

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, May 1, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation; and the Petition of Home and Research Centre for Retarded, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions. Presenting Reports by Special and Standing Committees. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts begs leave to present the following as their first report.

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Lissaman as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that, for the remainder of the Session, the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of Eight (8) members.

Your Committee has examined the Public Accounts of the Province of Manitoba for the Fiscal Year which ended the 31st day of March, 1968, as published, and finds that the receipts and expenditures of the monies have been carefully set forth and all monies properly accounted for.

Your Committee received or has been assured that it will receive all information desired by any members from the Minister, Heads of Departments, and members of the Comptroller-General's Staff with respect to receipts, expenditures and other matters pertaining to the business of the Province. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to examine vouchers or any documents called for, and no restriction was placed upon the line of examination.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to introduce our young guests that we have with us today in the gallery. I might mention that there are six schools, which I think is rather wonderful. We have seven students of Grade 12 standing from the Dryden High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gervis, and they are the guests of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

We have 35 students of Grade 4 and 5 standing of the Arden School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Irene Rainka. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

We have 26 students of Grade 6 standing of the Brandon Central School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Hammond, and this school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon.

There are 35 students of Grade 11 standing from the West Kildonan Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Jahn. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)

There are also 60 students of Grade 8 standing from the Bellevue School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Senchuk and Mr. Parker. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Finally, we have 40 students of Grade 7 and 8 standing from the Pilot Mound Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Smith and Miss Kester. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. It is now a month since Medicare has been in operation. Can the Minister give us a report on the operation and on the number of doctors now opted-in?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Well, Mr. Speaker, there are still some problems which they are ironing out. There were 933 I believe, or 928 - around that figure - 930 roughly of doctors who had regularly billed MMS last year; 333 have opted-out. Those are the figures from the Corporation as of the 1st of April, and of course there's no change in that as it takes two months to get back in. They're still negotiating also with the optometrists but I've had no report from the Corporation of any particular difficulties at this point. I know there's all sorts of administrative things they're dealing with, but nothing that they have brought to my attention.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. I take it then that two-thirds of the doctors roughly have opted-in and one-third have opted-out. I'd like to address a question to the First Minister then. Is the government considering any legislation to force the doctors who have opted-out to come into the plan?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, no, that would be a matter of policy that would be announced following a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services, Mr. Speaker, the question being: Do people that find themselves qualified for the exemption under the Medicare legislation, that is the premium exemption, after having paid one or two premiums, do they qualify on application to get a refund if they find they should have been exempted?

MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I would imagine, as in the past, they would qualify when they qualified, as of the date they qualified.

MR. USKIW: A supplementary question. I have a case in mind where these people didn't know that they were exempt, or that they didn't have enough income to be exempt, and since getting this knowledge they filed an application for an exemption. But they want to know if they can get the previous two months of the premium refunded to them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Yesterday he stated in the House he was meeting with the Compensation Board, and in view of today's press -- I asked the question in regards to the resignation of Mr. Gerald A. Williams -- in today's press there's a quotation that he resigned because the Board failed to provide him with adequate staff for on-going safety programs. Has the Minister got a report to make to this House in that regard?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Kildonan have a supplementary question?

MR. FOX: Yes, I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister report in regards to the question that I raised on grievance? Was that taken up in the meeting he had?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the question was the disbursement of the funds that were collected for the Accident Prevention Fund. They are collected by the Board as per - I forget the section of the Act - Section 53 of the Act: "and their disbursement then is

(MR. WITNEY Cont'd.)... entirely within the realm of the Workmen's Compensation Board." They advised me that any proposition that is made to them that is going to be grouped toward the matter of accident prevention, that they will consider its support. And I found out yesterday too that while we were debating at great length here yesterday afternoon, that in the morning the Board was meeting on its own. Even though the letter to the Union had not been answered, they had decided to ask the Union to come in to discuss their proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has indicated that this is a matter solely within the discretion of the Board. May I ask the Minister, as Minister of Labour, does he agree that because the money is supposedly collected from employers that the Workmen's Compensation Board should thereby support employer organizations rather than other industrial groups?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the policy that's been adopted by the Board, as I have pointed out, that if any organization has got a good factual accident prevention program that they will consider it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Government Services, I believe. This has to do with the Macdonald Airport. I understand that the option to purchase or lease the property by a certain person or corporation expired last night at midnight. Now the question is, Mr. Speaker, has the property in question been sold or leased?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services)(Cypress): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Letke filed with us a document which would appear to exercise his option. We are having it examined and our officials will be reporting to us presently.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): I would like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it a sale or a lease?

MRS. FORBES: It's a lease with an option to purchase.

MR. CAMPBELL: Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, if I may. The option to purchase is for how long?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, the document in itself I haven't examined, haven't had time to. I will have to take your question as notice and report to the House later.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I'm referring to an advertisement that appeared in one of the eastern papers advertising Manitoba's vacation land and it has for the headline adjectives: "Miles and Miles of Exotic, Sun-soaked, Fresh Water, Fabulous, Bikinied, Groovy, Shimmering White Sands".

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might hear the honourable gentleman's question.

MR. KAWCHUK: My question is, would the Honourable the Minister be kind enough to inform me where I could go in Manitoba to witness a beach worthy of all these adjectives? And secondly, my supplementary question, I also noted there is a portrayal of a couple...

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would be patient until the first question is answered.

MR. KAWCHUK: Well, it saves us time getting up twice... portrayal of a couple enjoying the sun-soaked beach, and I'm just wondering whether or not that's a Conservative position.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I think the area that was referred to was of course in The Pas constituency where many of the fine beaches in Manitoba are located. However, I do think it's typical of many other areas in Manitoba and would like to commend that advertisement to others for consideration and we certainly hope that it will have the desired result. Incidentally, that particular ad, I think, was selected for some special award among people who look at ads of this kind.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if again I might not remind the honourable members that this is the oral question period, and could we keep it within bounds in that respect? The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, there was a photograph, a large

(MR. DOERN cont'd.)... photograph on the front page of the Winnipeg Free Press today, and I wanted to ask you a general question based on it. I was wondering whether there were any other requests from the other media to film or record any of the proceedings in regard to the two governors, since one newspaper did have permission I believe. I wonder if you could inform us were there any other requests that were turned down; and secondly whether the radio and television people might also expect similar privileges subject to your approval.

MR. SPEAKER: I would inform the honourable members that it is always a very difficult question for me to deal with on occasions such as this, and insofar as yesterday was concerned and the occasion, I was approached by the one media and I gave limited privilege from the gallery to take a picture, and only a picture, and that be it. For the information of the honourable member, I was only approached by the one media, and on future occasions such as this, such as we had yesterday, I will decide on the point at that time, and of course all media are welcome to approach me in that connection.

MR. DOERN: If I might just add a comment, Mr. Speaker. I approve of what you have done and I would hope that you would consider opening it on some occasions to the other media.

MR. SPEAKER: They would have had the same privilege had they approached me on this occasion. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask another question of the Minister of Health and Social Services. Could the Minister make available to the people of Manitoba a copy of the means test that is being used to determine whether or not they are eligible for the exemption of premiums under the plan. I have a copy here mailed to me from the department, and I'm wondering if a copy of that nature was sent to all the people whether that wouldn't satisfy my first question this afternoon.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I've asked the department to see what can be done about streamlining the information required in such an application, and when that's ready I'll report to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. I understand that the federal government, I believe the Department of Manpower, has issued a directive to its offices across the nation to make special provision for student employment this summer, a figure of either an additional 1,000 jobs or a 10 percent increase in jobs available. I wonder, in view of this announcement, whether the Premier and his Cabinet would consider a similar move on the part of the provincial government to make more jobs available.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I think that to make work projects as such aren't necessarily being contemplated, but every effort that can be used by the government departments in employing university population is being carried out and we're trying to make as many jobs available as we can.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. I would also like to ask the Premier whether in view of the federal government's position, whether his government might reconsider the request of the University of Manitoba for \$150,000 to make jobs available on campus.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. Can he inform the House he is satisfied there are sufficient number of safety inspectors in his department to carry out an adequate program of inspection?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the Safety Department, the Accident Prevention Section over there is understaffed at the present time, but I am satisfied that irrespective of the resignation that they are being able to continue effectively and that they have begun to advertise for suitable people to undertake directorship of the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, does the Honourable Minister feel that the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, who implies that he is in the pay of management, can adequately fulfill his function as chairman of that board with that attitude?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't interpret the letter of the chairman to be what is expressed by the Honourable the Member for Inkster

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): ... a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I am sure you are aware of the serious economic problems of the farmer. My question is have you made any representation to the Federal Government in the last week or made any suggestions regarding the serious economic problem of the farmer?

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture) (Arthur): I think I did hand out a brief to members of the House. You were saying within the past three weeks - I think it was within the past three weeks that I approached the House of Commons Committee.

MR. DAWSON: ... past week.

MR. WATT: Not in the past week, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows:

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In view of the sudden and exorbitant increase in the price of beef, is the Honourable Minister's department enquiring into the reasons for it? There appear to be a number of reasons given; some of them are conflicting. Is his department enquiring into this unfortunate situation as it affects the consumer?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I'd be very glad to take that question as notice and see what responsibilities we may have in that regard.

I would like, while I'm on my feet, to reply to a question from the Member for Elmwood - who seems to have left the House - with respect to the advertising by United Health Insurance Corporation a program called Mediplus. I would like to say that the question that was raised on this subject earlier was dealt with on the 17th of April. On that same day, the ads were pulled from television at some economic loss to the company involved. The ads were withdrawn from radio completely. The ads were changed in the daily newspapers that appeared on the next day and in the next issue of the weekly newspapers. We believe that they have been very good in their co-operation with the department when the misleading nature of their ads was drawn to their attention. We thank them for their co-operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Government Services when I might expect the information on the Order for Return of April 2nd.

MRS. FORBES: Soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MILLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. This session?

MRS. FORBES: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, mine is a follow-up question to the Minister of Agriculture. Will you make some representation to the Federal Government on behalf of the Manitoba farmer?

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I have been constantly in touch with Federal Government and the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Pepin, in charge of the Canadian Wheat Boards, on the problems of the farmers in Western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. When we were dealing with the Department Estimates, I asked the question as to who would be responsible for repainting the historical marker signs that were placed throughout the province, and referred in particular to one or two at Neepawa and the condition they were in. My honourable friend said that he would attempt to get the answer and report to the House, and as yet I have not had a reply to that question, the question being, of course: who is responsible? And if the government are responsible for repainting, I suggest that they should be done before the tourist season starts.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Member to give me some more specific information with respect to the location of those signs. In some cases they are the responsibility of the Department of Highways, in other cases might well be the responsibility of our

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.)... department, and in some cases they may be the responsibility of the municipality or others who have interests in historic sites.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm referring to the ones that were put up by the Department, and there are several throughout the province - the wooden ones about five feet square and varnished, and it looks like a burned in inscription. Now these, I think in all cases these were erected by the province and, as such, I would suppose that it's their responsibility to see that they are kept attractive looking at least, and many of them at the moment are not in that condition by any means.

MR. CARROLL: If the member will provide the information I have requested, I will be glad to look into it for him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. May I ask, Honourable Sir, when I might receive a Return from the first Order of this House dated March 3rd, dealing with the questions of royalties and charges from various companies listed in that Order for Return.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'll enquire - I'm not able to say at this moment - I'll enquire and let my honourable friend know as soon as I can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I asked a question of the Minister of Health - because Medicare was in effect and the people up north in some instances were as much as 200 miles away from the nearest hospital and doctors - what steps was he taking to supply them with some service. He had stated at that time that when his department estimates came up, he'd answer the question. It's possible he did; I don't recall him; and if he didn't, would he mind answering the question now?

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind the honourable member that the Minister's estimates are still before the House, but however, if the Minister would care to answer that question now, I'm sure...

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I did. While I'm on my feet, may I also lay on the Table of the House a Return for an Order of the House No. 21 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Neepawa, and also No. 29 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Neepawa as amended by the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, another question to another minister. I received a petition today from Wabowden, with most of the people affixing their signatures on it, and it's a request for an extension of television that has just come into effect on April 1st in Thompson, and I recall the government making a statement recently that they were responsible for television up north. Would the government consider putting in a booster station at Wabowden which would serve the new mining area of Pike Lake and Soab Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Minister answered that question yesterday, but if he would care to add to it, it's his privilege.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to examine the question and see whether there is anything touching on my responsibilities.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's not a satisfactory answer. The government has been bragging right along they are responsible for putting television. Now let him answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government given consideration to providing inland storage of grains for the coming crop year, for the farmers of Manitoba? Has the government given consideration to providing inland storage for grains, of grains for the coming crop year, for the Manitoba farmer?

MR. WATT: Not at this moment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question then. Has the government approached the elevator or line companies to increase or enlarge their facilities for storing grain, that farmers can deliver a greater portion of their crop in the forthcoming crop year?

MR. WATT: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: One final question, Mr. Speaker. I had a lady come in to see me today - she was old enough to be my mother. She's a recent arrival from Czechoslovakia because of something that happened there last fall. I understand that the provincial government was co-operating with the federal government to get as many of these people to come into Canada. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to hear the honourable gentleman's question.

MR. BOROWSKI: I am coming to that, Sir. She is out of work - she has no relatives or friends in Winnipeg - she is out of work; she has no money and the Immigration refuse to give her any money. The City of Winnipeg has offered her \$70.00 a month, which you know very well no one can live on. What position, or what's the provincial government going to do about it? Do they feel they have any responsibility, since I think they were involved in bringing some of these people down here?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, may I answer the question. If the honourable member will give me the name of the individual, I'll see that the department people involved in Manpower and Immigration at least look into it. The manner in which the Czechoslovakian immigrants were handled was through the federal government with the co-operation of the provincial government, and a liaison was conducted with the Citizenship Council of Canada who were to assist in the various problems that the individual would have in adjustment, in job placement, education, etc., and if you will give me the name, I'll try and see what we can do in connection with this.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders, if I may address a question to the First Minister - if he could ascertain when we could expect a Return to an Order issued on March 7th requesting the names of members of the Economic Consultative Board Budget, etc., for the last five-year period.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, as soon as it's ready. I'll check on it and see if there's anything we can do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Government Services. Questions were asked earlier about the arrangement for the Macdonald Airport. Would the Minister be prepared to table the documents when she has them, pertaining to the lease?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, so far as my position here is, it's in a signing capacity only on behalf of the government of Manitoba. The question that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has asked should be directed to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can, in view of that, take the question as notice and I'll answer that tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of the Whole House. To consider third reading of bills. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. EVANS: . . . two items for the Committee of the Whole House. I wonder if you would now call the adjourned debates on second reading.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Bill 15; and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we have before us a motion which alleges that certain basic questions have not been answered in connection with the South Indian Lake and Nelson River Power Development, and in the speech that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie made he enumerated four items, as I recall. One was, is this the cheapest or best way to produce power? Second, to the effect that is this the best way to develop the north - is it the best thing for the north? Third dealt with some social values as to whether they were being adequately cared for and taken account of, and the fourth, as I recall, raised the question as to whether, by proceeding with this Hydro development, the province was to use the phrase

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)... "locking itself in", and I take it those are the four main or basic questions referred to in the wording of this resolution. I propose to deal with the first and the second and the fourth questions, leaving for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources the field that is his responsibility - to deal with the matter of how the people concerned at Southern Indian Lake and Pickerel Narrows, and perhaps elsewhere, are being dealt with and how the matter of the natural resources are being dealt with, because those are matters for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

I have had the view for some time that this, being a government responsibility to authorize and allow the Hydro development to go forward, that sufficient information has been made available to the public and to the members of the House upon which they can make up their minds as to the principle involved, and it's the principle that's involved at the second reading of a bill. Nevertheless, I would like to see what I can do to provide additional information or data bearing on the questions which were asked after I made my address. The four basic questions that I have run over were asked by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie after I made my principal contribution to this debate; nevertheless I now have an opportunity to further provide some information. I have considered the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. George and the Member for St. Boniface and I think - I hope I'm not mistaken - that probably all of the contributions to this debate from that quarter of the House fell under the main headings that were in the first place asked by the Member for Portage la Prairie, and I hope my understanding is correct there because it's on that understanding that I want to offer some comments today.

The first question: is this the cheapest, most economic way to provide power in Manitoba today? - the answer is an unequivocal yes, and I propose to offer some additional facts to support that statement. What are the alternatives? The alternatives are either other Hydro sites, and no one has challenged Manitoba Hydro's competence in their field to decide, as they did decide, that the advantage in favour of the high level diversion of the Churchill into the Nelson and the full development of the Kettle Rapids site, was the most economical of the Hydro developments open. I have had occasion to go into those figures as the responsible minister. I am satisfied; the government is satisfied; and the government is putting forward, as their policy, the development of the Hydro site, the full development of the Kettle site with the supplementary water of the high level diversion of Churchill water for the next phase of Manitoba's development of hydro electricity.

Then there was posed the question as to whether we should not abandon hydro-electric development in northern Manitoba and substitute for it thermal development in the south, and we had some discussion about that. I can tell the House that the cost of power at Kettle Rapids with ten units operating is 4.15 mills per kilowatt, the cost of transmitting that power to southern Manitoba is 1.77 mills per kilowatt, and the total of the two added together comes to 5.92 mills per kilowatt, and that price compares with thermal generation of power in southern Manitoba of 8.35 mills per kilowatt, so I answer the question as to whether there's any advantage to hydro-electric development over thermal development in the south, by simply quoting those two figures, first of being a total including transmission of 5.92 mills per kilowatt of power generated at Selkirk - mark at Selkirk because I'll return to that point in just a moment - by comparison with 8.35 at Selkirk and 5.92 for hydro generated electricity from Kettle Rapids, the product of ten units in operation delivered to southern Manitoba, a very considerable advantage in favour of this northern generated power.

MR. MOLGAT: Could I ask the Minister a question? The 8.35 mills is the present cost of Selkirk generation; is that correct?

MR. EVANS: It's the estimated cost that today's construction costs, and operating costs of an alternative source of power located in southern Manitoba based on steam-generated electric power in southern Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: ...producing the same power, the same amount of power as Kettle?

MR. EVANS: This can become very technical because for practical operating reasons it's really not safe or sound to depend upon one single thermal generating station which has to be shut down from time to time to enable repairs and maintenance to be carried out, whereas such plants as the large Hydro Electric ones can be shut off one turbine at a time, and whatever maintenance has to be done can be done without shutting down the entire plant. Now my honourable friend will recognize that I'm not technical in this field, and I suggest to him, as I suggest to other gentlemen here, that when they have matters of technical detail of this kind

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)... that if they would reserve their questions for the committee they'll have ample opportunity to question the assumptions that were made or the statements that I make, on behalf of Hydro, standing here now. And so the comparison of the figures that I have accepted and that the government has accepted is the comparison of 5.92 mills for hydro-generated power delivered in south Manitoba by comparison with 8.35 mills for thermal-generated or coal-burning steam plants in southern Manitoba.

This leads us directly into the question that was raised by the Member for Portage la Prairie concerning the quotation that I gave in my first address of \$4.90 per ton of coal, and a figure which he derived from an Order for Return of an earlier year, which indicated that coal was delivered at Brandon for as little as \$3.83, if I recall. If I'm making a mistake in these figures, perhaps he'll correct me. Well, I call attention in the first place to the fact that his figure was for coal delivered at Brandon and it is not possible further to expand the steam-generating capacity at Brandon because the capacity of the Assiniboine River to provide the cooling that is necessary is now reaching its limit, and with the present extension to the Brandon plant we are just about reaching the limit to which steam-generating capacity can be built on the resources of the Assiniboine River to provide cooling water, and that precludes consideration of building an additional plant at Brandon of anything like the capacity that can be generated on the Nelson. The only alternative site available where there is ample cooling water and where plans are in existence for expansion, of course, is Selkirk, and I would say to my honourable friend that if he had turned over a page or two in that self-same Return, he would have seen what the cost of coal was delivered at Selkirk - Selkirk, where it can be used. Brandon's just across the provincial border from where the coal is mined, but Selkirk has quite a freight bill attached.

My honourable friend didn't bother to do his calculating with regard to the Selkirk plant but I have, and I'll tell him what they are. At the time that he quoted \$3.83 a ton from this government Return, the coal delivered at Selkirk for the year 1967-68 was costing \$4.97 per ton delivered at Selkirk, and by the time the next year had rolled around, the year just ended, last March, that price had risen to \$5.23 per ton. I quoted \$4.90 as the basis of my calculation, and I go into these figures in some detail because he set some store by the fact that he thought he had detected some error either in my arithmetic, or the assumptions, or that mine wasn't a very reliable estimate, and I do point out to him that he neither had the coal in the same place nor the year. He didn't have the coal where it could be burned, to start with; in the second place, he didn't have the year in which it would have to be bought, nor did either of us for that matter calculate what is likely to happen to the price of coal in the years ahead with the continuing impact of inflation. And so, if I have spent a little time on this it's because the House, and I think perhaps the press as well, seemed to be impressed by the point that the Member for Portage la Prairie made when he thought he had caught me out in the price of coal, and I simply say that he did not take into consideration all of the facts, and that if he had he would find that my price of \$4.90 per ton delivered to where the plant would be, is indeed low by at least seven cents per ton and probably a good deal more when you bring it up-to-date and put it in the place where it can be used.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker ... is it not correct that with the Shellmouth reservoir the cooling capacity of the Assiniboine is substantially enhanced and then the potential of the plant's enhanced as well?

MR. EVANS: My information is that with respect -- it's taking about all of the flow of the Assiniboine at the present time going through the Brandon plant or through the prospective addition of the plant to cool the steam and whatever other things have to be cooled there, that the creation of a reservoir didn't increase the flow; it doesn't increase the amount of water available, it simply levels it out; and that the engineers and technical people say that it is not possible to count on the Assiniboine to cool a very large addition beyond what's already under construction. We have to take that into account - beyond the additions presently underway. It is not possible to count on the waters of the Assiniboine valley to cool any greater capacity than is there now or being planned for that location.

There's a second alternative has been mentioned, and of course that's the nuclear plant. There are two of them underway or being built, or having been built they're trying to operate them in Canada. One is at Point Douglas in Ontario and the other's at Gentilly in Quebec, and both of them are built at a very considerably increased cost by comparison with the construction costs on the Nelson. The cost of the plant at Gentilly is expected to be, when completed,

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)... \$423.00 per kilowatt, and the one at Point Douglas has cost just about \$400.00 per kilowatt. This compares with \$289.00 for the cost at Kettle Rapids, or when you add the cost of the upper, the high level diversion of the Churchill waters, and put the entire cost of the high level diversion on top of the Kettle plant only, not taking into account any further development of power plants either on the diversion route itself or on the lower Nelson, but putting the entire cost of the high level diversion on top of the cost of the Kettle Rapids plant, you come up to a total of \$334.00 per kilowatt, and that figure of \$334.00, which is the highest that our Hydro cost will go in the north, because obviously the cost of the diversion will, as it's spread over more and more installed capacity on the lower Nelson, is going to drop per kilowatt; that's merely a matter of mathematics. But those costs of \$334.00 then compare with \$400.00 at Point Douglas or \$423.00 at Gently in Quebec.

Well, those are the facts of the case and it can be expected that as further development comes on the lower Nelson, that the costs up there will go down. But there are further difficulties as well. The Point Douglas plant has had very considerable difficulties; in fact it's been out of operation for eleven, the equivalent of eleven of the 28 months in which it's been in existence, and that's not the kind of source upon which we can depend for power in this province, not if we're going to attract power-using industries here who have to count on a reliable source of power. The Point Douglas plant is at present closed for an indefinite period and nobody knows when it will re-open. There are other disabilities, too, with respect to a nuclear plant, because there particularly it applies that if you want to overhaul or adjust or have maintenance on the plant, you have to close the whole thing down, and if you have a plant so big as to supply a large proportion of the province's needs, you simply cannot afford to face the kind of brown-out there would be in the province if a plant either went out of operation by way of accident or had to be closed down for periodic maintenance.

So, at the present time, in the present knowledge of the industry, and the present skills and the present data that's available, nuclear energy is not, in the foreseeable future, a practical alternative or competitor to the costs that we're going to experience from the development of the Nelson River in northern Manitoba. That being the case, I'm going to turn to the second question, and that is: what is the best plan for the north? And this will not be a statistical exercise as the last one was. I think it's going to fall back on a rather more general proposition which invites just merely consideration of common sense.

The development of the north requires power. There can't be any doubt about that. You can't contemplate a modern mining operation or a pulp and paper mill operation or a woods industry of any kind, nor can you contemplate modern communities in the north, without power, and it's quite practical and indeed the very best alternative open to us to create the power in the north and transmit it to the south, but nobody in their right mind would contemplate generating power in the south by means of steam and then spending \$167 million to take some part of it up north to aid in the development of some mines. I would be just beyond imagining that anybody would think of doing that. So it's the very best thing for the north. The sine qua non for its development demands that we take this alternative and develop this great water resource in the north because the people of the north will be the first to benefit from it, and they indeed benefit in a very very substantial way. It would be impractical indeed to generate from steam in the south, steam which now has been shown to be more costly by quite a margin than Hydro power generated in the north and brought south, and then turn around and add another 1.77 mills to transmit it back up north again. It's just simply an exercise in absurdity and nobody would consider doing that.

So in answer to the second question as to whether this is the best for the north or not, I quote that simple proposition but I go farther. I don't think it's generally recognized that one of the great opportunities facing Canada, let alone Manitoba, let alone the north, is the establishment somewhere of a uranium enrichment plant, a very large opportunity. And I'm going to take a moment now to quote from a TED Report paragraph to which your attention has already been invited but which I wish to read onto the record as follows:

"Manitoba is in a highly favourable position to become a major Free World source of nuclear reactor fuel. New capacity to produce such fuel in the form of enriched uranium will be needed around 1980 to meet the demand created by the growing number of nuclear powered electricity generating plants. The growing commercial significance of such plants is creating a climate in which information on enrichment technology and economics, formerly kept secret, is becoming available. Uranium enrichment requires very large quantities of low cost power

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)... which Manitoba has the potential to provide. A Manitoba enrichment plant could achieve sales valued at \$200 million per year. The plant would cater mostly to an export market, thus generating sizeable balance of payment credits. The contribution of such a plant to Canada's international image and prestige would, or course, be profound. The project would transform the economic and social environment of northern Manitoba. As a part of an accelerated Nelson River development scheme, such a plant could utilize approximately 2,000 megawatts of Hydro power, yielding 50 to 60 million dollars in revenues. The scale of the project, more than a billion dollars, for the electric power and enrichment facilities together is such that Hydro and enrichment plant construction over a six to eight-year period would provide employment for several thousand workers. Later, this operation could provide employment for about 1,500 people, not to mention the permanent employment supporting the Hydro facilities and that required in the service of industries for the total complex of employees and their families. Thus the project would establish nucleus of a new Canadian community in the north." And that's the end of the quotation.

Honourable members will remember that an announcement has been made in the House that the Premier of the province has invited the Prime Minister of Canada to have a joint Task Force to investigate and if possible to put forward this projected uranium enrichment plant in northern Manitoba. This is made possible by the development of power on the Nelson. It becomes totally impossible, inconceivable, on the proposition of developing thermal power from coal in southern Manitoba. And so, with this great new opportunity facing Canada and Manitoba and northern Manitoba, the development of the Nelson is one of the building blocks upon which this great new opportunity can be made available to the people of northern Manitoba. That only adds, of course, to the basic advantage to the north because the present Kettle plans, the plans for the present Kettle Rapids station, with the diversion of the Churchill waters through Southern Indian Lake, makes the Kettle Rapids station completely viable on its own. It is completely economic. It can carry its own costs and repay its own capital and turn in to be a great asset for Manitoba, and that does not depend upon the creation of this perhaps rather exotic industry, this uranium enrichment plant, but it does lay the groundwork for it and make it possible for the accelerated development of the entire Nelson, to make power available in case this opportunity can be attracted to Canada in the first place, and then to Manitoba, and then to northern Manitoba; and there can't be any doubt that this is a very great event, even a very great opportunity for all of us, including the north.

Without taking too long I'd like to refer briefly to whether or not the development of the present plans in the north and the further development of the Nelson will do something called "locking us in", and I've had some difficulty with that phrase. I fail to understand it. I take it to mean that supposing we go ahead with this, that we would then somehow be denied the opportunity to develop an alternate source, or -- I'm trying genuinely to understand it, not to misrepresent what my honourable friend intended to say.

Let me deal with it then. According to the present state of the science and all that's known about the generation and transmission of electricity, and according to all the data that can be made available to Hydro, partly by the co-operation of the federal government that the joint investigation that has been made, there is no alternative way of making power for Manitoba's needs between now and at least the year 2000, which has any prospect of being more attractive than the development of the hydro resources on the Nelson. It is the one plan that stands out now as being the thing that Manitoba ought to do, and for that reason the Manitoba Government is going ahead to authorize Hydro and to assist them in the development of hydro power on the Nelson as quickly as possible, because it's my view, from what discussions I have heard, that by the time the year 2000 rolls around when there may be an alternative source in sight, that we will have used the full capacity of the Nelson and will be looking for every alternative that we can possibly get hold of, and we'll be looking for the next best and wish we had another Nelson or two or three lying around so we could develop them under exactly the same terms and conditions we have today. And that's the state of the science today and that is the lesson to be learned from all of the data that can be made available to people whose business it is to judge these matters. So, for the foreseeable future or at least until the year 2000, there is no likelihood that any alternative way of generating electric energy will make its appearance that will have a chance of proving to be in the end more economical than the plan that is now being put forward by Hydro and which is being pushed ahead.

We must remember that Manitoba's consumption of electricity is, in the first place, very

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)... high; in the second place it's doubling every eight years, and the entire resources of the Nelson are not very much when you consider that each eight years we are doubling the consumption of power by comparison with the eight years preceding it. That rate has been increasing or accelerating lately and it will not be a question of having a development under way which we regret we hadn't started, and wish we had turned to an alternative, we will need the next best source before too long and before the entire resources of the Nelson have been developed and put to use in Manitoba. And so, I think there is no question about being locked in to a decision. Certainly a decision had to be made at the time it was made. In the light of events since that time there is no reason to think that any other alternative could have been chosen, and indeed we are embarked on the best course now.

Now I come to one or two rather detailed questions and I think it's only really to put some information on the record that I engage in this next exercise, which is to discuss with the Member for Portage la Prairie some of the figures that he quoted. I don't do this to be contentious; I do it to put on the record what I think are the correct figures in several cases, and to provide information for honourable members. I'm not really trying to be quarrelsome in approaching this next section. I did think that the price of coal that he raised for discussion did have a bearing, an important bearing on this decision as to whether it should be thermo power or hydro power in the north, and so I discussed that at some length.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Would the Minister permit a question? About the price of coal?

MR. EVANS: I didn't hear that.

MR. JOHNSTON: Would you permit a question at this time about the coal prices? Would you comment on Mr. Bateman's statement, who is speaking for Hydro, on Page 21 of the transcripts when he mentioned the prices of \$3.77 to \$4.07 a ton for coal. Is his statement true?

MR. EVANS: Well, if you would tell me the year with respect of which he made the quotation and the point of delivery of the coal, it would be....

MR. JOHNSTON: January 27th of this year.

MR. EVANS: But with respect to what year....

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Bateman at the South Indian hearings, January 27th.

MR. EVANS: But where was the coal to be delivered? On what....?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I take it he meant to existing Manitoba thermal plants.

MR. EVANS: Well then, if you just take it that way, I correct your impression to say that the prices that I have quoted are the actual delivered prices of coal delivered to Hydro at Selkirk, and the latest two years in question, the one in 1967-68 being \$4.97 per ton delivered Selkirk, which is the only point at which it could be used, and the one a year later, being \$5.23 per ton delivered Selkirk. Those compare with the \$4.90 which I used and which my honourable friend challenged.

I proceed now to some other detailed matters. On Page 1625 in Hansard, the Member for Portage la Prairie indicated that in January, 1969, Manitoba Hydro imported 129,000 kilowatts of power from which he drew the conclusion this was the equivalent of a small thermal plant. The fact is that in January of 1969, Manitoba Hydro imported a maximum of 50,000 kilowatts from Ontario and furthermore this import was during off-peak hours when it was not available to support the system's peak. So it was off-peak power of 50,000 size, not 129,000.

On the same page, the honourable member said it would appear that Manitoba Hydro will be importing 290 kilowatts by January 1971. I take it that he meant to say 290,000. It may have been a misprint but I take it to mean that that's 290 thousand kilowatts, but in any event the fact is that Manitoba Hydro has made arrangements to import a maximum of only 190,000. I'm not sure where my honourable friend's figures came from but I put the facts on the record. They will import 190,000 kilowatts during the winter of 1970-71 in advance of the Kettle generating station coming into service.

There was a number of other figures which were drawn to my attention as not being exactly in line with my information, but I don't want to take up any that are not really important at this stage.

My honourable friend drew attention to some possibility of importing power from, presumably the United States or the neighbouring provinces, to meet our requirements instead of building to capacity or indeed by allowing the development of the Nelson and the high level

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)... diversion to be postponed by a year or so. It might be quite possible to buy this power from other sources and bring it into the province and the delay might not necessarily be fatal, but a lot depends on whether the neighbouring power utilities have the power to sell. We happen to know how much excess power they're likely to have available and there are no such quantities anywhere in sight, from our neighbouring provinces or from any inter-connection with the United States, which would make available power of the size required for Manitoba's requirements in that connection.

There were a number of questions which concerned the original proposal to export large amounts of power from this hydro development, or export it to the United States. This seemed to have stuck in the Member for Churchill's mind when he spoke about the development of this hydro-electric facility up north to export cheap power to the United States - I hope I don't misquote him; it was a question along that line - but this proposal to export power has long since been abandoned, so the Member for Churchill can set his mind at rest on that score, which fact I announced in my first paper, which was indeed a paper, although I wrote it myself.

There is much more here in the way of detailed discussion of figures, or separate or different views in connection with the hydro development, but in summary I would like to refer, then, to the broader issues that we have been talking about. I haven't entered into the consideration of what the Member for St. George said about reducing things to present value calculation instead of calculating annual savings for a period into the future. I'd be glad to look into that. It seems to me an alternate way of expressing two sets of values and comparing them. I haven't any doubt the same comparison would remain but he perhaps some day can instruct me in the science of calculating present values of future expenditures. I'd be glad to learn from him. I'm not expert in that science, and if he's able to instruct me on that, I would be very glad to have the benefit of his advice on it.

Then we do come back to some basics and that is, by comparing the high level diversion with its next best, the next most economic way of providing power on the Nelson at the Kettle Rapids plant alone, there is a saving of \$1,600,000 a year. When all of the plants on the Nelson some time before the year 2000, in my opinion, have been developed, the saving will be of the order of \$9,090,000 per year by taking the high level diversion by comparison with the next best alternative hydro development, and if the plants do in fact last 60 years - in Ontario, for example, they count on a life of 65 years for the hydro plants, and incidentally, in considering the matter of the cost of thermal plants it should be borne in mind that the life of a thermal plant or a steam plant is about 30 years, and so a plant has to be built twice to last as long as a hydro plant. And that's a very important matter when considering the original capital costs involved in setting up the two alternative ways of providing power in the province. And so, with these very large savings over a period of 60 or 65 years, some nine million dollars a year times 60 years, 500-odd million dollars - that figure still stands; that figure is confirmed; and whatever might be done to reduce it by way of some present value calculations of future savings, I don't know what that technique is but I'm quite sure that the same technique applied to alternative sources, which ... about the same kind of a comparison and really I don't think destroys the argument that I made in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might interrupt the Minister and tell him he has four minutes.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to him going over 40 minutes.

MR. EVANS: I appreciate my honourable friend's courtesy, and I had intended to conclude within my allotted time, having expended beyond it before.

So I simply say that for the main considerations that we have before us, involving the principle of this Bill: Is this the cheapest, most economic, the best way to develop power in Manitoba for the foreseeable future? Yes. Is this the best thing to do for northern Manitoba? Yes. Does this lock us in to some alternative way of creating power in the north which we'll regret before long? The answer is no. This is the best plan and still stands up as the best plan available to Manitoba, and for that reason the government has taken responsibility to put forward this proposal for development of the power on the mighty Nelson of the north.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): May I ask the Honourable Minister a question, Mr. Speaker? What other potential sites are there below Kettle Rapids, between Kettle Rapids and the Bay, Hudson's Bay?

MR. EVANS: Quite a number. From memory, I think there are some nine sites on the Nelson. I know there are four on the diversion channel itself. The channel by which the waters of the Churchill would be diverted through Southern Indian Lake, the high level diversion so-called, will provide an additional four plants, which four plants will exceed by 50 percent the present capacity of the Winnipeg River.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, without reference to Southern Indian Lake, but I was wondering about the sites below Kettle Rapids, between Kettle Rapids and the Hudson's Bay. The Southern Indian Lake is above, is it not?

MR. EVANS: I shouldn't answer that out of my head. I believe it's all set out in a very attractive pamphlet and I'll see that my honourable friend has a copy to show him where these plants are located, or will be.

MR. PETURSSON: . . . Mr. Speaker. It would be set out in those pamphlets, then, how much potential power could be developed in these sites below Kettle Rapids?

MR. EVANS: Well, I could make some guesses. I won't do so but since we are talking about the two things in relation to one another, that none of the -- all of the down river sites on the Nelson, that is those below Kettle Rapids, will depend for their continued supply of water upon a reservoir of some kind and the means of providing the quantity of water required in the winter time when the flow is low and the demands in Manitoba are high, the reservoir that will be created will be equally serviceable for the downstream sites not yet being developed as they will be for Kettle Rapids.

MR. PETURSSON: . . . question.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman hasn't exercised his privilege. He's asked a question and two supplementaries, as I recall it. I'm sure he wouldn't want to ask further questions at the expense of other honourable members who wish to ask a question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I understand, then, that after other members have asked their questions, that you would permit the Honourable Member from Wellington to ask a question - of course providing that the person asked is willing to answer.

MR. SPEAKER: That puts me in rather a difficult position. This could go on for the rest of the day. If that is the wish of the House, the House is its own master.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if we're discussing a point of order, I thought for some time I'm going to step aside from the person who's just been speaking at the moment and see if I can make a contribution as perhaps temporary or acting Leader of the House. But for the purpose of questions, either during a speech or after, this habit of asking questions after the speaker has sat down, I think is peculiar to our House as I remember. Nevertheless perhaps it's quite acceptable, but it should be confined to the clarification of something the speaker has said and not to enter into new data, new views, new expressions of opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, would this question that I asked be interpreted as something new, not related to the subject that he had been speaking on.

MR. SPEAKER: It would seem to me that having cognizance with what the Minister said a moment ago, I agree, that I wonder if the honourable gentleman isn't bringing something up that the Minister did not mention in his speech. He is talking about other units below the lake toward the bay.

Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question? First of all, I'd like to thank him sincerely for having given the House more information than we had before, which is what we were seeking. I wonder if he would be prepared to supply us the background studies for the figures which he quoted today, and in particular the studies relative to the alternatives, the high level diversion, and the next best alternative which he says is the low level diversion, and then the other alternatives as well, and in particular the Sturgeon Weir.

MR. EVANS: The studies are largely the engineers and other technicians on whom I rely for advice at the Hydro, and they will all be available at the committee to answer any questions.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, specifically though, could we have the studies giving the background information for the 1.6 million saving of the high level over the low level, and then the studies of the other diversion channels -- or the other alternate means of diverting the Churchill.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I still think the best method to examine those figures or to enquire into them or to satisfy the opposition members' curiosity about them or to give them

May 1, 1969

1805

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)... confidence in them, is to question the officials at the time they come to the committee, and that is why they are coming to the committee.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may though, the difficulty, if we don't have the studies ahead of time, is that we have no means of studying them. If they are merely handed to us or statements made to us at the committee stage, there is no possibility for an opposition group, or groups, to be able to study this without

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is making a speech, or taking advantage of an opportunity. Are you ready for the question?

..... continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Finance appears to have become very well schooled in the figures and economics that he has produced for us, which of course is very helpful to all members of the House, and of course, as he has pointed out himself, may be too great an exercise really for him to become involved in at this stage, because, as he has said, he will produce the experts I presume - well, not I presume - he has said he will produce the experts to back up his statements at committee meeting. I must indicate my own chagrin at the way this debate has gone on, and when I say this debate I'm thinking back to the debate which started before the session.

I feel very badly about the situation we find ourselves in. The development of Manitoba, both the far north and all of Manitoba, is something in which we are all interested, and as one of the members on the other side said, is something in which we all would like to share, share in the great development of the north, and I would like to share in the development of the province in which I was born and where I make my home. I would like to lend my earnest consideration to proposals that are being made so that I too can say that I participated in decisions.

I recall how several years ago, I think it was just before the last election, the then First Minister described the glorious future that we had in the north by this development, and I remember how it came about, when one listened to what he said, that this was something that Manitoba was doing on its own. We were going it alone; we were going to finance the whole operation out of our own pockets. And when I say "finance", I mean in the long run, because it was clear that the participation of the Federal Government in the building of the power lines was an advance being made against the future, and that in the end I think the only contribution that would not be Manitoba dollars would be in the preliminary studies as I recall it, and that other than that it was Manitoba dollars involved in a thousand million dollar project which was pretty big, and we were told then that it was really a glorious opportunity. And naturally we would like to share in it, the opposition is supposed to play a role in decisions that are being made, we are supposed to scrutinize carefully proposals made by the government, indicate criticism where necessary, make suggestions where one has them to make, and in a positive way proceed with the government of the province and the development of future plans. That's why I find it such a difficult and unhappy situation in which I believe all members of the House must find themselves, and having said all members, I suppose I ought to exclude the members of the Cabinet who are apparently privy to information that the others don't have, but I do include those members of the government side who are not members of the Cabinet because they too must feel, as I do, a sense of frustration, a sense of being unable to participate in the role they have.

I was out of the city during the hearing that took place in Winnipeg on the South Indian Lake, and when I returned I was in the position to read the accumulated newspaper reports in sequence and at the same time without having to wait for installment after installment, and I became disturbed as I read it by the fact that no one in the public, and the people present at the hearing, so many of them, were able to get all the information which apparently was deemed necessary by so many. In the normal course I would think that when recommendations come forth, supported by people of competence and recognized respectability, one accepts them, and since I am not prepared to accuse the government, the members of the Cabinet or any of the Ministers as being knaves, because I don't believe they are, I have to assume that they wish to come forth and present a picture which they are prepared to justify. But with the bungling that appears to have gone on on their part, they have cast out on their own statements and on their own presentation, and this is what I find so distressing. In the normal course, as I say, one would not question too much technical statements such as have been repeated here, especially knowing that an opportunity will be given to review these with the experts who make the statements, as I assume they do in Hydro, but once they are in doubt, then surely we have to be sure that we know the full picture.

So when the Honourable Minister of Finance talks about the economic approach, I haven't the slightest doubt that the most economic proposal is the one that is now being presented, because I think that the people in the Hydro are competent people to assess it certainly more so than I am, and having received their statement that they have assessed the economic approach and they believe - I'm talking about the production of power - that this is the cheapest way to produce power, I have not the ability even to question, much less to challenge what they say, and that's what the Minister of Finance, who is speaking now in his capacity as representing in Cabinet and to the government the public utility involved, is speaking about the most

May 1, 1969

1807

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . economic method of producing power, I assume he's right, and I don't propose to enter into debate about that. But he has not been speaking about what is best for Manitoba in the sense of the general picture on which so much doubt has been cast.

We find that when the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources who introduced the original motion, and who now happily has been given the opportunity to speak again without closing the debate - and I am sure the Member from Morris will be pleased to learn that because the way he reacted yesterday, I seemed to sense that he felt it was unfortunate that the Honourable Minister would not have been able to deal with this matter at this time, but now that he knows, as I assume he knows that the Honourable Minister can speak, it would be worthwhile having him come and speak about those aspects which the Honourable Minister of Finance denied himself the opportunity to speak, and that is the matters dealing with the social values involved. And I would think that since this debate will not conclude today, and I have good reason to think that, that we will still hear from the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources about the social values, and I think when one equates the social values against the values of the cost of producing power, one will have to pay a great deal of attention to the social values, won't one? So that one should hear from him.

When he spoke in introducing the Bill, he referred to the summary of conclusions of the much talked about secret resources report. It has been a much talked about report, that's true. The details have not been talked about at all, nor have the conclusions been talked about, just the report has been talked about. But he indicated that his Deputy Minister, Mr. Mair, prepared a summary, and he listed the qualifications of Mr. Mair - and they are indeed impressive qualifications, Mr. Speaker - and I had the opportunity to meet Mr. Mair just two days ago and I found him a fine person. I would like to get to know him better, and certainly with the background information about him that was presented by the Minister, one realizes that he is a man one would like to spend much time with and learn from, but to learn from includes all he knows, and all he knows includes this secret report or reports.

I might even be disinclined to challenge a summary prepared by a person with such a background and so well intentioned - and I say that with complete honesty in approaching it because I don't want anybody to think I'm being cynical about his background on that - I would be inclined to accept it if it were not already challenged, and the fact is it was challenged. Not necessarily his conclusion, but the fact that the report is not being given proper weight is being challenged, and is being challenged by people who have an equal right to respect, both as to their integrity, their well-intentions and their experience. I think only of Mr. Malaher, a former highly respected member of the civil service - senior member. I think of Dr. Solandt who is highly respected - and I needn't list such a long name - I think of names of people who actually were apparently involved in the production of the secret report who are people highly respected, and if they challenge the conclusions of the government, or of the advisors to the government, and that they suggest important omissions from the public report of this government on this issue, then surely the full context must be made available for further review.

It may well be that the Member for Morris is prepared to accept blindly what he is being told by people who sit in front of him, but he must have the experience of knowing that we ought never to be expected to accept blindly what we are told from across the aisle because it is our function to review, to consider, to assess, and to withhold our support until we know that we are satisfied that the support has been merited. And he knows it, the Honourable Member from Morris, and I don't think that it came well from him to accuse us on the other side for delaying this matter in order to be able to learn what he knows we have a duty to learn. And I hope we will hear from other members of the backbench to see whether they too are prepared to accept blindly what they are told, without knowing what is in these secret reports.

The Honourable the Minister for Finance, when he dealt with this matter on the previous occasion, from the lengthy address which he read to us said, and I read now from Hansard, Page 1550, "At the outset I want to state most clearly and emphatically that our decision to go ahead with the Nelson power project was made after most serious and detailed studies." I believe that, Mr. Speaker. He says that - and I'm skipping a little - "that it came as a result of several years of most intensive investigation involving expenditures of \$6.4 million by the Federal Government and the provincial government's agency, Hydro." And he says that "studies were made on the basis of Manitoba Hydro's function to provide and to continue to provide power at cost for the benefit of the people of the province." And there, I must interpret this, that he is now talking about the cost of production of power, and now I interpret this to mean that he is not talking about the secret report dealing with other aspects of the

May 1, 1969

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . consequences of the proposed action by Hydro. And that is really what I would like to learn more about because I am not an engineer; I do not have the resources with which to acquire the knowledge that the Honourable Minister has and which, as I said earlier, he has become well schooled in - it would appear.

On Page 155 he says that the Standing Committee on Public Utilities had an opportunity to deal with this matter and reported in - the record reads March of 1925 and I didn't correct it in my copy, but it was a little more recent than 1925, it was indeed 1966 - and he said, "How could it be said or alleged that there was no opportunity to discuss this matter?" How can one, Mr. Speaker, discuss in advance a study which has not yet been reported on, as far as we know, and which has yet to be reviewed? I must therefore ask where are these studies - just where are they? How can we find them so that we can assist the government in its deliberations?

When the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition asked him during his address, "Did not the hearings (referred to) reveal that there were studies going on?" And the Minister says, "Yes, there were studies going on." And the question was asked: "Would the Minister table those studies, Mr. Speaker?" And the Minister said, "Well if he has some particular studies that he has isolated here, he might wish to refer to them later. I'll not interrupt my presentation at this stage to deal further with that matter." Well that was one way of getting out of answering the question, and indeed he succeeded because at that stage the question wasn't pressed and the Minister went on to make other statements. He said, "As work progresses on this vast undertaking" - and it is vast - "it is natural, but unfortunate, to have a relatively small group of critics who become overly concerned about the consequences of any change."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member doesn't deep down inside regret that he made a statement such as he did. Is he now saying that the critics, the small group of critics are overly concerned about the consequences of any change. Would he really say that again if he thought about what he said, and if he did, would he think that he is justified in putting any questioner in the position of being an overly concerned individual? He said, "I would remind the House that whenever developments of this kind have been undertaken, there's a small group of people who have for one reason or another lost courage," - the word is "lose" but it must have been "lost"; oh, "they lose courage and they find solace in being critical of those who wish to move ahead." Mr. Speaker, I am critical of the government in the manner in which it wishes to proceed, but is that a form of solace that I have acquired, and have I lost courage to stand here and to listen to people accusing me with others of holding back development of Manitoba, as having lost courage and looking for solace in some way of being critical?

Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to what has been said on this side, and I must say from both parties in opposition, and I have not heard disagreement with the project itself but I have heard very strong accusations at the manner in which this government handled it, and that accusation is so justified as far as I can see, from the press reports, from the statements made by the Minister of Mines and Resources, that I think that should not be questioned. And I have heard questions asked here as to what it is that we are dealing with in terms of the knowledge given to us, and I have heard somebody laugh and a member behind me said we are ignorant about the problem. Well, you can't be well-versed if you know what it's all about, and you can't be well-versed unless you have the material to become well-versed.

The Honourable the Minister said again in answer to a question by the Leader of the Opposition - I'm reading now from Page 1560 of this year's Hansard. He said: "I'm not able to identify the studies my honourable friend has." And the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition said it's the Minister who quoted the transcripts and who brought the question into the House, and he asked the Minister will he undertake to provide us with these studies. And the Minister said: "There are six and a half million dollars worth of studies, and I couldn't possibly provide them." Frankly, I don't know why. If there were six and a half million dollars to acquire, they should be worth whatever it is to make copies available for study.

And again, the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition said: "Will he supply the House with those specific studies referred to in the questions that he brought up?" and he said: "I am not able to say." And that, Mr. Speaker, is really what has distressed me most in my attempt to deal honestly and fairly with this problem, and I am attempting to deal honestly and fairly. I assume we all are. But when the Minister himself says he is unable to say whether or not he will supply the House with specific studies and that he referred to, then how can he ask us to support the motion in principle, when indeed doubt has been cast and there is refusal so far on the part of the government to resolve the doubt.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

I then referred the Honourable Minister to a specific report because at one stage he said: "I don't know what you're talking about." And I referred to a report about which I heard in July of 1967, Mr. Speaker, July 1967. On July 12, 1967, I addressed a letter to the Manitoba Development Authority which reads: "Dear Sirs: I understand that you have a report made by Hedlin Menzies dealing with 'Transition in the North - the Problem of Relocation'. I would appreciate your letting me have a copy of same if it is available, and if not, whether you would indicate when it would become available for me."

Mr. Speaker, I had no idea what this report was about. I had heard from a source in Ottawa that there was a report entitled with this title and that's all, and I thought if it was the north of Manitoba indeed it is a matter that I, as a member of the Legislature, should become familiar with. August 2nd, I wrote to the Manitoba Development Authority saying: "On the 12th ultimo I wrote you asking for a copy of the Hedlin Menzies report dealing with Transition in the North - the Problem of Relocation. I would appreciate hearing from you in this regard." Still no reply, Mr. Speaker.

On August 16th I telephoned the Deputy Minister in charge, Mr. Scott Bateman, and enquired as to what was happening to the one-way correspondence I was conducting with the Manitoba Development Authority, and my note is that he said he would send it on to the Premier, who you may recall was then the Minister in charge of the Authority. I waited. On September 6th I wrote - this is 1967 - I wrote to the Manitoba Development Authority: "Dear Sirs: On July 12th and again on August 2nd last I wrote you requesting a copy of the Hedlin Menzies report dealing with Transition in the North - the Problem of Relocation," -- and I see that I was wrong in what I said before, because my letter says: "On the 16th ultimo, Mr. Bateman telephoned me and advised me that this matter would be referred to the Minister for reply. Since my first letter was sent eight weeks ago, I would appreciate it if a responsible officer could reply to my letter indicating whether or not it is your intention to let me have a copy, and if so when."

On September 14th I received -- that is, I received a letter dated September 14th, 1967, signed by the Deputy Minister, referring to the fact that I had written for a copy and had a telephone conversation, and he says in part: "I am instructed to tell you that the study to which you refer was done in confidence for the government, that it is still under review by the government, and that it must be regarded by us as a confidential document until the government decides otherwise. I'm sorry, but under these circumstances I cannot provide you with the copy you have requested."

On April 3, 1968, Mr. Speaker, I filed an Order for Return requesting information dealing: Did the government retain the services of Hedlin Menzies for such a study? How much did the study cost? How and when will be or were copies available to the government, members of the Legislature and the public? To whom and in what quantities were copies of the study distributed and what action has been taken by the government? And then, Mr. Speaker, a Return was filed to the Order - I don't think the date is shown but it was filed. The answer was, it was indeed obtained through the agency of the Manitoba Development Authority and Manitoba Hydro and co-operation with the Federal Government for \$37,000, payable 78,000 out of federal funds through FRED - ARDA -- that's interesting I think -- 22 percent of it provincial responsibility of which all was paid by Manitoba Hydro. Apparently 29 copies went to certain Cabinet members, departments most concerned, to Manitoba Hydro and to the affected federal agencies in May, 1967, two years ago this month, and the answer is that it is not for distribution any further, the action was taken, this is a confidential study prepared for interdepartmental use in consideration of certain problems in the area of Southern Indian Lake. That was the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I knew that that study dealt with this problem and that this must be one of these secret studies that we've been referring to. And I asked the Minister on the 23rd of last month, would this be available to us so that we could study it. He said, "I am not able to say." He didn't even say no, Mr. Speaker. He left us sort of hanging in the air. He was not able to say; as a result of which he may yet say "yes" and we can then go ahead with this and study this proposition carefully.

If you recall, on the same day the Honourable Member for Inkster asked the Minister, does he have available to him any studies which would indicate the cost which would be involved in lost resources or the subsequent problems which may result vis-a-vis the relocation of the people. Are there studies of those costs available to the Minister? And his reply was: "No, I haven't got the -- the studies would not be within my responsibility." So it would

May 1, 1969

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . appear that the presentation made, at least I am concluding, the presentation made by the Honourable Minister is based on that work which is within his scope, and that is the production of power, and for that he has given us lengthy speeches to describe what it is.

And then we are left, Mr. Speaker, where we started. We are left on this side saying, "We still don't know," and the reason that we do not know is that we are not told, and the reason that we feel that we cannot support in principle a project, is that we are not promised that we will be told. And when I read one of the newspapers, one of the Winnipeg newspapers saying: "This should be gone ahead with. This is important," does that newspaper know more than we know, Mr. Speaker? Because if we don't have the full picture, and presumably we would be entitled to it more than the press would be, and if they don't know the full picture, and if therefore the people of Manitoba don't know the full picture, how can we or they or any of us, except a few select members who have read all these reports, say that this is the right project and the best project for the benefit of the people of Manitoba? And the trouble, Mr. Speaker, is that it may be, and isn't that a ridiculous situation? It may be that this House would unanimously support the project and would go right ahead with it. It may well be, and why shouldn't it be? Is there some matter of political philosophy that prevents us from agreeing? Is it a matter which takes care of only vested interests, class struggle of some kind, power struggle of some kind, or is it a matter for development, Mr. Speaker? Then if it is, are we not all equally interested?

But Mr. Speaker, you don't know whether it's right. You'll go back to Swan River one of these days and somebody's going to say to you, is this the right thing for Manitoba? And you may say yes, and when asked why, you will say, "Well, I have confidence in a few fellows in the Cabinet and they say it's the best so I presume it's the best." But that's not the task that we have before us. We are supposed to say, "We believe it's the best thing," and let me end by repeating that had there been no substantial challenge made to the conclusions, then why should we be wasting our time questioning something which experts are advising us on? But it has been challenged. It has been challenged by people whom I have a right to respect as much as those people that are being offered to us as coming before the committee and giving us the benefit of their knowledge and experience and research. And until we have the promise, Mr. Speaker, how can we honestly approve in principle this Bill that we have before us on second reading? Without a promise that we will get all the information, without being given the information, we are being asked to buy a pig in a poke - and now I'm quoting my Honourable Leader who spoke on this quite some time ago. We should not be put in that position, Mr. Speaker, and I for one, who believe I have as much integrity as anybody else in this House, or should have anyway, do not want to be in a position of saying I'm brushing aside that which has been said in criticism without knowing all that the government knows; I'm paying no attention to that, I'm just voting to let's go ahead with it, blindly.

That is not the reason I would censure this House. That is not the basis on which I can expect to deal with this problem. I would like to support this matter going into committee. I would like to say that if it is what it purports to be, a very important project for the development of Manitoba, that I could vote for it in principle so that in years to come I'll be able to say, yes, I supported that. And the government has in its power the opportunity to make it possible for me to vote along with the government on this. Now I don't say that the government has to at this stage say, "Here are the reports; study them." It may take me a little while to familiarize myself with them, but does the government not have faith in its own judgment to be able to say, "We promise we will make this information available to you at committee, so you can confirm in committee the conclusions to which we have come once you have as much information as we have"?

But the government hasn't said that. The government has not promised to put us in the same position that their few Cabinet Ministers are in, and that I consider to be both an affront to the people that I represent and an affront to the members of the Legislature including their own backbenchers to whom they are apparently denying information. And therefore -- (Interjection) -- well, it has been suggested just now by somebody on my right that the backbenchers don't care. I guess they don't care, Mr. Speaker, because if they cared they would be standing up in this House and they would be saying that, or if not they would be holding up meetings in caucus, saying, "Give us the information," so I guess it's true. I guess they don't care. But we do care on this side. We do care to know and we do care to share, and I still challenge the government to say, "We will make all the information available to you. We will give you

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . the opportunity to share with us. We will not deny you that opportunity which we have kept unto ourselves." And until they do that, I for one cannot blindly accept their judgment in place of my own. That's not the reason I was sent here, and if I was sent here for any reason it was to question, to research, to challenge and to lend all my efforts to the same extent as they do to coming to the proper conclusion in the interests of Manitoba and future generations of Manitobans in this case. They are denying me and the people I represent that right, and I certainly resent that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)--passed -- The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): First of all, Mr. Chairman, there is something that I thought of, a question that I thought I'd ask the Minister before the Orders of the Day, then I thought maybe in view of the fact that we were still on the Health estimates that it should be mentioned at this time, and I'm referring to the report of the speech of the Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Quebec, who stated in his budget address that Quebec would have a Medicare plan - I think it was - I have the date here somewhere - on July 1, 1970, if they were permitted to opt out. And of course they would want the equivalent in grants from the federal government. This is an occasion, Mr. Chairman, that I think we should let the Federal Government know in no uncertain terms what we feel of this, what we think of this. I think the Federal Government should be informed that we do not feel that any of the provinces should have the right to opt out in this national plan. I also feel that if they want to go on their own plan they should not share in any grants received from the Federal Government and also that they have no right to demand that they be reimbursed the money, the amount of money collected by the Federal Government to finance their share of this plan. This is certainly an occasion where in this instance preferential treatment to the Province of Quebec would be wrong. This has nothing to do with culture or language or national unity. In fact, I think if they would receive, if the Province of Quebec received preferential treatment in this instance, it would do more harm than good and it certainly would weaken the Federal Government. I wanted to make this observation at this time, Mr. Speaker, because I feel quite strongly on this.

I don't believe that there is any point in prolonging this debate too long. Nevertheless though I think that we have covered quite a bit of the estimates of this department at this time. I think that there's an advantage, especially, probably more so in this department because we are asking the Minister so many questions, we want to get so much information, that it is not possible - especially in such a heavy department - it's not possible for one man to remember everything and he might be able to have some time to give us the information and then I feel that maybe we shouldn't take too long. Once we've passed the Minister's salary we certainly shouldn't start the debate all over again on every point. But I have some questions at this time that I would like to -- and some comments, that I would expect to receive from the Minister.

Now Mr. Chairman, in 1967 there was a big announcement made here in Manitoba: the medical expansion was approved. It was supposed to be at a cost of \$97 million. There was a list of priorities. At the time, the then Premier of the province stated that the provincial government had approved extended medical treatment, research and teaching facilities in Metro Winnipeg costing at least \$97 million. Now there was a list; I would say this was a list of priorities and I quote here from the Tribune of October 31, 1967: "A research and clinical investigation unit; a new emergency department and a new power plant for the Winnipeg General Hospital. A new 314-bed wing, university clinic and research facilities for the Children's Hospital of Winnipeg. General enlargement of St. Boniface General Hospital ward

May 1, 1969

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . capacity, plus a university clinic and research department for the hospital. Extended psychiatric facilities near the Winnipeg General Hospital, amounting to 84 additional treatment beds. Construction of 100 more extended treatment beds, probably on top of the present Manitoba Rehabilitation Hospital. After the initial five year period, projects would include expanded medical educational facilities, more extended treatment beds and a long-term children's psychiatric unit in the medical centre."

Now Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to elaborate, to tell us where we stand at this time. Later on we were informed that the medical plans were incomplete. I want to know if there is any change contemplated. This has never been made public, and I think that when we talk about the priorities, I think that it is quite important to remember the words, the answer given by Dean Fyles in committee when I asked him if there was a way to graduate more doctors, and this is what he said: "Give us the facilities," he said, "and we will graduate more doctors."

Now, today more than ever we are in need of doctors and we will notice that, it will be very clear to all of us, if it isn't already, that under this Medicare plan we will need more doctors and this is the time we should start. We should do something about this as soon as possible. I'm not suggesting for a minute that nothing is being done, but I think this is sufficiently important, I would like the Minister to comment on it while he's replying now, or anyway during the course of while we are looking at his estimates.

On the same big program, it came to my attention that at first it was intended to loop pretty well the Children's Hospital together with General Hospital and so on, and the administrators, the powers-that-be at General Hospital, at the time anyway, objected to this. They felt that the Children's Hospital should not be integrated. In fact they fought this quite strongly. Again I'd like to hear the Minister on this. Has there been some decision on this? What is the latest?

Then we've talked about the hospital in the north end. This hospital has been on and off and on and off. I remember the former Minister of Health stated and I remember he said it wouldn't take much more time for him to leave his home around McPhillips Street and come to General than it would to go to a hospital in the north end. He had a recommendation of the commission at the time and this was changed. This is not an accusation. I would like to know where we stand on this, but I would like to know - and this might be difficult - I would like to know why the commission changed its mind. There must be a valid reason and I hope it's not just a political reason because we are spending too much money at this time in this field that we have to be careful and put the hospitals where we really need them, and we have only a certain amount of money to spend and we must have priorities.

Another thing that we've talked about for many years is that the Veterans' Hospital in Deer Lodge should probably be taken over by the province, and now I'm a little fed up with the promises of the Federal Government who've been saying year after year - and I saw something in the paper just a few days ago - the hospital transfer is promised. Well, the Federal Government has been promising that for at least five or six years that I can remember of - probably longer than that. And I think that while we are going in this program of building, of getting more beds, I think that we should set a deadline on this to the Federal Government and ask them what they intend to do and that we need an answer and that we want an answer as soon as possible. We cannot have this going on for years and years the way it's been going now, and to say that "soon" they will release these hospitals is not good enough as far as I'm concerned. It was done -- certain hospitals in Toronto, I think, it was done a few years ago, and they were going to phase out, retire from this field, after arriving at some arrangements with the provinces. Now, is it the province that is not ready to play ball, for some reason or other? It doesn't seem not from the information that I get, it's the Federal Government that's quite slow, so I think that we should be firm on this and tell them that we expect to enter an agreement with them soon or that they can forget about it and be stuck with their hospital. That certainly wouldn't work for the welfare of the people of Manitoba.

Then on the -- we're talking about construction now. There's something that is quite important. It is the emergency wards, especially the busy hospital, General Hospital, and this has been a disgrace in the past and it's high time that something should be done. I know that the government has this on the priority list but again, I want to know how close we are and what is being done, if anything, and when we can expect something more up-to-date. And when I say it's a disgrace, I'm not referring to the personnel or the people at General Hospital. I mean the facilities. I want to make this quite clear. I'm probably a little more aware or have

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . a little more knowledge of the St. Boniface Hospital, being on the Advisory Board, but there again I think that we should have some directive from the government; we should have knowledge of what is being done. Again, for a number of years, we are being told that this hospital is approved and we're not going very fast on this. We're told that in '69 twelve construction projects have been approved for them in Metro and the Minister has stated that he will give us those during the estimates, but I would like to know how advanced, what's going to happen in St. Boniface, where we stand now. I think that St. Boniface Hospital, if they're going to put their plan in operation, would need \$18 million to \$19 million in the first five years. And while we are talking about the financing, I wonder if the Minister could find out for me what Metro collected this year, that is, under their 20 per cent of capital costs - what they collected for the capital cost of the province, if the Minister could get this for us.

Another comment that I would like to make - and it has nothing to do actually with the Minister except that I'm sure he's going to be concerned. The St. Boniface Hospital are in the process of building a residence for the interns. This doesn't come under this plan, Mr. Chairman. This is something that'll be financed in a different manner, but what I'm interested in, the St. Boniface Hospital needed an approval from the Forest and Stream, and the consultant of the Forest and Stream -- that is for the Foundation and where it should be built, before they could proceed to get the mortgage, the money needed. And this probably, this comment should be directed to the First Minister. But the consultant of the Forest and Stream lives in Scotland and there was a delay of at least two months before they could get an approval of the Forest and Stream, and this to me is not normal. It seems to me that we must have some people in Canada that could consult. I'm certainly not against anybody from Scotland helping us out but when it means an important delay like this and the costs could go higher, I think that the government should look into this. This is -- as I say, the only concern of the Minister is because this is something dealing with a residence for future doctors and it is important that this be done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you've noticed that I've talked about new hospital buildings, new hospitals and so on, and a few days ago I was saying that I agree that we have to be careful in how we spend the money. What I wanted is more of a comment from the Minister. I wanted him to tell us where we were going. I won't be that disappointed to learn - because I have a suspicion that the Minister will not be able to say we're going ahead full blast on all fronts; we're constructing a hospital whoever wants one, and it doesn't matter what district, we're going ahead - but I think that I for one, and I'm sure the members of this House and the members of Manitoba would like to have a kind of a projected plan; what's going to happen in the next few years. We've been told a certain thing a few years ago, and I don't think this is valid, or there are certainly some changes now. And I said not too long ago that we should start at the bottom, and I still believe this.

I think that we should have a list of priorities that should be arrived at after a lot of study, and I feel that maybe we shouldn't spend too much money on building new beds, for acute beds. I think that the nursing homes, for instance, is something that has to be improved. There was a request not long ago by a group to the Minister of Health, and again I want to quote, from the Free Press this time, of August 28, 1968. "A request that the provincial government study the possibility of establishing a fund to cover nursing home costs was made last week by the Age and Opportunity Bureau of Winnipeg, a private agency dedicated to service and planning for the aged." This explains here there's a chronic shortage of nursing home beds and many elderly persons are being cared for in the wrong places, who are on the waiting list to be admitted to a nursing home. "Some just don't have the money," says the report. Well, this only adds on to what I have said before, that the first priority, the most important thing facint this department, I would say, would be for the Minister of Health of this province to interest the other Ministers of the different provinces, and the Federal Government, to meet as soon as possible and to reassess the whole question of hospital care, care for the sick, and to do this as soon as possible. I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that this time we should criticize the federal government or the provincial government for not spending enough money. I'm not suggesting that at all, but I think that we must try to accomplish as much as possible with the money that is being spent now in this field of health, and I think that the federal government should be willing to recognize this. I said, when we were dealing with Medicare, that I felt it would be much better, had the federal government said, "All right, we want you in this question of health; it's important that all

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) Canadians have good medical care and we are therefore using some of this money that comes from the national funds, not only from a province, and that we will share equally with all the people of the country, and therefore we are allotting a certain amount for all provinces, a certain amount based on population." Now I think maybe it's too late to do this now that we have this national plan on Medicare, but nevertheless we certainly can see that we share the wealth of the country a little better than we are doing now, and I hope that the Minister will see fit to see the importance of what I suggest, and will agree with me to try to interest the federal government and the provincial Ministers of Health to get together and reassess the situation here.

Now, as I said, I'm probably more interested in seeing some of these beds, more money being used in the nursing homes, or chronic and geriatric hospitals. I think that we certainly would relive, would get people away from beds that are so costly now, acute treatment beds, and therefore we would have more beds and less of a waiting list and we would have the people that need care but do not have to be in these beds, we would take care of them another way. And it is difficult, and I don't blame the province for this. They are more interested maybe in building the other beds because there's a share of federal money in it, and this is why I say that we must go to the federal government and say, well, come on; let's have another look here. Then I'm sure that we can go ahead with construction, for instance at the chronic and geriatric hospital, Taché Hospital, which has been promised also and which is taking so long.

Another point where I'm very interested - it was announced one time that the St. Vital Sanatorium would be converted to a special treatment centre for retarded children, and I think that this should be a very high priority also. Now some people will say -- all right, you say that you agree that we can only spend a certain amount of money; what do you want to do with this? You say that this should have a high priority. Well this is a case, Mr. Chairman - I said at some time that I don't think we are doing enough when we are dealing with the children, especially those that are handicapped, the retarded children, and this is one point that I would - if this is a word, if I can use it like this - I would say I'm ready to out-socialize the Socialists when we are dealing with these kind of people, and I wouldn't be afraid of being accused of being a Socialist if this is what some of the members want to do. I think that we should do as much as possible when we are dealing with the children, the handicapped children.

Now there is another point, another comment that I hope that the Minister will make, and now I'm dealing with the Commission. Just a few months ago the Manitoba Hospital Association was asking the Minister to have a look, to review this Commission to see if it was doing the proper work. I know that we have had a change since then, and I certainly don't want to accuse the members of the commission and I'm not suggesting that we should change anything, but I would like to hear - the Minister no doubt did take a look because he promised the Manitoba Hospital Association that he would. Now one of the statements that they made was that the Commission was spending \$2 million on administration alone, and I think that they related that to being \$300 per bed and they felt that this was quite a bit, and they felt there was a lot of duplication. Now are there any changes possible? Are any changes advisable? I don't know, and I hope that the Minister will be able to clarify this a bit.

There is another point in this department that I feel is very important. Now this is going to be dangerous, politically speaking, dangerous to talk about this but it's something that has to be done. We have the -- (Interjection) -- if you try to be too careful you won't say anything I guess. I feel that the X-Ray Labs - the X-rays and the Labs - it seems to me that we should establish a central headquarters, some kind of a central bank. The equipment is so costly, and I think that if we had a central bank available to all the doctors and that we would have some form of a library, someone there that could read plates - and this could be open to all the doctors - we would not -- (Interjection) -- what would take too long? Take too long to get a report? Well, not if it's done properly, I don't see why it would take any longer. Now if we had this, we would phase out these X-Ray and Lab tests, phase them out from the private clinics. It seems to me that 8.8 million is a little too much to spend on this.

Now I'm not suggesting that it be stopped from one day to the other, it will have to be phased out. Some of the clinics have some pretty costly equipment and I think that the commission could buy this and that they should run the X-Rays either at different hospitals -- the member said it will take too long. I'm not suggesting there will be only one place in Manitoba, but I think it will be either at certain hospitals, recognized hospitals; in the country it will be at certain clinics, and there might be certain clinics that will be designated as such. But you

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . won't have this repetition, and if your doctor is not in and you go and see another doctor, the first thing you know you have got, as I said before, you've got a towel around you and you are going around for a test and X-Rays for everything and you probably had an X-Ray just a month or so ago. I think that this is too costly and I think that we should do something about this.

Now in the field of public health, it seems to me that the Public Health Act should be changed, and I'm referring now to giving a little more power to the health inspectors. I don't think that they should have to go to different municipalities to change the Municipal Act and so on, and we probably would not have the trouble that we have had. Well, this year we saw where those bakeries that certainly were not kept too clean - I think you know what I'm referring about - I think it was the City Bakery, and I won't go into detail, I think they found some little tidbits there in the bun. -- (Interjection) -- I think it was a little more than flies, and I think that the Public Health Act should be a little stronger and we should, the province - after all it's the health of the people of all Manitoba not just a constituency, a bakery might be located in a certain municipality but they are selling bread all over Manitoba - so I think that something should be done because right now it doesn't seem that we have the protection. Dr. Cadham wanted closure power, for instance, when he was dealing with this bakery and he had to go to the City of Winnipeg and I don't know what was done. But I think that an inspector, a medical man who is there to inspect, when he sees anything like that should have the power to close that bakery immediately - immediately, not wait until you get an amendment or a by-law passed by a municipality.

Now we might say a few words about ambulances. If you remember right, Mr. Chairman, at one time I felt that the ambulances should always stay under - I shouldn't say always - but should stay with the free enterprise. And then when I saw the abuse year after year and the bickering that we have had amongst the operators, and the lack of concern of the government at all levels, and the lack of financial help I should say, I even voted for a New Democratic motion a few years ago that maybe the government should go in the ambulance business. I think that we should maybe for the last time, the provincial government should have all parties meet and say: This has gone long enough, none of this bickering, can you operate an ambulance; if not, we'll do it ourselves.

And then, of course there is a member of this House that's quite interested in the speed of the ambulance. This is another point that should be discussed. I'm not ready to say that they should always go 30 miles an hour, they shouldn't have any siren. There's no doubt that they're abusing this as a privilege at times, but at times it might save a life. I haven't got the answers now and this is something else that should be looked into, but especially we should stop this bickering. This emergency ambulance service is very important. And I wonder, while we're talking about ambulances, if the Minister could find out the cost of the project that the government had not long ago. I think that they had an ambulance on trial and that ambulance was going to go around different municipalities, let the people see them and see if they would improve their position by getting this ambulance which was not too costly. I wonder how much this project cost and how many ambulances have been purchased to date by different municipalities or by private enterprise.

In the field of drugs, I certainly don't intend to start lecturing or discussing the question of drugs too much, but I think that nevertheless we should mention at this time that the traffic of drugs is getting quite serious. I know in certain parts of the Metro area it is quite serious and we have many pushers. It seems that the public is starting to be afraid to report these. Many of them said, well, we know pushers but we're afraid. And this, Sir, scares me because this is organized crime. A few years ago in this House I mentioned that we should do something about organized crime and not wait, the same as I mentioned about the unrest at the university that we shouldn't wait, that it was too late, and at the time the then Attorney-General laughed at me. He did, mind you, name a Winnipeg lawyer as the liaison between the RCMP and the Attorney-General's Department and we haven't heard a thing about this since then. I wonder if the Minister - this comes under him now, not only as a question of health - I wonder if the Minister could set the people's mind at ease and tell us that the pushers will not be permitted to go ahead and destroy the health, mental and otherwise, of the young people of this province. I think that it is time that we do something on this.

Now there is a special request that I have here. I want to put in a good word for an organization that I feel is well worth it, and I'm talking about the Canadian Mental Health Association. And

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . in passing I think we should certainly thank the news media who this week have done so much to try to get the people aware of the Canadian Mental Health and knowing what they are going to do and trying to promote next Sunday, which is a day this organization feels that they will be able to collect from well-intentioned people, collect some funds that'll help them to continue. In 1968, I think that this organization requested a grant, a \$25,000 grant from the government, and the government allowed \$20,000, and this year they've made the same request I think, and I'm informed that they will receive \$20,000 only.

Now, I'm not going to comment on this. As I say, I can on one hand say save money, we have only so much money and we have a list of priorities, and then keep on asking for more beds, more grants and so on; but I would like to leave this thought with the Minister though, and with the government, that I think this association is doing good work. They have a new building here in the Greater Winnipeg area and of course there's an expansion of services because of this. Of course this costs money and the cost of staff, field workers and so on, is also costly as we know. It's 77 percent was it, or 70 percent of the increase in the Hospital Commission's costs is taken up by increase in salaries.

I'm sorry the Honourable Member from Brandon - oh, I see he's not in his seat but he's in the House - the Honourable Member from Brandon I believe is aware that this organization has thought of building in Brandon, a building that costs between \$35,000 and \$40,000.00. There was a generous patron, a doctor that passed away a few years ago here in Winnipeg and left a sizeable amount to this organization. Well, they bought this building and they are serving an area, quite a large area now around Brandon, in fact there's an official opening coming soon and I received an invitation and the name of my Honourable friend from Brandon was listed as one of the people inviting us. Now it's a social rehabilitation program that they have for mental and former mental patients of the Brandon Hospital and the surrounding district. There's an awful lot of good voluntary work in this field and I think that we should encourage this by recognizing them, and, if at all possible, making it a little easier for them to keep on existing. So I just leave this thought with the Minister. I know that he would like to do as much as possible for all these groups, and maybe it's not right for me to single out this group but this matter was brought to my attention not too long ago and I thought that maybe I should, in view of the fact that we're starting Mental Health Week I think starting on Sunday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just have - not very much more - but there are some questions that I will ask on this Manitoba Hospital Commission, and if I ask these questions now the Minister will probably be in a better position to furnish me with the information when this comes up.

Now I would like to know what premiums we collected in 1968; it's not quite clear to me. I find the figure of \$13,657,000, and in another place there's 18.8 million. I know that in 1967 we collected 13,122,625, but what I'm interested in also is a forecast of what we will collect in 1969. Now we know that the premiums were increased in January, 1969 from \$2.00 to \$3.60 for a single premium and family premiums from 4.00 to 7.20. I wonder if the Minister could, when we come on this item, tell us how much money the province will receive from premiums in this field.

I'm also interested in knowing the interest that the province has been able to collect on the prepaid premiums because it is quite an amount and we've stopped now for six months, we are not collecting for the next six months, so I think this is important. The first group, after all we're starting in June, 1968 to pay these higher premiums and the second group in November 1968.

Now when we come to the statement of revenues and expenditures, I would like the Minister to break down, if possible, the federal grant. I see that it's over \$5 million more than we received in 1967 and maybe he can give us the reason for this. It's probably because the cost is higher and more beds and so on. And the provincial grant, well the provincial grant will be 21 million, one million more than in 1967 I believe. Now I ask the Minister, could he break this down and tell us how much has been collected through this five percent income tax which is set aside, which is earmarked as a hospital tax, the one percent corporation tax, what else has been added from the general revenue, and of course I'll have the grants.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister, is it a fact - maybe I'm wrong on this but I would like to have this clarified - is it a fact that the Manitoba Hospital Commission was subsidizing the out-patient department of certain hospitals, and what was the cost of this project during 1966, 1967 and 1968. Not necessarily break down all the hospitals, but the whole project of the out-patient department. And what amount, I ask the Minister, will be saved on this

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . now that we have entered into an agreement with the university because of this new Medicare plan, because I think some of it will be subsidized by the plan as the doctors no longer are requested to do free work - I should say charitable work - it still will be charitable work but they will be paid, and I think that they in turn agree to take part of their fees to subsidize this. I know that the Minister cannot give me all the figures now because in all justness, in all fairness, it'll take quite a while before we put this Medicare plan in force, it'll take quite a while before we settle everything at those hospitals and teaching hospitals, but the Minister might have some information that he can give us.

In the field of administration, I am sure the Minister will have the information at the time and I'm going to wait for this, the expense of administrating the plan, but one thing that I would like to have is what will be saved, if there's any saving, in this administration now that Medicare will also be administered and the premiums will be collected together with the hospital premiums. What will this save on the cost of administrating the Manitoba Hospital Commission? I imagine that when the books are prepared, the figures are prepared, a certain amount of the cost will be charged to the Hospital Commission for collection and administration, and another part, another percentage will be charged to the Medicare plan.

Now I think that this is probably way too many questions, so I'll sit down and give the Minister a chance to listen to others, and maybe if he hasn't got the time to answer at this time he'll probably get the information and be able to answer us fairly soon. And I wish to say at this time, Mr. Chairman, that I took quite a while, but I don't intend to try to embarrass or slow down the Minister, and once we pass this item I hope that it will go quite fast.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there's two general questions of policy that I wanted to raise and to also give some specific examples in that regard of problems that were drawn to my attention by people who reside in my constituency.

I would like the Minister to attempt to explain or justify the government policy in regard to the payment of medical and health premiums in terms of the standard that the government has set, in which they feel I believe that \$1,620 for an individual person, if you earned that amount or more then you are not eligible for having your health and medical premiums waived, or paid for by the government, because Mr. Chairman, that strikes me as being an unreasonable figure. It was drawn to my attention by an elderly gentleman who is a recipient of a \$75.00 a month old age pension and a \$60.00 a month CPR pension. He earns the exact amount of \$1,620 -- he gets the exact amount of \$1,620 which the government feels is adequate for a person to pay their medical premiums. Now if the gentleman earned, or received a payment of one cent or one dollar less, then the government would in effect pay his premiums, but now he is faced with paying premiums of \$8.50 a month, \$102.00 a year. If the government felt previously that \$1,620 was the right figure, I wonder whether they're considering readjusting that figure in view of the fact that premiums are now being charged to people in that category. In other words, if for no other reason, since you're now expecting people to pay premiums and you had a figure of 1,620, maybe that should be at least raised by the amount of the premium, because from my point of view this is a ridiculous amount and anybody who is earning or receiving that kind of money, and is now faced with Medicare premiums, really is in effect going under. So I'd like the Minister to comment on that.

The other question I wanted to raise, Mr. Chairman, with the Minister was if he could explain what the government's policy is in regard to people who need dental attention and yet can't pay for it. In other words, a person who has a very low income and is not on welfare, or even a person who is on welfare, where do they go to have dental work done, because this can be a very costly procedure. I'd like to draw to the Minister's attention a case that was raised with me, a person I've been in touch with, and I would like in fact to later on possibly give him the name of this person so that he could perhaps check the case further.

But I pose the following problem to him. A young woman with three children and a total income of just over \$200.00 a month who had a teen-aged daughter requiring orthodontic work. This person was told that she could go to the Dental College, the School of Dentistry which is of course financed by the Department of Health and the provincial government taxpayers, and was told that her daughter could have her teeth straightened there, instead of paying the normal commercial figure of \$600 or more, for \$150.00. Now she was fortunate in being accepted in the sense that it's very difficult to have your teeth looked after here - they only apparently look for unusual kinds of dental work - and this person's daughter was accepted but was then told that she would have to pay \$150.00 within two weeks or her daughter could not be handled. Now

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . although this is not a great deal of money for somebody with a good income, for a person in a low income bracket, and this woman is in a very low bracket, this is just an insurmountable barrier. I also understand that anybody, at least this is what this woman told me, that anybody can go there and have their teeth fixed if they're accepted. The impression was that there was no needs test, no questions asked about income, that if you were a millionaire or a pauper it wouldn't matter, you could have your teeth fixed, if you were accepted, for \$150.00.

So I would like to ask the Minister if this is so, and I would also like to ask him in that regard if a person is unwilling to pay what can only be described as a nominal charge, although a very stiff barrier in some cases, does the charge of 150, if they're unable to pay that, is there some department, or does the government have some method or means of paying for orthodontic work or dental work to people who can't meet these ordinary barriers. So I'd like to hear what the Minister has to say on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I want to cover one or two points. One is a small matter really, it's a complaint that was brought to me about a year ago. I could do nothing for these people but I would like it on record and question whether the method of handling it in Manitoba is correct. It's the sort of problem which doesn't happen too often, of a young boy who is suffering from a psychiatric illness and where the treatment in Manitoba, the recognized treatment would be through either Brandon or Selkirk, but it's pretty well recognized by the medical doctors here that there's not much they could do with him.

Faced with this problem, or this situation, the parents being human took their child elsewhere and sought consultation and advice elsewhere, and were finally advised through Dr. Hoffer in Saskatoon, who is reputed in his field to be quite an expert, that perhaps a hospital in British Columbia might help this young man or this boy. The parent followed the advice and proceeded to go to British Columbia where they sought advice again. The child was examined and the suggestion was that perhaps they might be able to help him and they registered him at the hospital. They left him there, but they found of course that the per diem costs were extremely high, running about \$1,000 a month, which they couldn't afford to pay. They hoped that the Manitoba Hospital Commission would pay part of the cost of hospitalization. However, it turned out that this being a private hospital it wasn't recognized in Manitoba and therefore nothing could be done for these people. Now although this is a private hospital, I'm told that the hospital is recognized in British Columbia, as a matter of fact it's affiliated with the British Columbia Hospital Plan, so although it's not a recognized hospital insofar as Manitoba is concerned it is a recognized hospital as far as B. C. is concerned.

The alternative that these people were faced with was either a treatment which was acknowledged to be at best doubtful; and another treatment, which although there is some doubt whether it will work - and I know there is disagreement in the profession and amongst psychiatrists whether this treatment is indeed of any lasting value. Nonetheless, you can readily understand why parents faced with this kind of problem, distraught parents, would turn anywhere and everywhere seeking some solution, and they can hardly be criticized as I am sure every member of this House would do the same if their child was affected. And although I recognize that the province having ruled that this is not a hospital in which they could participate and therefore they would not pay - there was no provision for participation - it seemed to me though that they're far too rigid in interpreting the regulations. And I'm wondering why the Hospital Commission could not accept the idea that if this young boy was in a Manitoba institution, whether it be Brandon or it be Selkirk, there is a per diem cost involved in keeping any patient, and if he was in Manitoba that per diem cost would have to be paid. In view of that, why could they not make available to the parents, or directly to the hospital in British Columbia, the private hospital, the same amount of money, or the same amount of dollars that it would cost them if the boy was in a Manitoba institution.

I'm not suggesting they pay the B. C. rate, whatever it might be - it might be very high, I don't know, these private hospitals sometime are - but I think that in terms of at least paying the equivalent amount of dollars that it would cost the Manitoba government if that child was in an institution in Manitoba wouldn't be unreasonable and it wouldn't be unfair. It wouldn't be an unnecessary drain on the Manitoba Hospital scheme, and I would ask the Minister to consider whether this perhaps could not be considered in the future as a policy that where, by choice, people decide to seek help elsewhere, that rather than discouraging them or rather

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . than hindering them, that we recognize that if they stayed in Manitoba there would be X dollars of cost, that that same X dollars should be made available to another institution to help defray the costs that these people would otherwise have to pay, or try to pay out of their own pocket. I know in this case they could not afford the \$1,000 a month. They kept him there; the hospital co-operated by allowing them to pay small amounts per month. They will be paying for the next seven years before they can ever hope to recover to pay the full bill, and they may never be able to do it, it will be a constant drain on their resources, and I think the amount of money that Manitoba could have contributed would have helped considerably to help defray the costs and make it possible for the child to attend in British Columbia.

Heaving dealt with that, as I say it is a single case, I don't know that there are any other similar ones that have occurred in Manitoba. I imagine it's not that unique and I imagine it does happen often. But I would also like to talk about the Portage la Prairie Hospital, or the Manitoba School as it's now called - I believe that's the new title, the Manitoba School - and discuss the situation there. Here's an institution that's been in Manitoba for many many years. It was originally designed and built and conceived to house retardates of all ages at a time in the development of the treatment of retardates when very little was really known about the illness and about the sickness, and in those days I suppose it was not uncommon, and it was probably very common, to simply put them in an institution on a custodial basis and in a sense leave them there for the rest of their natural lives. But thanks to the developments in treatment, thanks to better diagnosis, thanks to a better understanding of the illness itself, it's been fairly well recognized that a large percentage of these children can be trained, can be educated to a certain extent and can be made useful citizens and fulfill themselves to some extent.

So I am disturbed that although Portage has changed over the years and Dr. Lowther, the superintendent there has done a remarkable job, he's done a remarkable job under very trying and under very adverse conditions, and what he has achieved is simply by dint of his own efforts and the stress that he's placed on the work he's doing there and the fact that they've now organized parents and these are all helping to try to improve the conditions, but I think this government has lagged and lagged severely in handling the whole question of the institutionalizing of retardates, or the schooling for retardates. At the present time, the ones who are able to stay at home are being taught or are being educated in the school system, that is the educable and the trainable have now become involved within the school system and the school system is looking after their education. But those who cannot stay at home and have to be sent in to Portage are in a different position, and generally, I feel that Manitoba lags far behind. We seem to have, in spite of all our efforts, we're no farther ahead than we were a few years ago. It's as if you dam a river and you have a block and the thing just overflows, spills over on both sides, because at Portage there are at present, and there have been for a number of years, 1,100 patients, or residents as they call them. These have created, because of the overflow here, it creates a back-up at St. Amant where they're supposed to handle the children from birth to the age of six years of age. But they can't release them from there because there's such an overflow at Portage, so that St. Amant is jammed up as well, and because St. Amant is jammed up, the Winnipeg General Hospital is keeping infants at the Winnipeg General, the psychiatric centre there, keeping them there for months on end simply because there is no facility, no place for them at St. Amant due to the jamming up.

So we haven't really, despite all our efforts apparently, made much of a dent in the situation, and at Portage itself, where as I said we still have something like 1,100 residents, and there's a waiting list, I'm told, of about six to seven hundred, which is about the same as it was two years ago when the estimates were brought in at that time, and I'm told further that the waiting period is anywhere from three to five years; that people, if they want to try to get their children into Portage simply have to wait. Unless it's an extreme emergency or unless it's a very serious situation, they simply have to wait. Needless to say, it's bad for the child, it's bad for the parents, it's bad for the other children in the family and it's bad for the home environment - for everybody concerned. But of course there's no choice because the waiting list, as I say, at Portage is so very large and doesn't seem to be decreasing. I know that they've built something like four or six cottages in the last few years. This is supposed to relieve some of the congestion. Well, it has improved the situation to the extent that they are now able to have better groupings and separations between the various residents, but it hasn't really relieved congestion because they still have the same kind of a problem, of 600 waiting to get in and 1,100 there at the present time.

(MR. MILLER cont'd)

One of the problems, I'm told, is the fact that staff is so very difficult to get. One of the important functions of Portage is to train people in this very difficult and very specialized type of work, but the problem is that once they are trained, unfortunately I'm told the turnover of staff is very high. The salaries, the pay is not that attractive, and they either leave to take positions in the same field where they receive training at better positions in other institutions outside the province, or in many cases simply go into other fields of endeavour where they can get more money without the kind of work and the heartbreaking kind of work that this must be.

So, with the modern diagnosis that's available, the modern treatment and the modern techniques, it is hoped that more of these people, instead of simply being institutionalized and forgotten about, can be rehabilitated and can be trained so they can take their place in society, even though it may be on a limited scale. The emphasis, I feel, should be on getting at these children as early as possible so that the training process can start, with enough teachers, enough staff, enough trained personnel so that they can do the job which is required of them. And I'm wondering whether having, as we do in Portage la Prairie, a massive city of retardates - because this is what it is, 1,100 patients, a colossus almost - whether instead of trying to ease the burden there, trying to add to the facilities there to even make this huge city within a city even larger than it is, whether we shouldn't do this. Since Greater Winnipeg generates most of the residents of that institution, because this is the largest centre in Manitoba and I don't doubt that on a percentage basis it would automatically turn out that most of the patients would be generated from the Greater Winnipeg area, why not develop, start thinking in terms of developing a new facility, a new facility close to Winnipeg? It would be easier for the parents to visit instead of going out to Portage la Prairie. It would, I think, be easier to perhaps get staff because you are drawing from a larger city of residents, people who live in Winnipeg who might be more interested in learning, or going through the necessary training, than if they had to go to Portage la Prairie. Portage being a smaller community, I don't doubt it is more difficult to find the necessary personnel because it's a smaller community to draw from. So it seems to me that by building another facility instead of trying to add to the facilities at Portage, we might be achieving far more.

I'm not suggesting that Portage be closed down because I know that's impossible; we need the facility; but Portage perhaps could be left as the centre which could handle those patients who really very little can be done with, the ones that cannot be retrained or cannot be helped too much. They are bedridden patients; they are patients to the extent that they are simply being held in an institution and all you can do for them is care for them. In other words, custodial care only. Surely we should be concerned and I'm sure the desire of Dr. Lowther and everyone in that field, and I'm sure the Minister himself -- our concern should be to try to get at these children early enough, train them, so that by the time they reach the age of 18, hopefully they can be brought out - or even before that - be brought out, put into what are known as community homes - I'm sure the Minister knows what these are - community homes where they can perhaps live in a community, participate in a community, hold a certain limited type of a job, but at least become useful citizens. And by separating the facilities at Portage from a new one around Greater Winnipeg, I think we could perhaps come to grips with the problem.

I don't think we're ever going to come to grips with the problem if we simply try to add to this huge colossus of a facility at Portage which in many cases is now obsolete; some of the buildings are very very old; there's still cramming and jamming within the corridors now, or within the rooms now - beds as close as 18 and 20 inches space between them; rooms where there should be 14 or 15 at most, holding as much as 30 children sleeping there. It's an atmosphere which at best is very negative, which is very defeating, and it's an atmosphere in which it is very difficult I think for the staff to achieve what they're trying to achieve, and I'd like to quote from a report of a brief that was presented to the Minister, I believe in February of this year, a plea on behalf of the retardates which was presented by the Association, the Auxiliary I believe it is, and this is mostly made up of parents and interested people, and they stress the things that are needed. They say: "More living accommodation is needed to reduce the overcrowding in the three older buildings. More money is needed to bring the School's daily rates for patients into line with other institutions in Manitoba." Apparently, as far as education is concerned, the per diem costs, the per capita costs are far below what is spent

May 1, 1969

1821

(MR. MILLER cont'd) for education in the educable and trainable courses through the Manitoba schools. "There are no adequate educational and recreational facilities, and they are badly needed." They feel that there should be workshop programs for adults, just simply to combat boredom if nothing else, and that of the 1,100 patients they say 600 are mobile and yet there are no facilities to give them the recreation that is needed, and because these are, although mentally retarded children or adults, they are not physically retarded and they need the physical outlets that any individual would require.

The brief also says, "The School is predominantly an adult institution but there is no industrial workshop training because of lack of space and equipment." There are no shops; there's no indoor recreation facility. The handicraft rooms are separated from the school, are ineffective because of a lack of sufficient equipment and tools. Home Economics is taught there - in other words, on paper at least it's there, but the equipment in the Home Economics rooms or section consists of a stove and a table. It's a large table, but it's a table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: interrupt the honourable member. I call it 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.