

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, May 5, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to take a moment and introduce our young guests today. We have 120 students of Grade 8 standing from the J. B. Mitchell School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Lomas, Mrs. Nozik and Mrs. Arnason. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

We also have with us in my gallery today four gentlemen - Messrs. Erunse of Nigeria, Mapaderun from Nigeria, Matthews from British Honduras and Mr. Puasa from Brunei, Borneo. These gentlemen have recently completed a course in public administration in the Carleton University and are presently joining the Manitoba Government for practical attachment in their respective areas of endeavour.

On behalf of all the Honourable Member of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today and wish you every success.

And to you young people, I also welcome you on behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly and say how happy we are to have you here today.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Brandon. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion to adopt the report of the Committee on Public Accounts, I do not have the material as yet that I hoped that I might have by the time that I would speak on this particular motion. There is certain information still to come forward, but I would like to take this opportunity to make some comments in general on the financing of the government's operation. Members of this House know very well that the costs are increasing each year, and when we examine the accounts of the year 1967 to March 31st, 1968, that since then costs have gone up even further. We have to cope with this, and I feel that certainly there should be an arrest made somewhere as to the expenditure of government in Manitoba.

Now we know there are certain factors in bringing this about and in increasing the cost of government. I feel that one of the principal costs is the cost of money, because we know that this is also the case in all other business where you find that increasing interest rates means that mounting monies have to be expended. We also know that when the money that is being brought into existence, that every dollar that comes into existence is a borrowed dollar. Money does not come into existence except by borrowing, and the interest then applied on this dollar, on this money that is being borrowed, has never been brought into existence and therefore under our present monetary system we keep on piling up a debt that can never be repaid. The times have never been as critical as they are today because this process just keeps on going and there is no reversal - at least not as yet on the horizon - none of the governments have tackled this in my opinion the way they should.

We also know that the same holds true for purchasing power, that while people's purchasing power might increase and that wages rise and so on, that it's never possible to buy back the goods that they produce themselves. There is also a factor here, namely that markups and so on, again a factor that increases the cost of the commodity, which was not brought into existence and into play in the first place, and again for this purpose you also have to have additional borrowings. So that in the over-all picture you find increasing debt right across this country, both as far as the private sector is concerned and also the public and governments, and the Bank of Canada has been used on occasion by the federal authorities to purchase bond issues that are being floated by the federal government and then bought up by the Bank of Canada. We know that the Bank of Canada is owned by and for the people of this country, that even though they may charge interest that this interest then goes back to the government coffers and the result is that it didn't cost you anything in the first place because those funds are then being used to pay for the operation of government.

So I feel that we should put the Bank of Canada to use much more than it is presently being done; in fact it is being done far too little and that our provinces should also play a part in this matter. I would feel that this government should at least - the very least - approach the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) federal authorities and ask whether they cannot make use of the Bank of Canada, and that if necessary legislation be provided that we could do so, because we find ourselves in the situation this year where we are going to need a lot of money for capital supplies. The Minister of Finance has mentioned that we will need something like a hundred million for Hydro alone, and the interest rates as they are presently, now that the ceiling has been removed since the last revision of the Bank Act, there's no ceiling, and that interest rates are going sky high. I feel that this is unwarranted. Banks were making a very handsome profit long before these increases ever took place, and their present rates are outrageous. We know that they're working on the fractional reserve and that they do not pay interest for all the money that they lend to their borrowers, that they only pay a percentage on a certain portion, which is a very small portion, on the reserves that they have to deposit with the Bank of Canada.

So here we have a private institution that has all these powers under statute and I feel that this government should record a complaint with the federal government, with the federal authorities in this respect, and that we try and seek changes, that changes be brought about in the federal Bank Act and also in the practices of the federal authorities so that we can make use of the facilities of the Bank of Canada. We find, as I already mentioned, the costs are increasing year by year, and the whole matter of financing is costing more and more money. We've been told that the debt, the consumer's debt is increasing and is very large at the present time. It was reported to us, I think a year or two ago, that it was \$7 billion, and it has gone up since then. So this area, too, has to pay more in interest costs for their purchases and this is eating away the income of the people in all walks of life, and especially so in the lower income groups where these people find it difficult as at present. And when you look at the farm situation today where you have increasing taxation on real property and the markets dwindling away and that there's very little to be sold, you find it increasingly difficult.

I feel that this is the area that we as a province should tackle, that we should make an approach to the federal authorities to correct this aspect and that we should be able to profit by it and that those savings would then be reflected on the taxpayer of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to make a short comment on the remarks of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. The time, nor is the occasion right to engage in a full scale debate on the Social Credit theories which I had thought had been exploded long ago, but on some occasion it might be appropriate to go into at length the composition of our central banking system in the country and how the flow of money and credit is controlled by it and through it, and how the Government of Canada is financed as a part of the central banking system. It's a complex matter and unfortunately does not adapt itself to the Social Credit theory. The Bank of Canada administration and the financing of our monetary system and the expenditures of the federal government is indeed working well; the Social Credit system is not working anywhere that I know of, and so I think we will stick with what we have.

There may be ways indeed in which we can invite the consideration of the Bank of Canada and the Government of Canada to the financing requirements of the provinces and I think my honourable friend raised a good point, that we should raise at Ottawa the question of the extent to which - if any extent - the Bank of Canada can assist in the financing of the provinces. I noticed with interest in the Bank of Canada statement, for example, that among the assets that they hold there is an account open for provincial securities, but the last time I looked at it there were no holdings of provincial securities. I'm not aware why they shouldn't be; they seem to be empowered to hold provincial securities but they just don't happen to have any in their portfolio. These are matters which we should consider with our simple banking system in the country and I'm prepared to agree with my honourable friend that they would probably have some responsibility toward provinces and the provincial finances. I will undertake to raise this matter with Ottawa, and I think my honourable friend raised a good point.

I didn't want to let this occasion pass without acknowledging that my honourable friend has a point that he likes to raise on repeated occasions, at least once a year, about this financial system, and say to him that I listened with interest and I will try to take such points from it as will help us in our present situation and that I didn't want to pass it over lightly.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne) introduced Bill No. 84, The Local Authorities Election Act; and Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Commission of Northern Manitoba Affairs Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 95, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded; and Bill No. 96, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take advantage of the occasion to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 5 on the motion of the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In Saturday's Tribune there was a story which revealed there had been several outbreaks of violence following a strike at the Lakehead. To the Minister's knowledge, have any of these outbreaks of violence taken place within the boundaries of Manitoba?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): No, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge none have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Transportation.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the honourable the Member for Wellington asked me a question concerning lights burning day and night at PTH 59 and PTH 44, and I'm afraid I missed the target by a mile. What is happening is that the lights are in the process of being installed by Hydro. It is Hydro that has them on, which is apparently related to their installation. As soon as they are installed they'll be turned off in the day time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition asked me the other day about what went into the total cost with respect to the high level diversion at Southern Indian Lake. He enquired particularly, I think, whether that included the construction costs and the costs of resettlement. Yes, it is the total cost including those two items, among others.

My honourable friend from Churchill seemed dissatisfied with the answer I gave him the other day in connection with television at Wabowden. I undertook to find out whether there were any matters in that connection which fell within my responsibility. I find there are none, that the matter of television falls within the jurisdiction of the federal government and is administered by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and by the Canadian Radio and Television Commission, which was formerly known as the Board of Broadcast Governors. The only connection the Manitoba Telephone System has with it is to make available network facilities which may be rented to the federal government, or its agencies, for communicating television signals from one point to another, but they act only as the employed agent of the federal government whose responsibility it is to provide the television.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOW BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Minister for bringing this information to the House and I'd just like to ask him why, during the last by-election, they were going around the whole north country telling them they were responsible for the television.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question either to the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Transportation. Over the weekend I had many phone calls in regards to the flooded damage in the municipal roads, bridges and lands and property, and they are quite interested in what the government is going to do in regards to it. Have they a program set up to compensate for these losses and will they be notified real soon?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may just respond. As indicated by the Honourable the First Minister some days ago, no policy has been developed. It was suggested by the First Minister that the municipalities concerned might bring the details of any of these situations to the attention of the Water Conservation Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources.

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

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, last week the Leader of the Opposition asked whether the government was prepared

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) to table the document on Macdonald and I took the question as notice. We are prepared to table a document. I would simply ask that you file an Address for Papers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I directed a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources about a report I received about some work going on in conjunction with the South Indian Lake diversion. According to a report in the Thompson paper, there's 200 men presently employed on this project. I'm wondering how this is possible in view of the fact that Bill 15 has not been approved by this House.

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

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, if I may address a question to the Honourable the First Minister or the acting House Leader. I note in today's Votes and Proceedings there is Notice of Motion of what we normally call the speed-up resolution of the business of the House. My question, Mr. Speaker, would be: How many more pieces of legislation is it intended for the government to introduce for consideration of the House, apart from those of course that we have?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Well, Mr. Speaker, the notice is there and I'm not just sure when we'll be proceeding with the resolution, but it's being arranged to be put on the Order Paper. A "guesstimate" of the number of pieces of legislation is probably 10 or 12 - something like that. I think that's probably an approximation of the number of pieces of legislation that might be left.

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 Finance. I'm referring to his statement in the House on the 1st of May regarding South Indian Lake, and he indicated there that there's no alternative way of making power for Manitoba's needs between now and at least the year 2000 which has any prospect of being any more attractive than development of the Hydro resources of the Nelson, and then later repeated again, "for the foreseeable future or at least until the year 2000, no likelihood." Are we to understand that this is an announcement that the government has already made the decision to proceed with all phases of the Nelson development to the year 2000?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I didn't want to -- I was pausing to think for a moment. It seems that our intentions - the Bill will proceed - are clear, and we've entered a Bill in the House to provide the licence accordingly. It's a government measure and I think the government's intentions are pretty clear.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the Bill refers to Phase I; the Minister's statement here referred to the whole of the Nelson. So my question is, is the decision made on the whole of the Nelson?

MR. EVANS: No, not in the sense that decisions have been made to proceed with each succeeding thing, but as far as can be foreseen at this point, this is the best plan on the basis of present knowledge and present science of electric generation, and it seems highly probable to me that the next decision to be made will be the further extension of the Nelson River. But if anything else should appear in the meantime that looks better, we would do that, but at the moment there is nothing, as far as I can see, there is no prospect of any different choice being more attractive.

MR. MOLGAT: But we are not committed at this point to Phase II or Phase III - is that correct?

MR. EVANS: There are no contracts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm told that the question should have been directed to the Minister of Finance who is in charge of Hydro, the question I directed to the Minister of Natural Resources. Could the Minister of Finance answer that question?

MR. EVANS: I'm afraid I've forgotten the question.

MR. BOROWSKI: According to a newspaper report there's 200 men employed on the South Indian Lake project, and my question was: How is this possible in view of the fact that the Bill has not been passed by this House authorizing such expenditures?

MR. EVANS: I'll ask.

MR. BOROWSKI: I didn't hear the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for

MR. BOROWSKI: I have another question, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. I received a bulky petition in a letter from a group of individuals who signed themselves the Churchill Ratepayers. I understand that the First Minister received a letter also. There's apparently going to be a severe cutback, and I'm just wondering if the Minister has anything to say on this matter.

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't.

MR. BOROWSKI: Is the Minister indicating that he's not aware of the situation or he doesn't care that there's going to be a severe cutback of work at Churchill Port?

MR. WEIR: The question, Mr. Speaker, was did I have anything to say; and the answer was, No, I didn't.

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

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's.): Mr. Speaker, if I may direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of finance. On April 30th I asked about progress with the Return to Order No. 6, dealing with names of civil servants earning \$8,000 and over and names of consultative agencies. The Minister said he would enquire as to progress.

MR. EVANS: Yes, I did enquire and received a verbal answer that it is a rather large compilation and that it does involve not only the government but its agencies. The work is progressing. I'm not able to tell my honourable friend when it will be ready, at this date I'm not -- at this point in time, I'm not able to tell him when the answer will be completed. There will be no delay.

MR. CHERNIACK: Just a similar question to the Honourable the First Minister who undertook to investigate on May 1st the progress in connection with Number 11, dealing with names of members of the Economic Consultative Board, Budget, etc.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, my information is that that Order should be ready this week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question here for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It's a very long one, so I'll read it. Did the Minister receive a copy of a resolution passed unanimously by the Town Council of Thompson on April 10th asking the government to pass legislation which would allow Manitoba municipalities the right to establish Municipal Tenant Boards which would establish and review rents in a municipality and which would also hear and act on tenants' complaints regarding condition of the rental of property and which would prevent evictions except for justifiable reasons. And did the Minister receive another copy from the Thompson Town Council asking the government to review the Landlords and Tenants Act with a view of increasing the rights of the tenants under the Act. And if the Minister did receive this resolution, does the government intend to do anything about this resolution and request which was unanimous from the Town Council?

MR. BAIZLEY: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, and it's being referred to the Attorney-General's Department.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, on Friday the Honourable Member for Burrows posed a question in regard to price of meat, retail prices that relate to the price on the hoof at the moment, and I took the question as notice. It's pretty difficult to get an average price that beef is selling at by the cut in the retail stores, but I have current prices insofar as cut and wrapped sides are concerned. This morning two large retail outlets were selling sides cut and wrapped at 69 cents a pound and this is relative to beef sold on the hoof this morning at a net average price of 30, 75 - and I'm talking here about good and choice steers. Considering the dress-out at 40 percent and further approximately 20 percent trim on sides cut and wrapped, this price seems to be relative to normal charges for beef.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for prompt attention to this matter, but would he be good enough to also enquire into the price that the average housewife must pay for beef, because I take it that these were for sides and I'm sure that only a small percentage of beef is sold in that manner and the other prices might be considerably higher than that. Would the Minister make a further check into the average price paid by the housewife for beef?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Bill No. 15, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in amendment thereto. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, when I first spoke at the opening of the debate, I appealed to the government to deal with this issue openly and to give us all the facts before asking us to make a decision. I appealed to all of the members of this House to approach the question openly in the light of the information today and to make a decision for Manitoba and for its future based on the facts known today and not on the discussions of the past. I stated then, Mr. Speaker, that in my view this Bill was the most important one I had had to deal with. I stated that I was prepared to discuss it on a non-partisan basis. I deliberately refrained from covering the government's handling of the issue. I've deliberately refused to be in any way critical. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is what is the best for the people of Manitoba. How can we best develop our province? How can we make it a better place for all of our people? The issues at stake, as I said then, are wise public spending, northern development, economic provision of the most economic source of electricity, and the recognition of social values. I was disappointed at one point of the debate when the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and the Member for Morris obviously attempted to divert it from a sensible and serious discussion to a partisan, "You said so. I didn't" type of debate. I want to compliment the Minister of Finance for returning it to the proper level, where we on this side of the House honestly had tried to keep it.

As I've stated previously, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House regard Bill 15 as a major Bill, but it is a Bill that it is impossible to discuss seriously, even in principle, unless we are fully informed of the technical and economic details and decisions that lie behind it. In the Throne Speech it was made clear that we would be asked to approve legislation granting Manitoba Hydro a licence to flood Southern Indian Lake. Now we all know that legislation in the form of the Water Power Act exists for controlling the use of our water resources. It was under the provisions of this Act that the licence for the Kettle Rapids project was issued. For reasons that are still unclear to me, the government wished to by-pass the Water Power Act and ask the Legislature to decide on the issue. So we must note that, notwithstanding the results of our deliberations in this House, it will still be the government's responsibility to actually issue the licence.

However, the Bill having been brought into the House, we must do all that we can to make a wise decision, to make a decision that Manitobans will be able to live with in the decades to come, to make a decision that will be best for all Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, a wise and good decision in such a technical matter as this can not be made in ignorance of the facts concerning benefits and costs covering all matters related to the project. This was the basis of our insistence that we be provided with the reports of all studies relating to the high level diversion of the Churchill river. Some of these reports had come to hand before the start of the present debate, but they presented such an incomplete picture that they raised more questions than they answered.

Comments have been made about this debate being very technical. I make no apology for it, Mr. Speaker, the subject is complex and technical; nor, Mr. Speaker, do I make any apology for having made use of outside advisers and technical people. Members of the House cannot be experts in all fields. My colleagues in the Liberal Party, and I do not pretend to be experts in the field of power and so we have made full use of all qualified expert assistance available to us, and I want to publicly acknowledge this assistance and thank those who have helped us.

Some have been critical at other times of the involvement of a number of university professors in this whole issue over the past few months. In my view, this has been greatly to their credit and to the great advantage of Manitoba. These professors have nothing to gain and everything to lose from being involved. Their decision to become involved clearly shows their deep concern.

My colleague, the Member for Hamiota, dealt with the last speech by the Minister of Finance on Friday. Without attempting to cover the ground again, I must say that if the Minister's speech was to be the government's answer to the questions brought up, and if this

May 5, 1969

1901

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) speech was to be the conclusion of the government's position, then I am even more concerned about this Bill and the course the government is taking. For the Minister to admit that he does not understand present value calculations is incredible; but even worse is that it makes his figures unbelievable. Any economist will testify to this. My colleague pointed out the problems we have in accepting the Minister's calculations of thermal costs. He pointed out the fact that the Brandon plant can be expanded in spite of the Minister's statement that it has reached its maximum. Most surprising, as well, was the attitude on the one hand by the Minister that nuclear power is unreliable and that in the foreseeable future up to the year 2000 it can not be considered as an alternative; and on the other hand, saying that the government will try to convince the federal government to co-operate on a uranium enrichment plant in the north before the year 1980. The Manitoba Government will hardly be a good salesman to the federal government with this sort of an argument. On the one hand the Minister is saying it's unreliable, you can't depend on nuclear power; on the other hand saying to the federal government, but you must come and assist us in building a plant.

However, Mr. Speaker, out of the whole debate so far some key points have come out and the government has now admitted, first, that Phase I development of the Nelson River plan has been radically redefined since the 1966 Legislative Committee hearings. Phase I no longer includes the regulation of Lake Winnipeg. The second point: That the existing agreement with Ottawa does not bind Manitoba to each program as initially defined in Phase I. And point number three: that there is no technical reason why Manitoba should suffer any type of power shortage or brownout if the flooding of Southern Indian Lake is not approved; options do exist. This means that the Legislature is legally and technically free to review all parts of Phase I not yet constructed.

Last Friday morning, while the Honourable Member for Inkster was speaking the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources interrupted him to say that all the reports were available if members would go to Hydro to get them. Mr. Speaker, some time ago one of my Liberal colleagues and I had been to the Water Control Branch to see what reports were available.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I was referring specifically to the reports that the Member from St. John's and the Member for Inkster identified in their speeches, that is the five to six million dollar Hydro reports. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I take it then that the Minister is saying that not all the reports are available. Is that correct? Well, Mr. Speaker, we had understood too some time ago that the information was available. As I say, one of my colleagues and myself went to the Water Control Branch some time ago to see what was there. Our advisors had also been to Hydro to examine the reports there, so we've taken advantage previously, Mr. Speaker, of getting the information. Now in spite of these previous visits we immediately followed up on the Minister's statement on Friday that all the information we wanted was available in the Hydro library. Immediately after the rise of session I contacted Hydro by telephone to ask for copies of the studies and one of my colleagues went to the Water Control Branch and to Hydro that afternoon. And I want to congratulate Hydro, Mr. Speaker, for their co-operation in offering to show us all of the reports and studies which had been commissioned by Hydro.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interrupt the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in his important speech but it is an important matter that he is referring to. He's referring now to copies of information available. That again, Mr. Speaker, was never indicated by anybody in this House that they were available. I repeat that the information that he is specifically talking about, that is the details, the multitude of Hydro engineering information that was gathered over the five, six years, has been assured by me by Hydro officials to be available on request to any inquiring person. I did not suggest that copies of all this material was available.

MR. MOLGAT: Fine, Mr. Speaker. The Minister says copies are not available but the reports are available. Well Hydro went further than that, Mr. Speaker, and as I was saying, I congratulate them. Hydro supplied me with some copies, on loan, and I was able to do some work on them over the weekend. Now the Minister says copies are not available but we can see the reports if they're there. Well this makes it very difficult obviously for someone who wants to study a report if the only way it can be studied is by going to the library at Hydro. However, be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, Hydro were most co-operative and supplied me with some of the reports. I might add that Water Control Branch did the same on Friday. We were told, however, that Hydro could not supply reports which were not exclusively Hydro

May 5, 1969

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) reports and that we would have to get joint reports or government reports from the government. As I said, later in the day we were supplied with some reports by both Hydro and the Water Control Branch. But these are purely the Hydro reports, Mr. Speaker.

Now we've studied these reports as well as we could over the course of one weekend. Some had been studied by our advisors previously when it had been indicated that they were available, others were new to us on this weekend. Now the key to being able to make a sound decision on the issue before us is the information available giving the benefits and the costs. It's only when you weigh the benefits against the costs that an answer can be given. Now without the full information any decision is pure guesswork, and as Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, we can't afford to guess on such important matters. Too much of our future is at stake, and this is why the studies and reports are of such tremendous importance. And this means, Mr. Speaker, all studies and reports, not just the technical Hydro ones but all studies that permit a rational assessment of what is it going to cost on the one side; what are we going to benefit on the other side; what are the losses in other areas; and then a conclusion can be arrived at.

Now the Minister of Finance has stated that there are some \$6 1/2 million worth of studies. Now let's go over the history of some of the reports and studies, Mr. Speaker. First - and this is not an all-inclusive list I might add - but first, the First Report of the Nelson River Programming Board, and we'll refer to it as the Blue Book, November, 1965. It was tabled in this House in February of 1966. It clearly stated that alternatives existed to the Churchill River diversion and mentioned two in particular, the Southern Indian, Rat-Burntwood and the Sturgeon Weir route in Saskatchewan, and it was indicated that studies were going on. This is Page 22 of the Nelson River Programming Board Report dated the 30th of November, 1965.

Number two. In the March 1966 meetings of the Public Utilities Committee it was stated that studies were proceeding on the natural resource aspects - pages 31 and 32, March 21, 1966 hearings.

Number three. We have already quoted in this debate the late Dr. Stephens' statement of March 31, 1967, to a discussion group on Southern Indian Lake, in which he made very clear that Manitoba Hydro - and I quote: "With respect to the Churchill diversion it's simply a party-at-interest. We are not, nor should we be, lords and masters of the water resources of the province." The decision would have to be made under the Water Power Act or the Water Rights Act where - and I quote again from Dr. Stephens: "We" - that is Hydro - "would have to show to an independent body that what we propose would be in the general public interest, not just in the interests of power." Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a perfectly proper position for Hydro. Their responsibility is the production of power at the lowest price possible. The government's obligation is equally clear. Government has the responsibility to decide what in fact is in the general public interest. Government must therefore have the facts and figures to make this decision; government must have the studies to prove what is in the general public interest. The late Dr. Stephens made this clear to the government in March of 1967 as shown in the above quotation.

Fourth point. At our Session a year ago the NDP attempted to have tabled in the House copies of a report entitled "Transition in the North." This was refused by the government.

Fifth point. At that same session of a year ago, I moved an Address for Papers requesting, and I quote: "Copies of all studies and reports prepared by or on behalf of the Manitoba Government or any of its departments or its agencies or commissions with respect to the proposed diversion of the Churchill River and any alternate plans which have been considered." Mr. Speaker, this was turned down by the government as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that all this discussion about reports led members of the Legislature to believe that vast documents covering all relevant aspects of the subject were being prepared. We were somewhat surprised, Mr. Speaker, when on Friday we received copies of the existing reports. Our surprise was caused by the fact that there are indications that certain crucial subjects have not been subjected to thorough study. Let me give you some specific and crucial examples.

No. 1 - the Sturgeon Weir Diversion. Mr. Speaker, way back in 1966 when we began to discuss Phase I development of the Nelson, we were told that two major alternatives existed for diverting the Churchill River. First, we could divert the river at Southern Indian Lake, or second, we could divert the river near Frog Portage and Trade Lake in Saskatchewan.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) We were led to believe that both alternatives were being seriously studied, although admittedly some advantages were claimed for the Southern Indian Lake diversion. Given the immediate importance of evaluating alternatives to the flooding of Southern Indian Lake, we were particularly interested in seeing the studies of the Sturgeon Weir diversion when we obtained the reports on Friday. What were we able to find? The only consultant study which appears to have been made of the Sturgeon Weir diversion was made back in 1963 in the Crippen report. The Crippen report did not attempt to evaluate the economics of the Sturgeon Weir diversion. In fact, after noting a few problems associated with the Sturgeon Weir diversion, problems such as the interference with the Island Falls generating station, and after noting such problems the Crippen report stated - I'm referring to Section 6-02 and I quote: "In view of the above, and the limited information available for a more comprehensive assessment at this time, no further reference will be made to this diversion possibility herein." So, Mr. Speaker, they said, limited information for a comprehensive assessment, they were not going to study it any further.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should note the context in which the consultant made this remark. In the Crippen report only diversion of the Churchill River was being discussed. To be precise, the possibility of flooding Southern Indian Lake was not discussed. In the Crippen report the proposal involved only a \$6 million diversion of the river at Southern Indian Lake. Of course the plan to flood Southern Indian Lake creates a series of obvious problems, problems which might have led the consultant to examine the Sturgeon Weir diversion more thoroughly, but at that time there was no plan apparently to flood Southern Indian Lake. Mr. Speaker, that was back in 1963.

In 1965, Gibb-Underwood and McLellan produced an entire report on the Churchill River diversion. But, Mr. Speaker, this report did not study the Sturgeon Weir diversion. In fact, as the consultants state on Page 4 of their letter of transmittal - and I quote - this is the letter when the consultants were returning the report to Hydro and I quote from it: "Our terms of reference did not include the study of any diversion of the Churchill River outside Manitoba, and for this reason we have not given consideration to a diversion via the Sturgeon Weir River into the Saskatchewan River." On Page 21 and 22 of this report the consultants made some brief comments on the Sturgeon Weir diversion. It was noted that one advantage of this diversion would be that it passes through the existing hydro-electric power developments at Grand Rapids and at Kelsey; however, no economic benefit-cost analysis was presented. The Sturgeon Weir diversion was not compared on a benefit-cost ratio or basis with the Southern Indian Lake diversion.

Well then, what has happened since 1965? Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as we can determine, nothing has happened since 1965. More consultants have been hired to examine the diversion at Southern Indian Lake, but it would appear that no consultant has seriously studied the Sturgeon Weir diversion since 1963, and even the study in 1963 did not examine the economics of the Sturgeon Weir diversion.

Let's go on to another area of major concern, Mr. Speaker, and that's Lake Winnipeg regulation. Now this plan, which was defined until very recently to be a major part of Phase I development of the Nelson, in the initial proposals made to us it was part of a four way proposal - the Kettle Rapids, the transmission line, the Churchill River diversion and the regulation of Lake Winnipeg. Now naturally, in view of the fact that this had been in the original program and now by statements of the government it has been removed, we searched through the available reports for information on this subject. From what we can discover in these reports, Mr. Speaker, we are led to the conclusion that Lake Winnipeg control is a vital part and necessary ingredient for the development of hydro-electric power on the Nelson. The Crippen report stated - and I'm quoting now from Section 5-01, quoting directly from the report - "The Nelson River basin run-off is highly variable throughout the year, with a peak discharge in June about five times greater than the minimum discharge during the winter months. Utilization of this highly variable run-off can only be realized by regulation of Lake Winnipeg considered in conjunction with the Lake Winnipeg inflows."

The 1965 Underwood-McLellan report on the Churchill River diversion made this same point, and I'm referring now to Page 27 of their report: "Flow to hydro-electric plants on the Nelson River will be regulated principally by control of storage on Lake Winnipeg." It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that these remarks were made in the report which assumed that flooding of Southern Indian Lake would be included in the development of Nelson River power.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) Thus, it would appear that the impression which we received at the 1966 hearings was indeed correct, that as Mr. Stephens stated: "Lake Winnipeg control was of paramount economic importance to the development of the Nelson River." Mr. Speaker, I point out that this is Lake Winnipeg control, that there are benefits here from the standpoint of the control of the water levels, that it does not involve flooding of Lake Winnipeg, but Mr. Speaker, we find no such reports as to why this has now been removed from the plans.

So far, Mr. Speaker, I've discussed what seemed to me to be important areas in which information is necessary for a good and wise decision and information that is missing. What I've been discussing are mainly areas concerned with engineering and economic factors of power generation alone. In looking at a project of this magnitude, however, it is crucial that we take into consideration its ramifications and implications for all other aspects of the economy and the quality of life in our province. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that I'm saying nothing new here, for this very important point was brought out explicitly during our 1966 hearings. I'll not waste the time of the House in quoting from the many sources that have said the same thing, but it is important, Mr. Speaker, to note that as late as February, 1968, just barely a year ago, the demand for studying resource values and the other effects of flooding was made in a consultant's - and I'm referring here to Underwood-McLellan - in a consultant's report to Manitoba Hydro, and I quote directly from the letter of transmittal of that report on Page 2. Mr. Speaker, this is February, 1968, just a little over a year ago, and here's what that report says: "It now appears that a realistic appraisal of the effect of increased levels must include a deeper assessment of the other resources and human aspects involved. We have therefore deleted from the estimates the fixed costs of flooding used in the 1965 report on the understanding that a more complete assessment will be made by others."

From this, Mr. Speaker, we can only assume that at this time, in February 1968, the impact of the high level diversion on other resource values was not known - at least it was not known to these consultants. And with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote just once again from the same report. This is Page 5, the last paragraph: "The decision of Manitoba Hydro to include the diversion as an early phase of their sequence of development for the Nelson River has stimulated interest in the effect on resources in the area other than hydro-electric power. Should it prove that the diversion development has an appreciable effect on these other resources, then costs or benefits may vary appreciably with storage levels and diversion flows. Should this be the case, the range of storage levels herein indicated as being most economic for a given storage volume or flow would no longer apply, and the applicable development costs would be altered." Here then we have an engineering consultant saying that the economic value of this project can not be assessed in the absence of detailed information on other resource values that will be affected. We have been unable to find such information. The only studies that we know of are the secret Task Force report and "Transition in the North" - a Study by Van Ginkel, Hedlin and Menzies. We find no other resource studies, than the material that's been supplied to us, that the Minister said on Friday was available.

Mr. Speaker, despite the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' generous offer on Friday of last week, Manitoba Hydro was unable to provide us with these studies. In any case, government spokesmen have publicly denounced the Task Force report as unscientific and hasty, so presumably we cannot count this report. It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the government has not been recently enlightened in this area. As late as last Wednesday the government was thoughtful enough to inform the House that they are still substantially in the dark on at least one aspect of this subject.

The Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs stated - this is Page 1769 of Hansard - that the government did not know how great the recreational potential of South Indian Lake is. Mr. Speaker, this is the Minister responsible for Tourism and Recreation in this province. And what does he tell us? On the 30th of April in this House - and I'm quoting now from Page 1769: "I think I should report to the House that the recreational potential of South Indian Lake, we don't know at the moment how great it is." Mr. Speaker, that's the Minister responsible for the recreation and tourism development in this province, who admits he has no idea what the potential of the area is but who is quite prepared to vote in favour of flooding it without knowing. The Minister then dismissed the subject by noting that there was no recreation development there now. The Minister would obviously prefer that potential recreational areas should come complete with built-in facilities to aid in identification. The government evidently is perfectly willing to remain uninformed and unenlightened, although millions of dollars may be at stake.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)

In how many other areas of this project have the government adopted the attitude of willful, in fact even cheerful ignorance? Up until last Friday, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, in a rather informal manner, informed the House that all reports were available, we had thought that the government was guilty only of concealment of vital information. It is beginning to appear, Mr. Speaker, as though the necessary information does not even exist. At this moment we are still not certain. We are unwilling, Mr. Speaker, to believe even now that any government would proceed without such information. But, Mr. Speaker, the government is caught in this dilemma; either the information exists and they are concealing it, or the information does not exist and they are guilty of monumental folly. Mr. Speaker, the question is, and I ask the Minister, are there reports and studies on the Sturgeon Weir alternative? Are there reports and studies on the abandonment of Lake Winnipeg regulation? Are there reports and studies on the natural resources and the human resources of Southern Lake area? We are not raising such matters, Mr. Speaker, for our own convenience. We are not asking for information so that we can satisfy our own curiosity. This House consists of more than merely the members who sit in the government benches.

It has been suggested to us that it's the government's prerogative to make decisions, but I would point out that it is the duty of the Opposition to offer informed criticism. The government may not enjoy such criticism but greater men than they have thought it essential to our parliamentary process. The government can of course use the sheer weight of its majority to stifle opposition. The majority rules in this House and it may, if it chooses, rule arbitrarily. The government can use its numbers to steamroll this Bill through second reading without the members in the House knowing the facts; their members on their side as much as the members on this side. But while they may use their voting strength to put this House on record as approving in principle a Bill about which the House is ignorant, they cannot force us to condone such a procedure, and we will not add an air of legitimacy to the government's refusal to allow informed debate by making known all the facts, making all the known facts public so that it can be properly assessed.

Mr. Speaker, the government would have this House believe that only those who support this Bill are for progress in northern development. But of what does their vision of northern progress consist? They say we must reject nuclear power as unreliable, and this would doom the very source of energy upon which our hopes for a nuclear enrichment plant were based. They've scuttled Lake Winnipeg regulation and thus have denied both the full development on the Nelson project as well as the benefits of flood control that would accrue at no extra cost. Apparently, as far as we can find out, without adequate studies, they would permanently destroy any hope for the development of this vast Southern Indian Lake area for recreation and tourism. Apparently, without adequate studies, they would dismantle one of the most successful Indian communities in Manitoba at a time when such communities are sorely needed. This is their northern vision, Mr. Speaker, and it is for this that they ask us to vote in blind faith. Don't ask any questions; just vote. And it is criticism of this that is supposed to constitute criticism of progress. We have a larger vision of the north, Mr. Speaker, a north that is built rather than destroyed; a north that is developed rather than wasted. We don't look upon the north as simply a vast wild wilderness area as the Minister of Tourism does; we believe the future of Manitoba lies in the north.

Mr. Speaker, we've said many times during the course of this debate that we are at this time neither for nor against Bill 15. It is impossible to take a position on principle until such times as the members of this House know much more about the benefits, the costs and the impact on all Manitobans. If this is truly the best thing for Manitoba we want to support it, but the government must prove its case first, Mr. Speaker. If this is truly the best thing for all parts of Manitoba we will support it, but the government has made no case for this, Mr. Speaker, and our investigations reveal that they do not have the information to make the decision on. To date, the government has placed the House in an impossible position on second reading. The solution, Mr. Speaker, is to accept the amendment now before us so that we can get all the necessary information before the vote is called. Mr. Speaker, the issue in the amendment is clear, and we are prepared to vote on the amendment at once.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word or two in connection with this matter. I have followed it with a great deal of interest, as I'm sure every member of the

May 5, 1969

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) House has, but before doing so, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the privilege of the House to draw to your attention, Sir, that the distinguished gentleman seated in the visitors' gallery this afternoon, Sir, may not be known to you. I refer to Mr. George Olive who was the MLA for the constituency of Springfield, I believe from 1945 until 1953, and a former Mayor of that great and thriving community of Transcona. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you would be pleased that Mr. Olive saw fit, and had the time to come down this afternoon. There are only about three or four of us I presume in the House that really know Mr. Olive - the Member for Lakeside, the Member for Selkirk, and I believe the Member for Brandon are the only three in the House that had the honour of sitting with Mr. Olive, and I'm sure that you would welcome him here this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Leader of the New Democratic Party for his opinion. I don't think it requires any further words from me, other than to say I welcome the honourable gentleman today.

MR. PAULLEY: Now back to a topic of considerable debate in the House, namely Bill No. 15 and the amendment that we have before us. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that I can add but little to the debate dealing with the matters of technical data, a lack of materials and the whole question. I believe one of the last speeches I made before going on holidays dealt with the question of Southern Indian Lake, at which time I faulted the government for its attitude in respect of this very important matter and suggested that possibly the salary of one of the Ministers should be reduced because of the approach of the government. I think I would like now, if I had the power, really to suggest even a more sterner action and reduce the salaries of the whole caboodle across the road, but I doubt very much whether I have that power.

But I do think that in the interest of all of Manitobans I should make an appeal to the government to accept the amendment that is proposed and the amendment that is before us in order that, without requiring members in opposition to vote on a technical vote of agreement in principle with a Bill - or opposed to a Bill - that we may have the opportunity and the benefit of discussing this Bill with the officials of Manitoba Hydro. The other day my colleague from Kildonan asked the Minister responsible for our public utilities when the committee on public utilities may be heard to hear representatives of our public utilities. If I recall correctly, "In due course" was the answer, or an answer somewhere along that line -- (Interjection) -- "after this Bill is completed." But, Mr. Speaker, we also of course have other matters to discuss with the representatives of our public utilities that can be, and I'm sure that it would be, if this committee were called to consider all aspects of public utilities, the subject matter contained in Bill 15 would be raised and I guess this is the fear of the Minister in charge of public utilities.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of government is one of fear in having the officials of our Hydro utility appear unless and until, in their arguments, we vote in favour of second reading of Bill 15 as a matter of principle. The Leader of the Opposition, who has just taken his seat, indicated - and I believe him to be a sincere man - indicated that if the facts were before us in order for us to make a proper assessment of the ramifications of the development of the north and the Nelson, it may be that they would be prepared to give support to the development. This is what I said to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources some time back. Give us the facts upon which to make a proper judgment before asking us to vote on a matter of principle. I note that in the Bill, even the government in its Bill does not indicate full trust or competence of the officials of Manitoba Hydro, because the Bill says that before any plans are accepted, or any action can be taken by Manitoba Hydro, the Minister must approve of the same. So I say to the Minister, I say to the government, this matter is of such vital concern to all of the people of Manitoba, the future development of Manitoba, that the opposition and all members of this Assembly should be placed in a position where they could make their decisions after a complete assessment.

I heard the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources the other day refer to certain reports of Manitoba Hydro that would be available. True, but they're not all available. I understand that there are some reports in the Department of Water Conservation that are available for looking at. -- I don't quite understand the gesture of my honourable friend the Minister. He points at me. Well, if they're available in his office and if all of the reports upon which you're basing Bill 15 are in your office, my dear friend, may I suggest that they be placed on the table in this House so all the rest of us can have an opportunity of looking at them and coming to a conclusion.

May 5, 1969

1907

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

My colleagues have taken part in this debate on a number of occasions. They have expressed opinions based on the fear and mistrust of the proposition that's before us because that proposition isn't placed before us openly and above board. I recall back in 1966 when the former First Minister first introduced the subject of the development of the Nelson in a billion dollar project, and he said in due course the plans will be revealed. Following his statement there was a statement from the Leader of the Opposition and then by myself as Leader of the New Democrats, and I said then that I was not going to buy a pig in a poke, and one of the cartoonists of one of our papers had a cartoon accordingly and it showed a little drunk or a little pig beside a turbine saying "oink-oink - Paulley won't buy a pig in a poke." And the government today, Mr. Speaker, is once again, in effect, asking all of us in this House to buy a pig in a poke. For goodness sake! Will you not agree with me that this matter is of such vital importance to all of Manitoba, and indeed Canada as well and even possibly to the south of us, because there was consideration that in the development of the Nelson River complex that we may export power to the central United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, what has the government forced us to do on this side of the House? They've forced us into a position to do everything within our power by sweet reasoning, cajoling, or even brutal argument, to have the intestinal fortitude to place their proposition outside of this House before asking the members to vote on so-called principle, because frankly and honestly, Mr. Speaker, I do not trust the government, because I greatly fear that if we voted in favour of second reading of Bill 15 and then elicited some information that was contrary to what we've heard from the boys opposite, the members opposite respecting this development, they would turn around and say: well, you voted in principle for it anyway. So often -- (Interjection) -- I'm going to vote "No" - I'm going to vote "No" because we haven't got a government in Manitoba that deserves my trust as a member of this Assembly. And why do I say that - and I realize that that is a rather strong way of looking at government - because the government will not place its trust in the ability of the opposition to make a proper assessment of this matter. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? I don't think their own backbenchers - taking a cue from my colleague from Kildonan - I don't even think the backbenchers are truly conversant or cognizant of the approach of this government. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend the Minister of Transportation tells me to worry about my backbenchers. I worry about all backbenchers, but my prime worry, Mr. Speaker, is for the people of Manitoba in the development of what some people call one of the last frontiers that we have to develop, namely, Northern Manitoba.

I mentioned a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that six weeks or so ago, speaking in this House, I said to the government, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources at that time, give us the facts before we have to make any decision and I might even vote for the development of Southern Indian Lake; I might even go along with the whole proposition of the development on the Nelson River. Frankly, I would like to be in that position. I find, however, I can not - I can not support that contention. I find that I must vote for a proposition, an amendment to a Bill of the type that I really and basically object to, because it may change precedents that have been established. But, Mr. Speaker, if we can only obtain the information we want by changing the historic process of government, then let's do it because that is in effect what we are doing by this amendment. I would far rather the Minister of Public Utilities, who of course is the Minister of Finance as well, I would far rather - and I think I would support him - if he would stand up in this House this afternoon and say: Members, vote for the rejection of the amendment to Bill 15 on my undertaking that I will call together the Committee on Public Utilities to hear their opinion on the subject matter of Bill 15 and allied matters, and to give the people of Manitoba who are interested in this an opportunity of appearing before that committee. I don't know, but I would suspect that even the proposer of this amendment might be inclined, on assurance of the calling together of the Committee of Public Utilities, not to upset, even by a vote, the established practice of this House.

So I appeal to the government, I appeal to the First Minister, let you take some action that can restore some faith in you in the proper conduct of the government and the business of Manitoba; call the Public Utilities Committee together without forcing the members of this House to vote for or against the second reading of Bill 15. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, the reason for that is if we vote against it on second reading and then we find after further investigation that the Bill and the subject matter and the development is proper and in the best interests of all, that government there at some future date will say the Opposition voted against

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) this great development for Manitoba. What a position to place us in in a matter of this nature.

On the other hand, if we vote for it on second reading and it turns out to be a disaster for Manitoba, the government will say: Well, we had the co-operation of the opposition. There's only one way I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there can be fair play in this game respecting Bill 15, is for the First Minister, or the Minister of Finance in his capacity as the Minister answerable for public utilities in this House, to now stand up and ask the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the proposer of this amendment: Will you consider withdrawing the same and I will undertake to guarantee that the Committee on Public Utilities will be called together prior to asking the members of this House to consider the second reading of Bill 15.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, in answer to my honourable friend, I would say that I would be very pleased to follow his suggestion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I assure you that oftentimes my constituent and I have differences of agreement in many areas, but on a matter of principle and on a matter so vital as this, I'm happy that he now - and I say now just because of the time element and not because of any long period - joins me in this appeal.

Can I not then, in the interests of fairness to opposition and to all concerned, receive the same co-operation and the same assurances from the government of Manitoba? Hydro just simply either has not got or cannot give us the type of information we require. A moment ago the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources pointed his fingers to his chest, which to me indicated that he's got the information and that is why I said, "Table that information for our benefit as well." Well, it might poke right through. The Minister of Public Utilities, the Provincial Treasurer, surely he's got some information. The Bill itself says that Hydro itself must be very deficient in their knowledge of the plan, because before they could advance any undertaking, what they have to do has to be approved by the Minister.

So finally I come back to my major point. Stand up, please, and say to the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface in respect of the amendment to Bill 15: You withdraw your Bill; we will call the Committee on Public Utilities together to consider the whole matter of Hydro development in the Province of Manitoba and then we'll come back into the House to consider the second reading of Bill 15. And I think that I can assure the government opposite, as far as my caucus is concerned, that if we are convinced that this development is in the best interests of present and future development in Manitoba it will have our support. But as I said in 1966, and I say now, don't ask us to buy a pig in a poke because we're not darn well doing it, but you can show some statesmanship if you will. So I appeal to the government either to support the amendment proposed by the Member for St. Boniface or stand up and ask him to withdraw it on the basis of the calling together of the Committee on Public Utilities.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkmen, Borowski, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Doern, Dow, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Uskiw, and Vielfaure.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well for me to remind the House that I was paired with the Attorney-General, and had I voted I would have voted in favour of my own amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

May 5, 1969

1909

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) 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, Administration and Central Services. (a) (1)-- The Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say a few words to the Minister on behalf of a group called the Western Manitoba Guidance and Counselling Service. This is a group that has been doing a considerable amount of counselling in the Brandon and surrounding district area. If I can take the time to mention a few of the things that they have been doing, in their initial year of service they've been very busy and apparently their year has been very gratifying to them. I have a lengthy list which is an accounting of the stewardship of the time over the past year of the counselling they have done. They have worked with the Reston Community Hospital; the Brandon Hospital; Brandon Health Unit; the Brandon Regional Office; the Ministers' Wives Association of Saskatchewan; St. Andrew's College in Saskatoon; Rolling River School Division; they have supervised ministers' conferences in the Extension Department of the University of Winnipeg; the Counsellor's Training Program for ministers and those who are interested in counselling; they've worked with the Virden and Birtle Health Units - the public health units; the in-service training and many others. The list is very lengthy. It has been set up and they have a Board of Directors comprised of people throughout southwest Manitoba and a person by the name of Reverend Ken Beal is the director.

My reason for mentioning this particular organization is that it has been pretty well financed in the task by some of the churches in that area. It has become so large and they are doing so much good that they feel that the Minister should have fair warning that they will be making a request of him for a sizeable grant. Now I was amazed when I sat down with the gentleman that is the director and he told me all the good things that they are doing. They even have a case, which is private naturally, where they have counselled and assisted a psychiatrist. The title of the group is the Western Manitoba Guidance and Counselling Service. I thought I would repeat that for the Minister's benefit; I see that he was looking up. I have all the information here and I am going to ask the Minister to have a look at it.

But the point of my mentioning this particular group is the fact that I am convinced that they are doing a tremendous job in southwest Manitoba and are certainly entitled to some consideration in the form of a grant from the Minister's Department. They tell me that in the coming year their budget will be in excess of \$15,000 and it is becoming increasingly more difficult for them to reach this figure, not because they have lost some of the local support but because their field is becoming so much larger.

So I wanted to make this point, as I said before, and I would send this over to the Minister and he can peruse it, and I would ask him to return it because some of the things that have been sent to me have been loaned only and they would like to have them back.

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

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli): I would like to answer possibly a question or two from the other day, Mr. Speaker, namely, the Member for Rhineland mentioned the sheltered workshops for retarded children. I just wanted to advise him that after the school divisions took over the responsibility for training of mentally retarded children, the function as you know of the Manitoba Association changed and many of those facilities - Kinsmen Schools and other facilities created for the trainable retarded - many of them changed into the sheltered workshop type of program to look after the preschooler and the child coming out of the school system in that group of retardates. A grant is paid of \$50.00 a month for each candidate to the Manitoba Association of Retarded Children and the control of the development of these workshops is really their program, but we give them every co-operation in the use of facilities. As he pointed out, the workshop at Winkler is in the basement of the Eden Mental Health Centre, but many of the existing facilities - I believe there are 13 or 14 of these now spotted around the province in those facilities which they have created for this other purpose and now have changed. So initially the department isn't into any capital support of that particular activity at this time.

The Member from St. John's asked about the Social Allowances Act and the Welfare

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) Appeal Board. It's known as the Welfare Advisory Committee and it has 15 members chosen from around the province. In appeals, the practice is for the Chairman or Vice Chairman to hold regional meetings with at least two members of the board, which is a quorum, and any applicant or recipient of municipal - if the municipality has signed an agreement - or provincial assistance may appeal to this board respecting any refusal of assistance, the amount and the discontinuance or reduction of allowances. They must appeal in writing to the Chairman and usually the hearing must be held within 15 days after receipt of notice and the Chairman usually gives about three days' notice of the time and place of the meeting to the person appealing or to the municipality if the appeal is against the municipal assistance, or to our Director of Welfare if it's against provincial assistance. The board can dismiss the appeal; they can make an allowance or allow the appeal; but their decision in this matter is final. The composition of that board I'd be happy to give to anyone who may be interested. They're just citizens -- not "just" citizens, they're citizens-at-large from around the province.

The Member from Inkster made some excellent points with respect to ambulance services in the province, and this is something I believe I indicated in previous remarks, that our emergency measures officer and ambulance officer is working closely with the Hospital Commission to look at the very points and problems which he brought up in his brief. I might point out that the Federal Government Civil Defence does not contribute or share in ambulance services in any of the provinces. The Canadian Mental Health Association grant is going forward. The department hope to be working with them this year concerning the possibility of further sharing under the vocational rehab agreement.

I would point out to the Member for Rhineland that when he asked how much of the \$886,000 estimates for housing last year were actually spent, I'm advised they were pretty well all spent but a very small amount in elderly person's housing which was not quite spent on the date said because of changing in timetables, but is predicated in the coming year.

With respect to children's psychiatric needs - the Member from Wellington brought this up - there's no argument about the percentage of children in school age who are emotionally disturbed, and hospital treatment facilities are predicated in the first five years of the Health Resources Plan for this purpose. At the present time there are of course 15 beds for acute psychiatric cases in Children's Hospital and our mental hospitals accept these cases, but a special facility of the type envisaged in the Health Resources Program should put us well in the forefront I'm advised.

The Member for St. John's also asked about the Corporation's activities in the brochure. They advise me that they will be advising the patients every three months of the amounts paid by the Corporation on their behalf to physicians, and this is a decision of the Corporation in this regard.

There may be matters that honourable members may not feel I have answered sufficiently. If I have not I'd be prepared to get them, if I haven't already mentioned them to the members. But to start off this afternoon these are all the remarks I wish to make at this point.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask a question of the Minister. This was brought up to me by some of the rural councils. Apparently quite a few of the councils have developed a local ambulance service, where the municipality sets up the ambulance. The drivers are volunteers, but apparently they cannot be covered at this stage for workmen's compensation the same way as volunteer firemen can, and the request by the people who spoke to me about it from some of these municipalities was that they should be given the same protection as any other individual. They are doing a public service, and they should not be placed in an inferior position as a result of the fact that they are doing this on a volunteer basis, and that they're not paid employees. I wonder if the Minister would check up on this and make sure that from every aspect, workman's compensation, insurance and so on, that they be given full protection, because it seems to me that this development has been a very worthwhile one in many of our rural areas and one to be encouraged.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll certainly look into it. I think I remember some of the similar problems from my own experience but I'll see what our ambulance officer has to say about this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just one point before we leave this item. The Minister replied in connection with the workshops that I had mentioned earlier and the questions I put to him in connection with the financial assistance, and he made mention this afternoon that grants were being made to assist these workshops. But I was more or less interested in the capital part. What is the government's policy as far as capital is concerned in assistance to these workshops? Is there any made available? Is it just to this particular one that was referred to in the report?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I'll check that one in the report. I thought I had an answer on that, I remember looking it up. As I mentioned in my remarks, capital grants have not been paid to the Manitoba Association for Retarded Children for these workshops at this time. They have utilized largely, other than the co-operative arrangement at Eden, for example, the Eden Mental Health Centre, where they are allowed to use the basement of that facility for the workshop. The Manitoba Association own quite a few of these, which were formerly their schools before the divisions took over, and they're using these facilities I understand in about 13 instances and capital grants have not been paid. The workshops are approved by our rehab division following the recommendations of the Manitoba Association for Retarded Children in each case.

The workshop that's mentioned - do you remember which facility that was in? Was that at Portage, do you mean? I'll look it up later if the honourable member would allow me and

...

MR. CHAIRMAN:(Resolution No. 49 -- passed) (a) -- passed (b) -- passed (c)

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under these two items could we have a few particulars as to where these monies are being spent and . . .

MR. JOHNSON: Where is that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. FROESE: Under (c).

MR. JOHNSON: This covers Brandon and -- (a). 2 (c)? This covers the care and treatment of the mentally ill at Brandon and Selkirk and the institutional care and treatment in the Manitoba School for -- no, for the mental diseases, Selkirk and Brandon. The Winnipeg Psychiatric and the Eden Mental Health Centre at Winkler provides assistance to psychiatric out-patient facilities in general hospitals. This includes the salaries of all the personnel at Brandon and Selkirk of all categories - that's in Item 1. I can roughly break them down for the honourable member if he wishes. There's about \$3,175 million at Brandon; \$2,639 million at Selkirk; the Winnipeg Psychiatric Institute \$343,000 and Eden Mental Health Clinic, the salary item is about \$48,000, and that totals your \$6.2 million.

Also other expenditures - these are food, drugs, supplies, etc. Brandon \$838,000 roughly; Selkirk \$690,000; Winnipeg Psychiatric Institute \$18,000; Eden Mental Health \$12,000 - this, in the case of Eden Mental Health is an additional expenditure for a social worker and psychiatrist for consultive services and other expenses.

In the financial assistance division there, the third part there, the per diem rate at Eden Mental Health is \$185,000, and here's where you have your Canadian Mental Association grant, the Association for Retarded Children administration grant of \$15,000 and there's \$30,000 at Children's Hospital for psychiatric treatment services; Winnipeg General \$35,000 and St. Boniface. There's a heavy emphasis on modern drug and other therapy of course, in the treatment of mental illness and this is reflected in our additional costs, and also each year the staff advise me they're doing better in tendering drugs for these institutions on a group basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister may indicate to me - and I recognize it's possible that he may have covered this part to some degree, although I'm not sure that he has.

At the Selkirk Mental Hospital there have been some problems with respect to holding staff or a staff problem, generally speaking. I'm wondering whether the Minister can tell the House whether the difficulties that arose over the past summer months have been solved, whether the problems have been solved and whether or not we are still in a position of having to go to Europe to bring people in to fill the various positions. I note that almost every year - if not every year - the administration from that hospital sends someone down to Europe to find personnel, and I'm wondering whether there's a problem of advancement within that institution, of opportunity, or whether it's a problem of wages or salaries; but I have had a number of

(MR. USKIW cont'd) complaints from individuals and I would like the Minister to give me some indication as to just why it is that we can't recruit our own local people to fill these positions, and why it is that we always end up having to go to Europe, in particular, to find people to take these positions?

MR. JOHNSON: Well I think the proof of the pudding is in the serving. It's the only psychiatric institution west of Toronto to be accredited by the Canadian Mental Health and all the experts in the field of Mental health. I think we can take tremendous pride in that and in bolstering staff here, and bringing in new ideas, new concepts and in developing a first class attendant and psychiatric nurse program. They did find it necessary to recruit from elsewhere. I think the honourable member, if I recall, had a lengthy discussion that was reported to me, with the Superintendent. Certainly it's our intent to keep everything right out on the table. There's every opportunity for our Canadian graduates. Our salaries are competitive. I guess there is never enough in any field of endeavour but we do try to keep competitive.

I might say that this year we have 100 psychiatric nurses in training. We're going to the two year program with the raising -- to the Grade 11 for psychiatric nurse training. They're all on the bursary system with the hope that they'll stay with us and work with us afterwards as part of that program. It's a pretty good program, with bursary money elsewhere in the estimates here to support these people who want to take their RN after their psychiatric nursing, to affiliate for that purpose and so on. So hopefully I concur with the honourable member; I'm all in favour of training our own people wherever it's possible, but from time to time when the people responsible for the calibre of the program, the facility, do want some people due to shortages and trained staff, they do so. As a matter of fact, the way we have upgraded that staff in our nurse program and our facilities in these institutions is because we've done a certain amount of recruitment to take up the slack and improve the programs with very knowledgeable people.

MR. USKIW: Can I be then satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has undertaken to assure the local people that have been employed or are employed by that hospital, that where there is an opportunity that they will have that opportunity of advancement, and that we are not really interested in going beyond the local area if we have qualified people? This is the position that the Minister is taking?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . Qualification plus efficiency, dedication to this work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) to (g) -- passed) (h) -- The Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to discuss the question that has some general implications for the Vaughan Street Detention Home which came to my attention in the case of a specific complaint. It was a question involving two boys from my constituency who several months ago - in January - were picked up and alleged to have been drinking and were taken by the Winnipeg Police to the Vaughan Street Detention Home. I asked the Attorney-General at that time to make an investigation of the case and I did receive some preliminary reports. The police commission is still apparently investigating and their conclusions will apparently be made on Wednesday when the Commission will conclude its hearings and then will make recommendation. I'd just like to background this with a few sentences to get up to the point where it involves the treatment of these juveniles in the Vaughan Street Detention Home.

These boys who were both juveniles aged 15 and 16 were arrested on the night of Friday, January 31st in the evening, were picked up by the police, and according to the police - although I'm not sure this has been established - but according to the police and the Vaughan Street people the boys were intoxicated or acting in a peculiar manner. The peculiar thing to me is that in the middle of winter - and I think if the record was checked at that time, that the boys were, one of the boys did not in fact have any shoes - missing one shoe at any rate - they couldn't find both his shoes, and I'm not sure whether a very intensive search was made or not. The result is that the police took him, asked him to walk or forced him to walk to a cruiser car - and I think that the temperature that night was in the 20 to 30 below range - and then he went from there by cruiser into the public safety building, and again was made to walk from there to be booked. His parents were notified. They asked if he could be taken home, and apparently they were informed that this was not possible, that he would be taken to Vaughan Street for booking, etc.

Mr. Chairman, what concerns me in the first instance is the treatment by the police,

(MR. DOERN cont'd) that somebody in the middle of winter was in effect made to walk without their shoes. I don't care whether these boys were intoxicated or not; I don't care whether these boys were only made to walk a short distance. The point is that it was in the middle of winter. The point is that the boys were not fully clothed in the sense of not wearing both shoes, and in fact this led to a very serious case of frostbite. I don't contend that as a result of the treatment that their feet froze. I don't suggest that the boys were not wearing their shoes just for the time they were picked up to the time they were taken to the police station and then back over to Vaughan Street. I don't suggest that it was in that period of time that the boy's feet were frozen, because what did happen of course is that this one boy had a very severe case of frostbite. What I do suggest is that this did not help matters any, that it aggravated this boy's condition and that the boy's feet could have been given some medical attention and could have probably prevented a deterioration of the condition of his feet.

Well I'm not going to deal any more with the question of the police. I'd like to draw to the Minister's attention what happened in effect when he got to Vaughan Street. The two juveniles were taken to the Vaughan Street Detention Home, where they were booked, and according to what they have said - and is partly corroborated by what the people at Vaughan Street said, because I've spoken to them - first of all the boys claim that they were given cold showers - I'm not sure whether that is so, but this is what they have said, in effect, that they were put into cold showers. If they were in a state of intoxication, well, perhaps this was done to revive them although people at the Home say this is not so. I don't like to question their word, but let's say that that kind of treatment is sometimes given to people who are in that state, assuming they were in that state. Then they were apparently sent to rooms which were cold and they complained that they were not given adequate blankets or pyjamas and so. We did go, members of the New Democratic Party, a short time later, did go on a tour of the facility and in speaking to some of the people it seemed that it was possible that there was a window broken in the region where the boys were kept and that as a result of this it was rather cold there. What concerns me - and I don't want to go on too long about this specific instance - but what does concern me is that at the Vaughan Street Detention Home there really is no one that I can determine who is medically qualified to examine people who appear. These young boys came to the detention facility and presumably in a state of intoxication, certainly one of them was not properly clothed in a sense of his feet, and in the middle of winter it strikes me as only logical that someone should have the sense to realize that if someone is brought in without his shoes, that there might be a danger of frostbite. Now I'm sure that that may have occurred to the people at Vaughan Street, but in fact, the boy was given a - what I can only describe as a superficial examination - and I don't blame the person who examined the boy, though I blame him in the sense that maybe someone should have been called in, because the person who examined these boys is I understand - I'm subject to correction here - certainly not qualified medically, is only qualified in a sense of common sense - if he sees any ~~signs of~~ bruises or any unusual physical ~~looking problems~~ that he might call for assistance. But it seems to me that a qualified medical person would have been able first of all to check that this boy's feet might have been frostbitten. I've spoken to several medical people about this; I'm told that there are certain basic tests, they can tell by the colour, they might be able to tell by the reaction of the foot to certain tests, and that there could have been certain precautionary measures. I know that Dr. Johnson is better qualified than I am on these questions but I think his feet might have been painted with iodine or certain measures along that line.

So what I'm saying is that as a result of the way these boys were treated, this one fellow wound up in the hospital for at least I think three weeks with a severe case of frostbite, had to walk around on crutches and at one point was felt to be in danger of having skin grafts, of losing some of his toes, and so on, and this was a very unhappy experience, to say the least. As a result he missed weeks of school and had to then go to school being driven to school and I don't know how he got around there, but, it undoubtedly had a serious effect on his schooling. What I would like to say to the Minister is, I would like to hear what he has to say on this specific case because I'm sure it was drawn to his attention. I would like to hear him defend or explain the way that these boys were treated. First, they were given cold showers; second, were they put into cold rooms; third, why wasn't someone called in medically the same evening; fourth, why weren't they sent home?

The broader question growing out of this, in addition to the treatment of these young people is the question of, why isn't there a qualified medical person at the Vaughan Street

(MR. DOERN cont'd) Detention Home? There are dozens of young people in there. I think that there are problems of staffing in that facility, but it strikes me as absolutely essential that one person on staff at least, should be a qualified doctor or nurse. Let's take the more inexpensive of the two, and let's say that at least there should be a nurse on duty 24 hours a day. This would involve shifts, maybe three or four people working on shift to staff that facility. And I think it's necessary, because I think everybody that comes in there should be properly examined by a person who's qualified, not by a well meaning employee who uses his eyes and uses his judgment; he's not qualified to make that judgment. There are also people in there who are taking drugs, in a sense of they have prescription drugs which have to be administered and so on, and I think there's full justification for somebody who's a qualified medical person.

The other thing I would like to raise in this area, in terms of the detention homes, is the question of the Vaughan Street Detention Home itself. Members of the New Democratic Party made a tour of the facility and I think to the extent that improvements were made, I think were impressed with what was done, that there's obviously been money put in there. I would like to know the amount also, if the Minister can give us that, because it looked like a fair amount of money was spent in there on painting, redecorating and so on. There's now, I would think, enough space in general for them to handle the number of people who come in there. They have a great deal amount more of space and they've certainly improved facilities there. They still have a long way to go. Their library I think is still somewhat inadequate and their staff, they appeared to be somewhat short staffed as well. And as I said, they're certainly short in the medical field. But we have been promised by this government for I don't know how many years - probably 10; at least five that I'm aware of - we've been promised a new Vaughan Street Detention Home, and I've even heard rumours that there might be one constructed somewhere in the region of General Hospital, or that the government has property - there's all kinds of rumours, that the government is going to go ahead. But in fact they have not gone ahead, and although I commend the Minister and his Department for what they have done at the Vaughan Street Detention Home, I'm somewhat uneasy about that, because this may in effect, although it may be an improvement and maybe it's an intermediate step, it is not the solution. Those buildings are old, ancient, and I think we undoubtedly need a new facility, and it has to be a properly designed facility. We just can't take an old building like something like Fort Osborne Barracks - we heard about how that was a considered place - and put bars on the windows and call it a new detention centre. I don't know anything about prison architecture but it would strike me that a qualified architect and all the top people in the department would have to get together and plan the proper facility. — (Interjection) — No, I haven't been in the army. So those are some of the questions that I would like to hear the Minister speak on.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I won't be long. There's no decision yet, I believe, on the investigation ordered by the Attorney-General - at least not to my knowledge. The honourable member may know when boys come in in this condition - and I don't want to say too much about that - they're very humane good people at Vaughan Street. I was over there the next morning when I heard about this and spoke to Mr. Crawford, and as is the custom, the boys were asked to shower, put to bed and certainly there's no lack of blankets and there were no complaints during the night. Also, the staff looked them over for injuries or contagious eruptions or anything of that type. I think this whole thing is most unfortunate in the sense of the freezing of the feet. As I say, that aspect is under examination, but the whole problem is one that I know, that certainly the police, I'm sure if they had felt there was anything wrong to their knowledge, they would have taken the boys to the out-patient department. It's still doubtful, almost immediately, if one would see any physical changes to alert one as to whether there was, and what degree of frostbite might have been effected; so that's a very difficult thing I'm sure both for the police and for the boys, for us, for everyone; but our attendants did their best to make sure that there was nothing wrong with the boys. The policy of the Home - when they contacted the parents that evening, the Home Superintendent, as the honourable member knows, can discharge the boys to home if he feels it's prudent, and in this particular case, after discussing the situation with the parents, as I understand it, the boys were kept in that evening. That's the report I received from . . .

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, could I make a point there, to the Minister. It's my understanding that it was not discussed, that the parents were told in effect that they could not release the boys and it was in their best interests to stay there and so on; that the mother was

(MR. DOERN cont'd) quite anxious to take her boys home, but she was told in effect that they were not going to be released till the following morning. So if that's a discussion, that's a discussion.

MR. JOHNSON: I don't want to argue with the honourable member. I'd be happy to review the particular case with him. I have to depend on what my staff advise me. They probably advised the parents in this case it would be better to leave them over the evening in view of the local situation, and I doubt if anyone else would have - if you want to be frank about it - recognize the problem earlier than was in the case. But as I say, we want to keep everything out on the table. If there is a greater input or a better job we can do, our staff are going to try and do that. I don't know the total answer off the top of my head, the medical input, but I know that the head of the department is looking at this at the present time. In most cases when boys come in, of this kind, they would probably be discharged to their home, except when there may be some unusual circumstances such as occurred in the minds of the staff on this occasion. It's one of those unfortunate things, I guess, we'll learn from each case of this nature. But I really couldn't fault the staff under the circumstances in this particular case. I think they did conscientiously what they thought was in the best interest of both parties, but it just goes to show that this unfortunate frostbite was the thing that complicated the whole matter.

What the department are considering - it wouldn't be practical to have a full-time physician. They have two physicians on call to the Vaughan Street Home and are giving consideration to the idea of a registered nurse or licenced psychiatric nurse to be in attendance at the home, on the staff. This is what is being examined at this time.

With respect to the new home, I think I dealt with this briefly previously during this session. I would say the cost of renovations - I haven't got the final figure -- I believe an approximation of \$100,000 was placed on the renovation job. In the meantime, there have been certain difficulties with site. At the present time the government has chosen a tentative site. The land acquisition people are looking at it at the moment and I can't reveal more than that at this time to the honourable member. I can say that a firm of architects have been appointed some time ago with respect to the functional plan and we are pressing on with this whole area at this time. I think that's about all I can say at this particular moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I would like to have the Minister explain to us just what portion of the correctional institutions is being taken over under his department. What part will we be debating under the Attorney-General's? It seems to me when I look at the estimates of the Attorney-General there's nothing mentioned as far as jails are concerned. Does everything under jails come under the Health Department now and if so, I don't recall getting a report on this matter that we have been getting in past years as to the usage and the admissions and so on. Is there no report coming forward this year, because I feel that we should be discussing that under this item if all these matters have been referred to the Department of Health. I would first like to have an answer to that.

MR. JOHNSON: I inquired about a report. I was told there was no report in the past. If there is one, my officials are within hearing distance, I'd be happy to share one with the honourable member if there is such a report.

I think you got a copy of the newsletter setting up our department and I did state earlier that the adult correctional services are now under the division of mental health and correction services. This includes our correctional institutions and rehabilitation services. I'm thinking of Headingley and Bannock Point, the Falcon Lake work camps, the Birds Hill Rehab Camp. In Brandon they have the Brandon Jail, Brandon Correctional Facility, and the camp at Carberry, the Dauphin correctional institution, and in that connection the Cache Lake Rehab Camp, and The Pas Jail where they are building the Simonhouse Rehab Camp; and the Portage la Prairie Women's Jail and The Pas Women's Jail. I would point out that the facility has been run in the past at Norway House by the R. C. M. P. and that activity is being transferred to our jurisdiction, and the development of Simonhouse Rehabilitation Camp in connection with The Pas is being built at this time. Under the Mental Health and correction services division you have the adult correctional institutions and under the Department of Social Services we have the detention homes and probation services. I'm thinking of the Manitoba Home for Girls, the Home for Boys and the adult and juvenile detention homes in Winnipeg and Brandon and the probation staff, and, of course, as required by the adult division correctional branch, the social

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) service branch will make these probation services available.

This is roughly the breakdown that has come out of the reorganization. The Department are bringing all the resources of the health division, social services division, etc. to bear on the approach to our correctional facilities and to our treatment program. The rehab camps I think are -- if you've had the opportunity to see any of these, if you haven't I'd be glad to lay on a tour for the honourable members some time to see the kind of work that's going on in these camps. I think it's certainly a first-class program and as I understand it we're leading the country in this kind of development. That is the division and if there's anything that members have got in the past that would be helpful to them I'll try and look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) (a) -- passed. The Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): In respect to the Manitoba Home for Boys. On occasion it has been overcrowded. Can the Minister indicate what policies there are in regards to developing this area? The other thing is in regards to the staffing at the home. I read through his intake juvenile probation services and the family court but I would also like to ask whether he could indicate to us whether the facilities, whether there are sufficient staff at these institutions because I realize that sometimes, and I'm sure the Minister realizes it too, some of the people that go in there are not because they are to be detained but just necessarily for observation for a short period. Some of them are just a social more than anti-social and if they aren't handled correctly for the temporary time they are in and if they're mixed in with others they may come out worse for themselves and for society than when they went in. I would just like a brief explanation on that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JOHNSON: I believe I outlined and read to the House before the Orders of the Day one morning the kind of program we have for the correctional officers in the institutions. That is on the record. I haven't got it in front of me at the moment. We're always looking for more staff and the right kind of person as the honourable members knows, but I think that from everything I can understand and talking to my colleagues in other provinces, we, Ontario and B.C., enjoy probably the most advanced probation adult counselling services in the country and we're going to have to continue to build on this base. At the present time we have 49 probation officers and I think the complement of correctional people is up to scratch at this time. I'd be happy to deposit with the honourable member the training program for our correctional officers in our institutions.

MR. FOX: . . . as I stated occasionally the institution has been overcrowded by the number of people. Are there any facilities so that the place will not be overcrowded? I understand we've had as many as a 100 in the Manitoba Home for Boys.

MR. JOHNSON: Which facility?

MR. FOX: The Manitoba Home for Boys. I think its capacity is only about 90 or less.

MR. JOHNSON: Gee, I haven't got the exact figures on me. I was out there this fall. That's a matter I would have to look up, the exact capacity at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to go into an area that might be described as controversial or somewhat delicate, but it's the sort of thing that I think legislators are reluctant to deal with perhaps because of the attitude of the public, but I wanted to raise the question to the Minister of the question of sex in prison.

I might say, in general, before I begin that what I have in mind is that this is a question that is kept so much in the dark that nobody really knows what is happening and for that reason I think that there might be some value in an investigation. This is the kind of question that is normally covered up; it's the kind of question that people want to avoid and pretend does not exist. I might say that, in general, that this question was graphically drawn to the attention of the people of Winnipeg lately through the Manitoba Theatre Centre in producing a play written by a Canadian who was a graduate of our prison system, and I've heard some interesting comments on that play from the -- I saw it myself, I've spoken to people who saw it, spoken to some of the actors in the play, heard comments of people who were prisoners who said things like "that's exactly what is going on in our prisons." In short, that play told the story. "A Fortune in Men's Eyes" told a story of a young man who went into the prison system and was beaten into submission by some of the people around him, into indulging in what we might describe as unnatural sex acts. Also he was housed in quarters with several homosexuals and so on, which is a pretty unhealthy environment.

This question has been going on since the dawn of history and I recall first being aware

(MR. DOERN cont'd) of it some 17 or 18 years ago when I read a famous American case called "Scottsborough Boy" which was a famous trial in the 20's or so in some southern state where this question came out as part of this great legal case involving a number of young negroes.

I'm not going to go into this question in great detail because I really don't know first of all what is happening in Manitoba prisons; and secondly I really don't know what should be done. Obviously it is unnatural and unhealthy for people to be locked up for periods of years who are accustomed to a normal sex life, or people who are married and so on who are separated from their families and so on, this undoubtedly causes great stresses and strains on them; and I am sure that the Manitoba prison system is no exception, that if all sorts of homosexual actions and sexual perversions take place throughout Canada and in the federal prisons and all throughout the world and so on, that they must as well occur here. Other countries have attempted to deal with this. I recall I think reading about Mexlco where they allow the wives of prisoners to visit with them and so on and I'm sure that there are many other methods of dealing with the problem.

One of the most serious things I think -- or at least some of the most serious things connected with this is that men who may have other tendencies getting into an unhealthy environment may be pushed over the limit. Also people who are married, separated from their families, one of the bad effects are that people who are in prison - I'm thinking mainly of male offenders separated from their families for a long time - I would think that this is one of the reasons why there are divorces and why it is difficult for them when they do get out of prison to resume a normal relationship with their wives and with their families. There's complications, of course, in attempting to deal with the problems of perversion in the prisons because mainly of public attitudes. I would think the public would think first of all this is something that should be left alone or not examined or can't be dealt with because it's a sort of an unsavory subject. There's also problems in terms of what would you do supposing you uncovered all sorts of instances of homosexuality and so on, what would be the solution to these questions? Would you allow for example wives to visit, would you have facilities for this? Would you allow girl friends to visit and so on. It would be fraught with difficulties. The public would undoubtedly say as well that prison is not a holiday. We're not going to go into this sort of thing in any sense because these men are being punished. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it's not a question of do we lock these people up or do we have all sorts of special rights for them when they're in prison. I suggest that it's probably a question of would it be better to allow these men to, for say male prisoners for example, to see their wives under certain conditions or do you prefer the alternative which is perhaps perverse sex, because in a sense those are the two alternatives and they both have their difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister in particular to sum up what I have been talking about and what I intend to say. First of all, in regard to sex in our prisons does he or does anybody in a position of authority and power know what is going on in our prisons? It would seem to me that there's very little information, if any, forthcoming. I've spoken to wardens and I've spoken to a few people connected with this and the first reaction you get is a complete cover up. Nothing like that goes on in our prisons. That's the answer. I don't believe it. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- No I do not know for a fact. Do you? -- (Interjection) -- Then it would seem to me if neither of us are certain that there might be value in an investigation because certainly there's all sorts of documented evidence throughout this country and throughout the world of this sort of thing going on. So I think it might be useful if there was a study made. Maybe a one man Royal Commission, something to look into this.

And secondly, if a study was made - and I suggest to the Minister that it should be made - that some proposals toward dealing with the question should be recommended. I don't know what those proposals should be - whether there should be some sort of visits from wives or some sort of -- allow the prisoners to go home under certain circumstances and so on. That is obviously the trend. I'm not thinking of sex specifically. I'm thinking in terms of getting people out of prisons. It obviously is expensive to have people locked up and one of the trends that social workers are talking about and so on is getting people out, out of the jails. So I wonder if the Minister could comment because I'd like to hear what he has to say on this question and I'd also like to know whether he has any knowledge of the field I'm talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a few words about prisons. I'm afraid

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) I can't find the same amount of sympathy that our friend here from Elmwood has for people in prison. I've always felt I'm quite a humanitarian fellow when it comes to people behind bars but I think if you give them all what appears to me like luxuries that the member suggested I think a lot of us would be better off in prison than we are living in north Winnipeg or Cabbagetown in Toronto. Really when I see the five million people living in misery and poverty, in shacks, honest people, trying to meet their family responsibilities with dignity, when I see them treated the way they are by the various levels of government, I can't begin to sympathize with the people in prison. I'm not -- (Interjection) -- There's a lot of them that are out of prison too you know. I understand they're passing laws and making it legal, you know, so there's many ways of looking at it.

I can't begin to ask the Minister to spend a lot of money to make life easy in prison because I think this would ruin the deterrent; that is what prison is for, to pay a penalty for doing something against society. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak as someone with some experience, not very much. I've been a guest of this wretched government on several occasions. I may as well for the record -- in case somebody doesn't know -- for the record state that it was for not collecting. I paid the tax. It was simply for not collecting the sales tax and I spent three terms last year and in 1966 I think you'll recall that they hauled me off the steps and locked me up overnight. I don't mind that and I really don't expect any special treatment. As a matter of fact, when I was in The Pas I wasn't even given a pair of shorts. You were given a pair of pants and a shirt and you wore this thing until you left.

I'd like to talk about some of the things in prison that has to do with sanitation; not comfort. We had one mattress; I have no complaints there, I just have one mattress at home, maybe a bit thicker. But I am concerned about the sanitation in the prisons and I would like the Minister to take a very close look at it, because -- well first of all I wrote a letter after I got out of prison outlining some of the problems in it. The first thing that was violated is the Sanitation Act, where there was 50 to 70 men in one room - 35 by 35 room - and there was only two toilets. Now the Minister can look up the Health Act and I think you have to have a toilet and a sink for so many employees or so many people, whether it's a hotel or beer parlour or factory or even mines. I think underground they have to have washroom facilities for so many men.

So this is something that he should look into and get fixed up. In the Pas prison, for example, laundry facilities - they are given blankets. When a prisoner comes in to jail he's given a blanket - a dirty blanket, only one - and this is your sheet and blanket and you sleep under it until you're released. One chap was in there for three months - and I think The Pas jail is a maximum for three months, anything over that they send them elsewhere, possibly Dauphin or Headingly - but in this case I was in there the last time one month, and we're given this dirty blanket. All kinds of people come in and out of prison. One case we had a scare of tuberculosis. Now I don't know if it can be picked off a blanket or not but possibly some other things can be. But anyway the blankets are not washed and there's no sheet, and since there's no shorts a person sleeps with his pants and shirt on. In other words, for 24 hours a day you've got this one pair of pants and one shirt that you wear from the day you come in until the day you're released. So I don't think when I ask that these things should be changed that I'm asking it to make it more comfortable for the prisoners. There is sanitation involved and it's something very basic and I think they're entitled to it. I hope this Minister will look into this matter and do something about it.

Another point of sanitation. There was two showers in the place, and obviously you can't have 50 or 70 men using two showers for example. Ventilation - there's only one fan in the ceiling and you can imagine people walking around all day in dirty clothes what the room would smell like, and with one fan in the ceiling.

There was a further problem of fire escape, and of course this may be the unique situation because it's an old building built in 1917, but it's on the third floor -- (Interjection) -- pardon?

A MEMBER: 1917?

MR. BOROWSKI: That's the one. -- (Interjection) -- Well I can assure you there is no comparison. But this building was converted - it used to be a government office building I understand - they converted it because they're stuck for space, and until this day they're using it to house prisoners. And as I said, it's a 35 by 35 room on the third floor and if there's a fire in the place, so help me I don't know how to get out. I think we'd all burn. For example,

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) the fire escape door is always blocked by beds because there's so many prisoners in there that they put the beds - there's just enough space for you to walk in sideways and get on your bed - so the fire escape is constantly blocked by beds. So this is something the Minister can look at. I don't think there's a great deal of expenditure involved in any of the things I'm suggesting.

There's one other recommendation I'd like to make and this has to do with Thompson. We have a local jail with two cells in the place, and in a mining town you have to appreciate there's a lot of drinking and fighting, so Friday night and Saturday night the business is very good and there could be 15 or 20 people put into this place. Now this is very unhealthy and unsanitary. There's no mattresses in there so the boys spend the night standing up, and the worst part of it is they make the prisoners take their shoes off, so you're standing on cold concrete all night. I think this is terrible, and I think if anybody wants to complain about the treatment of prisoners, this seems to be the type of thing we should complain about, you know, instead of have the wives come in or something like that. -- (Interjection) -- There's just two cells, that's right, and 20 people - there could be more. It depends; a certain weekend, if it's a long weekend and the boys get paid and there's a lot of trouble - and there's bound to be, there's 19,000 people - and a lot of the prisoners are brought in from the various reservations, and the Bay line prisoners, all the way from Churchill down, are brought in there and lodged in the place until they're transferred over to The Pas by plane or by train or by car, whichever way it may be. The fact is they have to spend the whole night, and I know what it's like because I've spent one night in there, standing in your bare feet on concrete and guys throwing up all over the place. They throw up on you and the place stinks. -- (Interjection) -- Well there's no room, there's simply no room in the place, and I think this was brought to the attention of the Minister and I think he should look into this. This is very serious.

One other recommendation I would like to make and I think it's one that will save this government money. We have a situation in The Pas where there is approximately 50 to 70 men in this prison, and out of this number only 8 are allowed to go out and work. Now I've requested on several occasions that I'd like to go out and work. It's only 75 cents a day. Nobody does this for money. They just want to get out and do some work. You get up in the morning at 6:30 or 6:15; you eat breakfast; you lay around; you eat lunch; you lay around; you eat supper and you lay around. It drives you up the wall. If these prisoners were taken out, they'd first of all be a heck of a lot happier by getting outside, and they could be doing some valuable work, whether it's clearing parks or clearing bush along the Hydro line. As a matter of fact, you could have these doing other work for employers, and say they get \$15.00, well take \$5.00, put it in a bank account for the prisoner and take \$10.00 and use it for the operating of the jail. You may say well some of these will get away. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that 98 percent of these people are no more criminal than you and me. Seventy-five percent of them, approximately, first of all, are Indian or Metis and the only reason they're in there is they couldn't afford a lawyer or they couldn't afford the price of the fine; but they're no criminals. They just didn't have the money so they're in there. There's no danger, if a person is serving from two weeks to three months, there's no danger that he's going to run away. As a matter of fact, if you look at the record I think they have an excellent record in The Pas where escapees are concerned and certainly a lot better than at Cache Lake, just out of Dauphin where it seems to be they're always walking away from the place. -- (Interjection) -- You'll have your chance.

I think that the Minister should really look into this thing here and get these men out to work for their -- heck I just got an idea. You're going to be cutting a lot of bush at South Indian Lake; get them out there to cut the timber. -- (Interjection) -- V.D. I don't think there's any V.D. There's no girls there. But this thing is something I think the Minister should look into. Now I'll just go a step further, go into Dauphin Jail, which I spent a month in, and this I'm told is one of the - not by the authorities, by the prisoners there -- you spend a month in there you talk to prisoners that have been in every jail in Canada at one time or other, so you get a general consensus among them which are the worst and which are the best prisons. No kidding. These people are expert, they spend their lives in jail, and their opinion was that The Pas was one of the worst and Dauphin, believe it or not, is one of the best. And I think the reason for it, first of all, is that you can get a second helping of food at Dauphin. You can't get it anywhere; at least they tell me you can't. And the second thing is you can get out and work. I spent a month there and in that month we dug 700 bags of

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) potatoes, 300 bags of onions and all kinds of other things that we did, you know, cutting the lawn and raking, and when the month was gone I lost weight, I had a nice tan and I felt good. No kidding. When I got out of there I had no grudge, you know, I didn't go out hating the government or hating the police or hating anybody. I spent a month in and to me it just seemed to fly.

MR. McLEAN: At The Pas?

MR. BOROWSKI: No, Dauphin. Facilities there are excellent. The place I think is twice the size of The Pas jail, for example, but there's only 28 prisoners. You have your own cell, two men to a cell; you have your own toilet and sink in each cell, you have a television and radio -- this is a luxury I agree -- but nevertheless it's there. -- (Interjection) -- Walk over and punch the First Minister and you'll be there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . I'm sure he has a lot more to tell us at 8:00 o'clock. We'll call it 5:30 and I'll leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.

MR. BOROWSKI: You rescued me. Thank you.