

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, in the 12 years that I have served in this House this is my first time that I am going to attempt to go on a grievance.

I had really no intentions of being involved. I sat back during the debates in the Labour Department Estimates, and I tried to do my share but unfortunately the thing that gave me concern was that I didn't get an opportunity. You know the House Leader indicated that there has to be co-operation, that we were participants in designing these rules and I think it's to our credit that we, even while we are in government, had the foresight to see that the opposition should have a good opportunity in which to debate and to look at what is going on in respect to government, have an opportunity to debate it effectively and with as much time as they desire.

But you know I'm sure that the House Leader of the government sometimes has found himself in an embarrassing position. I appreciate his co-operation when it came to rules, his desire to have things go according to parliamentary procedure and, of course, to make this parliamentary system, which I value very greatly — and I guess many other members do, too — operate as efficiently and as well as it could for the purpose of conducting the business of the Province of Manitoba, or at another level, for the government for the people of Canada.

But it so happens that unfortunately, even though he is House Leader, often he hasn't been leader of his particular group of colleagues because they are the ones who have created as much problem in respect to the Estimates, in respect to the debates that have gone on, as anyone that I can visualize in this House. I am not going to say that they are the only ones to blame but I am going to say that in the time that I have been involved, as a member of the backbench previously and as an opposition member and of course during the term when I was in the Chair, as yourself, Mr. Speaker, I saw many things and many events take place but this is the first time that I have seen where the opposition — and sometimes they have a right; they always should participate if they can participate productively — have really gone out and, in this instance I believe, especially in the Department of Labour, have frustrated the opposition.

Now, some of their debates have been very good. I did appreciate the contribution of the Honourable Member for Pembina. I felt a little regret that the Minister hadn't done this, because she had been asked in respect to anhydrous ammonia regulations and so on. She had given us a printed paper and when we tried to question her on it, we didn't get too many answers from her.

Her colleague, the Member for Pembina, did a very excellent job but he has also had the ability and the . . . What shall I call it? I don't wish to be unparliamentary. But he has been rude, outright, very often, and so have many of his colleagues. You know, these members, the House Leader's colleagues, whom he is trying to protect, and I give him credit for trying to do that because, after all, he has to indicate that he is the leader and that he is trying to make things go well, he must close his eyes to when his own colleagues do not adhere to the rules that he would like to see us function under. I have to say this: That he really has to do a little bit of homework with his members in order to get them to participate, to co-operate, so that our members, when we try to do the job for the Province of Manitoba as members of the opposition, do have an opportunity, can be heard, can concentrate on what we are doing, so that the job is well done in the parliamentary fashion.

He has had another thing to contend with. A couple of times they have pulled off quickies on him. Now, maybe he was aware of it; maybe he wasn't. But it was pressure tactics which were not necessary. We started on the Estimates of Labour on Tuesday. Tuesday evening his members tried to force the opposition to sit late, when we tried to get some kind of indication after we had passed a section of the Labour Estimates, where we thought it would be a normal opportunity to stop. It was a quarter to 12. Now, you know, I think that's a fair hour. We are not into speed-up yet. When we tried to determine as to how late we would be sitting, there was no answer given. Now

that is not a sense of co-operation.

We have also had the same kind of opportunity that his members pulled off in respect to the perusal of the committees. When we were on the Committee in respect to the Public Insurance Corporation, again there was a hurry-up job done in the absence of a few members who were late. Now this is not co-operation.

We also had the same kind of a proposition that happened one evening, I believe it was two weeks ago this past Thursday, where again a committee was railroaded through in a hurry and pushed to its limit.

Now if we are going to have these kind of tactics, that is not co-operation. That is not parliamentary system. It's *aquid pro quo* that has to take place and I'm sure that the Honourable House Leader of the government would like to have the co-operation of this side. We are prepared to offer it, but we want to be treated fairly, equitably and not like little children, pushed and shoved, intimidated, coerced and often maligned from across the table, while we are trying to make our point with the Minister.

Now, maybe we have made a mistake in having two committees and having one in here. I have found that the proceedings in here proceed much more sedately. It may be the Chairman; it may be the atmosphere. I cannot say which but I do know that the ones in Room 254 have not been as conducive to good work or to as much good debate as the ones in here. So maybe we have to look at the atmosphere. Maybe we have to create some rules for the operation in that particular committee.

Let me get at some of the issues that have, as well, given me concern. The Honourable House Leader indicated that we hadn't come to the defense of the taxpayers. Well, I think he is wrong. You know, Mr. Speaker, we have brought up the issue in respect to the taxpayers that what this government is doing is totally wrong. They have — yes, they have reduced taxes, but for what taxpayers? Not the general majority, the ones who need it in this time of rising cost of living and inflation but for those who don't need it, for those who can afford to go without. Where is the equity in that? This is what we have brought up.

What else have they done? This government, Mr. Speaker, has gone ahead and created restraints. How? By playing a shell game, sort of a now you see it, now you don't. They have not spent the money, but they know that the cost of living is rising, they know that costs have not decreased and they have pawned off those rising costs on to other areas. Municipal taxes will have to go up, this is what is happening. The burden has been transferred in very many ways. There is no equity in the system that they are perpetrating. Where is the ability to pay principle that would create come fairness? They don't believe in that. Those people on minimum wages have not been given an opportunity to keep up with the cost of living, yet, when it came to negotiating with the doctors there was no problem.

Mr. Speaker, there are many ways we have tried to defend the taxpayers so I'm not buying the story of the Honourable House Leader of the government that we haven't done our share in respect to trying to protect the taxpayers. Yes, we have. My colleague for St. George spoke on the two cent tax which is a transfer of tax which was not designed by the previous government as a general tax, but nevertheless this government says let's take it off the motorists and put it into general revenue.

There are a number of other areas where we have tried to protect the taxpayers. We have indicated that the succession duties were not necessary to be taken off at this time. Those people, the 140, 150 families that were involved could very well afford the succession duties that were involved. The money that has not been taken in by the government in that regard could have been utilized for some other areas. We have created restraint in respect to our health system yet we have no problem in allocating extra funds to the Department of Highways. Now, you know, do people come after highways, what are the values of this government? These are the things that have made the opposition determined to try to get at the various kind of policies and principles that this government is operating on.

With respect to the minimum wage, the Minister just says we're still looking at it. Well, if we keep on looking at it from now to doomsday that's not going to put any kind of bread on the table for those people who are living at that level, yet at the same time their cost of living has not stopped, there is no restraint on the cost of living. This government has done nothing to help out people at that particular level.

So, Mr. Speake,, as I said in my first time in respect to a grievance I have had to get up and complain about the way the parliamentary system is working in this instance in this House. It is a disappointment to me that in the Labour Estimates we have not been able to get to grips with all the issues that are still before us. We have two hours and here we are going to try in that two hours to discuss the Workplace Safety Health Act, discuss the labour relations area, discuss a number of areas and there are quite a few areas that will have to need explaining. There is detailed information and we won't be able to get at all those we want to.

We discussed to a degree some policy in respect to the Minister of Labour's direction and thrust. I tried to elicit from her the kind of reasoning there was in respect to letting the eminent Dr. Woods go without trying to retain him; I think he did a very great service in aligning two hostile groups. He worked in the Labour Management Review Committee. Those two groups had been at loggerheads for very many years, it was Dr. Woods who was very successful in getting them to agree to some particular areas of general consensus, and those areas were then recommended to the government in respect to creating better statute, and in respect to unanimity as to which way labour law should be written and where there could be a consensus. He was just let go.

The Deputy Minister, very well, I can understand if their philosophies differ and if there was no agreement in respect to the Minister and her Deputy Minister — they cannot function together — but he too was a man of stature, because otherwise he wouldn't have been hired for a very very high and very particular kind of a position in labour relations. I believe it's one of the highest posts in Canada, as Labour Attache to the United States, so therefore he couldn't have been a man who didn't know what it was all about and who couldn't serve with integrity. He too was just let go, or fired by the First Minister.

We did have a brand new creation of a law, The Workplace Safety Health Act, the person who had been hired to shepherd it through with very good credentials wasn't fired — he left of his own accord. Why? Because he was being strangled in the position that he was in. There are very many ways of doing a job, Mr. Speaker; you know, it's so easy, and it may not seem like you're doing anything with intention, but it's so easy to cut off the funds and therefore there was no operation to that particular vehicle that was created to do a specific job.

I believe people all across Canada had hailed this as a very excellent piece of legislation, and from the look at the Estimates that I have had a chance to see, and of course it is very difficult to tell because we couldn't get any real answers in respect to how it was going to operate. The structural chart shows one thing, the Estimates show another, as to what comes under Workplace Safety and Health, and of course there being no director, one wonders how this piece of legislation will be enforced and so on.

Again, we come to the area of what the Minister of Labour does in respect to labour. I had placed an order for return in respect to The Power Engineers Act and to the kind of exemptions the Minister had given. What she had done is exempted people that had been in violation of a particular Act. Now is that a policy that she is going to follow in the future? When she was asked that question during the question period, she said we should ask her that in the Estimates, but apparently we are not going to get to have that particular opportunity to get around to asking her during the Estimates. —(Interjection)— I hear some chirping, but I didn't understand what was said, so I won't bother with it. Anyway, I want to get back to the Labour Estimates. I want to indicate that I had a cursory glance. I did look at it and I wanted to find out exactly what proportion of the time was spent by the opposition and what proportion was spent by the government on the Labour Estimates. And it's true, approximately 16-¼, 16-½ hours is my estimate of what we have had on these Estimates, but I find that as well, it's not just the opposition members that have taken up most of that time, but I find that approximately 35 percent, if not better, was done by opposition backbenchers.

Now, it's fair ball that the Minister and the opposition should have pretty well equal time, but when the government members, backbenchers, take up as much time as the opposition members, then we find that there's a disproportionate time being spent in the Estimates. So therefore, I would indicate that 16-¼, 16-½ hours wasn't too much time in which to use the guillotine and cut off debates on these particular Estimates.

Certainly the government will probably say, well you can go on the Minister's Salary, but under that kind of intimidation and coercion, we might find ourselves kind of worried whether we so should debate them at all, because if we debate them, we're liable to get another motion to cut off debate. Now this will be at the discretion of the House Leader, or maybe not at his discretion. It may be that some of his colleagues, when he isn't prepared and when he's got his back turned, will again make the motion that we cut off debate, and again he may be embarrassed that this is happening to him.

Now, I don't know whether he is embarrassed or not. That's entirely up to him, but in my opinion, knowing how he wants parliament to proceed and that he wants it to go well, that there should be *quid pro quo*, that there should be co-operation and so on, I would feel that he probably is embarrassed.

I have one final point to make, Mr. Speaker. As I said I'm not one to belabour a point too long, but I think what is really occurring is a sad state of affairs. I have a lot of respect for the person who is the Minister of Labour and I had never any doubt that she couldn't handle the job. Maybe not to my liking, maybe not to the liking of a lot of people, but at least I thought she had the capacity to do it, whether it was wrongly or rightly, that was immaterial. But I really am sorry that her own colleagues are the ones who didn't give her that chance. They were acting out of chivalry, or

chivalry, or some darn thing which I can't fathom today —(Interjection)— well, it may have been chauvinism too because they may have felt that the Minister being a woman couldn't do as good a job as anyone else. And I think that that's a mistake they've made, because for that reason, they went out on a limb to protect her, they were overprotective as backbenchers, they were overprotective as Ministers in suggesting what she should do, how she should conduct herself, telling her to do this, telling her to do that, bank the questions, do the other thing, and unfortunately, I think it has created the particular situation that we are at today, and as I say, I think that they have made a mistake in being that way, and in doing that as they did.

The other thing I want to say is that if anyone is to blame for the Minister of Labour being involved the way she is, or what position she holds, I put that blame particularly on the shouldeis of the First Minister. He was the one who selected her and if she's inefficient, or if she's anything else in that particular portfolio, it's because maybe that is the thrust he wanted to indicate through his government to the people of Manitoba, that he doesn't care for labour, that he couldn't care less how it goes, what happens, or anything else. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and Social Development and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Labour.to\$

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. WarrenSteen: Gentlemen, we have a quorum now, and we are on Labour Estimates. I will note the time, for the record, is 8:26; if we go till 10:26, then the two hours are up. The Member for St. Vital, am I reading the time correct?

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: I believe that would be correct, Mr. Chairman. I would just ask you, perhaps, whether you will add on any time that is taken on points of order or points of privilege, or any procedural disputes the Committee might get itself into?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am informed that I can't add on any time, but I can tell you that I have spoken to members of the same political stripe as I am of, and have asked them if they would be silent, if possible, so that the two hours are spent as valuably as possible.

I don't have a list of speakers, I must say. The Member for Flin Flon has asked me for two days if he can have an opportunity to participate in the debate, so perhaps I could start with my friend, the Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's been a very interesting debate. I think it's the most interesting debate we have when you debate in Labour. Of course, it is to miners or northerners. I was very interested in the views taken by the Member for Gladstone and the Member for Rock Lake, for they are so anti-union —(Interjection)— Yes.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: I want to correct the Member for Flin Flon. When I spoke the other night, that I said that I feel that labour and management have responsibility to themselves and society. I did not single out the unions; I said labour and management. I want that to be known for the record and for honourable members opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To members of the Committee, you can see how much influence I have on points of orders. The Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: But nevertheless, most of the members on our side are for unions.

MR. EINARSON: We know that.

MR. BARROW: When you compare farmers, and you can't take it away from farmers, they're workers and you give the impression that no one else wants to work. Well, I'd like to have you know that there's very little difference between a farmer and a miner as far as the work goes. A miner is

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

on a contract basis, and if he doesn't work he doesn't make any bonus. So it's there — they work, and they work hard. The only difference is, a farmer has a lot healthier life, I think. You know, he is outdoors, and he takes a beating too, but a miner really takes a beating. And they work long hours too; they don't just work when they're in the mines and go home and go to bed; they do their own building, their own carpentry work, their own plumbing, their own painting, dig their own gardens, and they keep quite busy. So, I wish you would take a different look at some workers. They aren't all living on welfare, as your colleague suggested. In fact, there are many, many —(Interjection)— Oh, yes, he did, he certainly did. No, the Member for Gladstone.

There are people that just simply refuse to go on welfare. We had families in Flin Flon, you had to coax them to take grocery orders. They wouldn't go and pick up their welfare cheques. They wouldn't even go over to get a welfare cheque and agree to pay it back later; they just didn't go. So, it's not all one-sided.

And a miner's future, you know, it isn't good. He's very lucky if he doesn't get silicosis or gassed or rheumatism or whatever, and it isn't the safest profession in the world. In fact when I first started, that was some 40 years ago, a Gallup poll taken in the mines in the States was seven years for an individual not to have a very disabling accident or fatal accident. That was his career before unions came in and changed the whole situation around and they say now unions are getting too strong, and I agree maybe they are, I think it's a good thing —(Interjection)— Pardon? That unions are getting too strong?

MR. CRAIK: That's what the Gallup poll said.

MR. BARROW: But my question is a very simple question Madam Minister and I'd like to ask the questions, they might not seem important to government or to the biggest crowd, but they are very important to me and I asked this question I think a month ago, that the jurisdiction in Flin Flon, you realize that Flin Flon's on the border of Saskatchewan which isn't bad right now on account of the beer strike, but it's not so hot when you come to jurisdiction. We're under Federal and the Federal's so far away. When you're separated from anybody, the less communication you have.

Now everyone agrees, the Feds agree, Saskatchewan agrees and Manitoba did agree that Manitoba legislation would apply in that mine, but it hasn't moved. It was agreeable it seems but you know, it hasn't moved at all. I wonder if you'd answer that Madam Minister?

MRS. PRICE: I'll come back to that, if you'd just like to carry on for a minute I'll get right back to you on it.

MR. BARROW: Will you?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. BARROW: Another thing that has irked me for many many years, we have fatal accidents in the mines and we've had a lot of them. We had nine in Manitoba. We had in one year in Springhill 80, one year 40 that was disastrous, but when things were going the very best we had one a month; out of a population of 8,000 we'd have eight a year or an average of one a month. And when they had the inquiry, I believe, it seemed that they put it off as long as they possibly could and you know what happened, Madam Minister, the more time it takes to have these inquiries it wears off, or people forget, or they lose interest, or they leave and they really don't prove anything. I wonder if you could shorten the time between the accident and the inquiry, would that be difficult to do?

MRS. PRICE: Could we?

MR. BARROW: Could we, yes.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I'm sure that we could and I agree with you that the longer it is put off an inquiry that the further people's minds go away from it, you are quite right and if that needs to be jumped up and it's in the provincial jurisdiction, then we will certainly look into it.

MR. BARROW: That's fine with me. And the third question is when we passed this legislation pertaining to safety, we passed a clause where no man has to go into a working place he considers dangerous. Now, do you agree with that? Are you in favour of that kind of legislation?

MRS. PRICE: I am very concerned about the safety in the mines and that's why we are having the committee that has just been formed now, as of this week, to go into the mines and check

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

on the safety and come back and report to the department so that we can work along with the Workplace Safety Advisory Council and improve the conditions that are now existing.

MR. BARROW: So you would agree that it would be up to the individual to go into the working place or not if he thought it was dangerous?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. BARROW: That's fine. Now the fourth question might be a little facetious, but I honestly mean it, Madam Minister. - Would the Minister prefer a different portfolio if given the opportunity?

MRS. PRICE: No, I don't think I would.

MR. BARROW: You enjoy . . . oh, pardon me.

A MEMBER: Everybody wants to be Prime Minister.

MR. BARROW: No, I'm not being facetious, I mean that.

MRS. PRICE: No, I'm enjoying this portfolio in spite of what all the honourable gentlemen across have had to say about me. I think that I am doing as well as any of my . . .

MR. BARROW: Colleagues.

MRS. PRICE: Colleagues. No, just a moment. With the exception of the Department of Health, the Minister of Health who has had experience as a labour critic, and the Minister of Northern Affairs who has had experience in unions, I don't think any of the others have had any more experience than I have had and I don't think what any of the members that sit opposite have had, with the exception of the Member for Logan who has had a lot of experience I believe with unions, but for the average one of you, I don't think they would have fared any better.

MR. BARROW: Well, Madam Minister, I'll conclude this with saying that when the Minister of Health was a labour critic and Russ Paulley was the Labour Minister, he'd already given out to the public and to his colleagues that this was his last effort, he was retiring, and Mr. Sherman was very very rough on him. He said that he was senile and another expression that he'd ask him continually, that he ought to see a psychiatrist. I think this has some bearing on the way this is going with these Estimates, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. PRICE: Well, for the Member for Flin Flon, I don't think I should be the batting board for you because you have something against what the Minister of Health has said with regard to my predecessor. I can't be held responsible for it and I don't think it should be taken out on me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't intend to be personal to the Minister, in fact I think I was defending her during my little speech just prior to coming to committee.

I would like to deal with the Mechanical and Engineering section at this time. I would like to know, and the Minister can bank these questions because she'll have to get them as information, what number of violations are presently pending under the Power Engineers Act in respect to personnel and in respect to equipment? I would like to know what length of time is allowed before corrective action is taken and when the decision is made in respect to charging the offenders if they are not conforming to the law? Who makes the decision in respect to prosecutions? Am I going too fast

MRS. PRICE: Just about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, to the Member for Kildonan, you could slow down a step or so.

MR. FOX: What kind of prosecutions have taken to date aside from the two that we are aware of in respect to Simplot and Hooker, and I mean since the last report, that would be to March of last year? And how many are pending at the present time?

One other question which is a general question, and that's in respect to Hooker and Simplot. The Minister did give those companies exemptions. Is that a policy or is this going to just occur

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

occasionally. Is their policy going to be enunciated? Is there going to be change in The Power Engineers Act in this regard? Will other companies who violate also receive exemptions and under what conditions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, to the Member for Kildonan, the Minister can get those answers and we can go on to another speaker. Is that all right, or would you want to wait a minute or two.

MR. FOX: I would like to get a general outline of the Workplace Safety Health Act. We aren't going to have time to be able to determine exactly the thrust that is going to take place under this government — if the Minister could give us a brief outline of what is going to take place, the amount of money that has been re-juggled, where it's going to be spent in general terms — ball park figures — so that we have an idea of which areas we want to ask questions on when we get down to the details again.

MRS. PRICE: Would you tell me specifically which one where you're referring to the moneys being juggled?

MR. FOX: Well, your organizational chart shows one thing; the Estimates show another. The figures from last year are different from the figures of this year because there was a different kind of alignment in respect to capital and operating funds, so therefore it's a little difficult to determine exactly where the changes have taken place, if any. That's all I'd like to know, in general terms as to what is going to be the thrust of the Workplace Safety and Health Division and how it's going to function, where it's going to have its major thrust.

MRS. PRICE: There's a difference in the workplace safety money on account of last year it was predicated on three-quarters of the year as you recall. It was only a part of a year and this year we have the full year of course so that's where there's a difference of the \$180,000.00.

MR. FOX: Well, the question follows right after that: Is there 25 percent more or is there less than 25 percent allocated for that Act?

MRS. PRICE: It's approximately the same amount as it was last year.

MR. FOX: You mean the same amount is being used for a full year's operation as there was for 75 percent?

MRS. PRICE: No, in proportion.

MR. FOX: Well, that's what I asked — 25 percent more than last year.

MRS. PRICE: Oh, yes.

MR. FOX: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: With regard to any violations re personnel or equipment there aren't any at this present time. With regard to the corrective action that is taken it depends on the seriousness of the problem and that has been prevailing, I believe — that's been the procedure over the last few years. And with regard to who makes the decisions re the prosecutions it's the Minister and the Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Minister.

MR. FOX: Well, out of that flows another couple of questions, Mr. Chairman. (1) Being an operating engineer myself I am aware that no plant operates perfectly and there are people changing jobs so I find it a little difficult to believe that there are no violations.

So my question is: Is the level of inspection the same as it has been, or has it deteriorated because of moneys being re-allocated and of course from that also flows, can the Minister explain when harassment takes place? How many inspections create harassment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: There isn't any lessening in the inspections that are taking place now as have done

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

in the past. When I made the reference to harassment, it was with regard that the inspectors were going at the turn of the shift around the clock to the two places, and that, in my opinion, constituted harassment.

MR. FOX: Well, was that normal for them to be doing. . . ? The Minister indicates that they are doing exactly what they were doing before, so therefore that must have been normal at that time.

MRS. PRICE: They are not going around at the turn of the shifts now because they have been told not to. They are going around during the day, and they are going around looking to see that the plants are operating in a safe manner, which we are of the opinion that they are.

MR. FOX: So, therefore the Minister is indicating that if a violation takes place, after the hours of normal working hours that doesn't count. Is that what the Minister is saying?

MRS. PRICE: No, I am not saying that. I am saying that we feel that the inspections that are taking place are assuring us that they are carrying on in a safe manner.

MR. FOX: Well, we certainly hope so. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think we have reached a fairly sad state of affairs in this committee and in this Session, and I regard the present debate as somewhat of a sham, because it's really very similar to looking down the barrel of a gun. Were given a couple of hours and told to make all our points, and then all of a sudden the debate will be cut off. And that to me, is a pretty sad state of affairs.

And I think it is also very easy to deduce how this came about, namely that the opposition has not been satisfied with the answers of the Minister, and that the backbench has been trying to defend the Minister, which is I must say a highly unusual state of affairs. I don't recall since 1966, a case where you had a score of backbenchers springing to the defence of a Minister in the Roblin government or in the Schreyer government. And what we saw essentially was the government backbench interrupting and interjecting and criticizing the members of the opposition for doing their job. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, also somewhat guardedly because I don't want to incur your wrath, but I would say somewhat guardedly, that last night, which was the prelude to tonight, that your chairing of the meeting I think was somewhat lax, that the members of the government were simply carrying on in a ridiculous fashion which, as a result, led to a frustrated opposition, a lengthy debate and then finally of course a closure motion. I think that it has to be recognized by members of the government backbench, who are unaware of some of the parliamentary traditions, that the weapon held by the opposition is in fact the right to speak, and that it is only by allowing the opposition an opportunity to speak without restriction and without interruption, that you really have an effective parliamentary process. We do not have the privilege that is held by members of the government to introduce legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I find it somewhat peculiar that the House Leader is one of those people who probably owed his election to the Liberal Government in Ottawa, and their arrogance, and the Pipeline Debate which eventually brought down that government and which eventually led to the direct election of the Conservatives under John Diefenbaker. It was because of a particular state of affairs and a motion of closure in a Pipeline Debate, that the Liberal Government went out, and instead of learning from that, it strikes me that the Conservative opposition hasn't learned from that all, the Conservative Government in this particular case.

So, now we're debating within prescribed limits, and as far as I'm concerned the department is finished now. I think that the government has demonstrated weakness in its closure motion rather than strength.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance, on a point of order.

MR. CRAIK: I want to raise the question as to whether the member is speaking on a matter of privilege, or if he is not, then what he is essentially doing, is speaking out of order, and not speaking to the resolutions before the committee. Mr. Chairman, this is a prime example of why we're having the difficulty, he is not speaking to the point that is before the committee.

MR. DOERN: Now you are cutting me off, is that right?

MR. CRAIK: I'm raising a point of order, Mr. Chairman, to point out that if it were not for this matter of deviating from the points before the committee, we would be making progress.

MR. DOERN: And you're the judge of that?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I have the full right to raise a point of order, and if the member is telling me that I don't have, then who is trying to practice closure. All I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the comments, unless he's on a point of privilege, it's more like a grievance — if he wants to go on a grievance there's a full mechanism for provision of that. But in the meantime, the members opposite were doing a fine job of getting to the point until he got us deviated off onto a grievance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster, on a point of order?

MR. GREEN: Yes, to the point of order. The Member for Elmwood, in discussing this point on the Estimates is dealing with the problem that he has in making it because of the actions of closure. I don't know why that would bother my honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, because the Member for Elmwood is using his time, that is, the Member for Elmwood's time — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, in two hours, or less, one hour and I suppose 35 minutes or something, the Member for Elmwood, who, if he took time on this item, to say things that were far ranging, which he is entitled to do, and I have gathered that what the Member for Elmwood on this item is discussing his difficulty in dealing with it, which he could get up and do.

If he chooses to use his time in that way he has thirty minutes according to the rules in which to make a speech. If his thirty minutes is in the Minister of Finance's view wasted that doesn't mean that he is not discussing the item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Elmwood I might just say that I'll carry on in the fashion you described from last night and be lax in the ruling but do mention, as the Minister of Finance did say, that you are encroaching on the two hour time limit and perhaps you might want to get to detailed questions. But again, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet says, "That's your business." The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have to remind my friend, the Minister of Finance, that we are speaking on the Department of Labour's Estimates within the context, within the context, within the limitations of closure. This is not a free debate. This is not an ordinary debate. This is not a regular debate. This is a strained debate within certain parameters and I object to that, and I object to being forced to speak while the clock runs.

MR. CRAIK: Some of your colleagues were.

MR. DOERN: Yes, well I'm telling you that I don't like it, and I'm telling you that you have set limits on the debate. I object to those limits and I am now making that objection registered. This is not a free debate. This is not a normal debate. This is a debate under stress and that's what I'm dealing with. Mr. Chairman I say this, that the whole whole problem, the ultimate problem when shaken down, I believe, is the fact that the Premier of Manitoba decided in his wisdom, or lack of it, a number of months ago to appoint the present Minister of Labour. I do not say that as a criticism of the Minister of Labour, I say that as a criticism of the Premier, because the Premier decided that he wasn't going to take a member, the Premier of Manitoba elected in the fall decided that he was not going to make an appointment that would be acceptable perhaps to the labour movement, that he would take somebody who had a feel for the department, that perhaps he would have taken the present Minister of Health and placed him in that portfolio which would have made sense from this point of view, that whatever in his innermost heart and mind he feels about the labour movement the Minister of Health has a background and had the experience of handling that portfolio. And I say that the Premier, in deciding which portfolio the present Minister should have, made a mistake. I believe that the Minister is capable of being a Cabinet Minister and would have been well-suited to a number of portfolios but this is one that she is not suited for, just as each and every one of us may have a range of abilities that are suitable for two or three portfolios and are certainly ill-qualified, ill-qualified and ill-suited for others. And I say that this decision has led to this impasse, that the original decision to appoint this Minister to this portfolio has led to this situation and I think it's a sorry state of affairs.

I can only draw a parallel in the sense of the kind of appointment that I believe should have been made, and I believe that each government has certain portfolios that it has a feel for and some that it doesn't have a feel for. I think that in our government a similar parallel is the Portfolio of Industry and Commerce and I believe that the Member for Brandon who filled that portfolio did

an excellent job. He tried his best to . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I again raise a point of order. The member is illustrating a classic example of where the comments should be made on the Minister's salary. Rather than using up the time on Workplace Safety and Health portion and the mechanical and other features that are involved, that the comments he's making with regard to the qualifications of the Minister or none, or whatever the case may be, are in the Estimates on the Minister's salary.

MR. DOERN: Well, on the point of order I again say to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Elmwood, I might point out that in Rule 64(2) it says that speeches in Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under discussion and just ask him to bear that in mind.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I am almost complete in my comments but I again say, you are talking about precision and you're ignoring a fact that we are not talking about the department in the normal sense, we're talking about the department in a context, and the context is a limit and that limit has been imposed upon the opposition and I think the opposition has a right to register its opposition to that particular action by the government.

So I simply say this, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that the time has come — I mean, the government will do what it likes, the government has the votes to do as it sees fit, but I believe that the time has come for the Premier to appoint a new Minister of Labour, and I tell you this — you know, the Minister just answered a question. I'm glad she did. She answered a question from my colleague, the Member for Flin Flon and she said, I think, if I recall exactly what she said, that she wasn't unhappy or that she to some extent enjoyed the position that she's in and, although I don't wish to doubt her word, I find that hard to believe because I know that the Minister would probably be better suited to the field of Consumers Affairs or other portfolios. I just say that I believe that the central problem that we are dealing with, it comes through as a debate that the government saw fit should be wrapped up. That's the context. It comes through as a motion of closure but I say that the fundamental reality is that the present Minister of Labour is not the person to fill that portfolio and that the sooner this government replaces her and moves her into a portfolio that she is better suited to, the better off will be this government, the labour movement in general, and the Province of Manitoba in particular.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With the stricture we have right now I'm going to try and deal with the Workplace and Safety Health Act section — Mr. Chairman, could you just quieten some of the people down? If you want me to yell, I can yell.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the members of the Committee please show some courtesy to the recognized speaker, in this case the Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: If the honourable members of the government side want me to yell, they know I can yell, and I can yell just as bloody loud as anybody. So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that, particularly the Member for Minnedosa who has a bold foghorn voice, that I wish he would just shut up and listen once in a while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: I was answering a question on a point of order. I was answering a question posed to me by the Member for Lac du Bonnet and that's how I became engaged in conversation when the member was wanting to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think the Member for Minnedosa has a lapse of memory. It was the reverse.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan, please.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To get back to what I attempted to start to do was to deal with this whole section dealing with Workplace Safety and Health, and my interest here is

to an extent, because the Canadian Bronze Foundry happens to be in my constituency. I know some of the workers who work in this place. I asked the Minister approximately a week or ten days ago, and she took the question as notice, why lab tests, which I understand are taken at the rate of about 40 workers every week, take four to six weeks for a test report to be filed and an employee, the doctor and company to be informed? When last year, in checking with the business agent of the International Motors Union, I was informed that it took approximately two weeks last year. Now is this because we have a shortage of personnel in the testing? Why do we find that this year it takes approximately anywhere from two to three times as long as it took last year?

Another problem that the workers at Canadian Bronze have a problem with is the fact that the reports are four to six weeks in coming, a person could have a blood level count of about .05, .06, and I think if she checks with her experts in this field that that type of a reading indicates that there is a chance of perhaps lead poisoning occurring. I'm sure that the Honourable Minister has been briefed on some of the effects of lead poisoning and one of the complaints that the business agent and through him, his members have voiced to me, is the fact that these reports are not available to the employees. I believe that your Mr. John Elias has said that this is a doctor-patient relationship, but in this case, it is not a doctor of their own choosing, it's a company doctor, I believe a Dr. Waugh, and the reports don't come to the employee, they come to the employer and to the company doctor.

Now, if the person is at a .05, .06, .07, getting close to the .08 at which level in most cases lead poisoning does take place, with the result that a person who will be working maybe three or four more weeks, the concentration of lead level in the blood and in the system builds up, and so where it would be possible maybe to take this person away from the job he's doing, perhaps even on a recuperative program, but lo and behold, we find by the time that reports are made, and a further check is made that the person now suffers at least .08 or maybe even higher.

And so, this is the problem that they have, and it is a problem I think that's been voiced to the Minister, and it's been voiced to Mr. Elias. Another problem too that the business agent told me about, that if he requested a check of the plant facilities for air pollution, and pollution is one of the problems and one of the ways that you can absorb lead poisoning, it's available through the lungs, it's available through the skin pores, and available in other methods. But if he made the request today, it would be approximately October before such a test would be made.

Now, the only conclusion one can come to is that in the field of inspection, we don't have enough people, because if it is going to take six months for a test to be made, if a request is made say today, then the answers that the Minister has been giving us, that we have sufficient inspectorial staff, well then that certainly doesn't tie in with the people who have to work in these places.

I would also ask the Minister how many lead battery operations do we have in the City of Winnipeg and in the Province of Manitoba as a whole, because I understand that is another place where there is a possibility of lead poisoning occurring and if the Minister could give us that type of information, that would be very much appreciated. And under the section dealing with industrial hygiene, we were able to elicit from the Minister the other day that under this section and occupational medicine, research is being done, and what research is being done in the province of Manitoba dealing with the effects of leads of poisoning, how to cut down the occurrence of it, and that is another answer that we as members of the opposition would appreciate.

I would also like to ask her under the item of safety and health, which is the item that she told us deals with education, because it is no longer in Item (a)(1) or (a)(2). So, the education for the workplace and safety health division is carried out, I understand, under the division, safety and health. What type of an educational program is she envisaging for the effects of lead poisoning, to warn the workers, to warn management of the effects and the dangers of handling this type of materials and to make sure that an educational program is being carried out and that the type of research that must tie in with your education, and to try and put in some of the pollution controls, and I understand that they have put some in at Canadian Bronze. But I want to know what type of pollution controls and other things that they have in other places that deal with items dealing with the use of lead. I understand some types of paint manufacturers — do we have paint manufacturing and paint spraying where lead is used in workshops in the Province of Manitoba. Perhaps her research people could give us some answer on that.

I think for the time being I'll let that go, and if the Minister wishes to answer them now or later, that's up to her.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Firstly, Mr. Chairman, I think the business agent's facts are not entirely correct. There has been volumes of tests that are being undertaken, are substantially greater than they have been in the past, it's the reverse. I am advised that it isn't a four to six week wait. The reports are coming in much faster this year than they did last year. There was one claim from Canada Bronze and

three other companies and foundaries in 1977 and there was 10 in 1978 this year so far, and there was 10 in 1977.

With regard to lead poisoning tests taking place, in other jurisdictions the testing is being done right by the plants, but here we do it ourselves in our government labs. So, I think that is a little more thorough than the other way.

If you have any specifics with regard to the business agent, what he has told you, then I would appreciate your either telling us or asking the business agent to call our department and tell us what it is, because we certainly haven't had any complaints to that effect. Every man who is exposed to lead is tested every two to three months by our government people. In the Act it reads that it should be done every six months, but they are done every two to three months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I thank the Minister for the answers, and unfortunately the rules of the House state that I must believe what the Minister said.

MR. USKIW: You don't have to believe her.

MR. JENKINS: I don't have to believe her, but I can't dispute her word, but I'm not, by any stretch of the imagination, disputing the word of the business agent. Now, the business agent told me that he is going to make representations to your department.

MRS. PRICE: Good.

MR. JENKINS: I took it upon myself to contact Mr. Roufo, Mr. Roufo is the business agent for the International Molders Union which hold the contract at Canadian Bronze. There's one question the Minister didn't answer — a couple of questions, one was dealing with the lead battery manufacturing plants in the City of Winnipeg, and in the province of Manitoba, or plants where they render down old batteries, what kind of checks are being made there, what kind of pollution controls are in place in these plants? I also asked her about paint manufacturing, and paint spray, where lead is one of the items that is used in manufacture of certain types of paint, and what checks are being made of the workers and the workplace safety in places such as this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: I understand that there isn't any lead poisoning from the batteries. They have the same inspections carried on by the doctors, but there isn't any lead poisoning dangers there.

I had a visit to my office about a week ago from the gentlemen from I think they call it the Canadian Paint Manufacturing, and he came in with a couple of local paint men — the Manufacturing Association and they are doing an extensive study and they are sending all their brochures and they are going to be coming around and giving types of seminars that our people are going to have a chance to take part in. They are going to be quite extensive, and this is something new that's just coming out. A man came in from Montreal and spent some time in my office.

MR. JENKINS: The Minister then is saying that there is no inspection of battery plants, physical inspections . . .

MRS. PRICE: Yes there are.

MR. JENKINS: There are no inspections of paint manufacturing plants, paint spraying plants. Is there any checks being made of these for types of lead poisoning? There are various types of lead poisoning. I find it very hard to believe the Minister when she says that plants that manufacture or render down old batteries, that there have been no incidents of lead poisoning in these plants. What type of pollution control have they got in these places?

MRS. PRICE: There are the same inspections take place in the battery companies as there is in the paint companies, and that's a visit from the doctors once a week. I didn't say that there wasn't any inspections, I said that there was, but there wasn't to date found any lead exposure to the people by the batteries.

MR. JENKINS: Can the Minister then tell us whether any air checks are made in these places? Surely to see that the air level content within these plants — and I understand that they are doing this in a place like Canadian Bronze — at least air checks are being made, pollution control equipment

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

has been put in. Now I'm asking the Minister, do any pollution control devices in these battery plants, do they have rendering plants, paint manufacturers? Surely somewhere within her department, her inspectorial staff must know this, surely that's not too much to expect.

MRS. PRICE: I think for the Member for Logan, I've just told you that the inspections take place in every plant and there was a thorough survey done just yesterday in Canadian Bronze, just completely yesterday, but I have not said that there is not inspections taking place in these different places, I have said that there is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next person, the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I want to begin my comments by expressing a degree of regret—(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Minnedosa and Logan, would you show some courtesy to the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I again want to begin by expressing a degree of regret that this committee has to function under a fairly severe restraint which is very common and typical of our present administration's philosophy, restraint on everything including speechmaking. I would like to also take a moment or two to comment on why we are in this dilemma, Mr. Chairman. And in searching that out, it seems to me that it is very logical that this was pre-determined by the action of the Premier in the appointment of his Ministers. I'm not going to make the argument that this Minister is incompetent, because I don't believe that to be true. I'm not going to make the argument that this Minister is unwilling. I think she is extremely competent, Mr. Chairman, to do what the Conservative Party wants her to do, and that is to do nothing with respect to labour legislation, and in fact, and in fact, if anything, to roll the clock back and to express a very negative attitude towards the issues involving the working people of this province. I think that's really what the job is, and that's what we have seen here in debate, Mr. Chairman.

We have witnessed, over the last few days, a reluctance on the part of the department to furnish information with respect to a whole host of items, and I don't believe that it's because they are incompetent to do so or it's because the Minister is incompetent to answer the questions. I believe it is part of the design, part of the plan to give a message to their gallery, the Conservative gallery, and that is that they are going to come down hard on labour in Manitoba, and in doing so, they will set an example to all of the private sector, the large companies who employ many people to also come down hard on the labour people of this province. —(Interjection)— It's part of the pre-determined, pre-planned scenario; which is unfolding piece by piece, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that we should feel sorry, as the Member for Inkster suggested the other day, for this Minister, because I think they know precisely where they are heading, and it's being demonstrated every minute with respect to the consideration of these Estimates.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's obvious what the logistics are. They know that in taking this position that the opposition can hamstring the government's process in the consideration of Estimates, and so we have to come down heavy with some other mechanism, because if the Minister isn't going to respond, and we are going to have an indefinite sort of period of debate, then that is not acceptable either. So, we have to bring in a threat that there will be a limitation on debate in order to force the opposition into a position of not, of not getting any answers from the Minister who has them but is unwilling to provide them to the opposition. And so I think that is a miscarriage of responsibility on the part of the government and on the part of this Minister in so being used, Mr. Chairman, in so being used.

The Minister of Finance, I wish he was here, probably would have raised a point of order. He probably would have raised a point of order on the basis of the comments that I've already made, but I think I can put them in context to satisfy him, Mr. Chairman, by suggesting that there is an unwillingness on the part of this department and this Minister to bring proper effect to the workplace safety and health program. I think that's a matter of fact admitted to by the Minister just a moment ago when she said that she has instructed her inspectors to inspect plants only during certain hours. Perhaps she has also sent a memorandum to the plants that they will be inspected only during certain hours of each day.

MR. BLAKE: That's not true, Sam.

MR. USKIW: Because that's the conclusion that I draw from her statement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BLAKE: That's a lot of nonsense.

MR. USKIW: That's the conclusion that I draw from her statement. That only in certain hours will an inspector appear on the scene to ascertain whether the Workplace Safety and Health rules are being adequately applied. Now, Mr. Chairman, how would one visualize even the Police Department working that way if it was known in advance that the policemen will never make an inspection after a certain hour or between certain hours. Perhaps that's the notice that that is when all the crime should take place, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BLAKE: Only when there's a robbery or a rape they'll investigate it.

MR. USKIW: . This demonstrates fully, Mr. Chairman, that this government and this Department of Labour has no intention of looking after the legitimate interest of labour in this province. This demonstrates it fully when the Minister can sit there responsible for this particular appropriation of \$2.5 million, which is supposed to assure the safety and well being of workers in Manitoba, to tell us quite openly, a bare-faced admission, that she has instructed her inspectors never to sort of sneak up on the industry, to let them know in advance what the hours of inspection will be. What kind of nonsense are we listening to, Mr. Chairman? This is absolutely ludicrous, and this is what the Minister has told us this evening.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm more and more convinced as we proceed in the debate of these Estimates that the design is as I stated and that is to roll back the clock with respect to all things that are very important to working people in the Province of Manitoba and that that should set the stage for the private sector as well on the assumption, which is a fairly right-wing assumption, Mr. Chairman, that labour has to be brought under some stringent control, that we need a very strong bridle on one sector of our economy without at least applying the same kind of restraint on other sectors of the economy. I think that's a very sad admission on the part of this government, Mr. Chairman, and it's too bad that the Conservative Government chose, and I say that probably in the method — well, I would like to be kind to this Minister and I find it difficult — I would like to say that they chose a lady to be Minister of Labour on the assumption that they can do all the dirty work, and in the hope that the opposition would tend her lightly because the Minister of Labour is indeed a lady and that we would not want to pursue too aggressively by the points in the discussion of her Estimates. I just make that point for the record, Mr. Chairman, because we have seen through this veil. It is very clear to us what is happening and we regret very much that the government has played down the importance of labour to the extent that it has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk and then the Minister of Highways.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to raise questions and comments with respect to workplace safety and health because that's the topic we're on and I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister will be answering questions that she has banked over the last two or three days. These are questions in relation to workplace safety and health that she has banked, and I am wondering whether she will answer them before we move on to another appropriation, Mr. Chairman, or whether she is going to wait until we get to Minister's salary because there has been some concern as to when she would answer those questions and I just want some clarification from the Minister on that, because there are a number of questions that she has banked that she hasn't answered yet.

MRS. PRICE: I did answer yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Transcona, I'm of the opinion that the Minister has answered most of the questions and you'll have to remind both the Minister and myself some of those questions that we've failed to answer.

MR. PARASIUK: Okay, I will take a few seconds to try and do those quickly because again I don't want to get into a long debate. I think one of the reasons why we've spent a bit of extra time than might have been taken on this department is that since the Minister decided on the urging of the Minister of Finance to change her tactic and bank questions we've had a lot of repetition of questions, and I can recall repeating a number of these questions and I don't think she's answered them and she can choose, of course, not to answer them, but I'm not sure whether she's choosing not to answer them or whether she's just forgotten to answer them.

For example, Mr. Goodison had been accused of appearing on the Peter Warren show and I asked her if it was true that Mr. Jack King, a Deputy Minister, his successor, had appeared on the Peter Warren show. Did he do so on the instruction of the Minister? Was his technical opinion regarding the Minister's exemptions for Hooker and Simplot contrary to the technical opinion of

his predecessor, Mr. Jim Goodison? Those were a specific set of questions that I'd asked three days ago on this particular matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: In answer to the Member for Transcona, the Deputy Minister did not appear on the Peter Warren show. He called in. It wasn't a technical question he answered nor did he do it because I had asked him to.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I was interrupted again by some comments from the periphery, and what I was trying to determine was whether in fact the present Deputy Minister appeared on, or I think I used the term "spoke by telephone" on the Peter Warren show, and I wonder if the Deputy Minister received permission from the Minister to do so in that the previous Deputy Minister has been somehow put into some disrepute by statements by the Minister that this former Deputy Minister had made some comments on the Peter Warren show.

Now I think what's good for the goose is good for the gander and I'm just wondering whether in fact the same situation arose here, and again when I raise these questions which again I think are valid questions, we have a whole set of comments coming in from the periphery again. Now I'm wondering if the Minister will answer those specific questions.

MRS. PRICE: Firstly, I was referred to as Norma in Wonderland the other day by the Member for Inkster. I think we can refer to the Member for Transcona as Willie in Wonderland. Firstly, the present Deputy Minister did not appear on the Peter Warren show. He called in and did not give an answer that was a technical one. What he did was he phoned in to say that the decision to give Simplot and Hooker permission to operate was not done without discussing it with the experts in our department. With making reference to the former Deputy Minister being on the Peter Warren show, he did so after he was out of the department. He took my private files out, phoned Peter Warren, and went down to CJOB and gave my private files and memos to Peter Warren to read on his program. I think there is no parallel there; it's a complete opposite.

MR. PARASIUK: But I asked very specifically, and I did use the term — did the present Deputy speak on the Peter Warren show via telephone, and I think I said that quite specifically. I also asked whether the opinion provided by the present Deputy was contrary to that provided by his predecessor, and the predecessor had indicated that the technical opinion of the department was that the exemptions for Simplot and Hooker shouldn't be given. And that was a very important point of contention with respect to workplace safety and health. It becomes more important when that Deputy who tried to put forward the technical expertise of his department when this Deputy is fired. Now that's what's important and that's an issue. If, in fact, technical people are going to put forward technical positions and technical analysis to the Minister, and the Minister is going to disregard that or appear to disregard it, and then later on fire those technical people who put forward technical expertise which the Minister possibly doesn't want to hear, then that is an important issue with respect to workplace safety and health. So I repeat the question, were the opinions of Mr. Goodison and Mr. King with respect to this particular issue of exemptions for Simplot and Hooker contrary?

MRS. PRICE: Firstly, I would like to correct you. You asked me, "Did the Deputy Minister appear?" There's a lot of difference between appearing and talking on the telephone. Secondly, you're referring to the former Deputy Minister as a technical expert. I don't think in less than a year he would become a technical expert in the running of the department. I think with regard to disregarding what you are saying, you are the one that is disregarding when I am trying to tell you that he took my files and when he made those comments on the air he wasn't even a member of the Civil Service or the Department of Labour.

MR. PARASIUK: I really don't want to get into the whole history of the Peter Warren show because what happened in that instance, Mr. Chairman, he said that the Minister wasn't telling the truth, and he felt that he had a higher duty to Manitobans to provide the truth and I think really we'd all agree that truth comes first, and that's why he put that forward. Those files were files that he had as Deputy Minister. He has put forward a technical position, and also, to refer back to what the Minister had said before and I can check through Hansard and I think she can herself. I said "appeared" and then I corrected myself and I said "appeared by telephone," and I did say that in my original question two or three days ago, but I do think we're getting off on a red herring. The point is that two technical people are providing contradictory opinions regarding a technical matter. The Attorney-General's office was involved in that technical matter. The Attorney-General

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

chose to follow the technical advice, it would appear, which supports the position of the former Deputy Minister of Labour. So I think that's a very important issue as to which direction the Minister is taking with respect to workplace safety and health. That's one particular question.

I also asked what are the responsibilities of the Acting Director of the Workplace Safety and Health Branch? Does the Acting Director presently hold any other positions?

MRS. PRICE: I agree for once with the Member for Transcona, the truth is very important, and when he is speaking about the former Deputy and his truthful character I think that is disputable when you see how he denied having taken an oath when he knew very well he had taken an oath so he's not above reproach.

With regard to the Acting Director of the Workplace Safety he is working as an Acting Director right now. The bulletin came out advertising the job today and at the present time the Acting Director is acting as the Director.

MR. PARASIUK: The Acting Director didn't have any other responsibilities beforehand. I thought that the present Acting Director also has another position as Acting Director of one of the sub-branches that we are talking about. Is that correct or incorrect?

MRS. PRICE: No, he worked directly in the Workplace Safety.

MR. PARASIUK: Which would that be, the Workplace Safety, would that be 2.(e) because there are about six groups there?

MRS. PRICE: The man that is the Acting Director now — there is another man that has been given his position in the meantime until the new position is filled.

MR. PARASIUK: Is that in Section 2(e), Safety and Health? Is that what it's called?!

MRS. PRICE: 2.(e).

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, in that I think the Minister originally said workplace — I now know exactly where that acting director was drawn from. Can the Minister inform us if the position that is now being bulletined as executive director of Workplace Safety and Health, has been classified downward? What was the Civil Service status of the previous permanent director, and what is the new position being classified at?

MRS. PRICE: It is being marked down from a senior to a P.O. 10.

MR. PARASIUK: So that means that the position is being downward classified. Does this reflect a change in responsibilities or a change in priorities or what, in that if you take into account, the previous answers of the Minister of Labour, she has indicated that the executive director in the new setup, will have a great deal more responsibility than the past one, and a great deal more tasks. This executive director will have to handle Research and Education, will have to handle a number of administrative tasks, because those positions have been deleted from this year's program. So what we are doing, we are increasing the workload of the executive director, a person has more to do, more things to do, taking away support positions to the executive director, and we are also downward classifying the position. Does this reflect a change in priorities or a change in workload? Can the Minister explain why the position has been downward classified?

MRS. PRICE: The reason it is being downward classified is because it was over-classified before. It was a new position that was put in in the past year, we are bringing it down so that it is in line with the other directors in the rest of the departments.

MR. PARASIUK: Can the Minister indicate whether in fact the director of Mechanical and Engineering — as a P.O. 10, or a Professional Officer position, what are the position classifications of the head of Mechanical and Engineering, Industrial Hygiene, Safety and Health, Occupational Medicine, what are the classification levels for those people?

MRS. PRICE: The Director of the Mechanical Engineers is a P.O. 10, Fire Commissioner is an eight, the Vice-Chairman of the Labour Board I believe is a P.O. 10, so we are bringing it down so it is in relation to the others, Industrial Hygiene is a P.O. 8.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can recall Management Committee staff and the Civil Service Commission taking a look at that particular position when it was established last year, and they

came out with an S.O. 1 classification. I also find it rather strange in public administration terms that you will have P.O. 10s reporting to P.O. 10s, that's not normally usual, in that the Minister has indicated that the executive director does have a larger responsibility than the Director of Mechanical and Engineering. So there is a contradiction in public administration terms, and I'm wondering whether in fact, this is not reflecting a change in priorities, and I don't know if the Minister has any documentation to blithely state that the position had been overclassified in the past.

MRS. PRICE: The Director of the Mechanical Engineering Department and the Director of the Fire Prevention do not report to the Workplace Safety. The other directors that are in the Industrial Hygiene Safety and Health and Occupational Medicine, H two of them are P.O. 8s, and the Dr. is an MD II.

MR. PARASIUK: So what you are saying then, is that according to the Organizational Chart, some people do not report to the executive director, and yet in your Estimates Book, you have your appropriation number and your sub-sets of that set up in such a way that one would draw the conclusion that Industrial Hygiene and Fire Prevention are all under the larger appropriation No. 2, which is Workplace Safety and Health.

MRS. PRICE: That is the way it was set up by the former director of the Workplace Safety, but it is not correct, and it'll be changed before next year, I assure you in the book.

MR. PASIUK: I'd like to know how many educational courses were put on by the Workplace Safety and Health Branch last year. The Minister has indicated that this will be the big thrust of the department. She indicated that she would rely on education rather than Commissions of Inquiry, to try and deal with safety issues in the province. Can the Minister indicate how many educational courses were put on last year?

MRS. PRICE: If the Member for Transcona would have been here yesterday, I gave all that information yesterday. There was 2,100 short safety sessions provided last year at an average of one hour each, as well as 155 longer sessions of half day and full day.

MR. PAISIUK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate occasionay the frustration of the Minister, but there are also two committees running simultaneously, so if one wants to catch any other part of the other Estimates, one has to leave the room, and I think that's going to happen this year, next year, and it happened in the past. I can recall reading Hansard and seeing that situation arise.

I'd like to know how many educational sessions are planned for this year. Is there any great change in the program that the department has envisaged in this respect?

MRS. PRICE: Last year in the safety talks, in the industry, there was 1,158 one-hour sessions; in the construction there was 942. In the Safety Committee in Winnipeg there were two that had three sessions of one-day duration each, and one in Brandon.

In-plant training in industry there was 94; construction 58. These sessions are of a minimum of one-half day in a series of six to eight sessions, and up to a one-day session in a series of three or four. This was last year's and it will be approximately the same this year.

MR. PARASIUK: You indicated that there are something in the order of 320 Workplace Safety and Health Committees, joint committees that have been set up by regulation. Is it 320?

MRS. PRICE: 313.

MR. PARASIUK: 313. I think 320 were called for by regulation, does that mean 7 are yet to be set up?

MRS. PRICE: Pardon me.

MR. PARASIUK: I think 320 were called for in regulation, but I ca't recall specifically. Have they all been set up?

MRS. PRICE: There was 313 called originally, and there's 290 set up so far.

MR. PARASIUK: Do you expect the others to be set up? Are there any particular problems occurring right now?

MRS. PRICE: They will be set up very shortly.

MR. PARASIUK: Now these have been set up by legislation. Is the Minister aware of any that have been set up through collective agreement, because I believe that there do exist a number through collective agreement. Is that correct?

MRS. PRICE: Apparently there are a number of them, but I know there are others who have set them up on their own volition without having been legislated to.

MR. PARASIUK: I think that these committees were set up in a sense as the first phase or first stage of committees under the Workplace Safety and Health Legislation. Does the Minister intend to increase the number of Workplace Safety and Health Committees through regulation, because I think there are far more than 320 workplaces in Manitoba?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, we are working on that now and we certainly do intend to not only encourage but to see that there are more Workplace Safety Committees in the city.

MR. PARASIUK: So then you maybe providing more through regulation in the coming year?

MRS. PRICE: I think that not only we are desirous of it, so are the people themselves, and we've had a lot of interest in it and in asking us how to go about it. So the interest expressed is very encouraging.

MR. PARASIUK: We are tight for time, but I was wondering if the Minister could give us a very capsule summary of what happens when the committees come in place. I imagine that the management and workers select members to this committee, then what happens? I'm not sure of what takes place after that and how this will in a sense promote Workplace Safety and Health. Could the Minister give us a capsule summary of how the committees operate or if she wishes could she take it as notice and perhaps give it when we come to the Minister's salary. Or is she in a position to answer that particular question?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, as you mentioned, there are people picked from both management and the employees, and they have their own regular meetings, and sometimes they call our department and ask for advice and our people go down and give them any in-plant training or talks that they desire.

MR. PARASIUK: Would the department undertake research in a particular area of concern that the Workplace Safety and Health Committee of a particular workplace identified?

MRS. PRICE: I don't follow you. ,

MR. PARASIUK: Well, if the Workplace Safety and Health Committee in a workplace for example, say, one of these battery plants, does become concerned with lead poisoning, will the department then be in a sense the staff research a? Within the staffing limitations, will the department then undertake to do that type of research, if a Workplace Safety and Health Committee does have some concern?

MRS. PRICE: Definitely.

MR. PARASIUK: Because I would think that the Workplace Safety and Health Committee wouldn't have the resources to undertake that type of research.

MRS. PRICE: That's the purpose of having the committees set up and we certainly will work with them.

MR. PARASIUK: Now, the research capacity, in order to do that type of work, then I assume exists in the salary section of 2.(a), 2.(b), 2.(e), 2.(f). Is that correct then? These staff people, who are the liaison people, also would undertake the research requirements of the department in this respect.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. PARASIUK: Does the Minister feel that she has sufficient research capacity to meet the demands of the Workplace Safety and Health Committees?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, we do.

MR. PARASIUK: I would like ask a couple of questions relating to the procedures involved after an industrial accident, and I would like to thank the Minister for past information that she has given me in this respect. There are a couple of gaps in it that I would now like to raise with the Minister.

Will she ensure that the workers in a workplace get the departmental report after an industrial accident? Will they get this free of charge? Is it posted somewhere for all the workers to see it or is the departmental report only sent to the management of the company?

MRS. PRICE: I am informed that the management doesn't get it either.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, I know of one report where management had been asked by the department to make four or five changes to the way in which they operate, following an accident. I would assume that in order for them to make those changes they would be given the recommendations, and they would be given the reasons and that probably one way or another would entail the report into the accident.

MRS. PRICE: I don't think that would necessarily entail the full report. They are just given certain directions to amend some of their regulations and that doesn't necessarily relate to the full report.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, if there is an industrial accident, and say an industrial death in a workplace, do the workers themselves get to find out what happened from the investigative group, namely the Workplace Safety and Health Group in the Department of Labour? Will they be told what happened or are they left to speculate on their own as to what might have arisen?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, the employees are advised what happened in most instances.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, the point is how are they advised? You know, I'm trying to clarify this in my own mind because I can imagine a situation where you have Workplace Safety and Health Committees in place, and then I would think that the process of advisement would be quite easy. You provide the report or a summary of the report to the Workplace Safety and Health Committee. They can look at it. They can ask questions of the inspector or whoever has undertaken the investigation and provided the recommendations, and they might even have something to contribute in terms of trying to improve the safety or increase the safety of that particular workplace. So I can see some type of forum within which safety concerns or real safety problems can be discussed and looked at through the Workplace Safety and Health Committee and I think it would help if that group was given the report arising from an accident.

MRS. PRICE: The inspectors go out to the workplace and have a meeting with the employees. If the employees have something to contribute to it, as to a means to a better end for their safety, the inspectors are certainly too happy to bring it back and relate to the Department of Labour.

MR. PARASIUK: But I've asked specifically if the Workplace Safety and Health Committee would get a report from the Department of Labour when it does an investigation following an industrial accident of se seriousness, especially an industrial death in a particular workplace. Will the Minister commit that the Workplace Safety and Health Committee, if one exists in a workplace, will receive a formal report form the Department of Labour Investigating Officer?

MRS. PRICE: They don't get a formal written report. They get the report as I mentioned, when the inspector goes out and discusses it with the committee, but there isn't a formal written report given to them or the employer.

MR. PARASIUK: And I guess if there is no Workplace Safety and Health Committee then it's a bit more difficult, the forum is much more amorphous as to how you would communicate with the workers as to what the possible causes of industrial death were, and what the possible steps might be to try and improve the safety situation in that particular workplace. How then does the department

communicate to the group of workers? Do they call them all together or do they talk informally with one or two workers at the plant?

MRS. PRICE: Our departments have said that they have had very good relationship with them whether there is a Workplace Safety Committee installed in that workplace or not. There is always a worker from the workplace goes with the inspectors. It doesn't necessarily have to be a safety committee there. People can be congregated and have their discussion with the inspector.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a very strong recommendation to the Minister that she have her department post in a public spot in the workplace itself, the report of the investigative officer after an industrial death or a serious industrial accident in a workplace. I think it's very important that the workers in that plant know what happened and get a formal written report, because often what happens is that you have a lot of hearsay circulating throughout the workplace and people don't know exactly what happened.

I think that that is the procedure in the mining industry. I do believe that if there is an industrial death the mining inspector does send to the workers a formal report on the accident, and I'm wondering if the Minister would agree that that would also be a good step with respect to the Workplace Safety and Health proceedings?

MRS. PRICE: The reason that there isn't a formal medical report posted is because of the legal ramifications. It could result in court cases against the Department of Labour. The orders that are arising out of the accident that are recommended by the inspector or the employees, could certainly be posted though in a public place.

MR. PARASIUK: I think, if I'm correct in my information, I do think that the reports are provided for mining accidents to the workers, and I don't think they've every had any great concerns about law cases arising from that. I think this is very important, and I've got some time to do it, I know of some specific industrial deaths. I know of some instances where people have contacted me afterwards, asking for information as to what took place, and I'm not in the position to give them specific information, and I was surprised that they were not told of what happened, and what corrective action has been proposed, and that's all I'm getting at. And I think that's a very normal thing to get at.

I would like to go on because I think there's one other aspect with respect to industrial accidents and industrial deaths and this concerns the next of kin. Now I do know from the Minister, and again I'm appreciative of that information, you can get the report from the court services office of the Attorney-General for a fee of \$10.00. I'm wondering if the next of kin is informed that if they wish, they can obtain a copy of that report because often the next of kin will be left in a somewhat uncertain state as to what happened. They are told something immediately after an accident. They are usually in an emotional state then. They sit back two, three or four months after, and they really are wondering what happened, and at that stage, I think it would be wise for them to know that if they want to get the detailed report they can. They may not want to get it. I'm not sure if the next of kin is always informed. I think that the Department of Labour, through the Workmen's Compensation Board or through some other group, should inform the next of kin, and secondly, frankly, the next of kin should probably receive the report for free, and shouldn't be charged \$10.00, but that's a very minor point.

MRS. PRICE: The general procedure is that the next of kin are informed by the police of any fatalities. With regard to them receiving a formal medical report, I'm under the opinion that they are a very confidential report and I would have to find out from the Attorney-General whether that is possible because I have been told that they are very private and personal information on the individuals and it would have to come through the Attorney-General's Office.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just inform the Minister, that it is possible to get the report, that the insurance companies do get those reports, because they know they exist and the report is of a different nature from the report given to the next of kin by the police or RCMP following an accident. I don't know, they'll say a person was crushed and that's what's happened. But the report of the department will indicate what took place, whether in fact it was a combination of human or other error or faulty equipment. I think it would be wise for the Minister to consider that recommendation, and that is that the next of kin be informed that they can obtain this report. I think if they pay \$10.00 right now they can get it, frankly I think that they should probably get it for free, if they wish to get it. They may not wish to get it. I would just like the Minister to take that recommendation under advisement, because I do know it's possible to get the report through the court services building.

MRS. PRICE: I will, I'll take it under advisement. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I was prompted to enter the debate, partly because of the remarks of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, and also recognizing the outrageous nature of the debate that has occurred during the Estimates of the Minister of Labour, that by and large were totally out of order, but under your rather liberal administration of the rules of the committee you've allowed a great deal of latitude, and I would expect that you would allow me the same latitude.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet talked about rolling back the time, and that couldn't help but remind me of the roll back of time of my own individual crisis, the first time that I met a committee such as this in the Estimates. The only difference was that at that time the New Democratic Party found themselves in the unenviable position, led by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, of leading a few millionaire vegetable growers in a fight to sustain a closed shop against my fight for trying to make it possible for individual Manitobans to buy a few carrots, potatoes, or tomatoes, along the highway stands of Henderson Highway, Assiniboine River or Red River. But led by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the New Democratic Party found themselves in that particular position. At that time the accusation of course was made that I, as a new and fledging Minister, was so totally under the thumb and under the direction of the senior Ministers, or of government at that time, Sterling Lyon, Duff Roblin, and others, you know, when the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet made some similar references to this Minister, the present Minister being used in a way by the Conservative Party this way, that's what triggered these remarks.

I must also remind some of the newer members and the generally hostile media that has so abused this Minister of the fact that the New Democratic Party of that day, collectively stood up, collectively stood up at that day, and on a counted formal vote, voted to reduce my salary to 98 cents, not a dollar, but to 98 cents. I would sily like to offer as a moment of respite to this case, that "I came back" as the add says, I'm still around. I prdict nothing but the most illustrious career for a very very capable Minister of this government, and that she will proceed to be your Minister of Labour and if nothing, gentlemen, that you have accomplished in the last few days, is to assure the fact that she will be the Minister of Labour for the next four years, you've accomplished that, that will last three

years. I also remind you that the Minister of Labour does not represent the Nels Thibault that stands up on this Legislative steps, and says that he is there to build a war chest to defeat this Minister of Labour and this government. He represents 28 percent of labour. This Minister of Labour happens to recognize her responsibilities in a way that a Minister of Labour didn't recognize for the last eight years. She represents all of labour, and she represents all of management, —(Interjection)— and yes, very much so, all of management and labour. It is not a Ministry of Labour that we're talking about, it is Ministry of Labour which includes management, which includes labour, which includes government. And that unfortunately, in the narrow tunnel visioned view of members opposite, they can't understand that. Their position is as black and white, and it's expressed most appropriately by the McDiarmids and by the Nels Thibault of organized labour and they've served us public notice and honourable members opposite should take no exception if we do not bow to the altar of organized labour. We will listen to them. We'll acknowledge their appropriate position in the spectrum of our social activity in this province, but we certainly acknowledge the fact, and this Minister ' is doing an admirable job of reminding Manitobans that there are a hundred percent of Manitobans to be represented in the greater debate of labour.

That is something that was totally lost, I say it with some respect, because I have respect for any member that has served the Legislature of Manitoba over the years, and I'm now referring to the immediate past Minister of Labour, the former HOONOURABLE Russ Paulley. But unfortunately Mr. Paulley, despite the fact that he was a good man, and an Anglican on top, just as a bonus, he failed to recognize, miserably, and he failed miserably as a Minister of Labour. What this Minister of Labour has picked up before she ever arrived at that office, before she ever arrived at that office, and I want to assure honourable members of this committee, that if they assume that by the position that the opposition is taking, that they are embarrassing this government, that they are losing us votes, losing us votes, that's wishful thinking of the highest order.

You know, when honourable members of this administration simply start finding out what the farmers have known for the last 25 years, about a fertilizer that we use and spread on our fields for the last 25 years, and now we're laying that at the foot of this Minister, that is just so much nonsense. It agains displays the dismal ignorance, the tunnel vision of these people. Unfortunately they have miners that have worked underground for a long time and they have never seen the light . Unfortunately they have people that have been involved with such closed-shop organizations as the Smelters Mine Union organization in Sudbury, pretty tight organization with democracy little known of8. They just don't know the fact that this Minister of Labour, in her own way, in her own

way, is meeting acceptance, the broad width and breadth of this province that the former Minister of Labour just could never begin to touch.

When she rescinded, and when she said through just common sense, which I know, I won't put my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster on the spot, but I know that he knew that a law like time and three-quarters was nonsense for Manitoba, he knew that, he knew that, he knew that. He, in fact, didn't enter into that debate, and the records will show that, but the former Minister of Labour was busy setting up monuments to himself, but this Minister of Labour had the courage to simply exercise a bit of common sense, and say, no, it's not fair to discriminate against family-owned businesses, small businesses, service industries, shops, hotels, everything else that said, we, in Manitoba, simply are not in that Monaco-like situation. We haven't yet, unless the Minister of Industry and Commerce will free up the Lord Selkirk to run a casino or something like that, we haven't yet arrived at that revenue-bearing situation that we can afford to be the sole jurisdiction in North America — in North America that can be so out of step with the rest of economic life in North America. This Minister recognized it and acted upon it. This Minister has acted upon all those promises that we made, that we made with respect to labour and she ought to be congratulated for it. She ought to be congratulated for it. Mr. Chairman, I just remind the Committee that, as a Minister who had his salary once formerly voted on to be reduced to 98 cents and who is still around and kicking, that if the present Minister of Labour follows that procedure, and she is being indoctrinated to much the same course that I was indoctrinated in 1966, it only measures well for her future success as a Minister of the Crown and as a servant of the people of Manitoba, because, Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind that the Minister of Labour has an intuitively — intuitively a greater grasp of her responsibilities than it is possible for any members opposite to do so because they are hide-bound, Mr. Chairman. They cannot get out of the union hall.

Mr. Chairman, there's nothing wrong with the union hall but, Mr. Chairman, labour doesn't end at the union hall. The fact of the matter is 70 percent of labour is outside of the union hall and this Minister recognizes the impact, the total impact of labour legislation on the economic well-being of this province, and this Minister recognizes what is possible and what is not possible.

You know, it doesn't take a Brandon University professor to tell Manitoba farmers how to apply fertilizer and that's what she's been subjected to for the last week because the Member for Brandon East thinks he's got a hot shot issue — because he thinks he's got a hot shot issue. Well, Mr. Chairman, that issue has been around for the last 20 years — for the last 20 years — 25 years, if I were correct. The innovative farmers have been using that fertilizer for 25 years so don't lay it on this Minister — don't lay it on this Minister now belatedly — what were you doing for eight years? Where were the rules and regulations that you passed in the last eight years while this material was being used? Where were . . . —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, where were the rules passed when the unrenowned, your former Leader, who came to become the Minister of Labour, where was he for the last eight years.

Mr. Chairman, all I can tell you is that, you know, the debate amuses me. I think it amuses the Honourable Minister for Northern Affairs, you know, as he listens to it, because it is one of these tempests in a teapot that absolutely affects nothing in the outside world. I say that despite the hostile press, but it is not going to change the practices of farmers as how they apply their fertilizers and it's not going to, with all due respect to the Honourable Member for Transcona who has obviously and understandably a deep concern about the inner workings of the bureaucracy having graduated from that particular field. He's particularly concerned about who sharpens pencils and how much he's getting paid for sharpening pencils in the Estimates. I don't think that's at all appropriate for discussions in these Estimates, but Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I should be relieved of course because I have been accused by the former labour critic of the New Democratic Party that I, Harry Enns, who stood for killing miners, and the Honourable Member for Flin Flon used to delight in standing up in the House once a year suggesting that Harry Enns likes nothing to do but kill miners. He would stand up once a year to make that statement. I would suggest, now I am fortunate that I now have a colleague, the Honourable Norma Price, who has now become the Labour Minister and now those remarks will be directed to her.

But I can only tell you that after eight years of having the members of the opposition telling me that and charging me with that, that has resulted from my vote increasing from 41 percent in 1969 to 49 percent in 1973 to 61 percent in 1977, and I predict that the Honourable Norma Price's vote will increase likewise in the next three years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet, then Kildonan, then Inkster.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would defer to the Member for Inkster.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Member for — what is he the member for? — Lakeside . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. GREEN: Yes — has what I think he will acknowledge is a faulty memory with respect to certain events. When he reads what I have to say in Hansard he will, I am almost certain, agree that he was incorrect.

First of all, when his salary was reduced to 98 cents it was not on the vegetable marketing issue; it was on the issue of him having said that he was going to have a bill granting license for the raising of water levels at South Indian Lake by some 30 feet when hearings, which he started and which he thought would do his bidding, did not do his bidding. Now, the last part is an editorial but the fact that the motion to reduce the salary was on that particular issue I am certain, and why am I certain, Mr. Chairman? Because it arises from an interesting thing.

My son, Martin, was watching part of that debate and we said that we were going to reduce the salary to \$1.00, and my son, Martie, said, "Why a dollar? Why not 98 cents," and I related that to the then Minister of Labour, Russ Paulley, and he thought that it was an excellent suggestion and that it would highlight the issue that he's not worth a dollar, he's worth 98 cents. And that's how the motion was made and that's why I am certain and the Minister will be able to probably acknowledge that it wasn't on that debate and that's really not very important.

The other area where his memory is faulty, or at least where his intuition is not correct, and were the Deputy Minister not a loyal Deputy Minister who would not reveal information I will do it for him. I will confirm on the record that I was one of the main proponents of the premium overtime rate, and I believe that it was a very good thing to do, that it was a very good thing to have, that it is merely an extension of Conservative legislation, that they were the ones who said that there should be a premium overtime rate because one would rather have 40 people working at straight time — 60 people working at straight time than 40 people working at time and a half and therefore there should be a rate to discourage overtime. That was not Socialism; that was Conservatism, that was Capitalism.

The premium rate doesn't do that any more and what we've said is that there has to be a discouragement. It would not cost the employers of this province more money; it would cost them less money, because they would start hiring people at straight time and save the premium rate. They would be paying straight time and, as a matter of fact, we would have less unemployment than we have in our province at the present time. So I say that for the record because the Member for Lakeside was trying to be nice to me as not having been the one to have made that suggestion — I made it. I don't know whether I can take credit for 100 percent of it but I was certainly in the forefront of it because there were other people at that time recommending, including the Conservative Party, recommending that we legislate against what they called compulsory overtime and what I call negotiated conditions of employment, voluntary to both sides, which is what the Conservative Party did not move away from. When they repealed the time and three-quarters they did not repeal what we did with regard to the overtime rates.

Well, the Member for Lakeside has protested too much, as Shakespeare saith, when he says how great the Minister of Labour has - done because, Mr. Chairman, it has not been this party, it has not been the opposition who has administered the strongest and most fatal criticism to the Minister of Labour — it's the Conservative Party. They imposed closure not on us; they imposed closure on the Minister of Labour because they couldn't stand it any more. They couldn't take it any longer. They had to get the Conservatives out of their misery from having to continue with the Estimates of the Minister of Labour, and Mr. Chairman, contrary to what has been said earlier, I think that a government in the position that they were in had no choice but to impose closure on this Minister, because it is not a fact — you know, the Minister of Highways said that 30 percent of the labour movement is organized and that 70 percent is unorganized, and is there a person in this room and is there a person in the Conservative Party — there may be one or two — who would not have it that it were 80 percent unorganized, or 90 percent unorganized, or 95 percent unorganized.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pembina is very happy with what I am saying and the Minister of Labour is his Minister of Labour for that reason. It is because this ministry has a bias against organized labour. The Member for Lakeside said, "Who are we. We've got miners who have not climbed out of the mines — have not seen the light." One of them is over there. He has seen the light. He was a miner. Was he a fool when he was a miner? Was he a fool when he was the president of the United Steelworkers of America, Local — was it 166 in Thompson? Was he a fool when he was organizing the steelworkers to undo . . . in Thompson and vice versa as well?

MR. MINAKER: Who said they were fools?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside in my opinion —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion — you know, the Member for Lakeside said a lot of things that were his opinion which you were prepared to listen to but you're finding that it hurts a little bit now —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside expressed . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Would the members please give the recognized speaker, the Member for Inkster, the courtesy of listening to him.

MR. GREEN: Expressed extreme, in the extreme, negativism — negativism towards organized labour and towards Nels Thibault, and towards the 30 percent, and towards the miners who have not climbed out of the dark. That's what I heard from the members of the — Mr. Chairman, and more than I heard it from the Member for Lakeside, I've heard it every time I happen to walk into this Committee, and I've heard it from the Member for Gladstone, and I've heard it from the Member for Pembina, and I've heard nothing but derogatory remarks about people who decide that in order to improve their working conditions they must unite together and with their solidarity attempt to influence their employer to bring about better conditions of employment. I have heard nothing but derogatory remarks from members of the opposition with regard to that.

They talk about people not wanting to work or carrying the drones — that was the Member for Gladstone's remark. Do we have to carry these drones? — about people who want to have union hiring so that there is some security as they have had for many, many years in the construction trade. So who has been the greatest critic of this now great Minister? And by the way, if you're comforted by the member's remarks saying that he was voted 98 cents and now he's the Minister of Highways — yes, but for eight years — it means that if you're going to follow Mr. Enns' course, and I'm not suggesting that you will, then you've got three years here, eight years in opposition, until you can hope to come back where he is. You know, if it works one way it also works the other way.

But who imposed this criticism, Mr. Chairman? This whole closure motion has got nothing to do, and in this I have some disagreement with what has been said earlier, has nothing to do with muzzling the opposition. This closure motion is to muzzle the Minister of Labour and to prevent her from talking. Mr. Chairman, this closure motion is made because the members of the government are worried that the Minister of Labour, who has thus far only succeeded in biting her toe nails off, will bite all her toes off as well. That's why this motion for closure is made. Mr. Chairman, there will be a little bit of time left and she will put one foot in her mouth to exchange it for the other, and maybe she will be left with some of her toes, but not very much, and it's the Conservative Government —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I will concede quite readily that I look at members of the opposite sex with a different view than I look at the Member for Gladstone. But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that I treat them as equals. And that is what I am trying to do at the present time. I'm trying to treat the Minister of Labour as my equal, and not as anything else.

And I say to her, that she is going to have to take the kind of criticism that is levied at a Minister, she's going to have to take it particularly because of some things that she has done, she's going to have to take it because of the attitudes that she has with regard to organized labour and which she wears on her sleeve. There's no problem with that, Mr. Chairman, and the fact is that I believe that she could have taken it. I believe that despite the fact that from time to time she was frustrated, that she was handling herself. The capitulation did not come from the Minister of Labour. The capitulation came from over here, the Minister of Finance. He said, "By God, we've got to get Norma out of this. We can't stand it any longer. We will move closure that will limit it to two hours, and then if we have to, we'll move closure again."

So Mr. Chairman, when the Member for Lakeside talks about how we have wounded and have criticized this great Minister of Labour, she has not been stabbed in her breast as she has been stabbed in her back. Those are where the wounds are, in her back, not in her breast.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance on a point of order.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It's been suggested here that the move on the closure is specifically related to the Minister of Labour and I want to point out to the committee that the closure motion was spoken to by the House Leader in the House this afternoon and it was moved at the point in time where we were also at the point of having reached a record level in hours consumption on Estimates and we're not at the end yet, we have some distance to go.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I think that we probably should have started using the closure motion as it's called, whatever you like, Rule 65(15), much earlier in the Session. We probably should have started when we were in Education Estimates. I don't think that on an every year basis that we can afford to spend 300 hours plus on Estimates review. It isn't related specifically to the Labour

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

Department, it's related to the total consumption of Estimates time. So I want to straighten that out, Mr. Chairman.

I also want to state that I would hope that in another year that we can mutually reach some acceptable agreement on the matter, but in the meantime, if that's the only device, and it's a very legitimate device, put there with a very clear purpose, that we would tend to use it in a very mechanical way, and it's not related to Labour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order, first of all let me say, there is no point of order. There is an attempt, by the Minister of Finance, to rationalize his position in a way in which I disagree with. There is no way that the Minister of Finance can show that on the orders of things as they have happened, that I am wrong and that he is right. All he can say is that this is the reason that he gives for having made the motion, and I interpret what the government has done as being, in my opinion, the real thing. Because if they were moving it on a department, they would have moved it on Health.

Mr. Chairman, we were 16 hours on this department, and rolling along very nicely on each item. We've been over 5 weeks —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, of course, and that's why I'm glad the member raised this as a point of order. Because what he really would like to do is to now camouflage the fact, and I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the rule is a good one. I was the proponent of the rule. I believe in the rule.

MR. CRAIK: Then live by it.

MR. GREEN: Who is not living by it? I'm living. Does anybody see me dying?

MR. CRAIK: You're sure screaming and kicking.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance doesn't understand the rule. I wish the House Leader was here. The rule was as follows: That the government would have the opportunity of doing this; the opposition would have the opportunity of indicating to the public of the province of Manitoba what the government is doing; and that the government would have to bear responsibility for what they are doing. So there is no rule, Mr. Chairman, that the government will impose this rule, and the opposition will remain silent about it. As a matter of fact, the exact opposite was said. I charge — the House Leader is now here and he will correct me if I'm wrong and I know that he won't because the House Leader would not say that — that the government would accept the responsibility for imposing closure, and the opposition would use the imposition of closure for whatever they thought it was worth in terms of trying to discredit the government for having done it.

The House Leader will not say one word in opposition to that, because that's the way the rule was formulated. So when you impose it, you cannot complain, or you cannot cry that the opposition is kicking and screaming because one of the well known suggestions as to what would happen if it was imposed, is that the opposition would try to indicate why it was imposed. And I've indicated why. And the public is going to judge. I will be happy to be judged by them.

The government says that they imposed closure because they thought the debate was lasting too long and questions were repetitious and they had to get on with the Estimates. I say they imposed closure because the Minister of Labour was an embarrassment to them, that they wanted to get her out of the hot seat as quickly as possible, before, as I said before, she chewed her toes completely off, and that that's what the government is going to have to live with. I'm happy to go to the people of Manitoba, you give your version, I'll give mine. It's not a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I only have a couple of minutes. I wanted to speak at this juncture to indicate that again, the Honourable Minister of Highways has made a hit and run which is becoming his style because he can't really take the debate very much anymore. Oh, he's come back, has he? He was out for awhile. I'm aware of what's going on. In my opinion, I think he's put on his clown prince act once more, which he does regularly with bombasts, with a lot of noise, and of course a little bit of shouting. Yes, I'm going to get to the facts in a moment, but it reminds me of the old saw about empty vessels make the most noise sometimes. I would suggest it's not because the Honourable Minister isn't intelligent, but sometimes he gets defensive that way and he doesn't have his facts to back him up.

It was a good indication that he didn't have his facts. He blamed the media; he blames the ..

opposition; even his Premier is with him because his Premier says the private enterprise is now on trial, they have to produce, too. Everybody's to blame except they, themselves, the people who are in government. You know, he says we are biased in respect to trade unions but he — (Interjection)— Let me just finish the sentence, Mr. Chairman, give me that courtesy. But he doesn't recall the fact that we weren't just asking the Minister of Labour in respect to trade unions, we were also asking for people who have no organizations, the people on minimum wage. I'll leave it at that. Let the public decide the issues, whether we are just for labour or whether we are for all working people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Lady and gentlemen, the hour of 10:26 having arrived, I'm interrupting the proceedings of the committee in accordance with the motion passed yesterday under Rule 65(15). I will now put the question on all remaining items in the Estimates of the Department of Labour, except the Minister's compensation — pass.

Committee rise.\$

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe. Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 42, Resolution 63, 7. Corrective and Rehabilitative Services. We are on Item (d)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, we were on this item a week ago, or was it yesterday? But the Minister, in his remarks, had suggested that perhaps prevention, or he thought some people might have meant intervention, was not one of his priorities in this regard when discussing what should and should not be done relative to juveniles. I had mentioned that perhaps we should spend more time and effort on finding out who puts people in the river rather than just pulling them out.

But the Member for Fort Rouge in his remarks had made reference to the private sector, or agencies in the private sector, and except for perhaps a misnomer in my mind, we wouldn't be that far apart in our opinion. It was as a result of a meeting of Ministers involved in Corrections with the Federal Government that a task force was established to determine what the role of the private sector could be in the delivery of services relative to those young people in conflict with the law. And I believe the Minister has a copy of this report. It may be somewhat strange, it was at the instigation of Manitoba that this particular study was carried out. But the disagreement that I have is, when we use the words "private sector" I don't think that the Member for Fort Rouge would disagree, what we're really talking about is community-based organizations, organizations which reflect a community. And in this regard, my interpretation of such organizations includes any organization which can give some evidence that they are supported by the community. It could in one instance be a church group or a synagogue group or it could be a service club, it could be almost any formal organization of people who get together to do social good in an area.

There is some difficulty, when we're talking about agencies which organize themselves for private gain in the delivery of services, that perhaps we might disagree on just exactly what their role is in today's society. Because I find it very, very difficult to accept that an agency is, in fact, a private agency if 99 44/100 percent of their funding comes from the public purse, with no direct responsibility or no need to solicit public support.

But in this regard, it has some relevancy in that in this item the Minister reflects that he is getting \$820,000 back from Canada relative to this amount, and perhaps he could tell us, further to what he commented yesterday, on the unresolved position of block funding relative to the care of juveniles. Is this anticipated against the same criteria which has been used to date, or is this some new formula which has been worked out?

Just on this point of outside organizations and their relationship to the delivery of social services in general and specifically with juvenile offenders, one of the things that was reported by this task force, Mr. Chairman, was the increasing difficulty that private organizations are experiencing in getting the average citizenry in the country to contribute to what most people would think to be a desirable goal. It used to be that people would see some social need and band together, and then canvass the community for support. They'd go around knocking on doors, and they'd say, will you give us a dollar? And the people would say, what do you want a dollar for? And they'd tell them, we want a dollar to do this, that, or the other thing. And if the person thought it was right, they would give them a dollar, and it's rather a simple thing that in the giving of the dollar they would actually become part of that which the organization was doing. Because I would agree that in many, many areas there is nothing more impersonal than a tax dollar, that if money is taken away from somebody by a big government type of thing, and they take that money and they apportion it, that there is really no identification with the average citizen and that which is taking place on his behalf in the community.

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

But nevertheless, I'm making the question, what can we do about it, because it is becoming exceedingly more difficult. Because unless you hang a brass ring in front of people, they are becoming more and more reluctant to contribute this dollar. I for one have to admit that I made a mistake, albeit I couldn't have stood in the path of the tides of the time, I should never have voted for the establishment of the Lotteries Commission here in Manitoba. I was sucked into it on the point that they said, "Oh, it's just a one shot effort, Bud, it's the centennial year, we've got to have the lottery, we're going to wind it up and it's going to disappear after this centennial year is over Isn't that a laugh? Well, I really got sucked in on that one, but nevertheless what is happening in this regard is people — the collection plates are getting thinner and thinner and thinner, and as a result more and more of these services are being dumped in the government's lap. And it may come as a shock to some people regardless of the political stripe of the government, I would suggest that the governments move more by default than by design.

If something is being done in the community and is being done well, the community will continue to do it, but if something is not being done and there is a crying need for it to be done, then the government has no other alternative but to move. This causes a problem, because most people . . . If there's one thread that goes through all of the literature of dealing with people that are having some kind of difficulty in accepting a responsibility for their behaviour within a community, is that we have to, in some way, get it back down to the community. The community themselves become involved in helping these people accept the responsibility to and for themselves, and to and for others, because if it continues to grow then it becomes more and more difficult.

The Member for Fort Rouge, in his remarks, referred to the institutionalization syndrome — one of his jargon phrases — it is true, that people —(Interjection)— You didn't use it, but I'm summarizing what you had said in jargonese. But it's true that people get into an institutional type of living and how do you break the cycle?

Earlier today, in another debate, the House Leader of the government said that we had no compassion for the taxpayer. Well, in this whole area of dealing with juveniles, this is what it was all about. (1) It was tried to develop a more effective service, and the Minister in his remarks said that we had been successful in establishing a tool to measure the difficulties which would come up with concrete recommendations for change which he had the eminent good sense to follow. So the Voluntary Probation Officer Program coupled with this thrust in the institutions themselves, was exactly designed the interests of not only the clientele that are involved in this particular program, but to increase the efficiency of the whole operation, that we could operate a better service for less cost.

But in his other remarks, the Minister said that the young people in conflict with the law is still occupying the last place on the agenda of Ministers of Correction meetings. He referred to the last meeting that he had attended, and once again it was the last item that was on the agenda, they paid perfunctory attention to the subject and nothing is done.

Questions were asked relative to what the intentions of the Minister are relative to the Task Force report. Now, I would suggest to the Minister that he seriously consider not bringing about any realignment of servicee relative to young people in conflict with the law, as I mentioned earlier, until two things occur: (1) that the new legislation which is still contemplated at the Federal level is brought into existence, and (2) until the new unified Family Court process has been in operation for some time. If this means a delay of one, or two, or three years, I would suggest to the Minister that that time would be well worth it, because to take this entity and to move somewhere else, the kerfuffle that will be caused will gain very little if it is necessary to go through another kerfuffle — I hope the Hansard people can spell kerfuffle — a kerfuffle? It's like a free lunch, I suppose. But anyway, they'll have to go through it again after these two pieces of legislation come into existence.

In the final analysis, it really doesn't make that much difference who administers the program, as long as you have well-directed people providing the programs. If those two pieces of legislation had been in existence, if the new Federal law had been enacted and the experiment in St. Boniface had have been initiated, then perhaps steps should be taken to move this into a community operations type of an endeavour. But nevertheless, because the Attorney-General and the government generally has decided that they're not going to be involved in this experiment with the Federal Government on a unified Family Court in St. Boniface, and we are advised that the funds that the Federal Government had allocated are going by the board, and further that the legislation at the Federal level is not going to come to fruition for some time, I would suggest that any realignment of this particular function of the Department of Health and Social Development would not serve the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item, I wanted to come back to some questions related to items that were raised briefly last evening, but because of the particular

intervention that we experienced from the other committee, we weren't able to pursue it in the detail that it should be and it relates to the issue of the way in which the responsibility to deal with native people, both status Indian and Metis, is being shared presently in the juvenile correctional field. I think it's a problem that again runs current to a lot of our discussions in this area, and it does relate back to some of the issues we had about the cost sharing arrangements that are presently in place.

I have, Mr. Chairman, a copy of a report that was prepared by the provincial government, I believe, about a year ago, dealing with an analysis of the question of native placement in the correctional institutions in the province, and it points out that some 25 percent of all the juvenile placements are those of status Indians, and it doesn't include in those those who might be of Metis origin. The report then goes on to state that this particular problem can be predicted to increase and calls upon the need for major measures in the correctional institutions to respond to it, and that to work out some proper funding arrangement to cope with the problem. To quote from this report, it says:

"The movement of Indian people to urban areas in search of employment and other opportunities and benefits will continue at an accelerated rate and because of the many barriers encountered in finding a meaningful role in urban life, their rate of involvement with the law and consequently with the correctional system will likewise accelerate." They then go on to a series of facts and figures, put it in projection and form some of the questions that could be raised.

What it seems to point out, Mr. Chairman, are two things. One is that the present ability ability of the correctional system, both juvenile now and I expect adult, is not in any way able to cope with that difficulty. And secondly, it does relate back to the issue I think that we began to join a little with the Minister on last night in his reluctance to join in a major program of prevention.

The third issue I guess that I would add on to that is the issue of funding of it, with the new block funding that is now presently arranged with the Federal Government replacing the capital grant. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us whether the new block funding will result in a higher proportion of that assistance being allocated toward the problem issue of dealing with native people and juvenile natives, and to improve the facilities and services being offered to them, so that we may be able to upgrade the present level of response that we're making in this area, or whether the same formulas that appeared under the old capital grant are still in place. In other words, are we now using this block funding to develop a greater flexibility in our financial formulas so that we can, in this province, devote a greater, or dedicate a greater proportion of those support funds for targeting at the need for native people to get better service and facilities, particularly outside the City of Winnipeg but I'm not excluding that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, with respect to the last question asked by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, there is really no formula determined as yet under the block funding proposal in the social services field, and there is no block funding prescribed yet in the young offenders' field.

The position of the Province of Manitoba throughout the block funding discussions and negotiations this year was certainly one of scepticism, and one of considerable cynicism. We felt that the cost-sharing formula under CAP and under VRDP was a preferable position from Manitoba's point of view, although block funding does give the provinces more autonomy and self-determination. We were not enthusiastic about the block funding concept because we recognize that over the long haul that's going to mean less money for the Province of Manitoba as we find ourselves levelled down to the national average, above which we sit at the present time. So it's a little difficult to answer the question of the Member for Fort Rouge. What he's asking me in essence is whether — or what it comes out to in *ade facto* sense, is whether the Government of Manitoba, having received a certain amount of funding from the Federal Government under the block funding proposal, is going to make the determination here whether a higher proportion of it will go to dealing with the native problem and native juvenile problem, than perhaps has been the case in the past. And that's a difficult question to answer at this juncture.

The difficulty is exacerbated by the fact that social services, those who deliver social services and social service programs, those who consume social services, have had their expectations elevated to a considerable degree because of all the talk that's gone on in the last two and a half years in this country about a new Social Services Act, and also because of the initial payment that was going to be made to the provinces at the time that proposed block funding legislation came into effect. As the member well knows, that initial payment has now been deferred, postponed, for at least a year. That amounted to \$132 million. That was the so-called pot sweetener that was to accompany the introduction of the new legislation.

The pot and the sweetener have both been removed from the table now, and the expectations are still out there high in the community, and the available resources and funds are diminished, so there is going to be considerable competition among all the community interest groups, among all the deliverers and consumers of social services for the amount of money that's available, and I don't need to burden the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, who is certainly knowledgeable of the numbers of deliverers and the relative numbers of consumers of those services in the community. So that the native and the juvenile native are in the same position that the other consumers of social services are in, a very competitive one for a fair share of that funding.

So what the honourable member is asking me is, are we going to make decisions that will shift the proportions a little bit and expand the proportion available to cope with the problems associated with our native peoples and particularly our juvenile natives, and I can only assure him that I will give it my studious attention. I can't guarantee him that that will be done.

I can guarantee him that the pressure on the Minister of Health and Social Development, whoever he or she may be for the next 10 years in this province, is going to be enormous when it comes to the bidding war for shares of those block funds. But I will certainly recognize for the record what the honourable member is saying about the problems of the community that we're talking about here, and the fact that it deserves certainly its fair share of that available total resource.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre asked me whether in the area of juvenile corrections, the same principle would apply under block funding as will apply directly in the social services field, under Health and Social Development. He asked a question relative to the \$820,000 shown in the Estimates here as Recoverable from Canada under this year's program in the Juvenile Corrections Division.

The answer is that whatever Health and Social Development gets under block funding, will not include what Corrections gets under block funding. In Juvenile Corrections, the same kind of principle will be applied, and I don't know what the final determination will be, but block funding is geared to population and to gross national product and gross provincial product, and population growth patterns, but it will be in addition to the block funds for Health and Social Development. It will be an amount of money that's funded for the care and treatment of juvenile offenders over and above what is funded purely and directly in the health and social development field.

Just on the subject on which we left off last night and on which the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre began this evening, on the subject of prevention generally, I couldn't agree more than I do with him and really with the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge when they talk about the kinds of agencies in the community that are, or should be available to perform in the vanguard of the prevention fight, and this is really is at the essence of our attitude towards prevention generally in the corrections and rehabilitative field. I would hope that there is no misunderstanding in the minds of my honourable friends or others, as to the government's general attitude towards prevention. Certainly, in the field of health, it's our primary thrust. It's the main emphasis of the efforts that I am hoping to make and continue and pursue in the health field. But when one is looking at the kinds of problems that exist at the social services level and certainly at the level of conflict with the law, the whole subject of prevention is really a total government responsibility. It's linked inseparably with a total government approach. The responsibility and the requirement on the part of a government to try to improve the condition of society; to try to make things better; to try to provide more opportunity for people; that is the essential and fundamental form of prevention that my colleagues and I would hope to pursue.

When you come down specifically to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services, or the Ministry of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services, which is what we are talking about here, we're really dealing after the fact. We're dealing with people who have had some difficulties and who now come under the aegis of the functions of correction and rehabilitation, and certainly there can be prevention applied to prevent repetition, to prevent perpetuation of a cycle, to prevent recidivism, but essentially we're dealing with the response to a condition and to a problem, and the function of prevention and preventiveness by itself is much more, in my view anyway, a function of certain components of the Department of Health and Social Development than it is of the Ministry of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services.

Nonetheless, through our counselling services that operate in the whole field of juvenile corrections and probation and parole services, there are certainly initiatives in the area of prevention that can be taken. I simply submit that in this field one has to move responsibly and cautiously lest one exercise what in fact really is intrusion and invasion and intervention and authoritarianism under the guise of the title of prevention. And I think that the best prevention in this field is probably done by agencies such as the external agencies which are funded by the department, by the church wherever possible, by the school wherever possible, by community clubs where they exist, by the police, and first and foremost, by the family.

I don't think that it's necessarily, primarily and fundamentally the role of the government to lead, direct and guide in the arena of behaviour, I think that that is primarily and fundamentally the role

of the family. I know some families are not equipped to do it, but there also is a situation where families who are equipped to do it won't do it if they're not motivated to do it, if they can abdicate that duty on the grounds that there is an agency, bureaucratic, governmental or otherwise, that there is an authority that is going to take care of that problem for them.

So I suggest that it has to be approached carefully and cautiously and that where possible, I would promote and intend to promote, the support of agencies working in the field, rather than direct government intervention. I think that the strongest of those, as I say, is the family, and probably the second most powerful is the Police Force. But there are certainly many others.

I don't think anybody has the answers to the myriad questions that surround the whole subject of preventive techniques. I don't think anybody has developed the science of prevention to a point of exactitude and precision where we can say that we can stop these things from happening simply by doing such and such. As a matter of fact, I was advised by one of my senior department officials today that an exhaustive study on prevention in this field had been carried out in the United States and Canada, and 6,800 prevention projects undertaken by different agencies, governmental and private, in the United States and Canada, over a ten year period, had been investigated and assessed by a team of qualified examiners, and that only 40 of those 6,800 were considered anywhere close to being reasonably successful, and that even among those 40, the participants, the administrators and the examiners, found it impossible to conclude that there was definitive evidence that those prevention projects had prevented a single juvenile from coming into conflict with the law and with authority.

That's not to be construed as a message of discouragement. It's simply a message of reality, so that I think that a government, an opposition, a province, a society, an individual, can expend a great deal of time, money and effort on prevention, and wind up in frustration and tears because there is no precise measurement that can be applied to say that the prevention techniques proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge or the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, or the Honourable Member for Fort Garry were successful, the one more than the other, or successful by any standards. And I think that in this particular field we have to be looking to a reinforcement of the family and the principles of family responsibility and family interdependence where we can, and probably the best prevention comes through a government program in totality that is not linked to prevention as a conventional specific exercise at all, but is directed towards improving the lot of individuals in society, improving their chances and improving their opportunities. If that is best achieved through economic initiatives, so be it. If it's best achieved through other initiatives, so be it. The important thing is that it be pursued and achieved. But that by itself is not what I call necessarily prevention. Prevention is a by-product of that. That is a struggle to improve society.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has raised some interesting points about the potentials or possibilities for making some meaningful changes in the system. While he poses not being a prophet of gloom, he certainly made a pretty convincing case for those who would want to take that role in life.

What I would be interested in knowing are two things. One I guess in the very immediate term. Whether some of the programs that were initiated previously in the correctional institutions, dealing with native people, and I think particularly the New Career programs, some of the work training programs, are continuing in those institutions and are continuing or expanding to try to take those people who are involved, as juveniles or as young people in the correctional institutions, and work them into the New Career or work training kind of activities, so that they would begin to acquire some skills and some work abilities and therefore be able to move out of it. It appears to me that once someone is caught up in this — what was it? — the institutional syndrome that my friend from Winnipeg Centre indicated is the problem, it appears to me from some of the figures that I have in front of me, that once they're in the system, it's very difficult to get out, that the rate of rehabilitation is very low. And I think that I can recall in some cases in debates, past debates in this House, when resolutions, there were members of the now governing party which indicated that rehabilitation was not to be an objective to pursuit in any event. I think the former Member for Swan River used to take that point with some degree of eloquence, that rehabilitation would never work anyway and that correctional institutions were simply there to incarcerate people, detain them from becoming damages, (sic) and I guess the resolution the Member for St. Matthews is going to bring before the House will even further utilize that argument.

The fact of the matter is that I would be interested in knowing at this point in time, within the institutions themselves, what kind of rehabilitation, direct rehabilitation training programs are available for those in the institutions, and whether the government has any intention of continuing them or expanding them so that there is that opportunity for juveniles in this system to begin either getting into a prepared educational program or work study program, to allow them to perhaps acquire

some chances, some opportunities, as the Minister indicates.

I notice that the New Careers had I think some 33 spots in the juvenile system in 1975-76 where we recruited for juveniles, delinquents, in the system. I would like to know if that has been increased or decreased, or if there any alternative to those 33 places, and really what has happened to them. And beyond that, I would be interested in knowing if in his counsel of despair whether the Minister has any idea in mind what he intends to do about the problem. If we take his report — not his report, I guess it's a report that was originally prepared for the Management Secretariat, perhaps it was the Planning and Priority Secretariat in there, Mr. Rudnicki's responsibility, that the difficulties will substantially increase both in the urban areas and in the northern areas, that the proportion of the native population in the jails or in the juvenile institutions is five to one what their normal population would represent, and that the projections in this report are that it will accelerate, provide an increasing difficulty, considering the fact that we are I guess paying — what? — about \$30 or \$40 per diem for placements in these areas that that in itself becomes a fairly heavy cost item in terms of the provincial budget.

So I would really like to know what plans the Minister has in mind. He said last night he had some studies and reports going on. I think he has now indicated that. . . I think I've taken the position, I don't think that much more studying or reporting needs to be done, because I've got three files in front of me of all government reports and studies that have already been commissioned in the past three years, which seem to me would be sufficient amount of work for any consultant to accept. But it may be that the time has come for some consolidation of those proposals and some coming together of both public and the community agencies working in the field to decide exactly what role they want to play. If the Minister is right that there is very little that can be done in rehabilitation, then we should maybe cut bait and stop trying to do it, and simply spend our money to contain people, but if there is some meaningful rehabilitation role for those already in the institutional system, I would like to know what it is or what it intends to be, so that perhaps we could start doing a more serious job on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: With respect to the training opportunities available to young people in our juvenile institutions, Mr. Chairman, there is as the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has pointed out, a rather high proportion of native juveniles in the general institutional population, but there is no differentiation in the programs or the opportunities available to the populations as to whether they are native or non-native. The opportunities would be geared to individual capacities and individual capabilities, but they are not divided as between native and non-native. Some of the education programs that are available are the following: There is a continuing Education Program. It involves individualized education designed for each student and based on curricula from one of the following, either the Department of Education curricula, Department of Education Correspondence Branch or Red River Community College Adult Basic Education Program or Remedial Education Program. —(Interjection)— How many are in that? I can't tell you. They apply at Agassiz and at Seven Oaks. The approximate populations at Agassiz average in the high 80s and at Seven Oaks, around 30, 32 or 33, and the majority of those juveniles, if not all of them, would be occupied I believe. . . all of them are occupied in educational programs of one sort or another geared to their specific levels of attainment. Seven Oaks and Agassiz both are accredited schools with the Department of Education.\$

The Remedial Education Program involves teachers at Seven Oaks and at Agassiz preparing written individualized education plans for all students. The students themselves are in teacher guided programs, Skills for Living Program, various centres of scheduled life skills programs throughout the year. These include Drug and Alcohol Education programs, Family Life Education, and Nutrition Education. The intention is to expand these programs in the future and in each centre.

At Agassiz there is a program geared to severe learning problems, and these are the functionally illiterate and that comprises about 21 percent of the population at any given time. There is a program geared to significant learning problems. These are for another approximate 21 percent of the population who are two or more years academically retarded. There is a continuing education program, and that, at last count, included 46 students undergoing Department of Education curricula studies and 21 in Red River Community College Adult Basic Education courses. Remedial education program, 18 students — this is Agassiz again — in remedial education, in a Skills for living program which teaches the techniques of job search, job hunting.

Seven Oaks, which has, of course, a smaller population, an assessment program that included a program for those with severe learning problems, functionally illiterate again, 32 percent of the population there is engaged in that in the average. Significant learning problems, the two or more years academically retarded again, 19-½ percent of the population engaged in that; and programs similar to those that I've described at Agassiz in the continuing education, remedial education and

Skills for Living program fields.

There is also, of course, education offered at the Manitoba Youth Centre, although the length of stay there, hopefully and intentionally is substantially shorter, but even there, there is a basic academic assessment that's carried out within one week of admission, and tutorial help is available for continuing education and there is also a remedial education program in effect at the Centre.

At Agassiz, students can get their Grade 12 certificates from Red River Community College, and also the institutions are moving into specialized kind of education such as driver training, automotive skills, cooking skills, etc.

That's generally the educational picture in the juvenile institutions, Mr. Chairman. There certainly is a recognition on the part of the department that those who are *in loco parentis* of juveniles, are responsible for their education, and if it's their parents, it's their parents. And if it's the authorities who are responsible for correcting their behaviour in the juvenile corrections system, it's those authorities, and we recognize that we have to provide educational opportunities for the children in those institutions and it is done on a comprehensive scale.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I gather from the Minister's answer then that the New Careers program has been cancelled or is no longer available to those in these institutions because it was not among his list of programs, even though it was previously offered. I think it was said there were some 33 trainees in the juvenile institutions, so I can conclude from that, then, that the New Careers opportunity has been cancelled. The Minister might want to confirm that but I assume that that's the case.

MR. SHERMAN: There still are new careerists attached to the institutions and functioning in counselling positions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. AXWORTHY: One further question in that regard, Mr. Chairman, would be whether the Minister or the department have begun to look at anything similar to a fine option program or a work-fine option program where rather than detaining people in the institutions, they would provide them with the opportunity to engage in some form of work activity to detail their sentences or to work out their problems, either through a community agency or through some other form of residential location, and whether that kind of option has presently been employed or is being used where, say a juvenile who has run into trouble with the law, rather than being sentenced and being given some detention, is being given the choice, or the judge, rather, is given the choice of assigning him to a residential situation and a work option within that, so that the degree of sentence or the compensation can be worked off in those respects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)— pass — the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: I'll defer to the Minister if he wanted to speak on that question. It's just that the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for Winnipeg Centre basically have been dealing with reports and a lot of this is already on the public record. However, I did welcome the suggestion of the Member for Fort Rouge for the assignment of the work option, because I feel a lot of the assignments to the halfway houses and that are basically for idle time that could be spent, and I feel that, representing one of the core areas, namely Wolseley, that I'd be remiss if I didn't stand up and take a few minutes to talk about the past and the present and some of the future. I note, with interest, that in the past we had the attitudes that prevailed under the socialism government, of which we had a lot of problems out at the Youth Centre, we had the attitude of the past with that of the present, where the past seemed to be the "welcome back Johnny," versus the improvements that have been made under the work ethic of the present government and this Minister, who have gone into the search for pills and drugs and alcohol which were so readily available at the Centre in the past because of the lack of the search and attitude that was prevailing at the Centre.

We notice, with interest, that the newspapers picked up on the improvements that have been cited since the implementation that started under this current Minister, as of November 1977, which were the result of both the past government and opposition, together with probably a morale problem with staff and certainly the attitude of the youth themselves, that sort of insisted that something be looked at.

I can't help but think of Orders for Return that were filed, which basically dealt with the serious vandalism that was taking place, and I think it showed that the Boyce-Suss team that were involved in the head games, that it didn't work and that we had to try to avoid this thing. And I think that the indications are that the transfer of that gentleman together with the replacement of the Minister

has certainly made a lot of improvements at the Youth Centre.

I think that the punishment must be there, and I think this new work ethic attitude this government has established at the Youth Centre is taking away some of these Hughie Milquetoast workers that were out there in the past, and it would seem to me that we have still some at the present, but there is a new sense of attitude, a new sense of loyalty to the job and a sense of dedication to accomplish something.

I do think the Centre itself is basically there to serve a function of care, custody, and of course, assessment of the people that are in there, and to supply shelter, of course, for those runaways or Child Welfare Act cases.

I noticed in a couple of my visits out there that possibly some renovations could take place. It seems there are several sort of useful sections or useless sections that possibly serve no really valuable purpose, and maybe under a priority system could be renovated for some trade use, or something, whatever.

I'd like to dwell upon what can happen if people don't get involved, and I think if you are an MLA in the city area you have to get involved, and I would like to cite an example where at 234 Sherburn Street back in 1974 and 1975, we continued to write letters, as a member of the City Council, the councillors together wrote letters pertaining to a problem there, and the answer we got back from the individual people was, there really was no problem, and if I can quote, "no police action has been required," and so on and so forth. We were indicating that we were dissatisfied with the surveillance and the supervision. And attesting to that as an MLA, you knocked on the neighbours' doors and every one of them had special locks, every one of them shut off their lights or didn't allow their children to go out after 9 o'clock in the evening and there was a curfew, a sense of fear and a sense of curfew in the entire area. And this was caused by many many instances that broke out, and it was all because we tried to put violent juvenile offenders in a residential area.

Now, I know many of these halfway houses are extremely successful, but I think when you get into the area of a violent offender, I think that he needs psychiatric help, and I think the task force has indicated, and I'm suggesting that we can do something as a government in looking at the area of a forensic centre or some care for the juvenile people who need psychiatric help and a post-psychiatric follow-up and treatment, because I know, it's been suggested to me, that we could have identified several people who ended up committing homicides because they had a pattern of violence that was bound to be a prediction for something in the future. It seems that this violent pattern is there and if it's identified, that only the psychiatrists, in my opinion, can offer the proper suggestions and not the judges and the lawyers of the courts.

I am hopeful that we will be able to get on with supplying the funding for a forensic centre to look after these, because if you look at the financial picture of the Minister's Estimates, you see the famous 2-1/2 times 1 of the former First Minister, but in this case it applies to adult offenders versus juvenile offenders. And I might suggest that we could use a little more funding in the juvenile area.

Possibly in the northern policy, I would hope that we would look at the new The Pas jail when it's built. There's an indication from the Public Works Minister it will be going ahead, and I think we should have a juvenile remand cage in that institution, even though you don't like to put them both in the same building, I think it might be a financial saving and I look forward, with some interest, to the unnecessary travelling by guards and custodians that bring these offenders on remand or what have you down to the Youth Centre from the northern areas. It would be suggested if some of the youth were bored that they might commit some petty crime just to come in and visit some of their old colleagues at the Youth Centre for a week or two, and it seems to me that they should be confined in the north, because that's where the offence took place.

I did want to deal with the fact that because I'm from the Wolseley area, we're very concerned when David Lee and others print that juvenile crime in Winnipeg is one of the worst in Canada. I know that statement — the former Minister and now the Member for Winnipeg Centre took exception to that headline story — but I think that story served a purpose to draw focus on the role that can be played and some of the solutions that can be offered if we get some of the external agencies, the churches and the family and the police, the juvenile police section, and most of all, I think the community club staff, because in every particular core area, it seems to me the survival of the numbers game, as far as juveniles goes, depends on the activities of the particular community club. If you have a successful community club, you have a drop in juvenile crime, and I suggest that when there's an election on, there's a drop in juvenile crime because many of these people who are idle and involved in gang wars and what have you drop in to the campaign headquarters and what have you. I noticed —(Interjection)— well, not to mine, but in the Winnipeg Centre area there is a need for a drop-in centre or some activity, and a little more thrust to break up the gang warfare.

I did, as I say, want to report on the happy ending to 234 Sherburn Street, no thanks to the former Minister, in that the Honourable Bud Sherman has reported that because of police problems, the police have been called to this home on a number of occasions, and the fact that one of the chap who was out on — committed manslaughter, stabbed some fellow in a particular drunken party — and a number of other incidences in the area and outside the area, that it would seem to me that it allowed the department to re-think its situation and both the Manitoba Community Treatment Association houses at 895 Palmerston and at 234 Sherburn were closed, much to the delight of the neighbourhood. It was felt that if the attitude had have been there, if the dress had have been there — the dresslike authority, rather than this attitude that prevailed under the former government, of the super cool attitude with the long hair and the head games they played, and trying to be one of the boys— I think that when you're in charge of a group of juveniles you're there to demonstrate a learning process. It's not a picnic, you're there to demonstrate some sort of authority.

So for the people of Wolseley, I'm very pleased that the Minister has taken a number of steps to look to the future and the Task Force seems to be dealing with it, and I can only say that I myself will be continually drawing attention to the big business attitude of some of these homes that are not institutions. I don't believe that we have to build more institutions, I'm all for having people go out into the particular community under certain circumstances, and I think that we can accomplish this and we can accomplish it by telling the external agencies that we're not interested in a record system. Whenever it seems that they ever have a juvenile that's troublesome, they ship them back to the Youth Centre, or they ship them over to some of these lesser light external places that really the people running them do not qualify, but they seem to be the type of people that are the last hope, and they're willing to take chances for a little extra per diem, or whatever, to deal with these incorrigibles, and to the surprise of many people there is a success story at some of these places.

So maybe in the future we'll have to look at less professionalism because of the cost and when we deal with this less professionalism we can look at homes like 270-277 Spence Street that were a little seedy in their appearance and could have used some renovations, but the attitude of the people running them seemed to be that they were willing to take the rejects that the other particular halfway houses, when there was the slightest bit of problem, would turn these people back into the Youth Centre because they wanted to have an unblemished record. I think it's important that members of the Civil Service not be snowed by these facts and figures of external agencies wanting to deal with perfection, because we know that they simply send these people who are the slightest bit of problem back and the only hope for these kids is that they are sent to some of these less professional homes. I would hope that we would look at entertaining more of them at a lesser per diem rate because many people who, for health reasons or whatever, still have a lot of moxie and what have you in dealing with juveniles and it would seem to me that they could do the job where there is a void and possibly when there gets to be overcrowding.

So I would hope that, in closing, that our government would look at the Task Force recommendation for more psychiatric help for juveniles, and I think that with this forensic centre and that, we could identify some of the violent offenders that turn out to create some of the shocking crimes that we read about in the newspapers. And I would like to close by possibly sharing the thoughts in last year's Estimates of the Member for Roblin, who suggested that if the juvenile crime in Winnipeg did not have a downward trend, that possibly these young people should be known. They are getting off scot-free with some of their violent crimes, and I think that if there were some guidelines established, that in some circumstances the names of these people committing ten or fifteen break-ins and things like that should be printed as an extra deterrent to having them get on the straight and narrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, when the Member for Wolseley used the expression with reference to the Youth Centre that perhaps they should put a remand cage, my reaction is to stand up and say something like, who let the Member for Wolseley out of his cage tonight because I have the tendency sometimes to react to him.

The Minister last night, in his remarks to this particular item under consideration, had the good grace to say that as a result of the study which was initiated in July of last year, recommendations were made to him in November of last year, which he followed most of them, and he had the added good grace to send me a copy of that report. I'll go back just a little bit.

The First Minister, when he asked me to take on the responsibility of this Ministry within the Department of Health and Social Development said there are problems, and he asked me if I would undertake the responsibility of trying to solve these problems. Well, the First Minister did not give me *mecarte blanche*, he gave me an undertaking that I could attract a small competent staff, and he

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

reminded me of the admonition of Tommy Douglas, when he said that it's an awful lot easier to make a socialist out of an engineer than it is to make an engineer out of a socialist. And I got the message, because he said, "Attract competent people." And we were very successful in doing that. The Minister had the added good grace, once again, to compliment the staff that exists in this particular ministry.

In addressing ourselves to the overall problems relative to juveniles, the first task was to identify the problems, and as the Minister said earlier, there's 6,800 different programs which were assessed, and every new Ph.D. that comes out of the universities has an answer to all the problems — just give me the money, don't ask me what I'm going to do with it, just give it to me and I'll solve the problems. And this is one of the problems.

With the staff that we had attracted, I said, I don't care — if I tell you there is a problem, and you tell me that I'm going to hire a whistler and I'm going to put him down at the corner of Portage and Main, he's going to whistle. And I say, okay, go ahead and hire your whistler and put him down there, and if arson stops, I have reason to assume that maybe the whistler stopped the arson. But maybe I'm not too sure, so I say, let's take the whistler out. We take the whistler out, arson goes up, I put the whistler back, arson goes down — after a few of these attempts, there's reason to assume, no matter what kind of measurement techniques are developed, that the whistler stops arson. Now that might sound farfetched, but the Minister related that 21 percent of these people in the institutions have difficulty in reading, they have difficulty in understanding, so one of the biggest problems in dealing with these youngsters is communicating with them.

Now when I said it was some farfetched, sometimes you can only communicate with them through music, but how do you address this problem? You sit down with your staff, the people who have to accept the responsibility of delivering this service, and you say, what are we going to do? What can we do?

So in Management Committee of Cabinet, they had a group of dedicated people who can sit down and say, okay, what is the program? What are you trying to do? The staff says, we are trying to accomplish this. They devise the tool and they call it a management audit. You don't know if the tool will measure what you want, so you try it out. They tried this particular tool out in the institution in Dauphin, and as a result of the experience in Dauphin, they applied it to the Youth Centre.

Now the Member for Fort Rouge, when he stood up yesterday to address his remarks, he thought maybe that Bud's . . . had a soft shoe routine going here, and he said he was going to use a different attack. When I have some criticism to make of the Minister I intend to make it; when I think that he is going in the wrong direction I intend to point that out to him, but nevertheless for the Member for Wolseley to stand up, who is the most irresponsible member in this Legislature I would suggest, you just —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: The problems were there under your ministry, and for a hundred years before. Smarten up.

MR. BOYCE: It's impossible for him to smarten up. I just wish he would stop running in Wolseley and come back into Winnipeg Centre because I so enjoyed being on a platform with him and having the people in the audience laugh, because he's so irresponsible, and given the opportunity to discuss the problems directly with his constituents, he tells one constituent this and the next one next door the very reverse of it. And if he wants me to take him and introduce him to the two constituents to which I am referring, I will be glad to.

But nevertheless, there are problems in the Youth Centre, today, right this moment. That's what it's all about, because earlier when I said that there should be some attempt made to take it back into the community, I don't want anybody to construe or misconstrue that as a criticism of the staff within the department, because these are the difficult ones. The easy ones are creamed off, and sent outside of the institutions to some of the people in the private, "so-called private sector" fully funded at public expense, and many of these people are in the habit of bad-mouthing the people within the system who have the tough nuts to crack. In fact, in one experience I had to instruct staff to call a halt and in fact I sent a memo — if you'll take a look at the record — to my colleague, the Minister of Health, and said that these people that drop their charges off at the Youth Centre on Friday night as a babysitting agency for them over the weekend, I'm going to start charging them room and board for them.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I get angry, that's all.

The Minister, before we were so rudely interrupted in the rational debate which was taking place — by the Member for Wolseley — mentioned that the key once again to the whole issue is the family, and there is absolutely no disagreement whatsoever between the Minister and myself on this. There is a little disagreement in philosophy in that I think the Minister sees the government as "them", and I see the government as "us."

Tonight at suppertime I had a phone call from a person not in my constituency. I'd hate to refer to the particular constituency that the particular individual lives in because I don't think he's that well represented, but nevertheless it involves some youngsters around a store who are intimidating the neighbourhood. What can we do? The police don't seem to be able to cope with the problem. If you go near the youngsters, and they know the law, — touch me and I'll pull you in for assault — the people complain to the parents of some of these children, and they don't get co-operation from the parents. What is the answer to this problem?

One community in California solved the problem by enough of the parents getting together and taking the child home and telling the parents, we will not suffer this kind of activity in our community. That is our attitude on our street, in our particular block, that we don't suffer that kind of activity in our community. But so many people cop out, they see somebody doing something and they are intimidated — they are too busy, they won't act.

Years and years ago, Mr. Chairman, in the fifties, I picked up a Readers Digest and I read one of those little anecdotes at the bottom of a page, and it was a story about one of the people from North America who was over in Chatham in England, and he finished with an empty package of cigarettes and he threw it on the street, and this woman picked it up and handed it back to him, and he says, "I don't want it, it's empty." And she says, "Well, neither does Chatham want it." And until such time, Mr. Chairman, that the community takes back as much as possible the responsibility for the behaviour in that particular neighbourhood, and I'm not talking about a Ku-Klux-Klan or anything else, but nevertheless, until the neighbourhood itself sets a standard for activity within that community, you can't possibly hire enough policemen; you can't possibly build enough institutions; you can't possibly hire enough social workers; it has to come out of the people themselves, the family.

I was glad that the Minister raised this particular point, because it's something about which we hear too little in this day and age. I know it's corny in 1978 to talk about raising families, to talk about such things as honour, integrity, duty, responsibility, and this is corny, but until such time as this gets back into our society, the Minister isn't going to solve all these problems. Can you imagine the nightmare of the Member for Wolseley being made responsible for solving these problems. The Member for Wolseley says about the damage out in the . . . and when I asked the Minister about the question about it, I was somewhat reluctant to ask him, because I can't stop vandalism and neither can he. He had one key \$6,000 he tells me, one shot, one night, since he took office. So people want to bang about, you know . . . I get so sick of politics in this regard. That my mistakes were worse than your mistakes, or your mistakes are better than my mistakes, and all the rest of it; it's what confuses people.

I had one other question; it slipped my mind. The Minister was referring to the \$820,000 Recoverable from Canada in this regard. I was just wondering, overall, just exactly where we stand vis-a-vis the Federal Government. I think the last billing was that the Federal Government owes us 35 million on costs relative to native people. It is a constitutional requirement that the Federal Government is 100 percent responsible for the costs relative to delivery of social services relative to native people, and I believe last year the bill we kept arguing for was some 35 millions of dollars. In this regard, it used to be the policy, until the former government could not in conscience stand back any longer and allow it to happen; they had to intervene, by us even paying 100 percent of the cost in some instances because the Federal Government reneged on their responsibility. But perhaps the Minister could advise us where we are relative to the recovering of the \$35 million, and, Mr. Chairman, if they do get this windfall of the \$35 million that the Federal Government owes us for services provided to native children, I think we'd end up last year in a surplus.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have to check with my colleague, the Minister of Finance, to provide the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre with that information. What he says about 100 percent responsibility vesting with the Federal Government applies only of course, on the reservations, applies only to status Indians on the reservations. If they come into the City of Winnipeg, the Province winds up and the city to a certain extent, winds up paying for the services that are made available to them. I think the figure that the the honourable member, —(Interjection)—not in all cases, but certainly in a substantial number of cases, that that is the situation in which we wind up in a position of responsibility, but if they're on the reserves, it's totally 100 percent Federal responsibility. But I think that the figure that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre is referring to would be the whole amount outstanding for services for which the Federal Government is in debt to the Province of Manitoba including medical services and the whole range. I'd have to check that with the Minister of Finance to see where we stand on it. Whatever is owing I am sure is being pursued as vigorously by this administration as it was by the last, whether we have collected it yet or not I couldn't say, Mr. Chairman.

The Member for Fort Rouge asked me about the fine option concept and programs of the like, that might be available to juvenile offenders, juveniles in conflict with the law, and I would like to

advise him, Mr. Chairman, that essentially we're looking at the fine option concept for the adult field, rather than the juvenile field. There are a number of alternatives available to juveniles offenders now, so that a very small percentage of them wind up institutionalized. It's a fraction of the juvenile community that comes into contact with or conflict with the law that actually winds up institutionalized. I think it's one percent, if I'm correct, so that in the main, the whole juvenile system is a diversion system almost by definition. The alternatives are available, the additional probation officers and voluntary probation officers that we put into the field, have enabled us to expand upon the program already pursued by the previous administration of trying to keep kids out of the institutions and keep them in their homes and within their families. Those options are not as available in the adult system, so that we're looking at the fine option concept for application there. But I do think that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge can accept some assurance that the juvenile system is structured essentially as a diversion, as a broad diversion program, in its totality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, I think we should pass this item, but just while I was sitting there listening to the Minister, and I don't intend to repeat myself when we get to the Minister's Salary, so I just wanted to point out, when we're talking about these problems generally, so many of them refer to large urban centres, and I would invite some of the new members who come from the rural communities, having lived in a small town myself when I was younger, I know what it's like to live in a small town, but I don't think some of the new members understand what it's like in a large area in the City of Winnipeg where the people move in the anonymity which exists, which allows some of these things to take place. I know we've done it before, Mr. Chairman, is make arrangements for some of the members to tour these areas, to see exactly what takes place, so I would encourage the Minister to get some of his colleagues and take them around to . . . when we talk about the inner city of the City of Winnipeg, to take a look at what goes on in this particular area. I would ask him to take a look at any other constituency except Wolseley, because the Member for Wolseley has solved all the problems since October, but nevertheless, I think it would be worthwhile for some of the new members from the rural areas to take a look at just exactly what is involved in even the physical environment in which a lot of these things occur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (d)—pass; (e)(1)Salaries —pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I understand we are on (e). Were you moving that quickly, that we're on the Section ()), Adult Offenders?

Well, Mr. Chairman, your rapid fire approach, I hope I'll be allowed a little latitude to deal with the general area of . adult offenders and not confine myself just to the Community Agency approach. At 9:30 at night, it's a little tough to keep up with those who have such a quick tongue and mind, and though I have some comments to make about the issue of adult offenders and I think they will parallel in part the same kinds of questions that we had in relation to the issue of juvenile I guess one is generally an extension of the other as it turns out.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us what he is planning in terms of the statements that he has made in the past about looking at alternative treatment programs, work programs, and fine option programs. Is there in fact established initiatives now being taken, is it simply in the realm of speculation, and could he indicate where in these Estimates we would expect to see the provision of expenditures for these new programs that are being contemplated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, regrettably I can't point to specifics of that kind in these Estimates that the members of the Committee are looking at for 1978-79, although I want to repeat that fine option and work option concepts are certainly intended to be introduced and applied in the adult system as quickly as it's practical in the course of the coming year, but the increases in the appropriation that we are requesting the Legislature to approve, really provide only for the additional operating costs of the institutions which number 9 really, 6 institutions and 3 rehabilitation camps. Additions in salaries for administration and institutional employees, a contract position for a doctor serving Headingley, the Winnipeg Remand Centre, and the Manitoba Youth Centre, and financial assistance for community facilities, halfway houses, etc., or other facilities that meet the needs of persons so placed. So that the money that we're asking the Legislature to vote does not reflect initiatives or innovations of the kind that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has raised, but certainly recognizing the general problem of relatively high jail populations in Canada as compared to other countries and much of the western world, and a population in Headingley that is certainly

far greater than we would consider desirable and a cost to society both in terms of maintenance of a relatively high jail population, and the damage resulting from criminal acts. We are exploring very vigorously and I intend to implement as I have said, as quickly as is practical, options of the kind that will permit individuals to work out the cost and the damages and the penalties accruing to their infractions where it's practical and in the public interest, and to pay fines rather than undergo incarceration.

Over and above that, there is another area that I want to mention to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, and that is the area of problem idleness within our institutions, and I raise that specifically in connection with the conventional institutions. It doesn't apply of course in the rehabilitation camps. But particularly at Headingley, there is a problem in the idleness of the inmate population and the unhealthiness of that kind of idleness, particularly measured against the sort of climate existing in jail and prison populations across the country today, unhealthy both from the point of view of society and very definitely from the point of view of the population of the institution itself, and I include the security personnel, the service personnel, as well as the inmates.

So I am looking, hopefully, to development in concert with my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Public Works, and my colleagues in general in the Executive Council, of a program that would enable us to engage the inmate populations in useful and satisfying work that would not only get a job done for the people of Manitoba in certain areas, but would get a job done for the institution, and more importantly, get a job in self-satisfaction done for the inmates themselves.

That isn't easy, and I know that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge will respect the immediate problems that rear their heads, one of which is the general problem of the unemployment rate in the community generally, and the question of displacing candidates for jobs with inmates in our correctional institutions. Another is the whole area of public works responsibility. But I don't think those are insurmountable problems. Measured against that is the problem of the enforced and unhealthy idleness that I think poses potential difficulties for us, if not potential dangers for us, that have to be anticipated and defenced against now before they materialize.

So problems notwithstanding, I hope to be able to move in that direction in the next little while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, just a brief question, to ask the Minister if he would wish to assert — it would seem to flow from his comments of the last few minutes that he is in very basic principle in favour of the rehabilitation camp concept and would wish to see it considerably enlarged?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, very emphatically. I can't add anything to the point that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition makes without gilding the lily unnecessarily. I am very much in favour of it.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, that makes two of us, or three of us, or perhaps a majority of us. I think that the subject matter is frustrating enough and important enough that I should pass on some observations to the Honourable Minister, and say to him that when he made the passing comment that idleness was the root cause of much of the aggravated problems and difficulties facing the people that were incarcerated at some of the institutions, and Headingley in particular, I felt like rising in my place right at that moment and saying that I subscribe to that same assessment entirely.

That being so, and because the Minister now has put on record that he feels that way as well, I would like to ask him whether he has any concrete plans, or if not concrete plans, does he have a concept formulating in mind toward plans for the enlargement of either existing rehabilitation camp facilities, or if not the enlargement, the establishment of one or possibly two rehabilitation camps at some location or venue entirely different or apart from what exists now. There is a rehabilitation camp in the Whiteshell, it burned down, we gave a high priority to its re-establishment, reconstruction. There's one up in Egg Lake, not too far from The Pas region, and I believe that that is an ongoing operation.

Years back, perhaps for half a century, I don't know exactly how many years, at the Headingley Jail there was an institutional farm. Now, one understands, of course, that an institutional farm isn't likely to pay its way, but nevertheless, it served a purpose for many, many years of coping, at least in degree, in part, with that very basic problem which the Minister alludes to, and that is one of idleness. Unfortunately, according to the best of professional and semi-professional advice which was not confined to Manitoba alone, but I believe was rather nationwide, if not continent wide, a decade ago, plans were put into action to disestablish or discontinue the operation of the Headingley farm. I can visualize some of the practical problems of trying to cope with the problem of idleness and all that it breeds by running a farm with animals, a livestock operation, because as I was told

on more than one occasion, unless it's adequately staffed, that there is some inclination on the part of some of the people, and I guess that's why they're there, some of them, to simply take a shovel or a pitchfork or whatever, and pitchfork a cow in the rump, or a steer or whatever, that kind of thing obviously is what makes it much more realistic to think in terms of and we agree that a rehabilitation camp is better than an expensive institution of enforced idleness.

To think in terms of a rehabilitation camp involving the cutting of pulpwood, involving the fabricating, oh the variety and scope is quite large, the building of cement pads for launching ramps for our parks, I'm sure that the two examples I've given are by no means exhaustive.

These kinds of things can be done, admittedly at some cost, but what are the alternatives, and if the product that can be put out is, even in some measure, of some use, directly or indirectly to society, either to the commercial sector in the way of pulpwood or to our Parks and Recreation Branch for the use and enjoyment of the general public in our parks, so be it.

I assume that the Minister has received no advice and has no plans in mind with respect to the re-establishment of a livestock farm out at Headingley. Goodness knows, whatever the practical options are, something ought to be done as an alternative to a modern, updated, improved institution, with less and less for the inmates or residents, depending what word you choose to use, with nothing for them to do.

If the Minister is wondering whether there would be general support for an approach that would try to cope more effectively — goodness knows we tried, we did, as I say, waste very little time in rebuilding the rehabilitation camp when it burned down. My regret is that it was not seen fit, or practical, rather, to have built at least another one or two rehabilitation camps. Because who can really question the old adage that idleness breeds all kinds of consequential problems to aggravate an already difficult situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: The First Minister continues to push me. This is a continuation of discussions that went on and on and I agree entirely with the Leader of the Opposition, because I don't think anyone would disagree with what he said or what the Minister said, that there should be programs developed to employ people who can be employed. But the case to which the Leader of the Opposition refers to about the pitchfork and the rump, it was a vaginal insert that they used trying to bring it out the other end of the cow, and as a result, killed the cow, because many of the people involved in this think that to milk a cow, you grab it by the tail and pump.

I'm referring the Minister to Page 2%0 of the report of the Department of Health and Social Development and Ministry of Corrective and Rehabilitative Services for 1977. This problem can best be put in perspective by reducing it to its simplest terms. In referring to Table 9 of the departmental Ministry report, it shows that out of a total of 3,336 individuals dealt with, that 467 had a sentence of seven days and under; 916 for under a month; 420 for under two months; 601 under four months; 211 under six months; 302 under nine months. Now, people have to recall that after having served one-third of their sentence, they're eligible for parole, so if you take those numbers and squeeze them out for those people who would be eligible for parole, you're dealing with very small numbers of people who are in there for any length of time, nine months plus, because it is usual to take into consideration in sentence, that time which is spent in remand.

I would suggest to the Minister, if he has time, that he read a very, very small book, it's written as a layman, it's the book, "I Chose Prison." It was written by Bill Bennett, who was the former Director of Penitentiary Services in the United States, and it's a recount of the strange chain of circumstances that put him in a position to be in charge of the American penal system. I enjoyed it because it was a strange chain of circumstances which put me in that position for a brief period of time. One of his experiences was, it was very difficult to work out all of the problems involved in having people actively involved in productive work in the correctional system.

I think the Minister will find that all of the plans and all of the difficulties relative to a lumber operation, exist in the department, that there was a whole program worked out, that the discussions had taken place between labour, between marketing agencies, and all the rest of the people involved in having people involved in a productive way that are in the institutions for any length of time, but, because of the economic conditions, we were unable to proceed with this particular program. I would hazard a guess that should economic conditions change, that within six months, the Minister is prepared to be in the position to bring that to fruition.

In dealing with the total population, perhaps the Minister could give us the perspective in which we're dealing, as of today's date, if he could tell us how many people are in Headingley at the moment, how many are in a remand situation in Headingley, and how many are in a remand situation in the Public Safety Building.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked me a number of

questions about the concept of work, useful work and work projects that might be undertaken by our jail populations, and also whether we were contemplating any expansion of the rehabilitation camp network. I want to respond to him by assuring him that both those initiatives are in place and underway and well developed in the planning stage.

Two new camps are being considered. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is correct in his reference to the one that was closed by fire. We still have Bannock Point and Egg Lake in operation — Spruce Woods and Egg Lake in operation — Bannock Point was the damaged one. But there are two new camps being considered, one at Hecla and one on the east side of the province in the Nopiming Park area. The intention is to expand the other two, so it would produce four with an expansion of the two in existence, and two new ones, which are very definitely contemplated and in the planning stage.

At Headingley itself, the gardens have been reintroduced there and the intention is to develop a tree farm in place of the old animal farm, and also I am discussing with my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, the viability of permitting the inmates of Headingley to work on general interior repairs, renovations, painting, general carpentry, etc., at the institution itself, doing jobs that in other words heretofore or at least in recent years, have been undertaken by Public Works and have not been available as duties on which the jail population can be applied.

We're discussing camp expansion with the Parks Branch at this time. There is a tentative proposal being studied for jail population to work in Beaudry Park, south and west of Headingley, and inmates are being used to build concrete ramps, car stops; that kind of facility both in the Bannock Point and Spruce Woods areas so that the program is underway. There is much to be done and much to be hoped for, but the concept is beyond the talking stage and it's being undertaken gradually, as quickly as has been practical up to this point, and hope that we will be able to move forward in a very broad way in the immediate future.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre asked me about the populations at the institutions. As of this past weekend, the total population at Headingley was 310 including 60 on Remand; total population at the Winnipeg Remand Centre was 103.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: The Minister made reference to four work camps, three of which I believe were in existence for some time. The three being Bannock Point, Egg Lake, and Spruce Woods. I'm sorry, I didn't catch the reference to the fourth one, the one that's under planning, in the planning stage.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that Spruce Woods and Egg Lake always have been in operation, that Bannock Point is back in operation and there are two new camps being considered; one at Hecla and one at Nopiming Park in the east side of the province, so that would actually make five, if they come onstream.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I take that as a positive indication that there are two being There may well be a problem of determining whether or not the time duration of the average sentence is such as to make it practical and feasible for persons sentenced to be assigned to a work rehabilitation work camp. I would assume that if the time duration of the sentence is relatively short, then it's a case of a holding action at some nearby institution such as Headingley, which makes it interesting in turn, that work should be planned and contemplated that involves tree nursery farming at, or near Headingley, Beaudry Park, which was an acquisition by the Crown about 4 or 5 years ago, somewhat controversial at the time, but nevertheless, it is now part of a public asset and a nature preservation and also presumably and apparently according to the Minister, will provide a useful outlet for work rehabilitation.

When the Minister makes reference to Nopiming, that is a provincial park that was established about 2 to 3 years ago, to take care of the always present danger of overloading of the Whiteshell, and by the creation of this several thousand square miles of new provincial park north of the Whiteshell, now that we hear of the possibility of a work camp there, I'd be curious to know if the Minister could just answer these two very brief questions.

One, more precisely, where at Nopiming, and what is the general nature of the work activity that is planned there? Is it to be a duplication of Bannock Point at Whiteshell, or is it something different?

Secondly, is there anywhere in these Estimates, current or capital and they are combined now so all the more relevant to ask, is there provision here for any capital funds, or any funds, period, for the construction of this additional one or two work rehabilitation camps or is the Minister going to confirm that it's in paanning stage and that the funds won't be required for more than 2 months hence?

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the camps that are projected for Hecla and Nopiming Park, I can't give the Honourable Leader of the Opposition a fix on the precise location in Nopiming, or the nature of the work. It is simply felt that the camps are useful, worthwhile, that we should expand the concept and that is an area in which work opportunities relative to the development of parts of the park would be available, so that there would be a practical objective to pursue with the persons who were confined at that particular rehabilitation camp in the work area. But the specific location and nature of the work have not been defined, simply a proposal that at this time has certainly the endorsement of myself and my department, and has been endorsed at the government level as a good suggestion, a good idea, one that we would like to develop and work towards. There is nothing in capital this year either for the projected camp at Nopiming Park or the one at Hecla. It will have to be built into the budget for next year; it wasn't possible to achieve that this year, but I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that certainly very active consideration for me, in my planning for next year, and with more familiarization with the whole process of planning and the necessity for anticipation and initiative in the development of the Estimates process, I can assure him that with that experience I'll be able to pursue that objective with more knowledge.

I would like to just expand a little bit on the information I gave me the Honourable Leader of the Opposition a moment ago about application of the work principle already. There are some other examples. We have one highway crew working out of The Pas consisting of ten inmates; one similar crew consisting of another ten will be going out from Headingley shortly to work on highways, and we have ten inmates from Headingley who do voluntary work on a daily basis with patients at the Manitoba School for the Retarded in Portage la Prairie.

Some other proposals that are in front of us are for the use of correctional institutional populations for the cleanup of river banks, particularly the Assiniboine River banks, both east and west of Headingley, general landscaping in pursuit of an upgrading of the greenbelt around Headingley, and day work relative to certain employers in the vicinity of institutions who need temporary help, demolition of old buildings and in this respect we look at such time expired facilities as the old Brandon Correctional institution, the superintendent's residence at the Seven Oaks Centre for Youth, and buildings of that type.

Those, along with the projects that have already been discussed such as the tree farm and the concrete ramps and the work in the parks, add up to the kind of program that is underway, certainly has my endorsement and certainly will be pursued and expanded as quickly as is practical to do so.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister and those of us on this side may have a good deal in common with respect to our attitude with respect to the extent to which we should continue to make effort and indeed, make increased effort, to inject a more adequate work rehabilitation camp system into the Corrections system of this province. However, there is one very important aspect here that I am afraid there must be, obviously must be, a divergence of opinion, and that has to do, to start off, with the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and who of us here doesn't give lip service to that oldest of axiomatic expressions. Nevertheless, in much of the Estimates of this department and other departments of this government, there has been a tendency and rather a pronounced one at that, to snip and shave a few thousand dollars here, and a few tens of thousands here, and a hundred or two hundred thousand there, from the Estimates of public spending, all under the guise of the new political religion that government is spending too much and we must all cut back on public spending to leave more for discretionary private spending, especially those in the \$30,000 a year income bracket and higher.

The other day, I asked the Minister in this House whether it was correct that the Province of Manitoba was cutting back on its support for the Youth Action Centre, and the Youth Action Project. You may well ask, Mr. Chairman, what that has to do with the item under consideration, but adult offenders are the result of inadequate effort being made to work with the young people who live in problematic conditions and circumstances, so that brings me smack back to the question of the other day namely, whether the Minister feels that it is justified that this year despite a 6 or 7 percent inflation rate, that in fact there should be not only not keeping up with that but in fact a net negative movement or reduction in the amount of financial support for the Youth Action Centre and Youth Action Project which has now come under a new name known as the Winnipeg Boys and Girls Clubs Incorporated. Last year they were funded to the extent of \$172,000 approximately, of which the United Way put up in the order of not quite but almost half. This year the Red Feather or the United Way is increasing by 10 percent or more their support for this group but the province, lo and behold through its two or three relevant departments of support, is cutting back some roughly fifty thousand bucks. In that circumstance I believe it is relevant to ask whether it is not a case here of being too parsimonious with people who are at a critical stage really in their formative years, as a consequence of which we face to some degree even higher per capita institutional costs at a later date.

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if it would be appropriate to have the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Wednesday.