

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, May 6, 1969

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, would you be good enough to call Bill 15.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I assure my honourable friend that I am so cooperative tonight that if he wants to call the private members' resolutions or bills that we didn't deal with this afternoon, I'd be happy to do that too.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if all the private conversations are over. Order please. Order. Would the honourable gentleman please take his seat. I regret to have to take this attitude, but now and then it seems as though things do get a little out of place.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - Bill No. 15. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I trust that I will merit even a small percentage of that applause when I finish.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 15 has been before the Assembly for quite some time, and many speeches have been made with regard to it and the amendment that was moved to it. I must confess - and I don't like confessing, Mr. Speaker - but I must confess that I have seldom found myself in the position of approaching a discussion of a Bill with less enthusiasm than I do on the present occasion. I have listened intently to the speeches that have been made on this Bill and the amendment. I have not heard all of them but almost all, and I think that with a couple of notable exceptions, to which I may refer later on, that the level of debate has been unusually high. I would like to pay particular attention to the two speeches that were delivered by my Leader, which I think were excellently prepared and equally well delivered. I think the speech of the Honourable Member for Inkster, though it was rather hard-hitting, as sometimes speeches have to be in this House, was a particularly good one. And I think the Honourable the Minister of Finance deserves credit for the fact that he has at least tried to give information to the House that would be valuable to it in arriving at a position on this most controversial Bill.

I find myself in the position of having very mixed feelings. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and privilege to have been closely identified with the Manitoba Power Commission, which was one of the predecessor companies now making up Manitoba Hydro, for almost 50 years, and my connection with the administration in total, and with the many men that I have worked with in that organization, has been an inspiration to me. In all of my years in public life I have never known an organization, either public or private, that seemed to have a better facility for public relations than that particular organization. And one of the things that I regret in the situation that has developed here is the fact that I think when they are perforce drawn into the arena of controversy and conflict which has unavoidably developed during this debate, that the esprit de corps and the spirit of that organization might for some time be somewhat diminished. And Mr. Speaker, I hold the government completely responsible for that situation, because I believe that Hydro itself has done in all ways what it considered to be the right thing to do, and I would not be at all surprised to find out that in the end that not only the majority but almost all of the members of the House agree with their position. But I would think that the vast majority of the members of the House, including many who sit on the government benches today, must have very grave doubts about the way this matter has been handled by the government. And if in any way whatever the public image of that institution that has served Manitoba so well for so long is tarnished to the slightest degree, I would lay the blame 100 percent on the government itself and not on the organization.

I shall not take the time, Mr. Speaker, I will not attempt to take the time to run through the dismal category of errors that have characterized the handling of this important issue. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if the government had set out deliberately to plan a method by which this situation could have been confused and misunderstood, that it could hardly have operated more effectively than it has done under the circumstances, and if - if it happens that in any way that institution suffers from what has transpired, then I think the government will have to take not only the major but the full share of blame.

And I will prophesy now, Mr. Speaker - it won't take any prophet to foretell that this Bill is going to now go to Committee, that's a foregone conclusion - but I'm going to prophesy

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)... as well that in the end it will be decided, in spite of the valid arguments that have been presented on the other side, that it will be decided by the majority of the members - even including the ones on this side - that the only thing to do is to proceed with the work that has been undertaken. And the reason that I think that will be done, Mr. Speaker, is because of the fact that I believe that right now Hydro is committed to the extent that they simply cannot turn back from their program. And if that is the fact - and I am inclined to think it is a fact - then, Mr. Speaker, the government should have had the courage to have gone through with the proposition and seeing that the licence was issued. Because to bring this matter to the House was simply inviting the differences of opinion that have been bound to be expressed here, and I am afraid that the cause of the Hydro has not been well served in the process.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I think there is one advantage to be gained from this frustrating experience - and I consider it has been a most frustrating experience - I simply cannot understand the stubborn attitudes of the government when they have had proposition after proposition presented to them by which they could, with a very minor degree of adjustment of their program, have placed the members on this side of the House in a position to go along with them and to have kept this important subject out of the realm of public controversy. Many many arrangements were suggested. Many compromises could easily have been effected, but no, the government simply stands, or sits, and refuses to give the information on which this side of the House would wish to base its opinion and what can eventuate from a situation of that kind rather than the type of debate that we have had.

In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, I agree with what my Leader said recently, that in spite of that the debate has been kept on a high level. Only twice, I think, did it descend to a more political basis, and I was astonished to find that on one of those occasions the debate was initiated by my honourable friend the Member for Morris, because that is not the type of debate that I had come to expect from my honourable friend. And while I agree with some of the statements that he made, one being that it is the right and the responsibility of the government to make decisions, that is true, but having made that decision the government should have carried through with it and seen that the licence was issued. And wouldn't it have been much easier - even taking it for granted that there would have still been some difference of opinion as to the program - wouldn't it have been much easier to have simply defended that position on the basis of the Hydro interests as being paramount than to have dragged the whole question into this Chamber for decision, a decision that the government itself should have made or else have left to the constituted authority to have made.

I mentioned the Honourable Member for Morris, whose level of debate I thought was not up to his usual standards. He quoted two precedents of where the Liberals had gone wrong. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have no immunity against error. We make our mistakes along with the rest, and I guess if you go far enough back in history - and my honourable friend went a long way back - if you go far enough I'm sure you can find many instances where the Liberals, both federally and provincially, have made mistakes, mistakes that they would willingly have had the opportunity to have corrected later on. But the two that my honourable friend happened to pick out were really ones that I think he should have done some research on before he so gaily recounted them, because, Mr. Speaker, the building of the Transcontinental Railway, the first Transcontinental Railway in Canada, goes back even before my time. I know there's some members of the House who think that that's so far back that we don't consider it, but my honourable friend from Morris went that far back. But if he will - and I cannot speak of those events from first hand knowledge - but from my reading of history, if he will do a little research there, he will find that the circumstances that surrounded the first efforts to build the first Transcontinental Railway were some that the Liberals were pretty well advised to object to, and he will probably find that the arrangement that had been made, to which the Liberals along with others objected, resulted in the defeat of the government of that day.

And then he came down to an era with which I am more familiar, though I was not a member of the House at the time, when he said that the Liberals had objected even to the erection of this stately edifice that we meet in, and pointed that out as being a mark against the Liberals. Mr. Speaker, there again my honourable friend should do some research before he quotes an example of that kind, because anyone who wants to go back to the circumstances that surrounded the building of our Legislative Building here will find that that, too, was the subject of a great deal of controversy and misunderstanding, resulted in a Royal Commission composed of

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)... three men of the very highest calibre, and resulted in an extremely adverse report upon the government that was connected therewith, and again the circumstances, not of the report itself - which came after - but the circumstances leading to the report necessitated the resignation of a government. So far be it from me to argue that the Liberals have never made mistakes - they have made their share. But those two instances, I think history will record that albeit by accident, if my honourable friend wants to put that construction on it, but that they were on the right side.

Then my honourable friend the Minister of Tourism and Recreation indulged in one of his characteristic orations in this House where he esteems it to be good argument to vilify the other fellow, and on, not one occasion, but two recently, one being this debate and the other one on the resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, my honourable friend took occasion to -- he seemed to think that he was advancing his particular argument, Mr. Speaker, by telling how remiss the former government was and of the mistakes that they had made. And to such extent, Mr. Speaker, did his enthusiasm lead him that he, I believe at that time a resident of The Pas, had the effrontery to tell this Assembly that when his government came into office that there wasn't one single mile of provincial road in the north. Yes, that's exactly what my honourable friend said. That's exactly what he said.

MR. CARROLL: No, that's not true.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then I'll have to read it to my honourable friend.

MR. CARROLL: Read it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I'm not so fond of my honourable friend's speeches that I like to read them to him, but -- as a matter of fact the honourable gentleman said that maybe he should be corrected on this, but -- now I hope I'm not taking this out of context. For that reason I'll have to read some little distance. Here's on Page 1877, the honourable gentleman speaking: "I find it rather amusing really that this whole resolution is brought in by a member of the Liberal caucus because I think one only has to look at the record of the former government in office to know that very scant attention was paid to northern Manitoba during the period of time in which they occupied the treasury benches of the House. As far as I know, between the year 1950 and the famous year 1958 when the government changed, I don't believe there was one mile of provincial trunk highway built in northern Manitoba."

MR. CARROLL: Just between those years.

MR. CAMPBELL: But those are the years that they were built, my honourable friend. Now my honourable friend tries to weasel out of this but the fact is that those are the years that they were built and my honourable friend was living up there and ought to know.

MR. CARROLL: The Flin Flon highway was completed in '49.

MR. CAMPBELL: That was not correct. No.

MR. CARROLL: That's the information I've got.

MR. CAMPBELL: Your information is just as wrong as it so frequently is, my honourable friend.

MR. CARROLL: No it isn't. No.

MR. CAMPBELL: In fact it would be better to characterize it as lack of information because that's what my honourable friend continually displays in this House. And my honourable friend went on in his effort to attempt to make his case by vilifying somebody else, to say - right in that same statement it's concerned and he used the same argument in the other debate - that that government had paid little attention to the north and he went on to enumerate the great things that this government has done and the roads they have built. But he missed one thing in his catalogue, Mr. Speaker. He missed one thing; and that was that it was the government that preceded his that put all of those developments in the north that made it possible to build roads and to require the power plants and all of this. Every one of the major industries that are in the north, every one of them went in during that time, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend just conveniently forgot that, the one point that didn't seem to him to be important. He had a whole catalogue that he could read of what had been done, and he was quite convinced in his own small mind that nothing had been done previous to that, but Flin Flon went in there before that, Lynn Lake went in there before that, Thompson went in there before that; and what are those but the very base on which the future has depended? And my honourable friend would pretend to use an argument like that in a serious debate as something that should carry the sense of the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, this doesn't matter so much as far as this type of thing is concerned,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . because we folk **all** get the opportunity to answer questions of this kind. But what really struck me as being a new low, even for the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, was when he decided to impugn the objectives and the public interest of such a distinguished scientist as Dr. Solandt by questioning his good intentions in giving an opinion upon this subject, by saying that what he wanted was to paddle down the river.

A MEMBER: That's pretty small.

MR. CAMPBELL: Pretty small?

A MEMBER: Small mind.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, if we aren't taking too much for granted in using the term "mind".

Well, Mr. Speaker, with those exceptions I can say that I think the debate has been carried on on a high plane and I regret the fact that I have to reply in kind because my colleagues on both sides of me, who have spoken here, are such gentlemanly members that they simply won't use this kind of language in a debate, but I've been here so long that I have become accustomed to my honourable **friend's** method of debating and there are times when you have to get down to a man's own level in order to get him to understand you.

And so, Mr. Speaker, what position are we put in? The government has refused to provide the members on this side of the House with the information which they say they have or that the Hydro has, and they will not make it available in the way that we have asked. True, it's been said that members can go and look at it, and some have done this, but this is a very different thing from having it in one's possession and preparing a case in order to make the best use of the officials when they come before the committee. The information simply has not been forthcoming, and on the matter of principle I feel that we were justified in asking that that information should be made available. There again I think that there is one advantage, though I would have preferred to have it the other way; there is the advantage that the research that has necessarily gone into this subject by the many members who have spoken on it - and several have done a great deal of research, I know, and have been assisted by able and interested experts in the field - that will put the members on this side of the House in a position to profit by the fact that the Hydro officials will soon be in front of us.

So what to do in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, is the question. I would have no hesitation whatever, in spite of my admiration for the Manitoba Hydro as an organization and my personal friendship with a great many of its officers and personnel, I would have no hesitation in voting against the bill simply on the basis that on the matter of principle I could not make up my mind in the absence of the pertinent material and time to study it. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I would not have any great struggle with my conscience to be able to vote for the bill in spite of the almost unbelievably clumsy way in which it has been handled by the government, on the basis that I expect to find that in practical terms this is what we will have to do, because I will expect to find that Hydro, with the full knowledge and consent of the government which they should be man enough to acknowledge, has proceeded so far with this undertaking that they cannot reverse themselves. But I don't propose to either act on principle and vote against the bill or to act in the pragmatic sense and support the bill. I propose, for one of the few times in all my years in the House, to say that on this measure I shall not vote. And I have consulted with a number of my colleagues and I believe it's the position that will be generally taken.

Mr. Speaker, we regret this position. We certainly regret if any harm in any way shall have come to either the public image or the business program of Hydro. If any has so developed, then I lay the blame completely at the door of the government for the way in which this matter has been handled. In the meantime, I know that the government has made up its mind to force this bill through. We can simply make the best of that situation and we'll avail ourselves of the opportunity later on to try and bring out that information that is at present denied us.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CARROLL: . . . clarify a point, on a point of privilege. I indicated that there were no highways built in northern Manitoba between 1950 and 1958. I just want to state for the record that the highway to Flin Flon was completed in 1949, the highway to The Pas I think was completed in either 1938 or 1939. Now if there were other roads, I would be glad to hear of them.

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend will find that there were other roads.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I note that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is getting to his feet. As the introducer of the bill, if he speaks of course, he would be winding up debate. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... Member for Lakeside and I join with him in the position that he feels that he must take as an individual and possibly for the first time, as far as I am aware, that the honourable gentleman is, as he indicates, going to abstain from voting on this very important bill. I want to make it clear to all and sundry that how I am going to vote and I believe my colleagues will vote in this instance, is no criticism of Manitoba Hydro. I have, and I am sure that this is shared by my colleagues, every confidence in Manitoba Hydro and its officials, even though they like the rest of us, oftentimes make mistakes. I want it on the record I am going to vote against the bill, as I indicated yesterday, because I place no trust, I place no faith or confidence in the government of Manitoba in their inept handling of this very important measure for Manitoba. Therefore, I want it clearly on the record that, in voting against this bill, it is against that government who in my opinion has no right to lead this province any longer.

As I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the government may attempt to construe our actions, in voting against this bill on second reading, as voting against the principles of development of Northern Manitoba and the Hydro facilities. I accused them yesterday of attempting, or they will attempt whenever we face the electors of Manitoba, of using this attitude and this action against us if, after hearing the officials of Manitoba Hydro in committee, we change our mind. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, for the record, that we reserve the right to change our mind and vote for this bill on third reading. After hearing the committee in committee, the representation from Hydro, they may justify a position of the development and the raising particularly of the waters of Southern Indian Lake, so let there be no misunderstanding of the position that we are taking in this, and I dare any member opposite when we are on the hustings, to use our vote against what is termed the basic principle on second reading against my party, because the government knows and I am sure the people of Manitoba and elsewhere will know the reasons for the attitude that we are taking and our approach. No confidence, no faith, no trust in the government of Manitoba because they didn't have the intestinal fortitude of giving to the members on this side of the House an opportunity of full investigation, of meeting with the officials of Hydro before they forced us into a position of voting on this bill.

So I say to my honourable friends opposite, and I say through them and through you, Mr. Speaker, in this House: let the citizens and the electorate of Manitoba know why we are taking the position that we are, and in saying this, Mr. Speaker, I can understand the position that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has taken and indicated how he is going to vote or not to vote, and I appreciate the predicament that he is in and possibly members of his group, and I am sure that in that position he is not expressing any confidence in the government opposite, that I am trying to make it a little more clear; and I dare you once again, members of government, to attempt in the future, no matter what the outcome might be, in respect of Bill 15 after it has gone through the process of being considered in the committee, be wary lest you endeavour to take out of context the position that I am taking - and I believe that is the position of all of the members in my caucus.

Now Mr. Speaker, I don't know if others want to speak or others will speak. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who introduced this bill, indicates that he is now going to close the debate. If he is going to be but honest to this Assembly and honest to the people of Manitoba, accompanying the closing of this debate he will table in the House, for our information, all of the documents and the reports that we have pleaded with the government to make available to us in order that we can make a proper assessment of the contents contained in Bill 15.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this long debate continues even to its ending here on second reading, to take its own peculiar course, and it has been a peculiar performance and we've seen in the last 15 minutes or half an hour when we have the Official Opposition to this government taking a position - and announced by a person for whom we all have a great deal of respect for, and so I don't say lightly what I feel I must - a position of convenience, and we have the Honourable the Member from Radisson not worrying about the issue that's at stake but worrying about the next election, as well as he might.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I object most strenuously to the remarks of my honourable friend, for he's taking out of context my complete statement here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would suggest to the House that the honourable gentleman and the House as a whole gave the last two speakers their undivided

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)... attention, and in spite of some of the things that were said, which of course is no affair of mine, but at the same time I would ask for the same respect to be shown to the Minister whilst he has the floor.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on a point of privilege, that if the honourable gentleman takes out of context what I say, then I have the right of this House through you and with your permission advisedly to take exception to the remarks of the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: I doubt if the honourable gentleman has the question of privilege at this moment.

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: He's already spoken.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that it will not be my purpose to provoke any of this -- a continuation of this in the closing of the debate. I don't really think it's incumbent upon me to attempt to review or summarize all that has been said. I think that essentially what the Opposition benches have been telling government, that either they have insufficient information upon which to come to a decision at this juncture or, on the other hand, if it so chooses them, that they, with the good help that they have availed themselves to feel that we are bound ourselves into a situation that hasn't taken into account rapidly changing technology, and I find it very difficult to equate this with the very noble - sounding -- I retract that word. I accept their legitimacy, that the noble words of praise and evaluation of the competence of one of our better institutions in this province, namely Manitoba Hydro, that while a good portion of the remarks that have been made in opposition to Bill 15 have centred on the fact which leaves us no other argument or position to take, that of challenging Hydro's competence in the matter of -- (Interjection) -- . Well now, I am not, Mr. Speaker. I have never attempted to argue the matter of the price of coal and as to its significance, whether it's available at one price at Brandon or another price somewhere else, I feel that this is possibly in the domain of those people specifically charged with the production of power in this province, and I accept that kind of advice and that kind of assistance from that corporation, but my honourable friend opposite had a great deal of difficulty to accept that. I accept -- for instance, I do not find it all that difficult to accept, as this government has accepted, the advice and the suggestions that a particular source or course of action was in fact the best course of action, and I'm not particularly concerned that when alternatives because of (if I may use the expression) laymen's views expressed in this House do not coincide with those in the best judgment of this - again - competent institution and many millions of dollars of studies have produced, I have not that much difficulty in accepting that course of action as being perhaps the proper one or the best one in the interests of the citizens of Manitoba. -- (Interjections) -- That's fine. I'm merely attempting to recall the debates of a few days ago, particularly those that were of a detailed, technical nature, that I don't see how we could have taken any other attitude other than that its being one that put the person who was delivering the speech in a position where he was more acceptable to the advice that was immediate at hand to him and chose to reject the expert testimony of some two years ago or three years ago at committee, or chose not to avail himself to the information that has been available to him, as it has been available to all, at Manitoba Hydro. The areas where we have...

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege. If the member is saying that we did not avail ourselves of the information that was made available to us, he is not telling the truth. We took advantage of the information that was available to us. It's the information that's not available to us that is germane. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will recall and Hansard will record that we covered...

MR. SPEAKER: There's been an accusation made which I would like cleared up, made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I'm sure the Honourable the Minister heard the remark. I wonder if he would clear that up for my satisfaction.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the reason why I didn't rise to clear up the remark, I in fact think that it is clarified in the recorded Hansard of, I believe, yesterday or the day before, when precisely an exchange took part in this area as to what information was offered and what information was available to the honourable members, and it was clearly stated by me as to what information was in fact not being offered and not available to the members, and if the honourable Leader wishes to persist that that is an inaccurate portrayal of what I said at that time in referring to my statement of a few moments ago as being an untruth, then I would have to...

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I think we should clear this up, because I think it is

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.).... important. The Minister stated a few moments ago that we had not taken advantage of the information available to us. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to retract that statement because the facts are that we did take advantage of the information available to us, and I would wish the Minister to clear that.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I think we're talking in circles now. I have no difficulty in retracting the statement if he chooses to interpret it that way. I felt that, by the use of their preference - let me put it this way - to other material that was also available to them, during the course of their debate and their speeches it would seem to indicate to me as a listener in the debate that they chose that source of information over and above some of the additional information that was available to them. However....

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I must rise again on the point of privilege, because there's a clear-cut case here. I state categorically that we took advantage of the information available to us, that members of my party and people who were advising us took advantage of this information, and I acknowledged that yesterday and I thanked the government for it. We have taken advantage of that even before the Minister's statement of last Friday, although we thought that that statement expanded what the government was making available to us, and I simply cannot accept, Mr. Speaker, that there's any inference by the Minister that we did not do so because this is saying basically that members on this side of the House deliberately stayed away from information that was being offered.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder -- the words that were said that are being objected to have long since gone, and I wonder, with the explanation given by the Minister, that he did give an opinion that you had misconstrued what he had said, and I wonder if there is anything to be gained by pursuing this at this particular time. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition feels that the Minister has committed something by way of an untruth, I am sure the Minister would be only too pleased to withdraw it if he's given that feeling.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in peculiar circumstances for a Minister who has been roundly accused for not divulging information. I'm quite prepared to accept that the Opposition has taken advantage of the information that I have offered to give to them.

Mr. Speaker, if I can continue. The Honourable Member for Lakeside made a rather significant point. I think it was central to his speech tonight in his condemnation of government behaviour in this role, and the possible implications or reflections that our attitude or our manner in the handling of this matter has on Manitoba Hydro. He inferred that our basic failure here was our lack -- I think if I'm recalling his words, "man enough" or "gumption enough" to -- no, I don't think that was the word that he used - to do what was in our power to do, namely, to make the decision, and not to subject this matter to this House for the greater area of public controversy and any subsequent concern or spill-off that this may have with respect to the morale of Manitoba Hydro.

I would want to think that the Manitoba Hydro is an organization that is well able to weather onslaughts of one kind or other. I have every confidence in their ability to withstand this. I do remind the Honourable Member for Lakeside that it is, of course, precisely because this government did exercise, or at least indicate this fact that a decision, as far as the government was concerned, was made, and it was repeated by me, that has brought this particular Minister in this particular instance into this much difficulty, and that has been so roundly attacked by all sides of the House, the fact that our minds, our decision has been made in the introduction of this bill, and I'm sure the Honourable Member for Lakeside, as a long-time parliamentarian, hardly needs a relatively junior member of this House to lecture him in the responsibilities of the members opposite; that is, that your function is to pass your judgment, good or bad, and then to do what you may, or abstain from the decision reached by the government benches on this side of the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Without information. Would you accept that?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I do want to just very briefly suggest to you that, while a great cry has been made by members opposite that insufficient information has been forthcoming from government benches, that they have not listened to all the information that has passed to them, either directly from the government through individual Ministers, myself included, that they have particularly with respect to the reports that they are showing such a keen interest in dealing with the other areas of resources and human values, that they have to the best of my knowledge, at least, on not too many occasions referred to the very full and concise summary that was prepared for the members opposite, specifically taken from some of the preliminary

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... surveys and findings of the Task Force group that worked on this material. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it's been some time that my introductory speech was made, and that members chose to ignore some of those particular points that were brought up at that time, and I'm referring specifically to the resource values and evaluations that were put forward in reasonably clear terms, terms of the value of our commercial fishing in that area; the potential value; the terms of the forestry and timber values in that area; the potential values. — (Interjection) — The government presented it. Now I know you've made it patently clear that you're not prepared to accept government advice or government information in this particular matter, but that's of course your privilege — that's of course your privilege. But I wish to underline the point that of course it is also our responsibility, having gone on record and having stated these values, that these are in fact the kind of circumstances, situations that this government will have to answer up to at some point in time. The difference that I'm trying to suggest to you is that had we refrained from attempting any information in the area of these additional resources, these additional resource values, that an effort has been made here to suggest that when those taken in and compiled on top of the figures of the cost of the project, that it would in fact term the whole project uneconomical and one unwise to pursue in the interests of the people of Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Would the honourable member permit a question? Would you deem that we received, the members of this House received enough information to make a fair and reasonable decision, or assessment?

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, for his information, may I say that we on this side of the House feel that this is not the case because the Honourable Member from Morris stated, when he was asked by my Leader had the honourable member seen the studies to back up whatever losses are involved in the flooding, this is what he said and this is on Page 1781: "Mr. Jorgenson: I'm not privileged to see the report any more than...." Are you afraid to listen to this? All right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the Honourable the Minister permitted a question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I'm asking him if he is aware of this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The question has been attended to. I don't think it gives the honourable member licence to enter the debate at this particular time.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister has the floor.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, I'll ask — Mr. Minister, are you aware that the Honourable Member for Morris said, "I am not privileged to see the report any more than you are. They are the property of the government, the government in this case happening to be the members of the Cabinet." Are you aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please! I think enough has been said.

MR. ENNS: that he has been given a full synopsis of the information contained in that material, the same as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and all other members of the House have received.

Mr. Speaker, we have not attempted on this side of the House to suppose — and there is a great deal of supposition and subjective judgments of individual people involved when you're dealing in potentials and you're dealing in the distant future. We have shied away in the speeches that both my honourable colleague the Minister of Finance or myself or others who have participated in this thing, we have not attempted to put the rosy hue on our aspect of our debate that we well might.

The Honourable Member from Churchill asks, or says he cannot vote for this bill because he doesn't know what it's all about. Well I could tell him what it's all about. I could tell him that if he votes against it he's voting against 18,943 good paying jobs in the north in the future. I could tell him he's voting against hundreds of miles of blacktop pavement in the north. I'd tell him he's voting against the kind of social services that we need in this province. I could tell him this — you know, this is the kind of argument that we have come counter against it. I've been told that \$120 million of recreational potential is being jeopardized because of this. Do we take even the minimal Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — if I may be permitted to

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... finish my speech - if I may be permitted to deal with one aspect of these potential figures that have been thrown around - and I'm referring to the recreational value at Southern Indian Lake. To come anywhere close to arriving at that minimal figure that has been mentioned, \$8 million per annum, would require that we have 1600 people every day of the week for 10 weeks, paying \$500 per week. We may have this at one time, but when? Are we going to have it in the next ten years, are we going to have it in the next twenty years or in the next 50 years or in the next 100 years? These are the kind of

MR. BOROWSKI: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. On a point of privilege I think what the Minister is saying is not true. I'm not going to call him a liar, because it's unparliamentary, but I suggest to him he is full of horse

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please! I wonder if I might attempt to remind the House again, that there has been many weeks of debate, a considerable amount of debate, and I wonder if the Minister might not have the privilege to complete his speech. I know he's quite prepared to answer questions, but does he have to be constantly interrupted?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit me to ask one question at this point? Mr. Speaker, I just want the Minister to answer whether the advantages that he just spoke of, which he says we are voting against, would still be available to the people of the north if an alternative diversion was used other than the high level diversion?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to answer that question, because that really is the crux of what the honourable members opposite fail to understand and what the situation is. I would like to think that industrial expansion, economic development, comes to this province because of the fact that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is good looking and charming, or energetic. -- (Interjection) -- No it isn't. It comes because of a carefully computerized corporation decision that puts every element of financial advantage, of economic advantage, that makes a decision as to whether or not a plant locates in here, and it becomes extremely important to us in this province. We recognize some of our disadvantages. I'm not going to talk about them, because there's no point in being a negative person about these. One of our advantages are our ability to produce power at reasonable rates, and I suggest to you it is not unreasonable for all of us to grasp that that single fact is more important to us in Manitoba than the same fact is in Ontario or perhaps in B.C. where they have other advantages to offset perhaps higher power.

So when the Honourable Member from Inkster asks me what is the significance of maximizing to the optimum our opportunity to produce power at a reasonable price, then it has tremendous implications. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it is to the question, because in our judgment, in the judgment of Manitoba Hydro, this scheme, the high level diversion at South Indian Lake, does that; it produces power at the optimum, maximum available from the Nelson on Phase I. Other alternatives, other alternatives as are possible, can be considered, are open for options if the government wishes to pay a price, if the government wishes to pay a price, and I'm suggesting it's when you attach that price to it that you begin to slip from your advantages that the scheme has and the advantages that it spreads over the whole economic development of this province. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to enter into debate with the Honourable Member for Inkster at that time and I would ask that you allow me to proceed with my few remarks. And they will be few.

But it is this difference, it is this question - and these are fundamental questions - it's questions such as, even if the thermal production of power were compatible with the costs that we are considering for Hydro power here. I think any Manitoba government would legitimately ask themselves why should we be enriching the economy of perhaps Saskatchewan, Alberta, to the tune of -- I won't mention the particular figures, whether it's \$140 million worth of coal or \$175 million worth of coal, it's not really important. The fact is we have the resource, we have the water, we have the capacity to do it. I won't talk about the distinct possibilities of building thermal plants in southern Manitoba, because I thought the remark -- and I'm trying to, I think it was my colleague the Minister of Finance who -- you know, quite obviously we would not be in the midst of building 170 or 200 million dollar transmission line north if we had the thermal power here. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member from St. Boniface seriously feels that these questions will not be answered to the fullest extent possible at committee stage -- and in fact, most of them have been answered at committee stage by Hydro officials in 1966.

MR. DESJARDINS: Did you vote before getting the answers? Did you vote before getting

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... the answers?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if you want me to continue I would suggest to you that we have attempted in the manner — and I'd like to come back just for the reason why the bill is before the House again, briefly. And that is, we had hoped to, in a very clear and definitive way, by statute, ensure that certain things would be done, particularly with respect to the human resources in this area, the communities that are going to be affected in this area, that they would not simply by an internal bureaucratic committee of senior people within government, who would be in essence directing their affairs, their relocation problems, their retraining problems and so forth, like that, subject to day to day or month to month changes, decisions, something like that, but that in fact some of these specific concerns and needs would be identified in legislation and as such, an accountability will have to be made by this government or future governments as to how we live up to these obligations that we now undertake to these people at Southern and Granville Lakes. This was part of the reason, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is before us. Unfortunately, a good portion of this reason received scant attention during the debates before us.

I want to close Mr. Speaker, by using — I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, the Honourable Member for Inkster opened the debate on Bill 15 some time ago, on the adjournment, or with the permission of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and he opened the debate, Mr. Speaker, by telling us a story from Tolstoi. He likened Bill 15 to that situation of a rich man being on a poor man's back and doing — well, I thought if I can recall correctly, my memory is not all that bad, and he likened Part 2 of the bill of the rich man's willingness to wipe the perspiration off the brow of...

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Minister wishes to be accurate, and I'm sure if he will check Hansard, it was his speech which I likened to the Tolstoi story, not the Bill.

MR. ENNS: I accept that correction Mr. Speaker. It doesn't really change very much what I wanted to say, with respect to my reference to his story, simply that it does indicate that, you know, the gulf between him and I or this side of the House and that side of the House is possibly a little more than the 30 feet that separates us here. We sometimes in jest label him as a doctrinaire socialist, sometimes not in jest. I had difficulty of course, in relating this story to the subject at hand and in attempting to identify just who the rich man was. Did he mean me personally? I don't really think so. Did he mean this party or this government? I'm sure he didn't mean Manitoba Hydro as being the rich man on the poor man's back, this great organization, manned by the people of Manitoba. — (Interjection) — This story ran through my head for a considerable length of time after his participation in that debate because this did provide me with some degree of thinking.

It did provide me with one other thing, Mr. Speaker, and that was with a closing line, as to how we should close the debate on South Indian Lake at this time. It also happens to be a sentence by Tolstoi, who dictated it on his death bed, and it is simply this: "that if for the good of all, do what must, come what must."

Mr. Speaker, I commend Bill 15 to the House and to committee. It's a measure of major importance to the economic welfare and benefit of this province and I would suggest that the honourable members opposite avail themselves to the expert people that will be made available to them at committee for all the information that they require.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has a question.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes. Would the Minister permit three very quick questions all related? No. 1, did I understand correctly the Minister to repeat tonight that the government had made the decision to grant the licence?

MR. ENNS: That's correct.

MR. MOLGAT: Question No. 2 Mr. Speaker. Is it not correct that the government has the right under other legislation now to grant the licence?

MR. ENNS: That is correct.

MR. MOLGAT: Question No. 3 then, Mr. Speaker, is, why is this bill before us?

MR. ENNS: Read Hansard.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Minister a question. It's not pertaining to his address but where we go from here. I understand the bill will be going into the Committee on Public Utilities. Is that correct? Can the Minister indicate when that bill will be before the Committee on Public Utilities; will advertising media be used so that people

May 6, 1969

1977

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... will be aware of the fact; and would the Minister provide recording equipment at that particular committee meeting?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe these are questions more suitably asked to the House Leader or perhaps the Clerk of the Assembly, with respect to additional equipment that would or should be made available at these hearings. Your paramount question as to - yes, this will be referred to the Public Utilities Committee. I would assume that they will be meeting soon; again, subject to the schedules of the other committee meetings it would have to work in. Possibly Friday.

..... continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just wonder whether the Honourable the Minister would permit another question at this point. Mr. Speaker, my question is, did I understand correctly that the Honourable Minister said that the cost factors were determined by extensive computer research and that the basis on which the decision was made was on the basis of finding the lowest cost. Was that a correct understanding of what he said?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Claydon, Cowan, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Graham, Hamilton, Johnson, Jorgenson, Klym, Lissaman, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Borowski, Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson and Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 26; Nays, 12.

MR. SPEAKER declared the motion carried.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, would you point out exactly what section we're dealing with?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(1)(a) Preventive Medical Services. I called it last night.

MR. CHERNIACK: What number?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(1)(a).

MR. CHERNIACK: (1)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: He's talking about (1) (1).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I called it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that at the time of the rising of the House last night we still were dealing with the question of Care Services, under (k), because I had raised one or two questions and then following that the Honourable Member for Churchill had just made an interjection insofar as why he wasn't in the House, and just prior to that the Honourable Member for Rhineland spoke insofar as, respecting Care Services. At least, Sir, Hansard does not recall or point out that Care Services item has passed.

I would like to ask a question of the Minister. It might have been that during my absence this matter was discussed and dealt with. It's concerning the use of the now empty Grace Hospital on Arlington Street, and it deals of course with Care Services, if it is going to be used for extended care use or nursing home use. I understand that there have been some negotiations between the Salvation Army and the government or the Minister respecting the use of this property, and as I say, Mr. Chairman, it might have been dealt with in my absence. If it was, then a word from the Minister would be sufficient for me going through Hansard to see what was said. If not, I would like to have from the Minister some indication as to the state of the situation at the present time and discussions between the Salvation Army and the Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That question has been dealt with under the Manitoba Hospital Commission.

MR. PAULLEY: All right. In all due respect, Mr. Chairman, it may deal with Care Services which is different than hospitals. It's one of those areas that can take either one and because we have been dealing with extended care facilities, nursing homes, under Care Services, I think it would be quite in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, one of the areas in which the government have completely ignored or neglected to advise the House when we were dealing with Bill 15 was this whole field or area of resettling the displaced persons at South Indian Lake. This is the third time, Mr. Chairman, that I have asked my honourable friend to tell the House of the experience that the government has had in the resettlement of the Indian and Metis at Easterville. I asked about ten specific questions on this subject matter, and I understand that my honourable friend is going to tell us in some detail the success or failure of the resettlement plan, or the resettlement that took place at Easterville when they built the dam at Grand Rapids. Because, surely, Mr. Chairman, that if we have now had some experience in this field of resettling displaced persons, that it would be valuable to the House at this time. That is, has it been a success or has it not been a success. This is one, I suppose, one of the questions that Hydro or certain other officials will be able to inform us on when we're in committee. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. My honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside says that experience is a wonderful teacher. And we have had experience, we've had it; but let's hear how good or bad that it was.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this would be a wonderful opportunity for my honourable friend the former Minister of Welfare to get into this debate, right now, and inform the House because he's been close to the area up there, and tell us in no uncertain terms that this resettlement at Easterville was a howling success and has lacked absolutely nothing. Now, if my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Social Services is not completely informed on this subject matter there's no question but that my friend the former Minister of Welfare will be able to give us some answers. I hope that my honourable friend will know the ten questions or more that I asked him because there were I think ten questions that I asked; and if I get a complete answer to these ten questions then it will certainly help the House to decide on this very important matter.

I don't know whether my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party was here when I asked these specific questions, but they were briefly these: The number of people that were on welfare at Gypsumville prior to the resettlement; the number that are now on welfare; and the cost, the cost, by all agencies, the government, Manitoba Hydro and any other agency involved, the total cost, because this is important, the total cost per person or per family, anyway you want to put it, of the resettlement; and the number on welfare now and the cost per person on welfare since the resettlement, and whether or not that their pattern of life has changed materially. That is, how is the fishing and how is the hunting and how is the pattern of life been changed since the resettlement? Is it better or worse than it was prior to resettlement? These are some of the things that need to be answered, and with the experience that my honourable friends have had in this field then we will be in a position to say: "Well, you've made a good job, or it's been a complete failure, or let's find out."

Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that certain studies were made by Hedlin-Menzies in this particular area? Now, if they have, if this firm has made an assessment, then is their report available to members of the House now, or will it be made available when Bill 15 is before the committee? We don't want part of the Hedlin-Menzies report, if they made one. We want it all. One thing the government has continued to say in the last 15 days of debate, if it's been that long, is that not one single thing will be withheld when Bill 15 is before committee - not a single solitary feature. Well then, I say let's have the Hedlin-Menzies report on this and any other subject matter. Let's find out what the "experts" say, because that's the term that my honourable friends were using. I don't place my honourable friend the former Minister of Welfare in exactly that "expert" category, but in this area he must have certain information that the Honourable Member for Morris does not have available and certainly that's not available to us.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether they want to discuss that under (k) or (l) of the estimates that are before us, or when they get down to Social Services; but certainly before we pass the estimates tonight I think it's incumbent upon the Minister or the former Minister of Welfare to inform the House on this whole area that I have mentioned on three different occasions and failed to get a single answer.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the Member from Neepawa asked me the question on Friday, ten questions, considerable detail. The information is being assembled, but let me say now that it is a severe dislocation for any group to be moved such as the Chippewayan group

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . into Easterville, and as you know the input from Hydro and the continued presence of the community development officer in the community. I don't minimize for one minute the effect on the group of people in giving up their habitat of many years to relocate in a new settlement. It isn't easy and I wouldn't minimize it. But the houses have been built, the general government services are available to them. I don't know if all of them can be broken down, but I will do my best to capsule his questions when they're fully available to me. I know from the preliminary report to the department that approximately 20 families in that community are in receipt of provincial assistance at this time. I haven't got the comparison; I'm trying to get this information and when I have I'll make it available to the honourable member.

In respect to Grace Hospital, I did deal with that earlier under the salary I believe but I could inform the Honourable Leader of the NDP, the Commission advise me this is under active negotiation, the final decision as to the exact use of Grace Hospital, and the recommendation will be forthcoming very shortly. The original program that had been anticipated has been receiving the consideration of the commission; they've been in communication with the officials of the hospital and this matter will be subject to their final recommendation to the department and to the government.

And as I say, with respect to Easterville, I will do my best to get more precise information. The department have been working on it. I guess on that occasion I will have to make a statement before Orders of the Day some day, if we do ever happen to pass the estimates before us, or prepare it in written form for the information of the honourable members.

I believe those are the two questions asked this evening, and as we wound up last night, we had been talking on Care Services and are on that particular item. I think it's important to clarify just a couple of points that came up last evening. I think I outlined the personnel of Care Services. I could say that within the Greater Winnipeg area Care Services do provide visitation by the nurses, once a week, oftener where there are problems; once a week for the doctors for general purposes, more often for treatment; social workers average once per week; some homes daily, some less often according to requirement; and a dietician relies on reports from the staff as to the food standards and so on. This is the function of Care Services in the Metropolitan area and also acting as consultants to our rural areas where these facilities are carried out by our local health unit staff. They don't in that sense have the responsibility for the total program of providing homes throughout the province; this comes under the general aegis of the department through the elderly persons' housing program and of course there's the fullest liaison with Care Services. They are recommending standards to the department as they're adopted, as are our health unit personnel, and these of course go through your provincial board of health and then to cabinet for approval and so on. The rates are set by the agency relations group where we have our staff who do the cost accounting for these determinations. I just thought I would make those few remarks to clarify the picture for the honourable members.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for revealing to me that Grace Hospital was discussed on his salary. I will look up the article, or Hansard accordingly. I would like though to appeal to the Minister. He indicates that negotiations and discussions are going on or continuing between the Salvation Army officials and the Commission. I would ask him to use his good offices to, if necessary, speed up the negotiations. There is, as I understand it now, a cut-off date of federal contributions for hospital construction - and I think that includes construction of this nature - and it was my understanding, some few weeks ago, that there was some fears and apprehensions on the part of the Salvation Army that these grants might be lost if there wasn't rather quick consideration to their request on the use of Grace Hospital on Arlington Street.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . the honourable member and the committee that we've been appealing to Ottawa re that rule that we had to have the spade in the ground by the first of May 1970, you know, or lose our construction grants which are being cut off, but I don't think that would be too much problem with respect to this facility and I can frankly state that, as members may recall some years ago, when the plan to move to the new site of the Grace Hospital was carried out, the original intent was to develop this present facility, remove the obsolete portion of the hospital, which has been done, and look at the rest of it for another acute facility, but in the course of time certain things happen, such as was the problem with Deer Lodge. They're under negotiation there . . . does, that bring on to stream unexpected acute beds in that region of the province, so all these things have been weighed and the Commission

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) advise me they will have a recommendation for me shortly. They haven't completed their negotiations with Deer Lodge, either. All this is tied up in a ball of wax, so I'll try and if anything occurs during the session I'll let the honourable member know.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to thank again the Minister. As I indicated last night, he says that he's on track; all that he requires is a little steam and I hope he uses it in this instance as in others. It's my understanding that a good case might be made for the continued use of the newer section of Grace in the centre of Winnipeg for extended care, which is services or something allied to that, that will cost less of course, as the Minister is well aware, than the . . . care of \$50.00 and upwards in acute bed facilities. So I thank the Minister for his indication that the matter will be speeded up with a little more steam, with the train that is now on the track.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)--passed; (1)(1)(a)--passed . . .

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, under this item I have a number of questions of the Minister and, well, they're going to be disjointed, but the first one is in respect of biological products: Is this the area where money is spent for the various health units for immunization and the various other medicines that are dispensed in those health units? Could the Minister give us a rough breakdown of that, as to what is involved.

The other item under Preventive Medical Services is Occupational Health. I notice that the expenditure for salaries is very small and I am just wondering whether that is just a secretary that is involved and the other expenditures, whatever that is, if the Minister could explain. The other question I have in regard to occupational health is the question of liaison with the Workmen's Compensation. Is there a flow or a dialogue being carried on, and is any of the information from the Workmen's Compensation in regard to occupational diseases, or any other of the related subjects, transmitted to this department, and how is it carried on?

MR. JOHNSON: I'll answer question one. There's \$230,000 in VIII 3 (1) with respect to biologics for the entire province. And No. 2 - that occupational health item is because of reorganization here. It was felt that -- This program was under Environmental Sanitation; you recall we passed that earlier under another division in the department, but this left the medical personnel in the Preventative Medical Services Branch, so this is really a transfer of a position back where we had the Environmental Sanitation group, where we had the public health engineers, agrologists under that division. This is just a transfer of a position that shows up here, so it's really not a -- it's a separation out of that medical component in Environmental Sanitation and thought it best to leave it under Preventative Medical Services. And with the Compensation board -- oh yes, there's the fullest liaison on different surveys we conduct in concert or for the board with respect to silicosis, other surveys within industry which work most closely with the Compensation Board in this regard.

MR. FOX: Before we move on, I did mention the aspect of brucellosis when I was under Compensation. Does that mean that under the Preventive Medical Services, this is the area where a new approach will be taken and a policy decision would be made, or would it be left up to Workmen's Compensation and only the research may be done in this area.

MR. JOHNSON: Are you talking about brucellosis?

MR. FOX: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: It's now eliminated, I believe, in our province. Well, the continuing preventative program for the province is carried out under here and I think you are talking of silicosis.

MR. FOX: No, I'm talking about brucellosis. This was a new disease, an occupational disease that we had a problem with, and we brought it to the attention of the Workmen's Compensation Board. They accepted it after much argument and appeal but there were side effects which the Workmen's Compensation Board was not willing to admit to, and I'm just wondering under which area of occupational health, whether under the preventative area it couldn't be looked at again.

MR. JOHNSON: This is our continuing concern as part of preventive health services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Clause 3, (1)(1) to (4) was read and passed.) (m)(1)(a) . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, under (m)(1) Local Health Services, I note by a propaganda sheet of March 7th last, that "local Health Units throughout the province are developing home care programs to relieve the acute shortage of hospital beds. Plans are also well advanced in the Department of Health and Social Services to incorporate family planning

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . clinics into existing Health Units as soon as federal legislation will permit such a service to operate. Manitoba is now adequately geared to move forward on a broad, effective front to cope with existing problems and anticipate problems not yet apparent."

Now, Mr. Chairman, this indicates that not only will all the present problems be taken care of, but they're away out ahead of the ones that they might anticipate. Now in light of that and in light of what has been said during the health estimates (and incidentally, I think we have been too long on them, but not because of anything I said), but in light of that, how is it that the estimates are not on this particular appropriation, it's not up. It's not up, and yet we are going to take care of all present and future problems. I wonder if my honourable friend could enlighten the House and tell us, and myself in particular, at the Neepawa Health Unit, what is planned in this whole area of home care? Will the staff there be increased to take care of all the home care patients that might relieve the acute shortage of hospital beds?

Now I agree that this is an area in which a lot more can be done. Mr. Chairman, there are hundreds and thousands of people in this province that are occupying hospital beds that could be taken care of just as well in alternative care institutions or at home. I've said this for eleven years and I'm glad that my honourable friend intends to pursue this area that is so vital at this stage in history, particularly with the advent of Medicare, but I would delight in hearing what my honourable friend has in store for the Neepawa Health Unit, say, because if he has a program there, then I suppose the same program will be implemented at each of the health units in the province.

MR. JOHNSON: My honourable friend has a new Health Unit building, as he's well aware, and a very excellent director, and the health units have always been - the public health nurses - doing a certain amount of home care. The reference to the article concerned is the increased emphasis on this which the director of the department, and with the concurrence of all, would like to emphasize home care, more so at the local health unit level. We think this is the best instrument, especially in our rural areas; you know, where you haven't got the central Care Services Division, out in the rural units. It's through the public health nurse offices that we are going to be becoming more involved in home care services. This is public nurse visitation and so on. Also, the Maternal and Child Hygiene Division is going to be heading up the Family Planning program which we expect to develop and emphasize through the Health Unit personnel at Well Baby Clinics, you know, in concert, and the same approach to those who wish to seek out help with respect to family planning and problems, and this again would be part of the Health Unit staff function under the general aegis and direction of the Director of Maternal Health and Hygiene and, in turn, with the university people who are giving leadership in this field.

We think we must become involved in this area. The increase in expenditures in local health units over last year, as you notice in salaries, is up from 1.3 million to 1.7. This is largely due to expansion of the program generally to the southern health unit on a full year's operation and increased costs throughout the units, but I would concur with the honourable member that we are going to be placing more emphasis at this level over -- it has been done in the past and is being done successfully, as you note in the article in the Red River Unit, and we think this is the instrument through which to deliver these services at the local level generally throughout the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (m) (1) (a)--passed; (b)--passed; (c)--passed. (2)(a)--

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on (2). We were discussing the Health Units. I was wondering whether the Minister could give us a little more information in connection with the new unit that is being established, I think it's at Morden: how much money is allocated for that particular unit; the area that is covered; and the number of people who will be employed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the name of the unit - the Minister would like the name of the unit, I think.

MR. FROESE: It's established at Morden. I'm not sure whether that's the title of it.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . the perimeters of that -- that's the center based at Morden and it covers all that isn't covered by the Red River Unit on your east and your southwest unit on your left or on your west. I'm just trying to remember; the southwest center is Killarney, Morden is the base. It would include all that area, I guess, from the river north including Manitou, Morden. I haven't got the exact names. I'd be glad to get a map and make it available to the honourable member. If my staff can hear me, we'll make that available to him.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) This completes the organized areas of the province insofar as health unit coverage is concerned, and, as you know, much of the space is all ready to go. It's a matter of gradually staffing it. Now some of the staff are there in the Lab and X-ray facilities, but there's more staffing to be done and this is in these estimates this year in that over-all figure.

MR. FROESE: . . . allocated for this particular unit.

MR. JOHNSON: Oh gee, I haven't got the breakdown of all the units here. The book was so big, I didn't bring it into the House with me but I could have that broken down. It's in the estimates as a figure.

MR. FROESE: When he gives the information later on, would he also specify the number of people employed and just what type.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--passed; (b)--passed; (3)(a)--passed . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could say a few words on this. I've mentioned quite a few times that I felt there could be some improvement on this. I felt that we should have some kind of a central, not necessarily one only in the whole province, but a central, recognized place or bank or whatever you call it, where we would have the proper staff to read the plates and so on, and I'm worried here about the question of cost, especially with this Medicare coming in and the high cost of all this equipment. It seems that this is one big factor. We're spending 8.8 million and I know that the Minister is concerned about this too. I wonder if the Minister could tell us what the government or the department suggest they do on this. It's a question of cost and then there's also this duplication that we'd have less of, because these plates and these records would be available. There would be some kind of a library and it would be available for awhile and if after so many months, I don't know, after so many months or years, if you have to take another one this is fine, but eventually you could get your finger on a report in no time. It would be available to all doctors; it would be the property of either the Hospital Corporation or -- but I think this is something. We're always talking about saving money and this, because we know that this is a very, very costly department. We know that we will not spend less money, we will always be spending more money in this field, especially now that we have a socialized Medicare plan also. I wonder if the Minister could say something or at least if nothing is contemplated in the near future, I hope that somebody will be working on this, because I certain intend, if I'm here next year, to insist more on this.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the member has brought up a point I think I have referred to in the past but I'd like to clarify it as simply as I could. As you know, the lab and X-ray and health unit services cover now about 603 of our 1,000 or more, especially in our rural areas. The lab and X-ray facilities are approved facilities - an approved facility is one that has the proper pathological and clinical approval; that is, that it meets a minimum standard, and these lab and X-ray services have been supported in the past by public health grants, by fees charged to people who are outside health units, and by municipal levy, and these three inputs provided the money to operate the insured out-patient lab and X-ray services for people not in hospital. With the introduction of Medicare, as my honourable friend knows, such services are covered under the medical care program. So these services, then, will be paid in the coming year through the appropriation in the Medical Care Insurance Corporation, and the municipal levy will not have to be levied, the health grants for that purpose have been withdrawn, and there will be no individual charges, so that revenue side disappears also.

Now, the point is that these are approved facilities and in most communities such as Portage la Prairie where we have your area, Neepawa health unit and so on, the doctors utilize these facilities because of the staff and so on. There are some parts of our province, however, where lab and X-ray services have not been developed to that level, in which case in going into operation with the HCX kind of pattern of care, these are declared approved facilities so that patients can receive service from the physician who is utilizing these facilities. In the Greater Winnipeg area where the bulk of our diagnostic work is, in order to continue the HCX pattern the corporation made an agreement or came to an understanding with the profession, in co-operation with the College of Physicians and Surgeons in the province, that in going into medicare with the HCX type of pattern so we didn't disrupt existing patterns of practice too dramatically to start with, and I know the honourable member will understand this, that in the next nine months they would look to an approval of facilities, looking at the facilities that are now in existence and looking at those that will be approved "for inclusion for diagnostic services in the future," so the problem is that it's come into operation very

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . smoothly but later the provision of insured services will be contingent upon approval of the facility under a standards control program, and the profession are working with the corporation in bringing in a rational plan for the future, and of course looking at the best method of doing this. Now I don't want to anticipate just how this is going to work out because we've left it with the consultants in the field to the corporation plus the medical profession and the college to develop these approved facilities. I think that's the explanation of the problem and that is why this particular appropriation will be passed over to the Medical Care Insurance Corporation as part of the insured benefit under that program.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his reply. It did help, although I don't seem to -- I don't think I made myself quite clear. The Minister talked about these facilities, where they never had these facilities before. I'm not suggesting that we should curtail this. He talked about the country points - this is fine; I understand that, and I think they've got a good start there and I suggest that they -- I certainly don't think that all these tests and lab and X-ray facilities should be restricted to the Metro area.

Then the Minister talked about the standard, I think, to make sure that all these places that are doing that now would be of a high standard. I would go along with this but the specific point that I was making, and I think the government will have to have a look at that, the laymen not necessarily the medical profession, I'm talking about saving . . . I want to know -- by the way, I should say right now that I don't expect this will be done from one day to the other. I recognize that you're just putting on a plan; it's a very very difficult plan, and it'll take a while, and I feel that we, all of us, should co-operate and all the citizens of Manitoba, by the way, should co-operate with the Department of Health to make this plan work - and the medical profession. But I want something a little more specific than that. I mentioned this last year and the year before although we did not have the Medicare at the time, and I'm suggesting that there is too much duplication, too much money spent in this field. If I'm wrong I want the Minister to correct me, but right now any doctor that wants to start a clinic, I don't think . . .

MR. EVANS: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I interrupt the honourable gentleman. I'm sure he's got lots more to say on this very important subject and we'll discuss it tomorrow. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply wishes to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services, that the House do now adjourn.

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