

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'd like to take a moment, if I may, to say it is a pleasure for me to see the Honourable Member for Radisson in his seat today after a month-long confinement in the hospital. On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome him back and trust he will continue to progress and return to good health.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): If I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank you for your welcome back to this hall of democracy. I understand that I am privileged to be back on a very auspicious occasion, when we have distinguished guests with us from that great nation to the south. It makes it all the more worthwhile for me to come back. I do hope to have the occasion, at a little later date, of expressing my appreciation to the Premier, the members of the Cabinet, the members of the Assembly, for their courtesy, their kindness and best wishes while I was sojourning in one of the establishments under the control of Dr. Johnson, the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services. I say to him: Thank you kindly for your hospitality. My Deputy Leader has also suggested it might have been a House of Correction. Possibly it was; it was indeed. However, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure to be back attempting to serve my province, and I will in due course extend my appreciation a little further. Thanks.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: It is indeed an honour for me to introduce our most distinguished guests, the Honourable William Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota, and the Honourable Frank Farrar, the Governor of the State of South Dakota. In doing so, I am mindful of the fact that this week, April 27th to May 3rd, is being celebrated as United States-Canada Goodwill Week, commemorating 100 years of friendship and goodwill between our nations across the border of many, many thousands of miles. To mark the historic occasion of your visit to the Province of Manitoba, Honourable Sirs, I, on behalf of all the honourable members of this Assembly, invite the Honourable Governors to address the House assembled. The Honourable William Guy.

MR. WILLIAM GUY: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, young people, and ladies and gentlemen in the gallery, I bring greetings to you from North Dakota from our people. I like to come to Manitoba because so often you say, "our friends down south," and when you refer to us as being down south we get ten degrees warmer, just like that. I am pleased that Governor Frank Farrar and his wife are here from our sister state of South Dakota to emphasize, by both of our being here, the importance that we give to the breaking down of any parochial barriers that can possibly be eased or broken down, in order to facilitate the social and economic flow between our peoples.

North Dakota and Minnesota and South Dakota are engaged in a vast, and I think highly important project called the Souris-Red-Rainy River Basin Planning Project. Under federal law, we are co-operating with all of the United States federal agencies as well as the state and local agencies to combine all of the aspirations that each agency, each state, each locality has in the beneficial use of water in these three huge drainage basins, all three of which terminate and flow in and out of, I might say, this nation of Canada. And I know that Manitoba is monitoring this project in which we seek to put to beneficial use every drop of water that falls in this vast basin.

But we're working together in many ways other than water resource development. I looked down on your highway system as I flew in today, and I see where the so-called interstate highway system in the United States will be linked with your highway system here to provide the finest north-south access to our country from yours, and to your country from ours, that our people in this mid-continent area have ever been blessed with; a fantastic highway system.

Then there's the air travel trails that are still in the process of development. But there's the International Peace Garden, too, that binds us together in a common purpose. I visited the Peace Garden last week, landed on the air strip, spent a while there touring that park, and I was pleased to see in the Speaker's office some pictures of the Peace Garden. I hope the Peace Garden will become the focal point, the cause célèbre, maybe we can say, of a vast new tourist development project involving Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Minnesota and North Dakota.

(MR. WILLIAM GUY cont'd.) .

In 1961, the American Petroleum Institute sent a representative to me, and the Petroleum Institute is interested in fostering travel and selling gasoline and other motor fuels. And they said, "Governor Guy, we'll help you if you will take the lead in establishing a five-state tourist loop," and so we started. The Governors of those five states got together and we established the Old West Trail, now a trail that generates multi-million dollar nationwide advertising to attract people to these five states.

So successful has the Old West Trail been with its full staff and executive director, that I thought the time had come when we could do the same thing with two Canadian provinces and two states, and develop a loop that would be a tangent to this well-developed Old West Trail. So today, as you are seated in this beautiful vaulted Chamber, somewhere in this building there are people who are working to bring about the start of an international tourist loop, a loop which people could go on and be attracted off to lateral attractions or on alternate rounds, but nonetheless a basic loop.

Two years ago my wife and I were here for the opening of the Pan American Games, and to kind of test out this loop concept I started from Bismarck, drove to Minot up to Regina, back to Riding Mountain, over to Winnipeg, down through Brainerd, Detroit Lakes and back to Bismarck. It was a fabulous vacation for us, and yet we did it not really knowing what to expect along this trail, not knowing what each community had to offer and finding, strangely enough, that many communities didn't realize what an attractive community they had for those who want to travel the air-conditioned route of the upper midwest portion of our continent. And so I see a great future for very close, intensive ties in tourism between the two provinces and these two states.

My wife and I were at the opening of the Pan American Games - some of you might have been there. We were seated, very thoughtfully, in a moulded fibre glass chair with a kind of a bucket seat configuration, and those in front of us thoughtfully raised their umbrella so that their water came in our laps, and those behind us, with great forethought, brought their umbrellas and we had their water in our necks. We sat in the moulded fibre glass chairs until the water level reached the top and began to spill over, and I suppose we might have lost courage had we not seen Prince Philip standing there, bare-headed, with rain drops glistening in his thinning hair and drops of rain dripping from that handsome face of his, as he stood there resolutely welcoming all of the teams of athletes as they trooped by.

But I think Prime Minister Pearson gave us the greatest inspiration. He sat there very erect, and his hat brim was turned up, and the hat brim would fill with water until it started to leak over, and then with great, great dignity he would lean forward and the water would cascade out of the brim. My wife had thoughtfully worn a heavy wool dress that she had knitted herself, and as she sat there like a sugar lump in a saucer of coffee, the water was being absorbed by this heavy wool dress. When the affair was over, we got up and headed for the car that had been graciously furnished us by the Premier, and each step that heavy wool dress dropped another inch, and when we reached the car my wife did not have a knee-length wool suit dress, she had a wool formal down around her ankles. Those are great memories; they really are. We probably wouldn't have remembered that day if something out of the ordinary hadn't happened. Thoughtfully, the eternal flame had been lighted the day before because I don't think a flame would have burned that day on the way up to light it.

Many years ago this territory that we're all a part of had not been separated by the surveyor's chain into counties and states and provinces and nations, and those that lived here and made their living followed the tributaries and the rivers of basins, and they followed the geographical outlines of the country, and then when the surveyor's rod divided us up into counties, states, provinces and nations, that was when the problems began, because we begin to take on a selfish parochial interest in ourselves, and only in recent years - and I say in recent years; I suppose we could go back to the Thirties when our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, under great criticism instituted the reciprocal trade agreements - only in recent years have we finally begun to realize that in order to achieve great productivity in a constantly rising quality of life, we have to trade among states and we have to trade among nations, and so we are here as a trade team, not to pirate or steal any Canadian industry - far from it. We admire the success of the Canadian industry that has proved that you can succeed under what many industrialists call "adverse weather conditions" because of cold; Canadian industries that have succeeded even in the face of transportation difficulties. These are the kind of

(MR. WILLIAM GUY cont'd.)... people we want to attract, to expand in the United States, and hopefully to use North and South Dakota as the base of their expansion. We don't want to diminish or decrease a single job in Winnipeg. We simply say that businessmen that know how to operate their industry in this climate and in this area of the continent are welcome in our states to expand, because in so doing we can provide profitable investment and new jobs for our own people. And I say "our own people" - I am talking about the children that you and I raise and so often have to go to the seaboard or the metropolitan areas to find an opportunity. And so we're here seeking your help really - and we've had it in the past - and I hope in industry and tourism, water resource development and in every other aspect of our economic lives, we can work even closer in the days ahead. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Frank Farrar, the Governor of the State of South Dakota.

MR. FRANK FARRAR: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, our very close and good friends, the Canadians and Americans. It is really a thrill for my wife and I to be privileged to meet with this wonderful House. It is indeed a high honour. I know that you do not usually permit this type of greeting by people who are not members of your Assembly, and we really appreciate the congeniality, the hospitality and the concern for your neighbors to the south. We feel that we have a tremendous trade opportunity between Canada and the Dakotas and the upper midwest, and that trade in Canada, trade in the United States, has always gone east and west and we miss the advantage of the north and south, and we're here for that purpose, to perhaps open some doors and some opportunities for Canada and for America to exchange ideas, to exchange products, and perhaps bring more prosperity to our areas.

We are particularly pleased at the tremendous job you have done in economic development in Manitoba. In our country, the expansion of economic opportunity is in the southern borders of our country because of the climate, but here, even though you are 300 miles north of my state, you have shown tremendous growth and in fact been one of the leaders in your nation in plant, in industry expansion, and you are to be commended for this effort, because we feel in our state, where our basic economy is agriculture, it's a billion dollar business that is dwindling because of scientific and technology changes and the tremendous productivity we have on the North American continent, and we have to diversify with aggra business, with tourism and, as Bill Guy has indicated to you, we feel these are very important. And the Old West Trail that's been developed between our states on an area concept, should have an indirect benefit on Manitoba, because we believe, with our spacious and vast prairies and beautiful forests that you have, and the wonderful Bad Lands in North and South Dakota and the Black Hills, that we are going to attract even more tourism to our respective areas, and that tourists will stay longer if they can travel on a loop such as Governor Guy has proposed, and the Old West Trail, and the Lewis and Clark Trail that we have.

We have national publicity. We would like to include you in this very important project because we feel a million tourists mean 2,000 more permanent employees for our people - and one of our greatest exports in South Dakota is people. We lose over half of them and only for one reason: because we don't provide a job for them, and our program is in job opportunities - to permit people to do whatever they are capable of doing in an industry within our state. And our people are successful wherever they go, but we want that success in our state, and the best way to do it is to do what you have done, expand into garments and fashions, aero-space and metals and chemicals, doing such a great job.

We would like to increase our 180 million manufacturing economy to a billion, that you have had, and of course, it's done through the opportunity for people and the good governments that you have provided in Manitoba, and I would hope that we have in South Dakota, to attract industry. And it has proved successful because in our state we are bringing in some of our national firms such as Minnesota Mining, Census Control Data, and other garment industries in our nation, and we feel that this trade should go nationally down the Red River, as it has done in history, to improve the exchange of goods between the north and south, and we're very much in favour of bringing in air-lines to Winnipeg. There is no reason that they should stop at North Dakota. We would like to see the expansion of Canadian air-lines to the United States and in return, so that you can come to our Black Hills and Bismarck, the capital of North Dakota, North Central and Frontier Air-lines. We think it would improve communications; it would improve industry; and this is the answer, as we see it, for our people: to expand our economic base so that we do not have to increase in taxation; to provide more jobs for our

(MR. FRANK FARRAR cont'd.)... young people; and I think together we can move to an even greater friendship, a friendship that I think is unequalled in the world, that of United States and Canada. I get a lump in my throat when I think of the North American continent and what a great friend you have been to America, and that we have the International Peace Garden between us, and that we have always and will continue to look upon you as a friend and ally. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could be granted leave just for a second to say, I think on behalf of all members of the Legislature, that we appreciate very much the opportunity that we have today in having with us the governors of the two states, and Governor Farrar, of course, accompanied by Mrs. Farrar and the members of the commission that have accompanied them. I think that I can say on behalf of all members of the House that, while this is an occasion that we seldom have in this House, we are pleased that their visit was timed while the Legislature was in session so that they might express their words through the members of the Legislature to all of the people of Manitoba, and we are extremely pleased that they have been able to join us today. We hope that they will have a beneficial trip, that they will carry back with them the good wishes of Manitoba to the good people of North Dakota and South Dakota, and that the benefit of all of our regions will be enhanced as a result of this visit.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. Reading and Receiving Petitions. Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs begs leave to present the following as their Third Report. Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 44 - an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (1).

No. 62 - an Act to amend The Brandon Charter.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee has also considered certain further sections of the draft of The Municipal Act. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister move the report?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, that the report of the Committee be received.

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 would like to take a moment to introduce our young guests today. We have in the gallery on my left 90 students of Grades 4 and 6 standing, of the William Osler School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Betker, Misses Greenberg and Thomas. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can you tell me when you will be doing something about the TED Commission's recommendation to create a standing committee from the Legislative Assembly - regarding economic development?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you have a supplementary question?

MR. DAWSON: Will it be this session?

MR. SPIVAK: I have no information to give the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Churchill asked me concerning toll lines to Pukatawagan. I have made enquiries and find that the toll traffic from Pukatawagan is handled by radio. There is no present intention on running a land line by the telephone system to Pukatawagan. If my honourable friend wants further information, he might wait until the Telephone Commission appears before the Committee on Public Utilities, when he will have an opportunity to question the officials.

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

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Health in connection with the information regarding medical insurance under the new Manitoba Health Plan which was received by me yesterday. It includes in a line dealing with payment for doctors' services, if you select a doctor who has decided to collect his fees directly from his patients, it states that the doctor will bill you direct, and that you or the doctor will send in a claim card and that the plan will subsequently pay the patient directly for services. Then it states: "At the same time, the Plan will notify the doctor of the amount paid to you." My question is: under what law, and with whose authority, is the Plan going to the trouble of giving that doctor information dealing with money paid by the Plan to the patient?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to take that as notice and speak to the Corporation about the reasons for such an inclusion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just as a supplementary question dealing with the same pamphlet, I am wondering about who is responsible for the grammar in clause (6) which reads, "Who to contact for information."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce or the Honourable Minister of Transportation. Has the province of Manitoba been involved in negotiations with the Federal Government for the construction of airstrips, commercial and tourist airstrips, such as are being planned for northern Ontario?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, No.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A subsequent question. Could the Minister please elaborate on this? Was it "no" because of the province's decision not to, or was it not brought to the province's attention that this program was being launched?

MR. McLEAN: Not brought to our attention, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. I note that notice appears in the Votes and Proceedings received today that he will present on Friday, give notice of the introduction of an Act entitled Provincial Auditor's Act, and I would ask of him whether it would be possible to obtain, before second reading of that bill, the report that was ordered by the House on motion of my honourable leader on March 5th for a report of administrative and financial management practices re efficiency of Comptroller-General, as referred to in proposal re appointment of Auditor-General.

MR. EVANS: Well Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable gentleman knows that, as I have said in this House before, there is no such report, and when any return such as that is turned in it will be a nil return. I have said on another occasion that the government will some time during this session be providing some information with respect to this efficiency review, but there is no formal report subject to being tabled.

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Might I preface it by saying I was not aware of this statement that had been made by the Honourable Minister. If I knew how to find it, I would certainly have looked it up so that I would be able to reprimand myself for not knowing what he has stated, but would not a report be filed in any event, since it was accepted by the House? And if so, why not sooner?

MR. EVANS: The Order was for a report, if any. I have said on several occasions in the House, and I repeat now, there is no such thing as a report concerning operation productivity which could be the subject of a return to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to place on the table of the House and provide the members of the House with a copy of the submission prepared by the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Manitoba Design Institute presented in Ottawa today to the National Design Council. The Executive Committee of the Manitoba Design Institute travelled to Ottawa today to deliver this brief and to review with the Executive Committee of the National Design Council ways in which the two organizations could work together more closely for the benefit of industry in Manitoba. The brief, in essence recommends that the National Design Council establish in Manitoba the Canadian Institute of Industrial Design to provide a national centre to promote good design in the manufacture of Canadian products to make them more competitive in export markets.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the First Minister, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. There was an apparent announcement made that the Rivers Air Force Base is not being moved. Does the Minister have any further information on this for the House?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We've been in touch with Ottawa. We are told that the report is pure speculation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): I would like to address a question to the Minister acting on behalf of the Honourable the Attorney-General - I presume it's the Minister of Transport. Are you aware, Mr. Minister, that it is possible to issue a garnishing order against wages before judgment in the Court of Queen's Bench, yet it is prohibited under the rules of the County Court? And the amount can be for an amount which is within the jurisdiction of the County Court?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of that information.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the Honourable Minister be kind enough to look into it, and if he finds out that I am correct would he bring in the necessary legislation this session to stop that gap?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on the subject of Rivers, I understand the Minister to say that there is no guarantee the base is not being moved. May I ask the Minister a supplementary question: whether the provincial government is continuing negotiations with the federal government on this question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I did not answer the question in the way the Honourable Member for Elmwood suggested. I simply said that the article in the paper was pure speculation, that a decision on Rivers had not in fact been reached. We have been informed by the Minister that the matter is under consideration and it's still under consideration. No decision has been reached. The presentation was made by the group who attended with the Premier, which represented both the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party, and representatives from Rivers. That presentation has, in the opinion of the Minister, been very well received. The matter of both the presentation and the consideration of Rivers is now in the hands of the Minister and the Cabinet sub-committee, and no decision has been reached.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary Mr. Speaker. Is the government going to make any further submissions or any further comments to the federal government, or is it now exclusively in their hands?

MR. SPIVAK: We have been told by the Minister that the matter is exclusively in their hands and that the decision will be reached by them when they determine other matters relating to defense policy and to defense budgeting.

MATTERS OF URGENCY AND GRIEVANCES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that the House do now adjourn for the purpose of discussing a matter of definite public importance, namely (1) The recently revealed position of the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. W. Elliott Wilson, to the effect that the operation of the said Board is solely financed by the employers, and his further position that said financing should and does affect the activities of the Board, including the making of grants to employer sponsored organizations and not to employee organizations, and further, to discuss the implication

(MR. FOX cont'd.)... of said position as it now and each day affects the employees who are having claims for compensation considered by the Workmen's Compensation Board and whose claims are being affected by this attitude. (2) The sudden resignation of the Workmen's Compensation Board Safety Director, Mr. G. A. Williams.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for Kildonan for complying with the rules of the House and affording me the opportunity of prior perusal of the motion. One of the basic principles in dealing with a motion of this kind is that it must involve the administrative responsibility of the government. I find that the Workmen's Compensation Board is an independent board, operating within its own jurisdiction, and is not subject to direction by the government or the Minister in a matter such as outlined in the motion. In my opinion, the contents of the motion will be the subject for a conclusion by the Board itself. This is not presently the administrative responsibility of the government. I must rule this motion out of order.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, the Honourable Member for Inkster asked yesterday if a woman had to sleep on the floor while being held in the adult section of the Women's Detention Centre. I looked into the matter and found that on this very rare occasion it was necessary, because of overcrowding for a few nights, that a woman was required to sleep on a mattress which was placed on the floor, and she was supplied, of course, with pillows, sheets, blankets and so on. Some of this -- it was one of the reasons given amongst different reasons, namely: because of the overcrowding, a couple of people being held on bail, others required for court, and two or three who were awaiting transportation to the north during breakup. I am assured that this is a comparatively rare situation coming from a combination of unusual circumstances, and regret the inconvenience to the person concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for informing the House as to the facts. I wonder if he can advise us that the situation is now changed and that this woman, who is not in custody awaiting trial but who has already been sentenced, will be able to spend the sentence in an institution such as I believe the province is required to provide.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm hoping, Mr. Chairman, that the concern that we're expressing will lead to an improvement in the situation over the future, and certainly I will have the fullest consultation with the staff on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs concerning the Medi-plus ad. Could the Minister inform us as to whether or not the United Health Corporation have made changes in their advertisement?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, my information is that they have.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister inform us as to what date these changes occurred?

MR. CARROLL: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker, but I'll make inquiries.

MR. DOERN: Perhaps then I could forward something to the Minister to look into, that appeared late last week, which was still the same type of advertisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Can the Minister inform us when the Public Utilities Committee will meet to hear the Annual Report of Hydro and the Manitoba Telephones?

MR. EVANS: I'm not able to name a date at the present time. I think it might be convenient to hear it after the discussion of Bill 15, but I'm not sure at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, according to a report coming out of Churchill, which was confirmed by the RCMP there, the crime rate has increased by 100 percent over the past 12 months, and liquor offences have increased by 222 percent. I'm wondering if the government is aware of this and, if they are, whether they're looking into it and what they're planning on doing about this.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that's a matter which will receive the attention of the Attorney-General.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I may; maybe this ought to be on a matter of privilege, because the Honourable Minister of Finance, in answering my question dealing with the Order for a Return which was moved by my honourable Leader on the question of the report, said today that the Order read, "report, if any". I have checked and....

MR. EVANS: said so I was mistaken. I was not attempting to quote the Order. I think that was merely my interpretation of it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, then may I indicate to the Honourable Minister that it did not say "the report, if any" and his interpretation is of course his, but it said, "the report or reports of the review by the government of its administrative and financial management practices designed to ensure maximum efficiency," and went on like that, there's no reference to the possibility that there were no such reports, and the Honourable Minister, who was the only one who spoke on this motion, stated, "I have no objection to this Order. It is subject to the usual rules of the confidentiality of information." No indication at that time that there were no such reports, and the House, having ordered that a report be given, having unanimously, I presume, approved that the reports would be filed, I think that the report ought to be answered and dealt with.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would differ with my honourable friend about the House having ordered that a report be given. The Order is taken that a copy of any report that does exist be tabled. The Order was not accepted in the sense that a report should be written for the purpose of being tabled. I simply indicated there is no report of that character capable of being tabled.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I may. The Order reads that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the report or reports of the review by the government, etc. etc. I think we're entitled to a report - a Return, rather. What the Return says is in the hands of the Minister but surely the House, having ordered that a Return be given, shall receive such a Return.

MR. EVANS: will undertake to see that a Return is made.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask ... a question, Mr. Speaker, not ...

MR. SPEAKER: On the same subject?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, No, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask of the House Leader, or the acting House Leader, when we can expect a Return on the motion passed on March 5th, 1969, on my motion for information regarding civil servants earning \$8,000 a year or over, past and present, and names of consultative agencies.

MR. EVANS: I will enquire and let my honourable friend know as soon as I can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question to the questioning followed by the Member for St. John's. When the Minister accepted the Order for a Return, or the Address for Papers originally, was he aware that there was no report of the committee?

MR. EVANS: Yes, and I think I said so at about that time in the House. I'm not able to point the exact date. Certainly I've expressed myself in the House long before the present date to the effect that there is no such report as referred to, and I repeat that now.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Bill No. 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, I would ask the indulgence of the House if this matter could be allowed to stand. I'm not prepared to go ahead today but of course I have no objection if any other member wishes to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words in this debate and particularly on this resolution to refer the Bill to committee for further information before receiving further consideration by the House. The members of the Opposition are referring to a lack of information with respect to the subject that is before the House. I think the only information that they have not received is that information that is normally considered to be confidential, available to members of government, and not required to be tabled

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.)... in the House, not required under any rules of this House of which I'm aware. I think there's a great deal of information that is available to members of the House. There have been a great many reports made by Manitoba Hydro; the matters have been dealt with very fully in committee; and of course there have been other meetings on the subject as well. I think much of the debate is merely a rehash of debate and questioning that went on in the committee hearing some three years ago. A great many of the questions are of a technical nature or questions in detail which really aren't the kinds of questions that should be raised on second reading.

The main matters of principle in the Bill, I think are quite simple. The first one is: Should a licence be issued for the high level diversion? And we, of course, in considering this matter must take cognizance of the adverse effects of this flooding, and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has dealt to some extent with that subject matter on his opening of debate on this subject.

We must also take into account the economic effects of this project, a matter that was dealt with in principle by the Minister of Finance when he spoke on this matter last week.

The other important matter of principle is: Should a commission be established to ensure the rights and the interests of the people who are to be affected by this flooding? The Member for St. George the other day talked about the tremendous recreational losses and I think he referred in figures in the order of eight to a hundred million dollars. I think we should place this in some kind of perspective as we look at the subject matter that's before us.

Some information has been made available with respect to the resources in the area. I think I should report to the House that the recreational potential of South Indian Lake, we don't know at the moment how great it is, but we do know that there is no recreation development on South Indian Lake, on Granville Lake, or on the rivers that are tributary to it or that are part of the area that will be subject to the flooding by means of the high level diversion. We do know that there is no lodge or resort development located within this area. We do know that there are no out-camps, to our knowledge, located in this area. We do know that there is no potential development insofar as our department is concerned, the Department of Tourism and Recreation, with respect to tourist development taking place on this lake. I think we can say that there is no use being made of this facility, except perhaps by local people, for recreation purposes at the present time.

I've referred to maps issued by the department. We know something of the 115,000 lakes available to us - the tremendous tourist and recreation potential that these lakes offer. We know something of the development in the areas to the south, to the east and the west, areas north of South Indian Lake, and certainly there is very little interest so far being shown in the present area that now has become so important to the recreational future of the people of our province.

A prominent witness that has been called before this Legislature to give testimony to the value of that lake has been Dr. Solandt. I refer to the letter that's been read, I think, twice in this House - I don't know if it's ever been read in full. Some of the material contained within this letter, I agree with, but I would like to refer to one or two matters contained therein. Dr. Solandt - and I quote - "Most of the statements, both for and against the flooding of Southern Indian Lake by the Churchill River diversion, have assumed that the development of hydro-electric power where it is reasonably available is an economic necessity." Mr. Chairman, I've heard a great many discussions with respect to the subject of the development of power in Manitoba; I know of no case in which anyone has suggested that a hydro-electric source be developed where it wasn't economically feasible to do so, so I refer to that matter in Dr. Solandt's letter.

I refer again to the letter and quote: "The cost of power from the burning of fossil fuels is often lower than the cost of hydro power," and with this we would agree, because we in Manitoba have developed power from fossil fuel where it was economic to do so, and I recognize that this is a valid point; one well made.

The next point that he makes: "In addition, the cost of nuclear power will soon be competitive" - and I emphasize that word "soon" - "will soon be competitive," and I would like to point out that there was a full discussion on this point in committee some three years ago and it was apparent to all that nuclear power appeared to be becoming economic in terms of very very large installations - much larger than could be contemplated by the needs and demands of the Province of Manitoba for some time to come - and I want to point out that certainly we're

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) . . . far from perfecting the techniques of using nuclear power. I merely refer to an item in the paper a week or two ago in which it was pointed out that the Douglas Point Power Plant in Ontario, which has been operating for some 28 months, has been down under repair for at least 11 of those 28 months and they've never attempted to operate that plant under heavy load. They've been trying to operate it only under light load - at least the re-fueling part of it. So I say that nuclear power may be some time away.

But I go on in Dr. Solandt's letter. He refers to recreation on the bottom of the first line in his letter and he refers to the "recreation resources of northern Manitoba". He's writing this in his personal capacity as a citizen and as a p. . . . , one who is interested in some of the historic early trade routes, and he is one of the pioneers who has tried to follow through on these routes and I admire him for this particular recreational activity. But I refer, later in the letter, to the following: "To subject the future value of wilderness area" - and I emphasize the use of the words "wilderness area" - "such as the Churchill basin, to a cost benefit analysis is exactly the same as trying to make a cost benefit analysis of the Royal Winnipeg Ballet." Here he's wanting to be on the side of the angels. He's wanting to compare this with our wonderful cultural and artistic group, the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, and of course he equates these in terms of importance to the Province of Manitoba. But I want to emphasize the words "wilderness area" because he goes on in the same paragraph and I read: "but I feel reasonably certain that when the issue is presented clearly to them" - presumably the government - "they will decide that they can afford to preserve the wilderness of the Churchill Basin for posterity, and that they will be willing to forego," - listen to this - "they will be willing to forego some of the small immediate benefits in order to achieve this." Small economic benefits; \$1.6 million with respect to the next cheapest alternative mentioned by the Minister of Finance in his speech the other day. I don't consider this a small economic benefit in spite of the fact that there are others in Canada who are willing to sacrifice this opportunity at our expense because they want to paddle down our rivers.

He goes on in his final paragraph: "I hope that before the final decision is reached all possible alternatives will be carefully examined and that in the evaluation, the future importance of wilderness areas will be given due weight." And I again emphasize the term "wilderness areas".

I think there are a great many people who would say that three-fifths of the Province of Manitoba is a wilderness area. I don't say that, but there are a great many who would like to keep it that way, who would not want to see the development take place that most members in this House would want to see. There are the purists in the conservationist sense, and among those I consider people who are today developing our national parks, who want to draw rings around very large areas of land, draw lines around them and preserve them for posterity in their natural state. There are others, of course, who feel that we have many God-given assets in this province, among which we rate our areas of tourist potential, our lakes and our rivers and our forest areas, and that our responsibility is to develop them for our people and to develop the opportunities therein for others who want to come to our province to enjoy these recreation areas, to contribute some of their tourist dollars and thereby mutually benefit in the enjoyment of our vast natural resources. And we think, of course, that we have room for both of these ideas within our province. We believe that we have a responsibility to use our resources wisely, to use our water resources wisely and, as the Governor of North Dakota said this morning, "the beneficial uses of water," and we must consider those, and they're very important; we must also consider our recreation potential.

Now I think, in looking at northern Manitoba -- and I wish we had a map here and some day I would hope that we may see fit to have a permanent intallation in this Chamber of a map of suitable size, where we can point out the many wonderful features of our province and, as we consider matters like tourist potential, we can actually have a look at the province and get some idea of the perspective of what we're talking about here, because I would like to say that there are literally hundreds, if not thousands, of alternatives that offer equal or better recreation potential than the Southern Lake system, and I don't minimize the economic values that are there, and I think that there are economic, that there are recreation and tourist values there, and, to the extent that we can, I am going to be working to preserve them.

But I think we want to put this in some kind of perspective and I think that I can say that, from the departmental point of view, Southern Indian Lake and that area of Manitoba that will be flooded has had very low priority in terms of other more accessible areas. I think if one

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.)... would like to refer to the TED Commission report he would find the TED Commission is sharing the same views. There are many close-in areas of tourist potential that should be developed, more quickly perhaps than they are at the present time. They mention the Duck Mountain area; they mention other close-in areas that have great potential, and I think these are the areas that we would look to develop in the immediate future. But I would like to say this, that we will be examining - or we have already done some examination - the tourist potential of the Southern Indian Lake system, of the Forebay area, the Granville Lake area as well, and take such steps as we can to preserve those areas that have some potential for future resource development. We believe this is possible and we will do what we can to protect that. I'm very happy to see the Minister of Finance who brought in the map of the actual Forebay area showing the fairly large amounts, but not large in terms of the overall size of the province and not large in terms of the area for potential in the north there, that will be flooded by the Forebay itself.

I think the next point I would like to mention is the people of the north, because I think this has always been the primary concern of government, the main concern of government, the main concern of Hydro, and I think should be the main concern of the people of this House as well. We recognize that the people of South Indian Lake are particularly resourceful, particularly successful people in developing and utilizing our resources. We admire the way in which they have relocated themselves to seek economic benefits from an area that had great potential, to move out of an area that was overcrowded, but I think we also recognize that in South Indian Lake there is evidence of overcrowding of the population, pressures on existing resources; maybe not quite so much evidence in the last year or two because there have been substantial jobs, numbers of jobs available with Hydro to take up part of the slack that might otherwise have shown. We do know that there were a considerable number of young people in South Indian Lake, older teenagers, early twenties, with Grade 8 education or less, who did not have trap lines, who did not have fishing licences, who were beginning to show the effects of the pressures on the resources even in South Indian Lake, and we know something of the good work that was done by the Nelson Agency to try to help those young people to be exposed to other opportunities, educational upgrading, the social adjustment that is given at the Pembina House near Ninette, to be exposed to job skills and the kinds of opportunities that will be developing in the northland and elsewhere.

We recognize that one of the real tragedies of northern Manitoba is that our populations have been growing and out-growing the resources upon which they have been depending, so that we've had a diminishing return, and these diminishing returns are starting to show up for the people of South Indian Lake. And we recognize that we may have an opportunity here in this relocation to provide better opportunities over a short period of time for the people that are located within this area. The principle of community development is that all people want to improve, all want to upgrade, all aspire to higher goals, economically and socially, and such was the case with the South Indian people when they moved from Nelson House to South Indian Lake, and we think that we may have an opportunity here to point new directions to many of the people who will be relocated if this Bill passes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Where are they moving?

MR. CARROLL: I think it isn't up to us to say where these people should move. This is one of the principles that's contained in this Bill, and a principle that I think the members of the New Democratic Party don't understand. Why are we establishing a commissioner? Are we going to go in there and play God to these people and tell them where they should go and what they should do? We have a responsibility... -- (Interjection) -- Yes, we're going to tell them to go and I accept responsibility for that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If the Honourable Member for Inkster wishes to speak, he must do it from his chair, not from another chair.

MR. CARROLL: I think there's no question that the move is the responsibility of government. We recognize that many worthwhile things demand sacrifice of people, whether it's getting an education, whether it's building a beautiful park on the edge of Winnipeg, whether it's building the Floodway or the Portage Diversion; people's lives are affected adversely in many cases but it's for the benefit of the people of the province, the people as a whole. But that doesn't mean we can advocate all responsibility for trying to minimize those adverse effects and turn those adverse effects into opportunities for those people. But we don't intend to tell them where to go or how to run their lives. One of the wonderful things about this approach,

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.)... the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources -- the establishment of a commission, a commission that can work with those people, can provide them with the kind of advice and counsel they'll need; provide them with resource information that they may not have at the present time; find out what the alternatives are; protect their interests; make sure they get a fair deal. But the decisions are ultimately going to be made by the local people and we want to encourage them. This is what we call participation; we call it democracy; we call it community development in the department I was in prior to coming here. This is involvement of the local people in making their democratic choices, and I think it can be a worthwhile opportunity.

I want to commend the Minister of Mines and Resources for his selection of the man to head up this commission. He is an outstanding Canadian, Dr. Monture, an outstanding Indian, a man who is proud of his background and that we should be proud of as well; helped to defend Canada - his grandfather; he himself fought for Canada in the First World War. He has served the Government of Canada as a senior civil servant; has served the United Nations; has served the Colombo Plan; he has had broad experiences throughout the world in many countries and is still now serving his people and his country in accepting this responsibility to make sure that our Manitoba people at Granville Lake and at South Indian Lake get a fair deal as a result of this act that we are committing, because these people are being asked to make sacrifices in the interest of all the people of Manitoba. We want to make sure that they are properly rewarded, properly compensated; that they can take advantage of the kind of opportunities that they open up to them for a better life, economically and socially, than they may have had even in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable Minister? When the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was detailing his plan, among other things he mentioned a floating fish processing plant, and I wonder if the Honourable Minister now speaking would be able to go into a little detail about how that plant would operate amongst about a million uprooted floating trees on that lake?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to answer that question. This is one of the possibilities that has been considered by those people that have had responsibility in negotiating or discussing future possible plans with the people of South Indian Lake. There have been some discussions take place in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. I would think that every effort will be made to try to allocate to them the resources necessary to give them the best standard of living that we can within whatever area they may decide to settle. I have a great deal of confidence in the people of South Indian Lake, partly of course because they have demonstrated an ability to cope with change. I know something of the people of Granville Lake. I associated with some of them a few years ago and know the quality of people that live in that settlement, and I am quite sure that all of them will be able to re-establish and will be able to make the sacrifices and come back from them, from this thing that we are asking of them, that they relocate and give up their present homeland.

I'd like to mention a word or two about northern development because a great deal has been made of this point by, I think, every speaker that's raised himself, from the Liberal Party. The Leader of the Opposition of course wants to turn back the clock to 1966. He says we want to start all over again. Let's forget what's taken place since then; let's start from the beginning. -- (Interjection) -- Well, this is what you said. I heard you on television.

MR. MOLGAT: You heard me on television saying turn back the clock? Not at all. What I said, Mr. Speaker, is that we want to deal with the situation today, the interest rates of today, the construction costs of today. It's the government who wants to turn back to '66. I say, forget '66; deal with the situation as it is today.

MR. CARROLL: Right. We'll be glad to deal with the situation as it is today, but I did hear very distinctly the Leader of the Opposition say he wanted it back to 1966; let's start all over. You know, I think really the Liberal Party are very timid souls. They're afraid of their own shadows. You know, they see bogey men behind every bush, behind every branch and every blade of grass. You know, they're really not very venturesome. --(Interjection)-- Behind every bend. Maybe that's -- I think you know, Mr. Speaker, their idea of northern development is build more coal steam plants here in the south. Their idea of northern development is build more nuclear plants. Their idea of northern development is do anything but leave that Nelson River alone. This has been their attitude right from the beginning.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.)

You know, the people of the north historically, historically have wanted the Nelson River development. I can remember my friend who sits at the end of the row here with me, the Minister of Labour, and myself and a few others coming down from the north to appear before the Committee on Public Utilities and Resources in 1954 or '55 or thereabouts, and we were wanting power in the north. We wanted the base on which northern development could take place. You know, I think we had an ally at that time in a man by the name of Jobin. I think he was friendly to that idea, but of course we know what his Party did to him. I don't know whether it was because he was interested in northern development or not, but he was turned out or got very scant support in his bid for leadership a few short years ago. -- (Interjection) -- Well now, I say the people of the north want power development in the north, but I don't think they should have it unless it's economic, unless it's sound; but I want to say this, that the greatest impetus for development in the north in my lifetime has been the development by Manitoba Hydro, the pushing back of the frontiers, that great great thrust into the hinterland there; Grand Rapids - and we know what our friends thought of that; Kelsey; Kettle Rapids. We know the kinds of roads that were required to aid that development, the communication systems that brought live TV and are bringing live coloured television to the north now, one of the important amenities if people are to be happy and content in that part of the country. We know what it's doing in terms of jobs for northern Manitobans, helping to build job skills, helping to give them a future that will be more secure than they've had in the past.

What does it mean in terms of spending, Mr. Speaker? Hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent in northern Manitoba, on transportation, for equipment, for supplies, for services. What does it mean in terms of consumer spending - very substantial sums of money. It means new opportunities for the north, new opportunities for industry that didn't exist before; new opportunities for mining development; opportunities for forest development that didn't exist before and I am just wondering what would happen to the Uranium enrichment that is being talked about in the TED Commission if we don't proceed with this bill and with the development that it under consideration at the present time. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Liberal Party, if they want northern development, they've got an opportunity to vote for it today, to vote in favour of Bill 15, to get rid of this amendment so that we can get on with the business of developing the north - if this is what they're interested in.

What does the benefit cost ratio say? Based on existing resource development for the lower Nelson alone, 1.6 million dollars, it's a five to one benefit cost ratio in favour of this proposal. And if we develop the other sites along the diversion route, I believe we're talking about \$9 million; it's a 27 to one benefit cost ratio in favour of the development. It means an additional 12 billion kilowatts of power from the lower Nelson when its developed. It means an additional 17 billion dollars when we include the diversion routes as well. This is a 30 to 50 percent increase in capacity as a result of the South Indian Lake Diversion. We believe that this proposal, this bill, is in the best interests of all Manitobans. It means an insured supply of power for years ahead. It means an elimination of the annual escalators that exist with respect to coal-steam plants to a greater degree than they do with respect to Hydro developments where your costs are known over long periods of time. It means we develop a source of power that is more responsive to market demands.

I have no hesitation in recommending that all members of this House vote for the Bill - with reservations if you must. This is not an uncommon thing. If you have any doubt place your reservations on but vote for the bill so that we can get into the committee and have a full and free discussion. I'm satisfied with the competence of the members of the Hydro Board; I'm confident that their staff and their officials and others can answer fully all of the questions that may be put to them by members of this House. I think we will get into a forum there where . . .

MR. PAULLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then why does not the government call a meeting of the Committee on Public Utilities for this purpose. It does not need to wait for the passage on second reading of the bill dealing with Southern Indian Lake. -- (Interjection) --

MR. CARROLL: I don't know whether my honourable member has spoken or not; the last part of that didn't sound like a question to me. But in any case -- (Interjection) -- oh, he asked his question and then he made his comment. -- (Interjection) -- What I'm saying here is the information that is needed on which you can make your decisions in principle are already known

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.)... to members of this House. The detail, the technical questions that have been raised, many of them have already been answered three years ago. Even the material that's been raised and many of the statements that have been made are far from factual - not all of it no - some of it unfactual, some of it contained in reports that are available to members of the House.

I'm satisfied that if this bill is approved on second reading and it goes to Committee that we can have this full and free discussion and it will allay all of the doubts and fears of those people opposite who have some question about this bill at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote against the resolution and to support the bill going to second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it they're all questions, are they?

MR. MOLGAT: I was going to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There were three rose - I take it all have questions so I'll ...

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister not agree that if its a question of getting the subject matter into committee, that by supporting the amendment we could get it immediately into committee? We would agree to no further speeches if the government will agree to support the amendment. Would that not solve the question?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I think we would be establishing a precedent that would be very difficult to live with in this House. We've never done this procedure before, to my knowledge - I've been here now 11 years. I think that the questions before the House are simple in principle. If honourable members are opposed I suggest they vote against it. If that's where their heart lies because -- I think they've always been against the development of the Nelson River. That's what they told us in 1954, they said these far out ideas are not for us. We want the tried and the true, we'll stay close to home and build our coal-steam plants down here and not worry about the more imaginative kinds of developments of the north.

-- (Interjection) --

MR. MOLGAT: If the Minister does not want to answer the question, which is very simple, support the amendment and then we'll discuss the matter. However, I'd like to ask the Minister another question. He referred to a benefit cost ratio of five to one. Would he supply the House with the studies that back up this benefit cost ratio?

MR. CARROLL: I'm quite sure that questions of that kind may well be put to Hydro officials who provided the information to the Minister responsible. -- (Interjections) --

MR. CHERNIACK: I also have a question I would like to ask and I'm afraid if the Minister of Mines and Resources speaks then we may not be able to ask a question -- unless he wants to ask a question of the Honourable Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I'm learning every day. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister, if I may. I would like to know whether he has had access to the secret reports?

MR. CARROLL: What secret reports, Mr. Speaker?

MR. CHERNIACK: The secret reports that were referred to by the Honourable Minister at the beginning of his speech.

MR. CARROLL: I've seen some documents that may not have had general distribution.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Is the Minister proposing that we should vote on the basis of less information than he has acquired?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, it's a rule of this House that's been followed for many years that the government seeks advice from their staff and sometimes others that becomes confidential information to them only. This is a principle I think that applies in Ottawa as well. This is a common principle that's supported by every political party that's in office. I suspect that when they get out of office they acquire different views. These are the rules of the House.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, does that then mean - and I'm again asking the Minister - that Hydro will not be permitted to answer all questions that are asked of Hydro at the committee level?

MR. CARROLL: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what questions they will be posed, but I just recall the report of the committee that considered these matters in 1966.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.)... All questions were answered to the satisfaction of all members and that included the South Indian Lake Diversion of which every member of the Committee was aware at that time.

MR. CHERNIACK: One final question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if we are getting anywhere with these questions? The Honourable Member for St. John's

MR. CHERNIACK: Just one final question. Did the members of the caucus, outside of Cabinet, also have access to these secret recommendations and reports?

MR. CARROLL: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): I have a question, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister began his remarks this afternoon, he quoted some figures that I had used in my remarks on Monday. Is it not correct that I was quoting from figures provided by officials working for the government in reports they've prepared?

MR. CARROLL: I don't know Mr. Speaker, and I must confess that I did not consult Hansard. I made some very brief notes on what the member said and I understood him to say what I repeated here today.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I was quoting figures prepared by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think that there is anything to be gained by continuing this general question period that is developing on the Minister. However, I ask for the co-operation of the honourable members at this time so that the business of the House may get along. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I do have another question but it's along somewhat a different line, although it's a follow-up to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Minister has said that the procedure suggested by the Leader of the Opposition would be a new precedent in that it would be the first time that it's happened. Is the Honourable Minister aware that the procedure suggested is in order as being within the rules of the House, and if he is, then other than the fact that it's the first time it's happening, what has he got against it?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I simply said that it was a departure from the normal procedures of this House. I think the principles in the bill are simple and can be voted on with the information that's available to members. The questions of detail are properly asked at the committee stage.

MR. GREEN: But what damage could there be - and I'm interested to know because I can't understand the government's opposition. What possible damage would there be to going to committee now. Do you have any negative aspects to that procedure, except that it's never been done before?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . remind the House that this matter can be debated. Any honourable gentleman who wishes to discuss the matter, and express his opinion, the opportunity is his as we proceed with the discussion to do with this amendment.

MR. GREEN: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but I'm really asking the Minister his objection to going to committee now.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I can add nothing further to what I have already said on that subject.

..... contined on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, there are two matters that bring me to my feet at this time. Firstly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member speaking to the amendment?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes I am, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The first is a comment made by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources yesterday in reply to a question put by me to him; and the second, a statement made by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation speaking on this Bill today, when he spoke of South Indian Lake as being overcrowded, 600 people living on an area of hundreds - in fact having access to the use of thousands of acres of -- in fact square miles of land and water, and those people are overcrowded in that community.

A MEMBER: Not enough fish to catch.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Not enough fish to catch - not enough fish to catch, despite the reports that have been presented at the hearing on January 27th. But what is even more significant, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources whether he had received a report from Mr. Weber, who was Chairman of the hearing on January 27th of this year, and his answer was in the negative. I then asked him whether he could give some indication as to when he expected to receive the report, and to this the Honourable Minister replied that he does not expect to receive the report. And my further question was - is it not correct that the hearing was conducted with the intention of enabling Mr. Weber to report to the Honourable Minister on this matter. The Honourable Minister replied that "I think it's apparent to the House, to the Honourable Member for Burrows, that the action now under way in this House supersedes those hearings and the anticipated report that he refers to."

Later, on questions before Orders of the Day, the Honourable Member for Inkster put this question to the Honourable Minister: Does the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources not consider that a report would be helpful for the deliberations of legislators on the question of South Indian Lake, since the hearing was conducted and Mr. Weber presided at the hearing. The reply to this question, Mr. Speaker, was silence on the part of the Honourable Minister.

Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that at that time the government's indication that it's scrapping whatever it had set out to do, that from here on in there is no report necessary from Mr. Weber, that that is a betrayal of the people of Manitoba, because the people of Manitoba were looking forward to a report from Mr. Weber to be handed to the government and now the Honourable Minister says that he's not interested in receiving any report. He's not looking forward to receiving a report; the presentation of this Bill to the House supersedes the need, and despite what has been said at the hearings, despite what has been said in this House of the need for additional information, this doesn't matter to the Honourable Minister. He has now completely scrapped what had transpired up to the end of January on the two occasions, the hearing in Winnipeg and the hearing at South Indian Lake. And may I remind the Honourable Minister when I said that this is a betrayal of the people of Manitoba, at the opening of the hearing in Winnipeg - this was the second session, the first was on January 7th at South Indian Lake and then in Winnipeg some three weeks later on January 27th - Mr. Weber stated that the purpose of this hearing is to hear, as the notice indicated, to hear briefs and presentations respecting the application of Manitoba Hydro. Once we have heard the parties that wish to present information in respect to it, there must be a report submitted to the government in respect to the matter.

And then on further questioning, to make this point crystal clear that that is the purpose of the hearing, the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition stated, "Mr. Chairman, that it will be a recommendation on your behalf to the government." Mr. Weber's reply was, "That is correct" - That is correct. And yesterday the Honourable Minister gets up in this House and says that the action now under way in this House supersedes those hearings and the anticipated report that he refers to. And then today the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation says that all the information that is required to deal intelligently with the contents of Bill 15 we have, and if there is any information we do not have, it's only confidential information - only confidential information that the government is privileged to have and no one else.

Now may I just refresh the Honourable Minister's memory on a few points and ask him whether that in fact is confidential information. Information sought, information requested in the course of the hearing held in Winnipeg when Professor Kuiper stated that we need to know the engineering costs and the power benefits of the four alternative diversion possibilities. Is

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . that, Mr. Speaker, is that confidential information? First of all, the tangible damage that can be measured in dollars, such as the loss of timber, the loss of fishing and trapping and the loss of potential mining. Secondly, the intangible damage that cannot be measured in dollars, such as the disturbance of the Inidan community and the loss of recreational value. Is that confidential information, Mr. Speaker? And I'm concerned about the last point, this item that cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Has the government considered that aspect of this project, of the effect that it would have on the Indian community? Mr. Speaker, if you read the Bill you will find that it deals only with matters that can be measured in terms of dollars and cents, and even at that doesn't give the residents of South Indian Lake community very much time to make up their minds. The deadline isn't all that far away.

At the same hearings when Mrs. Nelson, on Page 128 of the transcript, when she states that ecological studies from the central United States have shown that it takes about 75 years to advance ecologically from a devastated area to a flood plain forest, she questioned the statements made by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, seeking further information. Is that confidential information that the people want? Is it confidential information requested by Mr. Murphy with respect of the effect on wildlife in this area? Is that the information that the Honourable Minister refers to as being confidential and not available to us? Or perhaps is it the information or the items upon which we lack information that Mr. Mair refers to? Maybe that is the confidential information that the Honourable Minister refers to.

On Page 164 - I'll locate the page - the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell just bear with me - On Page 164, if the honourable member has read the report he will recall, and if he hasn't I would suggest to him that he do read it; it is excellent reading. It's excellent reading. It's an excellent example of what the Honourable Minister means when he speaks of community involvement, community participation, of democracy in action. On Page 164, Mr. Mair says, "We don't know at this time the possible effects of change in the stream flow and consequent increase in salinity at the mouth of the Churchill and the White Whale." Later on in the same report: "It is however an area in which it is very difficult indeed to make accurate projections and assess values. Data on the relative values of these lakes to be flooded and those not are not available." Later in the same report Mr. Mair states: "Human needs and values cannot and must not be ignored." But we have no assessment, no evaluation, no report dealing with the sociological impact of this industrial development that the government proposes to enter into in northern Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that, as I indicated a few days ago, that the procedure that the government will follow in handling this matter will establish the guidelines for future industrial and economic development of the Province of Manitoba, be it by government or by private enterprise. It will establish the guidelines. Whatever price tag the government puts on human values in this project, that is the price tag that will be put on human values by future governments and by private enterprise because it will use this as an example to follow.

Then Mr. Mair continuing in his report says: "It is a matter of concern to me therefore, as indicated earlier in my brief, that it is not possible to know precisely what the terms in face of change in natural resources may be under flooding." Now, doesn't this indicate to the Honourable Minister a need for further study, for more accurate reports from people qualified and trained in that field?

Then at Page 172, Mr. Mair states with respect to the fishing industry, "And just the way things have developed and that not much attention has been made, to my knowledge, to possible lake production. Data on the relative value of those lakes to be flooded and those not are not available," says Mr. Mair at Page 172. At the bottom of Page 173: "We are also concerned, however, to know the precise situation and needs of the area so that in part of our bargaining with Manitoba Hydro we may include the matter of how much water would be required to be released over the proposed Missi Falls dam." And at that time, "So we make no bones about it, we would like to have more information." Mr. Mair says they would like to have more information.

Later on - I believe this is in reply to a question put to him by Mr. Buchwald - Mr. Mair states: "I think that our judgment and our management programs would be better if we had the information earlier." Everybody - those citizens of Manitoba to whom this matter was of great concern, spokesmen for various agencies closely associated with life and development of northern Manitoba, everyone who spoke before this hearing asked for more information.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) Everybody agreed on this one common thing, that there was insufficient information provided on the basis of which to make a decision with respect to the flooding of South Indian Lake. Nobody, but nobody, Mr. Speaker, disagreed on that point. Even those -- there were a couple of presentations made, one I believe by the Allied Hydro Council and the other, I think it was the Manitoba Farm Bureau, whose position was somewhat different from that taken by others, but even they in their brief do ask for more information. Mr. Martin, presenting the brief on behalf of the Allied Hydro Council, did admit on several occasions that the organization that he represented at that hearing did not have information resulting from studies of the effect and the impact of the flooding of South Indian Lake on that community. They presented their position from their point of view, from a point of view of providing labour for members of their organization; the Farm Bureau presented their position from the point of view of being supplied with electricity. But they did not argue, they did not argue against the position taken by those who questioned or who wanted more information on the sociological impact. They didn't argue with them; they stated what their position is, and one group wanted jobs and the other group wanted electricity.

But there are other issues involved that this government ought to consider. And in fact, in fact, Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Hydro itself on Page 249 of the transcript of the hearing, in reply to a question put by Mr. Buchwald, Mr. Kristjanson has this to say: "I think I would concede" -- I'm sorry, I must go back to Mr. Buchwald's question to make the answer meaningful. Mr. Buchwald's question was this: "You do acknowledge the ability to make all relevant information - I think that was your expression - available so that positions might be available so that decisions can be made by . . ." - and Mr. Kristjanson interjected by stating: "I think I would concede that collectively we have not done this as adequately as we should have." Speaking, I presume, on behalf of Manitoba Hydro.

And later in reply to a question put to him by Mr. Buchwald there was some inaudible comment, but what is recorded of Mr. Buchwald's statement is a question asking whether he subscribes to the principle of considering all aspects of the resource consequences. And Mr. Buchwald concludes his question by stating: "No planning has been done by Hydro, is that correct?" To which Mr. Kristjanson replied: "No planning has been done by Hydro with respect to the non-power aspects except in those areas where we had direct responsibility, as for example in the Port of Churchill." But all the other non-power aspects were not studied by Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Speaker, and those, as I have repeated time and time again, are of extreme importance and cannot and ought not be ignored in the course of dealing with this Bill.

Then at Page 257, Mr. Kristjanson, dealing with the same matter of more information, information that could be derived from other studies, from studies that might be beyond the scope and the power of Manitoba Hydro to do, Mr. Kristjanson has this to say: "Well, from our point of view the application must go forward for power purposes and the question of whether or not it can go forward with respect to other matters is for someone else to decide." Now of whom was he speaking? Was he speaking of the President of Timbuctoo? I'm sure he wasn't, Mr. Speaker, he was speaking of this government, because Mr. Buchwald then goes on and asks Mr. Kristjanson, "Who else, Mr. Kristjanson?" To which Mr. Kristjanson replied: "Well, I would suggest at this stage it is pretty much squarely in the hands of the Chairman of this hearing" - and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, to whom the Chairman indicated that he must report, to this government - "I would suggest that it is squarely in the hands of the Chairman of this hearing and he will have to assess the evidence that is before this group and make a recommendation to the Minister." And you will also recall that earlier in the discussions it was stated quite clearly, and we know, and it is a fact that the decision has to be made by the Minister. So surely, Mr. Speaker, it's clear that even Manitoba Hydro very clearly indicated in crystal clear terms to the people at this hearing that other studies must be entered into and that it is the government's responsibility to conduct those studies.

Now if the government should choose to tell Manitoba Hydro that certain studies are its responsibility, well that's a matter to settle between the Manitoba Government and Manitoba Hydro. But after all is said and done, it is the responsibility of the Manitoba government to seek out all information, all relevant information that may in any way affect not only the land, not only the provision of electricity to the people of Manitoba but the people themselves, be it in South Indian Lake or be it elsewhere, because I wish to remind you again that it is in this Bill that we are establishing the guidelines that will be followed in the future industrial development of the Province of Manitoba.

And may I just remind you, Mr. Speaker, of what Mr. Weber's closing statement was, his closing statement to a hearing, to a hearing to which the Honourable Minister of Mines and

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) Natural Resources referred to yesterday as having been one superseded by Bill 15, and we can just take the 317 pages of evidence and chuck it in the waste-paper basket because he's not going to read it, he's not going to bother looking at it. Mr. Weber in his closing statement said: "During this hearing I have received written briefs and I have also heard verbal representations which have been submitted and produced before me, and I would thank those individuals who brought information to this hearing which bear on the application of Manitoba Hydro, and the hearing is now concluded. I will be making my report to the Minister on Manitoba Hydro's application, and let me assure you that it will be as required by the regulations under The Manitoba Water Power Act." He did not say I will be reporting to the Minister, but if the Minister should draft his Bill faster than I'm able to report to him then I will not bother reporting to him. He said there's a regulation, there's a law that says that I must report to him and that I will do. And yesterday the Minister gets up in this House and says, "I'm no longer interested in his report. I have presented a Bill to this House and we are now dealing with this Bill; it supersedes any other report that may have been required."

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the honourable member would want to give the wrong impression. That remark he referred to the Minister a moment ago, I didn't hear him say it and I was here, that he was not interested in the report from the honourable gentleman that you're speaking of. I didn't hear him use those words.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, that was my interpretation of the comments that the Honourable Minister made in reply to my question, in saying that the Bill supersedes the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. WARNER JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, this debate has been ranging on for several days and I feel compelled to make a few brief comments on this occasion. And I want to deal with some of the questions that have been raised, not that I am pretending to act in any official capacity. There was a question raised about sending the Bill to the committee before it's being read in the House a second time. I think our rules, if I read it correctly, explicitly stated that a Bill must be read twice before being sent to a committee. But apart from that, apart from that, Mr. Speaker, the practice as I understand it under the parliamentary system, it is that the government is assuming the responsibility; it is not the Opposition that is being asked to assume the responsibility, good or bad, for this legislation. The government have made a decision; that decision has been conveyed to the House in the form of a Bill which all members have before them. The House is being asked to pass the Bill for second reading so it can go to a committee, and the normal practice under these circumstances is that once the Bill has been passed for second reading and sent to a committee of this House, technical people will be invited to answer questions on any aspect of the Bill. This is the procedure that is being followed and it is not a departure from anything that hasn't been done in the past, and it is in keeping with the responsibility of government. We're not asking the opposition to share that responsibility. They do have -- and before the Leader of the Opposition gets too excited, I noticed he looked up -- they do have a responsibility in ensuring that the government is questioned on this matter, that they state their positions on this matter, and then when it gets into the committee they're going to have a full opportunity to ask questions on every aspect of it. I see nothing wrong with that procedure.

Now nobody is questioning and no one is attempting to say that this is not a serious matter. It is an important matter to this province, but it's important in more ways than one. When the Premier of the province first announced the possibility of this project becoming a reality - I think that the year was in 1960 - it was greeted, from the newspaper accounts that I've been able to read of that day, with a great deal of enthusiasm as a forerunner to development of the northern part of this province, and studies were carried out pursuant to that initial stage. Studies were carried on to determine the technical and other aspects of the operation. On the basis of those studies the government - and there can only be one government in the province at a time - the government has made a decision. We're not asking the opposition to carry that responsibility that is being carried by the government. They have their responsibilities, and I don't think anyone is attempting to take that responsibility away from them.

But what has been the criticism of this project? It started out, it seems to me, when the hearings were first held in the early part of January, and at that time the criticism was levelled at the Hydro and at the government that sufficient provisions were not made to relocate the Indian community at Southern Indian Lake. That was one of the questions that were raised at that time. Following that came the questioning of what was going to happen to the wildlife.

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . Opposition members in . . . homes complained that the fish were going to drown and the muskrats were not going to be able to swim to shore, the geese were not going to be able to nest. I rather think - well this is the impression that I get listening to the Honourable Members opposite. And they complained along these lines. I must say that in my view the fish and the muskrats and the wildlife have a lot more sense than the opposition give them credit for.

Then suddenly there came through their eyes the visions of a great quantity of minerals located in the area to be flooded. There had been no indications of minerals there before, but suddenly, suddenly minerals were there in abundance, so we couldn't flood the lake for that reason. Forest products in the area were so vast that they could not be disturbed. And recreation - I don't know how many thousands of lakes there are in northern Manitoba, but it seems to me that one lake - and it's an important lake, nobody has denied that - one lake, where the temperature very rarely gets about 45 degrees, suddenly has become a blossoming recreational area and must be preserved at all cost.

Now the pusillanimous nit-picking went on. I remember on other occasions, I remember when - and I'm going to use this, Mr. Speaker, in a way to illustrate a point -- I recall the discussions that took place on the floodway, and honourable members opposite, and particularly those in the Liberal Party, oh how they moaned about that project. I have some interesting comments that were made by the Honourable Member for St. George, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I'll just read them into the record to illustrate how wrong they were on that occasion and how wrong they are on this occasion.

Here's what the Honourable Member for St. George had to say on Page 781 of Hansard in 1961 on March 13th: "Well, I'm not only opposed to the way the government handled the expropriation, I'm opposed to the construction of the Red River diversion. I'm opposed for two reasons: One, I don't think it's necessary; and secondly, I think the enormous cost of this program isn't justified for the benefit that Greater Winnipeg would receive. In 1950 when the flood struck Winnipeg and the Greater Winnipeg area, Winnipeg virtually had no protection at all, yet in many areas where the damage was the greatest the people fighting the flood nearly succeeded." That's the remarkable thing about that mentality - they nearly succeeded. "I refer to one instance in East Kildonan on Leighton Avenue where the people fighting the dykes there one evening - and I happened to be there that night - when they came within an eyelash of holding out the water." What a remarkable observation.

"Now we have the Perimeter Road encircling Winnipeg" - and he goes on a little further in his speech - "which was virtually a dyke around Winnipeg." Imagine the perception, the engineering skill that would be required to visualize the Perimeter route becoming a dyke around the city of Winnipeg. "I well remember that in 1950 the McGillivray Boulevard was used as such a dyke and saved the whole area of River Heights from flooding." No mention of the fact that perhaps River Heights was a little bit higher than parts of Winnipeg. "The Perimeter Road could be used to an even greater advantage because it is higher at the south end." That's a remarkable thing, because then that would back the water up further back. "Another advantage is that in the spring of the year all the heavy equipment which would be required to fight a flood, if it was necessary, is all available."

So we go through this procedure, according to the members of the Liberal Party, and I presume he was a spokesman for them, we go through this procedure every year, remarkable foresight, spend eight, nine, ten million dollars every year fighting floods, to say nothing of the hearbreak, to say nothing of the dislocations - and they're talking about dislocations, to say nothing of the expense. "Why," he goes on to say, "I've been told by people that the cost would well reach 100 million, and amortized over 50 years at five percent this project could well cost the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government, if they decide to come in, and I have my doubts, between \$200 and 300 million." What remarkable powers of prognostication. "If we can go by the history of the Red River, we can expect the Red River to flood the way it did in 1950 once every 36 or every 40 years. However, as I said before, even if the water rose again to the level of 1950, I sincerely believe that Greater Winnipeg could successfully fight off the water. What damage would be caused, I think, would be negligible and the government would be far better off by paying this damage rather than spending millions of dollars on a project that I am sure will not work out."

Now, these are the attitudes of another day, and we have the benefit of the experience as our guide today. We know how far wrong they were on that occasion, and in a couple of years

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . they're going to know how far wrong they have been on the Portage diversion. We can go back a little further. These were the same people who opposed the construction of the CPR. Oh, a program of running from teepee to teepee, they said. The Roads to Resources program was an igloo to igloo program, and believe me, if I remember correctly, we had the same comments about the construction of this very building, a showpiece of the City of Winnipeg.

Well, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface who is not averse to making comments in his place -- I remember, I think it was one of the first occasions that I sat in this Chamber, he was prodding the government on to assume greater leadership, to show leadership, and to do the things that would indicate that this was a government on the move. They're hardly, Mr. Speaker, in the position to be talking about leadership.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Do you know what leadership means?

MR. JORGENSEN: For a month, for a month or so after they announced their convention, they had more people opting-out of that leadership race than they had doctors opting-out of the compulsory Medicare program.

Now the other day the Member for Portage embarked on a new kick - they wore all these others out - now they're talking about cost-benefit ratios and thermal power and they quoted figures on the basis of so many dollars per ton - \$4.00 and something per ton - and projected their figures as if the price of coal, which incidentally will not be produced in Manitoba but will be purchased from Saskatchewan and Alberta, presumed that those prices were going to be remaining constant. Can't you just see it, Mr. Speaker? Once we have constructed thermal power plants in this province - and I presume they would want them built in the City of Winnipeg where everything else is - they talk about locking ourselves in. We locked ourselves in to something like 35 million tons of coal a year, and if you don't think that loses bargaining position then I miss my guess. How long would it take before the cost of coal was such it would be completely and totally all out of proportion to the cost of producing an equal amount of power by hydro-electric means.

But apart from all of these things, Mr. Speaker, is the question of regional development and as long as I have been a member of this House and of the House of Commons, I have constantly heard people talk about how we should be using government power, government institutions in promoting regional development. I can't think of a more appropriate occasion than to use a Crown agency of the government to promote the development of a region that is in need of development, using a resource that is the property of this province, bringing riches to an area of this province that we can stand to develop. I find it awfully difficult to listen to the Member from Churchill whose contributions to this House consist of vulgar insults to Ministers rather than debating on serious points and bringing to the attention of this House matters that are of concern, and here is one that is of vital concern to him and to his constituency, the development of the power project at Kettle Rapids.

Reading the newspaper accounts of that day when the announcement was first made by Premier Roblin, reading the newspaper accounts of that day, they visualized vast mineral developments, manufacturing, an increase in the use of the Port of Churchill, almost everything including the development of forest products, almost everything imaginable. Here is an opportunity for members of this House to join with the government in pushing this project forward. No one is questioning your right to ask questions of the people who are qualified to give answers to technical questions; that opportunity will be available to you in the committee. Let's get on with the business, let's stop this nit-picking, get this Bill into the committee and then ask your questions there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Will the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. JORGENSEN: Sure, sure.

MR. MOLGAT: Has the honourable member seen the studies to back up whatever losses are involved in the flooding?

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm not privileged to see the report any more than you are. They are the property of the government, the government in this case happening to be the members of the Cabinet.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question.

MR. MOLGAT: A question. All right.

MR. CHERNIACK: I was just wondering would the member not feel that he would be more able to deal with this had he had access to those reports, the secret reports?

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . made the decisions, not me. Under our system the government is entrusted with the power of making those decisions.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, the question was, are you not . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: No, if they're right or wrong, they take the responsibility and are going to be judged on the basis of accepting that responsibility.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I can't force him to answer a question, but I was wondering if he would answer the question, which as I recall it was, would he not feel better able to deal with this matter if he had access to those secret reports.

MR. JORGENSEN: I am quite prepared, I am quite prepared when the matter is before the committee to ask what questions I think I must know, what questions I feel I would like to know when the Bill gets to the committee. I'm quite prepared to accept years of tradition in this Chamber, as in other Chambers throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the free world, in following the practices that are laid down for the smoothest passage of the business of a Chamber of this kind.

MR. CHERNIACK: Are you prepared to answer my question?

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member suggesting that the role of the opposition is to take the word, a vote on a question of principle only on the say so of the government? This is exactly what my honourable friend is saying. You're saying that you yourself don't know enough to make a decision.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend is at liberty to vote as he pleases on this issue.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much for informing me, but would you mind answering my question?

MR. SPEAKER: It seems as though -- Order, please. It seems as though these questions are developing into debate and that I don't want to happen. If there are any questions I am sure the honourable member will attempt to answer them.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, and I did not want to interrupt the honourable member in his flights of fancy, but he was for long parts of his speech not debating the issue before us. I did not object, but I simply make the point that I trust the same leeway will be given members of this side of the House whenever they happen to be discussing topics that may not be directly on the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for that opinion but it has been my feeling, sitting as I have and listening to the debates, that many members have done exactly the same. I was quite conscious of the fact of what the Honourable Member for Morris was doing, and he simply took advantage of what privilege other members have had in speaking in this debate.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't intending to speak on this because after the last time I swore I wouldn't say another word on South Indian Lake until this gets into committee. I have taken the position that we don't know anything so therefore it's pointless to discuss it, and I haven't changed by mind. The Minister that spoke said this was a very important matter and I am sure it is a very important matter because the Minister in charge isn't even in here. He's the one that should be in here giving us the facts before we go into committee, or go into committee right now.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable gentleman is taking advantage of making a speech.

MR. BOROWSKI: The Minister . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: What he perhaps doesn't realize is that if the Minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I wonder if the responsibility does not lay in my hands to handle the affairs of the House. I wonder if I might be allowed to continue. The Honourable Member for Churchill has the floor. Thank you.

MR. BOROWSKI: I'll try once again, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to say very much, I simply want to make a few observations because of what the Minister of Tourism said. He talked about such words as "principle and democratic rights of the Indians involved," and just judging by the way this carries on, Mr. Speaker, the words "principle and democratic rights" coming from their side, to me, is sheer blasphemy. They have got a lot of nerve to use words

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . like that when they are talking about these people here. They are telling us today they haven't made a decision where they are going to put them. He said we have all the facts, but there is two -- the most important facts we don't have. Where are you going to put the Indians? You tell us that you have hired somebody from Ontario and you are going to find a place for them, but surely if you are serious about principles and democratic rights, the first thing you should have decided on was where you are going to put these people.

MR. CARROLL: Would you permit a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Go ahead.

MR. CARROLL: Does the member feel that the local people should have some say as to where they are going to go?

MR. BOROWSKI: It doesn't matter what I think, you are the one that's using these fine words and degrading them by talking about principle and democratic rights. You know, you are not giving them any rights and you are not telling us where you are going to put them.

There are two important things, where are you going to move them and how are they going to live? Are you going to put them on welfare? What is the cost of welfare going to be? These are the facts, and surely we have a right to know. You are giving us all kinds of other figures that we can't cross-check to see if they are true, but one of the figures anybody can check - all you have to do is go up to the Department of Welfare and find out what it costs to keep a family, whether it's a white family in Winnipeg or an Indian family in The Pas or Shamattawa or any other place. Well why don't you give us these figures?

And the most important thing, as I see it and I have mentioned it several times, what are you going to do if these people won't move? Are you going to go in there and arrest them? Are you going to use Mace on them like Mayor Daley did in Chicago at the Democratic Convention, or are you simply going to put up the dam and flood them out of there? Play God and for 40 days and 40 nights you'll let the water run and drown them. What is your plan? Tell us. You've got all the other figures you are handing out here, but you don't seem to think this is important enough to tell us what you are going to do with them and where you are going to put them. There's all kinds of wilderness down there but there's no place to make a living as you very well know. You look at the welfare rolls in the north and you'll know how many Indian people and Metis people are self-supporting and how many of them on welfare. You have those figures.

MR. CARROLL: Has the member ever asked them where they would like to go?

MR. BOROWSKI: What I think is not important, what's the difference what I think? I haven't even been there. It's what they think - that's right, that's right - and this is something you are not taking into consideration. If you want a conversation with Mr. Molgat and Stephens there . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman but I am sure his colleagues will advise him, as I am going to advise him now, that he must address his remarks to the Chair and not across the floor to members. I am sorry to interrupt the honourable gentleman but I just wanted him to know that.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, I have no objection to shouting in that direction, whichever way my head points doesn't matter. The matter is going that way, my remarks are directed towards the government. We can talk, Mr. Speaker, we can talk about this thing until we are blue in the face, but what it really boils down to in the final analysis is can we, as members on this side, trust a morally bankrupt bunch of demagogues? This is where you will boil down to, because the Minister you recall back in January, or was it December, he granted a licence to flood and then he revoked the licence.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman doesn't appear to wish to release the floor. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think I should make a statement so that the Minister with the beard doesn't bother me any more. When the people of Churchill constituency sent me here, they didn't send me here to answer questions, they sent me here to ask them, and I expect to get answers so that I can take them back up north.

One of the statements the Minister made is that the people of the north want cheap power. Now this is a lot of baloney, Mr. Speaker. It's simply not true, because Kelsey, which supplies Thompson with power at present, is operating at about sixty percent of the potential -- I'm sorry, the potential of Kelsey is about 60 percent developed. I think there is a new turbine going on stream, or has gone in the last month, and there is room for an additional four or

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . five, and if I am wrong the Minister can correct me. So we are not asking for the power; we already have it, and the people, Mr. Speaker, are going to pay the highest price, they are going to suffer, aren't going to get any power. The people that are going to suffer as a result of this flooding, of this destruction of two villages, are not going to benefit - and I am talking about the people of Churchill. They are taking away 80 percent of their water, and what else happens nobody knows at the moment, but there is concern that many things will happen. But the very people that are affected are not going to get one kilowatt of power and the Minister knows it, and he is trying to come into this House and say the reason we are doing it is because the people of the north want it. Well, what baloney.

You know, I don't know where he gets this type of information. Maybe he was campaigning, and spent too much time in the north listening to his friend and as a result they lost the deposit, but the people of the north aren't asking for this development. It's his friends down south. He has told us that he wants to sell power. The government has said this, and the whole thing is based on their ability to sell the power to the States and this is what the whole thing revolves around. If this is what the case is, let them be honest. Why come in here and tell us they are doing it for the people of the north. He couldn't care less, just look at the highways if you don't believe me. It's power that he wants developed so they can sell to the States and make some money. From a businessman's point of view this is not a bad idea, but let him not come into this House and give us a lot of nonsense, that the reason they are going ahead with this thing here is because the people of the north want it. Well this is just not true. Thank you.

MR. CARROLL: Would the member permit a question now?

MR. CHERNIACK: Through the Speaker.

MR. CARROLL: Through the Speaker.

MR. BOROWSKI: I see he understands English, yes.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the member doesn't trust the government. I would like to ask him if he would trust Dr. Gilbert Monture with the responsibilities that are being proposed to be assigned to him?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd love to answer that question. If we were dealing with Dr. Monture, whom I have never met - in fact didn't know anything about him until recently - if we are dealing with him I certainly would, but if they are paying him, I wouldn't trust him any further than I could throw him.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe there has been enough -- order please. I believe there has been enough said in that direction. Are you ready to agree with the motion that is before the House?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, in that event, will the motion still stand in my name?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that's right.

MR. EVANS: In that event I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, 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.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MATTERS OF URGENCE AND GRIEVANCES

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on a grievance at this time. Earlier this afternoon I tried to make a motion, which in all due deference to you you ruled out of order, so therefore I have no choice but to speak on the matter now.

The question as I stated at that time, and I'll reiterate, is that recent revealed position of the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. W. Elliott Wilson, to the effect that the operations of the said Board is solely financed by employers, and his further position that said financing should and does affect the activities of the Board, including the making of grants to employer sponsored organizations and not to employee sponsored organizations, and further, to discuss the implication of said position as it may now and each day affect employees who are having claims for compensation considered by the Workmen's Compensation Board and whose claims are being affected by this attitude. And the second point, the sudden resignation of the Workmen's Compensation Board Safety Director, Mr. G. A. Williams.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why do I bring this point of grievance before this House? Because I do believe it is a most serious matter. The Workmen's Compensation Board was set up many

(MR. FOX cont'd) . . . many years ago to serve a function which was necessary under our social order, and that was, it was to provide protection to the employer from having suit brought against him in case of accident on his premises; and on the other hand, it was to provide protection and to develop safety programs and education in this area and compensation to victims of accidents. Now this was a high and well thought out plan and consequently was put into law, and I have no quarrel with the Act. From time to time we have suggested amendments be made and the government, in its wisdom, in due course sometimes has listened to these requests and has made amendments; sometimes on its own as well.

But it is the administration and the interpretation of the Act which has quite often received more criticism than the Act itself. I have, when we were in the Labour Department Estimates, brought to the attention of the House and to the Minister that the Board was operating in a niggardly fashion, that its interpretation and its administration was not in the best interests of the people that were involved. At that time I expressed no concern in respect to the employer's side of the coin of this two-sided question we are dealing with; I was only interested that the employees who were affected would receive just and fair treatment. But since then it has come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that there is a bias in the interpretation and in the administration of the Act, and I say this because I can corroborate it.

First of all, I would like to read into the records a letter from the Canadian Food and Allied Workers to the Chairman of the Board, W. Elliott Wilson, and it reads as follows, and it's of March 28, 1969. "W. Elliott Wilson, Chairman, Workmen's Compensation Board. Dear Sir: Re Inspection under The Employment Safety Act. For quite some time now the local union officers who are employees of the meat packing plants in Manitoba have been concerned by the manner in which safety inspection is carried out in the plants. To that end we took steps to set up safety committees under the direction of the Sub-district Council 104 which is comprised of all the locals in the Canadian Food and Allied Workers in Manitoba. Discussions with the delegate representing packinghouses led to the enclosed resolution being endorsed. Would you kindly advise when meeting can be held with the Board to discuss our proposal? Awaiting your reply, we are, Sincerely, H. Sprague, Chairman, Sub-District Council of the Canadian Food and Allied Workers."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution that this body representing some 3,000 workers in the food industry said, was - and I'll read it as follows:

"RESOLUTION: Whereas the Workmen's Compensation Board has seen fit to appoint a representative of management to the position of inspector for the meat packing industry under the Safety of Employees Act; and

"Whereas the Compensation Board has given a grant to the appointee; and

"Whereas this amount is supplemented by an employers' organization of the meat packing industry;

"Therefore Be It Resolved that the Canadian Food and Allied Workers request the appointment of an inspector by the Compensation Board selected by the Canadian Food and Allied Workers, with the end in view of a dual approach to the inspection and safety so that both organizations shall be able to develop and carry out programs to educate and encourage employers and employees in the adoption and adherence to safe working practices, procedures and techniques, including the publication and distribution of notices, papers and bulletins, lectures and courses, with or without visual aids, in respect of causes and prevention of industrial accidents, industrial diseases, first aid and other related matters."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this was a simple resolution asking for equality and for fair treatment, and in due course a reply was received. And now we come to the nub of my grievance, and here is the reply on stationery of the Workmen's Compensation, office of the Chairman. On April 11th this reply was sent to H. Sprague, Chairman of Sub-district Council, Canadian Food and Allied Workers, and it says: "Dear Mr. Sprague: I have your letter of March 28th with the accompanying copy of a resolution passed by delegates from safety committees representing all the locals in Manitoba.

"(2) The Board certainly welcomes interest in the plant safety and fully realizes that the participation of every worker is essential if satisfactory levels of safe work are to be attained. It is very well established that four out of every five industrial accidents include to some extent human factors, and no one other than the workers themselves can eliminate these human factors.

"(3) However, the preamble to the resolution contains a number of statements which clearly indicate that the locals are unaware of the facts of the matter and have been proceeding

(MR. FOX cont'd) . . . upon the basis of misunderstanding.

"(4) The Compensation Board has not seen fit to appoint a representative of management to the position of inspector but has rather, noted that the Meat Packers Safety Council has for a long period provided the entire financial support for the Council's activities, and that these activities have included the consultative and monitoring services of persons experienced in plant safety.

"(5) For many years these services were provided for by Mr. Trevor Davies, previously a Chief Inspector in the Provincial Department of Labour, and latterly by Mr. Peter Irwin who had many years of experience in the management of one of the member companies.

"(6) The board has indeed accredited Mr. Irwin with the authority of an Accident Prevention Officer under The Employment Safety Act so that he would be in a position to insist on the carrying through of directions relative to the situation which he believed to be unsafe, but the arrangements between Mr. Irwin and previously Mr. Davies and the Safety Council are an internal matter for that Council. What the Board has done is to make a grant to the Council in recognition of the value of service performed by the Council.

"(7) As a matter of plain fact, seeing that the Board has no funds except those provided by employers under our assessment system, even the subsidy is from money collected from the firms in the meat packing industry.

"(8) If the Union was desirous of having an inspector selected by it, would the union propose to pay his salary? The Board can pay salaries only to those who are appointed by it and who are under its control and direction.

"(9) The proposal outlined in the resolution has some commendable features and others that would be quite unworkable and the Board will certainly be glad to discuss matters with your committee. However, it feels it's very important to clear up the area of misinformation upon which the resolution was based and now that this has been done the Board may reasonably hope that the committee will replace the resolution with one which is in keeping with the facts.

"(10) When this has been done, please drop me a line so that any meeting which might be helpful can be arranged." The last line, Mr. Speaker, is impertinent. Since when does a Board Chairman tell some organization what they should do in respect to resolutions? That's real impertinence. I want the members of this House to consider that. This is supposed to be a person who is dealing with the public and this is his attitude at the tailend of his letter.

But let's go into the letter itself, what it means, what it states. To begin with, in item (4), he says the Compensation Board has not seen fit to appoint a representative of management to the position of inspector, but has rather, noted that the Meat Packers Safety Council has for a long period provided the entire financial support for the Council's activities. And then in the fifth paragraph he goes on to say that he does appoint and has appointed, not only this person but the one previously too. Now, where is he? In one paragraph he's stating he's not making this kind of appointment, in the next paragraph he states that he does make the appointment. Then he gives the reason why this is done and why the grant is made to an employer's organization. Because the money, he said, is collected from the employer's organization. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is simply not true because this is the way this set-up was put into statute and this body, the Workmen's Compensation Board, becomes an independent body after it does become - and the funds have no strings attached to it. But even if we were to consider this analogy, that there are strings attached to it, let us consider what would happen to these moneys if they weren't paid into the Workmen's Compensation Board. They would not be a cost any more to the company so therefore they would be a profit to the company and they would be taxable; so they are really public moneys that he is talking about and they are still not the employer's money any more. So therefore he's deceiving us when he's saying that this is money that belongs to the employers.

Let us go into the further implications of what all this means. As I started out at the beginning I indicated that the Workmen's Compensation Board was to alleviate the employer from being sued, and also to create a climate in which workmen would be able to have safe working conditions, to have proper inspections, to have fair treatment and also to have compensation in case of injury. But, if we go through this letter, then are we really led to believe that this man is capable of giving an unbiased decision or is he biased in favour of the employer. This is a question we have to ask of ourselves; and I think it's a very serious question that we should consider. I have indicated from time to time that there has been difficulty in respect to claims; I know that some of the people that have approached me have said that on the most trivial things claims have been thrown out. I seriously think that it's time we had an

(MR. FOX cont'd) . . . investigation of the Workmen's Compensation Board, especially the attitude and the interpretation of the Board Chairman, through whom most of the directives and the operations of the Board will take place; I think it's time we had a real investigation into this area, Mr. Speaker. I do believe that we have an Industrial Relations Committee which has not had enough work. In fact this was brought to the attention of the House that when we have things pertaining to labour they should come before this committee. The government in its wisdom has not seen fit to do this. But here's an area where they could really go to work. They could really investigate, and see what is the trouble in this department.

The second item I mentioned was the resignation of the Director of Safety, and yesterday I asked in the House, of the Minister, if he could give us any answers to this question, and his reply was, and I quote from the record: "Mr. Speaker, the Director of Accident Prevention Safety has resigned." And I asked "Is the Minister going to let us know why?" And the Honourable Minister said, "No, Mr. Speaker. I don't, really. He just simply said that -- he thanked us for the amount of time that he had been able to spend at the Accident Prevention Association." And the Honourable Member for Inkster asked him: "Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Minister of Labour interested to see whether there are, in fact, deeper reasons for the resignation? Does he intend to find out or is he satisfied?" And the Honourable Minister replied after that: "Mr. Speaker, a meeting is being held with the Workmen's Compensation Board tomorrow." Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's enough, just having a meeting with the Workmen's Compensation Board. I think we've gotten into a much deeper problem than just a meeting will do. I do believe that all the members, or at least the members of the Industrial Relations Committee should have an opportunity to get a crack at this Board, have a good look at what the problem is, and really do an investigating job. In fact, I would even go as far as to say under these circumstances, under this letter that I have before me here, I do believe that I would be fully in agreement if the Minister of Labour would ask for the resignation of the Chairman of this Board. I do not believe that he is carrying out his function fairly and equitably with the answers he has replied to the Canadian Food and Allied Workers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think I should say one or two words on this grievance because I'm beginning to wonder whether he hasn't got a grievance. His grievance seems to be based on a letter that was sent to the Allied Council from the Chairman. I'd like to suggest to the honourable member, the Allied Council sent a letter and in that letter they spoke quite strongly; they use such terms in the resolution "that the Workmen's Compensation Board has seen fit" and on April 11th they got a letter, and in the letter I think that it could be considered and argued that the Chairman had the courtesy to explain to the Council what his views were - and they're right in this letter, as you have pointed out. And then he also concludes the letter by saying that he is ready to have a meeting with them. And that letter is - it's right in the letter here that he'll have, and I presume that he hasn't heard from them as yet. But if they want to take issue with him about the statement that he's set out in this letter quite clearly, the offer is there for a meeting, when they can bring it up with him and discuss it.

MR. GREEN: He's in the pay of management.

MR. WITNEY: No. I can't see that there's anything more courteous that a man can do. He gets a letter, he answers it, he puts forth his views and he says I'm ready to discuss it with you. Now what kind of an argument is that for a grievance? The grievance came out that it seems, that he said that the Chairman of the Compensation Board has taken a specific point of view. But he's also said, let's talk about it. And he said this in the letter, he said let's talk about it. Why should a member be asked for his resignation - or at least a suggestion that the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board resign - when the man is telling them what his viewpoints are, telling him what his interpretation is and says I am willing to sit down and talk with you.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, will the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. WITNEY: No. He also comes along and he makes a statement that apparently with the Accident Prevention - I don't know quite what he meant when he said the Director has resigned. The Director is employed by the Board. The Act clearly states, Section 42 or 43, I forget which one it was, "That the Board may make appointments and the Board may cancel them." It's given to them. And surely, in the interests of the employee and the employer, if

(MR. WITNEY cont'd) . . . a Board is unable to carry out its function, those interests are going to be eroded very rapidly. The Board must have the authority to run its business as per the terms of the Act; and in the terms of the Act, in Section 53 it sets out how these assessments are made from the employer. It's right here: "The assessment upon classes of industry." It can be discussed with these men when they come there and I feel - as I say, I'm not too sure what sort of a complaint or grievance he had on the basis that the man had resigned. It's within the jurisdiction of the Board, as is the setting up and the administration of the Fund within the jurisdiction of the Board, as per the terms of the Act. And the Allied Council can get all the clarification they wish by the meeting which the Chairman has said he will have.

So I'm not too sure, Mr. Speaker, I'm just arguing the point that I feel on the other side of the coin that there is the argument that the honourable member has not got a grievance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I intend to ask the Minister whether he is permitted now to answer a question?

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I'd like to request that the letters referred to by the previous speakers be tabled.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister of Labour permit a question from me?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, I think from my honourable friend, I will.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's very kind, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister indicate whether or not he agrees with the Chairman's statement that since employers pay into the fund that therefore it is employers' money which is being spent by the Board for salaries paid by the Compensation Board? Does he agree with that statement?

MR. WITNEY: I don't wish to comment on that right now, Mr. Chairman, because as I - or, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry - I don't mean to demote you on a nice day like today - but I am meeting with this Board tonight over this whole problem and I want to discuss these matters with them and to discuss these two letters which have come to my attention. As a matter of fact, this letter of April 11th, I think this is the first time that I've seen it. But I still don't back away from the statement that I don't think the honourable member has a grievance because the Chairman of the Board has said he would talk with them and he had the courtesy to put his position to them.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . a further question, if I may.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Does not that letter say that he is prepared to talk to them if, as and when they change the wording of a certain resolution? Just the last line.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, that's not my interpretation of the letter. He's prepared to talk to them.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House. Are you ready for the question.

MR. SPEAKER put the question 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; (2)--passed; (3)--passed; (a)--passed . . .
The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, last night, shortly before adjournment, I was on my feet to make a few additional comments about this department and I had asked the Honourable Minister about the makeup of the Welfare Advisory Committee. Now I'd like to suggest today that the Minister give very consideration to the establishment of a human resources committee, a Human Resources Committee composed of members of this Legislature involving citizen members, something similar to what had been done a few years ago in dealing with the matter of consumer affairs. You will recall that at that time there was such a committee established, a very large committee, a committee with a number of sub-committees charged with the responsibility of enquiring into certain specific areas. Now a couple of nights ago I had mentioned four areas of great concern to me - namely, housing for senior citizens, housing in general, the matter of children and the matter of a preventative program - and the Honourable

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . Minister replied that there are a few hundred units being built, 200 or 100 units being built in northern Manitoba, which I feel is a drop in the bucket, as far as the over-all need is concerned. He spoke of what is being done in senior citizen's housing and I would like to suggest to the Minister that that is not enough because on the basis of the applications that are received for accommodation in senior citizen's housing projects, there is indication that there is even greater need of housing accommodation. And he also made reference to the Hellyer Task Force - that the Hellyer Task Force very highly commended the Province of Manitoba for its activity in this area. This may well be, and that may be the impression that one would get upon visiting this province for the short period of time that they spent.

But I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is need for a greater study, a more detailed study of the entire matter of social services not -- in fact I would suggest that the term "social services" is an incorrect one, is a misnomer, that a more appropriate title for this department would be "human resources." That it should be a department of human resources and its responsibility should be the maximum utilization of human resources from the point of view of the individual's productivity, from the point of view of the individual's ability to enjoy life, to enjoy the things that a human being ought to be able to enjoy in terms of comforts, of proper living accommodation, in terms of proper recreation facilities, in terms of proper medical and health services, in terms of proper services which at the present time his department offers to a very limited degree.

And this brings me to my reference to a preventative program that I feel the Honourable Minister's department should be more involved with. Now I have a recollection of seeing a couple of sentences in the report making reference to a preventative program, and I believe that the Honourable Minister did mention last night that preventative work is being carried on, and he gave one example. He gave an example of a young man who passed away prematurely and that his department stepped in and assisted the family in rehabilitating itself to the new environment that it of necessity found itself in. Well, I suggest to you Mr. Chairman, that isolated examples are not enough, that this type of assistance, or the machinery for this type of assistance should be available to each and every individual. And I'm not talking in terms of an expenditure of an exorbitant amount of money. Now, I'm guessing, if I'm away off base the Minister can correct me, but it would seem to me that it would probably cost \$20,000 a year to employ a social worker - and I'm now speaking in terms of his salary, his office facilities, transportation, stenographic help, everything else - the cost of supervision and whatever incidental expenses there may be. \$20,000.00. -- (Interjection) -- Minimum wage? That will be the minimum wage to hire a social worker, \$20,000 - \$25,000.00? I don't know. But I'm sure it will somewhere be in the vicinity of that figure. Now what would one million dollars do? One million dollars would put an additional 50 -- if my figure is correct, or close to correct, one million dollars would put an additional 50 social workers in the Province of Manitoba, one per constituency, one per constituency -- I speak in terms of constituencies. The department does have the province divided into regions, I'm well aware of that, but unfortunately at the moment I'm not acquainted with the boundaries of the regions, but the constituencies do fall into regions -- and that social worker's responsibility would be primarily to conduct working with others in his area, but his main responsibility would be to conduct a preventative program, preventative work, it will be his responsibility to keep an eye out for families having lost a breadwinner either by death or separation, desertion of the home, whatever other reason it may be; keep an eye out for people who have lost their job due to being fired or laid off, bankruptcy of the business; people being forced into a different environment, and as a result of which they will have to make certain adjustments, make certain changes. And as I indicated the other night, if assistance were ready and available at that point, I would suggest to you Mr. Chairman, that a tremendous amount of money could be saved in terms of what is now paid in welfare payments.

Our Province of Manitoba always has had a history of people being in a position of having to make tremendous adjustments to environmental changes. Our forefathers have had to make such adjustments. There are people coming into the country today who have to make similar adjustments. Think of the people entering our province from other countries who require assistance, guidance and counselling of this type to enable them to make a satisfactory adjustment. Now it could be argued by some that most of these people have an ethnic organization, an ethnic welfare organization to fall back on, to rely on, to go for assistance, but I don't know if this is good enough. An organization of that type does not have the force, the power to deal

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . with that a government agency could have. Now, we have to examine the whole matter of human resources in a context which I have mentioned earlier, not just to remain as an agency, as a charitable agency, handing out benefits to those who come with cap in hand begging, but one which would take the initiative of its own accord to elevate and raise the general welfare of the people of the Province of Manitoba. Even those who are employed are in need of the type of assistance that the Honourable Minister's department could offer them. This is true, Mr. Chairman, in all areas; poverty isn't restricted only to certain portions of Manitoba. I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that there is poverty in the constituency in which he lives, that there is poverty in the Town of Tuxedo - and there is poverty there - and he knows of it and I know of it. I work in his constituency in which he lives and I've seen it and I'm aware of it. These people may not be on welfare but they are in need of assistance. There are widowed mothers, there are separated mothers attempting to keep a family together, suffering from extreme problems because they're suddenly faced with the need to earn a living. They were living in a situation wherein they were able to enjoy a certain standard of living; now things have changed, now they have to go out and earn a pay cheque. At the same time they have to keep their family together. Many of these people do have problems with their children, and they do need help, and I suggest that for the benefit of those families there should be assistance available from this government.

Now to make a thorough study, a thorough analysis of problems of that type and many others affecting the people of Manitoba I would strongly urge the Minister to consider the establishment of a committee to study the matter of human resources and its problems and how the general welfare of the people of Manitoba can be improved.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes.

MR. McKENZIE: He mentioned social workers. Did you say you suggested 15 for the province or an initial 57? You mentioned a cost of a million. I'm wondering . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: I said a million dollars would provide 50, five zero.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And this was, as I had indicated in my speech, that my figure of 20,000 per social worker, I'm merely estimating, probably - or I hope it would include other incidental expenses of putting a social worker in the field. I'm not speaking in terms of salary. Some might be in receipt of a salary, I agree, a supervisory staff, of a salary close to that figure but all social workers are not. And I also mentioned maybe \$25,000 is closer. It doesn't change the picture that much when you relate that to the over-all cost of this department, whether it's 20,000 or in fact 30,000 dollars.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you.

MR. EVANS: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply wishes to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Thursday afternoon.