

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, May 29, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. James R. Ferguson: Gentlemen, we now have a quorum. We are on Item 5.(a) and the only speaker that I have listed here is the Member for Selkirk. Oh, I'm sorry, the Member for Transcona wasn't finished. Okay, carry on.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to ask the Minister if there are any particular plans for the property in South St. Boniface now. He indicated that they're close to a development agreement and if a development agreement is signed, which I gather is at any particular moment, they could proceed to call for tenders for the installation of the first level of services in that property with respect to Phase I. Is that the plan of the Minister and the corporation at this time with respect to the South St. Boniface property?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: On the South St. Boniface piece of property, when it's returned to us at MHRC, we intend to take a look at the development plan that has presently been put together by Leaf Rapids Corporation and decide whether we think it is a development plan that will suit that area and will be saleable lots. The reason for that is because of the experience we're having in Selkirk that I've gone through and I don't think that that will take us too long to take a look at the development proposal or plan I believe it is called, that is ready to go to the city and that's the plans we have at the present time for St. Boniface.

MR. PARASIUK: I gather he's aware that with respect to the South St. Boniface property, the planning process there entailed a great deal of consultation with local groups in the area and when the zoning approval was given some months ago, the community committee commended the corporation on the degree to which there was involvement with local groups. So I think that in terms of the zoning process, in terms of the planning process, the local people in and around that area certainly have had a good idea of what will be happening in that development and seem to have given their approval to it.

Can he tell us the value attached to the property in South St. Boniface?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, the value with the total costs all added in, the purchase price, taxes, survey fees, interest costs, for all land feasibility studies, administration, interest and legal expenses is \$611,000.00.

MR. PARASIUK: Does that include the amount spent on the planning to date to bring it to a development agreement stage?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, when you get into planning and design and consulting, marketing, interim financing, administration . . . At the present time, it's at \$1,104,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. Would the member wait to be recognized for transcribing?

MR. JOHNSTON: The present costs are at \$1,104,515.00.

MR. PARASIUK: We are talking roughly about 200 acres in South St. Boniface, is that correct?

MR. JOHNSTON: 197.5 acres.

MR. PARASIUK: So we're talking about 197.5 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona. Just a second. We don't have a debate going between you or a private conversation. Let's keep the thing straight for transcribing.

The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Roughly speaking, we're talking about 200 acres. I've talked to some land developers about prices of land and the difficult thing to determine is whether in fact the land is ready to go and that means whether it's gone through the zoning process, whether it's received agreement through a development agreement and I gather this one is right at the stage where, really it's right at the stage of having the development agreement signed. These people tell me that that type of land that has a development agreement signed could be worth, at a minimum, \$30,000 per acre. So we're talking about land that, if a development agreement is imminent, is worth a minimum of \$6 million. We have spent to date, or the government has spent to date, \$1.1 million. Now this is land that is obviously a hot piece of property in Manitoba. It's land that is worth a great deal. I'm speaking in minimum price terms; it depends on the type of development that is put in there as to whether the land is worth more than \$6 million but \$6 million is a fairly conservative estimate of ready-to-go land.

Given that, the overall profit and loss statement on Leaf Rapids Corporation is obviously a very favourable one. It would, even by the Minister's accounting, probably be in a picture of having a profit or a presumed profit even at this stage of \$5 million. Can the Minister indicate how that land will be disposed and whether there is going to be any type of reserve pricing on that land if it is put up for sale to be developed by someone else other than Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation at this stage, seeing as how Leaf Rapids Corporation obviously will not be developing that property?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the member has put a price of \$6 million on the property, but if the decision is taken to proceed with the development of Phase I, then the Corporation will be required to let construction contracts with the approximate value of \$3 million. All the planning and everything is done, but there is another \$3 million to be added if we go ahead with development. From that point of view there is no question that if it were sold with a development agreement on it, it would be worth much more money, but certainly whoever buys it has to spend a lot of money developing it, or we have to.

His question is: What is going to happen to the property if we don't develop it? As I said to the member earlier today, if we don't develop that property, I have said it will be houses and there are several ways of doing it in such a way that we will be able to be in a position to see that there is houses on it and see that there is houses on it that low-income families can be involved in. It is just the same as the city is talking about going into a development agreement with Qualico in St. Vital. Those things could be done, but there has been no decision made on it as yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I wish the Minister could be somewhat more specific on how he could envisage houses getting on that property. Conceivably if you sold the land for \$1.1 million to a development company, you would recoup that which you had put into the property even though it has a value much greater than \$1.1 million and conceivably the development company could then proceed to develop that land even though you sold it at under price. I am not saying that you would do that but I am saying that these are the possibilities that exist.

Do you envisage establishing a management contract with the land development company or do you envisage auctioning it off in a sense to the highest bidder, which given, in a sense, the desirability of the property might be a good possibility and then putting some conditions into the auction to ensure that MHRC had access to some of the property. Is that what the Minister is talking about?

I think that this isn't that unfamiliar to MHRC especially since they are developing land north of Inkster Boulevard. So I would hope that the Minister could give us some specific answers as to what the intent is with respect to that property?

MR. JOHNSTON: What was the last sentence, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to get some specifics as to how the Minister envisages housing going in there if MHRC doesn't develop it itself.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I hope that I'm not trying to be dense or anything but I have said that

the land is in the hands of MHRC. If we do not like the development proposal that has been put forward by Leaf Rapids Corporation, we could take a look at one of our own. The property could be sold at tender or we could enter into a development agreement with a contractor and to be more specific than that, I'm going to have a hard time because there has been no decision made on it as yet.

MR. PARASIUK: Okay. The reason why I'm asking questions about specifics is that if you tender it out, which as I said, given the desirability of the property might be a good course of action to pursue, there would probably be a very good chance that the big four land developers would be quite interested in ensuring that they purchase that property and they may, in fact, or one of them may in fact pay the highest price. Is it the government's intent to auction off property without putting any constraints on it because the reason why that land was purchased through a land banking program in the first place was to provide for some type of competition to the big four land developers that presently, in a sense, have a pretty strong position in the land servicing market in Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, that's quite true and I think I said earlier today it's our desire to have constraints to make sure that the smaller contractors have the opportunity to become involved in any property that MHRC owns. There's no question that we don't want to see that piece of property be used by one big developer. The member says if we put it up for tender that could very easily happen but there can be constraints when it's put up for tender and, as I said, those are some of the things we will be looking at. The honourable member is probably wondering why we are concerned about the plan of South St. Boniface. West Selkirk was purchased for \$2,580 per acre. The consulting, administration and servicing costs exceed \$48,000 per acre and, you know, no development should exceed more than \$37,000 per acre. We want to take a close look at what the plan is and the costs and everything of the plan that has been presented to us by the Leaf Rapids Corporation.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, I would question the Minister saying that no land should be developed for more than \$37,000 an acre. I think if the Minister checks in the private housing industry, you'll find instances where land has in fact been developed for more than \$37,000 an acre.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, it's not all that common to be over \$37,000 per acre. It was running \$25,000 per acre about two years ago; it's up to approximately, the average, the most runs around \$35,000 at the present time and certainly not more than \$40,000 if we want to draw straws, but \$48,000 per acre is what the land in southwest Selkirk has cost, \$48,000.00.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I know of land that The Bay has purchased thinking of a shopping centre but not quite sure whether they'll proceed with the shopping centre, where they are talking in the order of \$40,000 to \$44,000 for land alone; and I know that land development companies are interested in purchasing that land from The Bay on a contingency basis, for up to \$44,000, provided that there is a development agreement in place. I'm saying that the land in south St. Boniface does have a development agreement. It depends on the usage, in large part.

What I'm pointing out, however, is that the property in south St. Boniface is worth a great deal and it is worth a great deal because the public invested in it and held it and it's worth money now. The point is, how will that increment, that increased value that exists because the Crown owns that property, be utilized? And that's why it's quite important to determine whether, in fact, the Crown will develop that land itself, to ensure that serviced land is provided at as close to cost as possible; or whether, in fact, it would be possible to — you know, I think the government is interested in possibly selling that land — and I'm concerned that it doesn't sell the land at a give-away price. That's why I'm raising these points and I find that the Minister hasn't got any specific answers to those questions.

MHRC owns a lot of other property as well, through land banking. It would be interesting to note what the values of that land that the MHRC holds right now, is. Can we get an idea of how much the land costs? Can we get an idea of what the carrying costs are? And can we get some idea of what that land might be worth in different parts of Winnipeg?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I think the last question is, what is the intent of the province to do with the land bank?

MR. PARASIUK: Yes.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I have to accept the criticism, I guess, that I cannot give specific answers as to what is going to happen to the land bank which is owned by the Province of Manitoba, at the present time.

I have said that the land bank that we have will be used for housing, and if there are profits made that the member is speaking of, those profits will be used to benefit housing in the Province of Manitoba and benefit low income families to be able to get into houses, in the Province of Manitoba. There is no question about that.

Now the policy of what will be done with the land bank, we discussed the other night when the Member for Fort Rouge asked me. There was one opinion of his that thought that we should maybe, if we were going to sell it, dump it all on the market at the same time. I'm not completely in agreement with that suggestion.

But the policy on the land bank, or the property that the province owns, even in land bank and even properties throughout the Province of Manitoba, in towns, cities, is under discussion at the present time. But I can assure them that the land was purchased for housing; it will be housing; or it will be — well, I don't see that the land can be used for anything else, it will all be negotiated and sold for housing or any profit derived from those properties will be used to benefit the housing in the Province of Manitoba and more than likely, in benefiting people with low incomes being able to get into their own homes.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in the past, and I think some other members of this party, have been somewhat critical of the Provincial Government in the past, acquiring land through the Federal Land Banking Program.

They've pointed out that the acquisition of this land has resulted in the province incurring liabilities. What is always forgotten, however, is that against these liabilities, are assets; assets that seem to be appreciating very quickly and which are very very valuable.

Now, the whole point of the land banking program, when the Federal Government announced it — and the province responded in response to a federal initiative just as I think the province, right now, is responding in response to federal initiatives regarding housing policy — and the intent was to acquire this land and it was to service some of it, service some of it on a continuing basis so that the availability of serviced land would have some impact on the market. Now, this is what the Member for Fort Rouge was raising when he said it would be quite important to try and provide more serviced land. The previous government was going to try and provide serviced land at a steady clip, something in the order of 200 to 300 lots per year. I don't see the present government making that type of commitment. The present government says it's not sure whether it will be providing serviced land, and that would defeat the whole reason for the land bank in the first place.

The Member for Fort Rouge has asked whether there will be more serviced land becoming available. I'm asking, specifically, whether it is the policy of this government to proceed with the development or servicing of something in the order of 200 to 300 lots per years from the land bank, which is quite large, which the province presently holds. Is it the intent to service 200 to 300 lots per year?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that there's any question about the policy of the government as to being in the land development and servicing land. I think, if we went back through our election campaign or if even discussion in the House, or anything of that nature, it is not the intention of this government to be a large land developer.

To date the government has not been successful in developing land. To date we are in a position where we develop land and of having been at a deficit position on most of them. Land development is a business where you naturally have a piece of land. You've got your estimates of the market, the size of lots that will be sold on that piece of land, the mix on the piece of land and after you develop it and put the roads and everything in, you hope that you've got the right thing and you hope that the market hasn't gone soft on you.

The development business is a fairly risky type of business for government to be in and we haven't been successful at it. We haven't been successful in The Pas; we haven't been successful in Winnipeg; we haven't been successful in West Selkirk — you know, the member puts up all kinds of arguments on West Selkirk and at the present time we cannot sell a piece of property in West Selkirk. If we sell it at cost plus ten, we will be above the market in the area of Winnipeg and Charleswood. As a matter of fact, Charleswood — in the paper tonight — you can buy a piece of property for \$3.18 a square foot. If we sell our property in West Selkirk, we will have cost plus ten, we'll have to sell it for \$4.00 per square foot. And in Winnipeg, the same type of zero lot lines, are selling for \$3.25 market.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the success stories of the government being in land development are not good and I don't think that Leaf Rapids Corporation, I sincerely hope that the development in Inkster is successful, but we have not had a good success story in land development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just going to say to the Member for Transcona, I was wondering if he would yield to other members that have indicated they would like to ask questions, particularly the Member for Selkirk.

MR. PARASIUK: I would like to ask just a couple more then I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister started off saying that he has looked at this very pragmatically, that the success of the province with respect to land development hasn't been very good. He points out a number of examples; in part mostly MHRC examples, and he points out one in West Selkirk, which is still not final.

He then has taken some actions; namely, dissolving Leaf Rapids Corporation, transferring his assets in activities to MHRC and he implies that the Corporation itself wasn't successful and he implies that the Corporation wasn't profitable. Yet if you look at the value of those assets, if you look at the value of the assets of that Corporation — the assets of that Corporation are worth in the order of seven or eight million dollars and they have expended something in the order of \$2 million. It is a very successful operation, it is worth a lot more than it was a few years ago. MHRC, as a corporation involved in land-banking, is worth much much more than it was a few years ago and this isn't the same as the situation regarding social housing, where the Minister said, "Well, I am not sure whether in fact social housing has a market value." I dispute that because I think the social housing, which has cost \$200 million, could quite easily fetch something in the order of \$400 million in the private market right now. But I am quite certain that the land that the Province has, which it acquired over a period of time, is worth a great deal more . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Not in Ethelbert.

MR. PARASIUK: Not necessarily in Ethelbert, because I think that the Member for Roblin's perspective really can't go beyond that, really can't go beyond that because he has some difficulty going beyond that in his own mind.

But I am talking about Winnipeg and I think it would be wise for the Member for Roblin to take a look at some of the land in Winnipeg; take a look at the south St. Boniface property. He should, you know, get off his. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you keep addressing your remarks this way I will have to bring you into order.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, I am having some difficulty trying to speak when I am having this person rambling in the wilderness, where he usually speaks from. He usually speaks from his feet, not standing up.

MR. McKENZIE: You guys have never spent five cents out there in all the years you were in power.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, if the Member for Roblin wants to speak he should get off his seat and speak. He should sit on his mind and not let it wander.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the members of the Committee, would you please address your remarks through the Chair. To the Member for Transcona, the Member for Roblin is on the list after his colleague, the Member for Selkirk, and I will ask him if he will try and refrain his interjections. The Member for Transcona please.

MR. PARASIUK: I am trying to point out that the assets of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation are worth considerably more than they were before the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation got into the whole area of land-banking and land development.

The Minister is trying to give the impression to us and to the public that somehow these assets are worth less. Now I contend that they are worth a lot more than they were when they were purchased. I contend that the south St. Boniface property is worth a great deal more, if you include the development costs as well, is worth a great deal more than \$1.1 million, which is the development

cost today, including the price of the land. I contend that it is worth a minimum of \$6 million. That means that the land development venture has been highly successful. The point is whether in fact people are going to want to try and achieve that profit as a public land developer.

Now if the province doesn't want to proceed with public land development, which I think it should, then it has a big question facing it. What is it going to do with that increased value of land? The Minister has indicated that he has some qualms about seeing low-income people somehow get some type of windfall by moving into a home that might be worth \$5,000 less than the market. Well, I wonder and I raised this before, if the Minister has any qualms about private land developers possibly purchasing the south St. Boniface property at a price of 1.1 or 1.5 million dollars which to the general public may seem like a fair price because it covers the costs that have gone into it, but is far far below the market value.

Those are questions that the Minister really still can't answer, but I think are quite critical. Because if in fact that land is sold for anything less than \$6 million, when it does have a development agreement in place, then there would be no other way to describe it but a gigantic rip-off, and the Minister, I think, has to come to grips with that particular problem, and has to come to grips with the dilemma that the land development program and the land-banking program has created a lot of wealth for the people of Manitoba through its land holdings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I hope the honourable member doesn't honestly have any idea that we would sell south St. Boniface for \$1.4 million. There is a market price for land and you find the market if you are going to put it out for tender and I assure you that it is not going to be given away. The reason for the land being valuable is not because of what Leaf Rapids did to the land, it is valuable because of inflation. It is valuable because land prices zoomed up, and as the Bellan Report says the price has zoomed up because of the government being in the land-banking business. He made that very clear.

Mr. Chairman, the south St. Boniface land that he speaks of if we were to develop it with the figures I just gave him, with another \$3 million on top, at least \$4 million would have been spent on it, and then there is the other two in Selkirk. So the assets that you are speaking of are \$6 million, not \$3 million that you were speaking of, if we put in services.

I can tell you this, that the reason for the assets of Leaf Rapids Corporation being so good at the present time is because the land was transferred from MHRC to Leaf Rapids Corporation at a book value or at what we paid for it, and that is why the assets of Leaf Rapids Corporation are as high as they are. The Leaf Rapids Corporation on the development plan that they have at the present time over an eight-year period, the total development budget for south St. Boniface for 177.2 acres of developable land is \$65,000 per acre over an eight to five year period, and that is very high costs, and that is why we are going to look at it.

Now, regarding the whole policy of what will happen or the policy that will be decided by the government as to how the land bank will be treated is one that I have to say that I cannot answer at the present time. I can't be clearer on it, other than it will either be in housing or if there is any profits such as the member was speaking of, it will be used to put people into houses and used to put people with low income into houses. That is the plans that we are looking at at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PASIUK: This will be my final point for now and I will let the Member for Selkirk speak.

The Minister implies that land which cost \$600,000 a few years ago, now is worth something in the order of \$6 million, only because of inflation. That is a ten-fold increase and that really doesn't wash at all. The reason why it is worth a lot more is that raw land which was considered only a possibility with respect to development has been taken and a lot of planning, a lot of work has been done with the city, a lot of work has been done with local people, and since that land is now very close to development because of the effort of the developer in transferring raw bank land into developable land, which could have tenders called on it next week if the board decided to sign the development agreement that that land at that stage, because of the efforts of the developer now is worth something in the order of a minimum of \$6 million. The point is that this is just the case with respect to 200 acres. What about the other 3,500 acres owned by MHRC? I leave that open because I think I might get back to it; I'm going to ask some questions later on about the Inkster North development and about some of the joint holdings between the Province of Manitoba

and the City of Winnipeg.

What is the intention of the province with respect to this whole huge package of land which is worth a great amount more than the province paid for it and also —(Interjection)— Well, maybe the Member for Roblin would like to give it away but I certainly hope that the Province of Manitoba doesn't give it away. I wouldn't trust the Member for Roblin with anything of a public asset nature but, at the same time, I do think that the present Minister wants to be very careful on how he disposes of that land. So I'm raising these points with him so that he realizes that although some of the land that is banked may be some distance from the major services, that if the province does undertake some effort in providing some of the initial services, that that land will increase in value tremendously.

In my constituency, BACM has front-ended some of the major services so they've converted about 1,000 acres in Devonshire Park into land that is worth a great deal of money right now. Prior to BACM putting in that front-end servicing, that land was worth a great deal less. I'm just afraid that the province may in fact sell out some very valuable assets at a very low price if it is, in a sense, ideologically disposed to getting rid of those assets which it holds. I would hope that the Minister would undertake not to dispose of the assets. I would hope that the Minister undertakes to keep them. I would hope that the Minister would only undertake to dispose of the assets if a particular firm comes along on a management contract basis and decides that it can convert some of that raw land into serviced lots at an agreed-to price and the agreed-to price of the lots is made known to the public so that when the public buys that lot, it then knows what the land price is and then it can go to a contractor and get the contractor to quote a construction price for the house itself. In this way the shadow game that goes on, I think right now, in vertically integrated companies with respect to the real cost of land and the imputed value of land in the final price of the house could be tackled. Right now, people are spending far too much money on land and on houses and somehow if the Minister wants to achieve his objective of providing affordable housing, he is going to have to be a bit more aggressive as the Minister responsible for Housing in dealing with that problem.

MR. MCKENZIE: The government jacked up the price of land. You just said it, you just spelled it out loud and clear.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member is quite right in that the value of the land has gone up. It's gone up in value as raw land. It has gone up in price because there is a development agreement that could be signed on it. That is true. The price we paid for Selkirk and there's only been two pieces of land that the Leaf Rapids Corporation has worked with. The Selkirk land, if we had sold it as raw land, we would have had a very good profit off it. We have developed it now and we'll have trouble getting our costs back. That is the fact of the matter. You either put a development on it that it's a development that is saleable or you don't and this is something that has not been done in Selkirk and something that we're going to analyse as I've told you. The five to eight year project is going to bring the development of the St. Boniface land up to \$65,000 an acre and it's in the figures here.

So, yes, the land is worth a lot more money today if you want to sell it raw, the land that is in the government land bank. It's worth more money if you get a development plan on it, a plan that is approved by the city but once you start putting your development and services in and find that you can't get your costs back because your development is not what the people want, or your costs are higher than market, then you've got a problem and that's the problem we have at Selkirk. It's very clear.

A MEMBER: We're talking about St. Boniface.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Selkirk is the reason why we are taking our time on St. Boniface and taking a look at the whole situation. We just got it back as of Friday and we have the figures that are available to us because of what the Board of Directors asked for as far as the costs and the planned costs are concerned and we see very clearly that in Selkirk we have a problem and we don't want the same problem in South St. Boniface. If the honourable member would like an opinion from me, I don't think that South St. Boniface is worth less than \$20,000 an acre if it was just sitting there raw, by any stretch of the imagination. That's an opinion from me and I'm not what you would call a qualified appraiser. But certainly I don't think that we can be faulted for not taking a close look at where we are going as being a developer.

You are saying that the government is going to be in the development business and be a developer. It's a very risky business. There is a lot of money to be found up front and I can assure you that before we go into it any further, we have every intention of looking it over carefully, regarding

the whole land bank. The member was not here last year when we were in these Estimates. I referred to a report that was done by Mr. Axworthy's Urban Study Group. There are not that many pieces of land within the government land bank that is going to be able to be used until 1985 or further on. So we are looking at pieces of land in Brandon, Charleswood, St. Boniface. There certainly is the involvement with the city in Fort Garry and the St. Vital areas but we are not involved to that great an extent except the money passes through us and we have the right to look at 25 percent of the property for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to see that there are certain types of housing that go on it. But we are not moving ahead and making decisions on the land bank at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words if I could in connection with the West Selkirk project as there has been considerable discussion pertaining to it. In the process of making my comments, I would like to direct some questions to the Minister. I can say that I am disappointed that something cannot be done in order to develop and to make effective the Woodlands Development in Selkirk, and I do feel that in fact something could have been done.

I'm concerned first, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that Ensign Homes Limited has a virtual belt of land which they own in the areas in which Selkirk most immediately can grow toward. In other words, one private developer has a large chunk of available land for development purposes, so that, Mr. Chairman, I've looked upon the Leaf Rapids project as an alternative chunk of land to that which is basically owned by one large land developer. My concern therefore, which I would ask the Minister to deal with when he responds, is if it is the Minister's intention to sell Leaf Rapids Development Corporation land in Selkirk, is that land going to be sold in such a way as to ensure that it will provide competition to the builder that is presently, as I said earlier, in a virtual stranglehold situation in that that builder has large chunks of the existing land. So that's one question.

Maybe the Minister would like to deal with them individually or I could deal with them all, and then listen to the Minister's response.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. James R. Ferguson: The Minister of Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I'd like to deal with that particular question while we have it before us. Mr. Chairman, the member is concerned that somebody has a piece of land, or all the land, and he is going to be holding people up for it, or as I gather and that's maybe a little more crude or maybe straightforward way of putting it. Mr. Chairman, the cost of the lots — there are 199 lots — and we're selling them; quite frankly, we are selling them now, but here's what is happening. At 199 lots, the estimated cost per lot is \$9,588; nearly \$10,000 a lot, that's our cost. There is 2,640 square feet, which gives us a cost of \$3.63 a square foot. Now, that means a 33 by 80 lot in Selkirk is approximately \$10,000. A 50 by 100 square foot lot at the market today is going to be about \$16,200, and it's double's. At the present time, the market for lots in Winnipeg, an average of 4,400 square feet — let's take 44 by 100 — \$14,300 per lot, and the average cost, the 4,400 per square foot is \$3.25 per square foot at market. And you know, the developer who developed that, he pays taxes; we don't pay, the corporation doesn't pay taxes. He does all of those things and he's selling at \$3.25 per square foot. In Charleswood in the paper tonight, you can buy land for \$3.18 per square foot, and we are saying in Selkirk, for a lot that's 33 by 80 — 33 by 80 — in an area where your consultants back in October and in February advised not to go ahead with.

Now, people from Winnipeg are not going to come out and live in Selkirk on the basis of because they want to get in wide open spaces and live on a 33 foot lot. The people that live in the rural areas want to live on larger lots, we've proved that in The Pas, we can't sell Bell Avenue. So all of a sudden, if we were to sell the lots, at cost plus ten in Selkirk, Manitoba, we'd have to get \$11,000 a lot, and, Mr. Chairman, I am told, that you can buy a 60 foot lot in Selkirk at the present time for around \$14,000.00.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am told that the Selkirk properties are not anywhere near as expensive per square foot as the ones we have developed in West Selkirk. Now they're for sale. The honourable member today said he has some contractors that were interested. As a matter of fact we checked it out. There was a contractor interested and we have talked with him. He could not get CMHC funding, CMHC will not fund on speculation to the contractors in West Selkirk, and he came to us and said, "Yes, I'll build if you will guarantee that you'll buy them back if I don't sell them," and that's not really any speculation by contractor.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's the problem in Selkirk, and that's the problem that we're not going to run up against in south St. Boniface. If the Honourable Member for Transcona wants to bring these gentlemen down to my office next week, or tomorrow, and have discussions with our people then fine, bring them along, we're only too happy to see them. We want to move the property too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I could just ask the Minister though, my concern is that this land is to be sold, that it will not be sold in such a way as to intensify what is already a growing control of available land by one or two companies and is the Minister indicating to me that the land will still be held by MHRC and sold by MHRM, or is it to be released to the private sector?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, we have been trying to release it to the private sector; we have been in discussion with contractors. The CMHC will not advance contractors speculative money to go into West Selkirk at the present time. If you come to me and say that I am going, or go to CMHC and say I am going to buy that lot for myself and build on it, they will probably give you a loan, but they will not work with developer or contractors at the present time in West Selkirk. We have had several discussions with them on it.

MR. PAWLEY: I'd like to just say to the Minister that I have the impression that when we talk about the 35 foot lot, I should mention that the local municipal authority approved the lot size, 35 by 80, for very good reason, and that is that with such a level of density per acre, then the municipal authority was entitled to \$1,000 per unit towards assistance insofar as the municipal authorities infrastructure costs were concerned. So there certainly was local municipal support for this project.

I am wondering when we talk about the costs, and the member refers to \$48,000 as being the land cost, I think the fact is that the land in question mainly was purchased from the . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Forty-eight thousand dollars per acre.

MR. PAWLEY: Forty-eight thousand, that the land was purchased originally raw form from the Crown itself, and thus that would be a concern which I would ask the Minister whether or not in the original purchase of the land from the Crown, the land price might have been in excess of that which should reasonably been attached to it. The land was not purchased from the private sector originally, the raw land, but from the Crown itself.

The third aspect I'd like to mention to the Minister is, it seems to me when we talk about the size of the lot that we ignore the man-made lakes, the park area, which is additional green space, and I have reviewed the plans for the Woodlands development and I've been quite impressed by the plans because they involve so much green space.

If one wishes to assume a negative position toward the development one speaks only in terms of 35 foot lots — the negative, but the fact is that there is a great deal of man-made lake, there's a great deal of green park area, wooded areas, that I do believe is rather unique for a development plan. I know of no other part of Selkirk, for instance, that has the man-made lakes, the parkland area, as this development would have and I do think that's a real selling feature. But there's been minimal, Mr. Minister, minimal effort, I think, to publicize that.

I can recall one brochure being distributed at the time of the Selkirk Fair, I believe it was, last year outlining the development plan, what it contained, but I have seen no effort since to publicize, and the project is bound, I think, to fail if there is no effort made to emphasize the attractive features of the project. I do believe that had there been an active sales program, if there had been some effort to publicize the good features of the project that there would be greater interest than possibly the Minister is finding in the project, but there's been no publicity. I don't believe there's been any effort to my knowledge to publicize the project. People in Selkirk are not aware. I sent to the Minister a letter, I believe it was two or three weeks ago, from a constituent who was interested in information toward his possible purchase of a lot in the development which he hoped to build a home on. I don't know whether the — certainly that is an example of an individual who approached me — had no idea of what the development was like, so that I say to the Minister, there's been no effort to ensure that the development would be a success, no mention of the fact that the lot size could be 50 feet width rather than necessarily 35 feet width in all instances. So I say to the Minister that I do believe that there has been insufficient effort to ensure the success of this project.

I would also like to say to the Minister, and his words the other day in the House confirmed

this, 176 families trying to find accommodation in Selkirk, only 52 units I believe the Minister said, available, indicates the pressure especially on the part of lower income groups in the area, and I don't know why MHRC doesn't lead in the forefront here and at least develop 20 percent or 15 percent of these lots for public housing. There's been no lead that I'm aware of.

And also I would like to point out to the Minister that a penitentiary very close to that area is slated to be constructed in 1980 in a Federal Government announcement, and this land will be very much in demand at that time, so I do believe that this project has a great deal going for it but I feel that there have been certain deficiencies in promoting it, selling it, and realizing some of the original objectives that this land was to be used for. I would hope that the Minister, and I say this to him sincerely, because of the housing pressures, would have a very thorough review of the project in order to attempt to rescue it from simply ending up in the hands of those, as I indicated earlier, who do have ownership of a belt of land around the community, and I fear that the costs will escalate out of all proportion if this belt of ownership of land around Selkirk is permitted to widen further, and there's very little choice insofar as the acquisition of building lots in the area. I'd appreciate the Minister's comments.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, to answer his first question the land cost \$2,580 per acre. Consulting and administration and servicing costs exceed \$48,000 per acre, and that is high. Nobody wants to sell those pieces of property more than we do but at the present time, working with the contractors who have been interested, we have not been successful. I say if you have some bring them down. Mr. Chairman, you forwarded to me a person who was interested in one piece of property. Well, we'd be very interested to talk to him now. It's back at MHRC and, as I said, if we could get our cost at the present time we'll be higher than the market is in the area. Does the member really think that we should sell off these lots at a loss?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention to the Minister that I'm not sure what lots are selling for in Selkirk quite frankly, but I do know that in the area surrounding the Town of Selkirk that unserviced lots, an acre and a half lots out in the country, and there's subdivisions being approved and I do believe that that's eventually going to be a problem, are selling from \$20,000 to \$22,000 each.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, that is why people want to move to the rural areas so they can have an acre and a half and they're quite willing to pay for it. We have not been successful in detaching contractors to the 33 x 80 lot in Selkirk, and as far as advertising is concerned I assure you we'll make it known they're for sale.

MR. PAWLEY: Has there been any effort to indicate to prospective buyers that those lots can be sold 50 x 100 feet. The Minister keeps referring to 33 foot lots and it doesn't require very much adjustment to 50 foot lots.

MR. JOHNSTON: First of all the design of the project is they cannot be increased in depth; in width they can. If you go to 50 feet by 80 feet you are going to end up with the lot, if we go at cost plus 10, costing \$16,000, \$4.00 a square foot. Now I assure you, when you can buy a 50 x 100 foot lot for around \$16,200 or \$22,000 for an acre and a half as the honourable member says, it becomes a little bit of a problem. And when you get to \$16,000 on a 50 x 80 foot piece of property, and your AHOP is at \$39,500 I assure you you're going to have some problems at \$33.00 a square foot putting a house on it that may qualify. As I said earlier today if you went to 66 x 80 you'd get the lots up to around \$18,000 or \$19,000 and then you've got to put a house on it and then how will you qualify for AHOP?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, could I ask the Minister then if in fact this project is not going to successfully realize its objective which was to deal with what is a large market of families that require low income housing, what plans are in the works insofar as dealing with — well, with the problem that he mentioned the other day in the House of 176 families that were awaiting housing accommodation only in the low-rental area alone, the low income area because I believe this information came from the Selkirk housing authority.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I said earlier if one of those individuals want to come forward and purchase a lot they can, and they can probably get financing from CMHC. If you want to have individuals come and purchase them we will advertise that they're available, but I don't know, you know, the turnover in Selkirk is not that great. You're talking 176 people looking for low cost accommodation or subsidized accommodation. Now if he wants us to subsidize those people by selling these lots at less than cost — is that what you're saying?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, all that I can say to the Minister is that I understood that the philosophy of his Party has been better to assist and subsidize families in the purchase of their own homes rather than through rental accommodation, so that I had thought that this would be an area that the Minister would want to explore and which was very convenient to him insofar as this very development is concerned rather than construction of numerous public housing units. Is the Minister indicating then that the only way that this need then will be realized in Selkirk will be in the direction of further large scale public housing development?

MR. JOHNSTON: No. No, the Member has brought up something that will have to be considered. If those lots are not going to sell the way they are at the present time we have to consider doing something. As I said last week on Bell Avenue in The Pas we have set up a loss of nearly \$700,000 and we still haven't sold one.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister advise what sales efforts are undertaken. Is there any brochure or pamphlet or are there private agents that are involved at all in the sale of these lots in —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I'm having trouble making myself heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk has the floor.

MR. PAWLEY: Could the Minister detail for me the promotional effort that is being undertaken to dispose of this property?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, the Leaf Rapids Corporation had a person on salary whose position it was to do nothing except market the property, and he hasn't been able to market it.

MR. PAWLEY: I'm wondering what steps were taken by the person in question. Although I live locally I must say to the Minister I've seen little effort to promote it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I said we will analyze the steps that have been taken by Leaf Rapids Corporation. We will discuss and we will advertise. I'm sure that the member has to realize that it's only common sense. Maybe we'll have to use a local real estate man. I can't say whether there has been or not, but we will find out. I can say to the member — I don't know whether he was here when I mentioned it before earlier today — we have not been able to attract any contractors. Now individual people we'll have to advertise. We'll have to make it known they're available at these prices, but when I tell you that the cost plus 10 percent is higher than the market for zero lot line lots in Winnipeg or in other areas of the city, or in some areas of the city, we have a problem.

You mention the \$1,000, the \$1,000 incentive grant is only paid by the Federal Government if a house is started. It looks as if they're not going to be able to take advantage of that.

MR. PAWLEY: I, of course, don't have the information the Minister has as to how the cost figure is realized, but I'm wondering in the apportioning of cost whether the cost is apportioned over a larger area than that which we are immediately dealing with because certainly the services that are involved here I suspect would be of such a nature that would extend over a much larger area than the 25 to 30 acres immediately south of the mental hospital.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, there's \$423,000 that were appropriated against Phase II, which was attributable to the pond that the member is speaking of, and Phase II is a long way off. The amount of money expended to date is \$1,168,000 with an estimate of \$740,000 to complete it. Mr. Chairman, the estimates of Leaf Rapids Corporation — these are of April 15th — were in the neighbourhood I believe, \$2,068,000 in the beginning, and the layout of the lots, obviously they knew then what the costs were going to be and it was laid out in this fashion.

MR. PAWLEY: So the Minister can assure me that the costs claimed as against this property have all been attributed to this property, and that other costs not related to this property have been directly or indirectly added into the cost figures.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am assured that the costs that were presented to us by the Leaf Rapids Corporation staff, are the actual costs of the Leaf Rapids Development in West Selkirk only, charged against that. I'd be quite willing to have the member come and check with the staff on this anytime he'd like to.

Monday, May 29, 1978

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder if I could ask the Minister what plans, if any, are underway in connection with the proposals that have been made to him or to MHRC in connection with the senior citizen housing projects for Petersfield and Lockport?

MR. JOHNSTON: Petersfield is being examined at the present time. I had a letter from the member and we have taken it into consideration, and we are examining it at the present time. It would look very much like Petersfield would be a natural for the non profit housing program that is coming forward from the Federal Government, which is a very attractive proposal and we in the province, when we finally get our agreement settled with the Federal Government on that particular proposal, we'll be suggesting that to them. They can move ahead almost as fast as they want and I had a meeting with the gentleman from Petersfield who informed me that if that proposal was available to them, they could probably go ahead right off the bat.

The next question comes up as to whether that non profit housing, would be able to support people in them that are on the minimum income? Yes, the province will definitely take a look at people living in those non profits by subsidizing some of the rents in those projects.

MR. PAWLEY: In Lockport, is there any. . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Lockport again, is also the same thing, it's very hard to justify too many units in Lockport and the problem in Lockport is the people that are coming forward with their names have assets that put them in the position of not qualifying. Here again, the non profit set up is probably the best way to go.

MR. PAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin is the next speaker, Elmwood, Transcona, and then Lac du Bonnet.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, do I hear my ears filling me in correctly that government is in the land development business, fixing prices for land; buying land, and hoping that the price will go up and ta-da, ta-da. Would the Minister fill me in and for the the benefit, especially the new members, what's the policy of you as a Minister and MHRC? Are you buying land, speculating on land, and I'm thinking in this subject of the matter that just came up in the House of Commons the other day where members were being accused of buying on the floating dollar.

MR. JOHNSTON: No, no, no, no, no.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, maybe it was phony, but I wonder would the Minister clear up where this government — what's your policy on land development, buying land, fixing prices of land in the city areas, in the urban areas, in the rural areas . That will be my first question.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, the policy of the present government on the purchases of land as far as MHRC is concerned, and that's where the land has been purchased — the corporation that the government land has been purchased through for housing — is that we are not purchasing any land at the present time unless it will enhance the piece of property we presently have. And as far as fixing the prices, no, we don't fix the prices. The land that the government has purchased has increased in price because of inflation, and in some cases because of work that has been done on it.

MR. McKENZIE: May I ask the Minister whether the south St. Boniface Development — how you can anticipate or deal with that kind of a profit that you were talking about earlier from the initial price of that land, and the market value that was suggested by members of the Committee earlier — was that capital gain or. . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, if we were to sell the land and make the type of profit that has been mentioned, the profit would be used for housing in the Province of Manitoba, and preferably be used for housing or helping low income families to get into their own homes.

MR. McKENZIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister explain to me how the former Minister arrived in my constituency during the last election with a shovel, and one day he stops into the Town of Roblin and turns a shovel —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, would you listen to the Member for Roblin please?

MR. McKENZIE: . . . and says he is going to build X numbers of housing units and unfortunately he never notified the MLA that was the city member from that area, because I would have liked to have been there and polish his shovel, but unfortunately during the heat of election campaign, the Minister never checked with the town to try and ascertain if that would cause any problems. And fortunately the town now has seen fit to have to set up a new lagoon, they had to go and buy X numbers of dollars of land which they are in the throes of doing, and I can show you the project likely is still on the rails because we're not going to turn back any of the projects from the former government, Mr. Chairman. But here is the ad in this week's issue of the Roblin paper on this project that's not off the ground yet, to show you what initiative and what directive we're getting. They're now asking people, 55 years of age and over — "You are now eligible to apply for accommodation in the new senior citizens home being planned." Now, Mr. Minister, has the senior citizens age been lowered to 55? The senior citizens housing, Mr. Evans set up in Roblin — (Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the members of the Committee, you all know. . . The Member for Roblin, please.

MR. McKENZIE: Now, would the Minister advise me and the. . . I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for one moment please. For the last twelve years or so, all members who have ever witnessed the Member for Roblin know that he has never, ever interrupted anyone, so would you please show the courtesy to him that he has shown to you members for the last number of years? The Member for Roblin, would you continue on please.

MR. McKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'll not bring Ethelbert into the debate at all tonight; I'll keep that for another day.

Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering, even at this late date, they are still looking for people 55 years of age and over and the project hasn't been built yet in Roblin because the lagoon hasn't been even planned, if it would not have been better for the government of that day to put those dollars into personal care home beds in Roblin, where I think there is a waiting list of 34? —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Roblin, would you please address your remarks to the Chair?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Oh, it's this government that did that.

MR. JOHNSTON: To answer the Member for Roblin's question about the age, Mr. Saul Miller, the Member for Seven Oaks, when he was the Minister of MHRC, lowered the age to 55 providing there was a need on the basis of disability or something of that nature. Otherwise, the age of 65 is the qualification.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, to answer the Member for Roblin's question, on the 10th of October, 1976, there was a submission from the Corporation regarding the suggested housing units to be built in 1977. They were forwarded to the Minister; the Minister returned it to them on the 21st of December, 1976, suggesting that the projects that were on the list, certain projects on the list should go ahead, and in that list he added Roblin, Gimli, Birtle, Shoal Lake, Rosssburn, Swan River, Anola, increased Portage la Prairie, Emerson, Alonsa, McCreary, Winnipeg Beach, and Teulon. On March 15, 1977, there was a document sent to the construction department of the Corporation, giving him a list of what could be gone ahead of immediately, and the following non-Winnipeg projects may not proceed until further notice. Of that list there is 25, and of the 25 there is 7 that were on the original list recommended by the Corporation. Roblin was added on the basis of 42 units and they had 48 eligible applications and the policy of the Corporation is to build half; if you have 48 applications, they build half, and that's always been the policy. The contract for Roblin was for 42, the new board took a look at it and felt that they could not justify 42; it's being redesigned or re-looked at for 24 units, and we will be in touch with the Town of Roblin whether they want to go non-profit or whether they want us to build it. That's where Roblin stands at the present time.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to see the tax dollars of the citizens expended where there is the greatest advantage. I wonder because of the fact that the lagoon still hasn't been built, it still has to go before the Clean Environment Commission before that structure can ever come

off the ground, and that may take another year or more because there is some controversy in the wind, is that the lagoon will be spilled into the Shell River which is one of the last freshwater rivers which we have in the province.

Would it be possible for MHRC or you as the Minister to change the priorities of those dollars and put them into personal care home beds where the list is a rather lengthy one and I don't think it's that lengthy for this type of housing? Would it be possible to transfer those dollars where the need is great, and this government of course said that they knew all the things and they were representing the high priorities of people of need? I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, they sure didn't do it in Roblin because we need lots of personal care home beds. I think this project could wait for another year and then come on-stream. If those dollars could be expended in personal care home beds, I'm sure every member of the committee would be patting you on the back, Mr. Minister, if that could be done. But I know it is very difficult, Mr. Minister, to undo what that mumbling jumbling crowd did across the table from us because I wish I could have taken Mr. Evans' shovel for — no, I'll go with his second shovel in the campaign . . . May I, Mr. Chairman, he went down the road to Grandview and got his shovel out again and he knocked another sod over and flipped one in Grandview and I have the ad — this one's finished. They were more political in Grandview and they had more ins there. This one is finished and here is the ad and it's been finished now for some time and this alarms me. They are advertising today in Grandview.

Here is the May 24th issue of the Grandview Exponent, Mr. Chairman. "The Grandview Housing Authority," Mr. Chairman, "invites applications for four-bedroom homes, three-bedroom homes, bachelor suites, double suites, . . ." in that housing unit that has just been finished.

Again, may I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister, would it be possible to turn those dollars around and hopefully turn that into a personal care home unit for the people? I have likely 22 or 23 people who are waiting for personal care home beds in Grandview and unfortunately they don't have to advertise in Grandview for this type of housing but they are hopefully hoping that you, Mr. Minister, and the government will turn the policy around from this former government 180 degrees; change our priorities and maybe move personal care home beds, maybe only for one year and I don't quarrel with the other government at all, they did a lot of good works and all government do good works, but would it be possible for us to expend more of these dollars in personal care home beds than we are doing. Now, I can't speak for the city, only for the rural areas. —(Interjection)— Let the Minister ask. I know the former Attorney-General thinks he is government and he still likes to answer my questions but unfortunately that is not it. We have a new Minister and I wonder if the Minister could answer that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Committee, would you let the Minister answer the Honourable Member from Roblin's questions.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I will start at the last one. In Ethelbert — I am not aware of the ad that he is showing — we have eleven family units and 18 —(Interjection)— Pardon me, Grandview, not Ethelbert. We have 11 family units and we have 18 elderly which have just been finished. That was started back last September . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: During the election campaign.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . and it has just been completed. As far as transferring the money to the Minister of Health for nursing homes, I'm afraid that I am just not in the position to answer that. I think the Minister of Health and myself have to get together regarding some policies to have, well, as the Member for Transcona calls it, "enriched," but at least some co-ordination between senior citizens and nursing homes, in that respect. But as far as transferring money from the Corporation to the Health's budget, I'm afraid the Minister of Finance is just not going to allow that. The money we have that we are looking at for Roblin is budgeted for 24 units and I don't think we can change that. Is the member making a request that we sit down again with the Mayor of Roblin?

MR. MCKENZIE: No, I don't know how you are going to do it. May I just ask the Minister — and give me this assurance — that he as a Minister of the Crown will never go into any MLA's constituency, flip a sod with a shovel, or set up any works of any kind without the sitting member having knowledge of it? Is that a fair question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I have informed the staff of MHRC, and I assure you that they won't — I'm not saying something that was just suggested to me — I have told them that if they ever go into any member's constituency to discuss housing or anything, without their knowledge,

I would be very disappointed.

MR. McKENZIE: Now we are going to get good government. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood, Transcona and then Lac du Bonnet.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, that was an interesting little episode we just witnessed where we see a preview of the P.C. caucus where the backbench isn't afraid to stand up and give the Cabinet hell. I think that is healthy . . .

MR. McKENZIE: It will be that way as long as I am around.

MR. DOERN: . . . particularly where the Member for Roblin is attacking his own administration for talking about lowering the age of retirement to 55. I agree that's a bit too much.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister about one specific item that concerns me and that is the proposed senior citizens' development in Elmwood. I am sure the Minister is familiar with this. Our government planned a 68-suite elderly persons' housing project in Elmwood at Talbot and Stadacona. This was in line with an attempt to decentralize such housing throughout the city and throughout the province and there was considerable interest in this project. I might tell the Minister that when it was announced, which would have been in March of 1977, there were a lot of senior citizens who spoke to me about it and were very delighted that this project would go forward and were anxious to sign up for it. So I had telephone requests; I had personal requests and people were keenly interested in what was going to happen. I would simply ask the Minister, to begin with, if he could tell me what the status of that project is?

MR. JOHNSTON: The status of the project in Elmwood, I believe it was to be an office building. It was to be part of an office building, a senior citizens' home with an office building.

A MEMBER: Another office, you've got to be kidding, an office in Elmwood?

MR. HANUSCHAK: You were complaining about too many edifices in your riding so we're putting some up in Elmwood.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, in Elmwood, as of a survey that we have just taken, the total responses to the review to May 24th, responses received May 25, and 26, in the East Kildonan area, which I guess took in the Elmwood area, we have a total of 42 applications. Seventeen of those applications wish to stay in that area; 27 of the applications wanted it as their second choice. Eight of the applications that are interested in Elmwood want to go to area two which is central Winnipeg. Two of them want to go to three, which is North End. One of them wants to go to Brooklands. One of them wants to go to St. Vital. Three of them want to go to St. Boniface. Three of them want to go to Transcona. Five of them want to go to North Kildonan. One prefers to live in West Kildonan and one prefers to go to the rural area. There are actually 17 people in this survey who have a desire to stay in that particular area.

MR. DOERN: Is the Minister telling me that he makes his decisions strictly on the basis of demand, so if another 10 or 20 people make application, he will proceed to construct?

MR. JOHNSTON: If another 10 or 20 people make application, Mr. Chairman, we would take a look at it from the point of view of half, which has always been the policy and we would look at it from the point of view of whether the land that is available is economical. We had one presented to us in St. Adolphe and when we arrived in government, they were going to go ahead and they were going to pay \$42,000 for a piece of land. Now, those are all things that have to be taken into consideration.

The other problem that we have with the senior citizens, many of the people that we have surveyed want to live in one place and no place else.

As far as building a senior citizens' home with an office building, it will not be done by this government.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the attitude of the government with regard to the office component, but I am talking only of the senior citizens' component and that is the only thing that the Minister is responsible for. The site was acquired after a considerable search in the area,

Monday, May 29, 1978

because there are not too many sites of sufficient size to construct any particular project. There are a lot of small 50 by 75 by 100 foot wide lots but when it comes to something that is an acre or so, then there isn't very much available. I am saying, let's take the project right now, the land is there, a contractor was, I believe, given a green light on the first phase of construction. I ask the Minister what the status of the architectural design is and what the status is in relation to the contractor, which was Poole Construction? What is happening there? Have they both been told that the project is dead? Has it been put on ice? Is the Minister reviewing it?

MR. MCKENZIE: We'll send Frank out during the next election campaign, Russ, with a shovel.

MR. DOERN: Who is Frank?

MR. MCKENZIE: The Minister.

MR. DOERN: That Frank, okay.

MR. MCKENZIE: That's the way you guys did it. . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, that particular project was under Public Works. It then left us in the position of having to take a look at the senior citizens' accommodation for that area and we have been doing a survey, as I have just mentioned to you. We started about three weeks ago. We sent a letter to 1,573 people. After examining all of the responses and following up on the applications on file, the Corporation has 713 applications on file for senior citizens' homes. This is research that had not been done before. We also have researched with the statistics that I just gave you as to where the senior citizens' homes should be placed.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet left the room the other night. He was saying because we have 44 empty units on Strauss Drive in St. James, it wasn't bad because of the number of units we have. It's bad in this respect, that we built a \$3 million building in St. James on Strauss Drive that we can't fill. Now maybe half of that should have been spent elsewhere.

MR. MCKENZIE: . . . all those empty ones in The Pas.

MR. JOHNSTON: So those are the types of statistics we have been working on and the staff has been working closely with the Greater Winnipeg Housing Authority. I might say the application form that the Member for Transcona had I believe was dated March 15th. It's a form that when somebody makes application, before they're even accepted, when they send the letter back we send this out with them. We list the names of the projects. We have on top all occupied waiting list and the changeover that we had in the last three months is 103 units became available if I'm not mistaken from people passing on or moving or something of that nature as far as the units are concerned.

We have more units that will be coming on stream. I believe that Sargent and Kennedy will be coming on stream which will take up another 90 people. And we're well aware of the fact that most of the people wanting to live in public housing are making application and wanting to live in the downtown area. Just to give you those figures, in the area two, which is central Winnipeg, out of 261 applications 151 of them want to stay in the same area and 226 the second choice is to be downtown. In the north end 252 applications, 124 want to remain in the area, 190 second choice. And the Fort Rouge area is another one — and the north end and Kildonans, or the West Kildonans are fairly heavy.

Mr. Chairman, we are planning our senior citizen constructions around two things: (a) getting our agreement settled with the Federal Government on our cost sharing. I said to you on Friday we had nothing official from CMHC as to what our Section 43 funding would be. We have an unofficial figure at the present time of \$14 million and then they want us to go on the new program, and the new program will give us some problems but we'll overcome it.

MR. DOERN: I'm still not clear on how the Minister obtains his information. He indicated that 1,573 letters were sent out. I mean who gets these letters? Is this all of Winnipeg? Where do you get the lists? Where do you get the names? And so on.

MR. JOHNSTON: Applicants off the waiting list were contacted.

MR. DOERN: In other words you're saying that in the last X number of months you had 1,573 applicants. Is that it?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, I said we had 1,573 about a month ago and after going over all the lists thoroughly we are down to 700 and — there was 400 people that weren't even available for comment out of the 1,500 — 713.

MR. DOERN: You don't elicit or solicit these inquiries. These are things that come in through the mail?

MR. JOHNSTON: That is correct. Pardon me, we sent a letter — we contacted the list and sent a letter to those people who were still available asking the questions that I read out here the other day and these are the results we have back, and the list for senior citizens in Winnipeg at the present time is 713 applications.

MR. DOERN: So in the last number of months or whatever you had 1,573 people gave their names maybe over the telephone or in writing saying they were interested and after a first scrutiny of these, or shakedown it came down to 713 people who were still interested in acquiring senior citizens' housing. Is that right?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, what I'm saying is the accumulated list was over 1,500 people and had never been changed. They just kept growing and nobody ever checked after a couple of years as to whether they were still interested, whether they'd moved, or whether they'd passed on. But we did.

MR. DOERN: Okay, fine, so you checked now and you determined that there are 713 people who are interested and willing and want to go into such projects. Right?

MR. JOHNSTON: Correct.

MR. DOERN: Do you have 713 spaces?

MR. JOHNSTON: No.

MR. DOERN: No. How many of the 713 do you intend to build for?

MR. JOHNSTON: If we were to start off and build 713 immediately we would start off by looking at half which has been the policy of the corporation. I would say that there is a turnover of 150 a month. We have 93 new units coming on stream and we have some that are empty at the present time in certain areas.

MR. DOERN: Okay, my point is this though, what figure again did you give for Elmwood and East Kildonan as still being interested?

MR. JOHNSTON: We had 42 applicants from the East Kildonan area, the area called area 12 of which 17 requested to stay in that area.

MR. DOERN: Okay, so is this going to be the one and only technique upon which the Minister is going to make decisions. In other words he's going to follow this particular pattern and if he sees a particular demand he's going to respond to it. I'm going to say to the Minister, quite frankly if that is the basis of his decision making then I'm going to go out and tell people in my area to pour letters into him so that we can get 50 or 100 or 150 people demanding senior citizens' housing in the area and then I assume that the Minister will then guarantee me that he will proceed to build the unit, if that is the basis of his decision making. Or are there other factors?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I will not guarantee anything. If the member wants to go out and get a bunch of people to mail in their names for senior citizens' housing if they qualify — their assets, etc. — if they qualify, —(Interjection)— and then we will examine the applications. We will also have discussions with the Winnipeg Housing Authority, the management of it, as to whether he believes that we should be moving in that area and work on his experience as well.

Previously senior citizens housing was built on the basis of applications on file, land available, and spend the money if you had it.

MR. DOERN: Well, given that policy when you came into office were there many vacancies, or were the units essentially filled and a backlog?

MR. JOHNSTON: When we came into office we had the regular changeovers. We had the new ones coming on stream — Assiniboia, as I mentioned, Kennedy, Strauss Drive coming on stream, Pembina's coming on stream, given all of those things we decided to make a survey of the applications on file to see if they qualified or even if they were still alive.

MR. DOERN: But I'm saying in effect do you know what the vacancy rate was in these EPH units across the city?

MR. JOHNSTON: The vacancy rate across the city when we came into office? It would be a vacancy rate at the end of December which would be — I said 150 earlier — I believe I was wrong. There's a turnover of 50 per month. Am I correct on that? 50 per month turnover? And the vacancy rate at the end of December? My staff can probably give you the figures on that. I don't know whether they have them here but the — it's worked out on a three months basis of units — the number of units that are empty. In other words we might have had 350 units that were not rented for a one month period of time because of notices, etc.

MR. DOERN: But essentially, given the backlog and the waiting list you could fill those fairly quickly?

MR. JOHNSTON: We could fill some of them fairly quickly.

MR. DOERN: Well, my point is this, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister if this project were proceeded with in Elmwood as planned by the previous administration you would have had 68 units coming up in the summer or the fall and I assume that those units would have been filled by local people, by people . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: According to the figures we have now they wouldn't have been.

MR. DOERN: They wouldn't have been. According to present figures.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. DOERN: But yet you don't have — you're not looking at senior citizens' housing in various parts of the city where you have half the units empty or something. You're not faced with that kind of a problem.

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm faced with 61 vacant bachelor suites on Moray and Strauss.

MR. DOERN: And you feel — 40 or 60?

MR. JOHNSTON: 40, pardon me.

MR. DOERN: And you're concerned that that won't be filled? I mean do you think that they're going to . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: When this was written from Mr. Charles to Mr. Bill Nickaraz it says, "Bill, I am passing on the most recent up to date I have with regard to the feeling of the units under management of Oldfield Kirby and Gardner", — that's Moray and Strauss — "To date 36 bachelor suites and all eight one-bedroom suites in senior citizens' buildings have been filled. This leaves 61." I'd just like to ask my staff why that is now 40. I believe I remembered it . . . "This leaves 61 vacant bachelor suites. A total of 22 bachelor applications have been forwarded to them. However, 22 bachelor's applications have been forwarded to them. However, as of this date we have no additional applications on hand to forward. This problem may carry on for some time."

MR. DOERN: Okay. So, anyway, I'm making a slightly different point to the Minister. I'm saying that in the case of Elmwood and East Kildonan where I believe there is a demand and a need for public housing that if the units were built, if the project was proceeded with I believe it would be filled.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, in the elderly persons . . . Edmonton and Sargent 64 units will be coming on, Kennedy Street, 95, Moray and Strauss, 41 — what about Pembina? It's not on here? Family, pardon me. The total is 200, plus the turnover of 100 in a two months' period and

there'll be in the next two months an availability of 300 units. Now we're down to 300.

MR. DOERN: Okay, but I'm saying to the Minister that the Minister's logic goes as follows: he is saying to me that where there's a demand he's going to build. I'm saying sort of the opposite. I'm saying that if the previous government had built 68 units in Elmwood I believe that it would have also generated a demand in the area, that the people would have seen it and that people would have applied, but given the way the Minister is going to approach the problem then I'm saying that I'm going to go out and talk to my people and tell Mr. Fox to do the same and if we come back with 50 or 100 applications that qualify and are eligible then I assume that the Minister is going to take a look at that and possibly proceed. Am I right?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member has said "demand". That's the way it was done before. There was a demand on the basis of application. We will build on the need of people who qualify.

MR. MCKENZIE: Hear hear. Not like Grandview or Roblin. Hear hear.

MR. DOERN: So then I say — I just ask this question then. That site — there is a piece of property there — I'm saying is the Minister going to hold that property. Is that his present plan to hold that property or has he already given orders to dispose of it?

MR. JOHNSTON: The property is owned by Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Right. And to the best of your knowledge it is being held by Public Works, is it?

MR. JOHNSTON: To the best of my knowledge.

MR. DOERN: As opposed to being disposed of?

MR. JOHNSTON: I can't answer that.

MR. DOERN: Can't answer it. Then the other thing I would simply ask the Minister and it's again maybe under his colleague is that the architect's plans — the architects were told to design a building with an office component and a senior citizens' housing component and there was also a contractor there. Does the Minister know, can he tell us what has happened to the architect and to the contractor? Have they been told to cease and desist? Has there been a settlement made with them? Has there been an understanding reached as to what they do? **MR. JOHNSTON:** Well, I have to refer you to the Minister of Public Works again. The plans, the contract and everything on that particular building was under the Minister of Public Works and I have no idea of where it stands, but I can ask him if you'd like me to.

MR. DOERN: Okay. I would ask the Minister if he would discuss it with the Minister of Public Works and inform me.

The final thing I would like to ask and maybe you already gave this earlier, is in our end of town, namely in Elmwood and East Kildonan in particular, or maybe even North Kildonan and Transcona — but particularly in Elmwood and East Kildonan — are there any plans now to construct any senior citizens housing, or does the government have any plans in that whole area including Transcona and North Kildonan?

MR. JOHNSTON: We have no plans at the present time in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The other day the Minister indicated that it was not his intention to proceed with the development in Tyndall and suggested that the Tyndall community could very well consider going into a non-profit type of arrangement under the new Federal proposals or policies. In listening to the Minister discuss other projects, I notice that he is not making the same suggestion with respect to demand for senior citizen facilities in Winnipeg, that they too should consider going the non-profit route, and I would like to know from the Minister just how he singles out Tyndall as the community that should follow that procedure and that course of action as opposed to the rest of Manitoba.

Monday, May 29, 1978

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, we have had all kinds of organizations in Winnipeg coming before us, asking if they can become involved in the non-profit type of housing in Winnipeg for senior citizens, and just as soon as we have the agreement signed with the Federal Government, we will be moving in that respect. We have already written letters to many of them, suggesting that the new program would be such that they should consider in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Elmwood is gone, but Elmwood is served by elderly persons; public housing units owned by the Legion 72, and the Cosmopolitan Club 81, that's 153 units at the present time.

To further answer the question from the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I can assure him that there are people in the City of Winnipeg just waiting to move on the non-profit thing, in fact it's something we have to look at very closely with the Federal Government, and we have to become involved with them in this respect; that if we're not involved, we won't know just where they're going to go and we have to be involved so we will know where they're going to go because we feel we have better statistics than the Federal Government as to the need in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate new applications following a new policy enunciated by the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba, but here you have a situation where a decision had been made, plans were underway to proceed, and now the Minister advises the Committee that they are not proceeding through the existing program, but that we should suggest to that community that they fall into the sort of new untried system of non-profit organization for the purpose of building senior citizen facilities. At the same time, as I understand the discussion, there is every intention to proceed with additional government building of senior citizen facilities throughout Manitoba. It appears to me at least from what the Minister indicates, that there likely will be two programs : (1) the carrying forward of the existing program; (2) an alternative under the new Federal policy of non-profit organizations. That's why I raised the question. The people of Tyndall have discussed this with the government, there has been an announcement of intent; the municipality in question had made arrangements to set aside land or properties for this facility and they're sort of being caught mid-stream, Mr. Chairman. And it seems to me rather awkward or unusual to proceed in that way; I could understand it with respect to a brand new approach or a new application, but this has been in the works for some time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I can only say to the honourable member that he'd better speak to his colleague. He had not recommended Tyndall in any one of his recommendations; even the MHRC submitted recommendations of where projects should go, the Minister came back with a list of where he thought projects would go, then there was a directive given to the construction department of what they should proceed with — Tyndall was not on. I am informed that the previous Minister gave a commitment to Tyndall to survey the need and would be looked at on that basis.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister to then consult with his staff who are there at his elbow, because I am aware, and participated, in a press announcement announcing three projects: one in Tyndall, one in Garson, and one in Beausejour. They were all done on the same day, and the staff that is here is aware of that, Mr. Chairman. What the Minister has stated is not correct. There has been a public announcement in full dress, with the municipalities involved, announcing the three projects at the same time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on the list of projects that I have in front of me, Beausejour and Garson were there; Tyndall, there was no plans when we came to office, there was no architect appointed, and there was nothing done. At no time, just checking with the staff, if the Minister decided to make a press release saying Tyndall, it could quite easily have happened, but —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? I am informed that there was an incorrect reporting in The Beaver which was contrary to the Minister's intentions, so I guess the Minister wasn't to blame either.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I raise a question again. Because of my personal involvement at that particular time, I can advise the Minister that the intent, and we had a meeting in the Minister's office on it, subsequent to which a trip was made out to Beausejour and the announcement was made with the intention of proceeding with the three units. There's no doubt about that, Mr. Chairman, that was done with the staff and the Minister present and in the presence of the R.M. of Brokenhead, the Community of Garson, and the Town of Beausejour.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the announcement that was made that day was the intention of Garson, Birds Hill, and Beausejour, and there was an indirect statement made

in The Beaver, and the commitment made to Tyndall was that there would be a survey made. Now that's the information I have at the present time and I can tell you that there was not an architect appointed; there was not even any request for an architect on Tyndall; there were no plans or anything when we came to office, and I assure you that Tyndall is not listed in the projects that were recommended by the previous Minister.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the staff could advise the Minister that there was a meeting held to discuss Tyndall along with Beausejour and Garson, and it was decided then and subsequently announced that the three projects would proceed and that although the architectural work was not undertaken, the announcement was made that the project would be proceeded with whenever the land was assembled and that was to be subject to negotiations with the R.M. of Brokenhead. And after that point, they would undertake to plan and design and construct a facility. Because there was no readily available land, they were not able to proceed at that time, but the announcement was made all at the same time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I think that that only confirms what I have been saying, that the previous Minister obviously said that he would take a study of it to see if there was land available, etc. I am told that Mr. Dubowits was at that meeting and there was a commitment made to survey and check it out. But I have given you a commitment. I have said to you that we have been checking it out and we feel that they would be better to go on the non-profit situation, because Garson is very close to Tyndall, and you're going to have senior citizen homes there and the qualifications for senior citizens is such that the number of people in that area are not available that actually qualify. But you do have a lot of people that are senior citizens that would qualify to live in non-profit senior citizens housing, that is what we are going to be discussing with Tyndall.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has completely contradicted himself in that he has indicated the other day and today, that he has unfilled facilities, facilities that were not built in the community of the applicants choice who are idle, and that his preference would be to accommodate with facilities those communities who wish to have them, and where there are applications for them. Now he is telling me that the Tyndall people should accommodate themselves in a neighbouring community, that they should not look forward towards having their own facility where they prefer to live. That's a complete contradiction of the Minister's position of the other day and indeed today. Surely the Minister isn't suggesting a double standard here for different communities.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, it is not a complete contradiction, and the member should try to keep himself clear on this. I said that because of the Garson senior citizens home that is being built, Garson and Tyndall are very close together. I told you the other night, I just said that now. I said it probably would be more preferable for Tyndall to look at the non-profit type of senior citizens home, which would accommodate people who don't qualify for Garson, and they can do that under the non-profit, and that's what I said last night we were suggesting for Tyndall, or the other day. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if the member had stayed while I was answering his question, he probably would have known that, but he was halfway out the door when I started to answer him.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I heard the comments of the Minister the other day, so that he doesn't have to feel that I was not in on the discussion.

I again point out to the Minister that you have two communities here — although they are relatively close together — that the people from one community don't wish to relocate to the other community, either way with respect to these kind of facilities. I am not talking about people who would not be eligible for the standard service that we now provide; I am not talking about the kind of program that the Minister describes in his non-profit arrangement. I am talking about people who would be eligible under the present criteria for senior citizen housing involving governmental subsidies on rent and so on, so that we're talking apples and oranges here, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is indicating that I should be talking about a different clientele altogether, a clientele that could participate in a non-profit arrangement which would be self-sustaining. I am not talking about that, Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the regular program that is available for the people of Manitoba, that is wanted by people in the Tyndall community.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to venture that Tyndall with Garson, Beausejour, and the senior citizen accommodation that is available within the area, that when we take a look at the need for Tyndall as we did in Garson — in Garson we had approximately 16 applications I think and we built 12, and on that basis we probably should have built 8 or 6 — I'd be willing

Monday, May 29, 1978

to say and I am not sure, but we will do the survey, that if we were to build 12 units in Tyndall of more senior citizen housing, we would have trouble filling them or we would be emptying people that are living in their own houses at the present time into those units. So I am suggesting that there are a lot of people in the senior citizen age group who want to live in senior citizens accommodation, who because they have assets that are such that they can't, that the Tyndall area should look at the non-profit type of accommodation, the non-profit type of unit. That doesn't mean to say that if somebody in Tyndall comes along that qualifies for senior citizens housing, cannot be subsidized in that unit. That is more than likely — in fact that's some of the arrangements we have now with non-profits.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if I'm getting through to the Minister. I am not suggesting that we build a facility that is not needed. I am merely asking the Minister, that if a survey could show a demand factor, whether the government is prepared to carry on with the project. I am not asking him to build one where there is no demand.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, certainly the demands will have to be within the limits of what we have coming from the CMHC, that is first of all what we have to look at, and I've said to the member that I will and we are surveying Tyndall at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I am really pleased to see that the Minister is now going to be fair and at least let the MLAs in the various constituencies know what's going on in the department. May I ask the Minister, and if this question has already been raised, I will withdraw it. How many housing boards or authorities do you have today in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. JOHNSTON: I am told it's 115 housing authorities.

MR. McKENZIE: Are there more contemplated?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Chairman, we establish a housing authority when we decide to build in an area. If there was one there previously, they take it over, if there wasn't, we establish a new one.

MR. McKENZIE: Could the Minister for the benefit of the Committee spell out the terms of reference of these members on these various boards or authorities?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well it has been answered before, but I can do it quickly. It's one-third from the tenants; one-third from the town or municipality; and one-third appointed by the Minister.

MR. McKENZIE: The next question. What is the most predominant problem that you see dealing at this level of government with those boards or authorities?

MR. JOHNSTON: I don't think we have what you might call a predominant problem. We find that the housing authority people in the rural area are usually very, very conscientious people. We do have some problems with housing authorities when we get to the larger communities: Dauphin, Portage, Thompson, Churchill is one that is a problem, and naturally Winnipeg. But the problems are minor; it's something that can usually be overcome very quickly by our staff.

MR. McKENZIE: There's no problem with the construction of the buildings or the — basically they have been reasonably well constructed and in order.

MR. JOHNSTON: I would say that the construction in the rural area has been good. I would not say that the construction nor the design in the Winnipeg area has been everything I would like it to be; I don't know about anybody else.

MR. McKENZIE: May I ask the Minister now, on these units that are under people that don't pay their rent, or there is money owing, are there any arrears at all of rent or telephone, hydro; let's class it as accounts receivable?

MR. JOHNSTON: Our arrears are probably higher than the private industry. We're running about four percent, which is lower than most of the other provinces that have public housing. We are starting to become very concerned and making it known that the rent must be paid because if they

Monday, May 29, 1978

don't have their own funds to pay them, they apply for assistance from the government in some way, shape, or form to get their rent paid and if that happens, we think it should be paid. So we are trying to toughen up as much as possible.

MR. McKENZIE: Can you give me a round figure of the accounts receivable as of the last time you looked at it?

MR. JOHNSTON: At the end of December, I think we were in arrears of close to \$500,000 if I'm not mistaken. I had that figure in a speech that I made to some of our housing authority people and I think at the end of December — \$489,000 in rents owing — at the end of December, 1977.

MR. McKENZIE: What do you class in arrears — 30 days, 6 months, 12 months; is it in arrears after 30 days?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, after 30 days if they haven't paid their rent, it's in arrears, yes.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister what vehicle do you use then to collect those moneys? Do you go out and take a lien or do you tell the utilities to shut off the hydro, or the telephone, or is that left to the local housing authority or how do you deal with that matter?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, we have the housing authority in the area and if it's large enough, we have a manager in the area who goes out and tries to collect the rent. If it's a continuing problem with the person, we have to give notice like anybody else. As we said, the rents are paid; money for rent is paid to them by somebody, but the Landlord and Tenant Act prevails on us the same as it does anybody else and we have to abide by that, but we certainly try to get our rents collected.

MR. McKENZIE: I thank the Minister. The Critical Home Repair Program, no doubt that's been dealt with at some length, and I congratulate the former government for bringing that program in. All governments, as I say, the years I've been here, they bring in good legislation, good programs, and I congratulate the former government for that and I congratulate the Minister for continuing with it. I am wondering though, what type of surveillance or people you are sending in to check in on some of these buildings, to see if in fact it's worth spending the taxpayers' dollars to repair those. I am not sure about whether the Minister continued with that paint program, but I saw paint going on about 17 layers of paint, and I wondered why that old paint shouldn't have been scraped off and the contractor, whoever is in charge to do that painting program, that any painter today if he's worth his salt, will scrape off the old paint and go back and preserve that old lumber, but I saw paint going on layers and layers of paint. Does the department send anybody out or MHRC to check that building and see, you know, supposing you're going - to spend a thousand dollars, and naturally those people that are in that, and the program is a good one and those people are most deserving, in a lot of cases I've seen them spending a thousand dollars on a building that actually isn't worth a thousand dollars. It would be much better to do something. . . Is that considered at all?

MR. JONSTON: Well, it's a ticklish subject. There are certainly houses that you're spending money on that you wonder whether you should or not, but the senior citizen is living there and they feel that they don't want to move. But we do — when the application comes in — we have an inspector that goes out and looks at the project, makes sure that the person qualifies for the work that they are requesting to be done. If it is, we ask them to get prices and submit them to us. We take the lowest tender usually and award the work. When the work is finished, an inspector goes out to inspect the work and if he is satisfied and the person is satisfied, we pay the bill.

MR. McKENZIE: Now may I ask, on an application under the Critical Home Repair, what's spelled out in the application? The qualifications, the tenant, is it a means test, or just an application, or do you ask the local municipality or a local jurisdiction to initial it, that in fact it's legit, or do you just . . .? I am told that in most cases these applications, people go in there and it comes out holus-bolus. In a lot of cases, if the inspector would at least communicate with the village secretary, or the town secretary, or the municipality, a better liaison could be established and the program would work a lot better. Now maybe that's being done and I'm not aware of it, but I wonder if the Minister would consider that in case it isn't being done in some jurisdictions.

Monday, May 29, 1978

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, we're taking a look at that at the present time. At the present time, the application is filled out by the person, I think it's very close to being an honor system — it's a declaration I am told — and the application shows that if you earn X number of dollars to X number of dollars, you qualify for X amount of money. And then up to a certain amount, and if you've had something done this year, certainly you won't be first in line next year; you can only go so far.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, for the benefit of the Chairman — in case you're not aware — the Department of Municipal Planning is carrying a pretty heavy mallet out in my constituency, and I suspect if you're not, that we'd better start real quick dealing with the jurisdictions because I have people in my jurisdiction who can't change a fence post without a permit. And they're in the municipal planning scheme and I am told that these programs are going on under the Critical Home Repair Program outside the jurisdiction of the Planning, because the local municipalities are not being brought into the scene at all. There have been some concerns expressed by municipal people in my area that they are being by-passed, and yet we're under the jurisdiction of the Planning scheme. I am wondering, are these Critical Home Repair Programs or proposed repairs, being brought to the attention of the local planning district?

MR. JOHNSTON: I don't know. I can't really tell you whether the person that's applying to have some repairs done in his area or around his home, I would imagine they have to have the building permits that anybody else would have to have.

MR. McKENZIE: Apparently, it's not that way. . .

MR. JOHNSTON: But our Critical Home Repair is mostly roofs, painting, heating systems, electrical, things of that nature. I think that they would have to have the local inspection the same as anybody else, but I don't know about them checking with the planning district.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, just for the benefit of the Committee and the Minister, and Municipal Planning here of course is a vehicle of the Legislature, and we passed it and approved it. I suspect and I have evidence in my area that a lot of these jobs are not being brought to the attention of the local municipal body, and maybe some of them are but I just suggest to the Committee and to the Minister that we shouldn't bypass that vehicle because we could have some problems and I think the program is a worthy one and one that we support and approve, all members of the Committee. And just to improve upon it, it might be worthwhile to when these applications. . . let the local municipal body at least know that it's being done, and I'm sure they wouldn't turn it down, but at least they know that we're not working behind their backs in the area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: I'd just like to ask a short question of the Minister regarding what I thought was an undertaking on Thursday, May 25, Page 2668 of the Hansard, where the Minister undertook that he would provide a written statement breaking down, in as rough form as they could get, the statement of operations for 1978 and the statement of operations on which they base their Estimate requirements for 1979.

MR. JOHNSTON: It's in the works.

MR. PARASIUK: I was wondering, you know, I'm just raising it as a reminder, perhaps we could have it for tomorrow if we meet at 2:30. With that, Mr. Chairman, I move that Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the members of the Committee who aren't informed, it was agreed upon by the government side that we would quit at 10:30, so the Motion is —(Interjection)— To the members of the Committee, there are other questions and the Member for Brandon East who isn't present, the former Minister, has asked that he be allowed to ask some questions and it was just agreed upon between the Whip, the Member for Gladstone and the Member for Transcona. Unfortunately the Member for Gladstone left the room, so the Motion — Committee rise.

MOTION presented and carried.

SUPPLY — HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right, where we have 26 cubs from the 169th Westdale Wolverines Cub Pack under the direction of Mr. Woods and Mrs. Spence. This cub pack is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 38 under the Estimates of Health and Social Development. We are on Item (h)(1) Dental Services: Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Mr. Chairman, although I did participate in the debate when it first started, I mostly have sat back and tried to get a reading on what the Minister is doing with Children's Dental Health Services. He has been trying to create the impression that there is really little difference on his side of the House and between our side of the House, that the objectives are the same, that in fact it is just a matter of working things out.

But, Mr. Chairman, I reject that image that the Minister is trying so desperately to project. You know, he has a number of times said he really can't quarrel with the need for a Children's Dental Health Program. But he questions a state-run operation and he says it is necessary in his point of view that the private dental sector, the dentists in private practice become involved. He implies, of course, that under our plan they couldn't become involved. Well, that is absolute nonsense. The plan that is in existence today in 29 school divisions does include, can include, people in private practice.

The fact of the matter is that any dentist can enter into the plan. The difference is this, Mr. Chairman: In order for a plan to work and to be economically within our reach — now, I don't mean today — I'll use the term the Minister often uses, downstream costs, because he refers constantly to not only the immediate costs, but the downstream costs, and I agree with him. You have to look at downstream costs.

But there is no doubt in my mind from having studied the plans, having personally been involved in developing the plan and seeing it work elsewhere, that the downstream costs in order to be within reason can only work if it is not a plan under the control of the dentists in private practice.

Mr. Chairman, the difference of opinion between the MDA, the Manitoba Dental Association and ourselves was that very key thing. Who controls the plan and who becomes captive if the plan is controlled by the private sector? Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that if we follow the route the Minister is now suggesting that the dentists in private practice should be brought into the plan, that he hasn't had a fair shake, and that no matter how desirable that somehow he is not in favour of a state-run plan. If we follow that, then the plan will become controlled by, and therefore will become captive of, the dentists in private practice. And we need only look at Medicare to see what happens, or any service, to see what happens when one group has the power of life or death. And they do, because they can withdraw their services when they so choose; you don't have an alternative. You have to work for them, you have no choice.

I recall — I forget when it was, years ago — when a new schedule was established in dentistry for those people who were on welfare and it was put to the Dental Association and they rejected it. And they simply said, "Sorry, we are not going to look after these people. We don't like the fee you're giving us because it is on a fee-for-service basis and therefore we're not simply going to serve these people." Then they sort of backed away little and said, "We will leave it up to the individual dentist and he will do what he wants."

So some did, in fact, look after the needs of people on welfare. There were others who didn't. Of course, there always were a number who wanted no part of it and they picked and chose whether or not they would treat people who are on welfare and accept the fees that the government at that time indicated would be paid.

Mr. Chairman, if you go to a fee-for-service basis — and that's what the Minister is saying and that's what the MDA is saying — if you go to a fee-for-service, you will go broke trying to expand the Children's Dental Plan to the point where it takes in the entire community. Because remember we are starting with the five and six-year-olds and maybe seven, in some areas, but the plan envisages annually adding one more year as the children go from age five to six, continuing those who have already been treated in one year, continuing on and on and on until I think they are age 16 — or is it 18? I forget which. So that over a period of a number of years you are covering all the children, including those that are ready to graduate out of school and those that are still coming in at the bottom end. And so you are dealing with a huge sector of the population.

If you are going to deal on the basis of a fee-for-service, which has to be negotiated annually with the dentists who can either go in or go out, depending on how they feel, then you will inevitably end up in the most expensive plan possible.

So I say to the Minister that although his objective, as he puts it, may be the same as ours, I say it isn't. Because his objective is this: First, and I'll use that since he has already been tagged with it, I will use the same analogy. Cost first, need second; in the case of health facilities. Here is the way I see what the Minister has said: First, there shall be fee-for-service, because that's what the MDA wants. Second, that it shall be controlled by the dentists working in private practice. Third, the downstream costs, and last, the needs of the children insofar as their dental needs are concerned. Because you are not going to get the utilization — no way. The logic of working in the schools rather than having the children brought to a dental office — which they may or may not or which their parents may or may not do — the logic of working through the school is so obvious that I can't understand the hesitation.

If the Minister would take a day or two and go to Saskatchewan and see the setups within the schools themselves, where the atmosphere is such that to the children it becomes — it's almost a picnic really to go to the dentist. How different it is when you go into any dental office here. There is a fear; you know, people don't flock to dentists, whether adults or children. There's a tendency to be somewhat frightened of dentists. But the setup as it's created there was to create an atmosphere where fear has been simply dispelled, where the peer pressure group of other children has made it almost as if the children were participating in an acceptable activity, which is going through the dental clinic at the school, having their teeth checked, having the various — not just a lecture, you know — the Minister mentioned that there is a dental health education going on all the time. Lectures don't mean a thing; you have to be there to see how the dental health nurses are dealing with the children, and almost teasing them into becoming more aware of their dental health needs and doing something about it. So it's an entirely different ambience in a dental office and in the school itself; it becomes part of the school activity.

So that I can't accept the case, or the arguments that the Minister puts forward. I say he's being penny-wise and dollar foolish. I am saying, if he's concerned about downstream costs, then don't get trapped by the MDA into accepting a fee for service and control. Because that's what they're looking for, and that's what apparently the Minister is willing to give them. If you want a dental program that over a number of years is going to cover a huge section of the population, then you have to use your para-professionals, you have to use your para-dental people. And certainly, the Minister made a point that it's difficult to get dentists to go into northern Manitoba and other remote areas; of course it's difficult, and it's always going to be difficult. You know, the people, professionals who are mobile, prefer not to be isolated, not just for money reasons but for social reasons, for cultural reasons, for reasons of family. As the Minister knows, it's very uncommon, even teachers who may go off to teach in northern Manitoba, as soon as their own children become of school age, they want back into southern Manitoba.

But, by using dental nurses, by using para-dental people, and training them as they are being done now, you have a people who are on a 20-month course doing a very narrow but specific work in developing a very, let's say a narrow, specific skill, but they become so perfect at it because that is all they do. They do it for 20 months, and they do it in the field, and they become expert, just as a draftsman becomes better at drafting than an architect, who knows more about it, theoretically. But if he doesn't do it day and night, constantly, he loses his skill; he loses his speed. The use of para-dentals is absolutely essential, and certainly in our plan, the one in existence, the dentist supervises. But there's a difference, perhaps, in the terminology. When the Manitoba Dental Association talks of supervision, they mean that the dentists must be standing there and maybe he'll allow the dental nurse to probe in the mouth. But the dentist is sitting there. He'll let the dental hygienist clean my teeth but then he'll walk in and take a look around, and says, "Pretty" or "Not pretty" or whatever it is, in which case, the dentist has to be present.

The plan that exists today, it was modelled after Saskatchewan, and I know the Saskatchewan plan better than I know the Manitoba plan at this point, is that the dental nurse does nothing that the dentist hasn't already agreed to. The X-rays are taken. The X-rays are read by a dentist. The procedures to be followed are established by a dentist and simply carried through by the dental nurse.

Six months later, a year later, the chart is checked, the X-rays are taken and it is seen whether or not more work is needed or whether the work is done in accordance with the dentist's requirement. But you don't have to have the physical presence of the dentists right there. If you're going to depend on the dentists to be physically present, then you are not going to get the mass utilization; it's

Monday, May 29, 1978

going to be a lot more expensive program and the downstream costs the Minister is concerned about in other areas, and certainly should be concerned in this area, I predict are going to cost us much more money than the plan that was developed here.

The Minister mentioned \$9 million or \$10 million is what he foresaw or anticipated that our plan would cost for Manitoba. I suggest to him, he'll be lucky if he gets away with \$20 million the way he's going through the MDA, and will not get the kind of 80 percent or 85 percent utilization that we now have. You know, 80 and 85 percent, it's extremely high compared to the present, compared to what's been going on for years. If you had 24 percent of the children going to a dentist — I think if I recall some of the figures it was in that area, 23 to 25 percent — that was considered good dental coverage because it's left to the parents and not all the parents are interested and it costs money, but apart from the money there isn't the same feeling about, or concern, about the dental health needs of a child, and parents haven't got that concern as much as they do with the medical health. Having to take the child to the dentist, having him go to the dentist, maybe having to sit with them, it's far different than having the activity take place within the school itself where the children may leave the classroom for a few minutes, go in, go out, go back to the classroom, it's a totally different milieu and therefore it is a milieu in which the thing can work and has proven to work and has proven to work well.

So I say to the Minister that I don't accept his statement, the image he's trying to create of saying, "We're all on the same side. We all want the same thing." Mr. Chairman, maybe he can speak for others in my group, he isn't on side with me. What he wants, I say is not attainable and for that reason, I don't want. I don't want the Dental Association, the brass, to control the program. I don't want them to have a stranglehold on it because of the fee for service that they want to operate under and the control they have on everybody else who is in that system.

I am concerned with downstream costs and I predict they're going to be so high the government will back away and say, "Well, we really can't afford it. We haven't got the money. This will break us." Because I remember seeing figures on covering an entire population. If you went to a dentacare program, similar to the Medicare, in other words everyone can go to a dentist as they can now to a doctor, the costs were far more expensive, far more expensive for a dentacare plan than a medicare plan and I think the Minister agrees with me. Those are known figures so that the costs are certainly a factor. I suggest that the way the ministry is going those costs are going to happen. The last thing is the needs of the childrens, the dental health of children. We know, we know this for a fact that if a child is enrolled at age 6 six and continues in the program through school, checked annually or semi-annually and is talked and is lectured and has other children as examples and the entire classroom, the whole peer group accepts the care of his teeth as a prime responsibility and something that he does as second nature, then by the time that child is 16 or 18, the pattern has been set and the habits which have been learnt in early years will continue on in later years and that is where the big pay-off comes so that you avoid the very very costly dental bills that can take place in later years because of what wasn't done in the early years.

So, Mr. Chairman, I regret the things I heard from the Minister and even though he seems to try to give the impression that we're all on side on this, I can't accept his position. I say we're not on side. He's on side with the MDA; he feels that the MDA should be given control; he feels the MDA can deliver and should deliver and I say, I don't represent the Manitoba Dental Association, I represent the people of Manitoba. The Dental Association can work within the plan. Any dentist in private practice can if he wants to participate in the plan today. On a sessional basis he can work within the plan, he can devote one day a week, a morning a week, an afternoon, whatever he wants to the plan itself, work within the parameters of the plan at the school.

He chooses not to do that and the reason he chooses not to do that, I'll tell you why, not because he didn't like our government or he won't like yours if you insist on it, because he doesn't want to give up control, because he knows that the moment he works within your plan he loses his private business operation control. He then is paid by you within a system, an operation which is controlled by you and for which you set out the parameters. He wants to be a private entrepreneur. Good luck to him if he wants to do that and let him sit in his office and let people come to him if they want to and pay him whatever they want to, but dammit all you don't screw up an excellent program because of some ideological quirk that you may have or because the MDA doesn't like it. With all due respect to the MDA they're there and they want to stay in business and they want to practice and they want to have their private businesses, let them have their private businesses, but what was launched in Manitoba was an attempt to meet head-on and overcome the problems of dental health for future adults, but you have to start with the children' and I'll turn this back to the Manitoba Dental Association you're going to lose that. You know, if we didn't have a public

school education today and we were talking about how do you best educate children, and there were some professionals out there who said, "Well we have rented premises and if the children want to come, they can come and we will teach them on a fee-for-service basis." And we might even be having this argument here today if God knows how many decades ago they hadn't passed the Public Schools Act and it was required that teachers should be at the school, rather than vice-versa. And be at the school with the children, rather than the children go to the teacher. The teachers are paid to teach the children in the school.

Similarly, in our plan, there is a Dental Health Plan. It is part of the school system. The dentists can work in it today, and he always could work in it, any dentist could become part of the plan, but they didn't do it because they felt that this would be an erosion of their power and control. In a sense, they are right, but I'm not interested in the MDA. If, because of a good dental health program, 25 years from now we can do with half the dentists that we have today, so be it, so be it, if dental health has become so natural and instinctive to people that they don't need half the dentists that we have today, whether in Manitoba or Canada, then so be it. Maybe they have worked themselves out of a job.

I've heard dentists say that if you practise proper dental health care from the very beginning that they would have nothing to do to adults. There would be very little left for them. And so be it, so they have worked themselves out of a profession. But I'm not here to defend them or to protect them, I'm here to try to see to it that what we get in Manitoba is a dental health plan, which we started. You know it's just in its infancy and it's so easy to kill in this point in time, so very easy. It hasn't really taken root, it has only been in existence for so few months and I'm concerned that it is going to be killed because the MDA wants it to operate under their control in their offices, on a fee-for-service schedule — the worst possible way for any dental or any health plan to work.

So, Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept the good intentions voiced by the Minister. I feel that he is consciously sabotaging what was the beginnings of a plan, not only for this group of youngsters that are enrolled now, but for the generation to come, and beyond. And in the long-run the downstream costs that we hear so often from the Minister, he is sacrificing that in order to yield to the Manitoba Dental Association.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister a few questions, if I may. Last Friday the Minister said that the dental nurses that were graduating this year were assured of a job, of a position of employment. Could I ask the Minister — I might say to him that I am asking this question because over the weekend I received a call from a dental nurse who was going back to Regina today and she was quite concerned. I told her what had happened on Friday, that she need not have any concern, that she was guaranteed a job, and she wanted to know when that employment would start.

Now, another question that I have. The Minister, under the previous item, Continuing Care or Home Care, told us how much was underspent what was voted on last year was underspent. How much are we underspent on this item? Mr. Chairman, that's my other question that I would like to know.

Well, if I could have the answer to these two questions, and then I can keep on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, let me just say that with respect to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that I respect his opinions and I'm glad to have them, and I certainly don't mean to treat them in cavalier fashion but I don't think that I could respond to them without being ruled out of order by you for repetition, Sir, because we have debated the philosophy and this government's approach to the concept since late last week and I'm sure the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks would agree with that.

As for the questions raised by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, it's our intention to employ those particular student nurses coming out of Wascana College as soon as we can in the current calendar year. It would be predicated on when we can get equipment and my information is that that will take some months. We have equipment on order. They are not likely to be launched in their employment until the autumn of the year, but we will start them just as soon as we have the equipment and can do so.

As for unspent funds, or underspent funds, in 1977-78 out of a vote of \$2,140,500 we turned

back \$620,000 in total; and in 1976-77, the previous year, out of a vote of \$709,000 a total of \$369,000 lapsed.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the pattern is very clear after that. It wasn't quite clear after Home Care but it is certainly clear after this. You know, I think that this government or these Ministers are paranoid. If there is anything started by the previous government it is bad; get rid of it immediately. —(Interjection)— Well, all right, well one of them admitted it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have been at this for a couple of weeks now. There isn't one program so far that the present Minister is not endorsing 100 percent. He started his introduction by saying cost now, need after. Then he said, "Well, I was talking about capital. I was talking about . . ." And we will certainly come to that fairly soon. "I was talking about construction of personal care home beds." —(Interjection)— That's right, but he was talking about every program, because he is repeating that. He answered to my honourable friend, my colleague from Churchill, that there was cost first. There was a question, "Why aren't you doing it now?" And he said, "Because of the budget." Now, it is pretty cute the way they are coming around with this budget this year. They took over in the middle of a year. They cut down on many programs — there's two in a row — but I'll talk about this one because I can't prove what went on except that the Minister said, "Well, you're underspent but we didn't change anything", which I don't believe now especially after this, but "You're under spent. You couldn't spend the money". He's saying the same thing in this program.

Well, there was a freeze immediately when they came in because the money was there to buy the equipment — now my friend says he's got to buy some equipment — that there were six new school divisions that were going to get the program and the students were in Regina being trained to come and take over this program. It was frozen immediately and my honourable friend said, "There's no reduction. It's only frozen." They froze that last year so therefore he says, "Those six divisions weren't operating, so we're not reducing the program." There is a freeze and a reduction of programs, Mr. Chairman.

Now, my honourable friend in item, practically every other item there was a cut and they told the hospital, they told the personal-care homes, they told everybody, you've got to change except the Manitoba Dental Association because of commitments during the election, during the campaign and that's exactly what's happening. I challenged my honourable friend to tell me if there was anything wrong with this program, and he didn't even answer this. I'm asking the school division who accepted the implementation of this program, the parents and the children, and there's nothing wrong with the program; my honourable friend says, yes, it's a very good program.

He was a little impatient today when a member from this side of the House read a letter written to him by a dental nurse — he has no patience with that. The Member for Elmwood was. . . mildly but he was chastized for reading that letter more or less. I'm not responsible for this, but the Dental Association breaths and bang he jumps.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is an ideological thing, it is only that they're afraid of having the government — this is the philosophy that the government is going to be too strong.

Now my honourable friend repeated time and time again that the Dental Association wasn't given a fair break as far as he was concerned. As far as they were concerned they weren't given a chance to participate. He took their figures and nothing else, nothing else. He doesn't have to believe me, Mr. Chairman, but he has a staff; one sure knew exactly what went on because they were involved in many events, they were involved with this and he can tell them exactly what was done and all the work that was done with the Dental Association.\$

Now, Mr. Chairman, before the dinner hour the Minister said, well, it's going to be difficult and you know, there was this oh wishful thinking that everybody agrees, the north has got to stand on its own two feet and you've got to bring industry in the north, we all agree with that. He's going to try to have more doctors and more dentists, we all agree with that, everybody co-operates but what do we do now when the need is there? Nothing, nothing, and that is exactly why this program was brought in in Saskatchewan and other areas. There's a shortage of dentists all over the place and most of these dentists, not too many want to go in the rural area, they don't want to go in the northern area of this province. Now, that's why we brought this program.

My honourable friend has said repeatedly before he was a Minister when he was sitting on this side, we all said it, that we have to plateau and I think reducing is dreaming but plateau anyway — he said reducing to start with, now he sees that it can't be done but we've got to try to plateau the medical cost, the cost of medical care. And that is the way that we chose, that other countries

chose, is by getting people, paramedical people that will be trained to do a certain thing, that they can do as well if we listen to the experts, to the three dentists that looked at Saskatchewan that can do it better, because they do it like my colleague has said, that they do it so often and they're specialists in that area, they do it, and therefore at least what they can do instead of getting high-priced people — and don't tell me, nobody in this House can say that a dentist's fees are not pretty high. I'm not commenting, I'm not saying they're not fair, I'm saying they're damn high right now. It's not everybody that can go and take advantage of this kind of care.

Now, we're talking about the what, an education in prevention. I ask my friend the Minister, will the dentist have the time to start educating to tell the kid this is how you do it, or will he just say now be a good boy, slap him on the back and say don't forget to brush your teeth, or will he go through the motion and show him the way these dental nurses would do it? Will there be this kind of prevention? This, Mr. Chairman, I think is very important. If there was any difference between the government of the day when this program was brought in and the Dental Association was exactly what I told the Minister the other day, there were three givens: One, they did not accept dental nurses, period. They did not accept dental nurses. They passed a resolution to that in one of their annual meetings. They did not accept dental nurses. The Minister said, I do. This is what they didn't want. Number two, they wanted to build their own clinics and you know we're going through the medical profession now and the fees and Minister said, you know, that's not all an increase, there's about 50 percent of operating costs and expenses. This is what you would have in a few years, the same thing because after all it will cost money and this is what is going to go up. This is what my friend from St. Johns was trying to get at last Friday.

You know, it's easy now, this is no pilot to help establish a dentist in the rural area, that would be fine; that income would be guaranteed. This is what we wanted, and then, if need be, we would go and recruit some dentist that would work for the government and that could travel, and so on.

Now, last Friday, I mentioned to the Minister, I said, "All right, don't tell me any more that it's your role, you have the mandate;" that's recognized, and I'd do the same thing today. But you're telling me that you have no ideology hang-up, that the two plans are good, but that you want to see what was wrong. Well, you know, he's re-inventing the wheel; we did all that; we did all that work to see what the best plan was, and it still is right to wait, but in the meantime he has frozen everything else. And I said, well, at least, try to compromise, take those nurses that will graduate this year and the next year, and put them in the public plan. I thought that he seemed to be interested, then he got up and he said, "I don't know what difference your suggestion is to what I already stated I would do."

That is not what he said he would do. And he let the cat out of the bag a couple of times, Mr. Chairman. He said that they will guarantee a job for those graduating this year; now we find out that we have no equipment. I don't know that equipment should have been ordered a long time ago. In fact, my question was, what are you doing with the equipment that you have now, that you ordered? But apparently there is no such thing, I guess it wasn't ordered. So these people will be guaranteed a job, and then the others, "I'll do everything possible." And then he said, "Look, if you play ball, if you co-operate" — look what happened in Saskatchewan. The dental profession have come a long way; they are now saying, "We want the dental nurses to work for us." But he let the cat out of the bag; he said, "Yes, we would agree, this might happen here in Winnipeg, in Manitoba," and the dentists will have the right to charge to the patient or the government for the work done by the dental nurses, as if they were doing it themselves, and that, Sir, is the crux of it; that is it. That is the control; that is the only control. I don't care who gets the control, but it would be ridiculous and asinine to get a jobber, to get a percentage, on the work of the dental nurses. They are there, and they do work, and my honourable friend can call it ideology, he can say it's big government; he can play the games that he wants; I think it makes sense, the same as I mentioned to him, and he said he would consider it. And then there's quotes from the people in the dental profession. The dental profession are not afraid any more, you know. They've gone through that, they don't control the nurses, and they play ball with them.

Now, I was talking about immunization, vaccination, and I said, it should be done in the schools, and that's where you should have the testing of the eyes and everything. You know, it's ready-made, it's an education, it's part of education, it's prevention, and it's learning how to live the good life. That's exactly what it is. In many areas that is paid for by the Department of Education. And he said he would consider that, because right now the people go and — — if I'll tell you something I was going to have blood taken out, or if I was going to have a vaccination, I would much sooner get the nurse to do it than the doctor. She doesn't hurt as much because she knows, and most of the time she does it. And they can do it, you know, those people aren't stupid. They can do

Monday, May 29, 1978

some of that work, and when we have a shortage, there's nobody is trying to destroy the dental association. When there's such a shortage, especially, doesn't it stand to reason, Mr. Chairman, that they should do the things that nobody else can do, Especially at the fees that are being charged? And, isn't that the idea, of plateauing the costs? Isn't that what we should do, having certain people, instead of saying, "Well, these are the kings in this area; they control everything." They control the chiropractors, the denturists, and they charge, whatever is done by these people, they charge what they would charge themselves. You can take somebody out of Grade 12, give them two years of expensive training, on the job also, to do certain things; give them fair salaries that they will be happy with — especially when we're talking about doing something for the female sex in this province who have been categorized as having certain jobs, and that's all. All right, this could be a career for those people.

Now, my honourable friend said, "Well, you know, it's very hard to have dentists up north." Well, of course it is, and we know that. And that is one of the reasons why this plan was brought in. You can measure this plan, Sir, you don't have to bring anybody. First of all, I'll tell you who was watching this plan like a hawk, it was the dental association. And by the way, they are good citizens, and I want to make sure that you understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister understands this is not a blanket accusation of all the dentists; far from it. But the militant few in that association, and every association has a militant few and that's their job, there was no co-operation with the government at all. Now, I'm making the accusation; I've had it for three years — I'm fed up with this stuff, that there was no co-operation, there was just confrontation. The government of the day, as my friend said Friday, had every right, they had a mandate to bring in programs, and they brought a program, and there was no co-operation. That plan was blacklisted, there were letters going out, — don't co-operate with this plan at all, because they are trying to take over. And it was organized, and they took part in the campaign, and my friend knows it. And this is the payoff.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that's fair, because we are looking at the people of Manitoba. There is a shortage of dentists, the work is done, it was a very good plan; it was progressing, and all of a sudden it was frozen. It wasn't the staff that wouldn't listen to it; the Minister didn't go to Saskatchewan to find out how it was going he listened to certain people; he was already committed, or at least this government was committed to, and they froze everything. And he penalized certain districts, certain districts who in good faith were going along with their government, the government of the people of Manitoba. They made application; it was accepted, and it was supposed to be delivered, and he took it away from them to give it to another group that wanted the dental association.

You know, it's not that the Minister is saying, "Here's the pilot project," that bothers me. It's not that; I offered it to them at one time. He can say, "Okay, they feel that your offer wasn't sincere." Fine. Now I am offering. But the Minister could have said, if he was concerned with the people of the north, the people of Manitoba, he could have said to them, "Well, you say you can deliver," because I've got documents that say they can deliver. "No problem," they say. All right, don't just pick a place that you feel is going to be easy. Let's find out, because it is the need and priorities, and it's the people of the north, because they have no dentists there at all. So you deliver it to them. That could have been an idea. Or, you could have given them one or two — I don't care, or three or four — but he didn't have to kill the plan. When you have a pilot project you have a plan, and the Minister to this minute hasn't said one word against that plan, except that the former Minister was not giving these people a fair chance; didn't want them in the plan, and this government wants to make sure that they participate. Well, they certainly were invited to participate. And we made the statement that if there's a clinic not far from a school we'll even try that. We're not going to build another clinic in the school — I'm talking about rural areas. We did everything to co-operate with them, and some were coming along.

All right. But, the Minister said, "Well, I want a pilot project." That's his mandate; that's his right — not his mandate but it's his right, because they said that there wouldn't be any change in programs; this was made here, so it's not a mandate to change the program at this point. But, why did he have to kill the other plan, and make no bones about it, that's exactly what he's doing; he let the cat out of the bag. He's saying these dental nurses that will come in won't work as dental nurses, they're not accepted in that plan; they'll be glorified dental technicians. They'll get the pay all right because that's a commitment, you know hell would be raised if this wasn't the case. These people are there, he says, only for a year — no, I don't think so, I think that they will get it — they'll earn their keep, don't worry. But it will come that they will not be recognized so you'll have dental technicians, so you know we are going backwards. We're getting people that are graduating, and eventually because that place will be closed we won't be sending anybody in there,

and if some of the people quit in the district that we have, you know what we'll hear a few years from now, it will be said, "Well, you know, we're sorry we have no nurses. They are quitting and we can't so we have to give this over to the Dental Association."

Sir, there was all kinds of co-operation. The only thing and the big is, of course, they want it in their office. I don't know when they are going to do it, because they're working full time now. I don't know when they are going to do it, how they can deliver all across Manitoba. As I say you wait a couple of months to get the service now — they'll have to do an awful lot of recruiting because remember, they do not accept and recognize the dental nurse. The dentist has to do everything himself — not everything, but he has to supervise, he has to be in the same room because that was one of the complaints they had, the biggest complaint they had.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the difference, what is the ideology, what is the difference? One of the things, the Minister in charge of the Task Force will be able to say, "We got rid of 60, 70, 80 people. Look at it since we're in power, look at it, there's way less civil servants, way less civil servants. You know, you get a jobber, if he wants to do that I'll be the jobber, I'll take care of it and he can give me a job and I'll resign here and you won't have any civil servants at all. I'll take a commission on all of them and I'll take care of them, and you charge them to me. You know, that's a joke, Mr. Chairman. That's what we'll be able to say, because what else?"

The Minister recognized the fine work. He has to because it's been proven. I don't think that anybody in their right mind can argue that there will be a better utilization rate. They can say maybe we'll achieve the same, but not a better utilization rate in going to the dentist instead of having it right there where they're in school. And look at what's happening in all those countries; look what's happening in Saskatchewan and look what happened here since 1976, look at the utilization rate. You don't have to say it's a brand new thing we've got . . .

MR. SHERMAN: . . . we're now up to the point that we were last Thursday.

MR. DESJARDINS: Not at all, not at all, because my honourable friend got up and said, "What you're suggesting now is exactly what I said," and it isn't at all, it isn't at all, because he didn't accept it, he didn't understand, or . . . my colleague here said he understood — I think if he had understood he would have told me.

Now what ideology? This is what I want to look at. So there's the thing — and remember this, Mr. Chairman, for those who don't really understand, this plan doesn't take over the dentists and say, "We control you." Not at all. Those that are willing to do the same as the doctor who is ready to teach at a teaching hospital gets a sessional remuneration for so many hours or for a day. This would be done for the first examination — is that that bad? Is it better to put him on fee for service in their own place where they can control and you're billed? Does anybody in his right mind feel that it is going to be cheaper to do that? Do you have any doubt. Do you really think that the Dental Association, or the people that may bring a private plan, and if the government is paying fee for service and if they don't recognize the dental nurse and if you have to pay for their operating costs the way you are now for the medical profession, do you feel that that is going to be cheaper than if you have it right in schools once you've got all this established and where that dental clinic or that place in the school could be used for vaccinations, for eyes testing, for ears testing, and for this dental program? Now, you know, what's wrong with that? Is that too big government? Remember, remember this that if there's any doubt at all, these people are referrals and they have the chance . . . they don't go to this first dentist — remember that. The government of the day was not trying to control this program or trying to control the program but not the dental profession at all. Then, for some reason or other, they have to go and see a dentist, they are referred or for some reason even if it's not because of the work, but because of the condition because it's a child that's nervous, and so on, then it's fee for service — there was no battle about that, there was no battle about that. So the big thing, the big difference was certain given that this government, after a long time and lots of study — many years — said there's three givens, we accept the dental nurses, that's no problem — there would be no program if you didn't accept that — they said, "No." Now we're on the same side on that, the Minister says . that he approves them. Utilization, we want it done right in the schools, he said, "No." Third, sessional for the first thing, after that we don't care, and that, I say to you, Sir, is the big one. What's wrong with saying, "I'm going to go out there, it's all going to be organized by the school, by the division, by the teachers, and so on, the kids will be coming there and they'll have an orderly way of going through and the doctor's going to do whatever work he has, fix the chart, and then with the work and the dental nurse is going to do that work and the doctors will be paid so much time for his half a day or a day, or whatever, and then that any referrals will be sent to him and they will be fee for service.

I say, Sir, that this is a complete sell-out to the Dental Association, and I say that this is killing the plan, and it's no use going around and saying, "No, it's just I'll be very disappointed." Why should you take that chance of being disappointed? Why should the Minister take that chance of being disappointed? Why doesn't he really keep that plan alive; why doesn't he go on with these other divisions, why should they be penalized because they went along and they said, "We'll take advantage of that." And why all of a sudden wasn't there any money? The money was there, it was frozen, and all of a sudden there's money found for a pilot project.

But let the Dental Association have their pilot project, in fact, give them more, but don't kill the plan — that's the thing that gripes me — and you are killing the plan when you are saying, "Well, we'll guarantee them a job, they'll go and work for the dentist and the dentist will have the right to charge the public, the patient or the government for the work done by dental nurses as if he was doing it himself. They'll never let go with this, Mr. Chairman, they'll never let go and the Minister will be disappointed, unless he's trying to lull us to sleep and say, "Well, everybody agrees, and we know their priorities, and we would like to see the work done." But in the meantime, what is being done for the north, what is being done in the areas where there is no dentist?

So, Mr. Chairman, this is why that we can't go along. We've gone along with a lot of things, and we understand that it's a new Minister, a new government, and they have the right to change things, but we feel that this is the case, what I want to do today, my reason for getting up and speaking is to make it quite clear that this is not just a pilot project and then we'll take the best, that this is now killing the public plan because you won't be able to recruit and then those people who have trained, you're sending them to work with the dentist somewhere as glorified dental technicians.

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

MR. SHERMAN: There's just a couple of points I'd like to challenge the Honourable Member for St. Boniface on. You know, the Honourable Member for Elmwood gave an example this afternoon of the kind of myth, the kind of distortion that some people in the community in general have in their minds with respect to various things this government is doing or not doing in the health field and in other fields generally, and he zeroed in on the myth that's abroad with respect to the Children's Dental Health program when he referred to the media reports that had prompted a particular correspondent to write him, and then quite legitimately so, about the status of the plan. And as I said to the Member for Elmwood at that time, and I say it again to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I cannot help what kinds of stories other people are spreading. The Member for St. Boniface stands up here and says that the dentists took part in the election campaign, and this is the payoff. He said that three or four times during this debate on this item; I denied that on Thursday and Friday and I deny it again today.

If the dentists took part in any significant way in the election campaign in 1977, other than Manitobans generally took part in the campaign, well then he will have to acquaint me with it. Because I'm not aware of it. I'm not aware of it. —(Interjection)— Is there any law that says dentists can't participate in election campaigns, and I daresay there were dentists working on all sides of the political spectrum in that campaign. —(Interjection)—

I am not aware of any wholesale, significant commitment of the kind that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is alluding to. Certainly, there were probably dentists who participated in the campaign. I am sure there were dentists who participated in my own campaign, in my own constituency, but they have a perfect right to do that. And to suggest that this is in any way a payoff or a sellout, is a suggestion that I repudiated out of hand earlier, and I repudiate it again. There is no sellout; there is no payoff; there is an undertaking by this government to follow through on a philosophical examination which strikes at the very heart of the difference between the Conservative philosophy and the NDP philosophy. We made no bones about the fact for six years, for eight years, that we didn't agree with the state-oriented approach that the previous government was taking to the affairs of the province. We've never hedged on that or ducked that issue. We didn't believe in the total state approach to a children's dental health program, and we made that plain.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface says that my references to the fact that we intend to involve the dentists meaningfully in conversation and consultation is a continual suggestion or implication that he never did so, and the previous government never did so, and he says that the Minister knows that what he is saying is wrong, because he's got a staff who can tell him that it's wrong. Well, I want to tell the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Chairman, with all the sincerity

and honesty that I can muster, that I do not know that it is wrong. When I say to the honourable member — (Interjection)— he's entitled to that opinion. But I do not know that it is wrong. When I say to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that the leadership of the dental profession in this province, the executive leadership that we deal with, in other words, the MDA, I'm not talking about his private dentist or my private dentist, I conceded for four days ago that there were individual dentists walking the streets who were in favour of the program. We're talking about the political leadership of the dental profession. The honourable member asked me to accept his word that he bent over backwards and made every effort, I accept that. I ask him to accept my word that the professional leadership of the dental profession has assured me over and over again that in their view, they did not have a meaningful, realistic, opportunity to participate, to get involved, to be consulted, to be sought out for advice, or to take part in any other way in the formulation of this program.

Their opinion is that it was foisted off on them. Now that is not the opinion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, but he has no right to stand up in this committee and say that I know that that's wrong. Because I don't know it's wrong. It's what I've been told by the Dental Association. —(Interjection)— Well, certainly I can read the file. I can also talk to the Dental Association. The honourable member says to me, "Read the file." I say to him, talk to the Manitoba Dental Association. The two stories are different. He's got his story, I've got mine. That isn't to say that he's wrong or that I'm wrong. I'm not accusing him of being wrong. I'm prepared to accept his impression, his opinion, but it's only his impression and his opinion. The Manitoba Dental Association, professionally, politically, says they had nothing but window dressing, they had nothing but fancy footwork, they had nothing but verbal footwork, they had nothing but a snow job, they were never involved meaningfully.

Now, on that basis, confronted with the difference in philosophies to begin with —(Interjection)— well, I have never ducked the philosophical difference, I said from Day One, we accept the concept, we do not, wholesale, accept the philosophy. If we have to go with this philosophy as the only way to have a universal children's dental health program, it may be that we come reluctantly to accept the philosophy in that limited area. But we certainly don't start out by accepting the philosophy. We believe that it's possible to do it with the private profession as well, or better, than it is to do it through a state imposed program.

Now, if we find out that we can't, then obviously we'll stick with the state imposed program. But all we're attempting to do is to test it and to suggest that going into Turtle Mountain is in any way an abdication or a repudiation of commitments to the program, is simply not correct. It's simply not true. The School Division of Turtle Mountain came to us and said, "We don't want the government program. It's going to kill certain activities in our school division and in our area. It's going to threaten the existence of our dentists, whom we happen to like, whom we happen to think contribute to our community, whom we happen to want to continue here. We don't want the government plan. We want a plan involving them."

I suggest that it's totally illogical of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and his colleagues to argue that a Conservative government should not be responsive to that kind of a position or that kind of appeal, at least to check it out, at least to try it out in a pilot project, because we don't believe in state operation or state imposition of a program just automatically the way the opposite side does, we want to see if the private profession can do it. If they can't, they won't be used, they won't be utilized.

Now, as far as the money is concerned, again, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is trying to build a case where he has none, trying to make a mountain out of a molehill. The money that was voted last year and unspent, that was current money, and that represented a much smaller percentage than the same situation of the previous year, and it was the same government both years, 1976-77 and 1977-78, and in 1976-77, out of a vote of \$709,000, \$369,000 of it lapsed. That's 50 percent. —(Interjection)— All right, it's a part year. But half of it lapsed. And then in 1977-78, the Capital authority for this program was \$698,700, every dime of which was spent. Every dime of that \$698,700 was spent, 1977-78, the year just ended. —(Interjection)— 1977-78. —(Interjection)— As a matter of fact, that took it right through till February and March of this past winter, it carried it right through to the end — that was the Capital authority for 1977-78, and in fact, there was still money being spent in February out of that Capital appropriation on this program. In fact, we went a little over that. I believe we transferred a small amount over from Current to clean up a couple of commitments that could not be met through the Capital authority, an additional \$20,000 or \$21,000.00. The amount that's underspent, and it was appropriated by that government when they were in office, the amount that's underspent was \$620,000 out of the vote of \$2,140,000.00. So that the pattern is quite clear, that since the inception of this program, the government that

introduced it, voted, appropriated more for it than it was possible to spend. These are the turnbacks, these are the lapsing amounts, and the Capital amount was spent in full, in its entirety and even required a small transfer over from Current in order to clean up some of the housekeeping edges of it.

So that the case that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is trying to build simply does not hold water, Mr. Chairman. We came into office facing a number of programs that were shaped by a preceding government, and did what any new government would do, did what the previous government did with respect to the assumption of its mandate and its authority in 1969, began to develop and shape approaches based on its own philosophy. We said from the beginning we didn't believe in a state operated, state imposed children's dental health program, unless that was the only way that it could be done. We're not convinced that is the only way that it can be done, but to argue that to go into a pilot project in Turtle Mountain, a division that turned that government program down, and ask for an opportunity to have a program that was based on private input, is simply not a justifiable position to take when talking about the deferment up to this point in time of any plans for going into the north, or going into additional school divisions over the 29 in which the program currently exists.

I have said repeatedly, and here again the Member for St. Boniface makes a statement that completely ignores the pledges that I have given him, the assurances that I've given him in the last three days in this House, makes a statement that these nurses who are coming out of Regina in June, he says, "they'll come into the program all right, but they won't work as dental nurses." Well, I don't know how many times it's in the transcript of the committee hearings in Hansard over the last three days when I have said that they will be utilized as dental nurses, they will be utilized to their capacity, to their training and their qualifications, we will not permit them to be brought in and then sidelined or shoved into a corner and used in a menial capacity, just to meet the letter of the commitment, without meeting the qualifications and the training and the expertise that they have achieved. They will be used as dental nurses, and the ones who come out next year, if I can make good on my effort to put a plan together that will accommodate them, will also be accommodated that way, not as technicians, not as assistants, not as bookkeepers, not as office clerks or secretaries, but as dental nurses. I've given the honourable member that assurance.

But he says that they will come into the program, but they won't work as dental nurses. And that statement, I'm sure will be given broad circulation and distribution. I'll read it in the newspapers, I'll hear it on the radio, I'll see it on television, and the dental nurses will all be upset again, because the Member for St. Boniface, the former Minister of Health, has announced in the House that the dental nurses will not work as dental nurses. Well, I don't know what I can do, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what I can do. I've said it at least 15 times. I'm in danger of being ruled out of order by you. They will work as dental nurses. But I can't dispel the kind of mythology and distortion that the other side spreads if they want to continue spreading it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if there is any distortion we know exactly who is doing it. First of all, even tonight, following me, the Minister misquoted me two or three times. At no time did I say he didn't have a right to have a pilot project. In fact, I invited him, Friday and again today, to have two or three of them. At no time did I say that wasn't right. I never mentioned that all the dentists worked in that election. What I said, it was a commitment, as he called them, the political arm of that group declared war on this government, they circulated things and said, okay, we've got to stick together, and they've had meetings to see what's going to happen, and they did everything. And that is their right. Because they didn't like this program. That is their right, and there were commitments during the campaign — we'll see, we'll treat you well, we're not going to do like this former government. The Minister can stand up and say they automatically want a plan, a government sponsored plan, a controlled plan, but oh, not me. I want the other thing. You know, he can make that statement. But then he doesn't like it when I make a statement.

That's exactly what I was saying, that they did not want this plan, and they're trying to do everything to scuttle it. Exactly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there was some money voted. He said that last year there was extra money. When you start a plan, a new program, that often happens, you can't start exactly when you think you're going to start and so on, that happens often. But this time, this money was committed to do certain things. It was a commitment, the work was done, everything was in place, and the Minister came in, as is his right, but damn it, admit it, and he froze it. He froze those plans. Is that right or wrong? He did not deliver to those six divisions. Right or wrong? Did he deliver with the money that was there? Then he says, "it's you." So he can have it both ways. He can say, "we're getting

as much money as you had because you didn't spent it last year," and he can say that he saved all kinds of money. This is exactly what I said.

Let's go back to the last one about the dental nurses, because that's a good one. I did not say anything about the first year they graduate. He's got a plan going on, mark my words, he's doing everything, he's admitting it now. Finally. He doesn't like that plan, he reluctantly will accept it, and he is trying to deliver, as is his right, but damn it, let's call a spade a spade. Because that's what we're saying, that that is wrong. That is their right, but, Sir, have we come to the day that we will be muzzled, that we will not be able to speak as members of the Opposition? And he's got the gall to say that he's going to read that in the paper. He's had more press conferences, he's done very little in here, except agree with everything. And look, every day, there's nobody that gets more ink than he does. Because he's the best PR man they have, and he's doing a damn good job. But all of a sudden, he resents it. This is the second time he's said that. If there's anything said, if there's any criticism of his government, or of his department, he panics. He panics because he's trying to mislead the people of Manitoba.

What I said about the dental nurses, the second year, and he said so himself, and I can find it in Hansard if he wants, he said, "We've come a long way. We've come a long way in Saskatchewan." They've come a long way because the dental profession said yes. Did you say that or didn't you? The dental profession said, "Yes, we will accept the dental nurses, they will work for us in Saskatchewan." In Manitoba they said no. There's a resolution on the books. There's a resolution now that said they will not accept it. And he says he's going to dictate to them. Now you talk about confrontation, he's going to say to them, you must accept that because that's the deal I made with them.

I didn't say that they would work — I said as "glorified" and you know exactly what I mean by that. Sure, they can have any title they want. They can call them the Minister of Health for all I give a damn. But they will be glorified technicians, that's what they will be, if they end up in the dentist's office, and the dentists will charge, as my honourable friend said, — of course they will accept it then — they will charge for the work done by the dental nurses, the same as if they were doing the work themselves. And that is what I'm saying. He has the right to have as many pilot projects as he wants. He has the right to freeze everything when he comes in power. He has the right to cancel any program. But he also has the duty to call a spade a spade, and finally we've got it. He is reluctant about that program, he doesn't like it, he will do everything he can to scuttle it, to turn it, it's obvious. He says, if it can be done the other way, okay, fine. I don't mind this. There's nothing to get excited, so we disagree. We're all for a certain program, we brought it in when we were in government, they don't like this program, they now are trying to change it as is their right.

There's no reason for arguing on that, but when the Minister gets up and says it's a pilot project, and that's good, when we have a chance we'll go up north and all that, and all this malarkey. He doesn't like that plan, he's finally said so tonight. And I hope, for the people of Manitoba, too, that he's right, that he's not that disappointed. Because I wouldn't want to see us start all over again. I hope they can deliver. But I can't see, and I certainly have the right to say it, if I can't say it in this House where am I going to say it, Mr. Chairman? I still say, and the file is there, when I refer to the staff, they've got that file, they can show him all that file because they participated. He doesn't have to take my word on anything. It doesn't change a thing. It's not going to make me much happier if he's going to take my word or not and then do the opposite.

I said there were three givens. Well, isn't that the way you deal with people when you have a mandate, if you have to show leadership don't you, after three years, sometime, you've got to go ahead and make a decision, and there were three givens, as I repeated, Mr. Chairman.

One was, in the schools for utilization, you can't criticize that, the Minister can't criticize that, I want to see how this is going to be monitored, who is going to do the monitoring on that. I want to see the school division find out.

And then another one, that the dental nurses are going to practise. The dentists said, no, we don't recognize them. But he says he does, so it leaves us one thing. He's got this ideology, it's a public plan. It's a public plan, so it's bad, it's socialism, it's communism, it's everything else. But, you know, this great free enterprising system that we have, get the public to pay, the profession won't even have to collect their bill, give them an assignment. Now, that's not socialist. Well, that's the best of both worlds. That's socialism. The best form of socialism. You know, you've talked about government, what's so wrong about government or politicians, what are we doing here if it's so bad, if we can't do anything at all, if we have no responsibility, if we have to surrender to everybody else?

This government is saying, all right, if they want to give it, that is their right. I could argue as long as I want that it's wrong in our views, that's my right and my duty, and my responsibility, and I'm not just going to start panicking or refrain from taking part in this debate because the Minister doesn't like it, that maybe he's advised on then, I'll make sure that's not in the paper. And he's done everything. Where did he make all his announcements? He made one announcement on Day Care, that was the biggest one. We've heard every day, even last week, there was some other announcement. Every day there's an announcement somewhere, at a luncheon, somewhere else, or a press conference. And if we dare ask a question — I didn't say a word about this program before, I asked the Minister a question. He's saying, I'm not responsible for these rumours. He flies a kite, Mr. Chairman. That's all he's done. I can mention all kinds of things where he flew a kite, a trial balloon, to see what the people will think, and then he decides.

Who stood here, and who went to the press and TV after that, and said, "I'm not responsible for these dental nurses. I can't guarantee them a job." Who said that, did we on this side of the House, we didn't know what was going on? So I asked a question, "what's happening to this dental program?" "Well, it's being surveyed now, it's being studied, we don't know. In the meantime, we froze everything." That was the answer that I was given in this House, and then he blames me because the nurses come in, apparently they can't get hold of him, they said they've tried to get hold of him. I didn't invite them — I don't even know these people, some of them phoned me to find out, we've got to talk to somebody — what's going on? They're concerned. They're concerned.

And I'm concerned too, because, when I say dental nurses I'm not just talking about the salary that they're going to get, I'm talking about a profession. There was a career being started for these people, they were recruited with that promise. They got the proper training, they're expert, and if the Minister wants me to read it again, see what the dentists said about the work they do. Maybe I should put it in at this time, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— All right. But you didn't comment on it, all right, what's wrong with that then? What's wrong with that? So you don't like it. You don't want me to tell you that they do as good work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have allowed the debate to carry on, and it appears to be a repeat for the last short time to the point where it's "I said," "he said," I would have to rule the Honourable Member for St. Boniface out of order if he carries on in the same manner. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if you want to rule me out of order tell me and I'll sit down. —(Interjection)— they're going to be any misunderstanding, I have the right to bring it to your attention and the attention of the members of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't rule the honourable member out of order, for St. Boniface; I acknowledged the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. Is the Honourable Member for St. Boniface finished? The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am still not clear on where the Minister stands as far as the dental nurses are concerned because I am reading in Hansard and I believe I find the different comments that he made yesterday and I will quote here, on Page 2722, the last paragraph: "There has been considerable concern about the future and status of the dental nurses who are currently enrolled at Wascana College in the course and I want to advise Members of the House that the 28 student nurses at Wascana who are graduating in June will be absorbed and accommodated in the program. These 28 dental nurses will be absorbed and accommodated in the program. The age expansion in the geographic areas in which we currently, currently. . . " — and I emphasize "currently" — "operate will make that possible."

I take that statement to mean that the 28 nurses will be absorbed in the program that is now in place, not the program that is coming up in Turtle Mountain or whatever. Am I clear on that?

I'll just continue for a moment. On the next page, he seems to change his position. The Minister says, and I'll just read the last paragraph — he is referring to the guarantee: "There will be no change in that and I will extend to them my guarantee of good faith — if that's worth anything to them — that I will do my very best within these next two or three months to produce a finally structured program that will no doubt include the private profession, the members of the MDA, but may not, depending on what they are able to work out with us, but a finally structured program that will provide opportunities for them when they come out of their course a year from this June."

Is he referring now to the 40 extra or is he referring to the 28? I just want to get that point

very clear, because it appears as though he may be referring to the 28.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, the first group, the 28, is the one that I gave the airtight guarantee on, that is the group graduating this June. The second group is a group that started as 40 — I think there are only 37 in it at the present time — that graduates a year from this June. They are the ones to whom I have not been able to give an airtight guarantee but I said that I would guarantee them my earnest good faith in the efforts that will be made in these next few months, to work out a program, and it will be a program that we want that will accommodate them. But I can't give them the details of the program yet because we are just working on it.

In the meantime, their education at Wascana is guaranteed. Their bursaries and their support will be available for them and I think I said in that same exchange that I would encourage them to continue and to complete their courses.

MR. ADAM: Yes, then we can have assurance now from the Minister, we have assurance that the group of students who will be coming out next year, a year from this June, will be presented with an opportunity for employment in a program that will be suitable to them and that they will not have to do like the nurses are doing now now, going to some other country to find employment as we have seen as far as the nurses are concerned. These are the areas . . . You know, we have to educate these nurses and the costs are being paid by the taxpayers of this province and if we are going to see them next year filing out of the country to look for employment elsewhere, that is going to be a real tragedy, in my opinion. The Minister has a dilemma on his hands. He would like to see dental health care extended to northern parts of our province but he has a dilemma because on one hand he would like to see that happen and on the other hand he knows that that is not possible under the private system. You can't fault the dentists for not wanting to go to northern Manitoba. They are private businessmen and they will go where the income is the greatest and you can't blame them for that; I don't blame them certainly. And that is the problem when you are captives; you are a captive of a private-sector system of delivering health services and there is no way that you are going to be able to provide that service in the north and that was very ably articulated by the Member for Churchill and it was very clear, after that exchange, that when the Minister gets backed into a corner, he falls on that very famous argument, and that is, there is no more money or we don't have the money. He knows that the only way that there will be dental. . . He knows it, I know it and everybody else knows it, that the only way that we will be able to provide this kind of service to remote areas in northern Manitoba is a socialistic program and that sticks in his craw. You know, if somebody is working for the Hudson Bay Mining or the Hudson's Bay Company or Imperials Oil, if they say, you go to The Pas or you go to Thompson, you go. You go; there is no way out. And that is the difference between having to be captives of a private system because they won't go and I don't blame them for not going; I wouldn't go either. That is why we have to continue with this program.

So I say to the Minister, you know, he complains — and I'm not responsible for the myths that are being circulated. Well, you know, let's look at one of his friends in Saskatchewan, Dick Collver, who says, and I'll just read the first paragraph because I don't think you are going to like it: "Progressive Conservative Leader, Dick Collver, took a shot at the Manitoba Conservative Government Wednesday, saying the 9.5 percent increase in Saskatchewan's Health Budget was better than the 2.6 percent increase in Manitoba but it is still not enough. Governments, which increased Health Budgets by only 2.6 percent as the Manitoba Government did this year, don't deserve to be called governments." That is the answer from one of your very good friends, one of your own good friends. So you should put that in your pipe and smoke it, Mr. Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I don't smoke, Pete.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can't leave one error on the record. The preamble to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose's remarks, going back about three or four minutes, he said that then he took it that the Minister was guaranteeing the student nurses coming out of Wascana a year from now a program that would accommodate them. That is the guarantee I did not give. The guarantee that I gave was on the ones coming out this June. All I can extend the others is encouragement to go back and complete their course and my guarantee of my most earnest efforts to work out a program this summer. But I can't give the class of 1979 that guarantee at this juncture and I think the honourable member left that impression on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (h)(1)—pass — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. My colleagues are participating at some length in the consideration of the Estimates of spending for this department and in the course of the past couple of days on Dental Services, for young Manitobans in particular. But I feel I would be remiss if I did not draw the Honourable Minister's attention to at least some considerable amount of inconsistency in his position and that of the government which he represents.

To listen to the Minister this evening, it was almost like a poignant cry that he was making, that he tries to clarify certain situations and then the Member for St. Boniface raises certain doubts and asks certain questions, which I would be surprised if he thought that a Member of the Legislature was supposed to do otherwise than to raise questions for clarification, but merely by raising questions, recreates certain doubts and thereby causes some needless confusion, I guess the Honourable Minister would say, and myths.

Well, I want to say to the Honourable Minister of Health, that I guess he is finally learning the lesson of what any Minister of the Crown, and any public servant for that matter, eventually learns and that is that there are oftentimes many myths raised and sometimes to multi-hundred million dollar proportions. So if it is sticking in his craw a bit that there is some alleged myth or confusion being recreated, I can give my honourable friend examples, multi-hundred million dollar examples of exactly the same thing when they sat on this side of the House. I am not going to bore you, Mr. Chairman, with a litany of such myths and exaggerations but perhaps you would obviously allow me to give at least a couple.

The Minister of Health, I believe, is on record now as saying in one of his more candid moments last week that the former Minister of Health deserves credit and through him, really, the former administration deserves credit for keeping a fairly realistic line and a fairly realistic hold on spending in health care and health services. Indeed I believe that to be true. I don't pretend that we set any Canadian records in terms of minimums of spending for health care delivery. On the other hand, I believe that we did set a fairly admirable pace of slow and steady expansion of health care services, including the very one that we are talking at the moment, namely children's dental care.

The Minister of Health in effect was saying that, you know, one of the reasons perhaps why he is finding quite a different reality facing him when he talks about cutting spending in the Health Department is that there isn't all that much fat to cut. Indeed, in trying to cut, they are actually cutting, since there is little fat, they are cutting into flesh and bone pretty quickly. I guess maybe that is one of the reasons that prompted the Leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan to observe from afar, from the next province — I would not have believed it if I hadn't heard the Member for Ste. Rose put it on the record quoting the Regina Leader Post newspaper, which is the major newspaper of Regina — that the Conservative Leader of Saskatchewan should say that a 9 percent increase is barely enough or in fact not enough, and that a 2.6 percent increase is ridiculous. Well, I believe that per capita spending on health care in the two provinces, since we are sister provinces, are pretty closely comparable and that therefore if they are increasing 9 percent this year and we are increasing 2 percent, then obviously something is wrong somewhere. If a Tory leader has to describe another Tory party government as being in effect ridiculous with a 2 percent or 3 percent adjustment, whether it be in health care of post-secondary educational institutions, then at least the truth is coming home.

But that is only one of the points that I want to make. The other is that the Minister may now have the opportunity to reflect in cold sobriety — I'm not suggesting by the way that he is ever otherwise but I mean really really candid analysis on his own part will show that if it bugs him, if it bothers him, and I don't blame him for feeling that way because it used to bother me and so we are now sharing the same kind of frustration — how sometimes a particular position I can be taken which mythologizes and which causes the government and a Minister no end of trouble in having to explain after, and explain and explain in order to keep the records straight.

Well, if he's concerned about some statement that my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, is supposed to have made — supposed to have made I said — and he can certainly set that straight himself; that the dental nurses that will be graduating will not have adequate guarantee — the second year students — that they will not have adequate guarantee of employment, and the Minister is trying to insist that they will and he doesn't appreciate the fact that there is now this contention mushrooming. Then I want to say to him, how would he like to take this on for size; that after three or four years of mythologizing that this province was spending excessively, when we look at the statistics for our country as a whole we find that government spending in this province is the third lowest in Canada, and so there is a multi-million, indeed multi-billion dollar type of myth that has been perpetrated in the past two or three years.

Now if the exchange between those two honourable gentlemen has bothered the Minister of Health then he can at least begin to appreciate how they certainly were not innocent sweethearts when it came to perpetrating myths about wild spending and about excessive spending and excessive socialization of life and living in our province. You know, socialism at one time certainly was to say in all honesty, it certainly was a pretty rigid and doctrinaire political philosophy, but in the last three decades of the twentieth century socialism has become pragmatic — at least it has in most countries of the free world — and we now have to, in fact, stand back and witness the sort of re-emergence of hard core doctrinaire rigid ideology in the right part of the political spectrum, right of centre, where we have a program like Children's Dental Care, which after the initial start up under a pragmatic arrangement where the public puts up the money — that part is socialist — and it will be carried out through our schools by means of a system whereby dentists, qualified professional dentists, are either in the employ of the program or in private practice but working on a sessional payment basis.

The other alternative is the one that my honourable friend prefers, and let me make it very clear, and now I'm merely underlining what my colleagues have said already, that it is only natural, in fact it is only to be expected that my honourable friends opposite, having a mandate to govern, may wish to make changes, and if those changes move to the right then I guess that's what it's all about and that's their right. But in doing so they don't have to use terminology and excessive exaggeration to try and paint the other alternative method of achieving the same end as being somehow born of ideology and doctrinaire ideology at that.

What is socialism to my honourable friends opposite obviously is something that must change in their mind because ten years ago — well, Mr. Chairman, I am in this same Chamber here now for the twentieth year, thank goodness I had at least a bit of a break for a few years — and what I heard back in the late 50s and early 60s about medical care, forget about dental care for the moment, hospitalization and medical care as being the vanguard of yet additional unneeded, unwanted, socialization of our life, and telling people how to spend their own money, and they could do that better for themselves. The fact is that medicare has become part of the warp and woof of Canadian life and living, and anyone that would advocate medical care today certainly would say, "Well, it's not necessarily socialism." And I heard all kinds of arguments, and I dare say if I were in the shoes of the Minister of Health I'd probably be hearing them from some of my even more right-winged colleagues in caucus, as to why we don't really need it, just as we heard arguments years back about not needing medical care.

And among the arguments we used to hear were such as: that the per diem costs of operating would rise simply as a result of it being a publicly financed plan, and of course it has increased and increased tremendously, and people say, "Aha, you see it's because it's publicly financed just as we told you, it's an invitation to rising costs." Except the problem is, when you look at the per diem cost and the increase over years ago, in hospitals in San Diego, Washington, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Tulsa — anywhere you like in our neighbouring country, where they do not have a civilized, publicly sponsored health system, and which Congress now by the way in one of the more compassionate years is looking seriously towards the implementation of it — we find that the per diem costs of hospital care in major American cities has increased at least as much or more as it has here in Canada, where we have admittedly public financing of health and hospital services.

So quite frankly I'm not interested — maybe that's not the right way to put it — I listen, but I listen with just a trace of disinterest to words like socialism, words like there is a better way to do it, a heavy-handed estate, we're going to do it this way or that way. I'm more interested, having refuted that theory by the way through our hospital and medical care plans, I'm more interested in any case in listening to whether or not we will be moving steadily toward — not all at once, of course, but steadily — each year toward a program that will bring dental care service to all the young people of this province, eventually.

And I care only in terms of relative efficiency, and only for that reason do I care as to whether it is done by means of a private fee system or the other system. My honourable friend wants to try a pilot project and I can only echo the words of the Minister of Health, we don't object, in fact we wish he'd try two or three and combine that with the continuation of the admittedly experimental effort to run it the other way in some of the other divisions, and let experience itself determine which is the more efficacious of the two. But you know, doesn't it stand to reason that whichever of the two methods is used the public will be getting better value for amount of service rendered if, in that system which makes more effective use of trained dental nurses and paraprofessionals in other words, as opposed to having top flight professionals at high price performing duties that could be done by paraprofessionals. In other words it's not something new, the word for it is over-professionalization

of function and service with over-cost being the result, and that's the key.

My honourable friend, the Minister of Health, will have to be watching that closely, and for a year or two try and put some kind of restraint on his inclination to get involved in ideological suspicion so quickly.

But what are we to make about this observation by the Leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan. I can only assume that it must be a misprint or a misquotation, that he is saying 9 percent increase in the health budget in that province isn't quite enough, and a two and one-half percent increase such as apparently is the case in Manitoba is . . . how was it put again? That a government that would presume to do that isn't fit to govern, or words to that effect. Oh yes, "Governments which increase health budgets by only 2.6 percent don't deserve to be called governments," Collver said, Leader Post, March 30th. Well, I think he must have said that before he realized what the budget would be here in Manitoba, or would he have known by that time already? —(Interjection)— The spending Estimates were out — well then he knew, which makes it all the more a surprising observation. But my honourable friend, the Minister of Health, is not answerable or responsible for whatever may emanate from his cohort Conservative in Saskatchewan, and that's not the main issue here.

The main issue here is to try and develop some sense of enthusiasm for the extension of public health service to include Dental Care for Children on a gradualistic basis, since that is admittedly a reality that he has to face as we did, it can't be done all at once and so we aren't quarrelling with that. We are quarrelling with the effort to impose ideological predisposition into it.

Secondly, and more important than that even, is to offer a non-controversial type of what I hope is good advice, and that is to look carefully to see which of the two approaches makes more effective use of lower cost paraprofessional service to avoid overprofessionalizing of function.

And having said that, I close by reminding the Minister of Health once again that in a democracy the perpetrating of myth he feels that he has stumbled across some such, and I really would invite the Member for St. Boniface to clarify whether he really is guilty of that, which I doubt very much, but if my honourable friend wants some examples about that I'll give him some examples on a

ti-hundred million dollar scale when the Tories were in Opposition, talking about wild spending in Education, wild spending in Health a year ago and two years ago.

In the election campaign and now we hear, not in a scream as they were screaming a year ago about wild spending, but in sort of *sotto voce*, very quietly we're hearing from them, "Well, you know, there wasn't that much excessive spending in the Health Department, or in our colleges and universities. Naturally there wasn't and that's why there is all this protest when the amount of adjustment is less than half the amount of inflation, the reason that there is the protest is because it's an unrealistic thing to do. Our university people that have the responsibility of making it run are up against it; our health people in our hospitals are up against it, and I guess somebody like Dick Collver, the Tory Leader in Saskatchewan realizes what is realistic and what is just being silly and foolish, because of being caught in one's election campaign myth.

When a government of the Province of Manitoba looks at an overall budget including health, dental service, post-secondary education — secondary and elementary education — and the overall totality of it amounts to something like \$1,600, \$1,550 per man, woman and child in this province, and when you look to all the other provinces in Canada and you see that seven out of ten have something higher than that in terms of spending, then was it not a myth for them to have been talking about excessive and wild spending?

Ah yes, I remember now what the last point was that I wish to add here. The Minister of Health seems to find it important, because he has mentioned it more than once, that we should have programmed and estimated X amount of dollars for this dental program and not spent it all, which is a little bit ironic because on the one hand we are accused of having always spent more than we said we would and here we are told that we didn't spend as much as we said we would on a particular program. And it's important enough because it's so much a matter of common sense that it deserves to be acknowledged as common sense, to point out that in the first year of any new program it is extremely difficult and obviously much more difficult than in any other year to come up with estimates that will be precisely close to what actually happens. To begin with, to use the old English adage — the first step is always the hardest — taking the first step is always the hardest in terms of preparation, getting ready, getting it moving. It may have been anticipated that it would be operating for eight months in the first year, and it may come off two months late or three months late, and that wouldn't be unusual with a new program. And so therefore, at one fell swoop, that can account for X hundred thousand dollars less expenditure than was anticipated and estimated. So there's nothing new about that.

But just because that happens in the initial year, does not mean that that, therefore, is the pattern. The word "pattern" was used. That doesn't set the pattern for a full year in the second and subsequent years, when it's fully operational. So the very first year is hardly ever the pattern, and therefore to take the first year results and if there's underspending and therefore to cut, and say, "well, they didn't use it all, therefore it doesn't cost that much, we're going to freeze it at that level, or even cut it a bit," and to use that then as your basis of drawing up your Estimates for the following year is really the most silly kind of unrealistic assumption and the most unrealistic way to proceed.

In light of all that, I can say in closing that I hope that the alternative courses of action that are being opened up here for the bringing forward of Children's Dental Care will prove themselves in such a way that it will be less controversial, less subject to debate as to which is the more effective way to go. In the final analysis, that's what we're interested in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (h)(1)—pass; (2)—pass, (h)—pass. (j)(1)Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we're into a new area now. Community Field Services, I believe that's (j), isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Correct.

MR. MILLER: And this, I believe, in order to keep my comments pertinent, if I read the program notes here, it's the departmental field resources delivering social services, public health nursing, family planning services, home economics services, vocational rehabilitation, child and family services, mental health and mental retardation services. I'm assuming that the mental health and retardation services are the programs within the community delivered through the various offices of the Health and Social Development Department. This is not the institutions per se.

Would this, however, include the community residences that have been started within the community by various organizations, various groups? Is this in this area, or are these only field staff?

MR. SHERMAN: . . . in this area, Mr. Chairman. This is departmental field staff we're talking about. The question raised by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks comes up under Resolution No. 60.

MR. MILLER: I thank the Minister for clarification, because I don't want to talk about something which will be rehashed later on. Mr. Chairman, this, however, does deal apparently with the community health . centres, which are funded by the department, although some funding I suppose is by the Health Services Commission as well, and the participation in the City of Winnipeg.

I'm wondering whether the Minister has had any time to consider the duplication that has been occurring, which our government was not able to overcome, insofar as what is known as the inner city health department. The City of Winnipeg was always in the forefront in providing public health to its citizens in the style of this in the years when the province did very little in that area, and this goes back many years before our administration, or before the former Conservative administration. They always felt it was the responsibility of the municipal government and they acted accordingly. But in the last few years, as health units developed throughout the province, as the province accepted responsibility for it, the City still continued with its program. We made one major change. We recognized that the City of Winnipeg had not been getting a fair shake, that in fact whereas the Province participated financially in funding the health units throughout the rest of Manitoba, including some of the suburbs around Winnipeg, that the City of Winnipeg had never received the financial consideration that was due it, and that they had been bearing the major cost.

We changed that, and we made a grant to the City which was equivalent to the amount that was spent in other health units. We made a grant by the Province to the City because we felt it was only fair that the City should be receiving the same financial consideration that other areas were getting. But I'm wondering whether the time hasn't come — and I'm wondering whether the Minister has considered this — whether the time hasn't come to consider whether or not the inner city Health Department, as such, should continue, or whether in fact, just as in other areas of Manitoba, the health units are really total provincial responsibility, whether in fact the same shouldn't apply in the inner city.

Because what's happening is this: There are regional offices in the city. There are community service branches within the city, and there is therefore a duplication and an overlapping within the inner city public health, the inner city social service workers, and the provincial. And I'm wondering whether this is really the most efficient way of delivering a service, whether there isn't a fragmentation in the overlapping and the duplication, which I know this Minister would like to correct. And I'm asking whether he has considered, has he looked at that, and whether he has any plans in that area.

Generally, since we're dealing with community field services, this is the area where the province, through its community branches, its regional offices, delivers the services in public health and social services, which are essential to the entire province's well-being. The people on the provincial staff have to work with hospitals, very closely with hospitals, in order to have a two-way flow of information, so that patients leaving the hospital can be plugged into a home care program, or whatever other services are available to a citizen after he's discharged, and the hospitals have automatically, because the service is there, have learned to work with them, deal with them, and rely on them. And I was concerned, a few weeks ago, when my leader asked a question in the House with regard to a complaint by one of the hospitals that with the withdrawal of certain staff, I think it was social workers, or some form of social service personnel in the community offices, that the support to the services in the hospital was therefore endangered. I gather that the reason was that there has been, not perhaps a layoff, but a freeze on rehiring as vacancies became available. So that the result is, the community service offices, branch offices, were not able to replace staff as they retired, quit, or whatever reason, they left. And since they couldn't replace staff, the hospitals were therefore left hanging, or left in the position where they could not depend upon the services of the province as they had in the past.

And the same, I'm afraid, is true in dealing with some of the community health centres in Winnipeg, like Klinik, like the North-West Co-Op, like — I forget the name of the organization at the St. Andrew's Place, where they have developed a very excellent service —(Interjection)— Citizens' Health Action Committee, where their purpose really, is prevention, is to try to make it possible for people to stay within their own communities, within their own neighbourhoods, to maintain themselves and therefore to be less of a drag on the system itself and less call on the public facilities, such as hospitals or nursing homes.

I'm concerned that as this service is withdrawn, and I see by the Salaries that it stands pat, pretty well, there's no expansion, therefore it doesn't allow for any inflationary costs, and in that figure of course, I think it was 60-odd home care personnel which were included in this \$11.2 million, so that it's not an increase in expenditures, it's a decrease, especially when you take inflation into account. In the other expenditures as well, there's a slight decrease; it's only in External Agencies there's a small one, and I suspect that reflects some inflationary costs.

So the concern I have is that the province is not going to continue to offer the level of services that it has in the past. Even though the Minister may say, we're not tampering with anything, we're not stopping anything, or we're not reducing anything, the mere fact that it's level, is remaining constant, is a reduction, and is cutting into, as my leader — the term I think he used was "cutting into the sinews" of the program itself, and making it more difficult for the social workers, the public health nurses, the various field staffs, to deliver the program.

I'm also interested in the Minister advising his views on district health plans, on whether it's his intention to continue to allow the development of district health plans, and the basic concept of a single unit delivery system, to avoid the fragmentation which has been traditional, where a family can find itself being serviced by five or six different kind of personnel, one dealing with public health, another dealing with child welfare, a third one dealing with the adult problems, another dealing with marital problems, and having to try to relate to seven different offices. The purpose in the district health plan, the purpose in the single unit delivery system, was to try to rationalize the system so that a person or a family in need could be dealt with by one office, with a personnel that may have specialties but nonetheless where the case is looked at by staff, is known to staff, and they can address themselves to the problem of the family as a whole, whether, as I say, the children are the problem, or the adults are the problem, or both are the problem.

There are a number of other questions but I think I'll wait till I get some of these responses before I continue. I wonder if the Minister would want to respond to some of these.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks began by raising a question

about the kinds of services provided under this particular branch of our department, and the City of Winnipeg and the inner city area and wondered just what the situation or the status was with respect to those areas of responsibility. There are only a certain number of services in this community field service and public health field that the City does provide. For example, services in the field of VD and home care, mental health and mental retardation are not provided by the City. Those are all provided by the Department of Health and Social Development of the Province. There is a meeting planned very shortly between the department and the administration of the City with respect to some of those responsibilities, particularly the VD service to determine whether the City would be prepared to pick up the responsibility for functioning in that area and work with us. Also in some other areas that question is being raised.

The City itself focuses most of its attention in this field, as the honourable member probably well knows, on other programs including a fairly heavy emphasis on health programs in the schools: school health, immunization, prenatal and post natal services. But the overall question of the viability of sort of merging the two operations has been a recurring one that is not yet resolved. There is a question I supposed that's raised at this level of government, and just articulated by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, as to whether the province should be looking at taking over the delivery of services in this whole field in the inner city. But at the same time there are spokesmen at the city level who feel that possibly they should be taking over the functions that the province currently delivers, and that they should be the responsible authority. That question I'm sure is not new to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, either from his city experience or his provincial experience, it hasn't been resolved yet, I can't give him a clear indication as to whether the government has come to a firm conclusion or a firm determination on the direction in which we should go on this issue. We will I suppose obtain some indication from meetings with the city administration this week as to what current feelings are in that respect. We've certainly had assurances from the Chief Magistrate, from the Mayor, of a ready willingness and spirit of co-operation insofar as working with us in these Public Health fields is concerned.

The member is probably familiar with the ancillary questions that would have to be resolved relative to any decision to merge the operations under one authority. There are a number of administrative questions that would take some considerable study and some resolution, and that is an open question at the moment still. I intend to consult with my colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs, and with other colleagues in the government, after I get some feedback from the city administration itself as to just how it feels at the present time going into the immediate future on the subject.

The Member for Seven Oaks raised the question about social workers — the availability of social workers. We haven't felt a pinch in that area yet, Mr. Chairman, I can assure him that I have asked my staff and certainly asked professionals through the hospitals and health facilities and the Manitoba Health Organizations to let me know, to keep me in touch with the situation so that any deficiencies, any weaknesses, any requirements or needs are pinpointed and identified for me and for the department without undue delay so that we can examine them, assess them and move on them as quickly as possible, but I haven't had specific instances of difficulty brought to my attention.

I know that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has raised the question in the House in recent weeks, particularly with respect to Social Work Services at Concordia Hospital, but even there in my communications with the hospital and with officials of my department I have not found that there is a significant or damaging situation or difficulty at the moment. If it appears that it is significant and damaging then I would consult immediately with my department officials to make the necessary adjustments in the Social Work staff because we do have a flexibility in that staff — flexibility with respect to the social workers we have available. They can be moved around, adjustments can be made as required, and certainly that would be considered in any reasonable instance. Our social workers establishment stands at 74, not counting supervisory staff, there are, on the basis of current figures three vacancies in that total at the moment, but it is not a significant vacancy level or one that is inhibiting the service.

The honourable member also raised the question about district health systems. There is no policy decision that has been reached on that question, Mr. Chairman, although we're not enthusiastically out inviting or looking for or encouraging an extension of the district health system concept. Applications can still be made, they are still being received and accepted, the unit at the Manitoba Health Services Commission which deals with applications for district health systems is still functioning at full establishment, is still available to help, but the government itself has not made a decision on the district health system concept. Those that have been dealt with at the application level up to this point in time, and those that would certainly be the most acceptable from our point of view in the present context are the Type I applications. When we get into Types II, III and III(a),

it raises considerably more complicated and sophisticated questions for the government and reaches into an area of policy and philosophy that we intend to have to spend some time this calendar year, 1978, resolving.

Like many other decisions, Sir, it is one that has ramifications linked to the direction, the thrust of a government of Conservative persuasion as opposed to a government of NDP persuasion, and I'm sure that the honourable member appreciates that, and it, like some other questions in that category, requires time for study and assessment that the new government has not been able to produce or deliver during the crowded winter schedule in preparation for this session of the Legislature, but it is certainly a policy area and comprises a policy question that will be addressed this year as I want myself, and I know other members of the Legislature would want to have as soon as possible a clear indication of the government's philosophy on this subject. So it's a topic that has to be approached from a government policy point of view during the calendar year 1978, and it will certainly be one subject that we will be studying as soon as time is available to us after the current session of the House.

MR. MILLER: I thank the Minister, and I appreciate his comments during the last two or three minutes where he stated what I was glad to hear, that he is now stating bluntly that it is a philosophical question and the Conservatives have a different philosophy, and that before they encourage the creation of Type II or III or III (a) health districts they are going to judge them on the philosophical merit of it, whether the Conservatives agree with that kind of approach or not. The Minister knows that we on this side feel that the best system is where there is decentralization. The best system is one where one office, in a sense, the local area, deals not only with the hospital, the personal care home, but also the ambulatory services, the outreach services, home care or any other, meals on wheels, or what have you, and by bringing them all together you have the most efficient kind of service and also the service a which is responsive to the needs of community, and which the community can help develop.

Now we feel very strongly that this is the way to go. I don't think it's a philosophical matter, with all due respect, I think it's a matter of what is the most efficient way of doing it. The Minister feels it is philosophical and that's his right, and if he wants to use that approach, that's fine. What great philosophy is involved here I'm not sure. Now why the Minister should care if a community can hire a doctor to work on an annual remuneration rather than a fee for service, and as part of a health team within a particular designated health system, why that should bother him philosophically I'm not sure, I can't quite understand his hang-up. That's the Type III kind, which common sense dictates is the most efficient, the most effective, and in the long run the most economical way of doing things in the health field because the fragmentation is what costs money. The overlapping and the duplication is what costs money, the splintering of people into different parts so that they are treated by different segments as if they weren't a whole person but rather sliced up with each profession, each skill, doing its thing without the linkages which come about and are so natural when you have a system, a single unit delivery system where everything can be monitored properly, where the treatment can be applied, whether it's preventative treatment or an acute treatment or whatever the necessary requirements are.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that they are basically looking at it and they are examining it, and it is a matter of philosophy with him, a philosophical question, and his government hasn't got around to determining what their philosophy is in this regard, and therefore how they are going to react to the expansion of district health systems, and that's his right. I don't question it until, frankly, we get to the point where a decision is made. There's no sense my predicting what may come about or my saying that the direction we are moving was the right way to move, although I can tell the Minister that other jurisdictions that don't have NDP governments are moving in this direction because common sense dictates it, efficiency dictates it, and it's a logical way to go.

But you know, Community Health Centres are a natural part of the development of District Health Centres, and I was bothered a few weeks ago at reading that the Minister, in one of his many speeches that he makes, made the statement — and I can't recall the exact words but I'll paraphrthat the Community Health Centres are on trial, and they are going to have to prove themselves to determine whether or not the government will continue to fund them. Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, I read that and I was very sorry to read these comments and perhaps the newspaper quoted him incorrectly, I don't know, but if the Minister did indeed say that, then frankly I think he's being very narrow in his vision of what Health and Social Services are all about. To serve warning on the community health services, that you'd better prove your value, prove that what you're doing is right, prove that what you're doing is good, you know puts an onus on them which he's not asking the medical profession to do, he's not asking the present system to justify. The present system is there and he says that if it's there it must have been good — it's been going on for years and so therefore

it's there and we accept it. But something new, you've got to prove yourself.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, at many meetings in the field of health and social services where I was involved, at the Federal level, at the international level, one thing became crystal clear, that in order to not reduce the cost — because you can't reduce costs — but to try to get a handle on the rate of escalation, we had to try to rationalize a system that hadn't been rationalized, which just sort of grew and developed. We had to try to — when I say "we" I am talking about not just Manitoba but all Canada and generally the Western World — we had to try to rationalize a health system and a social service system. We had to try to prevent or avoid the emphasis on acute care, on acute treatments, to try to prevent that through prevention. Community health centres can do it, given the time. They have only been in existence for two years or three years in the odd case some of them only one year, and to serve them notice now that you have got to prove yourself, is pretty well putting them in an impossible position. You know, Mount Carmel Clinic, I don't think has to prove itself. I think they have proved themselves over the years, but Mount Carmel Clinic is different from the others. It is in a particular part of town; they have concentrated on a particular kind of clientele which the private sector is never able to cover and so I don't think the Minister will quarrel with Mount Carmel Clinic.

But he will talk about the others: Northwest Co-op; the Klinik; the Health Action Group out of St. Andrews; the Seven Regions Health Centre in Gladstone; the Lac du Bonnet experiment; the Leaf Rapids one; the Churchill; I believe there is one in Vita too, my colleague tells me. Now, they are still in their infancy and to serve notice now, "Prove yourself or you are out," is taking the very short point of view because it is known that when you are moving from one system to another, for a short period you are going to have a ballooning of cost and not a shrinkage because you have to have two systems going. You have to parallel the new with the old because you can't cut off one and start the other.

But over a time, community health centres, working through a single-unit delivery system, developing the confidence of people so they know that they have a point of reference that they can immediately contract, that their children are involved, they are involved and their needs are looked into and encouraged; their lifestyle, the kind of lifestyle they follow; their health needs — not acute needs but preventative needs — are examined, are encouraged. So that you get over the years a far lesser rate of utilization of hospital care where they are established, good and well-established community health centres. Those figures have been proven; they have been proven in other jurisdictions. I am not sure they can be proven yet in Manitoba because the experiment is too young but in other jurisdictions they have proved themselves and it bothered me to hear the Minister get up, and maybe he was talking to the MMA, I don't know, because I think they liked to hear what he said, that they are on trial and unless I am satisfied that they can do the job better, then they are out. That is, in my opinion, being — and I used this phrase before — penny wise and dollar foolish because there is no question that they are the way the health system is going to develop, whether under this government or some future government. It is going to.

You know, there is a clipping here from, I think it is the Free Press, last spring talking about the Klinik: "Programs that reflect community needs." It talked about in 1973, the Klinik which had first started, I believe, on some Federal grants and LIP grants, one of those, and was sort of bouncing around and nothing much happened and finally it became a community health centre. It was dealing with transients at that time when it first came into being. I think its justification was to deal with the summer transients through the city and I think as a drug crisis centre. But what has happened though is this: Now they deal with every kind of personal crisis situation from loneliness to attempted suicide. About 1,200 calls are received each month, of which about 175 are possible suicide attempts. People who are depressed, anxious, who have problems concerning sexuality, marital, family difficulties, drugs and alcohol, all of these, this particular agency is called upon to deal with that kind of problem. Outreach programs for elderly people; a crisis van which carries out emergency calls, carrying the elderly through the community. It is specifically for senior citizens in this area who are isolated and aren't making use of all the services open to them because they can't get around or they don't know. You need a place like Klinik, like this kind of Community Health Centre, which over a number of years becomes established, which the neighbourhood has knowledge of, develops confidence in, and they will help to nip the problems in the bud, instead of waiting until the anxiety problem or the marital problem becomes so acute that it ends up being a fair more severe case requiring even more costly treatment. They can, by being there, at the grassroots and being available and being known, can meet the problem in its early formative period and can deal with it before it becomes a major and a more costly problem.

I am hoping that what I read, and it's true I didn't hear the Minister and it could be that the newspaper maybe highlighted that aspect of his comments and maybe they took it out of context, I don't know, but I am hoping that the Minister, when rising, will assure me that what he said isn't as blunt and as callous as it appeared, that in fact he is not about to put the axe to community health centres because if he is doing it on the basis of philosophy then it is high time that he got off of the philosophical kick and just assumed because we put it in, it had to be tainted. I can tell you that we did not discover America with this; we didn't sort of dream these things up. These things came into being because they were developed elsewhere; they were examined elsewhere; they were studied elsewhere and gradually the systems have evolved with this as their basis.

You have people who are in the community who are prepared to volunteer their services and I can tell you the community health centres are using many volunteers, something that the Minister should be happy about. But because they are local, because they are serving the neighbourhood, they are able to get the volunteers within that particular community and there is a feeling of attachment to the health centre which you can't get with a hospital or you can't get with a private doctor in his own office.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister's views on this, to hopefully tell me that what he said, that his comments were not really as rough as I read into them or as the press reported.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I can give the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks quite the assurance that he is looking for. I did not use the term "on trial," to my knowledge. I think that was a headline that was used by one of the newspapers but it no doubt, in the view of the head writer, reflected the main thrust of my remarks and I probably might not have chosen that term but I can't really quarrel with it because what I said in that particular speech was that the community health centres would be evaluated this year, at the end of the year, to determine cost effectiveness of their operations. That speech, incidentally, was not made to the MMA or any other body, so I can allay the honourable member's concerns or questions on that score. It was made to the annual meeting of a community health centre and it was candid and forthright and frank. It wasn't said to anybody else; it was said to community health centre people and personnel themselves. I said that the government, up to this point in time, was not satisfied that a proper evaluative technique had been developed for measuring the effectiveness, the relative effectiveness of community health centres to be able to deliver services better, more efficiently and with more quality than more traditional types of health institutions and that to my knowledge and to my department's knowledge, there was not a library of assessment or evaluative or measurement material and that our jurisdiction, Manitoba, was not the only jurisdiction to find itself in this position but that many other jurisdictions in North America, particularly in Canada where the concept has been tried, have the same complaint that there has been no technique, or no method worked out for measuring and evaluating the concept. We wanted to develop an evaluative technique and evaluate the health centres a year from now, if we can, to determine just how viable and how saleable and how valuable a concept they represent.

It is my understanding that when the concept was developed and the first of them were put in place during the period when Dr. Tulchinsky was the Deputy Minister of the Department of Health and Social Development for the Province of Manitoba, there was an assurance given at that time that the mechanics and the techniques for monitoring and evaluating these centres would accompany the introduction of the centres themselves. It is my further understanding that no such mechanics, no such techniques, as I have said, were developed and put into place so that now we have the centres but we don't have the other half of the commitment that would enable us or any government of this province to measure their effectiveness, both in terms of quality of service and cost control.

That was my message to the community health centres and I don't back away from it or from the media reporting of it. The sort of justification for the community health centre idea, to which the Member for Seven Oaks has referred, is one that I don't argue with in a universal way. I think that there are many strong cases that can be made for the community health centre concept in certain areas, in certain regions, in certain districts, in certain neighbourhoods. This government is not convinced or of the opinion at this juncture, however, that the concept as such is valuable or desirable in a universal way. As a consequence, we have said that we are not proceeding with the establishment of any additional community health centres this year. None will be established in addition to the nine that are currently in operation. Those nine, incidentally, have not been

or have not been inhibited financially in any way, for this fiscal year 1978-79. The vote that we're seeking from the Legislature provides for a 6 percent funding increase for the community health centres that are in operation. The grant to the City of Winnipeg for the inner city health department is 5 percent higher, if the Legislature votes the funds, it'll be 5 percent higher than the vote last year.

So the community health centres are not being inhibited or restricted by this government in any way. We're just not adding any new ones at the present time. We're increasing the funding of the existing ones by 6 percent, we're looking for some mechanics and some techniques whereby the concept can be evaluated and then we intend to implement that evaluation. If the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks asks the logical question, as I'm sure he would as to where and how we intend to do that evaluation, I can only say at this juncture that there has been a federal grant made available to an individual, a faculty member at the University of Manitoba, in the School of Social Work, for the development of a technique for evaluating community health centres, among other things, and we would hope to be able to derive a considerable amount of guidance from that work, and in addition to that, we intend, through the department, to undertake work of our own to help put that kind of machinery in place and at our disposal.

In the long run, I would say that the assurance that I could give my honourable friend at this juncture, as Minister, is that there will always be places in Manitoba in need of the community health centre concept in order to deliver the services and the programs that are necessary for residents therein. He has referred to two or three which he says have proven their value, and I daresay that that assessment is widely held. There may be others who have or will, similarly, prove their value beyond question or doubt. There may be others that won't and there certainly are areas in parts of the province that I think would not be well served by the community health centre concept, so that any of a universal or blanket nature is not within the contemplation of the government, at least at the present time.

But there will be recognized, by the government, the desirability of the community health concept serving particular regions or particular neighbourhoods. It will obviously always be the best way to do it for some particular areas, and that will guarantee the existence of the concept on a selective and desirable basis. We want to have a chance though to measure the work and the cost-effectiveness of all nine that are in operation as soon as we can. I don't think it's going to be easy, or a job that can be done quickly. I would hope we could do it in a year, but I have no guarantee that it might not take us a little longer to work out the machinery that will enable us to measure them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his comments. I was aware that there are no changes this year. At least there is a reprieve for one year. I can't quarrel with the Minister, and it was never the intention to make this universally applicable across the province. That was never the thought. It was always felt that the way to move is through gradual expansion of community health centres where they make sense and where they best serve the needs of the community or neighbourhood.

The Minister mentioned a federal grant to the University of Manitoba School of Social Work to develop evaluative techniques, and that's all for the good, I'm glad it's them and it's not the MMA that he's going to look to for evaluation. But you know, when you try to measure effectiveness on prevention it's very difficult, and I'm not sure the Minister's ever going to be able to get a clean measurement of effectiveness or cost-benefit. For that matter, I'm not sure the existing system can justify its cost-effectiveness either. I just don't think it can be done. The existing system is treatment oriented, and even they can't justify or prove their cost-effectiveness. So that to expect the community health centres to justify with that kind of criteria is almost impossible. That was my concern, that the criteria developed would make it almost impossible for the health centres to justify themselves, if you use the traditional way of doing it, of proving out that case (a), if it hadn't been looked after at the community health centre, 10 years down the line might have ended up in a more costly treatment, whether for social services or for health services. It's very difficult to prove that out, except over many, many, many years.

I'm not saying that there was a move, or there should be a move to go universal across the province on every neighbourhood and every community should have a community health centre, but my concern was that the community health centres should not feel under the gun, so to speak, because a year from now the government's going to apply some sort of measurements and say well, by that measurement, you haven't proved your right to exist, your cost-effectiveness, sorry,

we're going to phase you out. I'm saying that if that was the approach, that would be a step backward, because there has to be a place in the health and social service system for community health centres reflecting the neighbourhood and the community's needs and requirements, and you can't get that in the kind of health and social service structure we have in existence today.

So that when the Minister tells me that they're okay for this year, they're not being squeezed, that's fine. They have another year. But before he starts applying criteria to them, keep in mind that if you try to apply a criteria today to the existing health system, he'd be sorely pressed to figure out the criteria that is being used now and justify it. The justification is that it's needed. The Minister — I don't want to throw it back at him — but I hope he doesn't go on cost first, need second. The justification for our present health system, it's needed. The present social service system, it's needed. The justification for community health centres are that they are needed, and they're fulfilling a function. If you start introducing some other kind of mathematical cost-effective formulas dreamed up by some actuary, you're not going to get a measurement that they can pass. But keep in mind also, if you apply the same measurement generally to our health and social service field, you also will not get a measurement that can stand up to an actuary's or an accountant's scrutiny.

I would like the Minister to keep that in mind when he's looking at community health centres. They're important, they are performing a function, they are being accepted by the people using them more and more, and the payoff will come in the years ahead.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add a few words to what my colleague from Seven Oaks had to say on the community health centres. I can't quarrel with the Minister when he says that, fine, this is something that in a certain area might serve the purpose and we're not going to open any more this year. I think that this is par for the course when you're starting a new department, you want to be familiar with the clinics. Because that's exactly what we did, also, Mr. Chairman. There was a lot of talk about them going to be set up all over the place and it might be that some of the planners in the department at one time had views, envisaged that, and I know that the MMA were quite concerned, they weren't too sure, especially before they understood the concept of the clinic. I remember meetings with them and with Dr. Tulchinsky where he explained, and many of them changed their mind after this was done.

But nevertheless, this is not something that the former government just went in without planning and decided to have one at every corner street.

But I think . . . first of all, the Minister said what? There are nine? Did he say nine? I don't think they're all the same. They're different things and they answer different needs. For instance, you can practically take Leaf Rapids and Churchill right out of there because that's their hospital and that's their facilities. I don't think they would be treated any differently than the hospitals. Then of course, there's Lac du Bonnet that started in a little trailer and then they built that place and the people of that area are quite pleased.

And then there's Mount Carmel. Well, what can you say about Mount Carmel. You might not like the Director or her politics, but I think you have to hand it to them that they've done some fantastic work right in the tough district of Winnipeg where there's a lot of people that would not get this care. Then I think Klinik, on Broadway, they have the same service. I don't blame the Minister for saying, well, we've got to try to get a handle on that, we've got to know what we're doing when we're approving funds. But I would like to leave this advice with the Minister. This is no criticism because he's been a very busy man since he took over the portfolio.

But I was a little concerned when I saw the statement — he might have been misquoted, but the Minister said in effect, "This is what I meant." But why is there a need for a new government, a new person, who is not familiar with a certain program — but it might be ideology, it might be something that they opposed, or it might be that some of the people that they have much confidence with will oppose — to make a statement like this, "Well, you're on trial, you'd better deliver." Because that statement, I think could be made to every hospital, to everybody. Why single out somebody? That's the part that concerns me, that maybe it wasn't meant to be. Why not single out — would the Minister dare say, speaking to the MMA, and say, all right, every year we're coming here, we're talking about different annual fees, 40 percent, and now the Minister said 50 percent is for operating costs. Well, we want to know what this is all about. Nobody has ever questioned that. You take that for granted. This is what they say it is in its operating cost. That's taxpayers' money.

Is it different, the way people dress or who they are, if there's any special class? As I say, it

is very difficult, it might be next to impossible, but the Minister has every right, he is responsible, the Minister has every right to say, "Well, all right, you've got to show me where this money goes." But I say to the Minister, don't let this be the only criteria. First of all, I think that you should go and see these clinics — you might have seen some, I don't know — because you'll have a different — there are some that I didn't see, and others that I did. For instance, if you go to the Klinik on Broad way, you're going to find it very difficult, to determine, you know you might have some professor at the university that'll give you a nice paper and say that this is it, but please go and see them, and see the volunteers. First of all, you'll be impressed by the lack of formality — like you were saying, the more reformed ways, you won't find that; you'll find doctors in overalls, you won't know who they are — not slacks, jeans, and you'll find social workers in jeans. They're volunteers, dedicated people.

For one thing, they're very patient. And you'll have people that will not be served. In certain areas — I was waiting for the Minister to say, first of all, we don't need this in the city. I think this would be wrong. I think you need the odd one, and I think this one and Mount Carmel are doing a fantastic job. A lot of people would not go to the hospital or they would be kicked out of the out-patient department of certain hospitals.

They spend time on the phone. At the last resort people that want to commit suicide, and they spend time on the phone, talking to them and asking them to come and see them, and maybe going themselves in the middle of the night — dedicated people, doctors, professionals, social workers and others. How are you going to measure that? Are you going to say, how many did you save? Who knows? How many would have committed suicide? . . . for this case you have 20 minutes with each one. You know, you should hang up after 20 minutes on the phone, it's going to be pretty tough.

And then you had an area where the people who were bothered with drugs and so on, this was where they were going. They weren't going to the hospital.

Then there are people who have anxiety, that they just have to phone and I don't know if the Minister knows exactly what it is, knows anybody who is sick with this mental illness, worrying about anxiety, who has anxiety, who don't know why but they worry for nothing. I can tell the Minister that I have some people fairly close to me who are like that and I know how much they suffer and I have seen that.

I would advise the Minister to just take — and it is not very far down Broadway — to go and see that one before he decides anything. I think he will be very pleased that he did go. As I say, others like Churchill, it is a little different if you close that; they have no hospital. The same thing in Leaf Rapids. But I think the Minister must be more familiar with Mount Carmel which has been here for a little while; I think he has seen it. There also, he will go and see them, and the place, they try to keep the place clean but with the people that they have, the class of people they have, the crowd that they have — people are waiting, sitting on steps, sitting on boxes. They have no place for storage, I'm talking about that old place they have there, and it is going to be very very hard. That doesn't mean that the Minister should not try, should not say I want a handle on that. I think he has to do that but I hope that he is not just going to stay in his office and base himself, well, this is something that the Conservatives don't like, or something. Go and see it before you say that.

This is not the same approach as the Dental Program — go ahead, you have to open more and this is a good program — even if you stay with what you have now. Then if you go into the community, the district health, that's a different thing. I think the Minister said he is looking at that also and this, I think, again, if this is understood, and I think we should talk about that. I think we are saying exactly what the Conservative Party has been saying for a long time — you let the people decide what they want. This concept is exactly that. Some people might say, well, all right, we want this kind of service or that kind of service. Not only that, but the government would be out of it because you would have a board that would run the whole show. I mean, the delivery, all these people would be transferred. You are going to lose a lot of civil servants because they would be transferred to that district, the same as with the hospital, the hospital would be part of the district if it works. So that again, I say to the Minister, before saying, well, that's another damn socialistic or NDP program, I think the Minister should look at it. It might be that he would want to change it or it might be that he wants to have no part of it. But I would feel a lot better if the Minister would not go in — this is what I'm afraid of — with preconceived ideas, or, "This is what we want to do," and the day you are elected, "Well, these are the commitments, I've got to do this." I think that he owes it to himself, to the department and to the people of Manitoba to have a look before he decides. I know that he doesn't become an expert from one day to the other, not more than any of us becomes an expert because we become the Minister of Health but at least

Monday, May 29, 1978

you are there because I hope you have could judgment and you can reflect the policies of your government. But at least, if you are questioned and so on, you will be able to answer. You won't just have a document from a professor from the university who might not really understand the situation and who might say, well, this doesn't work because of this and that. That has to be a factor but the other thing about what they are really doing, how they are doing it and so on, you know, they are not too sophisticated, there is no doubt about that.

Just for the record, I wonder if the Minister — we have jumped all over the place as we have been doing on this one and then we usually pass the three or four numbers at once — but I would like to have the breakdown of the staff, that is, by how many regional directors, how many medical officers, and I also would like to have those nine Community Health Centres, I would like to have the amount of the grants for this year, if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I can assure the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Chairman, that I intend to visit all those health centres. I have visited two or three of them, but I intend to get to all of them.

I can give him the breakdowns he asked for, if he wants to copy them down, or I can have them done and sent . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I'll copy them.

MR. SHERMAN: All right. This is the staff breakdown: Regional Directors, 8; Medical Health Officers, 9; Public Health Nurses, 197; Public Health Educators, 4; Child and Family Service Workers, 99; Mental Health and Mental Retardation Workers, 138; Services to the Aged, 6; Home Economics Program, 24; Home Care Workers, 66; Miscellaneous Services Staff, 40; Clerical and Administrative Support Staff, 173; Term Employees, 17 ½. That is a total 1978-79 staff man years of 781 ½.

MR. DESJARDINS: That includes the transfer from the north and the home ecs?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes. On the Community Health Centres, Mr. Chairman: Seven Regions Health Centre, the vote we are asking for 1978-79, \$122,100; Hamiota Health Centre, we are asking \$34,300; Leaf Rapids District Health Centre, \$145,600; Lac du Bonnet District Health Centre, \$102,500; Churchill Health Centre, \$408,900; Mount Carmel Clinic, \$402,400; Klinik, \$191,800; Citizens Health Action, \$52,600; Vita Health Centre, \$23,400, for a total of — I didn't add the city — it's a total of \$1,483,600.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is that with the city?

MR. SHERMAN: No. This is \$1,483,600, without the city, and with the city, which was \$1,677,700, it would give an overall total of \$3,161,300.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: Does that include, in the staff breakdown, the people who were transferred from the Home Care Program?

MR. SHERN: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . Home Care, 56 to 66. It was 56 last year to 66? There were only 10 that were transferred?

MR. SHERMAN: If the honourable member is comparing it to last year, transferred from Continuing Care, Winnipeg, the office of Care Services, 67. The honourable member is working on a base from last year of 695 ½, I would think. Okay, you can add to that for this year: Transferred from Continuing Care, Winnipeg — that's the office of Care Services — 67. From mental institutions, for Community Mental Health Workers, 13. From Northern Affairs — these are the Home Economists, 12. Other transfers produced a net reduction of 6, a minus 6. If you add those figures up, they come to 781 ½.

MR. DESJARDINS: I am going back to Continuing Care. Last year, the figures that I had were 80 ½; this year we were given 13 ½ and we were told that they were transferred here. Now, that would be the 67, I imagine, that the Minister said is transferred, but the staff breakdown that he

Monday, May 29, 1978

gave us, he had under Home Care Workers, 66 but there were already 56 there. That's 10. I can't see where that 67 comes from. You see, the Minister — I hope he is going to be patient with us — he said at the time when we had Home Care, they were transferred here and I am trying to . . . I have got the breakdown. Last year's breakdown, under Home Care Workers, there were 56; the Minister said 66, that's 10. Last year under the other programs, there were 80-something and this year 13. That's 67. So there is something that doesn't jibe here somewhere and I don't know where.

MR. SHERMAN: Perhaps it would help if I gave the honourable member the total Home Care complement in Winnipeg, Care Services complement in Winnipeg. It breaks down this way: Nurses, 24 . —(Interjection)— Do it in written form? Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 1—pass — the Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: This may be a good time to have the committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Tuesday.