

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
10:00 o'clock, Friday, May 2, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of Home and Research Centre for Retarded, praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded.

The Petition of Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation, praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 80, The Provincial Auditor's Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor); and Bill No. 81, The Financial Administration Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture) (Arthur) introduced Bill No. 92, The Resources Conservation Districts Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, a week ago I had asked the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs for a statement of warning re the use of firecrackers, which was thought to have been hilariously funny by the government. Now, is the Minister prepared to make a statement now - and I'm most concerned in view of the fact that accidents have been reported in connection with the use of same.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(The Pas): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Is it the intention of the Minister to make some statement on this matter in his capacity as Minister of Consumer Affairs?

MR. CARROLL: We're still looking into the matter, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services)(Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 31 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. In the light of the statement in the TED Report regarding the necessary reorganization of Metropolitan Winnipeg under one civic administration, does the Minister expect a report in sufficient time for action to be taken at this session from the Boundaries Commission on the matter of Winnipeg government?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): No, Mr. Speaker, I don't. I think this has already been made clear by the Minister of Municipal Affairs during his estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A second question to the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I put a question to him yesterday with respect to the sudden increase in the price of beef, which I believe he said he'd take as notice. Is he prepared to make a statement today?

May I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture with respect to the same matter? It's suggested that one of the reasons for the increase in the price of beef is the increase in the price to the producer. However, in the last month the increase is only about a cent. Could the Honourable Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: ... the question has been put.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The question is coming now, Mr. Speaker. I would like, in view of the fact that the producer appears to have received only about one cent increase in the price of beef over the last month, could the Honourable Minister of Agriculture inquire as to where the six cents went that the consumer is now forced to pay?

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that the price of beef has increased to the extent of six cents but I'll have a look into the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to ask a further question of the First Minister on the question of Metropolitan Government. Has the First Minister or any Minister in the government written to the Boundaries Commission asking them to produce their report quickly in the light of the TED recommendation?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Ministers involved are in touch with the Boundaries Commission from time to time, and I'm sure that they're working as diligently as they can; they know of the urgency that there is in having this matter brought forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I have a question to direct to the Honourable the First Minister. Is it correct that the James Bertram Company Limited is owned by Russell Industries Limited?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I suggest you write to the Bertram Company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance, and I regret I do not have Hansard to verify my figures so if I had the wrong figure, he could correct me. If I noted correctly, yesterday in his speech he said that the cost of Kettle, including the high level diversion, would yield installed kilowatt cost of \$334.00 per installed kilowatt. Now the previous figures that I had for Kettle alone were \$289.00 per installed kilowatt. Are those correct?

MR. EVANS: Well, from memory I think they are.

MR. MOLGAT: The question then, Mr. Chairman, a subsequent question: is it correct then that the cost of the high level diversion is the difference between these two; that is, \$45 million?

MR. EVANS: Yes, from memory, I think what I thought I was saying yesterday was that if the entire cost of the high level diversion were added to the cost of the Kettle Rapids station, the total would rise to \$334.00 whereas the Kettle station alone was \$289.00 - I think those are the correct figures. It can be assumed that I think what you said, then, is correct. Speaking from memory - I'd be subject to correction if I have not understood your question correctly.

MR. MOLGAT: ... Mr. Speaker, yes. Because we are dealing with a million kilowatts, the figures can be translated into millions, so we're dealing with ... Now could he tell me whether the 45 million includes construction, resettlement, and all other costs connected with it?

MR. EVANS: I think if we're getting into this detail I'd better ask for notice and try to provide some answers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: May I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could he inform the House to what extent investigations and inquiries are made into corporations seeking to establish themselves in Manitoba, and in particular in areas wherein they may become one of the major or perhaps the only employer, as to their financial structure, their financial soundness and that sort of thing.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, usually very extensively.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago while the session bell was ringing, I had a phone call from a man who was making an inquiry about the day and night burning of lights at the intersection of Highway No. 59 and Highway No. 4. He wanted to know why this should be necessary or whether it was necessary, and the reasons for it, and may I ask the question of the appropriate Minister to see whether he has an answer. I told this man I would try to get some information for him.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, it's a safety measure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has a supplementary, I believe.

MR. PETURSSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If I tell the man it's a safety measure, he would not be satisfied with that. He would want to know what kind of safety is necessary during daylight hours. He says the lights are burning night and day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Can he inform the House when a Director of Safety will be appointed?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): Just as soon as possible, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned yesterday, the advertising is being done now, as far as I know.

MR. FOX: In other words - a supplementary question - there is no promotion from within the department?

MR. WITNEY: Within the department, if they wish to answer the advertisement and apply, they will be able to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the fact that his department does make very extensive studies of the nature indicated, could he inform the House whether Russell Industries Limited is the holding company of the James Bertram and Sons Limited?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask the Honourable Member that if he is interested in the information he should inquire from the company. Our dealings have been with the principals of the James Bertram Company and particularly Mr. Douglas Bertram, who is now in the process of designing his home for The Pas where he intends to live.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The amounts paid by the Government, its agencies, boards, commissions, etc., for legal counsel outside of the Government Civil Service or those employed by governmental agencies, boards, commissions, etc., on a full-time basis for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1969.

(a) the amount paid to each individual or firm

(1) as fees

(2) as disbursements

(b) the purpose for which such legal counsel was retained.

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

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, would you now be good enough to call the adjourned debate on second reading of Bill 15.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate, second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Bill 15, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have carefully read the speech made by the Honourable Minister of Finance in response to some of the remarks that have been made with respect to this Bill, and I have a great difficulty understanding why the Minister persists in talking about the fact that the hydro power and the project that is being undertaken is one which is in jeopardy as a result -- or is one which is being opposed by members of the Opposition. I think that a great deal of his speech relates to the fact that this is a wonderful project and I don't think that there is really a great deal to argue on that position. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is using this argument to answer arguments and to answer a problem which he can't meet and which, Mr. Speaker, it is apparently known to him that he can't meet, because of course the entire project and everything that he said about it could take place without the flooding of South Indian Lake if there was an alternative; and Mr. Speaker, whether he agrees or not, I think that he himself has indicated that there is a satisfactory economical and feasible alternative. I think Mr. Speaker, that perhaps he said far more than he intended to say, but he has facts which are unknown to us, and every time, Mr. Speaker, somebody knows something which the other party doesn't know, there are times

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... when inadvertently it comes out, because it's very difficult to retain in a person's mind only when one is talking on a particular subject and the person has facts which he knows about it, whether he intends to reveal them or not, sometimes the speech itself inadvertently lets something out which wasn't intended to come out.

And Mr. Speaker, in this respect I'd like the indulgence of the House to tell a short, but what I think is a very humorous story along this line of how sometimes a person says what he hadn't intended to say. -- (Interjection) -- No, this is not a Tolstoi story, Mr. Speaker, this is a farmer's story, so the Minister of Mines would be, I'm sure, very happy to hear it. It's very brief, Mr. Speaker. It has to do with a farmer who purchased a prize-winning bull for breeding purposes and when he got this bull home it turned out to be a very lackadaisical bull and there was very little activity on the part of the bull, and of course this annoyed him because he paid top price for the bull and he therefore called the vet. The vet came and looked at the bull and said there's nothing very much wrong; it's the change in atmosphere from the location that you took it to the location that is here, and therefore he would supply the farmer with some hormone pills and that in no time at all the bull would be as fit as a fiddle. And would do some fiddling, I suppose. In any event, Mr. Speaker, this did happen. After a few days the bull started to behave very satisfactorily and serviced all the farmer's cows and then some of the neighbour's cows as well, and the neighbour came over and complimented the farmer on this wonderful bull, and he said, "But I noticed the first few days it didn't do very much at all, and how is that?" And the farmer said, "Well, it was really nothing. The vet came and told me it was the change of atmosphere and he gave me these pills to give it once a day." He said, "Pills? What kind of pills?" "Well," he says, "they come in kind of a small box, they're capsule shape, they're about an inch long, sort of oval, and they have a green glossy cover, and you know," he said, "they taste like peppermint."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the farmer never intended to reveal that the pills tasted like peppermint and I'm sure that the government has never intended by these speeches that they had made to reveal that in fact there are satisfactory, feasible and desirable other alternatives to the high level diversion which they are now proposing, but Mr. Speaker - and I stand to be corrected - but as I read the Minister of Finance's speeches, it leaves no doubt in my mind, and without examining the 6 1/2 million dollars worth of reports which the people of Manitoba can't even read through their elected representatives, but without examining those reports and just examining the Minister's speech, it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are alternatives, and what bothers me is that the government is proceeding as if, Mr. Speaker, they had cut off, that they have burnt their bridges insofar as these alternatives are concerned, and that their real problem is that they are not able to embark on what would have been a satisfactory alternative; that what they have done, Mr. Speaker, is to spend a great deal of money on the high level diversion and are not able, therefore, to justify embarking on the alternative. And I want to go into this, Mr. Speaker.

What has the Minister of Finance in fact told? He told us, first of all, that the whole project could be proceeded with by a low level diversion and I assume, and I'm accepting his remarks, I assume that a low level alternative would mean that South Indian Lake would remain as it is today, that there would be no flooding of the resources, and that there would be no dislocation of the people. A highly desirable result. A consummation, as Shakespeare would say, devoutly to be wished; a result which I am sure that they would wish, because they are sincere, honourable men. They would not like to flood the resources and they would not like to dislocate the people concerned, so if that is their view, then what do they say this alternative involves? And I'm now referring to the Minister of Finance who said, Mr. Speaker - and I'm going to quote him from memory - he said that the capital cost, the difference in capital cost would be \$5 million; that the difference in operational costs would be \$1 million six every year - \$1,600,000 every year.

Now Mr. Speaker, that sounds like a lot of money, and I don't wish to fall into the same trap that C. D. Howe fell into of saying, not only "What's a million?" but "What's five million?" But I want to put this thing into its perspective. Let us remember that \$5 million over it -- and if we talk about the first phase alone, I think that we can talk about a billion dollars for the entire project, or in the neighbourhood of a billion dollars. If I'm wrong, I don't believe I'm far wrong. The Minister is nodding his head, which makes it appear to me that I'm approximately right, so we are talking about a \$5 million capital cost on a billion dollar project. Now that's a lot of money, Mr. Speaker, and I have a great deal of respect for money, and I am

(MR. GREEN cont'd.). . . always seeking the economic way. But Mr. Speaker, we're talking about five cents on ten dollars. We're talking about spending ten dollars and a nickel instead of ten dollars, and we get for that extra nickel, we get for that extra nickel the lake as it is today and no dislocation of the population involved. Is that worth the \$5 million? Well, I'll examine that in a few minutes. We also have a saving, and I respect this, an operational saving of \$1,600,000 but that figure. . .

MR. EVANS: Just to clarify the understanding. I don't think it should be referred to as a saving in cost. I think the phrase that I used was that it was the benefit in the technical sense of the word "benefit", the advantage of the water being available through the high level diversion by contrast or by comparison with the next best alternative, the economic advantage was \$1,600,000 with the one plant running or \$9,000,000-odd with all the plants running.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, let's convert -- that even makes, I think, my position a little stronger and I thank the Minister for indicating that he has assessed this economic advantage as \$1,600,000, and then let's assume that he's correct - and I'm not by any means prepared to say that he is, but I want to, for the purposes of my argument, assume that he is correct. He is talking about \$1,600,000 on operation. Well, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean anything unless we know the total amount of the operation and what percentage this million six has to the total operational cost, because it may not be a significant factor in the cost of power if it . . . . . a very small percentage of the operational cost. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I can't be too disturbed about the operational cost, and we know that \$5 million is the difference in the capital cost and all we are talking about is Phase I. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is one of the alternatives and I'm going to come back to it and discuss it in a few moments.

The second alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to spend \$25 to \$30 million for a steam plant, and that that steam would do what the high level diversion would not do. I don't know whether I'm correct in this, but this is what he apparently said. He said that if we don't go ahead with the high level diversion, we'll have to spend \$25 to \$30 million for a steam plant which would be instead of it, and that would leave no differential in operational cost and that would be the entire difference in the capital cost. Instead of the diversion, a steam plant for \$30 million. Is that not what the Minister said? That's what I read in his speech - that this could be used; that one could be used instead of the other but it would involve an expenditure of \$30 million. Again, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. EVANS: I think, just since the question has arisen, that it would be a \$30 million steam plant but steam plants last only half as long as hydro plants. The steam plant would have to be renewed, I think, in 30 years instead of a hydro plant in 65 years. It becomes a more complex. . . .

MR. GREEN: But we are talking today, Mr. Speaker, about an additional expenditure of \$30 million, which then - and I repeat - would leave the lake as it is, would leave the resources as they are, and would leave the populations as they are. That's the difference in expenditure, which would mean, Mr. Speaker, \$30 million and now I'm going to talk about it over two billion, because this would completely fit in with the entire operation, Phase I, Phase II and all other phases - that the steam plant could take the place of the diversion and there would be no necessity for a diversion.

Well Mr. Speaker, we have two proposals, two alternatives, one which involves a capital cost of \$5 million and involves a low level diversion, one which involves a capital cost of \$30 million and involves no diversion at all and which is a steam plant, which may or may not have to be remade 30 years from now, because we don't know where we'll be 30 years from now. So let's talk about the immediate. Now that's a lot of money. I remember the Member for Lakeside said that these amounts always intimidate him, and one should be intimidated by a figure like \$5 million, but Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to put this expense into perspective. Let us assume that we were not planning a Hydro Development Project in the northern part of Manitoba. Let us assume that we had all the electric power that we needed and that we didn't need any more, that it was being generated at another source. And let us assume, Mr. Speaker, that we had forewarning, that we had forewarning that an Act of God was going to take place - not an Act of the Government, but an Act of God was going to take place, whereby South Indian Lake was going to be inundated permanently, irrevocably and with no possibility of changing the situation, by 35 feet of flood water. Let us say that we were told that, and let us say that we were also told that this is going to destroy two Indian communities, involving a hundred families and 600 Indians, and that we had an opportunity, if we acted, to save the

May 2, 1969

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... situation. Mr. Speaker, wouldn't these same Ministers be coming to this House and saying that Manitoba is faced with a disaster? That one of its choicest pleasure grounds, one of its most beautiful sites in the North is going to be inundated by 35 feet of water? That there is going to be a debris problem to last the next 75 years perhaps? That a community of Indians which has proved the lie to any statements that these people can't operate in a wholesome, healthy, viable, an economically viable community, are going to be forced off their land with no place to go? Wouldn't this same government come in and say, "We can stop this. We can save the lake. We can save the Indian population if we allocate \$5 million which is going to save that lake in perpetuity?" Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that they would do it, and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that they would get the approval of the Opposition, and I'll prove it to you, Mr. Speaker. I'll prove it to you.

This same government, or a government under the same name, told this House in 1957 or 1958 that every 20 years or so the waters of the Red River (and the Member for Morris referred to this) the water of the Red River has the danger of rising a distance of more than 26 feet above its regular level, that this will result in damage to the City of Winnipeg, that there will be great difficulties including economic loss and other difficulties associated with flooding, and we think it's worth \$64 million to prevent a flood, to prevent a momentary flood. We think it's worth \$64 million to build a facility which will prevent that flood. And Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about a permanent flood; we're talking about a flood which will come for a little while and leave, rather than 35 feet of water completely and in perpetuity flooding an area.

Now, the same government that says that it's worthwhile to spend \$64 million to prevent this partial flood, says that we will not spend \$5 million to prevent a permanent flood over an area. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they are going to -- in this case they are going to create the flood. And what is this \$5 million? Let's again put it into perspective. We have a convenient figure, Mr. Speaker. The same government, for the same project, spent \$ 6 1/2 million on reports; reports which we can't even read. Reams and reams of paper, Mr. Speaker.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the House before and I do so again to the Honourable Member for Inkster. These reports are available to him and to any members of the public at the Manitoba Hydro library.

MR. GREEN: Well Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for St. John's put in an Order for Return requesting a report. He has asked since on several occasions to get the report. The honourable member says that he could go down to the Hydro and look at them. I know, Mr. Speaker, from experience that without being in a position that the government is in, that I cannot get the same information from the people in Manitoba Hydro as the Minister can. If he really thinks that I can, if he really thinks that I can, then I say that he is being very naive, but nevertheless, let's assume, then, that the reports are available. They have spent -- the Member for Portage tells me that he was refused.

MR. ENNS: ... once more. Does the Member indicate that he has tried and has been refused: Has the Member for Inkster made any personal application to Hydro for any of these reports for his perusal, and can he indicate to the House that he has been refused?

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the Honourable Member for Inkster, but I would like to remind the Minister who interjected that I have had two Orders for Return refused in the last two years, requesting the information that he has the audacity to stand up and say we can have.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, ...

MR. GREEN: I'd like to retain the floor now and continue. I will tell the honourable member that I believe that my party, on my behalf, and members who I am associated with, did the right thing for the purpose of getting reports and were refused, but nevertheless, I don't want to let my argument be somehow challenged by the notion that if the reports are available that I'm not making any sense. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about \$6 1/2 million spent on reports and I'm not saying it was wrongly spent. It was probably correctly spent, but Mr. Speaker, if we can spend \$6 1/2 million to produce the reams and reams of paper which the Minister says we can see if we go to the Manitoba Hydro offices, then is he saying that it's not worth in the same project to spend \$5 million to preserve South Indian Lake? Would he pay \$5 million to create South Indian Lake? We have a doctrine in damages, Mr. Speaker, in law. How much should you pay a person, let us say, for the loss of an arm in a motor vehicle

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... accident? And judges have said that they should try to equate the damages with the amount which a man would not accept in return for the injury which has been inflicted upon him.

If we could create South Indian Lake -- and Mr. Speaker, I'm not that aesthetically inclined. I don't have that kind of artistic sense that beauty of that kind means a great deal to me, but I did see slides of this project the other night at a meeting where people were discussing it, and Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the Minister: would he pay \$5 million to create such a lake if it didn't exist? Because I'm inclined to think that he would. I know, Mr. Speaker, that individuals - not society, but individuals - will pay a million dollars for a painting because they say it's beautiful, and here we are saying that we will not add to the project the capital cost of \$5 million to purchase thousands of paintings, because none of them could be created by a human being, what is situated there in South Indian Lake. And I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we were faced with the prospect of a similar lake in Manitoba being permanently destroyed by flood waters which we could avoid - and I put that qualification - which we could avoid by the expenditure of \$5 million, we'd be yelling "Crisis"; we'd be yelling "Disaster". We'd be going to Ottawa; we'd be asking for contribution for the money, but we would save the lake, and the government would do it and the Opposition would help them. Try it. Try it. Because I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there is no doubt that this would happen. It happened, as the Member for Morris put it, with regard to the City of Winnipeg and it would happen with regard to the saving of South Indian Lake.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the steam plant - and this is alternative No. 1, which I say that if it involves \$5 million on the first phase - and I'm not going to talk -- I'll speak in a moment about the \$9,090,000, the difference in operational costs on the second phase, but it involves merely the saving of \$5 million on the first phase - I wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the government is not talking about this alternative. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that last year, without a great deal of fuss - there was some argument about it - and because a contractor made a mistake, we had to spend an additional \$28 million above his tendered price. Doesn't everybody in the room recall that? Don't we recall that a contractor came in with a \$73 million tender for the same project, that he indicated to us that he measured a road wrongly and that it's really going to cost him another \$28 million more, and after expressing misgivings and saying tough luck, we said that we had no choice but to give him the other \$28 million - on one part of the project? Are we so short-memoried that we can't remember that? And to correct that mistake we have to put up \$28 million, and I understand, and I don't wish to be unfair, that the alternative was to spend more, but nevertheless we were talking about a mistake of \$28 million which had to be dealt with, which had to be approved to this particular contractor rather than maintain the tendering practices, and by not maintaining the tendering practices who can say that we didn't lose more than \$5 million or more than \$10 million the next time a tender comes in. But that's what we did. And I'm just at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to understand, except by the hypothesis which I am forced to develop because I'm not given satisfactory answers by the government and which I'll develop in a few moments, I'm at a loss to understand why they don't say let's proceed with this alternative.

The steam plant, Mr. Speaker, they say that it will cost \$25 million to \$30 million to substitute the high level diversion by a steam plant. But surely, Mr. Speaker, there is a cost in the diversion itself. Do we not deduct from the costs of the steam plant the cost that would ordinarily go to making the diversion. Surely the diversion has a cost. The Minister doesn't say that the steam plant would cost \$25 million more than the diversion. All he says is that a steam plant would cost \$25 million. Well, how much do we offset that cost by the cost of the diversion? He hasn't told us. And Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that he doesn't want to know. The Minister of Finance has entered this debate under a severe disadvantage. He is representing Hydro. He refuses to discuss the other aspects of the development. I don't blame him although -- I don't blame him as an individual, I blame him as a Minister of the Government. I realize that he's at a disadvantage. But Hydro has probably done exactly what we would expect of Hydro. They have said that in the interests of the efficient economical supply of hydro power this is the cheapest and least expensive, this is the least expensive way in which it can be done. "If other considerations are involved, you will have to take those up with other people. We will not discuss them." And the Minister of Finance has told us that. When I asked him whether he has any assessment of the costs that will be involved in the loss of resources and the relocation of the people he said, Mr. Speaker, he said, "That's not my

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... department." And I'm saying this, Mr. Speaker, I say he doesn't want to know about it and he doesn't have to know about it if he's only talking in the interests of Hydro. That's for us to decide, and we can't decide because, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the information from which this decision should be made has not been available despite what the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says, and even if it were available, Mr. Speaker, that government, those people are the last ones who should be in the final position of deciding on what to do because -- well, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that it should be another government. That's the question and this is the answer and I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Because this government has behaved in the same way as the trial that took place in Alice in Wonderland.

I can't remember exactly who was being tried but I remember the theory of the court. The theory of the court was verdict first, trial afterwards -- verdict first, trial afterwards. And this is the way in which this government has behaved -- verdict first, trial afterwards. Because the verdict has been made and now we are engaged in the trial, and therefore the judge, Mr. Speaker, is the person who I can't trust, and I indicated to the Minister the first time I got up to speak on this matter that the simple difference between him and the Opposition, the simple difference is they want us to trust them, whereas they have done everything up until now in this project which makes it impossible for us to do so; and by the way, I want to congratulate the Liberal members who brought in so much information. I tend not to be in agreement that the hydro development project is not the best way of doing it, but I understand their frustration and I understand their desire to have many things on the record, but I believe that, as the Minister of Finance believes, maybe it's not an educated belief but somehow I have the notion that the hydro development project is a good thing for Manitoba, that it should not be substituted for by thermo power or other forms of power at the present time. But I don't see why the Minister appears to be saying to the House that we can't have this hydro development project without a high level diversion of South Indian Lake, because he himself has said that it's not true. He has given two alternatives, both of which if we look at the entire operation make a great deal of sense. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that there are certain fallacies that have been expressed by the Minister of Finance with regard to just how serious this problem is. He has indicated, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has indicated that the resources in the area need not be affected or that they will not be severely affected. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that we are all babes in the woods when it comes to predicting what's going to happen to the resources of that area; that even the experts can't tell us.

I want to quote to you from a book called Water Resources of Canada edited by Claude E. Dolman and from a very short article written by Norman W. Radford, "Nawapa and Muskeg". Mr. Speaker, this is what it says: "I must record on the other hand my dismay in learning that this plan has been devised without any reference to the muskeg factor..." Probably members in this House would think that that may be the last thing that they would have to consider, the muskeg factor. It sounds trivial. I mean, I'm almost ashamed to bring it up but here is what he says, and I'm certainly not, I make no apology for this because what he says is a very serious thing -- "... which I daresay contains the most significant controlling agent for water supply in our north. Any system of artificial control of northern water, whether by artificial storage involving controlled level, diversion of flow, reversal of flow, change in rate of flow or flooding, any such modification would be devastating to the physical and mechanical constitution and physiography of the muskeg, the natural regulator of supply. It is now widely appreciated that there are many kinds of muskeg. Each is a hidden reservoir of gravitational water releasing this commodity to the existing open drainage systems in accordance with built-in structural differentials in the organic terrain. If these differentials are to be disturbed, the seasonal or annual properties of the drainage sheds in question would be seriously modified to an unpredictable degree and our water supplies drastically affected. The muskeg factor, because it is primary, must be assessed in accordance with the water user requirement of Canada."

So I find, Mr. Speaker, that the muskeg factor, something which I couldn't consider, which I am not trained to consider, is of primary significance and must be affected by every diversion, every flooding, every change in flow. The Minister of Finance surely isn't considering that because he tells us that that's not within his sphere, the muskeg factor; nor is the relocation factor. And he says, Mr. Speaker, that there were relocation problems on the St. Lawrence. The very use of that argument indicates the weakness of his position. Is he

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . equating the settlements on the St. Lawrence with the settlement at South Indian Lake? Surely it's possible to expropriate, to change environmental conditions much more easily for people who lived on the banks of the St. Lawrence than it is for this community.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer Affairs says, and in this he makes a serious charge, and I think the Minister of Mines said that we are trying to create a static society of these people; we want to tell them where to go. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not so. They are the ones who are making the decision that they must go, and furthermore they're telling them that they must go, and I don't want to blame them at the moment but we collectively have proved ourselves failures at integrating these communities. And if, Mr. Speaker, if it were not true, if the Minister of Consumer Affairs would be able to show me that Indian citizens are working relatively on the same basis as every other citizen, that they are being educated on the same basis as every other citizen, that they are not at the bottom of the economic ladder, that they are not of the highest ratio in our correctional institutions, if he was able to show me that when these people go they are going to find an equally wholesome life in the rest of the community, I would consider this differently. But, Mr. Speaker, we have shown ourselves just the opposite. We hear the conventional wisdom about the native peoples in our society, that they are lazy, that they're shiftless, that they drink, that they can't work, that they're getting into trouble. And why do we hear it? Because we are looking at those native peoples who haven't been able to adjust in the system that we have provided and the system that the Minister of Consumer Affairs says that they should go to.

On the other hand, we have a community which is viable, which is healthy, which is culturally happy, which is economically on a very high level, and we say that we're going to change that community; we're going to dislocate it, and we're going to give these people the opportunity of saying where they're going to go. Mr. Speaker, we're not giving them the opportunity. If the Minister really wanted to give them the opportunity of saying where they were going to go, he would ask them whether they wanted to stay at South Indian Lake. But he won't ask that question because the answer is "yes". The answer is "yes" and he won't accept that answer, and it comes down to the fact that we'll do anything for them except get off their back. That's what it comes down to, and, Mr. Speaker, why is this? Are the government trying to save \$5 million? I just can't believe it. I can't believe that they would be more worried about facing the Opposition, facing the Leader of the Opposition, facing the Leader of my Party, facing all members on this side, that they would be more worried about coming in with a prospect that we could do this \$5 million cheaper.

Let's assume that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources came to the House and said that we have this program; it's going to be a low level diversion; we can do it cheaper by 5 million but it would involve wiping out this resource and dislocating the people and we won't consider this. Is he saying that we would be more critical of him than we are now? Because it's just ridiculous. Obviously that's not the reason.

Mr. Speaker, what is the reason? I suggest that the reason is that it tastes like peppermint; that what has happened is that the government has moved; they have taken a course and they have moved on the high level diversion; that they're really not now involved, Mr. Speaker, and this is what they're hiding. This is why we can't find out. That they are really not involved in making a simple choice as between the high level diversion and the low level diversion. That if they now choose the low level diversion it is going to be revealed to this House - and I make this as a suggestion because I have no facts except what the people there have told me and except that I can ascertain by the way in which they are behaving - that they have moved and they have spent millions of dollars on this high level diversion; that if we get into this House and change it they're going to have to demonstrate that they have wasted money. And that's why, Mr. Speaker, they won't come in with the alternative suggestion. The alternative suggestion, if proceeded with, is going to show that they have wasted money - and why do I say this? Because when I went down to Gillam I didn't find an engineer who wasn't perfectly sure and regarded it as an accomplished fact that we were going to divert the Churchill River into the Nelson River, and everything that they were doing was based on that. -- (Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, it wasn't decided -- if it was decided here in 1966 then why did Mr. Stephens say that you're going to have to apply for a licence? And why do they have to apply for a licence? Why, when you made the decision in 1966, why did you not make the decision to grant the licence? Because what the Minister, what the Leader of the Opposition has said. . . .

MR. ENNS: There is a fast answer, Mr. Speaker. I hate to interject, but. . . .

MR. GREEN: That you weren't here? Are you saying that you weren't here?

MR. ENNS: No, I'm just saying the answer was that the relocation problems of the communities that were involved in the high level diversion were left to be decided at a later date. This is what we are doing. That was, I believe, in essence what took place, or the reply of the committee.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that is not . . .

MR. MOLGAT: If the honourable member is speaking on a point of order I would like to join in.

MR. GREEN: Well he's not on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. He is totally incorrect.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure the honourable gentlemen will bear with me. I'm doing my level best to keep this debate going and it seemed to me that when the Minister rose that the Honourable Member for Inkster was prepared to accept what he had to say at the moment. It was in reply to something that he had said, and the Honourable Member for Inkster still has the floor.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition quite properly says that when this scheme was decided upon it was indicated at that time that studies would be made, and the studies were going to determine whether this total project -- and I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is really saying that in 1966, without any reports, without going into it -- he's making a far more serious criticism upon himself and his government than I am. Because I'm saying that in 1966 they had no reports, that they had not looked into the question, that they had drawn a technocrat's view of what should happen, and that it was subsequently going to be looked into. And they have looked into it, but, Mr. Speaker, their engineers are way ahead of. . . . They have looked into it, Mr. Speaker, and my view is that if they could change they would like to change; that the alternatives are better than their scheme. The Minister of Public Works last year in the House -- and I'm sorry I didn't bring Hansard in with me -- but my notion was that he told the Member for Portage la Prairie that they're going to look into the alternatives, and if an alternative is feasible they would go ahead with it. But what the Minister now says, Mr. Speaker, is that when they decided on the technocrat's program in 1966, without study, that they had already decided that the lake was to be flooded and that the diversion would take place. Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't make that criticism of him nor of his government. I would consider that to be too harsh a criticism. That's much more damning than what I am now saying because what I am now saying, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind the honourable member that he has exhausted his time but in view of the interruptions possibly he could take a minute longer.

MR. GREEN: I'll be closing in just a few seconds, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. Goerge): Mr. Speaker, we have no objections to him carrying on.

MR. GREEN: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that the honourable gentleman has the will of the House to carry on for as long as he pleases.

MR. GREEN: I thank the honourable members very much and I promise not to trespass on the time that they are giving me. I am in the process of concluding.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that what has occurred is that between 1966 and 1969 the diversion has in fact been proceeded with, except for the flooding of the lake. I don't know what has taken place. I know that there is equipment at the site. I know that engineers have spent government time on it. I know that all of the resources of the project have been directed at creating this diversion, and I say that if we now change, which the government would like to do, it's going to have to be made public and this is what is being hid, not the report, because the report will be interpreted by one person in one way and another person in another way; that the real hidden fact is that the alternative now would not cost the five million that the Minister of Finance spoke about; the alternative would cost abandoning an unknown millions of dollars, an unknown amount of millions of dollars which has already been spent and which the Minister used the phrase, "we can't turn back". Mr. Speaker, I say we can turn back if we assess our responsibility, if we say that what we have to preserve in this area are those things which are important to the people of Manitoba continuously, rather than which are important at the immediate time.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to say a few words on Phase II because what I have said doesn't apply if we go into Phase II. If we go into Phase II there's operational costs of \$9,090,000

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... every year, but Mr. Speaker, we may never go into Phase II and we don't know. The Minister of Finance has indicated in his speech that Phase I is perfectly viable as it is, and if we go into Phase II there will be no additional costs to flooding the lake at that time, in the year 2000, because if we're merely talking about Phase II requiring a high level diversion, then maybe by the year 2000, Mr. Speaker, we'll be in better position to make a high level diversion, if it's necessary - and I'm not all that sure that it will be, because by that time, as the Minister of Finance himself said, there may be sufficient technological changes to make it unnecessary to proceed in this level, so shouldn't that... decision, in view of the fact that there is no cost factor involved, in view of the fact that using a low level diversion now or making a steam plant now will in no way affect being able to make a high level diversion in 2000. Shouldn't we keep our options open? Because in the year 2000, Mr. Speaker, we won't be able to go back to a low level diversion. We won't be able to undo the damage that we are now doing, whereas the reverse is true.

One of the educations, Mr. Speaker, that I've had in life, is that where you have a course of action to take, one of which leaves you two alternatives and one of which leaves you no alternative, you take the course that leaves you an option. The course that is suggested by the Minister of Finance in his speech leaves an option. The course that is now being suggested leaves no option, and Mr. Speaker, the option may be worth the extra costs that we are told about. I suggest to you that it's not extra costs of the alternative that is moving the government towards a complete course of going for the high level diversion. I suggest to you that it's the costs that would have to be abandoned, and Mr. Speaker, if that's the truth, then let it come out and let this Legislature, let this Legislature judge this matter on the basis of the alternatives available, not on the basis of trying to save the faces of those on the government benches.

MR. CARROLL: Would the member permit a question? Do I understand him to say that he is making these proposals of alternate supply of power without the benefit of the advice or the guidance or the study of any of the reports that have been offered to him and to other members of his party by Manitoba Hydro?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the member asked that question. What I am telling the member is that I'm not going to vote for the high level diversion without the benefit of the reports, the studies and the other documents which he has just spoken of.

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

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, rather than refer to the speech of the Honourable Minister that was made some ten days ago, I would like to take a few moments and refer to the speech that was made yesterday afternoon. As you are aware, we haven't seen it in print yet, but I listened to it very carefully and attentively.

Rising to speak on this bill, the first thing I want to do is to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Finance on the seriousness with which he approached this subject in his speech that he made yesterday afternoon. In the past week, we on this side of the House have urged that the great importance of this bill merits a calm and a deliberate and a reasonable approach to the debate, and we were very encouraged on this side that the Minister saw fit to reply in this spirit. But I think more important than the spirit was the honest and candid way in which the Minister at last revealed to us some of the key elements of the government's position. It is now clear to us that the government's case rests, at least in part, on three facts or assumptions which are essential to your position. However, to me the accuracy of these three points is open to grave doubt. One of the first decisions, Mr. Speaker, that the government had to make was a choice between hydro power and its alternatives. Hydro power was chosen over thermo power on the basis of cost. One of the key facts in the Minister's argument concerning the economic disadvantages of the coal-fired thermal stations was that of the delivered cost of coal, and if I remember his comments correctly, he stated that the cost of coal was \$4.97 per ton at Selkirk and \$3.83 per ton at Brandon. Is that correct? In the year 1968.

MR. EVANS: I think the figure \$3.83 Brandon referred to the year 1967-68.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. The year 1967-68 I should have said, Mr. Speaker.

He went on to say that the higher of these two figures must be assumed because the supply of cooling water at Brandon is now fully utilized. But surely this statement is true, Mr. Speaker, only if we assume the most primitive use of cooling water from the Assiniboine River. I have been given to understand, Mr. Speaker, that it's quite common and it's very inexpensive in many North American and British power stations to re-circulate cooling water using the same water, and if re-circulation was used, the flow of the Assiniboine River could

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.).... supply cooling water to a station more than 10 times the size of Brandon. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you can understand why I'm puzzled at the selection of the Selkirk price that the Honourable Minister of Finance used yesterday. Now I say if the government is wrong on this, and it seems apparent to me that they are, then its cost comparison is seriously in error.

The Minister also referred to an alternative, and that was of nuclear power, I believe. In the Minister's remarks, they disturbed me in view of the fact that all of us have great hopes for building a uranium enrichment plant in the north, and nuclear power is recognized by experts to be a major source of future power in the United Kingdom, Europe and North America, and Canada is heavily committed; in fact we're in the forefront in this dynamic development.

I think that what we have to remember here, Mr. Speaker - and we must all remember this - is that the whole possibility of Manitoba building an immense uranium enrichment plant along the Nelson River rests on the assumption that the number of nuclear power plants in Europe and North America will increase very rapidly during the next decade. So I say Mr. Speaker, we can't afford to be negative on the issue of nuclear power. If we're in the forefront of progress we have to be positive, and I think we all agree on that. We have to acknowledge that nuclear power is becoming the dominant source of reliable future, low cost power. To deny this, Mr. Speaker, would be to destroy all hopes for Manitoba's proposed uranium enrichment plant. That's why I say the question of whether Nelson River power is the cheapest possible power for southern Manitoba has not been resolved by the Minister's statement.

We now know for certain that the cost of Phase I, Nelson power, has risen sharply by over 45 percent since 1966. The Minister stated yesterday that Nelson power would cost 5.9 mills per kilowatt hour rather than the four mills that he mentioned or estimated in 1966. But the question of the cost for thermal, for the best thermal or nuclear alternative, is still not clear; at least it's not clear to those of us on this side. This remains as a vital issue of the principle which can only be resolved by having expert testimony at the committee hearings. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at this stage, it's clear to assume that the government's position in this particular case is open to serious doubt. This is not to say that the alternatives to hydro power are necessarily better. I believe that it's possible, Mr. Speaker, that expert testimony will show that we should indeed develop hydro power on the Nelson River. Such testimony, however, is necessary before we on this side commit ourselves in principle to this project. But even if we assume that hydro power is the best alternative, we then must answer another major issue of principle, namely: is the high level diversion at Southern Indian Lake the best alternative available?

Another point I want to bring out, Mr. Speaker, was the Minister's remarks on this principle rests entirely on a particular method of calculation. In essence, he says his belief that the high level diversion at Southern Indian Lake is superior over all other alternatives, and this is based on his method of calculation, Mr. Speaker. Now I appreciate and I respect the Minister's frankness in telling the House that he's not familiar with the method of present value calculation, but surely he must agree that a great deal rests on whether we use his method of calculating savings or whether we use the method that was put forth by the Member for St. George, and if I remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, some \$60 million is at stake on this question. Surely \$60 million is no mere detail; it's no minor discrepancy; particularly on such a figure the whole principle of whether or not to flood Southern Indian Lake could well be decided.

Now I want to assure the Minister that I, too, am not an expert on the complex methods of economic analysis. However, it seems to me that we seem to have a relatively simple question at stake here. Although we have not seen the studies involved, the Minister stated that during Phase I there will be an annual saving of some \$1.6 million, if we use the high level rather than the low level diversion. Now Mr. Speaker, the Minister states that to measure the savings over 50 years, we simply multiply \$1.6 million by 50, giving a total accumulated savings of some - what would that be - \$80 million. This to some people may seem to be a logical mathematical exercise, Mr. Speaker, but as far as I understand from my experience in the business world, this is simply just not the way to proceed.

Take, for example, Mr. Speaker, the way in which our life insurance companies operate. They'll take \$10,000 in premiums from a man, say, age 20, and they'll give him back \$20,000 at age 60. Is this a give-away plan? We don't see any of the insurance companies going bankrupt. By no means. The simple point that I'm making here, Mr. Speaker, is that the \$20,000

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.)... which the person would receive some 40 years from now, is not worth \$20,000 today. According to such a life insurance program, the present value of \$20,000 some 40 years from now will be less than \$10,000 today. Insurance companies long ago learned that they could invest the money they received and the one dollar in hand is worth more than the one dollar in future, and I'm sure that any one of the honourable members could take an insurance policy - I happen to have one in my pocket here - and they could look at the cash surrender value, and it's a simple explanation of what I've just said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, unless we're prepared to assume that interest rates do not exist, a rather difficult assumption in this day and age to assume that interest rates don't exist, we must acknowledge that \$1.6 million to be received some 10 or 20 or 40 years from now, simply doesn't have the value of \$1.6 million today. We have to discount future savings back to present values, to values which if invested in interest today would give us the future expected savings, Mr. Speaker. On this basis the real present value of the Minister's estimated savings over 50 years would be some \$21 million, a figure which is \$60 million, Mr. Speaker, below the Minister's figure.

Mr. Speaker, we have no choice between equally viable methods of analysis. Only one method, the present value method, is valid. Only one method is used in all business and economic calculations, and I'm sure the Honourable Minister knows this. I repeat, that - well, I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate the fact that the Minister is no expert in these matters but I think he should ask his advisors why they have chosen such a radical, unusual method of analysis. When the government bases its case on calculations of this kind, can anyone say that serious doubts have not been raised, Mr. Speaker?

The Minister yesterday sought to assure the members of this House that even if the best alternative was not chosen now, the mistake would be small, since the need of Manitoba for power will be so great in the foreseeable future that not only will we have to develop the best alternative, but the next best, and likely the next best after that, and of course it's true that among the alternatives which must eventually be built, Mr. Speaker, we could not be drastically wrong in selecting one to be built first. It's enough to point out that this does not apply, as I am sure the Minister does not intend it to apply to the flooding of Southern Indian Lake. Only one method now or in the future will be chosen to supply water to the station at Kettle Rapids, and subsequent stations downstream. In short, Mr. Speaker, we are involved here with a once-and-for-all decision. Either we proceed to flood, creating a body of water which will be bigger than Lake Manitoba, or we choose an alternative which will not require such flooding.

Whatever we decide, Mr. Speaker, our decision is irrevocable. Furthermore, I think that we must keep clearly in our minds, everyone in this House, that the presently proposed scheme is the only scheme which requires flooding. There are other schemes which don't require flooding. Another thing we have to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, is there is no other scheme that would force us to destroy so much of our northern resources. So in such circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how we on this side can be held responsible for making such a decision until we have seen and compared all the estimated costs and benefits for each known alternative that the government has. The Minister - who is not in the House right now, Mr. Speaker - has not provided us with this vital information.

One other matter should be touched upon at this time, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister in his speech yesterday clearly defined Phase I of the Nelson River project but did not include the regulations of Lake Winnipeg in this definition despite, Mr. Speaker, in fact that it was specifically included in the 1966 agreement. It's a matter for concern to us here that such an important change was not even reported to this House.

I think we are aware that at the 1966 hearings the then Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro made it clear that the control of Lake Winnipeg is of paramount economic importance to power on the Nelson River. Why have the plans been changed, Mr. Speaker? To me, and to members of our Party, it looks as though the government has lost some of its faith in development of the Nelson. Mr. Speaker, the hard facts upon which the government has based its decision have been sparsely, and grudgingly too, distributed, when they have been distributed at all - that's the way we've got them, in little bits and pieces, and I'm sure that many remain hidden away in secret reports - but some have been given, and we can only assume that these have been carefully selected, to show the government's case at its strongest, and I'm sure that many people on this side of the House agree, that we have only got what they think we should have to strengthen their case.

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, ... such key facts or assumptions that were presented yesterday by the Minister of Finance, if you recall, in his speech he stated a price for coal which he had used in his comparative cost calculations. As I pointed out, the price assumes that the coal will be used inefficiently at Selkirk rather than be used efficiently at Brandon. Why, Mr. Speaker, do we have to assume that the most inefficient point will be the one that the government will use?

Now, the Minister yesterday afternoon dismissed nuclear power until the year 2000 and yet we are considering a nuclear enrichment plan long before the year 2000 - I believe the TED report was 1980. If nuclear power plants are unreliable, then I guess the government can consider themselves fools for going ahead with the uranium enrichment plan, wouldn't you agree, Mr. Speaker? They say in one hand that nuclear power is no good, yet they want to have a uranium enrichment plant. And I would say if the Minister is still in doubt as to whether he should use present value calculations, we are prepared to provide him or any member of this House with all the data to make him certain.

Mr. Speaker, with respect, we submit from our side that the House has no choice but to resolve these doubts before accepting the bill in principle. If we are to keep faith with the people in Manitoba, then I can assure those on the other side that I intend to keep faith with the people in my constituency. I want the information. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if the debate up to this point has proven anything, it's become pretty clear that such complex issues of principle that are involved in Bill 15 cannot be discussed in this House at this time. The Minister in his own words has assured us, and I'm speaking of the Honourable Minister of Finance, that he is not an expert in these matters. But this fact, Mr. Speaker, should not prevent us from hearing the experts, should it?

The Minister's two lengthy statements, the one about ten days ago and the one yesterday, prove to us in the Liberal Party that he agrees that there are complex points in Bill 15, and indeed they are highly relevant to the principles that are at stake in Bill 15. I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by asking the Minister of Finance: if he can't explain points to the House, how can he ask us, then, that we vote with him blindly on the basis of the faith that we have in them?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order. Yesterday the Minister of Finance, when speaking, indicated he would deal with I think three of the points which he had found, and that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would deal with the other. Will we be favoured by a speech by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources? We are not favoured by his attendance. Maybe....

MR. EVANS: I think, it it's a point of order, I would simply say that I indicated I would not deal with the matters that come under the responsibility of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, it seemed to us that the government had indicated that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would be dealing with a certain point.

MR. EVANS: I'm not speaking for him. He can speak for himself.

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

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

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

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) (1)--passed... The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rose to my feet yesterday because I wanted to deal a little bit more extensively with the ambulance situation in Greater Winnipeg particularly, but I think what I have to say will apply to the entire province. The Chairman will know that I do have a resolution on the Order Paper dealing with ambulances and I had one on the Order Paper last year, but I rather suspect that we may arrive at discussion on that resolution sometime very late in the session, as happened last year, and there was absolutely no opportunity to debate

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . the question.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister I am sure is well aware of the ambulance problem in Greater Winnipeg. The Minister of Labour describes the minimum wage problem as being the Achilles heel of any Minister of Labour and I would say that any Minister of Health in the Province of Manitoba, has an Achilles heel too, and that is the unsatisfactory situation vis-a-vis ambulance service in Greater Winnipeg. Now Mr. Speaker, I know I have a habit of trying to discuss things as if nothing existed but I'm afraid that in order to put the ambulance situation in Greater Winnipeg we should try to put ourselves in the position of what the Legislature would do if it was trying to conceive a plan for ambulances in Greater Winnipeg if nothing existed, and Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether there would be a great deal of disagreement amongst various parties in this house. Certainly basic things would be agreed to. First of all, that an ambulance should in some way be associated with the treatment of the victims who are required to be carried by ambulance; that it should in some way be associated with the hospitals. Secondly, that ambulances should be located at strategic points throughout Greater Winnipeg, so that when an emergency arose and an ambulance was necessary they could arrive at that point with a minimum of danger and with a maximum of haste; and in this respect, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I'd have the support of the Member for Wolseley who would rather see ambulances properly stationed so that they could arrive at their destination in the shortest possible time, rather than creating an additional danger perhaps to other victims, by racing through the streets at inordinate speeds and by the use of sirens which has not proved to be a real asset to the use of ambulance services.

So we would agree, Mr. Chairman, every member of the House, we would agree that they should be strategically spaced, that they should not be placed helter skelter in different parts of the community. We would agree Mr. Speaker without a great deal of debate, that the ambulances should carry trained personnel, that it would be desirable if possible, if economically possible, that they carry the most skilled personnel, that is medical practitioners themselves, so that treatment could be started immediately that the victim is reached and immediately he is put into the ambulance. We would therefore, Mr. Speaker I am sure, not be satisfied to have ambulances operating with people who have merely received a first aid or St. John's Ambulance certificate. We would agree furthermore, Mr. Speaker, that an ambulance is an emergency vehicle and that there should be no question of cost as an impediment to the use of ambulance services; that it's something, Mr. Speaker, that we would agree is a service to society generally, rather than a service to the individual; just as we now say that if a person is being broken into and requires the services of the police we would say that it would be ridiculous if in order to obtain police services that the person had to pay a fee to the policemen before those services were granted. We would I think, Mr. Speaker, if we had it to do from the beginning regard the ambulance as an emergency social service, for which we are all responsible, rather than for which the individual who requires the ambulance is responsible. So that would be another agreement Mr. Chairman, that I'm sure we could come to, quite readily, if the situation were not complicated by the fact of existing power groups and existing vested interests - and I don't want to say that unkindly. I believe that people who are in the ambulance business have legitimate interests which are of concern to them and which certainly would trouble them if they were to be disturbed, but I'm not sure that that is a consideration of the public at large, as represented in this legislature.

So, Mr. Speaker, I outlined I think three or four areas on which I think there would be not difficult agreement. The first is that they should be strategically placed; the second that they carry trained personnel; the third that they are an emergency service for which we are all responsible. This would be the ideal. Mr. Speaker, what is the hiatus between the existing situation and the ideal? The existing situation is that ambulances are not strategically located, they are placed wherever the operators of private ambulances wish to place them, with the result that the private ambulance operator makes an impassioned case for the privilege of being able to break traffic laws, and for the use of sirens, which he has legitimate cause to do in view of the fact that he may not be in the immediate vicinity of the accident. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, with regard to personnel we know that the qualifications of ambulance operators now at present are very unsatisfactory. Not only do we not have the most skilled persons but we have people who are relatively unskilled. And Mr. Speaker, I have forgotten a point - the ambulances are not in any way connected, administratively, with the hospital who treats the victim - that that is not the case, that there is almost no connection other than the connection

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . that they see each other frequently. We have the situation, Mr. Speaker, where the ambulance question of finances is the most complicated and if one will read the reports that have been prepared on ambulances, they will find, Mr. Chairman, that a very peculiar situation exists. There are at present in the City of Winnipeg three police ambulances - there are three or four, I don't know the exact number, but those police ambulances when they receive a call, have to spend the time to ascertain whether the person who is injured and who requires ambulance services, whether he has been injured in a motor vehicle accident, or some other public type activity, or whether it is something that happened in a home and is of a more domestic nature; and if it is of a domestic nature, then they must, as a civic responsibility Mr. Chairman, they must refer the domestic call to a private ambulance service, whereas they can go out and handle the so-called public call. . . . And I know, Mr. Chairman, that the police are very disturbed about this, and that they will lean over backwards to make their interpretation that this is a public call so that they can use the public ambulance service. And the same is true of the several fire rescue wagons which are perhaps the best equipped vehicles in the City of Winnipeg with regard to ambulance services.

So we have a situation, Mr. Chairman, where no -- we're not talking about whether half of what would be right is being done but almost nothing of what would be right is being accomplished by the existing service. And, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the ones who are complaining most loudly about the existing method of disseminating ambulance services in Greater Winnipeg are the private ambulance operators. They are continuously at loggerheads with one another; they are continually saying that the method of providing the service is unsatisfactory; they are engaged in a perpetual hassle over who will be called when the digits 999 are dialed on the telephone; they are engaged in almost perpetual dialogue with the City of Winnipeg; and I have heard the perpetual threats of the aldermen and mayor of the City of Winnipeg that if something is not done immediately we're going to call upon the government to institute a public ambulance service.

But, Mr. Chairman, those threats don't mean anything to them any more because they've heard this for the last six years and they have ascertained - and I hope that they are wrong - they have ascertained that the public just does not have the will to involve itself in an activity which everybody agrees, and they agree, should be centrally controlled; publicly subsidized, because they are all in favour of receiving a public subsidy for their services; and centrally regulated. But none of them are prepared for the step that this necessarily involves, and Mr. Chairman, they have been in agony for the last six years, or for more than that, and I say to the Minister of Health who is a doctor, let's take them out of their agony. I have no objection to using them, to using their intelligence, to using their experience as part of a public ambulance service. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to seeing that they are well paid, to seeing that the people - and I don't care if you make one of them the Commissar of Ambulances, or the Commissioner of Ambulances which is a nicer word - have one of these people, pay him a good salary, pay him as much as he could make as if he invested the money, but let's have a service which in some way meets the ideals that anyone, Mr. Chairman, if he was talking objectively and not being subjected to the pressures of the existing situation, would agree upon.

Now this involves cost, and I want to assure the members that I am the first person who regards costs as being important, but I ask the Minister to remember two things. First of all, the cost that is presently being paid. Any economy will verify what I am saying, that the community is now paying a cost for ambulance services, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that they're paying it the expensive way, that the total charge for ambulance services if it were publicly operated would be less than the total charged for ambulance services as are now paid, because the present system is an inefficient, ineffective one. Ask the ambulance operators; they'll tell you. So that I am, too, concerned with costs and I say that the total community costs would go down.

But secondly, Mr. Chairman - and I think that this is a point that the Minister could well look into - many years ago the Federal Government, in co-operation with the Provincial Government and with municipal governments, set up a Civil Defence Emergency Measures Organization, and Mr. Chairman, members of my Party in particular and members of the public, with some justification, criticized expenditures that were spent on civil defence. They called them a waste of time; they called them a camouflage which would stop the people working harder for peace rather than preparing for war. I can't remember all of the arguments that were used but certainly civil defence was criticized.

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Mr. Chairman, I think that it's possible to do some good with civil defence, and I'm not suggesting that everything that the Civil Defence Department is doing is good, but surely if people believe in a civil defence organization, if they say that we should spend money on shelters, if they say that we should spend money on evacuation routes, if they say that we should spend money on equipping police cars with inter-departmental radio services, if all of these things that civil defence money has been spent on are valid, then I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, they are infinitely less valid than spending money on ambulances. If we were involved in a civil defence emergency - and let's not talk about a war, let's talk about the type of civil defence emergencies that are referred to by the EMO people - let's talk about a tornado, let's talk about a flood, let's talk about a fire of high proportions, let's talk about another natural disaster like an earthquake, is it not the case, Mr. Chairman, and would not the Minister be the first to agree that the ambulances would have to be mobilized for civil defence? First of all for moving injured people; second of all for moving people who are in hospitals from one place to another; and if ambulances are an integral part of civil defence, and I suggest to you that they are, then I give the Minister an opportunity of hammering at the Federal Government. Can't the Minister go to the Federal Government and say that if you want us to be engaged in meaningful civil defence then we require, as one of the civil defence measures, an ambulance service which will satisfy the requirements of Manitoba and which will be based on some national scheme. And if so, Mr. Chairman, then we are not talking merely of the tax base of the municipality, which is the one that would have to be utilized at the present time, we are not even limited to the tax base of the provinces; we are talking about the entire tax base of Canada. And it would be an expensive program, but I repeat, a program which is more expensive now because it is operated inefficiently.

So I say to the Minister - and I don't say it as a condition because I don't think that it's necessary that we get civil defence funds to rationalize the provision of ambulance services in Greater Winnipeg - I say if it's necessary to do it, let's do it on our own; let's not use the Federal Government as an excuse for not doing it. But by all means, Mr. Chairman, let's go to the Federal Government, let's have people stand up in Ottawa and let them say that if nuclear fallout shelters are legitimate monies for the Canadian government to spend money on for civil defence then surely ambulances are, and ambulances by the way, Mr. Chairman, are at least guaranteed a use even without the disaster. Therefore, it's far more efficient because we are all praying and hoping every day that we will not have to use the fallout shelters that we turn schools into and what have you for civil defence purposes but we can't avoid the everyday use of ambulances, and if the Federal Government did offer some assistance in this area, and I would be prepared to embarrass them if they didn't because surely, Mr. Chairman, if they're serious about civil defence, if this is not a propaganda weapon, then they should get into it in a meaningful way and I say that the ambulance service is one of those ways. And I don't say, Mr. Chairman, that it should depend on it; the Minister should do something immediately.

I can remember, Mr. Chairman, reading a report by a member of the medical profession, I think it was Dr. . . . . - the Minister will have his report - who said if something is not done to create a public ambulance service right away - and I believe the report was dated 1962 - the politicians are going to pick this up and then they're going to make a lot of hay out of it. Well, Mr. Chairman, 1962 to 1969 is a long enough time and the politicians are on it right now, and they have been on it, and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the way of rationalizing the services is to put them in conjunction with the hospitals. If they are put in conjunction with the hospitals, they will be strategically placed. That is number one. Secondly, they will carry trained personnel because they will be working hand in hand with the hospitals. Thirdly, they will not have to be involved in the type of traffic hazards which increase the possibility of additional injuries. Fourthly, they will be a social rather than an individual cost. And we would achieve, Mr. Chairman, all of the ideals which I really believe, and sincerely believe, the members of this House would set down if it were not for the existing pressures on them by the existing ambulance services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Minister gets up to reply to a number of questions that have been put to him, I wonder if today he would be prepared to answer the questions that I put to him yesterday in respect to the Easterville settlement of the Indian and Metis people. You know one thing, Mr. Chairman, that I have waited for in this

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . . very lengthy debate on Bill 15 was for someone on the government side to get up and say: Listen, we have had experience in resettling Indians, and point to the Easterville project as the experience they have had.

Now the questions -- and incidentally, Mr. Chairman, no one, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the Minister of Finance and the former Minister of Welfare and the former Minister of Health, who I think have taken some part in the debate on Bill 15, none of them have mentioned this Easterville experience, if you want to call it that. The questions that I asked my honourable friend yesterday were for his opinion on certain matters. I asked specifically what the estimated cost of the original plan was for the Easterville resettlement project.

These are questions that I don't know whether we are going to be able to get the answers from Hydro on: the estimated cost of the original plan; the number of people involved and the number of families involved; the number of people that were on welfare prior to the resettlement and the number of people that are presently on welfare; and the total cost of the Easterville resettlement project by the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, Hydro, and all of the Crown agencies; and does my honourable friend consider that it was an outstanding success in every aspect. These are questions that we need to have answers to. And have the people concerned made a satisfactory adjustment in the eyes of the Minister? That is, have they upgraded their standard of living since the resettlement or is it lower than it was at Moose Lake or at Grand Rapids, and has the family pattern changed substantially and can we look forward to having the whole pattern improved as the years go by. I think when we're considering the resettlement or the relocation of all of the 650 people involved at South Indian Lake that we should have answers to these questions before we can intelligently deal with the subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment or two and in taking this moment or two may I first of all say that I'm under orders from my caucus not to say too much this week, to save it, if I have any contributions to make, to save it at least until after the weekend is over. For the first time, that I am aware of at least, in a political party inside of a Legislative Assembly there has been a new appointment made with the officers of the New Democratic Party, namely that of the officer of bouncer. I understand that the Honourable Member for Churchill has been appointed the official bouncer of the Leader of our Party if he gets up and says anything or if he sticks around too long.

I am now speaking under the fear of him coming and grabbing me by the neck and throwing me out of the House, but before he does that, I would like on this, the first occasion of taking part in the debate on the Department of my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Social Services, to pay a tribute to my hosts of 30 days recently; namely, the staff, the nurses and the doctors of Concordia Hospital. This hospital is one that is booked for rebuilding and relocation and I appeal to the Minister of Health to speed up, if at all possible, the construction of the new hospital which will be located in East Kildonan. I'm sure my honourable friend the Minister will recall we discussed this matter some years ago when he was the Minister of Health at that particular time, and unfortunately the sod has not as yet been turned for the new Concordia Hospital. There is some construction going on I believe with an extended treatment care centre where the new hospital will be located, and I appeal to the Minister to do whatever he can to bring about the early start of the construction of this hospital.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to pay a tribute. This hospital was originally started out as a benefit society of the Mennonites of Manitoba, a mutual benefit society which provided, I believe, one of the first Medicare schemes that we had in Manitoba. And I want to pay a tribute to the Mennonite people who are still connected with the hospital. Many of them are practical nurses and really are doing a fantastic job for the citizens, particularly of Transcona and the area of Elmwood and the like. My honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources -- if you recall, Mr. Chairman, just before I left the House I had made some suggestion that his salary should be reduced to 98 cents, if I recall correctly, and then subsequent to that I went into the Concordia Hospital and one of the able doctors of that hospital happens to be the brother-in-law of my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. And very typical of the Mennonite people, he said to me, "Russ, you may cause the rest of us to make contributions to the upkeep of Harry's family financially, but we're going to do the best we can to see that health-wise you get out of here as quickly as

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . possible." And this to me illustrates the type of people that there are at Concordia Hospital.

I might say that the nurses and the staff in Concordia, and it only being a small hospital -- and sometimes I wonder whether it may be advisable for us to stop building overly large hospitals in the Greater Winnipeg area and concentrate more on smaller hospitals. I have every respect for the larger hospitals. I have the honour of being on the Advisory Board of St. Boniface Hospital. I know that the Sisters of the Grey Nuns are doing a fantastic job, as are most of those connected with the hospitals of Greater Winnipeg, but here in this little hospital that may not have the most advanced facilities and equipment that you find in the larger hospitals, I think that they give something else that in many respects overcome the deficiencies insofar as the physical assets are concerned. You may have to, if I may, Mr. Chairman, wait your turn to go into the washrooms because of the lack of adequate facilities, but by jiminy Christmas, when you're feeling rugged and you're feeling tough and you require the attendance of a nurse or someone on staff, they're at your bedside constantly.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, I want to show my appreciation in these my first remarks on return to the House to Concordia, to the Board of Directors, the doctors connected with the hospital and my own personal doctors for the job that they have done. I know from time to time I have criticized the medical profession because, in my opinion, in many respects and in many areas they have failed. However, I have said that in the past, and I want to repeat it, it was never a criticism of the capabilities and the abilities of the doctors, but I thought possibly they were misled in some areas, particularly in the acceptance of Medicare. I note that the Minister mentioned the other day that about a third of the doctors in Manitoba are still on the outside of the plan, used their rights under the Act to opt-out, and I have no objection to them doing this, this is their right. I really don't know whether all of the doctors that came around to see me in Concordia were in or out of the plan, but I do know this, that whether they were in the plan or whether they were out of the plan, they did the job that was required for the patients of theirs that were in the hospital.

So while on many occasions in the past - and I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure I can assure the government there will be times when I stand up and criticize to the utmost what I consider to be deficiencies within the government or without the government, I'm happy that as a result of going into this little - I believe 80 ward hospital in Elmwood - that I'm able to stand up once again and say how much the people connected with the hospital have contributed to the health of the citizens of this area and the rest of Manitoba. I'm thankful, I'm thankful, and I say this, Mr. Chairman, without really expecting any return because in the area of Manitoba generally where the majority of the Mennonites reside, the New Democratic Party has made little or no headway politically, so I'm not really preaching for a political call. But I do want to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of saying thank you to all of those connected with Concordia Hospital, and Mr. Minister, will you please do your utmost to have new construction proceeded with with the hospital. The site is chosen; I understand the plans are in the hands of the commission and basically authorization has been given to the construction. More people would like to be able to take advantage of the services, particularly of a personal nature, that are enjoyed by those who unfortunately do have to go to hospital, and I would say again, in my books, Concordia Hospital is the tops in the Greater Winnipeg area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to take this opportunity to welcome you back. We've missed your good advice in the last month. I thought I was going to have to join you in that very hospital about two weeks ago myself.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Chairman, I wish to add just a very few words to those that have already been spoken on the area of Mental Health, and with some emphasis on the health of children and with brief mention of the Canadian Mental Health Association, the Winnipeg Division. These matters have already been mentioned briefly by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface and Kildonan and Seven Oaks, but I too would wish to add a word.

The Honourable the Minister presented some statistics on this particular field and gave a very rosy picture. I hope it is really as rosy as the statistics show, but I have probably - or between us - we have been reading different sources of statistics, most particularly those that deal with children of school age, and when I mention children I don't have direct reference to retardates. They are a very special problem in this field and they call for all the sympathy, understanding, the patience and the dedication that can be given to them, and I know of this

(MR. PETURSOON cont'd) . . . . because I have had some very close personal experience, but my reference now is specifically to children of school age who are healthy in other respects but have a mental problem.

Statistically, the Canadian Mental Health Association shows that the proportion of public school children with emotional problems - and here I read a quote from a statistical report by the Mental Health Association. It bears no other names actually. "These children of school age requiring expert psychological or psychiatric help represent as high as 10 percent of the total child population." School children with emotional problems. "In adolescence", it says here, "the proportion may be higher, that is about 15 percent. Certainly several thousands of mentally ill children are being cared for at home or in foster homes, shelters and other institutions without adequate psychiatric treatment facilities, and these children", it says, "are distinct from the retarded." That is there is a distinction being made; they're not referring to retarded children. Then it continues, it says: "Unbelievable as it may seem, some 100,000 acutely ill children need immediate intensive treatment; specialized psychiatric facilities exist for less than 400."

Now this is a Canada-wide report, as I understand it, and therefore the references are to the Canadian scene. But of the 100,000 that are reported here, they indicate that there are adequate facilities for something less than 400 of the total. There are some further references made in this report where it shows it's the usual - what shall I say? - it's the usual approach in making a comparison of expenditures in other fields as opposed to the expenditures made in this particular field. It is stated here: "The current expenditure of less than \$8.00 per mental institution patient per day compares with an expenditure of up to \$30.00 per day per patient on the physically ill in general hospitals. The federal government's allocation to mental health research amounts to only five cents per head population. It is in this area that money is more urgently required than in any other." And then there's the comparison: "In comparison, nationally we spend 30 times this amount on agricultural research to ensure that we have the best food; we spend 60 times this amount on research into national defence to ensure our adequate protection" - and then it gives the total defence bill and I don't have to be putting these figures on the record necessarily although it runs to a billion and a half. Then it says: "We spend six times the amount on military bands," and by comparison I couldn't think of anything much less useful than military bands as opposed to the well-being of the children who need help, need treatment.

Then it goes on: "Some indication of the financial needs in Canada can be drawn from the experience that has been had in the United States. Under the Kennedy Administration, we are told, the United States, facing similar problems in relation to its population, began to invest in corrective action. The federal government increased its allocation to mental health research from \$18 million in 1956 to \$212,500,000, and this amounts to almost \$1.20 per head population compared to Canada's five cents." I bring out these figures simply to emphasize the tremendous need of work in this particular field of the children who need psychiatric help, who need psychiatric care.

Now what proportion of these children, of the 100,000 that are referred to, what proportion of these are in Manitoba I don't know, but if there are facilities for only 400, then whatever facilities we have here in Manitoba must be on a minimal basis. I may not have been too attentive to the Honourable the Minister's statement on this matter, but I feel compelled to ask what treatment facilities for children are available in Manitoba, and operating, and what facilities in addition to these are being proposed.

This is part of the total mental health picture, and it was because of the enormous need in this field for help to people who were suffering from mental breakdowns of one kind or another that the Canadian Mental Health Association originally came into being. There is a division of the Mental Health Association here in Manitoba as - I would like to say - "everybody" knows, and there's a tremendous amount of work that goes into what is being done by this Association, a tremendous amount of purely volunteer labour for which no one expects a reward of any kind except the satisfaction of knowing that they have been doing something for people who can be rehabilitated, people who need the kind of help that is being given through the Mental Health Association and which can be added to by assistance from the government.

In very recent times the Winnipeg Division, the Winnipeg section of the Mental Health Association - and it's a province-wide institution - the Winnipeg section has acquired a new building which cost the government nothing. There was no subsidy by any outside governmental

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd) . . . . organization towards the acquiring of this building. There was a bequest left by a man who had been exceptionally interested in the mental health problem. He had left this bequest to the Mental Health Association and they felt that there was no better use that it could be put to than to acquire this building, a central headquarters where facilities could be created to carry on the work that the association does. And still more recently a building has been purchased in Brandon in the same way - at no cost to the government - but built from funds left by well-wishers and those who wished to be of assistance to the association. This building by the way in Brandon is having its official opening on the 10th of this month, on Saturday, a week from tomorrow, and it would be interesting to see some of the members of the Legislature attending that opening to give it a good start, although it has long since several months ago already started and is in good use.

But because these buildings have become available and are being used by the Mental Health Association, the association finds that utilization of the resources that it has now has increased, with the resultant need for additional funds. And while the Honourable Minister informs me that the allocation by the government is not being reduced, it will continue to be the same as last year, the needs have increased and nothing could be better received than recognition on the part of the government of the work that is being done by the association than by giving it an increase in the allocation that has been annually made.

The Mental Health Association is dependent on - I don't know whether I can call it charity - on financial assistance both from private and public sources. These come in a limited degree and I think that they are being used as efficiently and as effectively as they can be used, but only as far as they can go. I would urge upon the Minister that if he has a little reserve in some corner of his enormous budget that it wouldn't be at all amiss to dig into that reserve and subtract from it sufficient to give the Mental Health Association the additional allocation that was being asked for. It amounts to \$5,000, but when compared to the enormous work that the association is doing that is rather a small and insignificant sum. Compared to all the work that is being done by people on a volunteer basis, not only in Winnipeg or in Brandon but in, I would say, almost 30 different communities throughout the province - and if I didn't sound too much like a train announcer in a station then I could begin to read these off - but in every one of these communities, I think almost 30 communities in Manitoba, there are special committees under the supervision and direction of the Manitoba Health Association - Canadian Mental Health Association rather - who are operating on a volunteer basis and they are helping in the work. If these were all to be withdrawn, we can imagine what a calamity that would be to the province, and the kind of a budget that would have to be raised from provincial funds to carry on the work. I would urge every form of co-operation that is possible from the government to see that the Mental Health Association work is not limited by the lack of funds, that it be given encouragement in its work and helped to carry on, which as admitted by the Minister himself is an exceptional and praiseworthy effort.

This is all, Mr. Chairman, that I would wish to say at this time, other than to ask all members in the House to give their full support to the Canadian Mental Health Week, and to visit with other members the Centennial Concert Hall on a guided tour which will be held on Sunday, May 4th, beginning at 10:00 o'clock and will continue through until 5:00 in the afternoon. Anybody coming down during these hours will be conducted through the Centennial Hall, and if they have already seen it and do not need any guidance through it, at least they will meet a great number of people who have an interest in the aims and objects of the Mental Health Association.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, while we are on the subject of mental health I thought I should make a few comments. I note that the Eden Mental Health Centre's activities are reported on Page 54 of the Annual Report, and while it takes very little space in the report, nevertheless I feel that it is doing a marvelous job and certainly warrants mention in this debate of the estimates. It is one of the newer or later developments in mental health in this province and I think it has been quite successful. The report shows increased admissions with shorter stay periods and I think this is also welcome news. Where it's been really successful I think is in the out-patient area, in the visits made to the institution by out-patients. The report states that some 860 cases were dealt with in 1968. I think it speaks very well for itself. Then, too, it is much less costly to operate on this basis and yet it's been very effective. I personally know of a number of cases where people went to the institute, got treatment and

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . became well again. In this day and age where we have more people afflicted with mental illness, I feel that an institution of this type is really doing a very good job.

I note some of the vacancies that are still listed in the report have been filled since then, and I would really commend the staff that is working there. I don't want to begin naming names for fear that I would omit some, but I feel that this institution and the people in charge are doing a real good job in the care of the mentally ill in that area. I would like to extend an invitation to honourable members to visit the institution at some time when the occasion permits to look at the facilities that are available to the mentally ill in that area. I feel it's a real fine institution and I feel that we have very good facilities at this plant. I may be biased because it is situated in the constituency of Rhineland, but no doubt I feel that we are in the right direction in placing facilities of this type in rural Manitoba as well as in the larger urban areas, and it is for that purpose that I rise on this occasion to compliment the people who are working there and also give credit to the department in bringing this about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, last night the Minister gave a partial answer to a question I raised on optometrists and I wonder whether he could just clarify that a bit more for me. I received in the meantime a letter from a constituent who informs me that the price of glasses are indeed much higher than I myself anticipated. I quoted a figure of \$35.00 to \$45.00, but the gentleman informs me that his wife paid \$70.00 for what he described as nothing fancy and no frills, and that he himself paid for what he calls a medium priced frame, \$65.00 to \$70.00. So there is no doubt that the range does go pretty high. When the Minister answered, to the best that I can determine, he gave an answer that didn't really have any teeth to it. I would ask him if maybe you should investigate the price of glasses.

A MEMBER: Let them shop around.

MR. DOERN: What I'm asking the Minister is whether he is going to give us any assurance that in view of the fact that the refraction costs, the cost of eye examinations are going to be paid for by medicare, that the price of glasses will go down. You said they won't go down?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli): My honourable friend hasn't understood the basic . . . .

MR. DOERN: Well I would appreciate if the Minister . . . .

MR. JOHNSON: I said yesterday that the refraction would be paid through the medical care program, and if people have been buying glasses which included the refraction, then the glasses should be reduced by the cost of the refraction. That's elementary mathematics, in my opinion.

MR. DOERN: That's fine, the price of glasses should be under government assurances - will it be? Because I say to the Honourable Minister that if people are now paying for example \$45.00 for glasses and that some of these fees are going to be paid for by Medicare, I submit to the Minister that in some cases people are going to continue to pay \$45.00 plus the fact that the optometrist will probably be receiving his fee from Medicare. I would not be surprised if that is the case, and I'm saying to the Minister, can he assure us that the government is not going to allow that to happen, that in fact the price of glasses is going to come down because the Medicare plan will in effect pay for the examination costs. Now the Minister just assumes through elementary mathematics that they will go down; I'm not so sure of that.

I would also like to ask the Minister if he could give us some information on something that concerns the people of my area for the past five years, namely the New Concordia Hospital. In 1964 we were promised that there would be a new hospital built in the area. That still perhaps is in the offing, but as far as the people of our area are concerned, and the elected representatives on council and the MLAs, we see no real sign of this. This was promised five years ago. In the meantime, they promised us an intensive care unit in addition. So that's very fine, we have theoretically a brand new unit, an intensive care unit, but where is it? The people in East Kildonan, North Kildonan and East St. Paul were promised in effect a Health Unit in the new hospital. In East Kildonan, for example, they have a health unit in the City Hall, but it's very crowded and the people in the municipality want to know when they can transfer their health unit into that building. The City of East Kildonan, the city is now supplying services to the area where the new hospital is supposed to be built. They have installed a storm sewer, they have installed a sanitary sewer, a water supply. They have offered assistance to facilitate the construction of the building, they have promised a \$20,000

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . . a year grant for I think the next ten years, but every year they just take the \$20,000 and use it for other purposes because there is no construction.

I might say in passing that my Leader has been a client of the Concordia Hospital in my constituency for a long time and I think that he would appreciate this new facility as much as the people in the area. I hope that he . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I don't want to go back again Russell.

MR. DOERN: You don't want to go back. I hope you don't have to, but should that occur, then I would hope that this would be in the new hospital. So perhaps the Minister could clarify those points.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes left to me I just want to point out how the addresses this morning show the scope of the needs in Manitoba in the field of health and emphasize the tremendous job that has to be done and has been done. The several questions just point out the need for the department and the province facing itself. I think we as Manitobans have a great deal to be happy about. Since 1958 we, as I said in my opening address, have practically rebuilt and renovated all of the 6,800 beds that are operating today - a fantastic input. I would say today there is no comparison between what hospitals were in 1958 and what they are today - no comparison, it's night and day - but this has been a fantastic job.

We have also the responsibility to keep within our limitations. We had the responsibility of pacing ourselves so that these excellent facilities can be maintained to this standard and can be kept within reach of our people to pay, and we are satisfied from national studies that we are on target, that our commission has done an excellent job, and this pacing is going forward. The Concordia is in that mix, as you know, and I stated the other day in the House. It's in the planning stage now as members know, and it's tentatively scheduled for 1970. It's the same with many of our hospitals. The Member from Wellington mentioned how he for some years ago was on the board of the Municipal Hospital Commission and how they were planning then an extension. . . That plan has been altered a couple of times. That plan still has to be balanced in the total needs of the province. I think we have a very good development coming up in Manitoba as mentioned by the Leader of the New Democratic Party - the St. James in that section of the City, the Victoria in Fort Garry, the Concordia in Elmwood - you know, the 250 approximately bed hospitals in these sites. Land has been purchased at the north end for the north end site. They have been in communication with the four municipalities in the area planning that. You could almost call it satellite facilities in these areas, and we still of course have to plan this and go forward.

On top of this, we have to provide the kind of facilities the Member for Wellington was talking about this morning, the mental health. And if I was a dictator I'd put my priorities there, that's where I'd put -- and I'd say to some of the people let's forget some of these political decisions too, let's not be influenced in any way by any pressure, let's make the maximum use of our dollars, and if I had to say where they would go, I'd say they'd go for the next two years in the Mental Health and let some of the other things wait. That's what my common sense tells me from where I'm standing, and this is what we're looking at and looking at very hard.

So when I give lists of hospitals, that Health Resources Fund is going ahead, our teaching facilities, these hospitals are in the mix. We are working and planning with these people, so we can't outpace ourselves and outprice ourselves in the hospital field and we have to maintain that balance, and mental health needs its full measure. I am sorry, my colleague from Dauphin is ready for lunch.

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

#### IN SESSION

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 12:30. I am leaving the Chair to return again at 2, 30 this afternoon.