

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 28, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. Order please. I wonder if that might be handed back to the Honourable Member for Dufferin. I haven't called Reports of Special Committees yet. Hand that back.

Presenting Petitions. Reading and Receiving Petitions. Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Dufferin.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee on Farm Machinery begs leave to present the following as their First Report.

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Hamilton as Chairman and Mr. Einarson as Deputy Chairman. Your Committee has agreed that the quorum of the Committee shall consist of Eight (8) members. Your Committee received a brief presented by Mr. Roger Saunders, from a group representing various Breeders' Associations in Manitoba. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. WILLIAM HOMER HAMILTON (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to introduce our young guests today. We have 45 students of Grade 11 standing, from the Elmwood High School. These students are under the direction of Miss Ida Toews. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

We also have with us today 120 students of Grade 8 standing, of the J. B. Mitchell School. These students are under the direction of Mr. H. A. Lomas, Mrs. Nozick and Miss J. Arnasson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

We also have with us today 40 student nurses from the Victoria Hospital. These students are under the direction of Miss Dick. This hospital is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but I should say these girls are drawn from all over the province.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Churchill, I wonder if I might move this for him.

MR. MILLER introduced Bill No. 86, an Act to amend The Election Act.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(The Pas) introduced Bill No. 56, an Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Recreation Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor); and Bill No. 85, an Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 88, The Estate Tax Rebate Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor); and Bill No. 74, an Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to **direct** a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. I wonder if he at this time could advise the House as to whether or not the Automobile Insurance Committee will be called while the House is in session?

April 28, 1969

MR. EVANS: I'm not able to advise definitely. First, I'm not aware how long the House is going to sit, but there is no intention of delaying the calling of the committee and it will be called as soon as convenient.

MR. D. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, it saddens me to rise at this time, but due to messages I received over the weekend and again this morning and early afternoon before the House opened, it was over a situation of a death last Friday at our usual and famous intersection of King Street and No. 1 Highway. This is the sixth death in a very very short time. Some of those -- this last one was a very close friend of myself and my family; the first one was the president of my organization. I know the department and the two Ministers prior as well as the present Minister are quite aware of this situation and are trying to rectify it, but I beg of the Minister and the department, now is the time to come out. While there is a flashing red light been installed in recent weeks, this does not seem to be the right answer. I believe the red, green and orange lights are the proper ones to be installed until an adjustment is made to ease the confusion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether he can tell the House how many people are employed at the Electro-Knit plant in the Town of Selkirk.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): . . . Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest the honourable member ask the Company.

MR. USKIW: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister tell us whether or not the employees of that plant are working at or above the minimum wage level?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to answer that question, and I think the question should be addressed to the Minister of Labour. I would also suggest that the honourable member ask the firm concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Transport. Has he yet received the report from the Royal Commission on Transportation.

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

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Has he any indication when he might receive the report?

MR. McLEAN: No.

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

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. He may have seen a news report in last Saturday's Free Press, a lengthy story on racial prejudice charged by two couples in Winnipeg, both of whom are claiming that they applied for positions in Winnipeg, when they applied personally they were informed that the positions were filled, when they returned home and telephoned in, were notified that the positions were still vacant, and their conclusion was that the only reason for their rejection was the colour of their skin. Now the question to the Minister -- and I appreciate the opportunity I had to introduce it -- is whether or not he will wait until he gets a formal complaint or whether he is prepared to investigate this charge of unfair employment practices for which his department is responsible.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the lady concerned made a complaint on Wednesday, an interview was held with them on the Thursday, and they brought in some letters with their allegations on the Friday. The matter is under investigation by the department at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK(Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Transport. Is he aware that PTH Highway 206 is closed? Provincial Trunk Highway 206, the east side of Birds Hill Park is closed. Is he aware?

MR. McLEAN: I'm sorry; I'm still not hearing the . . .

MR. PATRICK: Is the Minister aware that Provincial Trunk Highway 206, which is east of Birds Hill Park, is he aware that the highway is closed?

MR. McLEAN: No, I'm not aware that it is closed.

MR. PATRICK: . . . is and the conditions up there are impassable, and I wonder if there's any reason that the park gate could be open past 11 p. m. to accommodate many people

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)... on the east side of the park that have to drive to the city every morning and evening, because the gates close at 11 o'clock. Is there any reason that the gates cannot stay open past 11 p.m.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I can only answer that I am not aware of the situation referred to. I'll have an investigation made and see what can be done, and what can be done will be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The other day he spoke to the National Livestock Exchange convention and seemed to take the position that he or the government favoured the Family Farm concept. I'd like to ask the Minister whether he was quoting policy or whether he was expressing a personal opinion.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): I was expressing the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Is that also the policy of the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Health.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Manitoba Medical Insurance Corporation for the year ended December 31st last. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also, in trying to both be helpful to inform, assist and what have you, or for your own interest or reading, I think it might be helpful with my estimates before the House to distribute to each member an organizational chart of the Department of Health and Social Services. I would also like you, for your own information, I thought this was such an excellent little journal, I didn't know whether all members had a copy or not. It's the journal put out by the Manitoba School at Portage that members may be interested in. I would also like for six copies - I think there's enough for six copies for each Party and two for the Member from -- or one for the Member from Rhineland - a paper on Intake Screening and Juvenile Probation Services and the Family Court that I thought might be helpful to the honourable members. It certainly was to me. And one on Adult Probation Services that I thought could be of assistance.

And while I'm also on my feet, may I just mention to the Honourable Member from Selkirk in response to a question the other day with respect to Tudor House in Selkirk, I have quite a file on it. It has the request by a group of citizens re the feasibility of a personal care home in that community. It's been under active consideration by the local Health Unit, the Elderly Persons Housing and Care Services Division, because there seemed to be some further questions that had to be answered re the proposed financing plus the need, and I'd be happy to go over some of this with the honourable member if he wishes, but I have communicated and will be sending another letter today telling the people that we will be in touch with them again. I think quite a bit of the -- when the first letter came in there were certain questions they had to go back after, and these have been elucidated but there are still some questions that we have to ask re the method of financing.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Will the Honourable Minister favour me with a copy of that letter so that if they do come into my office I can assist them in obtaining the necessary additional information required?

MR. JOHNSON: I'd be happy to give the honourable member a copy of my last letter plus explaining anything to him I can.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The cost to date to the Province of Manitoba of the Commission on Targets for Economic Development.
2. Are further payments to be made by the Province in this connection?
3. What amounts have been paid or are to be paid by way of salaries, wages, honoraria expenses or otherwise to each member of the Commission?
4. The same information as in question 3 with respect to each of the Chairmen of Advisory Committees.
5. The same information as in question 3 with respect to each member of the Central

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)... Research Staff.

6. The same information as in question 3 with respect to each of the Research Consultants.
7. The number of copies of the Commission's Report printed.
8. The cost of printing these Reports.
9. To whom were these Reports distributed?
10. The cost of this distribution.
11. Any costs in addition to the above in connection with the Commission's inquiry and report.
12. The names of all Provincial Government employees who contributed their services to the Commission, and approximate time so contributed.

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie in amendment thereto, and standing in my name. The Honourable the Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, before you proceed, I could ask leave of the House to substitute on the membership of the Public Accounts Committee the name of Mr. Klyza in place of Mr. Jeannotte. We are all aware that Mr. Jeannotte has not been able to attend the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, we would have no objections.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, we too have no objection. We assume that if we had such a request that it, too, would be received in the same way.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. I direct my remarks to the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie. I would like him to know that I have given very serious consideration to the motion of the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie which reads as follows: "That Bill 15, an Act respecting the Diversion of the Churchill River at Southern Indian Lake, be held in the House and the contents of the Bill be sent to the Public Utilities Committee for consideration, and that the Utilities Committee report back to the session."

First and foremost, I took cognizance of our Rule 84 which distinctly states: "Every bill shall be read twice in the House before being referred to the Committee or amended." The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, in drafting his amendment, I feel confident had knowledge of the contents of citation 382 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, which reads as follows: "It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill to move, as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to or differing from the principle's policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution, or otherwise opposed to its progress, or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence, or an opinion of judges."

May I draw the attention of the House to the first part of the citation which states "It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill. . . ." The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, in his amendment, makes no reference nor gives any special reason for not agreeing with the second reading of the bill. In order to invoke the legality of the amendment under citation 382, he must place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of the bill. In my opinion, the proposed amendment makes no reference whatsoever for not agreeing to the second reading of the bill.

My research carried me to our journals, and with particular reference to 1959 journal, Second Session, page 156, and also to 1960 journal page 255 - which in each case reveals that the mover of the amendment did not agree with the second reading of the bill. This, in my opinion, is the reason for the allowance of the respective amendments at that time. The 1965 journals, page 489, also imply that the mover of an amendment to a bill did not agree with the second reading of the bill, and the Speaker at that time ruled the amendment in order by the fact that the honourable member placed on record reasons for not agreeing with the second

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)... reading of the bill in its original form. A stated reference in each case, in my opinion, conformed with citation 382 already referred to, whereby the movers of the amendments gave special reasons for not agreeing with the second reading of the bill, whereas the motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie suggests the holding of the bill in the House but asks for its contents to be discussed in the Public Utilities Committee, which in my opinion is irregular and, in particular, contrary to our rule 84 of Rules, Orders, Forms and Proceedings in this House. In the light of our practices and authorities mentioned, I must therefore rule the motion out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on a point of order. I understand that insofar as the reason for not agreeing, that it is not in the motion. Did I understand as well, though, in your last comments that it is not in order to refer the subject matter to a committee. If the reason is given, is it in order to refer the subject matter?

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the opinion of the honourable gentleman but the rules of the House forbid me to enter into any debate at this particular time. I have made my ruling and there is an alternative, which the honourable gentleman knows.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, I had no intention of challenging your ruling. I was seeking information. I recognize that at this particular time you cannot give it, but insofar as there being no reason mentioned for referring it to the committee, I appreciate that is within the rules and on that basis I will not challenge the ruling.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 23, the Honourable Minister of Finance, speaking in his capacity as the Minister through whom Hydro reports to this Legislature, presented a lengthy speech to the Legislature on the economic merits underlying Bill 15. In his speech the Minister attempted to specify certain facts regarding the potential saving, power, costs, etc. involved in flooding Southern Indian Lake. As the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie mentioned on Friday, we are pleased that the Minister has outlined some of the major economic reasons which have led to the proposal of Bill 15. For one thing, the Minister's statement has served to clarify a number of important points. The Minister has stated that Phase I development of the Nelson River has been radically re-defined since the 1966 legislative hearing. According to the Minister, Phase I no longer includes a project to regulate Lake Winnipeg, a project which the late Mr. Stephens, past chairman of Hydro, stated was - and I quote - "of paramount economic importance to the development of power on the Nelson River." I am referring to the hearings of March 21, 1966, page 34.

The Minister stated that the existing agreement between the Federal Government and the Government of Manitoba regarding Phase I transmission facilities does not bind Manitoba to each program as initially defined in Phase I. The Lake Winnipeg regulation was defined to be an integral part of that agreement, and yet this program has now been legally dropped from Phase I without any re-negotiation of the federal-provincial agreement.

The Minister has stated that we can no longer expect that there will be a substantial export of Phase I Nelson power to neighbouring provinces or states. The Minister has stated we are not locked in to either future development of the Nelson after Phase I or indeed into all the programs which were initially defined in 1966 to be included in Phase I. The Minister has stated there is no technical reason why Manitoba should suffer any type of power shortage or "brown out" if the flooding of Southern Indian Lake is not approved.

The Minister has shown that at least two options exist: 1. Steam plants could be built before any deadline would be reached. 2. Manitoba could import power as it is doing now and will continue to do up until 1971. In short, the Minister has in effect stated that this Legislature is legally and technically free to re-examine all Phase I projects which are yet to be constructed. The only issue at stake is the economic issue of what is, on the basis of today's knowledge, the best plan for all Manitobans.

As soon as possible it will be necessary to determine what new circumstances have led to the above-mentioned changes in Phase I. It will be necessary to see if new circumstances and new facts, such as the higher interest rate and inflated construction costs, have also altered the economic picture regarding the flooding of Southern Indian Lake.

Certainly, it is no longer at all obvious that Nelson River power potential will prove to be the most economical source of energy to meet Manitoba's growing power needs up to the year 2000. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, all Manitobans would be overjoyed if it turns out that we can economically develop the Nelson River to serve our power needs up to the year 2000, but

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.)... we cannot just assume that this will be the case. More specifically, Lake Winnipeg regulation has particular importance to the economic evaluation of the Churchill River Diversion alternatives. It must be stressed that both the high and the low diversions would succeed in diverting the same average flow of water from the Churchill, the major differences being, between the high and the low level diversions, their difference in storage capacity.

It is the need for storage capacity which the Minister claims makes the flooding of Southern Indian Lake economically necessary, but storage capacity, in much larger quantities than the high level diversion will provide, storage capacity is precisely what the Lake Winnipeg regulation was supposed to provide. Storage capacity is required to even out summer and winter water flows and to provide reserve water to be used during dry years. The question is: how does the exclusion of Lake Winnipeg control affect the economic evaluation of storage capacity at Southern Indian Lake? Does this major change in the definition of Phase I serve to inflate the value of storage capacity at Southern Indian Lake?

As regards the subject of the Churchill River Diversion, the Minister discussed this topic on pages 1558 and 1559 of Hansard. He, of course, referred to the massive and exhaustive studies which have been made, studies which we are all keenly interested in. Specifically, however, the Minister states that several alternatives, each of which was studied, existed for diverting the Churchill River into the Nelson basin. The Minister states that these studies started as far back as 1963. A more important question is when the last study was started and finished. Have any studies been conducted since our 1966 hearing? When did it become quite clear that the high level storage scheme for Southern Indian Lake was the best possible alternative? Presumably many major studies have been conducted since 1966 on all topics and alternatives to resource problems etc., but we must see these studies if we, as a Legislature, are to make a decision.

The Minister of Finance went on to state that Manitoba Hydro now calculate that the high level storage scheme has an initial capital cost in the order of \$5 million less than the most attractive low level alternative. In addition, the Minister states that the high level storage scheme will give annual savings to the value of \$1,640,000 over those that would result from the alternatives with only Kettle generating station in service.

I will not comment on this further figure of \$9.09 million savings since this figure deals with the future far beyond Phase I. It is Phase I which is of concern to us today. If we accept these figures, what assumptions are they based upon? For example, do these figures assume that the Lake Winnipeg regulation is not preceded with? As I have already noted, both the high and the low level diversions succeed in diverting the Churchill River. Both schemes, in the words of the Minister, increase the capacity that can be developed along the diversion route by more than 50 percent of the total capacity of all the plants that we have built in the Winnipeg River in Manitoba.

To be more specific, both schemes divert on average roughly 27,000 cubic feet per second into the Nelson River. I will repeat, the major difference between the high and low level diversions is their difference in storage capacity, but storage capacity, in much larger quantities than the Churchill Diversion will provide, is precisely what the Lake Winnipeg regulation would provide if it were implemented. If Lake Winnipeg regulations is not assumed in these calculations, it has become relevant to know how much the existence of the Lake Winnipeg control and storage would manage to effect the annual savings which are stated. It also becomes relevant to know when the Lake Winnipeg regulation is planned to be built.

The Minister took the figure of \$1,640,000 annual saving and then proceeded to add it over a number of years. Over twenty years he claimed he had an accumulated added saving of \$32,800,000. This method of approach, however, does not involve valid economic analysis. As the late Mr. Stephens pointed out in the 1966 hearings - and I'm referring to pages 19 and 20 of March 8, 1966, and I quote: "Valid economic analysis requires that when costs and benefits as between two alternatives are spread out over a number of years, these costs and benefits must be adjusted back to a common base by the use of present worth calculations." In short, it is necessary that all values be discounted back to present day values.

The necessity of using this approach is also outlined thoroughly in "Guide to Benefit Cost Analysis", a major work by Sewell, Davis, Scott and Ross. This work, which was reviewed at the Resources for Tomorrow Conference in 1961, presents a systematic approach to evaluating and selecting resource development projects with particular reference to the

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.)... Canadian scene. Using "present worth" analysis and assuming a 7.5 percent interest rate over 50 years - that's the assumed life of the Hydro project - the present worth of the estimated cumulative annual saving due to the extra storage on the high level diversion is \$21.3 million.

It is not possible to discuss meaningfully later phases beyond Phase I without considering the Lake Winnipeg regulation project. Thus the total saving, \$5 million for capital plus 21.3 million cumulative storage saving, a total savings of the high level diversion over the low level diversion for Phase I, would be \$26.3 million. This figure is roughly \$60 million lower than the Minister would obtain by using this method of analysis. The estimated \$26.3 million of savings must be set against the known economic losses using present worth analysis which will result from flooding Southern Indian Lake.

On the basis of the fragmented pieces of information which we have been able to obtain, the present worth of known economic losses would appear to be costs of the order of four to six million dollars at least for resettlement of communities involved. According to the Winnipeg Free Press, Friday, January 24, 1969, "A Manitoba Government-sponsored survey estimated that flooding of Southern Indian Lake would destroy potential recreational development valued at somewhere between \$8 million and over \$100 million." This same article quoted government estimates of total economic resource loss. It stated that, at a minimum, some \$13 million worth of resources will be destroyed by flooding. High estimates, however, of the total losses involved, were well above the \$100 million. In total, estimated cost amounts to at least \$18 million. However, high estimates of real economic cost involved in flooding range well above the \$100 million. Thus it can be stated that, on the basis of the information before us, the highest possible potential net benefit of present worth savings minus present worth costs of the high level diversion are less than \$10 million. However, it is highly possible, on the basis of present government information, that this scheme to flood Southern Indian Lake would be placing on the people of Manitoba, in real economic terms, a net cost of many times \$10 million. It must be stressed that the above conclusions are based only on fragmented scattered information. We know that, at a maximum, net savings will be less than \$10 million. In short, the Legislature at present has a very unclear picture of the real economics involved in this project.

The economic feasibility of the high level diversion hinges on a delicate balance and this balance itself hinges entirely on the reports which are presently in the government's hands. Mr. Speaker, if we are to act as guardians of the future interests of all Manitobans, members of the Legislature must see these reports at once. In discussing Bill 15, it is important that two points must be remembered. Because something has potential value does not mean that it is economically worthwhile to develop that potential. The proposed flooding of Southern Indian Lake is a segment of Phase I development of the Nelson River. All present discussions must therefore be directed to elucidating the economics of Phase I development. Specifically, it must be noted that while potential energy available from the Nelson when augmented by the flow from the Churchill River is estimated to be 42 billion kilowatt hours per year, only seven billion kilowatt hours - and I'll repeat that figure - only seven billion kilowatt hours per year is estimated to result from Phase I development alone. In order to produce the remaining 35 billion kilowatt hours per year, it will be necessary to construct seven major additions to power capacity involving over 900 million in capital costs. Also involved at least 350 million for additional transmission facilities. In total, the 42 billion kilowatt hours per year will require a minimum total capital cost of 1.866 billion dollars in 1969.

While the Churchill River Diversion will add 12 billion kilowatt hours per year potentially available on the lower Nelson, only roughly 3 billion of this 12 billion potential kilowatt hours would result in Phase I from the diversion of the Churchill. While there will be a potential of five billion kilowatt hours of annual energy that could be produced along the diversion route, there is little evidence to indicate that it would be economical to develop this potential during Phase I. In total, while either the high or low level diversion would increase potential energy-producing capability by 17 billion kilowatt hours in Phase I alone, actual production of electricity will probably be raised by less than three billion kilowatt hours per year throughout the Nelson-Churchill system.

At the end of his speech, the Minister of Finance made certain observations concerning the exact amount of area which will be flooded by this project. I would repeat, however, that the major issue at stake is the issue of what exact damage will be caused by this flooding.

April 28, 1969

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) . . . This issue, of course, is of major concern. In addition, I gather that experts are worried that the presently identified area of flooding will, in fact, be increased over time. I gather that when permafrost in the area is flooded it will melt and this, among other things, may cause additional areas to be flooded.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most succinct way of putting the problem which we, as members of the Legislature, face, would be to ask the Minister the following questions: Would Manitoba Hydro or the government give approval for such a major project on the basis of the information which is presently available to the members of the Legislature? Would Manitoba Hydro or the government be content if consultants merely provided their concluding figures, or would Manitoba Hydro and the government insist that it be each studied in its entirety? The answer must be obvious, Mr. Speaker. Surely both the government and Manitoba Hydro would insist upon seeing the studies. Surely the government would want time to let its own experts examine the whole of these studies so as to be certain that no critical mistake has been made, so as to be certain that all assumptions had been double checked.

Mr. Speaker, any person who accepts responsibility for such a major decision would not evade his duty to double check all relevant studies to ensure they are adequate. We, as members of this Legislature, asked by the government to examine this issue, we ask nothing less and nothing more than the government itself would ask. Unless we are given all relevant studies, I fail to see how it could be claimed that this Legislature has any basis for accepting the responsibility of voting on this bill. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that under Bill 15 the government would assume all final responsibility for each and every aspect of flooding Southern Indian Lake other than the decision regarding the level of flooding. No clearing, no construction of any work could proceed without government approval. Thus, since the government is assuming such a responsibility it must assume responsibility for all studies which will be instrumental in shaping government's decision. It is the government and not Manitoba Hydro to whom we must turn for information since it is the government upon whom ultimate responsibility falls.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important to note that professional concern about this project ranges far beyond Manitoba. Last Saturday, April 26th, an important letter to the editor appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press from Dr. Omond Solandt. As many members no doubt know, Dr. Solandt is Chairman of the Science Council of Canada. In his letter he expressed his personal views, not the official views of the Council. However, I feel that we should take into serious consideration the views of such a distinguished Canadian. There can be no doubt that a man of Dr. Solandt's scientific background would not write such a letter without first examining the situation as fully as he possibly could.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from Dr. Solandt's letter: "I have for some months been following with interest and deep concern the proceedings concerning the flooding of Southern Indian Lake. I had hoped that reason would prevail and that the flooding would not proceed. Unfortunately, I now understand that there is a real possibility that this disastrous action may be taken. I therefore hasten to write to add my views to the many that have already been expressed.

"Most of the statements, both for and against the flooding of Southern Indian Lake by the Churchill River Diversion, have assumed that the development of hydro-electric power where it is reasonably available is an economic necessity. I would seriously question this. We are now at a time in the evolution of the world's energy systems when the cost of power from the burning of fossil fuels is often lower than the cost of hydro power. In addition, the cost of nuclear power will soon be competitive with that from most other sources. In the face of these facts, the devastation of a vast area of country in order to provide only hydro-electric power seems unreasonable. Future Canadians will find it hard to understand the logic of our era which has led us to destroy, by flooding so much magnificent territory, when alternative power sources were available at so little cost.

"Others who have opposed the flooding have emphasized the damage that will be done to the Indian settlement at Southern Indian and Granville Lakes. I heartily concur in their concern with this problem. However, I feel that the devastation of so much of the magnificent lakes and rivers system of the Churchill basin, both above and below Missi Falls, will deprive future generations of Canadians of recreational resources that are even more important to Manitoba and to the nation as a whole."

I will skip a section of the letter and it continues: "For all practical purposes, the

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.)... flooding of an area such as Southern Indian Lake is irreversible. Damage once done cannot be repaired. I hope that before a final decision is reached all possible alternatives will be carefully examined and that in the evaluation, the future importance of wilderness areas will be given due weight." This letter was signed "Omond M. Solandt of Toronto."

Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1967, the late Mr. Stephens was addressing a discussion group on the Southern Indian Lake question. Mr. Stephens was at that time speaking officially for Manitoba Hydro in his capacity as Chairman of the Board of Manitoba Hydro, and he said, and I'll quote him: "I think I should make one point completely clear before I close. While our Act gives us very wide powers and responsibilities in power matters, it does not, nor should it do, give us any overriding authority in the field of water management. Before we can develop or change the pattern of rivers or lakes, we, like any other party, require a licence. Before we are given the right that would be required to divert the Churchill into the Nelson or to alter the levels of Southern Indian Lake, we will have to make application under The Water Power Act or The Water Rights Act and, as we understand the present intention and prospect, we would have to show to an independent body that what we propose would be in the general public interest, not just in the interest of power, and if in the opinion of the independent body we ask too much, we would expect to be granted by that body only such rights as are thought to be in the over-all public interest. Manitoba Hydro, with respect to the Churchill Diversion, is simply a party-at-interest. We are not, nor should we be, lords and masters of the water resources of the province." And this is the statement given by the late Mr. Stephens on March 31, 1967.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should seriously consider these words of the late Mr. Stephens, for this is the place, this is the time, when the discussions must take place regarding what will be done in the general public interest. We cannot shirk responsibility without discussion any more than we can shirk responsibility for the ultimate decision.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Minister made a statement which I believe we all should focus upon, and I quote: "A united and growing Canada needs to take advantage of every major natural resource that she has." I would put that emphasis on the word "every". We must make certain that when the whole picture is examined, all Manitobans come out on top. As the Leader of our Party said last week in this House, and I quote him: "Mr. Speaker, when you are asked to make a decision on this sort of a basis, I think that all of us would do well to go back to what our own experts recommended as a basis of good planning in the field, particularly of resources. Coming out of the 1961 Canadian Conference on Resources were a number of recommendations as to what was a good approach to sound planning for the multi-purpose use of natural resources. The elements that were listed then are as follows as the basis of good planning: 1. The cost of all reasonable alternatives should be obtained. 2. The economic benefit of all reasonable alternatives should be obtained. 3. The cost of damage, disruption, benefits foregone and so on, should be obtained and added to number 1. 4. The intangible costs of each alternative should be assessed. 5. The intangible benefits of each alternative should be assessed. 6. The degree of closure of future options for each alternative should be assessed, and the conclusions then, on the basis of all points proved, the decision as to which is the most economical and desirable alternatives can be made."

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one point very clear. The Liberal Party is demanding nothing less and nothing more than that the rational management and decision-making procedure be followed when the House debates the complex issue of the principle involved in Bill 15. Our position is that in such an all-important matter we would be remiss in our duty if we did not demand that the government publicly and beyond all reasonable doubt prove that Bill 15 is the wisest and most economical way to proceed. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has at no time stated that it will vote against Bill No. 15; neither have we stated that we will vote for Bill 15. Our position is that with the present information before this House, no responsible member can vote on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that you considered the proposed amendment of my colleague the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie out of order, and I therefore want to propose a new amendment which I believe, after consulting the rules and precedents, is in order. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Selkirk, that all the words after the word "That" in the first line thereof be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "in the opinion of this House, insufficient basic information has been supplied to this House at this time by the

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.)... government to allow a vote on principle on second reading of Bill 15, and that the subject matter of the bill be referred immediately to the Public Utilities Committee for consideration and report back to the House during this session of the Legislature, and that in the meantime Bill 15 be held in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I'll take a second look at this and take it under advisement.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the member who just spoke permit one question. I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Member for St. George whether or no he has personally availed himself to the offer made on numerous occasions by Manitoba Hydro to personally pursue and peruse all the reports that he has referred to in his lengthy speech.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I personally didn't request it but other members of my Party have.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education)(St. Vital): Would the honourable member tell me again about Dr. Solandt's letter to the editor? Could he give me the date and...?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes, last Saturday's paper, April 26th.

MR. SPEAKER: ... the business of the House proceed to second readings?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services, that Mr. Speaker to 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: Department of Health and Social Services. 1. (a)...

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I believe that I had the floor when we adjourned last Friday morning. At the time, Mr. Chairman, I had mentioned that I thought that probably this department needed reorganization, but I felt that the department was too large and it was too much for one man to handle, and especially today, after seeing the chart that the Minister was good enough to have distributed to the members where we see the make-up of the department, nothing has changed my mind. I mentioned on Friday, I made a statement on the Medicare and also discussed the nursing profession, their salaries and wages, and I asked the Minister a few questions on this. I suggested that maybe we should have -- the clerical work done in the hospitals should be done by ward clerks. That's something that has been mentioned here many times, as something that would speed up procedure and relieve the nurses for what they would like to do, I am sure -- that is, the actual care of patients.

Then I also asked the Minister to see if we could have a copy of this research project that's supposed to be finished; that is, the more effective use of registered nurses. This project was done with the co-operation of the Department of National Revenue -- National Health, excuse me. We've been talking too much about revenue lately that I'm a little mixed up. -- (Interjection) -- I'm getting a lot of help from my honourable friend here in the front.

On Thursday the Minister, while introducing the estimates of his department, said, and I quote -- there's a few sentences here, some statements that I agree with 100 percent, and one of them was: "We should put our emphasis and major thrust into preventative programs," and then I skip a few lines and he's got: "To achieve the maximum integration and co-ordination of services at the level where people require help; and secondly, to bring forth those ideas and programs that have preventative possibilities."

Well, Mr. Speaker, at the time, or last week I also mentioned or suggested -- and I've been doing this for a number of years now -- that the government establish a Department of Youth, and I would like to leave this again with the Minister. I think that this is a department that can take some of the load from this department, especially in the correction, rehabilitation and so on of our youth. It is a department that certainly could help because I think it is, as I said, humanly impossible for one Minister to have all these responsibilities. Starting with the Hospital Commission, the Medicare, now which is quite a responsibility, Public Health Division, Social Services, Administration, Mental Health, Housing -- this is something new that was added to him also, and all those other responsibilities.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)

I think, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is probably one of the most important departments that we have in Manitoba. I think that it is something that we're pioneering an awful lot, or we're starting something new; it's not old stuff in this department; and I think that all the members of this House should work together in co-operation here or it's going to break the province and we won't achieve what we're after. The Minister stated that -- maybe I should quote him directly: "This is more than just a problem of holding the line or keeping cost increases within the resources of the province."

Later on he says: "The introduction of new services must be controlled and co-ordinated." He's talking about, of course, Mr. Chairman, in the field of hospital care. Well this is true, Mr. Chairman, but we'll have to be really careful here. We have an increase for the hospital care from the previous year of nearly \$10 million, but out of this \$10 million there is 7.7 that is required for the increase in salaries, or 77 percent of the total increase. Then, as I said, there's the drugs, there's the food and so on, so it leaves very little for new programs. I agree with the Minister that we have to be careful and we have to choose and co-ordinate these programs, but nevertheless there won't be any point in keeping on with the research, in the research done in other parts of the world, if we do not try to keep up with the times. We want to do this, as we heard in the field of power in Hydro, and this is really a human field; I think that we have to keep this up.

Now you might say, well, on the one hand you don't want to spend too much money and then you say that we should progress, and this is so true, Mr. Chairman. So then what? Well, I say that we haven't done enough; we haven't done enough to spend wisely the dollars that we have in this field. I think that an awful lot more could be done in home care, for instance. I've been suggesting for years that the department - and this is one good thing about this re-organization of this department - I've been suggesting for years that the Department of Health and the Department of Welfare should get together with the administration of different hospitals, and I suggested, after quite a debate and a few amendments that were out of order by the then Minister of Health of last year, I think that the House agreed with me in the dying days of the last session, that we should make strong representation to the Federal Government; we should get together as soon as possible, because this is what's good for Canada. It'll profit all the different provinces. I think that we should get together and have another look at this. At this time we received no help at all from the Federal Government for home care or for nursing homes, for a lot of those programs, but we do get all kinds of help for the, what do they call -- the acute care hospitals. We have waiting lists - the waiting lists are about the same. The cost of this, especially in these acute care hospitals, the cost of operating, I think I have this here also - it's increasing all the time. Yes, the average annual cost of operating each bed in 1967 was \$9,237; 1968, \$10,574; or a 14.7 percent increase, and it's going up and up and up.

Well, there is only one way, and this is not partisan politics. We have to insist; we have to take another look at this, and we have to start instead of building all these new beds, acute beds -- half the time we can't staff them anyway. We cannot go on forever. Just the salaries will cost a fortune and we have to help the government on this. We cannot keep on yelling that you need more beds, more beds. I don't think that this is quite a responsible statement to just blindly say we need more beds. We've had an awful lot more beds. I would like to start at the bottom of the ladder, Mr. Chairman. I would like to see, and I don't think that we're even spending what was allotted under this system of home care, and there's only one way of looking at this - we have too many programs here and this should be high on the priority list of this government; that we should be a little more responsible. Taxes, it doesn't matter; there's nothing free. You say, "We're going to get this, and if we spend this it will be matched by Ottawa." Well, it's time that we become a little more responsible. It is our money; it is the money of the taxpayers; and if that money is spent, if it's not spent wisely, we won't have it for something else, and I think that all the provinces should be -- there's no reason why we should be divided on this.

This hospitalization program has been going on now for quite a long time, and it's highly time that we sit down, the federal government and the different provincial governments, and see how it can be improved - and in the financing, for one thing. Then we could -- we can look at this; we can be a little more responsible. As I say, we can see what can be done in the homes. Especially now that we have this Medicare program going, I think it could be improved. A lot has been done but I think we could do more. As far as I'm concerned, this should be the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... No. 1 priority. Start at the bottom, the home care. There's a lot of people, as long -- if they see a nurse -- and I'm sure the nurses would much sooner do this, be part of a team that would go on and give care in the home than be writing charts all day. I think that this is something that we should do as a team that would -- or more teams. It certainly won't be as costly. What is the cost now? The per diem rate is what? Around \$40.00 or so, or more, in the hospitals? Well, 30.00 in some hospitals, but not in General Hospital, St. Boniface and Grace Hospital.

Well then, if we could have these teams going around, I think that we could accomplish an awful lot. A lot of these people would be satisfied staying at home if they had the visit of a doctor maybe once every second day and the nurses every day, or even twice a day, and we would save an awful lot of money, but we have to provide this, the help. If the government would say all right, this is a socialist program that we have on this question of hospital care and doctor care. Well, all right. Why say you have to be in this hospital? Do you have to be using a bed that cost \$40.00, \$40.00, \$50.00 a day or you don't qualify for anything? It's kind of ridiculous -- you get the whole thing or nothing at all. I think it's quite ridiculous. Then we can go back and, when we graduate, or a study from this home care, then we could go on and look at the nursing homes, and I think that they should come in, all the centralization and the help that we should give these people. We should start, as I say, at the bottom of the ladder. And then the geriatric hospitals, rehabilitation hospitals, and so on. And then, only then, see what waiting lists we have, because we know that when we're talking, when we're dealing with human beings, we know that some doctors will keep their patients in the acute beds because there the federal government, or the government I should say, is responsible for all the bills, and they'll keep them there. They'll keep them there a lot longer, two or three days. Well if you had two or three days, if you can knock off . . . -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? That's right. As soon as they leave the hospital they're off the assistance, they have no help at all.

I get phone calls once in a while, like all of you I am sure, by some of the people that say, "Well my mother's in the hospital. I have to find a place for her, but I can't afford it," or "It's so difficult; so what do I do?" Well, I'm practically tempted to say, well, keep her in there as long as possible because then you'll never get back in that hospital. Now if there was a system and this is certainly -- I'm not criticizing the government except I'm urging the government to go a little faster on this. This is something that I have been advocating for many years. I think this should definitely be on the top of our priority list, because we will keep on spending more money. This is something new. There are heart transplants now; there are kidney transplants; and are we going to say, "Well no; we are only allowed in this hospital two a year or three a year?" Is that what we are going to do? I wouldn't want to be the one who would tell the father, "No. We're finished. We can't try this operation and try to save your son's life because we've already had two this year."

So, as you see, Mr. Chairman, we will spend an awful lot of money so we should try to save some, and the federal government should be a little more realistic on this and if we get together when the Ministers -- and by the way, I would like the Minister to report on the meetings that they have had since we met last, since last year, because this is one of the suggestions that I made at the time, that the Ministers of Health of the different provinces get together and talk this thing over and then insist the federal government should review this situation. I know that I keep repeating this year after year, Mr. Chairman, but I think that it is very important. I think it is the only way that we could be responsible, not just say, well all right, Ottawa pays half of this so let's build more beds, more acute beds. We will end up one of these days, we'll probably have too many of those and not enough of the others, and you know how much this is spending.

Now another thing; I don't know where we are at now on this question of Deer Lodge. This is another thing that I mentioned many times, that there are beds that are wasted there and this is something that we should look into. Now is it something, is it a political battle between two forms of departments. If not, you can see that there is something going wrong either here or in Ottawa because, while we're spending a fortune trying to get more beds, there are beds that are empty in certain hospitals that could be used, so if they can't be used I'd like to know why, Mr. Speaker. The waiting lists in the hospitals are about the same -- I think they're being steady. I read where a certain doctor stated that he didn't have enough beds but I can't fault the Minister on this. I'm not going to start getting up here every year -- I

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... could, every year, and say you haven't got enough beds, and if we ever move en bloc this party here on the other side of the House, and the Minister comes on this side, he can do the same thing. It wouldn't be responsible to try to build a bed for every single citizen in Manitoba. It would be ridiculous, but these are the ways that we can do these things.

Now, I don't think there's -- I spoke for quite a while on Friday. It's no use going too far on this - we'd have other chances. I was going to cover the Manitoba Hospital Commission and we haven't had a chance to reorganize our department as thoroughly as the government did, but my colleague here will be dealing with the Welfare part of this department a little later on, so I'll give the other party a chance to ask some questions and the Minister a chance to reply to them and then later on we could go on the Manitoba Hospital Commission and the different programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, I open my remarks on the Health and Social Services estimate, with congratulations and also with an apology. My congratulations are to the Minister on having been shown great confidence by his leader in being placed in charge of the largest and the most difficult and the most demanding portfolio of all cabinet posts. I think I can say that without reservation because it involves not only what was carried by two ministers with their respective deputies, but it involves also large portions of what previously was in the hands, or the department of the Attorney-General. There may be some other departments which have also been raided to bring portions of their work under the direction of the Honourable Minister. I haven't been able quite to discover which ones they are as yet. As the Honourable Member for St. Boniface suggested in the beginning of his address, it seems to be far more than any one man should be asked to carry, all that work, and I concur with him in that statement and in that observation.

Then my apology, Mr. Chairman, is to the Honourable Minister for having been late on Friday when the Minister was completing his presentation. Since I am speaking and had planned to speak on these estimates, I felt that I should have shown him the courtesy of being present when he began the continuation of his address, which was interrupted by time being called, but I assure him that my absence at that time was unavoidable. It was not intentional; it wasn't an intentional absence; and so I offer him my apologies in the certainty that he will accept it and understand.

But then, on to this enormous department. The mere listing of his coverage extends over five pages in the estimates as compared to some others which take only one page or even part of a page. The total expenditures in his department are shown as being 96 million, some odd hundred thousand dollars, which is the largest for any department except education. Education shows a total of \$149 million but of that amount there are fixed expenses in the Department of Education in the form of grants amounting to \$126 million. They are a routine and necessary expenditure that, as I can see it looking into the department from the outside, means merely a regular issuing of cheques made out to the various school boards and school systems of the province. And in the Education Department that leaves of course \$23 million, but even that is large when it is compared with, say, the Attorney-General's Department or some of the other departments, and I wonder how it was possible to find sufficient work for the various ministers in their much lesser departments than, say, this Department of Health and Social Services.

The one department that carries the greatest responsibility, that involves the greatest difficulty in administering, must be this one department. I can't understand that there would be any other that would supersede it, and the Honourable the Minister, in explaining the size of his department and the multiple areas that it covered, has said that there were so many related areas that in spite of the fact that Health and Welfare had earlier been separate departments, that there was so much that seemed logically to belong together for administrative purposes that, along with some of the related fields that had been in the Attorney-General's Department, it was felt wise to combine these services, these fields, lump them all together and put them under one head. They were placed in this department with an appropriate number of deputies and assistants and with the Honourable the Minister at the top, and as I looked at this arrangement, the impression grew on me that by the same logic other departments could well be telescoped in the same way, with comparatively little disruption in any of them, and probably to the advantage of some. I looked them over and came to the conclusion that under the same or similar arrangements we could come up with, say, a total of four departments in addition to

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.)... the Health and Social Services, each with its appropriate number of deputies and assistants, and we could wind up with a neat little package of, say, five ministers and the Premier to make up the cabinet. Each would be king in his domain, paying homage to their overlord who, as the Bible says, "having nothing yet had all", to rule over, direct and guide these five minor kings under his authority.

Now, if this arrangement is logical, if the arrangement of the Health and Social Services is logical in one case, it should be in others. If we look for places to economize, it seems that here is a ready-made opportunity. Here is a place that is easily available. A precedent has been given by this particular department and others could follow suit, and we would be able to eliminate the salaries of - how many are there altogether? Thirteen ministers? Twelve. We could eliminate the salaries of twelve of the different -- seven cabinet ministers, and if the Department of Health and Social Services operates efficiently and the others therefore, telescoped or combined, would operate efficiently, we would be saving effort and energy and time in which these men are involved. But then, not expecting my good suggestion to be followed, wise as it is, we still have this one department - large department - and I am fearful that the good, the amiable, the kind, the even-tempered minister, will find that the pressures of this heavy office will some time soon begin to put an edge on his patience, an edge on his amiability, and like a saddle horse with a burr under his saddle, he may begin to display sides to his character that we have never seen and we never suspected. And it will all be because of the pressure. There's a limit to what one man can stand or, bearing it, he will have to summon up all the endurance, the strength, the staying power that his forebears, the great Vikings - who else? - had in such rich measure, and that they gave evidence of in their travels across the frozen seas, leading them to the shores of North America some 500 years before Christopher Columbus set foot taking a southern route on the balmy Bahamas.

That ought to be good for some kind of a poetic prize. Or to bring my illustration down to a period nearer to our times, the Honourable the Minister will need the endurance, the staying power of a Canadian hero, a man who brought home to Canada two olympic gold medals from Stockholm for leading the world in the 5,000 and the 10,000 metre contests in 1912, and that man's name was Joe Keeper. Some of the oldsters will remember him; some of the youngsters won't know whom I'm talking about. I like to mention him because, if for no other reason, than that I feel that such men should not be forgotten, men who brought honour to our country, and this same Joe Keeper is now 83 years of age. He lives at Norway House but if he lived instead at Southern Indian Lake, our government would probably be planning to flood him out along with all the others and pay no respect to him for having held high the banners for Canada as long ago as 1912.

Now, just in case the Chairman may think that I'm wandering a bit, I assure you that I'm not, because I'm speaking of a healthy man under the Health Estimates. He was a man of health and vigor - the type of man that the Honourable the Minister approves of, and a man of endurance; a man whom the Minister will be compelled to emulate in his own way, showing endurance and stability, if he is to stand up under the stresses and the strains of his office and administer what amounts to one quarter - that's twenty-five percent - of the total provincial budget in what is now his department. I mentioned Joe Keeper and I was interested to read earlier in March that his son, Joseph Irwin Keeper, has been appointed by the government to act as Executive Director to the Manitoba Metis Federation. He has acted as liaison officer at Cedar Lake, Moose Lake and Easterville, and the appointment now was made by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services and I give the Minister full marks - full marks for that appointment.

But I can't give him full marks for taking on a job that, even with the aid of able assistants, represents not only too great a demand on any one man but he may be doing the people of Manitoba a disservice, not to mention the disservice to himself. Indeed, it appears that in certain areas his greatly enlarged department is already loosening at the seams and perhaps beginning to fall apart. I cite the resignation of one of his top men in the Juvenile Probation Service, Mr. Ken Calmain, and he gave as the reason for resigning, as he put it, "chronic under-staffing and the unsatisfactory way in which the government's reorganization plans are proceeding. In a statement to the press earlier this month, he suggested that other staff members may be obliged to consider leaving the Probation Service, and he also expressed surprise, or puzzlement, at the plans to integrate Correctional and Probational Services with other services in the Department, taking them away from the Department where they had previously been, in

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) the Attorney-General's Department. He felt that in the present circumstances, the basic problem involved in probation and correction was not being reached, thus creating additional problems and failing to do the job that was really and basically required. But I am not going to follow this line of thinking through. I expect that some of my colleagues will pick this matter up and develop the theme but I do notice that in this large page that we received today, that Correctional Services seems to hold -- rather Correctional Institutions seems to hold rather a minor position in respect to many of the other areas that are being dealt with and which doesn't augur too well for the future in Correctional Services.

I have seen the Vaughan Street Jail after its improvement, remodelling and painting, and that's where some of the people who are subject to correctional services are housed, I believe, and will be housed. It's a big improvement over what it was but it is still a cage, barred and locked, and I wasn't aware of any kind of a program in there in which the inmates were involved. There was one young man who was whittling away with very limited tools and creating beautiful covered wagons, replicas of the real thing, and I was very much attracted. With the proper kind of shop and assistance and encouragement and equipment, he would be able to do a considerable amount that he is not now doing. This is only one instance. But the pity of it all is, it seemed to me, that there was little being done to help to rehabilitate this man - young man. He was -- I don't know how old he was; he wasn't very old. And if correctional services are being conducted, they could be and should be conducted on a very much larger scale than what they are there and probably elsewhere. The feeling that I have - and this is a feeling; I have no statistics to give - is that any correction is being given on a minimal basis. This young man had been charged with breaking and entering, and I think it was the man in charge said, "Now, when he gets out of here he'll probably go ahead and do the same thing." It would be interesting to know what -- (Interjection) -- yes. He said, "and he'll be right back."

It would be interesting to know what is being done to help to place this young man and dozens of others in situations when they leave the institution, to place them in situations where they will be able to take advantage of the abilities that they have, and perform to their own benefit and the benefit of the community rather than to become a charge on the community by having them continually arrested and re-arrested. Each time, they are discharged with the knowledge that there is nothing for them to go to except probably to commit the same kind of a crime as they did again, and they start the regular merry-go-round of coming back and coming back.

There were, we were told of, two young men who were in the jail who were - I think there were two, rather than four - who were there on a night-time basis, either studying or working during the day, and that sort of thing I would certainly go along with and encourage. But why it is so limited I don't understand, unless there's a lack of facilities or a lack of a total program that would enable more and more to do the same thing, because it is in that direction that our hope lies, and if our jails are to be emptied in some way or another, then everything must be done to help these men to rehabilitate themselves when they do get out.

I wasn't going to get off on this tack but I did. It's an interesting thing to me, this business of rehabilitation. I have an old - well, I'd say an old file - bunch of files. My wife calls them "the junk cupboard" and some of these date back to as far as 1930, 1929, '31, '32 and so on. I really don't want to inject myself too much into this thing but that's what these clippings are about. I don't take clippings out of newspapers that are about other men; I take them if they are about myself. If my name appears in them I cut them out, and so I have these clippings. Here's one - December 18, 1933, in the Free Press. I had waxed critical about Canadian prisons and the penitentiaries, and if they are supposed to reform that they are failing in their duties. And this was 36 years ago! If the jails and the penitentiaries haven't improved any more than they seem to have improved in the last 30 years, then it will probably be another 30 years before very many advances have been made, and I think it's unfortunate that this corrections and rehabilitation, or probation, has been placed in a department that has so much other work to do that it cannot really, under one man, pay the proper attention that it should to this phase of living and of rehabilitating people.

I believe the Honourable the Minister has some answers to this. I would certainly like to hear them. I would be very interested in knowing what he has to say. Can you not hear? I'm not asking you now. Pardon?

MR. JOHNSON . . . the last point there. . .

MR. PETURSSON: Sorry, I can't hear you. -- (Interjection) -- What was the last point?

April 28, 1969

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) I was saying that I thought that the Minister -- I thought I say him smiling and I thought he had an answer to what I had to say, and I would be very interested in knowing what he was going to say and how he would reply to this because this is a deep and difficult subject, and -- yes, what I did say was it was unfortunate that the government had seen fit to place this department into another department that had so many other things that it has to be concerned about and look after; that it might be like the stepchild and be pushed out into the back shed and not get the attention that it really should.

Now, to get on with other things. I wish to raise a couple of other questions and then go on to the question of nursing homes and some related matters. One subject that is repeatedly being broached by people who discuss the new medical plan with me, is the premium that each is called upon to pay, that \$9.80 - and this doesn't include the hospitalization - but \$9.80 sticks in many people's minds, \$9.80 for a married couple. So far when people come to me, I really haven't been able to give any kind of a satisfactory answer as to why this same amount is levied across the board, levied on all members of the Plan. Those on low income point out to me the unfairness, the inequity of having this levied across the board; and I have to agree. The only answer I can give, and nobody accepts it, except to laugh at it, is that the Minister of Health and the Premier and the government as a whole, want to feel that they are on an equal footing with even the lowliest cleaning woman, say, in the Legislative Building - that is, they all pay an equal amount. The lady that vacuums the rugs in this Chamber and dusts the desks and the Premier of the Province, they are equal - they pay an equal amount. In the payment of their Medicare premium, they can stand side by side and say we are equals, even though there may be differences in other respects. She doesn't ride home in - now I don't know what kind of a car the Premier drives - -- (Interjection) -- is it a Buick? - I put down Buick, I figured that that was about his style. But this cleaning woman doesn't drive home in a Buick. She does not receive a legislator's indemnity; she does not take trips to Florida or wherever it is that the Premier decides to go when he's taking a rest or vacationing. She doesn't smoke big fat cigars. But equality comes when she pays her Medicare premium and there at least she gets a receipt for exactly the same amount as the Premier of the Province of Manitoba gets - no more, no less - or the Minister of Health and Social Services or any one of the other members of the Cabinet. The only thing that is different is the equality of income, and after all that must have to be the real measurement of equality and of the ability to pay.

Another point brought to my attention a day or two ago is an abuse that seems to be developing in the doctor-patient relationship, and particularly where welfare or low income patients are concerned. I was informed of an old age pensioner, a woman, that called on a doctor for some minor treatment and she was told that she would have to pay on a cash basis before she could receive the treatment. She told the receptionist who was informing her that she had no money, all she had was her old age pension cheque, \$78.00, and the girl then offered to take the cheque and cash it for her and deduct the doctor's bill. The old age pensioner was offered an alternative, either of accepting that arrangement or of not receiving the treatment that she had called on the doctor to give. And I wondered how the Honourable the Minister could deal with cases of this kind. Is it possible, is it possible to provide information for such people as this elderly woman so that they may be advised of what their rights are and what they can do. Can publicity be given to an information source where people may turn to? How can abuses of this kind be overcome?

For a long time medical men have been held up before the people in such a way that people have naturally esteemed them. They felt that they were something above the ordinary run of human individuals and the doctors themselves have maintained an image of righteousness and service, of helpfulness to the sick and ailing, of being a haven of mercy for those who needed the ministry of healing hands. Doctors have set themselves up and have been objects of worship. They have set themselves up as and have been objects of worship almost by some people. But now after Medicare has been introduced into the province, the revelation that the doctors are like others, they also have feet of clay. They are victims of the same common everyday shortcomings that other men are victims of. It comes as a shock to some to realize that they are not after all a priestly class before whom people must bow; that they are not made of better stuff than the rest of us are; they are merely human beings and they are subject to all the shortcomings that human beings ordinarily are and it is being revealed very clearly as a result of the Medicare Act - and many medical men would wish that that Act had never been passed. This is one problem that the Honourable Minister will have to deal with.

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.)

The doctors originally expressed a great concern about possible abuses of the Medicare plan. They felt that many abuses would creep in, such as over-utilization; but in their eyes, the abuses would be by the people, by the people who came to them for treatment. But what do they now say about the abuses of some of their own fraternity? What does the Honourable Minister say and how will he deal with this aggravating and aggravated problem?

There's another problem that I also have on my mind that I would like to present and hope that the Honourable Minister may be able to give me some information on, that he could shed some light on the subject. It has to do with the municipal hospitals, the King George, King Edward, the Princess Elizabeth. I sat on the Municipal Hospital Commission for several years as one of two citizen members. A number of years ago now, dating back to about 1959 or '60, a proposal was made that an addition be built to that hospital complex, to help to relieve the pressure on the hospitals, that was then evident and is still evident, for admission and a move was developed to have a building added to the municipal hospitals. A submission was made first to the Manitoba Survey Board in 1960, in July, and then this was revised and re-submitted in 1963, I think it was in December. A letter was received by the administrator of the hospitals in 1962, in January, from the Honourable the Minister, confirming the availability of grants and the - if I still have it - and the letter concluded with the words, that I can read when I flip it over, concluded with the words - well, prior to that it's stated here, "On the basis of these studies, it is planned that hospital construction grants be available to your hospital during the following years" - and then the years are listed - "for additional beds, for an elevator in the King Edward, renovation of King George" - and so on - halfway house and other things. And then at the bottom of the letter it concludes, "The Manitoba Hospital Survey Board has confirmed the importance to the community which you serve of additional facilities at your hospital, and I am hopeful that it will be possible for you to proceed with the necessary planning to implement the recommendations. I should like to assure you that all possible assistance will be offered to your hospital by the government through the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan. I shall follow the further development of your hospital's facilities with keen interest. Yours very truly, signed "George Johnson, M D., Minister of Health."

This was prior to the Honourable the Minister taking over the Education job. And then there is another letter - well, let me take this in order. The City Council approved of the city's share, 20 percent share of the total project in June 1963, and that is also in the form of a letter here and it concludes with the words saying, "It would be hoped that construction could be commenced sometime in 1963 and completed perhaps early in 1967," and this being a letter confirming the allotment of the 20 percent share of the City of Winnipeg. But after that there were delays, there were more delays and there were more delays, and I have a letter here that was addressed to me by the city administrator - I think that was during the one single year that I was Chairman of the Municipal Hospital Commission Board - "The enclosed material forms the final functional programming for our building project, and these are the finalized conclusions arrived at following joint and individual meetings with every department during the past two months, at which time, along with the architects and at times representatives of the Manitoba Hospital Commission, we reviewed and amended the initial programs which were submitted to the Manitoba Hospital Commission in preliminary form at our meeting of February 17 last. We are now ready to submit this detail to Mr. Pickering."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would remind the honourable member that he has two minutes left.

MR. PETURSSON: I didn't think I had spoken that long. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I will be able to. I will just take time to read one additional extract and then I'm finished for now, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

In 1964, on May 15, the statement was "enclosed material forms the final functional programming for our building project." And then two years passed and another letter was written to the chairman and members of the Hospital Commission. "The attached is our finalized functional program completed to cover all the areas of our program that we are in a position to project at the present time" - April 13, 1966 - that's two years later. And July 4, 1967, "Enclosed is a copy of the Winnipeg Municipal Hospitals functional program which was forwarded to the Manitoba Hospital Commission July 4, 1967."

That is, functional programs have been drawn up, re-drawn and re-drawn again, and up to now there hasn't been a single spadeful of earth turned over to construct that hospital. Since 1960 it's been in the making. In the meantime, Grace Hospital, which probably got

April 28, 1969

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) going sometime about the same time, has now been operating for two years and the Victoria Hospital, which entertained the idea of building on the municipal hospital grounds at one time but those plans or those ideas were changed, but the Victoria Hospital is now under construction and probably before the end of the year will be in operation. In the meantime, the ground on which this addition to the municipal hospitals was to have been built and has been planned for since 1960 is still just the way it was at that time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will leave things at that point.

..... continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, like the other two members who have just spoke, I feel that the Minister has taken on a tremendous task in assuming the duties of this office, particularly when one considers the fact that the field of correction has also been placed under his jurisdiction. In my opinion, the field of correction is of sufficient importance to warrant a separate department. I know that the Minister will give everything that he has towards all the ramifications of his department and I know too that he will tackle his problems with sincerity and with purpose, but at the same time, I think that this government is taking advantage of the old slogan, "let George do it".

What I'd like to deal with, Mr. Chairman, is, generally speaking, the question of delinquency, juvenile delinquency, and in approaching this subject, and in my opinion, I believe that the basic weakness to our approach to all problems of crime in all its ramifications lies not so much in the reception, care, treatment, custody, and rehabilitation of offenders, but in our failure to approach the problem of juvenile delinquency in a comprehensive and co-ordinated way by preventing beginning problems from developing into adult problems. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I think that we are dealing with symptoms rather than causes, and I think that our emphasis today should be placed upon preventing beginning problems from becoming juvenile or permanent problems.

Now it is true that the treatment and re-education of delinquents is a form of prevention, but in my opinion such an approach is not sufficiently basic and our energies and resources should be extended back to the period before the delinquent behaviour has actually begun. The majority of our adult offenders have a background of juvenile delinquency, and if by placing our emphasis on that period of pre-delinquency we had then taken the necessary preventative steps, I am sure that our efforts would have been rewarded in the avoidance of suffering and in the saving of human and financial resources.

It is unfortunate that our definition of juvenile delinquent is far too inclusive and the average individual assumes that this definition connotes some individual under the age of 18 years of age who has committed a crime under the Criminal Code. This is not so. The definition of a juvenile delinquent is any child, and in Manitoba under 18 years of age, who violates any provision of the Criminal Code or of any Dominion or Provincial Statute or of any by-law or ordinance of any municipality, or who is guilty of sexual immorality or any similar form of vice, or who is liable by reason of any other Act to be committed to an Industrial School or Juvenile Reformatory under the provisions of any Dominion or Provincial Statute. I have always felt that the expression "Juvenile Delinquent" should only be confined to someone who has committed an offence under the Criminal Code. I do not think that such a term should be used to denote someone who has been guilty of a breach of a municipal by-law simply riding on a sidewalk or doing some such trivial act, nor do I think that the expression should be extended to any juvenile under the age of 18 who commits an offence under a provincial statute because we have no authority or power under provincial law to make an offence a crime. We are only dealing with breaches of provincial statutes, and a breach of a provincial statute is not at law a crime. I believe that if we had the definition of a juvenile delinquent changed we might be able to cope with the problem in a more scientific and basic way.

Now I have always felt that the responsibility, that is the primary responsibility for the upbringing and training of children lies with the parents, but unfortunately there are many parents who shirk that responsibility or are morally incapable of discharging it. Again, we have parents who look upon life in a strictly material way and to whom morality has become a matter of convenience and not a fundamental concept of good citizenship. It is to these two groups that our efforts must be directed as the only means of protecting their children. In other words, they are incapable of protecting their own children and for that reason the state must step in and do a job which is primarily theirs.

Now so far our efforts have been left in the hands of specific community agencies - the police, the school, social and recreational agencies and child guidance clinics. Now all of these agencies have made a worthwhile contribution but their work and efforts have been handicapped by a lack of co-ordination and co-operation, resulting in a difference of aims and standards and an overlapping and, in some cases, a gap in services. No doubt there are various solutions to this problem, but I am of the opinion that our best solution would be by the government of Manitoba establishing regional co-ordinating councils to give leadership to, and consultation with, these agencies. I believe that just recently in the City of Winnipeg that an effort has been made to co-ordinate the work of these agencies and I'll look forward with anticipation

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) to see how it works out.

Now I believe that these co-ordinating councils or agencies should be composed of home-spun individuals, not high-salaried so-called specialists who are more interested in the propounding of theories and the issuing of reports than in finding a solution. I believe, and I firmly believe, that parents who have made a success of bringing up their own children are the best types of people to have on these committees, people who know from experience the vicissitudes of life insofar as juveniles are concerned and people who have met the problem and have solved the problem. It's not going to be solved by looking up textbooks for theories; it is going to be solved by a practical application of common sense, and I think that's one field where we have been entirely lacking. I feel too, Mr. Chairman, that if we are to solve, or partially solve this problem, there must be a total community involvement, utilizing to their fullest extent the services of all of these agencies under the supervision of these regional co-ordinating councils.

About ten years ago, in my own constituency, a voluntary organization composed of a psychiatrist from the Selkirk Hospital of Mental Diseases, a provincial public health nurse, a local social worker, a member of the RCMP and a youth councillor was set up. Now this organization would investigate behaviour problems reported from schools by interviewing the child or children, the parent or parents, ascertaining the basic cause or reason of the problem, and making the necessary adjustments or taking the necessary remedial action. During the period of this committee's operation there was a substantial reduction in reported juvenile offences, and rightfully so, this committee felt that their work was responsible for that reduction.

I believe that such a committee could be set up in each community in Manitoba, and if that committee's work were done conscientiously and sincerely it would result in an early identification of potential delinquents, and if each community could so organize, it would be quite easy to have a blanket coverage over the whole Province of Manitoba. To me, one of the most difficult problems that we have to face, and which juvenile court judges have to face, is not in finding whether an individual charged with a delinquency is guilty or innocent, but after finding that individual guilty, in determining what is the proper punishment to be imposed.

In my opinion, the difficulty arises through our failure to relate or bring about a meeting of minds with the juvenile in question. In short, it is a total failure of communication. I believe that this failure exists in most cases in which juveniles are involved, and I believe that we might be able to partially solve this problem and to reduce juvenile delinquency by introducing into our juvenile courts the Fort Lauderdale system of having juvenile juries sit in with juvenile court judges, not for the purpose of ascertaining the guilt or innocence of an accused but for recommending to the judge the punishment which should be meted out. Naturally, the judge would not have to follow the recommendations of such a jury, but I feel that the institution of such a system would act as a chain of liaison between the court and the accused and thus be a means of closing that communication gap.

I have referred to the Fort Lauderdale system; that was the system introduced into Fort Lauderdale by a magistrate there. It has been in operation now for ten or more years and it has proved very very successful. It has been copied in other jurisdictions in the United States with the same successful results, and I believe that in Manitoba it would be worthwhile trying it out here. Today we are living in an age of good guys and bad guys and I think it is pretty nearly time that we started to make use of the services of the good guys to catch the bad guys, and there's no place that we could more logically start than would be the juvenile field. I made this recommendation to the House several years ago and at that time I thought the then Attorney-General was going to take some action in respect of it, but evidently no action has been taken, or at least there's no outward signs of any such action having been taken.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I'm sorry that the Honourable Minister has been loaded down with all the additional work now involved in his department. It is my feeling that there should be a separate department for this particular service. I'm sorry too that the field of corrections has become a branch of the Department of Welfare. I still think that it should have been retained, if you were not going to create a new department, with the Attorney-General's Department.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think anyone has the answer to all the problems that confront us today in the juvenile field, but I do believe that perhaps the best way to approach the solution to this problem is through engaging the community in joint community efforts, and I hope that the Honourable Minister will try and see if there isn't a possible way of getting a greater involvement at the community levels and in trying and seeing if we cannot co-ordinate the work of the various agencies engaged in this sphere so that we'll know where we're going and what we're

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) achieving.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll not take up my full 40 minutes as some others do because I'm quite reluctant to get up and speak, because usually when I speak on this department I get into trouble.

A MEMBER: No, John, you never get into trouble.

MR. TANCHAK: I usually do, and I'm not going to be critical of the Minister because I always regard the Minister as a very kind, exceedingly kind man and a very generous man.

A MEMBER: Now you're in trouble.

MR. TANCHAK: When it comes to Parties, I would say that in this regard, as far as welfare is concerned, I think I'm inclined to be more conservative than my conservative friend the Minister. But I always feel that we speak out here and we always talk about people who receive, and I think that I would like to speak for the fellow who is still willing to give, not only receive, because I feel that those people who really need help are not getting enough. In other words, our needy just barely exist, and I still feel that if it was in some way possible to eliminate those undeserving who are depleting the fund then we will be able to spend this money that's being spent unwisely this way. I'm not being too critical on the people who really need it, and I think this applies just as well to the national government as it does to the policies of the provincial government.

We know we have our problems; basically they are two-fold - financial and social. The financial problems we have been discussing in the past and we will still have a chance to discuss when the Minister of Industry and Commerce presents his estimates, so today I intend to say a few words about the social problems, and in my opinion I think that the social problems are important, as important if not more important as our financial problems. We've had many people, learned people, social workers and so on in the government and in private sectors who have spent probably millions of dollars and months, years of time, in discussing and exposing social problems and trying to provide solutions, but so far we don't seem to have found the real solution.

Some of the research people have given good suggestions - they don't always agree - but political parties who desperately try to seek a mandate usually create unwise policies, quite often unwise policies based on regional and social problems and then promises, regional promises. Why? In an effort to get votes. I'm not accusing just this government, it seems to be the general practice, and in this I am referring to too many give-away promises and give-away programs, and it seems that the more you give the more somebody extends a hand and still is not happy - more and more and more. And why should this be? Why should this be in a country like ours? Canada and Manitoba contain the greatest potential of any country of the world. We talk about our natural resources. We've got the greatest natural resources in the world, the greatest natural resources undeveloped. We've got the richest undeveloped lands in our country, and we've got basically rich and proud citizens - I mean rich in mind. So why can't we, why couldn't there be a solution based on development and expansion of industry in our country which would eliminate this social problem. I am sure there are solutions but a lot of these are by-passed, ignored, because a lot of them, if the policies were brought forward, may be politically unpalatable and that's why politicians are afraid to tackle these.

Our mass approach, impersonal approach to welfare fails to take into account the potential ambition and the vigor of the average individual. And I know, I'm thoroughly convinced that if we are to make any progress on this war on poverty we must make greater efforts to realize the great potential of the individual, not simply hand out and leave him no incentive whatsoever. We should, I think, concentrate on the fullest capabilities as an independent being, think of the man as an independent being rather than a ward of the government. It seems to be quite commonplace, or quite in order, that if you want a job the first place, many people will go to the government and the government must find you a job; the government must do this. Where has this individual's incentive gone? I don't think there is too much left, and I would suggest - and I'm not accusing the government that there isn't any of this - but I would suggest that there should be more emphasis on the incentive welfare approach. We've got that; we're trying to up-grade our citizens, we're trying to teach them in the schools, people who have failed to acquire knowledge, to give him a better living. We're trying to up-grade them, but I think that there should be more emphasis on motivation, on training, training for jobs, more emphasis should be put on and more money should be spent on that.

We hear quite a few politicians nowadays, they're going around and they're telling us that

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . that government should provide a guaranteed income to everyone, that it is every citizen's right to have a decent job and a decent home and a decent living. I would agree with that, yes. But those same people never say one word about responsibility of this individual, just "hear hear; hear hear." It's every man's right to have a home, a decent home and living, but nothing about responsibility of the individual. And I'm not accusing the government on that fact, but there are people who are doing that, who are saying that, that the government must provide that regardless of the individual effort and so on, and nothing about responsibility. I cannot see how we can go ahead, go on demanding our rights, and at the same time ignore our responsibilities. I don't think it is possible, and as sure as I'm standing here we have succeeded in killing the incentive of very very many of our individuals, the individual effort, by probably making it too easy for a lot of the people. This philosophy I can never agree with, the philosophy that regardless of effort it is up to the government to provide a decent standard of living to all. I think this is a defeatist attitude and the individual should be considered.

I have been accused in the past that I am against old age pensions and I'm against welfare and so on. I'm not against that; I have always said it in this House that it is the duty of every citizen, Canadian citizen and Manitoba, to help those people who need help - the needy, the sick, the mentally ill, the maimed, the crippled, the widows left with children and so on. They need help and it's our duty to help them, but if we indiscriminately go ahead and say everyone has a right to this money, why work? I would say that quite a few might just as well throw in the towel and go on welfare because they may make a better living than trying to put an effort. They might get their hands calloused, some of them, and if they go on welfare they may not. I would say that about 90 percent of the Canadians, or people in Manitoba, 90 percent of them if you come up to them and you call them socialists or communists they would be offended - about 90 percent of them. I remember not so long ago when I referred to my friends on the left as socialists - that's just when the NDP was born - they objected to that at that time. They said we're not socialists, we're the New Democratic Party. Even they objected so I include some of them in the 90 percent - I would say about 90 percent.

But if you look at our country now, outside of the communist countries we rate about fourth in the world with our social legislation already. I read not so long ago that we're even ahead of the Labour government presently in power in Great Britain in our welfare legislation; we're ahead of them. Maybe the Minister will not agree with me, he's looking at me, but I can't say whether I'm right or wrong. He should know more about it, but I think we are ahead. And as nice as it seems to receive something for nothing, we've always talked about that there must be a breaking point somewhere which will destroy our young country. We're talking about taxes on property and so on and it will destroy our young country, a country which is so desperately in need of some of this pioneering spirit which built our Canada years and years ago, and especially built our west. I'm afraid that some of these pioneers, the deceased ones now, if it was possible they would cringe in their graves when they see that we have so squandered what they stood for and what they had developed in other words, their heritage. -- (Interjection) -- Some of them believe in one thing and they say something else. I believe that a lot of our socialists are deep down free enterprisers themselves, but I'm afraid that a lot of these free enterprisers are a dying breed at the present time. They're slowly being strangled out by some of these undesirable ideologies that come from different parties; they slowly erode the foundations completely of our nation and of our great country.

And again here I'll say, let's help those people who need help and give them more help, but I'm afraid that we are making it too easy if we accept this ideology of everything for nothing, that somebody owes me a living without any individual effort or any responsibility. But I always believe that where there's life there's still hope, and right now I'll come back to where I have started. I think that we should stress more on the incentive welfare approach rather than direct approach; help these people to help themselves, because I've known generations that have been on welfare one after another, and somehow it's a way of living for them. They don't seem to be helping themselves; one generation was on welfare, the next generation goes on welfare and so on. So this incentive welfare approach should help. I say bring out the best in our people, give them good guidance, and I think that they'll help to develop our great Canada, because I still feel that the Canadians are proud, intelligent and ambitious.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . forty minutes, Mr. Chairman, but I think it would be the appropriate time before I forget and while there's members of the press here to speak about

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . the St. Amant Ward, which we all agree - there's one thing which all the members of this House agree - that the people that are operating the St. Amant Ward at the St. Boniface Sanatorium are doing an excellent job. They have their tea on Sunday, May 4, from 2:00 to 5:00 o'clock, and I think it would be a good occasion for us to do a little more than just talking about something, encouraging them and to see what they're really up against, and I'm sure members of the press would certainly be invited at this time. So I just thought that I'd take advantage before the Minister answers the questions. Everybody's invited and then they take you for a tour of the place, -- (Interjection) -- at the St. Boniface Sanatorium next Sunday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) (1)--passed?

MR. DESJARDINS: Whoa, whoa. He was up all raring to go, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, pardon me.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, first of all I just would like to not be got too far ahead of in trying to assist the honourable members with these estimates and their assistance to me. I appreciate very much the remarks of the honourable members because I think this is the most important forum to hear of these suggestions, and the constructive criticism that I'm receiving, I certainly welcome.

In trying to answer, I think I would like to start out, if I may, with some of the points raised by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. When he spoke the other evening he asked for certain information. I've tried to dig it out -- it's always a little difficult to anticipate what members are going to ask, but I think where we can get the information we're certainly happy to do so. I think in talking of the medical care plan he referred to the money set aside for doctors' fees and wondered how many doctors were in the province. I would just say to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that the Medical Insurance Corporation, made up of citizens and doctor members as we know of the composition of that corporation, advised the government that for a two year basis 85 percent of the 1967 schedule was in their opinion a fair and reasonable level, and they were, as I pointed out at that time, talking with other provinces and looking at the experience and so on from both the federal and provincial levels.

I found out some interesting facts, that there are 1,299 physicians in the province, that is listed in the College of Physicians and Surgeons, but 1,164 have full registration and there are 90 in what you'd call a temporary category in that these are Armed Forces personnel, interns and federal government employees - this is our best estimate there - nine non-practising and about 36 retired, and this gives you the complement as they have it. This breaks down to 973 physicians in the Metropolitan area and 326 outside.

In government services - we weren't able to get information re the Armed Forces in total but it wouldn't be very large, or Deer Lodge and DVA, who I think use many of our other practising doctors, as the member knows, in any event, and would probably include our part-time civilian and Armed Forces personnel.

Medical services - there are seven, four in the field. In the Public Health Division we have 28, but this includes three laboratory and three radiologists. These are people for example in our provincial laboratories who do not you know, receive their entire salary from the department and aren't in to Medicare. The Mental Health division - 67. Most of these are rendering clinical services, two in the City of Winnipeg. Then there are other administrative positions where we don't have the exact figures - Great West Life, CNR and so on. But I think the important thing is that MMS shows 928 regularly billed last year, but there would be some billings from some people probably not in full time practice, for example. This would be very limited however.

In the teaching field we have, full-time people, 88, of whom 17 are non-clinical - that is these are full time teaching people, and 71 who perform clinical services. And part-time there's 350, but this includes all the doctors in active practice and who, you know, attend part time in General, St. Boniface, Deer Lodge and so on, plus members of our own staff who have teaching responsibilities at the university. So I think 928 was the total of regularly billed MMS last year. The total number is 1,164 physicians, some of whom are dispensed as in the breakdown I mentioned to you. When we talk of full-time teaching personnel at the university in the field of medicine and we say 71 are clinical, I'd point out to the honourable member that these people, some would bill for services through MMS in certain cases as he probably knows.

I'd point out that in these estimates, as I pointed out earlier in debate this session, the Deputy Minister advises me that there'd be two million covering salaries of doctors, largely

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . psychiatric, in these estimates, clinical services of medical officers of health who are in our department in the field and had to be listed in these estimates even though the corporation reimburses the Consolidated Revenue for this. We have our superintendents of institutions, for instance the head of our Provincial Laboratory, and these people of course are still paid out of these estimates, but about two million in the total appropriation all told would cover the salaries being paid to doctors which would be transferred to the corporation. As the member may note in the budget address, this material that was distributed, this shows up in that figure. It would be 1.6 in lab and X-ray and it was estimated that one million would be as revenue this year. Last year the lab and X-ray appropriation was 1.2 million but increased usage and services sent up to 1.6 this year and of course that's transferred to the corporation and is recoverable up to -- half of that would be shareable under the Medicare program. So the total really, the transfer from the Consolidated Fund - you have to think of the Consolidated Fund first - is 3.6 million to the corporation, and that is the figure given in the budget I noted, that that is the total relief here minus, Consolidated Revenue's point of view, the .9 million - 900,000 we mentioned which goes towards municipal relief in total. So the net effect on the fund is 3.6 minus .9 or 2.7 million, and I believe I gave that figure previously.

Now with respect to nursing salaries, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface will recall that these are negotiated and the registered minimum salary allowance for 1969 have been increased - I think he pointed out about seven percent over allowances made by the commission in 1968. These negotiations were completed in November of this year and the full settlement for a two year period - the member wanted to know - was \$440.00 in 1969 effective January 1st; \$450.00 - September 1, 1969; \$470.00 - March 1, 1970; \$500.00 - September 1, 1970. This was the negotiated salary range worked out. Registered nurses minimum salary allowance in 1968 were \$415.00 and effective September 1, 1970 -- as well, there's a reduction in the work week from 40 to 38 3/4 hours in that negotiation.

With respect to nurse training, I should point out to the honourable members that the Victoria Hospital, as members know, is into the two-year program and these students can obtain -- this is proceeding and is proving quite successful. The St. Boniface Hospital advised they're planning a two-year program, and in the two-year nursing course that's being developed there's no nursing services required of the student. Of course they have to spend a certain amount of time on the wards, it's the only way they can learn to recognize sick people and to be of service, but really the patient benefits from this service and the individual under teaching supervision.

I should point out, and I think it's better just to tell you from my recollection of events in the last several months concerning the whole matter of nursing. If you recall, we planned to establish a central school or community college type of setting at MIT. Last year we talked about this and the idea was that the Department of Education would hire a full-time director of nursing and this lady would organize the two-year program. During the year, because of the fact that all schools of nursing had been going forward and revising, shortening their courses from the three years - I understand nearly all of them now are down to 30 months now in graduating a nurse - and it seemed that because of the success of the Victoria program, because we had all this expertise locally, that we would work with the local association of the MARN, the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses, our existing hospitals and the department in working gradually towards the two year idea at the MIT, and the Department of Education, our department and the Hospital Commission are working together in probably a gradual transfer of the two year program to MIT, but I think we're better to go more slowly than originally anticipated because it will be interesting to see what happens with these two year program within the hospitals. I think they'll get them initiated but that gradually, instead of duplicating and replacing teaching and other facilities in hospitals as they undergo renovations and new programming, it might be wise to build upon the central school, and the initial idea would be to transfer the Victoria school to MIT, give the two year program and then gradually phase in.

I have some interesting notes with respect to paper work of nurses and I'm advised -- first of all, I might point out to the House some very good news that came to me during the year, and it just shows you how a situation can change from year to year. The MARN membership advised me a few months back that they have now practising in Manitoba 4,949 nurses. In fact they thought there'd be another 40 by the end of the year so there's about 5,000 active practising nurses in Manitoba today, and active but non-practising are 393, so the nurse ratio per 100,000 in Manitoba is 480 compared to 365 in 1961. This is a very favourable position and I think part of that, they pointed out to me, was that through the Manpower programming

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . approximately 47 nurses had enrolled in the various hospitals on a retraining program to up-grade themselves. These are ladies who've been out of nursing for some years, came back and have up-graded themselves and are now back in practice.

In concert with this, of that total figure I'd say that about 150 are in the Bachelor's course at the university, and so it would appear to be some time before the major part of nursing is done by other than the bedside nurse, or the one trained more in the clinical sense, but we need the graduates for teaching in the future and for senior administrative types of work.

I'm further told that with respect to paper work, that in a situation of RN shortage or where a hospital tries to operate economically by increasing the proportion of auxiliaries, a nurse in charge does have increased clerical duties in the maintenance of those portions of the patient's record which because of the professional content, you know, which only an R. N. can do - would occur regardless in any administrative situation. In situations where a hospital has identified administrative and routine paper work as being a detriment to nursing care, the commission advised me that they are approving the employment of ward clerks. In two hospitals recently studied, both employing ward clerks, the percentage of head nurse time in non-chart clerical duties was three and a half to nine percent of the total and RN percentages were four and five percent. In the same two hospitals, the clerical work related to charts, that is writing notes, checking doctors' orders, medication and so on, amounted to 18.5 percent and 26.5 percent of the Head Nurse and assistant Head Nurse time and 12 percent of the RN time. In larger hospitals the duties of a Head Nurse are related to organizing and directing patient care rather than providing it personally. Consequently, in the two hospitals studied, the Head Nurses spent a great majority of their time communicating with doctors and staff and 12 to 7 percent respectively in the patient area. R. Ns, however, spent 71 and 66 percent of their time in direct and indirect patient care activities. Indirect activities include such things as preparing medication, giving and receiving information and obtaining supplies.

The proportion of auxiliaries, that is LPN's and nurse's aide time spent in the same way were very similar to that of the R. N although their activities and direct care were not the same; the R. Ns generally cared for the more acutely ill. And of course small hospitals, where because of the less complicated operation and the less number of doctors visiting, in comparison the paper work of course is much reduced and ward clerks are not normally employed.

In the last decade they tell me the number of small hospitals which have appointed administrators rather than expecting the Head Nurse to carry two major jobs has increased greatly. You will find for example in the Interlake area there is one administrator spending part-time in three hospitals, for instance Ashern, Fisher Branch and Arborg, where he can do central purchasing or he can take a lot off what was formerly the Matron's job and give her more time on the bedside. But I thought that in view of the interesting remarks of the Member for St. Boniface that I would point out to him that I think the nurses are more aware of this than anyone else today, the nurses themselves, of the problem of, you know, continuing to strive to return to the bedside, and I think that the trouble is that with the advances in mechanization within the hospital system that there is going to be a certain amount of it. But I thought I would just give that information to the members, while I was on my feet, with respect to some of the comments of the honourable member.

Now when we come to -- oh, the Hospital Commission Research Project referred to, which the Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked about, my department have not given me a summation of this although this was the report really compiled by the Assistant Medical Director of Deer Lodge Hospital, Dr. H. . . MacDonnell, which is a very interesting report on comparing the time spent on dressings and catheter insertion, the basic units within a system. I'd be happy to let him have my copy, and when I get a summary of it I'd be happy to pass it onto you. I haven't been able to interpret too much of it at the moment, but it's being studied by the Hospital Commission in their budget branch.

Indians on Medicare. I thought this was an important matter which the honourable member raised, in that I must say - and I like to give credit where it's due - that in our discussions last fall with the Federal Minister in respect to -- we had a very full discussion, and as you know the Federal Government would be paying the premiums of the people of Indian origin on Reserves and these people will be subject to the same benefits as the rest of Manitobans. But it's most important to get the services to such folk of course, especially at their isolated settlements in many cases. In addition to what is done today, the Manitoba Medical Association has been very active with a very large committee of about 12 or 15 people involved, and with the University of Manitoba and our Department in trying to develop a more rational visiting service if they

April 28, 1969

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . possibly can to the out-of-the-way settlements, where we think to be really successful the doctors should go in on a regular basis so that the people can expect it. This would involve physicians giving up their time to go on the circuit from time to time, and Universities being involved in the sense that they have a very great interest in northern medicine, in Arctic medicine, and they have been helpful at Churchill in the past year with our department. The Federal Minister, following our discussions, made a couple of visits here and concurred that we had to have a special look at this. He has called in some consultants, some eastern consultants to look at the whole problem and I believe they have been in our north country recently, following which he will be meeting with us and with the university people to tell us just what conclusions they have come to.

But we have hospitals, as you know, at Churchill and The Pas where a great deal of the more acutely ill are looked after. And of course we have the on-going public health program in the north which is tied right in with the preventative program which is tied right in with our northern health services, and we offer the same services in the preventative health sense, the use of our laboratories, the use of public health personnel, medication and so on, the same as we do for any other citizen of Manitoba, and our health units work on Reserves when asked to do so by the federal authorities. But I am very pleased that we will be working closely with the federal department in the coming year and involving the different disciplines in trying to give a better more understood service to our people in the north country, to our Indian people.

With respect to housing, this is a subject matter in itself. This is a -- with all humility I stand before you, having taken part in, or made a presentation to the Task Force. Following the publication of the Task Force report we met with the Honourable Mr. Hellyer in Toronto and had a very short meeting, and then we were to await the balance of the report, which we haven't received as yet of course, for the final recommendations. Basically, when we met with the Honourable the Minister, he shared with us simply his impressions and some of the thoughts he had after the report was published, which is a very extensive report as you know, and which really in some ways is all things to all people. But I think the Minister was very frank in discussing the problems with us. I think he said three things are causing the high cost of housing today: one is the cost of money; one is the cost of land; and one is the cost of construction.

As you know, he at that time felt that all provinces joined with him in placing importance on the housing program. The provinces pretty well, in discussions with him, recommended that they should have the right to set their priorities in any field, that direct loans to municipalities would reduce the municipalities borrowing power for other purposes as well as reduced capital available to the province for other purposes, and there was quite a discussion with him on the matter of direct -- one suggestion that had been made in the report was that the Federal Government make direct loans to municipalities. He was just discussing these with us.

Another point was that he felt that the provinces, particularly Ontario, protested the freeze which he had imposed on urban renewal projects. I think as you may have noted in the press he did this because it was the feeling of the Task Force that some of the major urban renewal schemes were just too big, that a lot of good housing was destroyed with the cleaning up of the whole area, and he wanted to have a good look at this. The provinces agreed with him that the Federal Government's proper role, and major one too, was that of banker, and the provinces agreed with him in his concept of acquiring dispersed housing for rent to low income families rather than having to have such big formal all-inclusive schemes, and this followed along some of the recommendations which we made in our Task Force suggestion. There was no general agreement with the Federal Government however that public housing programs as they now exist be slowed down. The provinces are just some of them getting into this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I interrupt at this time and you can continue on at 8:00 o'clock. I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.