sciences Centre itself. As you will appreciate, Mr. Chairman, there is considerable planning and

organization to get a complex of that size, that is at the present time somewhat unco-ordinated in terms of functional relationship between units, to get it organized in such a way that construction or renovation can be undertaken on a phase basis with the minimum dislocation to patients. That whole process has been under way for some months and is nearly complete. —(Interjection)— Well, certainly for some months and it is nearly complete.

That is the picture at the Health Sciences Centre at the moment, Mr. Chairman, except for the fact that in concert with the reorganization in order to accommodate redevelopment in the manner that I have just made reference to, there is also a major administrative and management restructuring and reorganization, for which the groundwork has been laid and which will be taking place in the foreseeable future.

You will recall that a management consulting team, Hickling-Johnson, was selected from a number who were interviewed, to undertake a management consulting study of the Health Sciences Centre's administrative structure and executive and management operations to determine not only what was desirable in terms of ongoing operation of a major health facility with an annual budget of approximately 80 million a year, but what was necessary to manage and administer a 138 million redevelopment program. The Hickling-Johnson Report was made public at a press conference held by the Health Sciences Centre Board, Chairman, and Executive Committee members, on, I think it was the 8th of February, and members will be aware of its primary recommendations. There are some wide-ranging recommendations for changes in the administrative structure, in the administrative format and since that time, a number of individually assigned search committees have been searching for and advertising across Canada for applicants for top executive positions at the centre. These would be top management positions from vice-presidencies to directorates who would be aligned with the president and the president's office to provide a stronger management team, and it may well not be necessary, Mr. Chairman, to go beyond Manitoba's borders to find the right people, but the search has been conducted beyond provincial boundaries. We're very hopeful that a number of the people that we need, a number of the prime candidates for those opportunities will be available right here in Manitoba.

I expect to be able to advise members of some conclusive results in that area by some time during the month of June, Mr. Chairman. The report was brought in and released, as I say, on the 8th of February, and the various searches, individual searches, were launched pursuant to that, and some time has obviously been necessary for those searches to be conducted responsibly and carefully, but I would expect that we would have some conclusive recommendations by at least the end of June, and hopefully perhaps a little earlier than that, something closer to the middle of June.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has mentioned, on one or two occasions, the fact that I have noted publicly, and am certainly prepared to note again today, that consideration is being given very strongly to additional active treatment beds at Concordia Hospital. That is true,

Mr. Chairman, and one of the primary reasons for that is the distribution of beds in the greater Winnipeg area, the uneven distribution, and the fact that Concordia is underbuilt. The previous government I believe at one time had intentions of a plant of approximately 200 to 220 beds at Concordia, and it's my understanding the hospital was designed to accommodate that number. Subsequently, a further decision resulted in a physical plant that had fewer beds than that, but was designed in terms of service capacity and support to accommodate those 200 to 220 beds.

I think it's generally accepted among hospital personnel and health administrators, that a hospital of the type of Concordia Hospital, in a major urban centre, serving a major urban or suburban community, today, is likely to be non-viable in operating efficiency terms, Mr. Chairman, at anything less than 200 beds, and this is one of the predicaments that Concordia finds itself in. It is a plant that is designed, supported and serviced for something in excess of 200 beds, and it has a total number of beds in the area of 120, not all of which are active treatment beds, so the logical place for any Manitoba government to build hospital beds, to build active treatment beds, in the province at the moment, is on the Concordia site, by adding an additional floor, or whatever is necessary, an additional floor or number of floors to provide a further 100 to 140 beds at Concordia. It makes much more sense if one needs another 100 or 140 active beds to build them there than to build them anywhere else, because the support structure is in place and they would, realistically, Sir, be probably the cheapest hospital beds to build in Manitoba.

So as we look at the overall bed spectrum in the city, and we look at the size of the Health Sciences Centre, and we look at what well may be the eventual decision with respect to configurations of other hospitals that are in place at the present time, Concordia logically qualifies as a site for additional active treatment beds, if, as and when we need them.

I believe that, at the present time, as I suggested the other day, that the argument that we have a bed crisis and a bed shortage is a myth, Mr. Chairman. I don't believe we have a bed crisis in Manitoba at all. We rank substantially above the accepted median, the conventional wisdom in the health care field in North America with respect to the number of active treatment beds a community or a society needs on the basis of its population. We have 5.7 per thousand, and the accepted level is 4 per thousand, with some jurisdictions lower than that and some jurisdictions trying to get lower than that on the basis that it would make for a more efficient delivery of health services.

We have no plans to compete with those jurisdictions who are trying to get their bed population ratio down whatsoever, Mr. Chairman. We have never suggested that we were looking for any area in which to close or reduce hospital beds, but the distribution of them, in Winnipeg, and indeed in Manitoba generally, is not all that comfortable, and certainly we have problems when we have a major complex like the Health Sciences Centre with something in excess of 1200 beds suffering from a particular condition on its own site, and I think that

responsible stewardship of the health care field only logically calls for some very careful assessment of that distribution and a very careful examination of the arguments for and the justification for distributing those beds in a more effective fashion, if that is possible to do.

In the context of that kind of thinking and planning, Concordia is certainly very much in the thoughts of the government and in the thoughts of my officials, so that possibility is alive and well at Concordia. —(Interjection)— Well, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface asks me, whether that's if we close some somewhere else; I can't answer that question yes or no at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, but that would be the likely equation, and it's in that context that we have said to Concordia that you've got a plant there that could accommodate another 100 to 150 beds, and we're certainly trying to fit that into and dovetail that into the bed spectrum in Winnipeg generally.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the honourable member, there is 15 seconds left before 4:30.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, all I wanted to say to the Minister in 15 seconds is, welcome to 1977, because you sure aren't giving us anything for 1980.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. I am interrupting the proceedings, and will return at 8:00 p.m. this evening in committee.

## IN SESSION

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. On Mondays, the first order of business is Resolutions. The first Resolution is Resolution 25. I understand the Honourable Member for Transcona is not here. We will proceed with Resolution 26.

### RESOLUTION NO. 26 — CREATION OF FOOD PRICES REVIEW BOARD

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, as follows:

WHEREAS there is inadequate information on the causes of rising food prices;

AND WHEREAS the ever-increasing cost of food is playing a major contributory role in the currently inflating living costs of all Manitobans;

AND WHEREAS there is some evidence of increasing concentration in the food production sector which could lead to high prices and unwarranted profits;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing legislation to create a Manitoba Food Prices Review Board to protect consumers from unjustified, unfair or

excessive increases in the price of food. The Board should have the power (a) to investigate costs, prices, profits and practices of any person or corporation engaged in the storage, processing, transportation, refrigeration, packaging, wholesaling and retailing of any food where a price increase is about to occur; (b) to inspect and examine any or all books, records and materials in the possession or control of any person engaged in the activities set forth in (a) and to require any other information from such a person that the Board considers necessary. Where, after making an investigation, the Board is of the opinion that a price increase is unjustified or unfair or excessive, the Board should have the power to make recommendations to the government on any appropriate action that might lessen the degree of inflation in the price of food. The Board should report on its activities to the Legislative Assembly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have looked at the Resolution, and while I find there may be some difficulty with some of the wording in the Therefore be it resolved portion of it, I feel that it is a matter for debate rather than correction.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that is not novel or original in the sense that it has come before this forum in other ways in other sessions. It is a matter which has been pressing and plaguing, not only the citizens of our province but indeed, Mr. Speaker, of all jurisdictions right across, not only Canada, but North America, and for that matter, indeed around the world.

Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, like all Canadians, have been caught in an inflationary price spiral. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that food prices have been a leading contributor with respect to the rise in the overall consumer price index. These increases in the cost of food, Mr. Speaker, as Statistics Canada indicate, account for approximately one-half the rise in the total CPI or Consumer Price Index for this country this year.

Mr. Speaker, the inflation rate in food has been running at approximately double the average inflation rate of Canadians for the past two to three years. Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada figures indicate that while earnings of our working people through employment have only risen some 7.5 percent, we have had food prices rising in the order of 15, 16 and 16 1/2 percent over that timeframe. This, Mr. Speaker, in my submission is cause for grave alarm. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a situation where there has been a real deterioration in the ability of people to maintain the necessities of life in the face of the cost increases pertinent to consumer consumption of food.

Mr. Speaker, even more alarming is the fact that generally while real income is down, we can say that it has deteriorated some 4 1/2 percent against inflation over the past four years. So, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where inflation is indeed outstripping the ability of consumers and people across our country to contend with it. We are now

daily, monthly and annually losing ground in the war against this horrible foe.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I bring this Resolution before the House is in order to address the necessity of finding some mechanism that can address this problem. We are told that in Toronto in the year 1979 and this, Mr. Speaker, is borne out in a report published by Goldfarb & Associates. We are told that some 70 percent of the residents of that city had actually had to adjust their eating habits in order to deal with food cost increases. This, Mr. Speaker, is an alarming statistic and one which, in my submission, requires immediate concern and consideration by all elected officials across this country.

Mr. Speaker, moreover we are faced with data that indicates that we have a very high degree of corporate control and concentration in the food retailing market. Mr. Speaker, my research has indicated that four companies in this country controlled between 55 and 60 percent of all retail sales across Canada. Mr. Speaker, I have some documentation with me that indicates that amongst Canada's largest corporations in 1979, these four companies placed in all cases within the top six in terms of sales and profit figures for this entire nation. These companies, Mr. Speaker, are George Weston Limited, Dominion Stores Limited, Canada Safeway Limited, and Steinbergs Limited. Mr. Speaker, it is indicative of the situation that confronts us to note that George Weston is the largest corporation in Canada. Dominion Stores Limited is the second largest company in this county. Canada Safeway is the fifth and Steinbergs is the sixth.

Mr. Speaker, when we concern ourselves with the fact that some 60 percent of all retail sales in food are concentrated in these four corporate entities, I say that we have grave cause for alarm. Even more so, Mr. Speaker, because in the year 1978 the largest company in this country, Westons, saw a profit rise of — and this is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, but it is statistically corroborated by Statistics Canada — 84.2 percent over 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you that this is alarming. In the context, Mr. Speaker, that in the third quarter of 1979, we had food store profits rising by some 37.9 percent, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in my research I found very few companies that enjoyed that sort of profit increase in margin year over year, quarter over quarter. I suggest that it is well worthy of our time to engage in debate on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak a little bit about the nature of concentration we find in this particular sector. It is quite incredible to me, Mr. Speaker, to relate to you that there is not only a good deal of horizontal concentration, but also the integration that perpetrates in this area is vertical as well. We have a situation where, just to use Canada Safeway Limited as an example, and I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I found that Canada Safeway is a wholly-owned subsidiary of an American country by the name of Safeway Stores Incorporated, which is the second largest retailer in all of the United States of America. We find that the company that ranks fifth in size in Canada is only a child of the second largest retailer in the United States, and we should realize and

appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of firm controls this in itself should give us grave cause for alarm about the sort of future and heritage we will leave for our children and grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed remarkable that something the size of Canada Safeway Limited can be nothing but a child of something the size of the American parent. Mr. Speaker, when we consider the influence that Canada Safeway has in terms of the tax dollars it pays to government in terms of the employees who are dependent on income derived from salary, not to mention all the wholesalers and producers who are dependent on an entity such as Canada Safeway, I can tell you that this is indeed a matter for research and consideration.

I found that Canada Safeway owns not only grocery stores, but it produces fluid milk, it has plants that do that, it has ice cream factories. Reports indicated that it is into wholesaling in a very large way; it produces its own coffee and tea, it has plants that do that; it has cheese factories; frozen food plants; beverage plants. The American parent company, which supplies Canada Safeway, is one of the largest producers of household chemicals in the world; it owns soap companies right across the face of this continent; it controls the largest — and this is amazing — it controls the largest private trucking fleet in the United States, which is incredible, one company. Mr. Speaker, one can say that it permeates and pervades in every sector of economic and social life in this continent.

Mr. Speaker, even more amazing, in 1977 our Canada Safeway showed a return on investment of an alarmingly high 27 percent. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the submission that if shares were widely distributed through our population I suppose one could argue that this is a good thing, a 27 percent return on investment is indeed an amazing performance level for any company, as I am sure all people who are familiar with business in this Chamber, would willingly attest, but, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is alarming when we consider the high cost of money, the fact that if you put your money in the bank you won't make much more than 11 or 12 1/2 percent. Here is a company that can turn a profit of some 27 percent.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the shares, just in case there is any argument or debate on that, I want to tell members present that my research indicates that only 10 percent of all income earners in this country own a single share. Ninety percent of the income earning-people of this country own no shares at all, and apparently the richest one percent of all income earners in this country own 40 percent of all the shares.

Mr. Speaker, going on, I also did research into the question of the Westons chain. I found that in Ontario, amazingly, and I had some information that I gleaned from the enquiries that were held by the commissions designated to do research into concentration there in 1978. The committee found that Westons were retailing breads under seven different corporate brand names in that province. People for years had thought that there was real competition in the bread market, because there were these seven major corporates, seemingly corporate competitors. Well, Mr. Speaker, they determined there that all seven companies were indirectly or

directly held by Westons. There was absolutely no competition in the bread, certainly in the south central parts of highly urbanized Ontario. They found that the milk for the breads came from Royal Dairies or Donlands Dairies, and they found that those two companies were also owned indirectly or directly by Westons. They found that the flour came from Sioux Line Mills (1969) Ltd. or McCarthy Milling Company Limited and when they got down to their research, Mr. Speaker, they found that those companies were indirectly controlled by Westons. So again, the flour, Mr. Speaker, that they used was in their control too. The sugar came from West Cane Sugar Company Limited, wholly owned by Westons. It was distributed under National Grocers Limited and York Trading Company, both of which were indirectly by Westons and in their control.

Mr. Speaker, they also found that at each stage profit was taken. Mr. Speaker, they determined that it isn't the producer that takes undue profit, there is no profiteering on the part of the little producer, but they certainly were able to say that there was more than a hint that there was certainly a situation where the manufacturer and producer and retailer could well have been taking an unwholesome amount of the price realized for the product.

The Mallon Report, Mr. Speaker, is also illustrative on this point. This was a component study done for the Anti-Inflation Board for the Food Price Review Subsection. It was done in the later part of 1976, Mr. Speaker. It demonstrated and I think definitively that in that year consumers in Canada were being overcharged by at least 4 percent on their food bills, because of a high degree of concentration. The Mallon Reporting Agency indicated that to the Anti-Inflation Board, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know whether any of us really remember at the time, but my research indicates that there was considerable concern in Parliament. It was a time when there was a great deal of concern about the topic of inflation and what had a cause and effect on it, and there was alarm right across this country. Four percent may not seem like a lot, Mr. Speaker, but in Ontario 4 percent meant 2.5 billion in the year 1976. When you consider that consumers were overcharged some 2.5 billion, which I believe is in excess of the budget of the province of Manitoba, gross, Mr. Speaker, I think there is reason to have some concern.

Also I think the Mallon Report is of interest because it demonstrated that there is some real problem with respect to market apportionment. The share of the market of the four major companies that I discussed earlier, Mr. Speaker, in the Prairie Provinces, is an astonishing 84 percent. It is even harder to believe that in Saskatoon, Regina, Calgary, and Edmonton, those four companies had taken a market share of in excess of 90 percent of all food retail sales.

Mr. Speaker, the day of the mama and papa store has long past. When we consider that in four major prairie cities, Safeway, Dominion, and I believe the Steinberg Loblaw's, control over 90 percent of all the retail sales, I think there is cause for all people to have some concern about this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have been talking largely about retailers. I think I would be remiss if I didn't mention some of the concentration ratios for food manufacturing industries because they also tell us a

great deal about what is happening in this country. In a report, Mr. Speaker, prepared for the Economic Council of Canada by Mr. R.M.A. Loyns — this was for the Centre for the Study of Inflation and Productivity, and tabled last year — I might add that Professor Loyns is employed at the University of Manitoba in the Faculty of Agricultural Economics. We find that in the slaughtering and meat processing sector of the food manufacturing industry, the four leading companies in this country have managed to dominate to such an extent that they now control 54 percent of all business.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of cereal products, we have domination to the extent that four companies have 66.8 percent. In the area of biscuit manufacturing, four now retain 73.4. In vegetable oil mills, we have four companies dominating 75.6. In confectionery manufacturing, 49.4 to the top four companies.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. The list goes on and on like that. Large, considerable holdings concentrated in such a way that indicates that competition is simply not possible. Perhaps it is probable. In the minds of some people, it is probable, but certainly hard to believe that it is still possible.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States, a commission studied this entire matter about two years ago. They studied 13 food lines and in doing so, they concluded that over 2.1 billion had been paid by American consumers because of monopolized concentration and power in the food industry in that country. Mr. Speaker, the house commission that made that study was not dominated by social democrats. It was dominated principally by Republicans. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that there is good reason for concern on the basis of that statistic when we consider that in Canada, food prices are a much higher proportion of the consumer price index. There is good reason to be concerned that we are in worse shape than the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am commending before this House this afternoon, a move which I think would have an ameliorating effect, one that if adopted would sharpen competitive forces, hopefully improve productivity and reduce the structural rigidities in the entire food system. I am doing this, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that statistical data now bears out the need for some government intervention in this area.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to address to members a complaint that was made in our own province just approximately the beginning of April by the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association, and some members on the opposite side presumably are familiar with that organization, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection)— Yes, they created the organization and now the organization has spoken out. They indicated, Mr. Speaker, and they did this publicly, that lower prices paid to producers have not benefited consumers because of the retailers' slow reaction to that situation. They indicated that the retailers were not passing on the lower prices to consumers. Mr. Speaker, they documented that in a way that I think demands the attention of government members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I put this initiative before members for debate today and I would indicate that I think the

time has come to take some action in this regard. Thank you very much.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the honourable member explain the resolution and what the New Democratic Party thinks it should be doing today, and the government of this province, in dealing with the ever problem of escalating food costs, which is as old as the hills, the problem and nobody yet, to my knowledge, has come up with an answer or put his finger on it. I just wonder where he thinks that we have all the genius and ability in this province to tackle this problem.

First of all, the inflationary factor — how are we going to deal with inflation in one province out of 10 when the giant that is creating this serious problem is our federal government. The members opposite stood up in their places and voted for a the government that was prepared to tackle inflation and likely deal with these kind of matters, but they stood in their places and saw fit that that government was removed from office very quickly. Now they are crying wolf and asking us to deal with the subject, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the member certainly brought a lot of very important and intelligent information into the debate, but I think he left an awful lot of it out as well because if you look at the 1980 Consumer Price Index which was released, I think, in March, the food prices in this city rose by some 7.4 percent from the year earlier. The national average under that Consumer Index, for all of Canada, was 8.4, so we are 1 percent under. I think the statistics will show that for Winnipeg, the 7.4 increase was the lowest, I think, since 1973. It is even more interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the last eight years, there were only two years in which the Winnipeg food Consumer Price Index was greater than the national average and those two years, according to these figures, were 1975 and 1976 when our honourable friends were the government of the day in this province. Those were also the years, as I recall it, Mr. Speaker, when the NDP and their friends in Ottawa were promoting the Anti-Inflation Board and the country was under the control of the Anti-Inflationary Board. —(Interjection)— Yes, it is certainly an indication to me that, if that is an example, that we can function far better without the proposed food prices review board.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be educational for me to point out a few other statistics on the subject matter. In 1973, I think, when the members opposite were the government in this province, the food prices in Winnipeg, I think they were up 14.2 percent in 1973. I think the increase was approximately, in 1975, I think it was 13.9. I think that figure was 1.5 percent increase greater than the national average.

If you look at the last three years, from 1977 to 1979, the increases in food prices in this city, in Winnipeg where we are standing here today, Sir, have been below the national increases. In 1977, the food increased by 7.8, which was .6 percent below the national average. In 1978, the Winnipeg prices increased 14.6 percent, compared to a national

average of 15.5. In 1979, the Winnipeg prices increased 11.4 percent, which was 1.8 percentage points below the national increase of 13.2.

That is a favorable comparison when one considers that in 1975 and in 1976, the increases in Winnipeg food prices were respectively 1.1 percentage point and 1.1 percentage point below the national average.

During 1979, I think Winnipeg fared quite well in other areas of comparisons on an inter-city basis. For 1979, I think Winnipeg had among the lowest commodity prices for each major commodity group that is listed. If we compare with 11 other cities, Winnipeg was the lowest for the cost of household operation, as well as for recreation, reading, and education. It was the second lowest, after Edmonton, for transportation; it was the second lowest, after Edmonton, for health; it was the second lowest, after Edmonton, for personal care; and it was the third lowest for tobacco and alcohol prices.

The latest survey, Mr. Speaker, by the federal Department of Agriculture on the cost of nutritious diets, indicates that in March, 1980, the cost of a nutritious diet in Winnipeg was up 8.2 from a year earlier. That was marginally a faster increase than the 12 city average, which showed that they were at 8.1. So therefore, the Winnipeg year-over-year increase in food prices was less than 6 of the 12 cities that were surveyed.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of the nutritious diet ranged from St. John's, Newfoundland, where it was 74.21, to a low of, I think it was 62.67, in Montreal. Winnipeg was 66.55, and that was lower than Regina.

Given these facts, Mr. Speaker, it is self-evident that Winnipeg and Manitoba, the province maintained a relatively favourable position in regard to food prices. In theory, the objectives that the member has put in his resolution, the objectives of a Food Prices Review Board, might appear to the members opposite like motherhood, but I was in the store business for about 30 years, and it was quite evident during the last decade or so, we have witnessed the formation and the operation of all kinds of agencies, boards and commissions which were to act as watchdogs on inflation and they were supposed to look after prices, incomes, product, you name it, and these boards and commissions were set up, and I can list a few of them.

In 1969, we had what was known as the Prices and Incomes Commission, which was established. In 1973, we had the Food Prices Review Board. From 1975 to 1977, we had the Anti-Inflation Board set up. From 1975 to 1976, we had the Federal Commission of Inquiry into the Marketing of Beef and Veal. In 1975-76, we had an Inquiry right in this province into livestock marketing, in Manitoba. In 1978, they set up the Centre for the Study of Inflation and Productivity. In 1979, we had the National Commission on Inflation set up in this province. One common thread, Mr. Speaker, binds all of those various agencies together. Every one of them failed. Every one of those agencies failed in their objective. Each agency, every one of them, failed in their attempt to control what they were set up to control.

Mr. Speaker, should we now be so pretentious to set up another agency after seeing the dismal record of these seven or eight, especially at the provincial level? I just can't understand what the honourable

member figures that we can do at the provincial level when they couldn't handle it at the national level. Would we be more successful than these that I have already listed? Where, may I ask the honourable member and the members of the House, where is the historical justification for creation of another agency of this type, today? I fail to see it, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there are influences over the food industry over which we in this province have no control, or if we do, we have very little control, because a great deal of the food is manufactured and processed outside of the boundaries of our province. What terms of guidelines, or how would we have to set up such a review board so that we can go into other jurisdictions and get access to their records, etc.? I don't know, Mr. Speaker. A large portion of the consumer dollar in our province is spent on commodities such as beef, sugar, cocoa and coffee, as the honourable member mentioned. I think a provincial agency would find it extremely difficult to effectively control prices of such commodities that are established on a futures market and through competitive bidding at public auction. The other thing is the cost of produce. How would we control the cost of produce in Florida or California where due to weather conditions such as we have today, we find that the market place is extremely high. Not only, I suppose, we can say do we import much of our produce, we also in this province have another problem, we have to contend with a very very short growing season with many times varied weather conditions that affect the production of the crop, affect the quality of the crop and affect the demand and the price that the fresh produce will get in the market place.

There's another point, Mr. Speaker, that the member didn't mention in his resolution or his remarks and that is that the cost of producing food. It must be related to labor because it's a very labor intensive business and as such wages compare and wages have a very significant impact in determining the price of the food across the counter. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition had intended that the proposed review board control wages as well as prices, but he never mentioned wages in his resolution. I think it should be because without such a balance with wages included, a review board, I think, would find that its hands were pretty well tied in trying to determine where the prices should be pegged.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat disturbed at the sweeping powers that the honourable member has proposed in his resolution. It would appear that any individual connected with the food industry in any way, shape, or form, would be subjected to detailed investigation simply because of the reason that the board was of the opinion that an increase was about to occur, as I read the resolution. That amounts, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, not only to a sweeping infringement on the rights of a private citizen but it also it's imposing some of a state control system over the entire food industry.

I don't think there can be any justification for us in this Legislature for putting a straight jacket on the food industry, nor for trying to limit the individual freedom which the resolution implies. Even, Mr. Speaker, if some kind of a review board was

established and was able to control some aspects of the pricing of food, the attempt at regulation would most likely result in a distortion of the market and when you distort the market you end up with higher prices for consumers than you had intended. Supposing that this review board set up a 10 percent level on profit as a classic example. How would you handle the matters of cross-subsidization of profits in a grocery store, or the markup on some items is 1 percent, the markup on others is 2 percent; when you get up to 12 percent, maybe 15 and 20 percent in the . . . But how? A flat level, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, the low profit margin on some products is subsidized by the higher profit margin on other products in stores. You can't basically just run an across-the-board profit percentage to make the system work.

There is another important reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposed to this resolution and that is the establishment of a market or food prices review board would be very very expensive. And who would that burden fall on? It would fall on the taxpayers of this province. All we have to do is look at the escalating expenditures that were related to some of these federal review boards. In 1973 the federal Food Prices Review Board, they started out with a budget of, I think it was 500,000, Mr. Speaker, and I think they had in 1975 — that was 73, and they started 75 — they had 75 people on the payroll and the bill was 2.4 million, and they never solved a thing.

Mr. Speaker, when we consider a provincial agency would be less effective in controlling than a federal agency, it's very difficult for me to stand up here and justify such an expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the resolution. It would be costly. The board would be ineffectual. It could result in higher food prices. But most important of all, Mr. Speaker, I can't support the implied infringement of individual and private sector freedoms. So I, Mr. Speaker, therefore urge the members of the House to join me in voting against this resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. George.

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to take part in this debate and, in taking part in this debate, to throw a somewhat different aspect to what my colleague for Wellington has indicated with respect to the concentration of the corporate sector in food merchandising and the relatively little or no amount of competition in the area of food sales and food distribution.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, the member from Roblin, certainly gave us a good indication of how his government operates and how he perceives the prices of food to be and how governments have operated or have done things or not done things in his remarks, wherein he indicated that Manitoba's food prices, although they increased last year by 7.4 percent and the national average increase was 8.4 percent, he indicates that we then are in a pretty

favourable position, Mr. Speaker, we are in a better position.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, to the one key element, and I haven't heard the Member for Roblin speak about the one main element in the food chain, and that is the producer. We have a Minister of Agriculture in this province of Manitoba who has shot his load for the last couple of years, talked about increasing production and wanting more marketing potential for our producers, and he led the way to encourage hog producers into increasing their production to an all time high and where do we have the hog situation now in the province of Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, where do we have it now? In a total chaos with many producers having to go bankrupt, many producers on the verge of bankruptcy. That is how the Conservatives treat the primary producer in this province. First of all, they promise him all sorts of goodies in terms of market potential and encourage him to produce, and now what do we have, Mr. Speaker? We have chaos in the hog industry; chaos that can only lie on the doorstep of the Minister of Agriculture of this province. And do we have greatly reduced prices to the consumer in the stores? No, we don't, Mr. Speaker, we certainly don't. Mr. Speaker, it is even acknowledged by the beef producers' group that the price decline to producers has not been totally passed on to consumers, Mr. Speaker. We all know that. We know that there have been price drops however slight, Mr. Speaker, in the price of pork but certainly, Mr. Speaker, not in the range that the producers have lost, in terms of net income from their production.

What do we have today, Mr. Speaker? We have the Minister of Agriculture attempting to take credit for some stabilization program that he supposedly supports on a national level that will, in effect, guarantee producers of this province incomes of a less than subsistence; in fact, put producers in a net loss position, because . . . Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is that national stabilization schemes, unless they are tied to a guaranteed cost of production and not tied to the marketplace can, in effect, keep producers in the poorhouse, Mr. Speaker, and that's what the Conservative government of Manitoba is in favor of, to keep producers in the poorhouse, Mr. Speaker. They are not in favor of a stabilization scheme. They are trying to not only abandon but they've totally sabotaged the stabilization scheme of beef and now they try to go talk through the other side of their mouths and say, well we're in favor of a national stabilization scheme for agricultural products. Who knows what they mean, Mr. Speaker? But it is certainly evident by their positions since they've been elected to government that they have favored only one side of the coin, and the side of the coin that they favor is strictly the corporate sector, Mr. Speaker.

They talk against marketing boards. They talk at every opportunity against marketing boards. We have the Minister of Consumer Affairs who when he was in opposition threw all kinds of rotten eggs at CIMA and tried to discredit the national marketing scheme of eggs in this country. We've had the Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Government Services, several members talk continuously against orderly marketing in this country, income stabilization to producers, but when

do they favour —(Interjection)— Marketing, national marketing schemes? I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker. Which board did they sign? Which marketing board did they agree to when they came into government? Broilers, Mr. Speaker, broiler chickens. The Minister of Agriculture said I'm signing this marketing agreement only on the condition that it will mean expanded opportunities for our producers. Mr. Speaker, who controls the broiler industry in the province of Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, more than 50 percent of the production of the broiler chicken production in Manitoba is controlled by less than a handful of producers, less than a handful of producers, Mr. Speaker, controlled by the corporate sector.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite want to talk about turkeys. If it comes to that point, Mr. Speaker —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, they sound like a bunch of turkeys in their seats. Mr. Speaker, they still want to talk about the turkey industry being controlled by the corporate structure. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they're a number of large producers of turkeys that are still owners, I think one or two, that are in excess of 25,000 birds per farm and they are operated historically by feed mills. And the one that I'm talking about is primarily — there's only one large that I'm aware of at the present time at that's Feed-Rite Mills, Mr. Speaker, and they have raised turkeys historically in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives, that is the only marketing board that they have been able to say that well, we're in favour of it. What did it help, Mr. Speaker? It helped to do what? To limit imports of foreign or off-shore products to this country. Has it helped the consumers in the province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker? It hasn't helped consumers in the province of Manitoba at all. It has protected — and you know that's who they protect, the corporate sector. It has protected the steady incomes of the corporate sector in the province of Manitoba. That's who they have benefited. They talk about being a friend of the family farm. The family farm, Mr. Speaker, is now disappearing. It is now disappearing in the way that the Minister of Agriculture of this province Manitoba has said, there will be one big farm if the NDP get elected.

Mr. Speaker, we are now moving that way without lifting a finger. By the agricultural policies or the absence of agricultural policies by the Conservative government, we will have one big farm. We won't have to do a damn thing about it because we have now the nice movement going on in rural Manitoba; the Conservative description of that would be consolidation. Farmers are going bankrupt, the high interest rates are forcing many farmers into bankruptcy, and the Conservatives sit back and say, look, there is no great problem in rural Manitoba. Food production will continue. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it certainly will continue. It will continue at the hands of the large corporations who they have allowed No. 1, into the purchasing of land, where there was exclusive restrictions when they came into government, and that consolidation will take place. We've seen the decrease in farm numbers in the last two or three years.

The members opposite think it's great fun. We've disappeared, we've just lost about ten percent of our

farmers in the last two years. We've dropped from 32,000 to about 25,000 farmers. That's nice, Mr. Speaker. Your TED Report, you know, the Minister of Government Services was part of a government that said that their policy would be to reduce the numbers of farmers to 20,000 up to 1980, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. JORGENSON:** I'd like to ask, Mr. Speaker, if you could tell us what resolution we are speaking on?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I have allowed a fair degree of latitude in this debate.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Consumer Affairs does not realize that the primary producer is the source of food in this country and in this province and in this nation, I think he has a lot to learn yet, Mr. Speaker, and that's who I am speaking about in terms of this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Consumer Affairs wishes to enter this debate, he'll have ample opportunity, I am sure, to speak on this very topic, Mr. Speaker. What I have attempted to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that it has been this Conservative government who has consistently attacked orderly marketing, attacked, really, the producers of this province, Mr. Speaker, and attempted to lower the incomes, while saying, look, I'm the friend of the producers, but who do they really help out? They have knocked every marketing board in existence, except one, Mr. Speaker. They brought in the Broiler Marketing Agency, and who did it help primarily? Yes, it helped about 60 or 70 producers, but about 12 of those producers, Mr. Speaker, are corporate, well, one could consider in this province, corporate giants in meat production, and they control more than 50 percent of the production in this province. That's the type of marketing boards that they favour, Mr. Speaker.

They talk about freedom — yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there is a regulation, the Minister of Highways raised a very interesting point, Mr. Speaker, about the intrusion of the corporate sector in marketing. I'll give you a minute or two just before I'm finished, Mr. Speaker. The corporate sector, Mr. Speaker, they have allowed Cargill Grain, in another instance, Cargill Grain to start producing hogs in this province of Manitoba, and what does the Minister of Agriculture get up and say he is prepared to do with respect to the vertical integration in the hog industry by the feed companies in Manitoba? Well, he says, you know, the producers, we favour the competition in the marketplace, and it should really sort itself out. Really, he is prepared to do nothing, Mr. Speaker. He is prepared to allow the vertical integration in the meat industry, in the hog industry, to continue, while the producers are receiving what one could consider disaster prices for their hogs, who he has encouraged. Mr. Speaker, what will happen to hog production in this province and in this country?

What we are saying now, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Quebec — The province of Quebec hog industry is primarily, in the main, vertically integrated by corporate and commercial enterprises. They are increasing hog production at an astronomical level at a time when hog prices in this country, farmers are in a net loss position in terms of producing hogs. What do we have in the province of Manitoba? We are having producers going out of business. You will see, Mr. Speaker, that before the year is out, you will have a movement, and it should have occurred already, but we have no movement on the Minister of Agriculture's part, we should have had demands from Manitoba that there should be a national marketing agency in hogs, Mr. Speaker.

The only way that producers can retain their position and their percent of marketability of hogs from the province of Manitoba is if there is supply management, Mr. Speaker, across this country. The only way that the producers and the consumers can be assured of an adequate supply of hogs is that there be a supply management program in hogs, Mr. Speaker, because what we will end up at, I predict that we will end up with a national hog marketing agency in this country, to the detriment of western producers and primarily Manitoba producers. And what will happen, Mr. Speaker? And it was clear what will happen. We have now a deviation of the National Marketing Agreement signed last year in the turkey boards, Mr. Speaker. What benefit has it had to Manitoba producers? And the Conservative government of Manitoba . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member has five minutes.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives, while they attempt to say that they are a friend of the family farm, they are a friend of what one could consider Friendly Family Farms Limited, Mr. Speaker, the consolidation that we have had, and will continue, it will escalate, because the Conservatives are totally devoid of any interest in the agricultural sector of the province of Manitoba. Their policies are primarily, (1) do nothing. Do nothing and we will accomplish what the TED Report in the '60s recommended that the Conservatives accomplish.

They will accomplish the reduction of farmers to 20,000 by, I don't know when, I will ask the Minister of Agriculture in his estimates when he will accomplish the recommendations and the targets set out in the TED report to reduce the numbers of farmers to 20,000. It will be some time in the 1980s. It will be then in the 1980s that they will accomplish it by their deliberate move to do nothing, by no policies with respect to credit. Farmers are now in a desperate position in terms of seeding in the province of Manitoba. There is no credit, what do they do? They abandon the MACC of providing operating loans, Mr. Speaker. They moved away from that. So where do the farmers have to go? Nowhere. They have nowhere to go but to the banking sector, who has been preaching restraint in this country all along.

While I am not concluding my remarks in this respect, Mr. Speaker, the Tories are abandoning the

agricultural sector to the detriment of the consumers of this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Would the member allow a question? Was the member speaking in favour of the resolution or against it?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the member should well know when the Member for Roblin talked about the Anti-Inflation Board, that the Anti-Inflation Board in Canada was one that did only one thing, that only controlled wages. It had nothing to do with the profitability of corporations. If the Anti-Inflation Board, Mr. Speaker, and the federal government was prepared to set up an Anti-Inflation Board that would control the entire system, Mr. Speaker, all the way from interest rates to profitability, then we would have an Inflation Board that could do something and consumers could benefit from that board. — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, absolutely. If the Member for Emerson is asking whether I'm in favour of a regulated economy and a well-managed economy, that I am in favour of, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Are you ready for the question?

Order please. The Honourable Member has spoken.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, we are not going to let this resolution go down the drain yet, Mr. Speaker. This is a good resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 5:30, when this subject matter next appears, the honourable member will have 20 minutes.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services that this House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.

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

#### ADDENDUM No. 1

#### Correction to French Text (Pages 2842 - 2843)

**MRS JUNE WESTBURY:** Merci, M. le président. Je pense que c'est indiqué que je parle sur ce sujet. Il me semble que le ministre en présentant cette législation a une responsabilité pour présenter aussi son espérance relative . . . pour accéder à d'autres besoins des Manitobains pour qui la langue première est le français. M. le président, ce gouvernement a une obligation pour démontrer quelques directions à tous les citoyens du Manitoba, aux Anglais et aux

Français. Le premier ministre se refuse à dire quelque chose aux Franco-Manitobains qui marque notre désir qu'ils restent Canadiens, que les Québécois restent Canadiens. Le fait que l'exécutif de la Société franco-manitobaine annonce leur appui des séparatistes de Québec est tragique, M. le président. C'est une tragédie, il me semble causée en partie par l'interférence du premier ministre aux problèmes endurés par les Franco-Manitobains. Où est la direction de ce gouvernement, M. le président?

Comme une libérale, la libération de cette législature, c'est approprié que je parle aujourd'hui pour tous les libéraux de cette province pour parler oui à cette législation et pour parler aux Franco-Manitobains et aux Québécois aussi. Les libéraux du Manitoba désirent pour vous, disons non à séparation, à destruction du Canada de la même manière quand une de deux maîtresse de maison servant en cette Chambre, c'est comme il faut aussi pour moi d'exprimer l'admiration et l'hommage pour les Yvettes du Québec, les Yvettes qui convenant à l'insulte d'un des ministères du gouvernement de Québec, organisent un ralliement immense pour parler à M. Lévesque et à Mme Payette, non à la question de séparation. Merci aux Yvettes de Québec, M. le président. Mon français n'est pas bon; je le parle aujourd'hui parce que je veux démontrer à nos cousines de Québec et aux Manitobains qui parlent en français comme langue première que moi-même et aussi tous les autres libéraux, nous avons besoin de lui.

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Merci beaucoup. Je suis désappointé avec qu'est ce qu'on a devant nous. Ça va pas assez loin. Pour moi, le ministre a manqué sa chance. Il aurait pu introduire quelque chose, montrer de la bonne volonté et puis que le français soit parlé dans les différents départements sociaux, par exemple, les gardes-malades publiques. Il faudrait qu'il y ait des gardes-malades qui peuvent parler en français. On m'a dit aussi, les gens de chez-nous, ce n'est pas ça qu'ils veulent voir. Ils veulent avoir le droit d'administrer leurs écoles, c'est ça qu'ils veulent voir. Ils veulent avoir le droit d'administrer le curriculum, l'administration et puis les classes. Ils veulent être avec d'autres écoles françaises qui sont totalement françaises, comme l'école à Laurier dans ma circonscription. C'est la seule école qu'on a en français. Je pense que le désir serait que cette école-là soit attachée avec d'autres écoles dans la province pour administrer seulement le curriculum et puis l'administration de l'école. La balance sera attachée avec la division qui . . . les endroits et puis les commissaires devront être des commissaires de langue française. Comme c'est là, ils ne le sont pas; ils sont d'autres langues. Alors on m'a dit: