

Is the care at the Golden Manor superior to other homes? Inspection reports don't support this theory.

Timmins taxpayers currently subsidize the Golden Manor by \$3.365M annually. This subsidy has been defended with arguments saying that the care at the Golden Manor is superior and that it is a place for everyone; however, the public inspection reports should have everyone questioning these arguments.

Inspection reports that have been done in the last couple of years have shown that the Golden Manor did not meet all compliance standards and they have been found to be in non-compliance on many issues in regards to personal care and zero tolerance for abuse. Is this what the quality care that an extra \$3.365 million dollars buys?

The Ministry of Health Inspection Reports are available online and reports for the Golden Manor can be found here: (<http://publicreporting.ltchomes.net/en-ca/File.aspx?RecID=11337&FacilityID=20210>).

An Inspection report dated December 2014 found the following:

- Non compliance supervisor staffing in the dietary and nutrition departments.
- Non compliance in regards to clear directions to staff and others who provide direct care to the resident.
- The Golden Manor only offered water to their residents. This is not even a minimum standard, and many homes we researched provide 3 different types of juices, coffee, tea, milk and water on their snack carts every morning, afternoon and evening.
- The licensee has failed to ensure that residents are provided with food and fluids that are safe.
- The licensee failed to provide with aspects of oral care (cleaning of dentures, brushing teeth, etc.)

These are just some of the items mentioned in the report. The reality is that the Golden Manor is not even meeting the minimum standards of Long term Care (LTCA 2007). The Board at the Golden Manor should be educating themselves on policies, procedures and the Ministry Regulations and hold management accountable. Timmins is not any different from any other city, town or community with a long term care home and it is time that the operational subsidy be thoroughly examined.