

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8 p.m., Monday, March 29, 1976

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 82 on Page 39 of your Estimates Book. Women's Bureau, Resolution (a) Salaries \$67,400--pass; Other Expenditures. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister was responding on Friday, when the committee rose, to a couple of questions I'd asked him with respect to the Women's Bureau appropriation. He had explained that part of the reduction in the appropriation this year as compared to last year related to special expenses that were undertaken last year in connection with International Women's Year. Whether he had any more to say at that time I'm not sure. I know the clock interrupted him and I would like to give him an opportunity to continue his reply now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Actually, Mr. Chairman, the clock did not interrupt me at all. My honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry had asked me a specific question dealing with the monetary input of the department or the directorship of the Women's Bureau. I gave him an answer and that was that; there was no necessity for any further comments in reply to my honourable friend.

MR. SHERMAN: Perhaps the Minister could develop a further comment with respect to where the Women's Bureau is headed; what kind of achievements he feels it has attained in the last year in the labour field; what its objectives and goals are for this year? Is it successful in achieving opportunities in the work force and the labour fields for women; has it measured up to the kind of expectations of the department; are there other goals and objectives that the department has set for it?

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend would refer to the report that I tabled as required by statute dealing with the Department of Labour, in total and the Women's Bureau, he will find I believe the answers to the questions on Page 39.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 82(a). The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Oh, I can see it's going to be one of those evenings, Mr. Chairman. Notwithstanding Page 39 of the report, I wonder if the Minister for the sake of the record, which is what is being registered here at this time, can offer a comment as to whether he feels the Women's Bureau has been successful in the terms of reference set out for it; whether there are expanded terms of reference for this year? I note that the appropriations, the total appropriation is down, the salaries appropriation is up. Does that mean, for example, that there are additional programs being undertaken, there's additional staff being taken on, or simply that this is simply a result of increases in salaries paid existing staff members or inflationary pressures?

MR. PAULLEY: I don't really understand my friend when he prefaces his comments, "It's going to be one of those types of evenings." I don't know where he was over the weekend, but I know I was studying very very hard the departmental Estimates and the progress that we have made, and the hopes for the future. Maybe he will give me the benefit of indicating what he means by, "It's going to be one of those evenings," because I'm trying to expedite the passage of the Estimates of the Department of Labour. But I want to assure my honourable friend I will not, in attempting to do that, neglect him because I'm sure that my honourable friend is one of those types of characters that does not like to feel that he's neglected, whether in effect he is or whether he is not.

So if my honourable friend is a little touchy this evening then I suppose that I must accept that as one of the normal traits of an individual such as my honourable friend. However, I do not want to attempt to evade any question posed by my honourable friend.

I indicated the last time the committee met why there was an apparent reduction in the appropriations dollarwise, because we had put into the Estimates for the Women's Bureau last year a certain amount of money, because there was the recognition of the International Women's Year. And that was a special appropriation.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

It is true, as he says, that there is an apparent increase, or an increase in the suggestion or requirement for dollars for salaries. I want to say to him it is not due to any actual salary increases of any nature other than incrementals. We have taken on staff, a part-time person at Brandon for the purpose of continuing the work of the Women's Bureau in that particular area. We do intend, we do intend to have a greater involvement of personnel, and not necessarily on permanent staff, within the Women's Bureau in the various areas of the Province of Manitoba. It is our intention to have a greater involvement within the community of competent personnel going out into the areas trying to demonstrate, or trying to educate to the labour force and in Manitoba, in particular the female labour force, their advantages of becoming re-involved in the work forces in the province. Much of this falls under the direction of the Women's Bureau and that is the basic reason for the increase in salary rise with the addition, I believe, that there is provision for, if memory serves me correctly, for about one and a half staff man year additions to the present staff of the Women's Bureau.

I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that members of the committee will realize that the Women's Bureau was only established a comparatively short period of time, and while it may be deemed advisable in some quarters that there should be a continuous expansion, as far as I am concerned I think we shall not, or should not continuously expand for the purpose of expansion. It's my intention before too long to have an assessment on a professional basis of the job that is being done in this particular directorship of the Department of Labour to make sure that having ventured into this particular arena that we don't just simply establish another bureaucracy and expand the same for the sake of expansion under Parkinson's Law.

In saying that I do not want to indicate in any way, shape or form other than the fact that the Women's Bureau has and is accomplishing a great deal insofar as attracting women into the work force and also on an educational basis to inform the women participants in the work force of their rights and opportunities. And this as I say is an ongoing fact of life. Had my honourable friend listened, and I'm sure that he did, he's not now, but I'm sure that had my honourable friend listened when I was introducing my Estimates, I did indicate to the House that I was hoping that this was one of those areas of governmental involvement that would before too long outlive its usefulness in, that if the programs and policies and the objectives of the Women's Bureau were achieved, that is, to bring about equality of opportunity in the work force, equality of opportunities in the broad spectrums of human engagement and achieved our objectives, then it would no longer be necessary because we would have true equality, and that is the aim, objective of this department.

We do intend to become involved with the engagement of a number of students under our STEP program to make assessments across the province as to involvement of women in the work force. We did that last year; we're going to continue that in the next ensuing fiscal year.

Now I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether I've answered precisely my honourable friend's questions, whether he needs any more information or not, but certainly I as Minister have no objective in attempting to withhold any information from either the labour critic of the Conservative Party or any other member of this House. We feel that there's a job being done. We think it's worthwhile. We are expanding slightly for this year, but the major reason for the lowering of the net cost to the taxpayer is because International Women's Year is now passed.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I appreciate the Minister's answer, Mr. Chairman. I think that he would agree with me that his answer is considerably fuller and considerably more illuminating than Page 39 of the report to which he referred me, and this is precisely the reason for my question. His answer is relatively full, certainly in comparison to that page in the report, and I think for the record those are important thoughts and important proposals from the Minister to have on hand.

I know that he referred to the work of the Women's Bureau in his opening remarks, but there were one or two points that he has made that I think are provocative

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) and indeed worth having on the record and worth developing, worth thinking about. One in particular is that obviously if the kind of equality and equality of opportunity and equality of training should be achieved that we're presumably seeking in this society, there would be no need for a Women's Bureau. So I think that it's important and helpful to have that acknowledgement on both sides of the House on the record. I wondered how close we were to achieving that kind of an eventuality in the Minister's mind. The report sheds little light on that kind of operational type of question and I think the Minister's remarks shed a good deal of light on it. So I'm pleased to have them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 82(a)--pass. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of matters I'd like to draw to the attention of the Minister under this, and the one is the Tri-Service monument that Mrs. Beryl Simpson and her group propose to dedicate this summer, and I wonder if the Minister has had any further consultation with this group, because I know they were in consultation with him last year on this matter, and wonder if in fact he's had further consultation.

I'm wondering also in the studies that's been carried out by summer students and others if the matter of wages for the housewife was being studied by this group or if they've had any enquiries about it. It has been raised to me from time to time because the issue certainly has had public attention from coast to coast. So I'm wondering if the Minister would care to comment on those two matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: First of all of course, Mr. Chairman, the Tri-Service Memorial has nothing to do basically with the Women's Bureau as such or the Department of Labour Estimates. It certainly has something to do with the Minister of Labour who as one who has had a deep and continuing association with the Legion movement in Manitoba, of which I happen to be a member, and as my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie interjected, an association with women. My first association of course with women was when my mother gave birth to me, and I think that that was a good start and I've carried it on to one degree or another, and in one area or another. But as far as the Tri-Service Memorial itself is concerned it's true that I had consultations with the President of the Women's Auxiliary of the Royal Canadian Legion and I think the Premier announced, either today or the last time we met, that there is an involvement on a matching grant between, I believe Ontario, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, or the Northwest Command I guess maybe would be the more proper designation, with the Northwest Command of the Royal Canadian Legion that there was permission given for the erection of the monument. A sketch was presented to the government of the type of memorial to be erected and I believe a general satisfaction has been exhibited as a result of that type of co-operation. And I was pleased that I had, oh just a minor input in the deliberations.

As far as wages for housewives is concerned of course, I'm sure my honourable friend is in the same boat as many husbands, continuous requests from respective wives for payment for services rendered, and the likes of this, and of course that's expanded now into a request by some that legislation of the Employment Standards Act should be broadened to provide precisely for wages for housewives. I would say to my honourable friend in all seriousness, yes, I've had some representations made to me from some groups, mainly women incidentally, to establish employment standards as far as wage is concerned, minimum wages for housewives. But I do say to my honourable friend as well, the Member for Roblin, I haven't given it as much consideration as some would like me to give it in order to establish it in legislation. And if my honourable friend the Member for Roblin would like to draft legislation and sign the same so that the desires of some insofar as payment for housewives is concerned, I'd be more than pleased to consider the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could say a few words on this subject. I might begin by saying that the Minister of Labour and myself for some years

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) have done some work with respect to obtaining not only recognition but action with respect to the Provincial Government's various departments where women and men are doing similar jobs, and I'm talking now about equal pay for equal work. I know that for a few years it was an embarrassment to the Minister that he couldn't either move fast enough or he couldn't get the bureaucracy going to make some of the long overdue changes that were needed to be made, and I of course am reflecting back in past administrations to Conservative and Liberal where there was glaring inequality in some of our institutions. And of course I refer specifically to the Manitoba School for Retardates at Portage where finally two years ago this group of women workers at the Institution finally had the opportunity to take the government to court and they won their case, and they received a considerable amount of back pay.

I know the Minister is sympathetic, and I know in his own way he is trying his best to complete the job that still is there, still has to be done with respect to provincial employees, men and women. I would like to know from the Minister if, for example, at the Portage Jail for Women, if the women superintendents and the custodians, if that's the term, are now receiving the same salaries that the male custodians or jailers - or whatever their names are - at Headingley are receiving, because this has been a real source of a feeling of injustice by the working women concerned in these particular positions.

I would like to know also from the Minister about the other institutions in the province, and I'm talking provincial institutions. Is there still areas of inequality, where men and women are performing similar jobs? Has the Women's Bureau, and I know they have, but what impact have their studies had on my friend's department, and what is he doing to finish this job? Now, with interest, I'll listen to the Minister's response and perhaps have something else to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to say to my honourable friend that as far as I am aware the situation that prevailed some time ago insofar as the superintendent of the Women's Jail at Portage by comparison with the superintendent of the jail at Headingley remains the same, that there is a vast difference in the responsibility and the input required for the relative positions. But I want to assure my honourable friend that the difference is not based on sex. The difference in the salary schedule is based on the administrative responsibility, based on the amount of areas of jurisdictions and numbers concerned. I thought that I had satisfied my honourable friend to this fact a couple of years ago. I know, and my honourable friend talks about other situations insofar as the difference between the nurses' aids and others at the Portage Hospital for the Mental Hospital, but it didn't have to go to court, it was resolved without the full necessity. The only part that went into the arena of the court was the time element, but not the work element.

It is our principle, it was my principle then, and I give my honourable friend credit for indicating that it was my basic principle then of equality between the sexes, and it still is. Again I say that the difference in the salary schedule between the superintendents in the Women's Jail at Portage la Prairie who happens to be a female, and the superintendent at Headingley who happens to be a male, is not based on sex but based on the involvement and the requirements for the respective positions. I think this is generally recognized, of a fact, and I would suggest to my honourable friend as far as the policy of myself as Minister of Labour or the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, that if the present superintendent of the Women's Jail at Portage la Prairie, if she was transferred into Headingley, the relatively higher salary would be paid to her. Now of course what my honourable friend might say is a corollary, if the superintendent of Headingley was sent to Portage la Prairie would the reduction take place, and I would suggest that relatively speaking the answer would be yes. I appreciate the fact that no one would want to go to receive a lesser amount of take-home pay; when one considers the responsibility however for the job, then that is a fact of life. What I am trying to suggest to my friend that the relative pay indemnities is not based on sex, but on responsibilities. And that's not only true insofar as the particular area of concern of my honourable friend, it's true in other areas of responsibility as well, because we have some people who are

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) called directors of departments in government who may all be male, that we have different salary levels which are associated with their responsibilities. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we have some Deputy Ministers who receive varying differences in their pay as a result of the different involvement in the area of responsibility. And my honourable friend then asks me the question, are there areas of inequality between the sexes, we must note his question was between the sexes in the government's employment at the present time; I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are no inequalities in payment as a result of sex, there are differences in pay because again of responsibilities; and I am not aware, I am not aware of any clause or term of condition either under the collective agreement that we have or any directive of the Civil Service Commission where there is any permissibility for difference in pay between male and female on the basis of sex.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the Minister and it seems to me he made some strange statements. First of all, he was all in favour of the equality of pay for men and women in the provincial service who are doing similar types of work, and then he quoted an actual case that I wasn't aware of when he mentioned specifically the superintendent of the Portage Women's Jail vis-à-vis --(Interjection)-- no it isn't - versus the superintendent of the Men's Jail at Headingley. It's a pretty weak argument it would seem to me, because there may be - and I am using ball park figures now - there may be 600 men inmates at Headingley and 100 women inmates in Portage, and the responsibility is the same; the work is the same, you are working with corrective programs, you are dealing with people who are confined, and it's an odd argument that he says that one's job is paid on the basis of more importance than the others, and I don't accept that.

Now what I have asked the Minister in previous years, if the women - I don't know the term, guards or jailers, I'm not quite sure of the term - are paid the same --(Interjection)-- custodian I always thought was a fellow or a woman that swept the floor and maintained the building, but I'm not too sure. But anyway, I want to know from the Minister if the women employees doing custodial work at Portage Women's Jail are being paid the same as men who are doing the same type of work at Headingley. Now I understood him to say that there is no more inequality, he solved all the problems, everybody's being paid the same for the same work completely throughout the Civil Service, is that a fair assessment of what you said, Mr. Minister?

MR. PAULLEY: You know, sometimes it's tough for a person in my position to get the story across to my honourable friend. The reason I referred to the superintendent of the Women's Jail at Portage and the superintendent at Headingley is precisely because that is the illustration - he may be getting a little forgetful in retiring years, but that was the particular instance that he constantly drew to my attention a few years ago. He nods his head now in assent, Mr. Chairman, so I guess I am not too far out on a limb on that. As far as I am aware, under the terms of the collective agreement the custodian male or female gets the same pay, if that is the correct term, wherever they happen to be engaged. So all I can say to my honourable friend, as far as I am aware that is the case. I haven't as Minister created any Utopia, I have been relatively persistent in attempting to bring about equality; I don't want any crown placed, because crowns slip, don't they? - but I do want to say to my friend that as far as I am aware as I stand before the Committee tonight, there are no inequalities in the performance of like work on the basis of sex within the Civil Service. If my honourable friend can - or even the Member for Lakeside who has been chirping in, even if my honourable friend from Lakeside can give me some illustrations I would be more than pleased, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of equality to take the matter up. When I am talking about equality, I'm not just talking of equality for one sex, but both sexes as well, because as I indicated and repeated again tonight, as far as equality is concerned it doesn't matter a continental to me whether it's female or male, there should be the same equality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 82(a)--pass; Resolution 82(b)--pass. Resolution 82, resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$117,500 for Labour --pass. Resolution 83, Pension Commission. Salaries \$62,500. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, we will of course be considering this section of the Pension Benefits Act in this session of the Legislature. As a matter of fact it appeared on the Order Paper today, first reading, and so I imagine that many of the questions we would be asking in this area can be dealt with during consideration of that legislation. But I would be interested at this juncture specifically in the appropriation of \$100,000, I would like to know from the Minister, is that to fund the new Pension Commission of Manitoba or to fund the support staff that the Pension Commission would have as a separate unit or a self-contained unit within the Department of Labour, or precisely what is that appropriation earmarked for?

MR. PAULLEY: Well I haven't got all the information I would like to have had here, some of it, I must confess, is on my desk in my office because I knew that questions would be raised, although I appreciate the fact that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has noted the introduction of a bill dealing with the Pensions Act and I anticipate a more full discussion at that particular time. The provision for \$100,000 for the operation of this section of the government is arrived at for the expenses of a superintendent of pensions. I may say to the members of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, that competitions were held for inviting applications for the position of superintendent of pensions, a decision has been arrived as to the person concerned, and while I am not in a position to disclose precisely at this time who the person is, due to the fact that his or her decision has to be referred back of the acceptance of the job, I want to say to the Committee that a superintendent of a pensions' position is in the process of being filled. There are positions for two analysts and one clerical staff to operate the Pensions Commission, or the Pensions' legislation, and I say and I made a report, I gave a report that is required by law in the House, tabled the first report of the Pensions Commission which has been functioning I believe since the beginning of October, somewhere in that general time period. Yes in October, under part one of the Act, the seven member Pension Commission of Manitoba was appointed and the Minister of Labour was designated as the Minister to which the Commission report.

My honourable friend will recall when the legislation was introduced into the House at our last session, it was introduced by the First Minister; and following that he asked me if I would - well, he told me, I guess would be better than really say ask - he thought that it would be advisable for the operation or the ministerial responsibility for the Pensions Benefit Act be vested in the Department of Labour, the Minister of Labour, and that is the reason that it is before us at the present time.

I'm sorry, really, and I think members will appreciate that I can't go into much more detail as to the actual operation, this is the first time that there is a request for an appropriation within the department for the operation of the Pension Commission. We did have a meeting of the Committee on Statutory Rules, at which time members of the Committee had an opportunity to direct questions to the members of the Pension Commission, which they did; that was really by way of opening up consultation with the Pension Commission and to make the members of that particular Committee aware of what is going on and our hopes for the future. I might say without - well I don't think that I'm being unparliamentary or disclosing features of the bill that I introduced for the first time today, when I say that the amendments suggested in there are rather of a relatively minor or housekeeping nature, dealing to some degree with the time element of the commencement of the plan and the responsibilities of the superintendent of pensions. I must say, and I think members will appreciate this, that whereas in the original legislation we had set a dateline - I believe one of the datelines for the registration of actual plans was the 1st of April, which is only a couple of days away - we found that for varying reasons we are not able to reach that time limit, and one of the purposes of the amendments would be to extend that deadline.

So really, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friends have any further questions of a precise nature, I may be able to answer them, but I think that the report that I tabled in the House gave an indication of where this stands. It's our ultimate hope of course, and this was joined in by all members of the House when the Premier introduced the legislation, that we would have far better control over the operation of pension plans in

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the Province of Manitoba and that those who are making contributions to the pension plans would have greater protection of their interests under the pension plans. As the days go on we will become more involved, but I do want to assure the members of the committee that in this very important field, unlike maybe some other fields, there will be no endeavour to prevent open consultations and deliberations with the House, with the committee and with the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the report of the Minister's department on Page 19 says that when the whole of the Act comes into effect in the new year, the Commission will be assisted by a small administrative unit to be established within the Department of Labour, consisting of a Superintendent of Pensions and support staff. So my question, and I infer from the Minister's answer, is that this \$100,000 appropriation is to go to fund the Superintendent's office and his support staff. Is that correct? And payment to the Commission. Okay, thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 83(a)--pass; Resolution 83(b)--pass. Resolution 83, resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$100,000 for Labour--pass. Resolution 84, Occupational, Safety and Health, \$100.00. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess first the most obvious question is, what's a hundred dollars, which appears to be the appropriation for the year ending March 31st, 1977? But far more important than that, because it seems to be so negligible as to be hardly worthy of spending much time on it, far more important than that item is the question that I posed last week in a series of questions to the Minister which he hasn't I suppose strictly speaking had a chance to answer yet until we came to this resolution - and that is that the Throne Speech which opened this session on the 12th of February told us that during the last year there were four times more working days lost through accidents at work than were lost through industrial strikes and lockouts. Now the Minister's report for the year says that the estimated number of working days lost in the 12-month period ended October 31st, 1975 through work stoppages was 147,940. Well putting that mathematics together, that means that the number of working days lost through accidents at work in Manitoba last year was something in the neighborhood of 600,000, and I would suggest that the committee would be most intrigued, most disturbed and most interested in having the Minister elaborate on what is a staggering figure, a staggering total. If we lost 600,000 working days in this province last year through industrial accidents, then something is seriously wrong and I hope we can get at it and get a solution tonight.

So this is the basic question under this resolution, Mr. Chairman, and the supplementary question to that is, how in the name of heaven do we expect to do anything about it with the massive appropriation of \$100.00?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Most intriguing, Mr. Chairman, most intriguing. You know, I used to enjoy myself when I sat - I believe for a little while I sat in the same seat as the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, or where the Honourable Member for Minnedosa - and I used to enjoy myself, and my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside enjoyed himself saying "heh heh heh heh". How can you reconcile an expenditure of \$100 with 600,000 man hours or man days lost in an accident and how are you going to pay him off? Gee, you know, it's lovely to be in that position. But --(Interjection)-- Yes, I've got the answers and I've given those answers. I've given those answers into this House but they've fallen upon deaf ears, Mr. Chairman. You know there's none so deaf as those that won't hear. --(Interjection)-- That's right. That's right. And isn't it fun sitting on your fannies over there without responsibility, but without even trying, without even trying to assess the situation that prevails at the present time. Of course, Mr. Chairman, when the Throne Speech was introduced by my two colleagues on behalf of the government, reference was made --(Interjections)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE! Maybe the honourable member should go to Corrections for a bit of corrective therapy.

MR. PAULLEY: You know, honourable members of this House should know what

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) I have attempted to do as an individual, on both sides of the House over the years in the interest, in the interest of safety and industrial hygiene and industrial environment. And yet when we are reaching, as I fully believe that we are reaching, a new area, a new approach, in the field of industrial safety, it causes laughter on the part of the opposition, because in that process there is a token amount contained within the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, for this new venture, for this new consolidation of all of the efforts toward industrial safety in the Province of Manitoba instead of the fragmentation that has prevailed over the years. And surely to goodness, my honourable friends should have, and maybe I'm giving them too damn much credit, sufficient intellectual knowledgeability to know that when a new program is being developed, and that when we're going to consolidate, as our legislation will reveal that we're going to do, various areas of industrial safety and environment that have been distributed between different sections of government over the years, I doubt very much whether it should even take a child in first grade school to know it, what it's all about. But such is not the case with Her Majesty's loyal opposition and their representatives because it's too incomprehensible for them to have any understanding and knowledge. I can understand somebody - oh hell I won't even go into that. --(Interjection)-- Yes, you're the one that I can understand not knowing because I don't think that you, over your period of career, have given a tinker's damn about industrial safety except to try and make a mockery out of what we are attempting to do on behalf of workers and employers alike.

It is unquestionably disturbing, to say the least, that the costs of Workers Compensation is continuously escalating. Who pays for it? All of us as consumers pay for it. The first direct input as to costs is levied against the employer but in the final analysis the greater suffering is done by those who are injured and as a result of the past deficiencies over the years of governments, including Liberals, Conservatives and yes, up until now --(Interjection)-- Yes, I am serious. I am serious, Mr. Chairman, and I'll tell you why I am serious. I hate people in this House attempting to laugh off and slough off an important division of society such as this. That's why I feel that I have to be serious, Mr. Chairman. Ask the fellow who loses an arm whether he would laugh at the endeavours of this government to try and consolidate all approaches in Workers Compensation and accident and safety prevention into one general agency. Ask the fellow who insofar as noise pollution and the likes of that, may have to deal with one department of government and can be sloughed around. Ask the fellow who is a spray painter who has to deal, in order to achieve reasonably satisfactory answers as to whether he has emphysema or some chest condition, that he has to go from one department to the other - to the Compensation Board, back to the Department of Labour and the Fire Commissioner's office, back to the Environment Division of the Health Division and then back to somebody else. Ask him whether it's a laughing matter that at long last they're going to be able --(Interjection)-- Then why laugh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: You know, boy oh boy I think you should. I think you should go where you're going. Out. It's not a laughing matter and it's not a question of the \$100.00. We haven't got legislative authority as yet to transfer all of the financial responsibilities that we're hopeful of having domiciled in the Department of Labour on behalf of the general public and in particular the workers, at the present time. This is not something, Mr. Chairman, that is new; it's been done before. The \$100 - laugh at the amount if you will - is there only to put a line in the Estimates of Expenditure and that will be adjusted as the full cost implications of the domiciling under one umbrella, services that are being performed at the present time in various areas of jurisdiction.

I sat on that side of the House, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Labour in that particular year, I believe the Honourable Obie Baizley, took out of the Department of Labour the responsibility for The Employment Safety Act and domiciled it in the Workers Compensation Board, under the Board. I joined in support at that particular time of that move because I felt that a better job could be done internally through the Workers Compensation Board or as it was called then the Workmens Compensation Board, before we had equality of the sexes. I felt that because of the association between the

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) employer who was doing the paying and the injured worker that there would be more inducement and there would be more involvement by he who is basically paying the shot in an endeavour to eliminate an incident of accident.

To some degree it was successful but now the objective is to bring it under one umbrella; noise pollution, industrial hygiene, all aspects of safety, construction safety standards which are domiciled in some areas and not in others. Many sections of the Department of Labour are going to come under the general umbrella of this legislation which the Throne Speech indicated that we were going to introduce on behalf of all concerned.

We're living in different ages now and different days in industry, Mr. Chairman. The incidence of asbestosis, poisoning particularly of the lungs as the result of the use of plastics and other materials in the building industry, in the manufacturing of draperies. Even the seamstress today - and I mean it not in any derogatory sense at all - but the seamstress today, Mr. Chairman, is subjected to the possibility of many harmful diseases of the lungs because of the type of fabrics that she is using to manufacture the draperies that we use in our homes, many of which, of course, as I stated the other day, causes fires because of their texture.

That is what this is all about, Mr. Chairman. Now surely to goodness instead of laughing, as far as the actual dollar and cents input in a line in the Estimates, my honourable friends should concentrate on what we say is the endeavour - provides for safeguarding the safety and health for the labour force of Manitoba.

It's the basic line within the Estimates to accommodate the legislation that I might say, Mr. Chairman, is in the process of being drafted at this particular time. Had that legislation been here before and passed, I might say that instead of an estimate of approximately \$100, it would be closer to bordering on a million dollars which I estimate an approximation of the dollar input. Fault me, fault the government for not having this done before the Estimates were tabled, if you will. But don't laugh, please, at the objectives that this government is attempting to achieve in the interests of workers in society as a whole.

We have so much fragmentation at the present time, Mr. Chairman, as you well know, as I do, as a railroader as I was, so much fragmentation in the field of industrial safety. I would suggest, and my colleague the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources knows what of I speak, when that in the area of the mining industry there is an involvement of three or four different sections of government or government departments charged with the responsibility of safety protection and the like. I'm sure that my honourable friend were he here, the Minister of Health and Social Development, would appreciate as I do the involvement of his department in the area of diseases of the lungs.

I will be tabling tomorrow the Annual Report of the Workers Compensation Board which will give precise documentation to the actual numbers of man hours lost as a result of industrial accidents. My honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, was astounded at the figure of 600,000 lost days in industrial accidents and I join with him, I join with him in being astounded, Mr. Chairman, when we look at that input, when we see and we know that there were nearly 150,000 man hours lost as a result of strikes. And there is a concentration by politicians and the public as to the loss figure in strikes. I'm happy for one thing, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is now cognizant as I hope everybody else is, that the ratio of man hours lost or man days lost as a result of industrial accidents is about four times that, as those lost in strikes.

Sure, Mr. Chairman, the incident of strikes make headlines in our newspapers and what are you going to do about it? Are you going to be bringing in compulsory legislation to force the worker back to work in order to continue creating an accident incident rate four times as great as that caused by a strike? That, Mr. Chairman, is one of the realistic approaches that this government is making. We know of the ratio of approximately four to one, from lost time by strike to lost time by accidents.

My honourable friends - and they're not alone - emphasized that loss, the loss of strikes. What I am attempting to do as the Minister of Labour, even though it's an insignificant one hundred dollar bill contained in the Estimates at the present time, I am

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) trying to concentrate what we are endeavouring to do in the field of industrial accidents. Mr. Chairman, if the public and indeed the members of this Assembly became as concerned over the incident of industrial accidents as they are with the incident of strikes, then I think we would really accomplish something because we are often told that strikes can be prevented. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure I am joined by many in this House that there is another area of human endeavour in which preventative measures can stave off or eliminate so much more human suffering than the loss of a number of days in strikes. How often have we, Mr. Chairman, as fellow rail-riders, aided and carried out our fellow workers on stretchers and the likes of that and sometimes they haven't come back. That's what adds up to the total of approximately 600,000 man lost days in accidents.

If only by this one hundred dollar bill, contained in the Estimates, that we could reduce the total accident input or statistics to that of the comparable strikes - about 150 man days, what an achievement we would be making and how much we would be aiding society. That is our objective and again, Mr. Chairman, having said all of that, and I trust it will be accepted by my honourable friends in all quarters of the House, but having said all of that, I'm sorry that I haven't got the precise legislation or didn't have the precise legislation for the consideration of the House before we got down to this \$100. Because I think and I feel that when the legislation is produced that my honourable friends in all quarters will say, it's a step in the right direction. We hope that your desires are achieved and we're going to support you. Because I've heard my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, speak before on the question of Workers Compensation, I know his keen interest.

Just the other day my honourable friend, aided and joined by a representative of the Liberal party complimented the Minister of Labour for the introduction of additional benefits for the injured workers of Manitoba. The cost of those added benefits, Mr. Chairman, are going to amount over the next seven years to some \$13 million. If we could cut that down by ten percent, there's 1.3 million. And if eventually in the Estimates of this department or this section of the department, the total bill is ten percent of the added cost of Workers Compensation, the benefit to humans would offset any financial input.

So, Mr. Chairman, when I say to the Honourable Member for Lakeside who is now absent, I had a resentment against his laughter because there was only an item of \$100 contained in the Estimates. I certainly felt that I had cause for resentment. I trust and hope now that I have attempted to explain the position of the government and the reasons thereof, that rather than laughter at the input of any amount of dollars there will be full support of our objectives of trying to alleviate suffering caused by the incident of accident in our industrial climate which is expanding. But far more important, prevention of those accidents occurring. I recommend to all members of the House not laughter, but support for a basic principle in program that I for one over many years in this House have been advocating and it seems that today I can look forward in reality to something really worthwhile.

I trust and hope that when the legislation is introduced and applied - it didn't matter a damned to me, Mr. Chairman, whether it was to be applied in the Department of Labour, the Department of Health, Mines and Resources but in one particular ministerial responsibility so that we had a comprehensive attack so we could make a concentrated attack on this huge expenditure, this huge loss of life and suffering that has been going on. My friend from Fort Garry in the debates on Workers Compensation pointed out to me many cases of suffering and loss. A hundred dollars? So what? The principle is what is counting and I want to be able one of these days to say to my honourable friend that he assisted in reducing the incident of accident by support for this program even though it started out with a measly hundred dollar bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I feel certain that I can assure the Minister at this point without having seen what he proposes, without having seen the legislation that he is talking about, that he will have my support for any efforts moving in that direction,

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) the direction of greater industrial safety prevention and prevention of accident.

But I cannot let the inference remain on the record that there was laughter from - certainly laughter in the accepted sense of the word - from anybody on this side of the House with respect to the urgent and critical question of industrial health and safety. The Minister said, fault me but don't laugh at what this government is trying to do in the area of health and safety of workers in this province. There was no laughter with respect to what he is trying to do or what he is hoping to do with respect to health and safety of workers in this province.

Certainly for my own part I asked him a serious question and my basic question was: what explanation can he give and what elaboration can he give on the challenge in the Throne Speech that there were four times as many days lost through industrial accident last year as days lost through work stoppages. In other words some 600,000. I said as a supplementary question that I felt the appropriation cited here, and not very well explained until the Minister got up to speak about it, was pretty inadequate to deal with it. If there was any laughter it was not coming from this particular corner of the House.

But, Sir, the sub-line in the Appropriations explaining what Resolution 84 is all about and what Section 10 of the Labour Department Estimates having to do with Occupational Safety and Health is all about, is a sub-line that I suggest with all respect to the Minister is pretty uninformative. He has stood up and told us what he hopes to do in terms of co-ordinating the various programs aimed at health and safety, developing a comprehensive program, developing an umbrella type approach and if that is what he is aiming at then that is something devoutly to be pursued. But it is certainly not the impression that one would get from reading the sub-line in that particular Appropriation and just for the record I would like to read it into the record. It says, "10. Occupational Safety and Health - Provides for safeguarding the safety and health of the labour force of Manitoba. \$100.00".

Now I think that it is reasonable to suggest to anybody in any opposition, and even if it was my honourable friend the Honourable the Minister of Labour sitting on this side as a New Democrat in opposition, and he read that in Estimates that were brought into this House by a Progressive Conservative Government or a Liberal Government or a government of any stripe that he would ask the same question and lead to the same kind of query and the same kind of criticism that I led to and that some of my colleagues joined. Because it is a serious and critical topic as alluded to in the Throne Speech and as explained by the Minister and as discussed by us on other occasions in this House. Certainly the descriptive line and the sum cited as the appropriation does neither answer nor inform nor enlighten nor serve those who would be interested either in opposition or in government in this province in pursuing a worthwhile occupational safety and health program. So if the Minister feels that we have taken unfair advantage or that we have read things into the particular item for the sake of embarrassing him or putting him on the spot I suggest to him that the knife cuts both ways. In preparing the printed disclosure of his Estimates that there was failure there to describe what is at stake and what is involved in the vote and what is not involved in the vote. His explanation is certainly important and crucial to this consideration. I would hope that he is progressing rapidly with that kind of co-ordination, that kind of development of an umbrella program.

But that leads me to another question as a critic in this House faced with a government spending program. The Minister has said that he would expect that probably the outlay for the program hereinunder not described would be likely to be something not in the neighbourhood of \$100 but something in the neighbourhood of \$1,000,000 by the time he has it properly co-ordinated. He said that it will be a program that requires an adjustment of the listing and the organization and the arranging of other programs. Well where will the adjustment come from? Where will that \$1 million come from? It is not in the Estimates facing us at the present time so we can only assume that what we are looking at here is really only partial Estimates for the Department of Labour for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977.

Now it can be argued that this is customary, that we always face the main

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) Estimates and later on we are faced with Supplementary Estimates. But not in the magnitude of 25 percent over and above the main Estimates. If we were dealing with a percentage of two, three, four, five percent we would be roughly probably in the area of the Supplementary Estimates we are looking at in comparison to main Estimates on the normal plane. But here we are looking at total Estimates for the Department of Labour of \$3.1 million which well may not be enough but that is what they are. The Minister is saying that this comprehensive program once it is co-ordinated under the umbrella will probably cost a million dollars. I see no allowance for that million anywhere in the Estimates so presumably we are going to be voting Supplementary Estimates for the Department of Labour of \$1 million. If it was \$1 million as against \$10 million or \$20 million that would be one thing, but \$1 million against \$3 million is an increase of, well not 25 percent - I think I said 25 percent - it is something closer to 33 percent. I don't say it isn't worthwhile, but it is still an increase of 33 percent. For the sake of argument if that were carried across the Estimates in general, across this Estimates Book, we would be faced with a pretty formidable threat in terms of Supplementary Estimates. So I would want to know first and foremost where that additional \$1 million adjustment is coming from.

Let me put another question to the Minister. He has said that the ratio of days lost in industry through accidents is four to one over days lost through work stoppages. That's what started this discussion, the 600,000 days lost through accident as compared to the 150,000 approximately lost through work stoppages. Well I would remind the Minister that just five years ago in 1971-1972 the estimated number of working days lost were 49,430. Well if the accepted ratio is four to one that would mean that the days lost through . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Where was that 49,000 figure from?

MR. SHERMAN: It is from Page 51 of the Department of Labour Annual Report for 1975, the year 1971-1972. The report lists the last five years for . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Work stoppage.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes. The report shows the last five years of work stoppages and it shows in 1971-1972 that the estimated number of working days lost is 49,430, strike loss. Days lost through work stoppages. Well if the ratio is four to one, if that is a constant or fairly constant ratio that would mean that the estimated number of working days lost through industrial accident in 1971-1972 was approximately 200,000 and this year, or for the last year we have the record, we're saying that it is approximately 600,000. So in other words what has happened here is that within the space of five years we are now losing three times as many man days of work through industrial accidents as was the case five years ago. Well if one follows those mathematics through - the Minister shakes his head - but four times 150,000 is 600,000 which gives us our figure for last year --(Interjection)-- Oh. Well the Minister says that just happens to be the ratio in the given year. But certainly in his comments one would get the impression from his comments that the ratio that he --(Interjection)-- Well he didn't use the term "constant" but I certainly had the impression that what he was suggesting was the ratio that he has been wrestling with in this province, in industry in this province is a four to one ratio. If one were to look then at 1971-1972 you come up with a pretty significant difference in the number of days lost through industrial accidents.

Well let me ask him then: was the ratio in 1971-1972 less than four to one or was it three to one or was it two to one? --(Interjection)-- Well then the kind of mathematical equations that we are dealing with are different but the question is still the same, Mr. Chairman. The question is still the same. Why are there more days lost through industrial accidents in 1975 or '76 or '77 or whatever, the year we are dealing with here is November 1st, 1974, to October 31, 1975, so we are really looking at the year 1975. Why are there so many more days lost through industrial accidents in 1975 than was the case in 1971 or 1972? Is the Minister going to tell me it's because there is a great deal more industry in Manitoba in 1975? Because that isn't true. There hasn't been that mathematical equivalent of increase in industry or in the labour force. The labour force in this province has remained pretty static in the five years under review,

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . .relatively static between 400,000 and 430,000 people, working people, men and women. That's remained pretty static.

So I think that we come to a pretty provocative question here as to why we are into a situation where we now have the overwhelming, the overwhelming number of some 600,000 days lost through industrial accidents in this province in 1975. I would still like to have the Minister elaborate on that point. He has told us about the \$100; he has told us that he has got legislation coming; he has told us that he is trying to put a comprehensive umbrella plan together; he has told us that he is as committed as he ever was to the pursuit of occupational safety and health standards in industry and industry's workers in this province. So that explains the errors or the faulty impression created in the Estimates before us where the \$100 appropriation is concerned. But he hasn't addressed himself to the question that I started with which is a basic question. That is why did we have 600,000 man days lost to us in 1975 through industrial accident and how does that compare with the two, three four years before that and who was at fault essentially in the Minister's view. Was it private industry? Is it the regulations and the statutes of the Province of Manitoba whether enacted by this government or previous governments or whether this or previous governments have failed to enact the necessary protective measures? I would like the Minister to enlighten me and if he will, educate me in that sphere. Because I think a great many people exposed to this kind of presentation of the spending plans for this year and the record for the last five years would ask the same questions.

One final question before I sit down, Mr. Chairman. The Minister said in his response a few moments ago that he would be introducing or tabling a report in the House tomorrow that would provide us with the documentation of the approximate 600,000 days lost figure to which we are referring. Will that report provide us with a breakdown of those 600,000 days lost? Will there be a breakdown roughly industry by industry or industrial category by category so that we can see and understand where most of those costly industrial accidents took place and where the safety program should be pursued the most vigorously. I will leave those questions to the Minister's attention for the next few moments if he cares to respond to them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: I just want to say to my honourable friend I enjoyed very much his rambling non-approach to the facts of life in industrial accidents. My honourable friend has been in this House now for a few years. Each year there is tabled in this House a requirement of the law, the Annual Statement and Report of the Workers Compensation Board. If my honourable friend has never seen one before, or took note of it, I'm sure that he will the next one that is tabled, because he asked questions as to whether or not the report contains the incidence of accidents in various branches of industry. I leave it to him to heed to after he has taken a look at the document to read what he's had the opportunity of reading ever since he became a member of this House. --(Interjection)-- Well, my goodness gracious. You see, oh, never mind, I'll ignore that. --(Interjection)-- Of the Workers Compensation Board. My honourable friend was chortling with his laughable friend from Lakeside at the time and possibly didn't hear it. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The honourable member is mistaken, I distinctly heard the Minister say he was tabling the Workers Compensation Board Report. --(Interjection)--

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, well, no, there's a hell of a lot doesn't reach that side of the House. I often think there is an invisible barrier of intellect between each side of the House, and I'm not going to go any further than just say that. But I say to my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, he wears the mantle. My honourable friend was talking about the percentage. All I can say in the ratio of incidence of accident to the incidence of strike, all I can say, that I was informed statistically speaking - and I don't go around counting on my fingertips industrial accidents and the man days lost, but I was informed that the approximate ratio of the incidence on strikes to the incidence of industrial accidents last year was about four to one. -- (Interjection) -- Here again you see, I again haven't penetrated that invisible barrier of intellect over to that side of the House, but I'll leave that. I haven't received really any intellectual criticism from my honourable friend of the statements that I have made of what are our

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . objectives. He's tried to rant and to rave about past deficiencies, which I accept and said so, not only of this government but of previous governments before. My honourable friend wants to attempt to slough off what was said in the Throne Speech introduced at the beginning of this session in respect of industrial safety. But such is not the case, Mr. Chairman, people outside of this House are far more knowledgeable of what's going on inside of this House than my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry.

I received a letter the other day from the Canadian Manufacturers Association, from the Manager of the Canadian Manufacturers Association. I don't mind quoting it: "Dear Mr. Paulley: The recent Speech from the Throne indicates that the government is considering 'An Act pertaining to the safety and health at work of persons employed in Manitoba' and that it is 'concerned with the increasing capacity of employers and employees to agree jointly on improving safety and health conditions in the work place.'" The Canadian Manufacturers Association, Mr. Chairman, knows what we are endeavouring to do. Apparently my honourable friend had his hearing aid turned down at the time that portion of the Throne Speech was referred to by His Honour at the opening day of this House.

The letter goes on to say: "I interpret this to mean you are contemplating mandatory joint labour-management safety committees, perhaps similar in function to the occupational health committees in effect in Saskatchewan, and I would greatly appreciate it if you would let me know if this assumption is correct." Then the letter goes on. He is seeking my co-operation and consultation with them in this matter of importance of industrial health and safety conditions. And of course there's no question or doubt that that spirit of co-operation will be extended to all groups of society. I only wish that I had that same co-operation from certain members in this House.

May I refer to another letter, Mr. Chairman, to indicate an interest outside of this House, and this comes from the Executive Director of the Labour Council of Ontario, who works under the Ministry of Labour in that great Conservative bastion of democracy. The letter reads as follows: "Dear Russ: I note from the Winnipeg Tribune of February 3rd that you are making successful progress towards bringing all industrial health and safety into a single branch of your department, as well as making labour-management safety committees compulsory in all Manitoba work places. As you may recall from our previous discussions, I am interested in such concepts, and am pleased to report that the labour safety council of Ontario is currently examining the same questions. Our work has not reached the stage of concrete recommendations and any such reports that you have would be helpful; in turn I promise to send you material as soon as possible. My memory tells me that I suggested to you last summer that you are not only ahead of us in having the courage to do this, but we wish you every success in your endeavours." From the Conservative Government spokesman on Safety of the Province of Ontario. And damn it all, all that I get in this House from the Conservative opposition is about a bunch of malarkey and veiled criticisms because we're attempting to do it and because the Estimates only has a line for 100 bucks. My honourable friend asked a number of other simple questions. I refer the answers to his own research department, they have the material and the information available.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister can indulge in all the typical familiar indignation he wants to, the fact of the matter is I asked him a question tonight about the Women's Bureau when we started the committee proceedings this evening, he responded that all I had to do was look at Page 39 of the report of his department. Then when pressed and urged to get over his temporary fit and pique and indignation, he elaborated at great length, which what I was seeking and what I wanted for the record and what I submit the people of Manitoba would like to have for the record, on a very important part of his department and its function of responsibility. I ask him to consult Hansard a few days from now, and ask himself whether the report he finally gave me after some cajoling that I would have thought would not have been necessary, if there is any relationship whatever to the 12 lines - in fact they are not 12 full lines, there are six full lines and six half lines on Page 39 of his departmental report, what I wanted on the

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) Women's Bureau was not contained in those six full lines and six half lines, what I wanted I did get, at least in substantial part, in the explanation that he subsequently gave. So we managed to weave our way through that jungle of indignation and rancour.

Now he's doing the same thing again on Resolution 84 with respect to Occupational Safety and Health. He apparently thinks he doesn't have to answer, he apparently thinks he can act in as autocratic a manner as he chooses, but I tell him that he can't act in that autocratic manner and get away with it; if he thinks he can't answer me I can stay as long as he can, and furthermore the people of Manitoba can stay longer, until we do get an answer. He has read me from his letters that he has received. Well unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, or perhaps fortunately, we are not privy to the letters that the Minister of Labour gets from his admirers in one province or another back and forth across this country who address him by the salutation "Dear Russ" and pat him on the back for the work that he has done. Unfortunately we're not copied in for copies of those letters, so we are at a great disadvantage, we have to come into this House and ask him to reach into his correspondence file and pull out the favourable back-patting letters and read them to us. If I had copies of those letters, perhaps I would have some answers, although those answers don't shed very much light on the subjects about which I have been questioning him. But that has no bearing on the debate that we're in at the present time, the fact that he's had a correspondent from Ontario congratulate him on the things that he is attempting to do to increase and improve the health and safety of workers in Manitoba.

He has referred me to the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Chairman, I've got the Speech from the Throne in front of me and I've had it in front of me since the 12th of February, and I would say that it's about as enlightening in the area of improvements projected and proposed in the field of industrial health and safety as are the Estimates and the sub-line that I referred to a moment ago. He got himself into a jackpot with people on this side from which he was only able to extricate himself by his usual rancour and bombast, because the sub-line explaining vote 84 and Section 10 explains nothing, it's a bland generalization which says that this vote is to provide for safeguarding the safety and health of the labour force of Manitoba. And then he takes off and tees off on us because we ask him how is he going to do that with an appropriation of \$100 which is as listed here, and he says, well you fools, in effect he says, can't you understand what this is all about, the \$100 has nothing to do with total provision providing for the safety and health of the labour force of Manitoba. Well I say then, why in heaven's name did he prepare the Estimates or allow them to be prepared that way? If he's got something to say about how the safety and health of the labour force of Manitoba is going to be safeguarded, this is the place where he's supposed to be saying it, he is not supposed to be saying it in correspondence back and forth to some admirer in Ontario, he is supposed to be saying here to the people of Manitoba and to the opposition when they are legitimately questioning him to what is happening in these field. And in referring to the Throne Speech and what the Throne Speech had to say about this subject, I submit with all respect, Mr. Chairman, that it is no more enlightening, no more informative than that particular mis-directed sub-line on the Estimates, Page 39. The Throne Speech is not supposed to be specific in its descriptions of government programs, and we are aware of that, but surely the examination of a Minister's Estimates and his department's spending program does provide an opportunity where the programs can be described in specific terms. Surely they provide an area for questioning and examination in which specific answers should be available.

The Throne Speech says this, and I quote it to read it into the record, Mr. Chairman: "You will be asked to consider an Act pertaining to the safety and health at work of persons employed in Manitoba. My Ministers are aware that during the last year four times more working days were lost through accidents at work than were lost through industrial strikes and lock-outs, therefore my Ministers are concerned with increasing the capacity of employers and employees to agree jointly on improving safety and health conditions in work places." Well that's very very admirable, Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure we are all in favour of it, as I'm sure we're all in favour of democracy,

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)and we're all in favour of clean air, and we're all in favour of motherhood. That's okay in a Throne Speech, nobody expects them to be more specific than that. But we're down to the Estimates now, Mr. Chairman, and we're down to the item on the Estimates having to do with Occupational Safety and Health in the field of labour under the aegis and responsibility of the Minister of Labour, and if we can't ask specific questions or seek specific answers and get specific answers in this area of the legislative process and in this stage of the legislative session, then where in heaven's name can an opposition, and can a citizen, can a taxpayer ever get those answers?

So for the Minister to glibly dismiss it as something that I can look up in his report, I suggest to him as arrogance of the highest degree. What good does that do the taxpayer or the public? And I remind the Minister, certainly he's sitting on the government side of the House today; he reminds us that he once was over on this side - well if he persists in that attitude of arrogance he is liable to be back on this side, and very quickly. The Minister has got a responsibility, Mr. Chairman, as a Minister and as an elected official and as a peer in this House among equals, fortunate to be on that side only because of the mathematics of the election process, to deliver and to answer some of these questions. -- (Interjection) -- Well he says he got more votes than I got, I suggest to him that - his Party got more votes than my Party got -- (Interjection) -- Exactly, and as he is aware, those situations can change very quickly in the political arena, political sphere. He has a responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to face up with some degree of candor to examinations of his Estimates; if we don't know about them, that's hardly our fault. Our function as opposition is to find out about them, is to ask questions about them. I can't see what is so objectionable to the Minister in the pursuit of questions about his Estimates and about his spending program when they are not explained either in the Throne Speech, in the report of his department or on the Estimate pages that we're considering. So he can attempt to dismiss them in that manner until the cows come home as far as I am concerned; I say that the opposition is not prepared to allow them to be dismissed in that manner and I challenge him on the point - and I'm sure he is a good enough and a professional enough and an expert enough politician to know that the public and the taxpayers are not prepared to let him get away with that kind of an answer either.

I am asking the Minister what the ratio is in terms of days lost through industrial accidents compared to days lost through strikes in terms of a median, in terms of a mean or an average whether the four to one ratio still existed a few years ago and whether the mathematics mean that there has been an enormous increase in industrial accidents, and what the reasons are. If he is Minister of Labour of this province he surely knows or has some suspicion and some ideas of what the reasons are and what can be done about them. I suggest that it is not good enough for the people of Manitoba any more so than for the opposition in this House for him simply to say that we are taking steps, we are doing things in the field of providing better safety and safeguarding the health of the labour force of Manitoba. That's a title; that's a generalization. What we are asking him here in this consideration of his Estimates is what is he doing? What does that mean? What are the steps that he is taking to ensure that kind of improvement, that kind of safety and safeguard. That, sir, I submit, put to any government of any stripe, coming from any opposition of any stripe is a highly legitimate, highly valid question on behalf of the taxpayers of the province. The Minister evades that I suggest at his political peril.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 84--pass? -- (Interjection) -- Is the honourable member finished or is he going to proceed?

MR. SHERMAN: No, I'm not. When I sat down, Mr. Chairman, it was to give the Minister a chance to answer my question. I've asked him . . .

MR. PAULLEY: If you had asked a question, I could have answered . . .

MR. SHERMAN: I've asked him to explain to the people of Manitoba, through the opposition, simply the questions as to what the ratio in terms of an average, in terms of a median, during the past five years is for industrial accident work days lost as compared to work days lost through work stoppages and strikes; whether there has

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) been an enormous increase; whether that 600,000 represents an enormous increase and what he and his colleagues in the government mean by the generalization in the Throne Speech that they are working to increase the capacity of employers and employees to improve safety and health conditions in work places. Is that too much to ask him - what programs he and his colleagues are undertaking or planning to undertake in order to effect that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend I am sure is filibustering, I don't know why. Because he hasn't said anything different within the last half, three-quarters of an hour, than he did say an hour or so ago. He's very repetitious and, of course, I suppose we have to accept that. I said to my honourable friend - although he disputes that I said it - I said to the members of the committee that there would be a report tabled tomorrow from the Workers Compensation Board insofar as lost time of accidents was concerned. He disputed that I said it until you, Mr. Chairman, had to point out the accuracy of what I said that I said and it penetrated, I presume rather reluctantly, into the cranium of my dearly beloved friend from Fort Garry.

He said as a member of the opposition that I owe it to the public of Manitoba to give an indication of the incident of accident and strike time lost over the years. It is a requirement under the law, as I tried to suggest to my honourable friend a little while ago, that a member of the government annually table the report of the Workers Compensation Board which contains that information and it's available -- (Interjection) -- You haven't got it? Every member of this Assembly gets that report every year, Mr. Chairman. It's also a requirement of the Statutes of Manitoba that the Minister of Labour tables an Annual Report of the Department of Labour which contains the figures of lost man hours as the incident of strike. Yet my honourable friend flamboyantly, with deep emotion, devotion and what-have-you criticizes the Minister of Labour because the public hasn't got the information. Well I suggest the public gets the information and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, the public is far more knowledgeable of what goes on in this House than the Conservative opposition because those reports are public knowledge. People ask questions.

The Throne Speech of this year - and my honourable friend keeps reading from the Throne Speech - indicated the comparative incident of accident and that we were going to do something about it. My Premier, speaking the other day in a resolution or in a statement to this House, compared the ratio of approximately 600,000 man days lost in accidents to 150,000 man day loss as result of strike, a ratio for that particular year of approximately four to one. I explained that to my honourable friend. He charges me with not giving answers. I say to him, I think that even a student in Grade 6 would have enough intellectual ability to take a look at the records over the years to ascertain for himself the ratio in preceding years. I haven't that at my fingertips. I'm prepared, because of the apparent lack of capacity of my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, to make this assessment himself, I'm prepared to either loan him a calculator or to get one of my staff or to get one of my staff or to get one of my grandchildren to arrive at a precise percentage comparison. Of course, my grandson, he's 13 now, he doesn't get \$1,000 as the rest of us do for the field of research, to give us that information that we need as members of this Assembly.

My honourable friend was somewhat abashed, disappointed, because it appeared that I didn't rise the moment he sat down after his blustering attack. So up he gets again. So now here am I. The reason I didn't get up, Mr. Chairman, was there was no comprehensive sensible questions asked of me by the Member for Fort Garry that he couldn't obtain or may even have the answers before he asked the questions. This is typical, quite typical of my friend from Fort Garry and, of course, he has some colleagues there that want to aid and abet him in his, oh, sort of miniature, amateurish, actorish approaches to the problems of this province.

I said the other day in respect of my honourable friend that he missed his calling in life, that he should have been, and maybe he is really, Mr. Chairman, maybe I'm not being too complimentary to my friend. I made reference or comparisons with my honourable friend to that great actor who was knighted not so long ago by the name of

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Charles Chaplin. Maybe I'm doing my friend a disservice when I said that he attempts to mimic him. Maybe I should say that he's a modern version of that 80-year old gentleman. But I seriously did not think that any of the questions that my friend for Fort Garry raised in his last blistering, blustering attack, needed any answers because he could ascertain them for himself.

He sort of played down the fact that I did have a couple of letters that I was able to refer to, where I'm getting support for what I'm attempting to do from the Manufacturers Association and even from representatives of the Conservative Government in Ontario. Because I'm attempting to do something - or not me, because I don't do it alone, of course, Mr. Chairman - this government is attempting to do something in the field of accident prevention. My friend wants to know why I would do that. Maybe I have to go outside into other areas of endeavour to try and get support or indications of support for our endeavours. Because surely, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the orations that we have heard tonight from the Member for Fort Garry, we haven't apparently any support from that side of the House for endeavours we're attempting to make for a better deal for all concerned in Manitoba in the field of accidents.

As I indicated a little while ago - and I apologize for the fact that I didn't have the precise legislation before the House at this particular time. Instead of accepting that as is normal or was normal in the House, as a fact, there was condemnation and criticism. I'm going to look forward in keen anticipation to the day when that legislation is introduced into this House as to whether or not the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is going to give it support or whether he would dare, he would dare to reject the concept and then dare to go the people in his constituency and say to them, they had a good idea but I didn't like it because I didn't like the Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has again dragged a red herring across the examination of the particular vote on his Estimates that we're trying to get at. His suggestion, his inference that there won't be support over here for measures that he may propose in the field of occupational safety and health is entirely and utterly unjust and contrived on his part. It's a typical tactic of the Minister to try to ascribe positions and impute motives, I would say, to members on this side of the House without basis, without fact and without honesty. There has been no suggestion on this side of the House that there won't be support for legislation aimed at improving occupational safety and health. I can tell him in fact when I rose to speak the last time I said to him that I thought I could assure him without even seeing the legislation that he would receive support from me and from our side.

But we have asked a few basic questions about the occupational safety and health crisis which obviously is at hand if we're losing 600,000 man days in the Province of Manitoba in a given year through industrial accidents. I repeat that all the inferences that he can read into our position or attempt to place on the record, all the allusions that he can direct towards us, all the arguments that he can raise to try and misrepresent the attitude of my colleague from Lakeside or anybody else on this side, or my position in this debate, are simply smoke screens and red herrings being dragged across this particular trail to cover up for the fact that he doesn't know and he may not even care, but he certainly doesn't know. If he knew, he would stand up and tell us what he is proposing to do in the field of occupational health and safety; why there were 600,000 man days lost last year; how that compares in terms of the record year by year in this province; whether it is substantially and significantly worse than immediately preceding years and why. I say to him that that is a fair, legitimate, honest, political question and all the arguments that he drags into the House to try to run me down and run the Member for Lakeside down and the rest of our colleagues are a typical noisy, blustery smokescreen from a Minister who doesn't know and maybe doesn't even care.

So he can adopt the attitude of misrepresentation of our position all he likes to try to cover up. But the fact of the matter is the inadequacies in his position are very glaring. I think we've been extremely charitable and considerate with respect to his position, Mr. Chairman, because he has, by his own admission, come into this House with his Estimates in front of us, without providing us as yet with some very critical

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) information. He has said to us: I'm sorry that appropriation No. 10, Vote 84, is so general and so poorly explained. He has said: I was hoping to have the legislation ready and perhaps I'm at fault. Fault me if you will for not having the legislation ready. Well we haven't faulted him for not having it ready although that perhaps is our error, sir. Perhaps we should do that. We've said all right you don't have it ready but tell us what is going on in this particular sphere.

He has said to us that he has a report coming in tomorrow from the Workers Compensation Board for the preceding year which will explain to us where and how these 600,000 man days were lost in industry. That's coming in tomorrow. Well it's perhaps particularly convenient for the Minister that we are in the closing stages of consideration of his Estimates today and tonight. We're getting that report tomorrow. We didn't get it yesterday or last week or in time to look at it before we were faced with this particular consideration. We're getting it tomorrow. Well the Minister says, "Neither did I." That's fine. I'm not criticizing him for that. We have accepted that. We have not said why wasn't that report -- (Interjection) -- I did not just say it. I said we have not had it. We haven't stood up here and said why didn't we get that a week or two weeks or three weeks ago which we might have done and been validly entitled to do because that report should have been brought into this House forthwith, in the words of legislative propriety, once this session got under way. We have now been in session for close to two months and we've seen no sign of it yet. But be that as it may, fault the Minister again if you will for not having that report in. We're not faulting him for that. We're saying okay, we haven't got the information, you haven't been able to get it ready but surely you can stand up and answer some questions on this subject. That, Sir, is a question and a challenge that this Minister cannot evade or avoid and I suggest to you, Sir, that he doesn't know the answers. He doesn't know the answers or he would provide some of them.

He accused me of not asking him questions. He's talked about orations from this side of the House. He has said that he didn't get up the last time that you called the vote on this particular question because he didn't think there had been any legitimate questions put. Well, Mr. Chairman, I've asked the same questions on several occasions tonight and I don't want to subject members of the committee to any more repetition than I've already subjected them to. The Minister, I ask in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, to consider the record of the exchange of questions and non-answers tonight. The Minister has had those questions put to him. The Minister has been asked legitimately about occupational safety and health and the 600,000 man days lost and why the total has become so staggering and so disturbing in this past year and where most of the difficulty and most of the loss occurred and what is being projected in terms of getting at a program to combat that in the future. Now those I think are questions that most ministers on that side of the House, most ministers of any party, of any government of any stripe, would be able to understand and in their sense of responsibility would attempt to answer for an opposition. He stands up and says he won't answer because he hasn't been asked any questions. I ask in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, whether the record shows tonight whether he's been asked some questions or not, questions that are deserving of some attention and not just a glib dismissal. If he continues to glibly dismiss them there's nothing much I can do about it except re-emphasize my conviction that in doing so he's demonstrating that he's not prepared to tackle the problem, that he doesn't know what the problem is so how can he be expected to know what the answers are. Worse than that, perhaps he doesn't even care. If he wants to leave it that way, then he's the one who's going to have to live with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 84--pass. Resolution 84. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$100 for Labour--pass. I now refer honourable members back to Resolution 75(a) - Minister's Compensation. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, on Friday morning I believe it was, I asked the Minister a number of questions having to do with current issues in the area of labour relations. I presume he has some record or recollection of them. I am prepared to repeat them but I won't do it unnecessarily. I hope he might be prepared to respond to some of them now.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I did jot down some questions raised by the honourable member. Now I don't know if I have them here. Maybe I should ask him to reintroduce them lest I misinterpret, which wouldn't be deliberate of course, the questions posed by my honourable friend. I'm sort of leery of that beloved gentleman lest I get accused to misrepresentation.

I note my remarks did say, and I say this to him on the credit side, that he did admit that the conciliation officers of the Department of Labour were good. I would join him in that and that has been very well recognized by most people in the province who are concerned or involved in labour management relations.

I believe one of his questions whether or not there was a conciliation officer involved in the discussions aimed toward a collective agreement between CUPE and Hydro clerical staff, I think that was one question. The answer to that is yes.

I believe another question referred to the school teachers and the Winnipeg School Board, whether a conciliation officer had been appointed in those discussions. The answer as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, is no. Then he wanted to know about negotiations between the Manitoba Government Employees Association and the government and we are still talking to each other. The present agreement expires in a day or two; the Committee of Cabinet and negotiators have met; the negotiating team on behalf of government have met with the Employees Association on two or three occasions and talks are continuing.

The Member for Fort Garry raised a question or two about labour relations and IBEW and labour relations and points that were raised at the Industrial Relations Committee meeting, a question of points raised by some of the delegates, persons who appeared before the Industrial Relations Committee dealing with the constitution of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; the question of some points raised by correspondence from the Director of the Labour Relations section of the Winnipeg Builders Exchange, the IBEW and some of their contracts and also a reference to a member of the IBEW, one by the name of Alex Tetach in respect of the constitution of the IBEW.

Having raised that question the answer I give my honourable friend: the constitution of the IBEW was arrived at democratically by the members of that organization and I don't know of any instance where a Minister of Labour of any jurisdiction has interfered with the internal constitution of a trade union movement providing that it does not contain any violations of the principles as laid down under our human rights legislation.

The Member for Fort Garry referred also to the matter of the Musicians' Union and its relationships with the booking agents and hotels. He said musicians are being let down by the union. On this particular occasion instead of the onslaught being directed towards the Minister of Labour the onslaught of my honourable friend, and of course we all know he's wont to onslaught this way, that way, and any other damned way he can, on this particular occasion the onslaught was directed towards the trade unions and not to the Minister. So at least for a little while I was relieved of his barbs.

But here again I say, Mr. Chairman, I did receive a communication from an entertainer, as a matter of fact a couple of entertainers, who have jobs in hotels obtained through booking agents. Members of the Musicians' Union did investigate the thing. The matter, as far as I can, I find that there were no violations of The Labour Relations Act and here again I did not feel and do not feel inclined to investigate into the internal operations of the Musicians' Union under their constitution. I just want to assure members of the committee that if I find or had found any violation of The Labour Relations Act that were carried on by the unions then they would be treated the same as violations by any other group in labour relations.

My member for Fort Garry referred to the committee hearings of the Industrial Relations Committee and there were three I believe. We met on three different occasions and heard quite a number of representatives. He says he will await the results with interest. I hope he doesn't lose interest because I anticipate the possibility of forwarding legislation before too long, after I have had an opportunity of assessing representations that were made to the Committee.

References were made by the Member for Fort Garry in respect of the Conservative Party approach to conflicts in hospital services. I gathered from my honourable friend that the position of the Conservative Party was such that they would use the whip instead of the

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) smooth hand to try and resolve disputes in the hospitals. He made reference to a brief that was presented by the Manitoba Health Organizations and that organization made suggestions to the Committee to try and arrive at provisions whereby essential services in the health areas would continue to function in certain areas that are more vital than others if there were to be a dispute in the hospitals.

Reference was made to the Woods Committee Report that was made to me late in 1974 and which is continuing its survey. But in the report made to me by the Woods Committee, which is comprised of representatives of both management and labour, that there should be no legislation preventing strikes in the hospital services. That was one of the recommendations contained in the Woods Committee report. They did suggest in the report that endeavours be made to try and get labour and management to come to an agreement to continue on with relatively small staff in the vital services area of the provision of the health services even though there was a strike officially on. Efforts are being made through the continuing Woods Committee to try and arrive at precisely that, and I may say that just the other day I did have the assurance of one of the unions that were in negotiations that if they - fortunately now that dispute has been resolved - but they were prepared to go to voluntary arbitration had we not been successful with the involvement that we were making in that particular dispute. Thankfully the dispute was ended but I just illustrate this to indicate that in some quarters at least--(Interjection)--They arrived at an agreement satisfactory to management and to labour. That is right. My honourable friend, of course, from Swan River doesn't understand the difference. He says they got what they wanted. I suggested that both management and labour got what they wanted because they signed an agreement. And if management hadn't got what they wanted they wouldn't have signed the agreement. So I don't know where that puts my honourable friend. Anyway, you interpret it your way. I'm just saying in giving you the facts of what happened, they came to an agreement and if that's wrong, to come to an agreement, well I can't . . .

But at any rate, getting back to the Manitoba Hospital Organization and their representations before the Industrial Relations Committee. Mr. Chairman, if you recall I asked them then to forward me additional information as to the sections in the Health Care Services that they would consider the areas that emphasis should be made on continuation even though they were in a strike situation.

Another point the Member for Fort Garry referred to is what we call, and I believe he's a strong advocate of the right-to-work legislation similar to what they still have in some of the slave states in the United States of America, the rights to belong to a union or not to belong. He discounts the general application of the principle that those that receive the benefits as the result of financial contributions to a union should pay for those results which now is a fairly well-established principle in most democratic countries. I would suggest, unless I read my honourable friend incorrectly, he would like to return to Barry Goldwaterism's and the likes of that, of his ilk, the ultra-Conservatives who would like to legislate anybody to work under any situation or under any circumstance.

Reference was made by the Member for Fort Garry as to an observation that one of the labour delegates made during the representations, that the Department of Labour should only be for labour instead of both labour and management. I know this is a very interesting field, Mr. Chairman. I know there are a lot of people who figure that the Department of Labour should be solely for the benefits of labour. But in our industrial society I reject that because I think that one of the requirements of a Department of Labour is to try and bring about as the preamble of The Labour Relations Act says, harmonious relationships between management and labour. While I have had representations made to me to change the direction so that basically the suggestion would be that the Department of Labour should be only for labour, I say quite frankly and forthrightly I don't accept that concept.

My honourable friend, the Member for Swan River, says we did that in 1972 when we changed The Labour Act. I suggest he awaits to see what the new edition will bring and I hope that I have the same support in my new endeavours as I had in 1972 because I well recall that in 1972 when the amendments were introduced into this House, that my honourable friend who is well acquainted with the little red school house concept which he

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) still dearly upholds, figured that all was lost. The net result is that many of the more progressive Conservatives than my honourable friend now suggests to me that it was pretty damned good legislation and give us more of it, Russ. But I'm not talking about hierarchy of the Conservative Party, I'm talking about the intelligency of the party. Now there is a big difference between the two.

So I say that instead of the concept of the Ministry of Labour just being for labour, that the department has an obligation to three segments, labour, management and government. There is no question or doubt that when one looks at the situation the way it is at the present time in the industrial world today, there is battles going on between big labour, big business and big government, and that is a fact of life that we have to face up to. It's something, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that will not just idly pass away. There is a responsibility on all of us in government, in labour, and in management to put our collective shoulders to the wheel to try and resolve the grave situation that we are being confronted with in society today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 75(a) - the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly pleased to have the Minister's assurance that he views the responsibilities of his department as being pretty catholic in embracing the three sides of the coin and--(Interjection)--Well pretty Anglo-Catholic. Put it that way. That embraces the three sides of the coin: labour, management and government and he is not susceptible to the blandishments of those who would see him acting in the main just for one of those elements rather than for all three.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister about northern hiring practices and some of the grievances, whether official or unofficial, of some of the trade unions who have been employed in construction projects in the north, those 16 trade unions that make up the Allied Hydro Council in particular or 16 trades that make up the Council I should say, and remind him of the inequities that some of the union leadership feels exist in the practices followed through northern Manpower.

The iron workers in particular have been in touch with me and I'm sure probably with the Minister with respect to hiring on northern sites, whether it be - well any of the major northern construction sites at Gillam, Jenpeg, Long Spruce or Limestone or wherever. The winter, as the Minister well knows, is a critical time for unemployment and for shortage of employment possibilities for skilled tradesmen on those sites because of the practice of northern preference, which in principle is a good concept. There are many union headquarters and trade union leaders here in the southern part of the province who feel that some of their skilled members are discriminated against in the hiring practices. I've had specific situations brought to my attention.

One of them in fact has involved the Honourable Member for Thompson and a job that he had at Limestone, I think it was on the Brodsky construction site, and the difficulty that many of the trade union leaders here have in getting a fair break for their skilled workers. I know of one situation where a qualified northern resident who was qualified for a job, and I believe this was on the Limestone site, he was one of two people, members of the Ironworkers Union, who were applying for that job and who, as I say, were northern residents, and who were qualified outside erection workers, who did not get that job because of practices that are imposed through the northern Manpower hiring procedures. As a consequence, one of them who had a large family to support would have wound up on Unemployment Insurance for some considerable time had another party not - and I don't mean political party but another industrial party - not been successful in finding him a job somewhere else in the southern part of the province. This man was qualified. He was an ironworker. The job that he was supposed to go to went apparently to an individual who was not an ironworker but a steel worker and the substance of many of these complaints that have come to me is that in many many cases these positions, filled through northern Manpower, are filled by only semi-skilled workers semi-skilled tradesmen if that. For the most part, only semi-skilled as compared to the skilled tradesmen that union headquarters in the south or in other parts of the province could supply for those projects. The people who were hired are hired because of a northern preference principle. I repeat that I don't challenge the objectives of that

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) principle. But I think it works a considerable hardship for skilled tradesmen who are unemployed through the winter because semi-skilled people receiving northern preference get jobs on site, on projects which should rightfully be the job of the skilled worker that could be supplied by the union here.

Trade union leaders here have said to me that if they can't supply the men for those jobs then they're perfectly happy to see them supplied from other sources. But they say if they can supply them, if they've got the qualified men, then they believe that it is inequitable that their qualified men should be unemployed, for example, through the winter while those less qualified or in some cases perhaps not qualified are given jobs on those sites simply through the northern preference consideration. I recognize the anomaly that's at work because obviously efforts have to be strenuously maintained to provide northern residents with northern employment opportunities. But I think what has happened here is that the Minister, as the Minister of Labour, through the practice and the restrictions that are imposed through this kind of hiring practice has really got himself in juxtaposition or counter-position to the best interests of the trade unions and trade union leadership and skilled workers within some of those unions.

One of those, I'm at liberty to say and I'm not divulging any confidences, one of those who feels most severely handicapped in this way is the Ironworkers Union. I have had a number of instances brought to my attention where their qualified workers have been rendered unemployed because of the practice that has put unqualified workers on the job. The work orders, of course, go out from Gillam or one of the northern offices, I believe it's Gillam, when tradesmen are required, craftsmen are required for some of those projects. It's really about 48 hours before the union headquarters in Winnipeg have an opportunity to act on those orders or to try to supply manpower to fill those orders. The consequence is that they feel that they're put at a disadvantage and that their, as I say, their skilled members are being discriminated against.

I would ask the Minister for his comments and views on that situation and also whether he would agree with the argument that's been advanced to me by some trade union leaders that there are very few skilled construction craftsmen in the mechanical trades at any rate, in northern Manitoba. That's not a criticism. I put that to him as a proposition that's been put to me, that unfortunately there are very few skilled mechanical tradesmen in the north and so this is the situation that's happening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am quite intrigued with the presentation of my honourable friend from Fort Garry and I will say that I have had some complaints in some organizations directed towards me because of some happenings.

Now first of all I want to say that I believe there are 16 trade unions that have entered into the Allied Trades Council Agreement which contains a no strike, no lock-out clause I believe for ten years, subject of course to periodic adjustments in some of the working conditions.

I'm somewhat amazed to hear my honourable friend come to the defence of the so-called - or I guess maybe it's not a question of so-called - the skilled worker in the Winnipeg areas against the northern preference worker who may be only semi-skilled. One of the difficulties that we have found here in Manitoba and I guess it's peculiar to other parts of Canada as well, is the lack of qualified people in the northern areas of our province to perform work. As a result of considerable and continuing efforts, northern preference has been written into some of the agreements and undertakings through northern Manpower and I want to pay a compliment to my colleague, the Honourable Member for Thompson, who has been one of those who have been most active in attempting to have preference employment for northerners in Manitoba for a varied number of reasons.

First of all because they are, of course, domiciled in the north and they have their family there and they haven't had the same opportunity over the years of having a decent apprenticeship training program as those of us that live here in the south. So it is true that they may not have the full skills and qualifications of those that have had the opportunity of a real truly apprenticeship system here in southern Manitoba. Call them semi-skilled workers? Yes. Maybe the only reason that they can't even be described as

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) semi-skilled workers is because of the fact that they've only been utilized at the time of convenience to the construction industry. When the construction industry could not attract people from outside of northern Manitoba to do the job that was required, they very reluctantly asked those that were available in the general area of the north and where construction was going on to - oh please come in and help us out, we can't get the so-called skilled worker from other areas. As a result of I would suggest the partial training, a little bit this year, a little bit that year, they have developed into a position of being designated as semi-skilled. As the availability of work in areas that my honourable friend suggests is the area where the skilled worker resides, as the availability of work becomes less available in that area, surely to goodness it's only right and proper that the fellow in the north who has been filling in, albeit that he may only be semi-skilled, should have the preference.

One of the problems faced by this government and all governments in Canada, is the tremendously high rate of unemployment in the more remote areas of Manitoba. The federal authority, the provincial authority has been forced because of unemployment rates of 50 percent and upwards in some of our northern communities, been forced into huge expenditures of dollars just to keep life and limb together. One of the reasons for that continuing the way it has been is because we haven't had the intestinal fortitude or the intellectual approach to try and train our northern citizens into the performance of useful work. That is what we're endeavouring to do. If the criticism that my honourable friend is receiving from some union, because of that factor and the input of a semi-skilled against a skilled worker - and while I said a moment or two ago that I felt that my position as Minister was tri-partiate, the Holy Trinity, or unholy Trinity, it's a matter of how you look at it, I'm prepared to accept criticisms from the unions if that criticism is because we are involving or attempting to involve our northern friends and fellow Manitobans in useful work efforts. Far better it be that way than otherwise.

We have an agreement under Canada Manpower that has been the subject of much negotiation between Manitoba, and I've had the honour of being closely associated with this with some of my colleagues in Cabinet and also the Honourable Member for Thompson, in trying to bring about a better deal in the operation of Canada Manpower for northern Manitobans as well. We now have a general understanding that insofar as work applications or requests for work we have a general policy now that when a work order comes in or an order for employees, they call them work orders I believe, comes in, it's on a preferential basis now and it wasn't so always but just comparatively recently. The first option or first preference is northern Manitoba; the second is Manitoba as a whole; the third is Canada-wide and then if there's non-availability of the type of personnel or tradesman that's required, then consideration will be given to going off-shore to bring in qualified people.

So this is the way things are operating. And as I say, Mr. Chairman, it is true that in some areas or in some unions that there may be opposition to this general basic policy. I'm prepared as the Minister of Labour for Manitoba to take that flack, if indeed it is flack, and explain the position that we take here. Because if they're really sincere in the development of the north in a true and comprehensive manner, surely one of our involvements should be to do our utmost to see that our friends, our cousins and fellow Manitobans in northern Manitoba have equal opportunities - a phrase that we've been using a lot in this Assembly of recent date - equal opportunities to be fully participators in this democracy. So I can appreciate the point raised by my honourable friend that there are some that object to this approach. I think it is a fair and reasonable approach. My only wish as Minister of Labour responsible for our apprenticeship program is that I were able to institute more apprentice programs in northern Manitoba for the benefit of Manitobans.

We have made, as I indicated when we were dealing with the division of apprenticeship, we have made a little headway. We have now domiciled in Manitoba for the first time in our history, a person in our apprentice division to try and encourage the larger industries particularly the mining industries in northern Manitoba to enhance their apprenticeship training programs so that the people up there will be more qualified to be

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) gainfully employed in developing what we call our last frontier in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): Mr. Chairman, the Member for Fort Garry is slightly misinformed as to the manner in which people become employed in northern Manitoba. The northern preference provision of the collective agreements in the Allied Hydro Council's Agreement were entered into and signed by the same members of those same unions who now chose to complain about it. Their problem is not one of the preference clause; it is a problem of the hiring procedure in the preference clause. The problem is one of failing to accept a provision that we requested when the initial original negotiations were going on and that of having a lay-off procedure in the reverse order of hiring. What would have occurred or what has occurred in the case of Gillam is that there has been a slight reduction in the work force, as a result of not having the reverse order provision in the collective agreement for that particular site. I understand now that at least there is a letter of understanding between Hydro Projects Management Association and the Allied Hydro Council that this reverse order of hiring procedure will be put in place.

I can't impress upon this Assembly more that the northern preference clause did not come easy in the negotiations with the unions. They have an organization within the Canadian Labour Congress called the Committee on Native Rights and when the negotiations were ongoing the resolutions that were passed at the CLC convention in 1968 and again in 1970 referred specifically to affirmative action programs for the employment of native people. The same unions who were in convention passed those same resolutions unanimously. Well when negotiations commenced on the northern preference clause in the Allied Hydro Council agreements and other agreements that have been entered into since we had to present them with the resolutions passed in 1968 and '70 and again in '72 to say, here is an affirmative action. This is in line with the resolutions that you passed in 1968, again in '70 and again in '72. Here is an opportunity for you to do something about it. What has made you change your mind? They did agree to the northern preference hiring procedure.

What it really does is give the local resident the first opportunity for employment on those sites, nothing very difficult about it. The job orders come in from the site to Canada Manpower, Manpower in turn relays it to the Northern Manpower Corps who have job information officers in every major community in northern Manitoba. If there is a person who can meet the qualifications of the job that is open his name is referred back through the system back to Canada Manpower and the employer has the final decision as to whether or not to accept that person who is being referred.

But I guess what has happened is that while there was some employment in Winnipeg that took up much of the slack, or much of the employees, and there was none available in the City of Winnipeg or in the southern part of the province to refer to northern job sites the unions then went beyond Manitoba, both east and west, and recruited in those provinces that had a surplus of manpower. These people were then sent north to fill those vacant positions and when work became slack in the City of Winnipeg, rather than complaining that there were people from off-shore or people from other provinces who were filling positions that could be filled with northern Manitobans, they took the position that I alone had taken the jobs away from the union. Well this is not the case. But if the northern preference clause qualifies me for employment on those job sites then I have every right as a northern resident to take advantage of them.

But I can tell you what conditions were like prior to the implementation of the northern preference clause. Any person who was living anywhere in northern Manitoba whether it was Thompson, Snow Lake, or Flin Flon or The Pas or any of the communities in the north, before they had an opportunity to obtain employment on northern sites which were within 30 or 40 or 50 miles from their home or right next door, or right in the City of Thompson during the International Nickel expansion, there was no provision for them to gain employment. The only way that they could possibly get employment on any of the sites in northern Manitoba was to come to Winnipeg and make application through the

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. DILLEN cont'd) hiring office of the union. Well you can't come to Winnipeg from Thompson or anywhere else in the north and if you lived outside of Thompson it meant you had to charter a plane from your home community because there were no air strips at that time, it was either skis or floats, and come into Thompson, catch the train, take two days to come to Winnipeg, wait in Winnipeg until there was a vacancy and then take the same route back. In all likelihood all they were doing was coming to Winnipeg on speculation. They didn't know if there was any jobs available because nobody told them and in those days there wasn't even a Canada Manpower office in Thompson. The nearest Canada Manpower office serving all of Northern Manitoba was in The Pas and there was nothing between The Pas and I believe Swan River, I could be corrected on that, and the next one was Dauphin.--(Interjection)--None in Swan River either. According to the Member for Swan River there was none in Swan River so that left Dauphin as the next possible site, then Portage and Winnipeg. How in the name of heaven was a guy that lives in Bird, or Split Lake or York Landing or Nelson House or Granville Lake or any of those communities that are adjacent to where Hydro activity is taking place, South Indian Lake, ever going to get the opportunity to be referred to those job sites if they were qualified to do the job.

Then it brings up another interesting question and that is the question of apprenticeship. Up until about three years ago I don't believe that there was an apprentice employed on any of the major sites in northern Manitoba, not one. I'm not so sure that that number has increased that much today because there is a certain restrictive attitude about unions in that they do not want to jeopardize their position by increasing the number of people that they have in their trade because it is impossible, on the basis of present forecasting at least, to determine in four or five or six years, what your manpower requirements are going to be. But I am happy to say that at least at the Canadian Labour Congress level and at the level of the Manitoba Federation of Labour that some serious consideration is now being given to attempt at least to forecast what the manpower requirements will be in three or four years, or five years or whatever the case may be.

The other thing that is very significant about the labour movement now is that, I don't know quite how to explain this, but the industry at the moment is plagued by tremendous peaks and valleys. You know there is a drop off in construction and everybody is unemployed and then three or four months later you may hit a peak again where there is a shortage of workers. So I think it is incumbent upon the labour movement and government to try to implement its major construction projects or at least schedule them so as to eliminate the peaks and valleys in the industry. I think that we are finally, after four years of pounding my head against the wall, there seems to be some movement towards that system in co-operation with the labour movement and government.

So I know the Member for Fort Garry may have some concerns about this system. When he made reference to the iron worker in Gillam who was unemployed and had a large family, that somehow the blame can be placed on the northern preference clause for him being laid off, well it wasn't the agreement that laid him off, it was the employer. Surely the employer should take some cognizance to the fact that you have a person living within 15 miles of the site who has a large family and then to lay him off at a time when you keep somebody else on, because he happens to be your friend from the same home town in New Brunswick, that the single New Brunswicker who is your friend and has no ties and is living in the bunkhouse remains employed at a time when a Manitoban with a large family is laid off, you know the agreement did not lay him off, it was the employer who did that. So that is something the Member for Fort Garry should take cognizance of. While the union apparently has been arguing on behalf of that person, that person was still laid off when I was referred to the job site. But they have a grievance procedure through which to attempt to reinstate that person within the agreement. But did this same union refer that man when the next vacancy occurred on the same job site that I was on? No. They sent another man from Winnipeg to fill that same job vacancy that occurred while just after I had arrived.

You know I have got to describe to you that on the job site where I was there was two people: one from Hull, Quebec, one from the Gaspé, myself from Thompson and one man from Winnipeg. That was the four iron workers that were employed on that

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. DILLEN cont'd) job site. So I think that it is just as well to say that the people from the Gaspé are just as responsible for taking the employment opportunities for those people in Winnipeg as the people from northern Manitoba. But I make no apologies for the northern preference clause. I think as a result of it our figures will show that we have employed, since the northern preference clause has been introduced, a tremendous number of people from northern Manitoba, remote communities and otherwise, who would not be employed had it not been for that agreement.

When the union gets into trouble and they can't supply, they will supply anybody that breathes. Don't let them give you the idea that there is great emphasis placed on qualification. I can tell you right now that there is no place in the Province of Manitoba where you can go to school to become an iron worker. The only place to get your training is to get out and do the job. That's how I had to do it, and that's how everybody else that is employed in the trade had to do it. There is no technical facilities in Manitoba for that kind of training.

But you know I worked at Long Spruce two years ago and the union referred iron workers to the job site. I had to take guys who come to work at 40 below in oxfords and a pair of oilers and a belt that was picked up off some job somewhere. No tools, didn't know how to hook up a cutting torch. Once I showed them how to hook it up, didn't know how to light it. And these were iron workers. So that this same union can't absolve itself from its responsibility in saying today that you must have qualifications because there is people sitting in Winnipeg. But when there is nobody in Winnipeg anybody that breathes can be sent to the job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution . . . The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I accept the Minister's position on the question of northern preference hiring, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that apprenticeship training programs would help to solve that problem to a certain extent and to fill the unfortunate vacuum. With respect to the comments of the Honourable Member for Thompson I must say, and I don't mean to be unfair about this I put the proposition to him, the grievance about northern hiring practices was only one-half of the grievance that I challenged the Minister with, the other one was specifically in relation to this northern resident with a large family, and he was not laid off by anybody, at least that was not the substance of the grievance that came to me, the grievance that came to me, and I put this in all sincerity to the Member from Thompson, was that he was a qualified iron worker, who was qualified for a job that was open up there and the Member for Thompson was hired in place of this person and as a consequence they had to locate that qualified iron worker in a job in Winnipeg. Now that was part of the grievance that came . . . the other half of the grievance was the northern preferences discrimination which I said was expressed by members of the Allied Hydro Council leadership here which I put to the Minister, and I accept the position that he takes on that, I accept that position and I appreciate his elaboration on it, but the northern resident that we're referring to was not the subject of a grievance that came to me because of a lay-off, it was a subject of a grievance that came to me because he had nine kids, he is a qualified iron worker and he wasn't able to get a job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 75(a)--pass. Resolution 75. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$431,200 for Labour--pass. That completes the Department of Labour. Committee rise.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. There being a quorum the meeting will come to order. I direct the attention of honourable members to Page 31 in their books. Resolution 62(a)(1), Minister's Compensation. The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, to my left are some of the senior people on staff and the numbers that are here just demonstrates the co-operation of the people in this Ministry to walk an extra mile. First of all I wish to thank the staff for their co-operation during the year and I want to express my gratitude to the co-operation of the courts. Also to the Federal Government, the Solicitor-General's Department for its co-operation with our ministry and also the Ministers for whom I share responsibility in the other provinces, because as most people know the correctional field is bifurcated in that some of the jurisdiction is under federal authority and some is under the province's.

The Solicitor-General was instrumental in setting up a Continuing Committee of Deputy Ministers which is followed up periodically by a meeting of the Ministers. I mean this sincerely. When we get down to business you couldn't tell who was who as far as political stripe was concerned. In fact one of my colleagues from Nova Scotia, sometimes he's more avant-garde than we are.

Also the non-government organizations which are affiliated in some way with the ministry and those people who in the private sector are doing work of a comparable nature, the Society of Criminologists on the federal level, and on the provincial level the John Howard Society, the Open Circle and the Salvation Army.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I am going to stick to a text because I think it is rather important. I think the opposition last year was more than kind because it was my first effort in presenting Estimates and I am going back over the pearls of wisdom that we hurled at each other. I see that I'd given an undertaking to explain at this time perhaps in more depth some of the things that we have done.

So the Ministry in addressing itself to the need for a balanced and comprehensive plan to guide the development of services under its jurisdiction, we are committed to taking the initiative to change the orientation, structure and programming of services designed to ensure efficient and effective performance of our role and function. Reflecting national trends the ministry's perspective has been broadened to include more extensive maintenance, planning and development of both existing and new programs with emphasis being placed on the concept of community-based services in corrections, rehabilitation and probations.

The ministry is becoming more involved in crime and delinquency prevention and in the promotion of better liaison, communication and involvement with the public, community organizations, all levels of government, social services and the total criminal justice system, in an attempt to answer an urgent need for co-operation and co-ordination.

National trends are also being reflected in planning and policy decisions relative to organizational structures and existing programs and the development of new and pilot programs based on the following points:

- 1) To fulfill the condition of imposed legal sanctions in a responsible and consistent manner;
- 2) To ensure the protection of society from those individuals who evidence a danger to other persons or property;
- 3) To recognize the essential worth and dignity of every individual involved in the criminal justice system;
- 4) To provide maximum opportunity for the rehabilitation and treatment of the offender;
- 5) To involve the entire Manitoba community in the responsibility for the maintenance of law and order, the prevention and reduction of crime and delinquency, and the provision of adequate resources to explore every available avenue necessary to correct the relationship between the offender and the offended.

In order to develop and implement a correctional system which adequately reflects this philosophy, a major effort is being directed to develop rehabilitative methods designed to assist offenders to return to the community successfully.

Community-based correctional programs are being developed and implemented to provide a more adequate range of sentencing alternatives to the courts. This process

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) requires the redevelopment and restructuring of existing institutional programs, continuing assessment of the needs of offenders and ongoing evaluation of rehabilitative effectiveness of programs. By assuming this sensitive but firm approach to community correctional programming the ministry recognizes the important contribution human resources have to offer in enhancing the quality of life. Emphasis is being placed on positive human development to encourage and promote attitudes, behaviours and activities, to counteract factors detrimental to the well-being of individuals and society as a whole. This approach is being applied to the juvenile and adult offenders and probationers of Manitoba to encourage personal growth and development in order to assist individuals in conflict with the law to lead fulfilling and law-abiding lives.

Of equal importance is the utilization of personal human resources and the potential of the ministry staff members who are so vital to the planning, development and to the implementation process of the correctional and probation system. In fact as I've mentioned on several occasions, many of the staff have moved on to other areas because of their efficiency in this system and some of them have even been named Man-of-the-Year, for example the chap in Alberta that I mentioned in the House previously. In this regard, as I announced in the House, my acting Director of Corrections for the juvenile system had indicated that he might be seeking other areas to make a contribution and I'm glad to report that he has reconsidered.

In the area of general programs in our ministry we have first of all a criminal justice information system.

2) The Judges and Probation Officers held a seminar on October 24th.

3) We have placed emphasis on the Main Street and core area.

4) We have carried out a public educational program in the prevention field.

5) We have solicited the co-operation and the leadership in all aspects of the Criminal Justice System through the liaison and consultation with the police, judiciary, private sector, all levels of government and fields of corrections and probations.

One of the things that we have initiated is a publication of a position of the ministry which we hope to carry forth on a quarterly basis. The Ministry has put out modest brochures of the programs that we are following.

8) We have been involved with the Attorney-General's Department and the police in the province in the co-ordination and co-operation of a mobile van project.

9) We have held a seminar just recently on February 26 and 27th of all agencies involved in the after-care services; and

10) Just last week we had a Cabinet approval in principle for the movement towards a community-constable type of a program.

11) We established a Task Force in the role of private agencies in the criminal justice area.

12) We established a Directors Committee.

13) We have moved on the recommendations of the Northern Corrections Committee which were accepted by the government; and

14) With special emphasis once again on the core area of the City of Winnipeg, meetings have been initiated between concerned departments, the city and interested groups to attempt to resolve the problems in this area.

In the area of Probation Services. The Probation Services directorate is designed to assume certain responsibility in response to society's need to be protected from those acts prescribed by law as seriously harmful to the social order. In addition it is responsible to respond to the needs of those individuals who transgress the law of society for treatment and rehabilitation under supervision in a community setting.

The probation process in Manitoba is the most prevalent and traditional form of community-based corrections, and for this reason is one of the most important and fortunate components of the correctional system. Probation Services attempt to minimize the involvement of the offender in the juvenile and criminal justice system by supervising individuals on probation where it is deemed to be in the best interests of the individual and society. In this manner offenders are retained under supervision in the community and are assisted to lead productive, law-abiding lives stressing positive social skills and

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) abilities. Efforts are being directed towards assessing needs, establishing open communications, streamlining procedures, encouraging involvement in decision-making and introducing a planning thrust related to the identified needs in this field.

1) The recent administrative changes at the senior level have been made to give the directorate a high profile in the criminal justice system.

2) Continuing support is being developed to ensure a high calibre of volunteer programs. The development of probation aides program is also of high priority.

3) The decentralization of Winnipeg services.

4) Emphasis has been placed on rural and northern probation services and on after-care supervision.

5) A Northern Probation Service Task Group is working towards the resolution of the problems in this area.

6) A major thrust has been made to emphasize assistance during the probation period through counselling, rehabilitation methods and life skills, for example.

The third point I would like to cover was a program review and developmental unit. Programs designed to achieve the goals and objectives of the ministry's philosophy necessitate the review of operations, planning and program development and the provision of technical support to translate progressive concepts into feasible policies, relevant programs and realistic procedures. The unit is responsible for definition of planning tasks, policy formulation, programming, evaluation and feedback in all program areas. The unit's valuable expertise is invaluable to the planning, development and evaluation of program design from a social development perspective, and in concert with the staff development and training unit plays a key role in the translation of ministry philosophy and policy into effective and realistic programs and services through first of all, organizational restructuring of probation services.

2) Review of the role and functions of the Manitoba Youth Centre

3) Review of Headingley Correctional Institution treatment program and after-care resources

4) Home for Boys study

5) Task force on the role of private agencies in criminal justice

6) Total juvenile facilities review task force

The fourth component is a staff development and training unit. In order to achieve a correctional system which complements the basic tenets of the ministry's philosophy it is necessary to proceed through available human resources; staff, clients and community members. In creating a manpower resource group able to deliver quality rehabilitative and treatment programs within a community-based correctional system it is essential to develop services flexible enough to adapt to changing correctional theories and requirements.

The establishment of a staff training and development unit is the initial step in developing the necessary integral components of a manpower system which will include the development and delivery of standards for recruitment and selection, orientation and induction programs, performance appraisals, career path planning, counselling, manpower development programs, educational leave and assistance programs, exit interview programs, organizational development programs and evaluation in follow-up programs.

In response to the need for a comprehensive system of human development for correctional institutions and probation staff, a Manpower Development and Training Program has been implemented with the support of the Federal Government. The program has five phases:

1) The establishment of the staff development unit

2) An expanded, more comprehensive orientation program

3) A 20-day upgrading program

4) A 6-month 30-day long upgrading program

5) A two-year pre-entry program

To date the Federal Government has expressed a keen interest in the program, and the Ministry, while modest, has received an initial \$18,000 grant to commence the

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) program and establish a unit which is presently functioning internally. The Federal Government has indicated an interest in cost-sharing on a 50-50 basis with the province on a three-year basis.

In August of 1974 the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba was restructured and given a mandate for all alcohol-abuse programs in the province under the direction of a Board of Governors. As you are aware, an amendment has been introduced to broaden the mandate of the Alcoholism Foundation to include other drugs.

I might report that the membership of the board is as follows:

General R. S. Graham, acting as Chairman and Chief Executive, The Right Reverend John F. S. Conlin, Mrs. Anita Cox, Mr. Alex Dobrowski, Mr. D.M. Plummer, Mr. Peter E. Swerhone, Mrs. Barbara Tulloch, Mr. Gordon Wade, Mrs. Jean Folster, Mr. Vince Hasker, D. H. Prosen and Mr. Zelman Selchen.

And of course by statute you will recall that the Director of Psychiatric Services for the Government of Manitoba sits on the Board of Governors, Dr. R. H. Tavener; and as - and for the Deputy Minister, Dr. John Banmen, and Mr. Vince as the Director of Rehabilitative Services.

The Alcoholism Foundation manages the funding of external agencies in the province, conducts research, prevention and education programs, and is responsible for ensuring quality programming and the provision of services according to the area of identified need.

1) One of the things that the Alcoholism Foundation did as a first effort was a November survey in 1974, which is a first of its kind in the province and it will be improved and modified as they move on.

2) Alcohol and Drug Education package was developed for use in the schools in co-operation with the Department of Education.

I digress from my prepared statement in this regard to give credit to Mr. Bill Potoroko who passed away last year. Many of you will recall that a number of years ago when there was really no one else putting forth the case in the public that we should involve younger people in some educational process, Mr. Bill Potoroko got a number of people together in the community and established initially Alcohol Education Services which became Alcohol Drug Education Services.

3) There was expansion of facilities in the Brandon area.

4) The AlCare Resort in the Ste. Rose region will and is providing treatment facilities in the Parklands Region.

5) A new facility was established in the Town of Churchill in co-operation with the local health board.

6) The Alcoholism Foundation continues research into chemical abuse, developing improved programs of prevention, education and treatment as well as programs for Native people.

7) Primarily through the efforts of Dr. Angus Reid, Manitoba became the first province in Canada to establish on a formal basis an inclusion in the medical school, a working with and through the Alcoholism Foundation to have medical students involved in the treatment of alcoholics.

8) The foundation in co-operation with the St. Anthony's hospital board in The Pas, established a detoxification unit which became known as Rosaire House.

In the field of Adult Corrections: The Adult Correctional system provides for the care, custody and treatment of those individuals committed to its institutions, either as a sentenced offender or as individuals awaiting the disposition of the courts. Correctional institutions serve two primary purposes, to protect society while simultaneously attempting to return the offender to the community as a contributing member of society. These objectives involve the utilization of a wide range of differentiated programs developed to reintegrate and resocialize an individual into his or her own community setting through the co-ordination of all available institutions as well as community resources.

Correctional programming includes classification, counselling, medical services, chaplaincy care, education programs, community release programs and rehabilitation camp facilities.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd)

The first of the institutions is Headingly. They have a new unit incorporating dining, storage, visiting reception, library, classrooms, workshops and accounting department facilities with vocational training building being remodelled to provide a reception unit and additional space for recreation.

In Dauphin there was an upgrading of the dining room in this particular facility, and you may recall as a third point, that Bannock Point having been destroyed by fire, it is presently being reconstructed.

One of the other items that is involved in Adult Corrections is the question of remands and lock-ups. A study has been going on and negotiations are proceeding with the City of Winnipeg to utilize facilities in the Public Safety Building.

The fifth point I would mention in this regard is 36 existing staff members graduated from the Correctional Officers' Training Course in the past year. At the same time two new careerists were hired as permanent staff, with eight remaining in training capacity at the institutions.

The seventh point, one of the projects that people in the department have been working on is the Logging Work Rehabilitation Program.

One of the things that is of concern is the overcrowding at Headingly because of the increase of numbers of people coming into the system. Hopefully this may be alleviated by the establishment or the investigation of the establishment of a short-term offenders' unit.

10) The Pas Correctional Institution which has been on the Capital Supply Bill is proceeding to working drawings at the present time.

The last point on this particular item, I would have to report to the committee that I'm still not in a position to make a decision relative to the granting of a tender relative to the construction of a new facility at Brandon.

The Juvenile Correctional system provides programs and facilities for the institutional care, custody and treatment of male and female offenders who require assessment and/or a period of institutional care. The residents of these facilities are admitted under the authority of the Juvenile Delinquency Act or the Child Welfare Act.

The Manitoba Youth Centre, Manitoba Home for Girls and the Manitoba Home for Boys each have their own programs incorporating recreational, educational, social services, as well as chaplaincy and medical programs. Treatment programs are provided at the Manitoba Home for Girls and the Manitoba Home for Boys.

In Manitoba we have a co-ordinating team which has been looking at the Young Persons in Conflict with the Law suggested legislation to be presented to parliament. The staff has been involved in the planning of a residential Halfway House treatment centre in Winnipeg and also addressing themselves to the question of over-population in juvenile facilities, and are reviewing the possibility of transferring 18 boys to a separate cottage at the Manitoba Home for Girls.

Further, the Juvenile Services Review Task Force is reviewing these issues as well as other concerns in the Juvenile Correctional system.

With these opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would recommend my Estimates for the consideration of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 62(a)(2). The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, following the normal practice, I would like a ruling from the Chair as to whether or not we hold the Minister's Compensation in abeyance until we have dealt with his Estimates in full.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Resolution 62(a)(2) Salaries. . .

MR. BILTON: I take it. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We come back to the Minister's Salary at the end.

MR. BILTON: I beg your pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We come back to - the Minister's Salary is the last item.

MR. BILTON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just a brief comment to the Minister. I thank him very much for his report this evening, for being very very explicit. But I do feel that he's taken us on to platitudes that those of us around this table would like a little rendering down of the fat, so to speak. We're talking about

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . \$14 million of the people's money. And the amazing thing to me is that in all these comments he didn't give us any statistics as to the problem we're facing today. He talked of the various organizations that have been set up and various committees that have been set up to study this and study that and study the other. I think we've got over the studying stage, Mr. Chairman, and we would like some facts, and as we go through these Estimates I hope and trust we will get some of the facts that are very important to the little people, the people this \$14 million is placed there to help. I don't want to see a situation develop where we're top heavy on administration and lack of spending on the people we're endeavouring to help, and I would hope that the Minister is quite prepared to give us some of the facts that we may inquire of him this evening. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, on this section I'd like to ask the Minister to be a little bit more forthcoming on the explanation of why it is really in the past six months three senior officials probably charged with the major policy of responsibilities in the department have either resigned or been transferred out of their departments. It seems to me that normally when personnel changes occur it usually indicates a change in policy or program or whatever. There have been some charges laid about morale but I think that's a difficult thing to define. But it does indicate that there has obviously by the major shift in the department under his control been personnel changes of a fairly radical nature, and I think that if that's a fair sign of something going on then I think it would be very useful if the Minister was able to detail much more clearly what is happening in his department. Is it a sign of things going wrong or things going right that these changes have been made and which have been made in such a wholesale way at the top level? I believe when I say three in number I think that's right, there may have been more but those are the ones I'm aware of which have either resigned or transferred. And while I recognize that the Minister says they may be going on to bigger and better things, I presume that if a department was gearing itself up for a major revitalization, then the bigger and better things would be here in Manitoba, not in Alberta or elsewhere, and that I think that that is really what requires some explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: We're on the . . . I don't want to be stuffy on this, Mr. Chairman, I know what the member's question is, I would be glad to answer his question but I just wondered whether I should answer on this particular item or not. We're on salaries relative to the operation of the Minister's office. In this area, there's been no changes in this. The three . . . you're talking about the three people who may have been changing their jobs within the department, not outside of the department, I assume.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're handicapped in this sense, that this comes under 7, there is no item under this department that deals with administration and therefore if the Chairman follows his normal precedent we wouldn't be able to discuss that overall change under the specific program areas. So there's really only one area that kind of works under the rubric of the Minister and because of the curious nature of the way the department is set up, we don't have an administrative sector to deal with.

MR. BOYCE: Well through you, Mr. Chairman, if I may, even if we're both out of order I can answer your question now.

MR. AXWORTHY: Okay. As long as we share the out of order.

MR. BOYCE: There were three positions, and one of the people that you're referring to is going on secondment to the home office in England. One of the other people who is actually the Director of Corrections, he is in the position of Acting Assistant Deputy Minister at the moment. The person who left on March 12th after giving ample notice, I was very sorry to see him go, but he was Acting Director of Corrections, Adults and he has left to go to Alberta. The other gentleman, I don't know if you were in the room or not when I mentioned that the Acting Director of Corrections for the Juvenile system had indicated that he thought he might make his contribution in this field through the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society, has subsequently changed his mind and is staying with us.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, that's the right question, Mr. Chairman. And back to the Minister: could he then explain what happens now in terms of these positions? Are they filled or are they all being held on an acting basis? Are the slots going to be occupied? And again, the second part of my question really was, does it indicate a significant change in departmental policy or program that would bring these about? Is it a matter of disagreements about the direction of the department or is it pure coincidence and accident that all these things happened at the same time?

MR. BOYCE: I believe in answering questions with candor, I honestly can't answer whether it's disagreement with direction. But nevertheless what is being changed, hopefully, is in co-operation with the Solicitor-General's office, they are seconded from the Federal Government to our system for a period of two years. Mr. Doug Clark who is one of their senior administrators, in the hope that between the co-operation of our department and the Solicitor-General that we can move towards the rationalization of the duplication of services in the province in the correctional field. Now I'm sorry, with reference to the Assistant Director who went to Alberta, many of the things that we are working on are because of his initiatives. I'm sorry I can't be any more candid than that.

MR. AXWORTHY: Let me ask a question in that respect, Mr. Chairman. I am interested in the Minister's description, particularly in the last instance, because while the initiatives may have been taken - I guess the concern I'm expressing is, are they now being frustrated, whether by dictum from on high or whether internally in the department itself; that you can take initiatives and if they don't sort of seem to be going anywhere - does it reflect some blockage in the system that these initiatives cannot be carried out or are in a sense being strung out for too long a period of time. Because I think in many cases the individuals in question have been with the department for a matter of a couple of years, had placed certain programs in process and now seem to be abandoning them, which seems a sort of strange thing to do. You know, a professional in the field would usually commit himself to a certain set of objectives and what I find strange, would be leaving apparently just before those objectives are being realized, that just somehow does not jive with normal behaviour of committed sort of public servants who have a strong commitment to the field.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I suppose all people, you know, share frustrations at times and I will have to accept the responsibility that sometimes I can't move as fast as the staff would like us to. But nevertheless I know that most of my senior staff have been offered salaries by both the Federal Government and other provincial governments which are highly competitive, and they have given me a commitment to stay here. So, while I understand the member's question, I can't give him more of an answer than that.

MR. AXWORTHY: I'll pass on this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BILTON: Following on with the comment. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BILTON: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm wondering in this item (a)(2) Salaries, \$33,000.00, I'm wondering if the Minister could identify the people who are involved in this salary. I'm wondering if the Minister could introduce the gentleman who is sitting beside him; the one gentleman I have had the pleasure of meeting but I have not met the other gentleman. I wonder if he could introduce these gentlemen and tell us just exactly what their functions are within his particular department. I'm talking of the two gentlemen sitting immediately to your left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: I'm sorry I was remiss. I should have done that. Going from my left is Mr. Rick Stevenson - I don't know what his title is, I know that we keep moving him around and he's had several jobs within our department. What's your title today? He's Administrative Officer. Next to him we have Bruce Johnston who is an administrative assistant and Dr. John Banmen as Associate Deputy Minister. Mr. Reid is an assistant to the Deputy Minister and Mr. Eric Cox is the Assistant Deputy Minister who is going to the home office as of the first of the year. General S. Graham is

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) Chairman and Managing Director of the Alcoholism Foundation, Dr. Jerry Dragen(?) is in charge of probation and Mr. Stu Hunter is the Acting Director of Corrections (Juveniles), and Mr. . . . is the financial officer with the Alcoholism Foundation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Minister, but I don't believe that these gentlemen are involved in this particular salary. I was asking of the gentlemen, actually there was Dr. Tavener over here. I do not recognize the other gentlemen with him. I was wondering just exactly what their position is within this particular department and whether their salaries are involved in this particular item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: To my immediate left is Dr. Roy Tavener who is Chief Medical Consultant to the Minister of Health, is Chief Psychiatrist in the province and he acts as Deputy Minister to myself and they appointed you to some board here last Friday. What board was that? The Pension . . . His salary is contained in the Estimates of the Minister of Health. Next to Dr. Tavener is Mr. Peter Schmidt who is in the Finance Department of the Department of Health and Social Development. I think that your particular salary is contained in the Resources Division of the Department which is contained in my colleague, Mr. Desjardins' Estimates.

MR. BROWN: So the \$33,000 that we're talking about over here is the amount of money that is paid to all these . . .

MR. BOYCE: No, no, that's relative to the operation of my office. I have one assistant and two staff persons and a secretary.

MR. BROWN: Two staff people and a secretary.

MR. BOYCE: One secretary and a clerk typist.

MR. BROWN: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm going back to the comments between the Minister and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. I don't think we can leave this situation as it sits at the moment. It seems to me, as pointed out by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that a vacuum is being created by some very important people. At least that's the way it strikes me. Those positions are not presently being occupied by anyone, at least the Minister has not told us so. Are we to understand that the work created by those people that the Minister spoke of very eloquently a few moments ago is still up in the air or is he going to assure us tonight that it's all go with those three programs that those individuals that have left the service?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Well, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, there is only one person who has left the service and a person is being seconded to us by the Federal Government. So we're in full complement at the moment.

MR. BILTON: When the question was asked as to whether or not individuals had left the service the Minister admitted that. Did I misunderstand him?

MR. BOYCE: I'm sorry to the Member for Swan River. I said one person had left the service and one person is being seconded to the home office. I've had one person that did not leave.

MR. BILTON: Well, do I have the assurance of the Minister from this moment on that it's all go in these particular respective positions that we've been talking about? Is the department rendering the services to the individuals that we anticipate or that we're going to be paying for?

MR. BOYCE: You have my assurance that they're doing the best job possible.

MR. BILTON: It isn't the matter of best, Mr. Minister. Are they doing the best job?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. BILTON: We're lost somewhere. Yes, we're lost somewhere. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

MR. WILSON: I don't quite agree with the Minister in charge of Autopac because I've been listening intently and the Minister's office, that means he has three people in his office besides himself and all of these, what we used to call administrative people or the expertise of the Minister, they don't appear anywhere in here. They're off in Mr. Desjardins' department somewhere. This is what I find confusing. The Minister's got almost \$15 million here and I felt that these gentlemen out here were part of the complement of that \$15 million, somewhere in it, and I find that most of them are in another department.

Then my other thought was I had asked the Minister under the question period and he said, I'll take it up with my Estimates, and the Member for Fort Rouge asked a question and mine was a little more specific. I said: is it true that the former Superintendent of Headingley Jail, Mr. Doug Lawrence, has resigned as Director of Corrections? And is it true that on Wednesday of last week the Acting Director of Juvenile Correction Division who is here tonight, Mr. Stewart Hunter, has also resigned? You told me that you'd give me the answers in your Estimates. Well I'm here tonight and I'd like to have them. Are you saying that Mr. Hunter is staying on and Mr. Lawrence has gone to Alberta? Is that the answer? Did I hear correctly, or what?

MR. BOYCE: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to come back to what seems to be an increasingly Byzantine kind of arrangement here and it may be one of the problems this curious cross-hatching between the Department of Health and Social Development and the Department of Corrections. It's kind of tough without a program to know who's on first base and who's calling signals or anything . . .

A MEMBER: You can say that again.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . whatever analogy you want to use. I'm not sure like who's doing what anymore. I'm wondering, does that kind of confusion that seems to be reflected in staff positions, where you've got one member receiving an apportionment from one department but serving responsibilities under your jurisdiction, does that reflect in the program itself? I mean do we end up sort of where we've got rehabilitation of juveniles that is under your jurisdiction but then somehow it gets integrated with District Health Services or probation? What I'm trying to suggest I guess is that it seems to me that maybe the departmental organization is the awkward thing, that's trying to kind of put a - I was going to say "pig in a poke" but that's really not very complimentary - let's just sort of say to put a small box in a big box or something and try to work out some relationships between them doesn't seem to be working very well.

Maybe that's the question we really should be asking the Minister: does this sort of curious relationship of a Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation which has some specific duties working in effect within a larger department sharing Deputy Ministers and sharing Assistant Ministers and sharing directors and sharing programs, it doesn't seem to be a very clean orderly line of responsibility. While I never got hung up on organizational charts it would strike me that that may be one of the difficulties that is probably reflected in the whole Department of Health and Social Development. It's so large and labyrinth like that we don't know what's really going on. I would really like to ask the Minister, because he is always very candid with us, does he find this arrangement to be a workable one in terms of being able to set very clear purposes, get policy implemented in a very explicit kind of way without having to kind of run into static or cross currents because there's so many other kinds of inter-relationships with other departments and other people and other staff and everything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Well it does cause problems but nevertheless I have tried to operate in this way because I happen to agree with the lineup at the present time. The only way to handle it would be to split it off into another department and then you'd have to duplicate all the staff. Because as you well know in the social service field there are many people who are involved, for example, in the field of abhorrent behaviour and one area - we call it mental health, you may call it juvenile delinquency - or this sort of thing.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd)

Now the government put out a White Paper some number of years ago and the White Paper on health policy is a goal to evolve toward. Now I don't know whether it would work or not if it wasn't for the people that are involved in the staff that have a horrendous job to do. The Associate Deputy Minister, Ron Johnston, who is over the Resources Division for both Ministries, you know, has a horrendous job. Mr. Schmidt is a left or righthand man, and I forget which one it is, but - both he tells me. It does cause problems.

But nevertheless in the whole field of social services the government at the moment has established this policy that this is the way it will be until we resolve some of the difficulties vis-a-vis the Federal Government in the whole field of social services cost-sharing and with the Correctional Act. It does cause us some problems, I admit that.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me just speculate for a moment then that I would feel that the question about duplications is something we all have to guard against. But it would seem to me by the description of duties that the Minister put forward - there's usually a very clear set of tasks that you're being asked to perform. You're looking after the area of corrections and the different programs that come under that area. I'm talking about the rehabilitative programs and then it swings off into the drug and alcohol field.

Would it not just make more sense really in effect to shear that one away from what is I think an acknowledged jigsaw puzzle called the Department of Health and Social Development which has all kinds of pieces that fit in and sometimes never fit, and just take a very specific well-defined task and do it without getting yourself all complicated with all these other connections. I suppose if you want to get some administrative help that's fairly easy to do because each department has a degree of self-sufficiency. But why are we trying to kind of, it seems to me almost unnaturally, force these things together when you have a very specific set of tasks, which I think deserves the attention of a Minister in the programs that you've set up. I would suggest, and I say so looking from the outside though, runs into perhaps some of the problems of complication and frustration simply because of the way in which it's organized at the present time. The government has not really taken it more to its logical extension and simply said, that's a job we want done, let's get somebody to do it and here's a group of people, and give you the job and let you go without worrying about all these other kinds of things. I just have a - like what's the old problem you know about running troikas, you know, you've got three horses running in the same direction and it takes a very strong person to hold the reins and in this case you in fact have two Ministers holding the reins. I'm just really suggesting that maybe we should be going the other way. Maybe we should be shearing it away and if necessary borrowing some of the things from the Attorney-General's Department, which I'm sure he'd be glad to give up because he has more than enough to do with all his wiretapping problems these days, to let go and --(Interjection)-- That's right. All my friends in Ottawa help him out.

So that's really the question I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister really, is that when we're looking at the benefit of this program that the government has established whether or not in fact we're creating a lot of organizational drag simply because of the way in which it's been set up as a hybrid organization.

MR. BOYCE: There is some, as usual, some validity to the member's suggested position. There are those that argue that there should be a parallel and the establishment of a Solicitor-General's function.

But there's also an equal group that says that it should be a Department of Social Services. In some areas you know it's aligned differently. In Alberta for example they have an Attorney-General and a Solicitor-General and then in Saskatchewan for example they have a Minister of Social Services. You know you could go back to the old argument of Health and Welfare type of thing.

Doubtless in the next few years there probably should be some shifts. Well, I may sound a bit conservative in this. If I had my "druthers" I would "druther" --(Interjection)-- Well as long as you spell it with a small "c" I suppose it's all right.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

MR. AXWORTHY: You spell it with a "K" actually.

MR. BOYCE: I think that to do things in a logical sequence we should work towards it over the next two years to see how things line up because of the shifts in the cost-sharing arrangements with the Federal Government. Because if we do it prematurely then we're just going to create new problems. We have problems and we're trying to solve them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last year before we went into the Estimates, and the Estimates at that time were a lot more modest than what they are at this particular time, but the Minister at that time drew up a diagram of his various programs that he was wanting, who was in charge of each program, who answered to who in his particular department. I found that this was most beneficial and it certainly helped me along to establish within my own mind who was responsible for each separate program that he was carrying out. I think that something like this would be very beneficial to us and I don't think that we would be floundering quite as much as what we are at the present time.

So I wonder if the Minister would be able to give us this particular diagram so that we could see just exactly who is responsible for which department and how these things tie in with other programs that he is running.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 62(a) (2)--pass. (a)(3)--pass. Resolution 62 (b), Manpower and Program Review and Development, (1)-Salaries. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, with your leeway, I understood the Minister to indicate that this was the section within his department that was doing an overall program evaluation of the different institutions in his care. Is that correct? Things like the Manitoba Treatment Centre and so forth. I wonder if then it would be proper to ask questions of the Minister relating to that program evaluation review, as opposed to dealing with them under the separate items of juvenile offenders and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will be guided by the Minister. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, if I might then, let me just raise with the Minister some questions about the concerns I think that I have had and certainly have been expressed in a wider public scale about the lack of cohesion in the treatment program particularly for young offenders, and that many of the facilities and programs presently operative are either serving purposes for which they were not designed or not serving any purpose at all.

Let me give, by way of example, the problem with the Manitoba Treatment Centre which I believe he said was under review, where it was initially established as a detention centre for short-term holding of offenders who had been charged but had not been sentenced. Yet the evidence seems to indicate, and I could be corrected, but I'd raise it with him, whether in fact the detention centre is becoming a long-term holding centre where people who are charged are sometimes being compelled to stay there upwards of 50 or 60 days which I think the Minister acknowledged in a question I raised in the House. And that the forensic treatments are very long in coming when ordered by the court, that the young offenders of different kinds of crimes, some of the serious psychotic nature, others of a very minor nature are held in the same cottage for long periods of time without much in the way of educational preparation or of treatment which has led to some of the disturbances that have been experienced at the treatment centre. Many of the people placed there are brought in from far northern areas, from isolated communities, brought into a pretty, you know, I think strange environment, brought into that modernistic design in Tuxedo, a long way from some of those very far northern reserve areas.

So that would be one area that I'd be concerned about, that in fact, is a program evaluation concluded that you've done or has it reached the stage where it simply says that the treatment centre, the Manitoba Youth Treatment Centre is being required to fulfill a lot of functions that it was not designed to fulfill. The reason why it's doing so

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) is simply because we don't have a full category or catalogue of treatment options in the province to deal with juvenile offenders. I would be interested to know whether in fact the review has come up with these conclusions or if not what sort of assessment they have made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if this wouldn't be better discussed under Part (d) of this section.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's why I asked the Minister at the outset. He said that there was a program review of the whole area and I was wondering if he wanted to deal with it as a matter of the overall review. I mean I'm quite prepared to deal with it in any other section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Well, you know, as long as people get their questions answered. You know if we get sticky you can get into difficulties, then I guess we'd have to be more formal than otherwise. I could answer this now perhaps.

I acknowledge the fact that the member asked me a question in the House about the 50 days. There are on occasions people who are held for longer than would be normal because of the logistics of it. People that come in for forensic assessments from the north or something like that.

But to your question about program evaluation. Now of course we're in the area of difficulty. One way of answering your question perhaps is to remind you, doubtless you're aware, that there are generally accepted three main learning theories of which there are about five different arrangements. Just looking at three theories of learning with five different alternatives that gives you fifteen types of programs which you would have to put in place. You know you can take Freudian . . . or Misbehaviour Mod or whatever, you know, there are always things coming in and out of vogue. And of course this is one of the problems in the social service field is that there are really no criterion which you can measure the performances of service against.

In fact I found this generally speaking of great benefit, this enquiry into Civil Rights that the McCreer Committee did in Ontario. In dealing with the question of professionalism, Legislatures historically have set up a group, they call them the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba and it becomes incumbent upon this group to say when a group is performing satisfactory professionally in the deliver of medical services. We do the same thing with the legal profession; we do the same thing with the dental profession. So as far as the evaluation of programs we still are searching for some type of evaluated techniques. It still comes down to the, more or less, subject opinion of competent people.

So if you can attract people who have a reputation in the field and rely on the judgment of these people in consultation with the people in the community I think it is much better than trying to say whether a particular program is successful because then you have to define what you mean by success. I hope I'm answering the member's question. I see a look of consternation on his face. Perhaps I'm not.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I find the Minister's explanation about the theories interesting. But I guess the point I'm trying to raise is that you've initiated a program review and evaluation of the whole area of treatment of young offenders running . . . with the Federal program.

We have certain specific facilities in the Province of Manitoba. They're established in a continuum beginning with the treatment centre through to the girls and boys home, through to some group homes, through to some foster homes. I mean we have a whole series of options in effect, which are designed to deal with young people, different stages of problems or with different kinds of problems.

Now the thing I'm trying to reach is; have you diagnosed the gaps or inadequacies in the present system so that you can take the pressure and the disfunctioning off places like the Treatment Centre which to my estimation are being asked to perform a number of things that it was never designed to perform, that we're putting the pressure on things like the Treatment Centre simply because there aren't enough other options available. That's why you're getting these kids spending 60 days in there waiting for

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) forensic treatment as opposed to having other options, whether it's for example community care in their own local communities where you get the local constable to say, "look, you keep the kid under guardianship until such time as he comes to trial." You know, those kinds of options which I realize may not be as universal as looking for the proper learning theory. But it seems to me that we've got some very serious blockages in the system right now and I'm wondering if on the first assessment that you've done whether you identified those blockages and whether in fact your program review is coming forth with some conclusions as to how we can release them and provide a more adequate range of options and services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, this paragraph (b) is quite explicit and what concerns me is that this thing didn't happen overnight. It talks about, provides planning, review of development services within the ministry. The program also develops information systems for monitoring and evaluating programs, works with community organizations, development correctional programs and co-ordinates manpower and training. That's a bunch of tripe to me. That's just a filler.

Now here a year ago the salaries were \$140,000. This year they're \$165,000 which suggests to me that there's an additional person possibly of \$25,000 income. A year ago other expenditures were \$13,400. Mr. Minister, they're \$110,000 this year which suggests to me that's just a mediocre advertising program in the interests of the department. Tell us about this. What's this all about? Are you hiring someone else at \$25,000 and if so what are they going to do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: To the Member for Fort Rouge first of all, Mr. Chairman. The question has been studied to death. I would suggest the senior staff is wholly apprised of, you know, the shortcomings of the system. In my jargon when I say "planning" on something, I wouldn't include planning unless I intended to do something about it. But when the Member from Swan River says, you know, this is window-dressing . . .

MR. BILTON: It sure is.

MR. BOYCE: . . . and that part of it goes back to the Member for Fort Rouge's question. If you will recall that the Youth Centre had been on the drafting boards for a goodly number of years and it wasn't brought to fruition until 1970. I'm not faulting anybody because this epitomizes the attitude of Legislatures across the country to commit funds in this particular area including our own. But when they opened the door the place was too small. The staff has been after me for example for houses and hopefully we'll be able to move in this direction. But to the Member for Swan River, I have to report that there was a Federal-Provincial Committee on Staff Development. Now this may be a rather abstruse point but nevertheless in my mind it's fundamental to the whole system.

It's difficult for me to hire staff, for example, in The Pas when you can get \$2.00 an hour more for pulling nails out of a board than I can pay you for working as a correctional officer. So one of the things that happened is when I took over this ministry the Committee on Manpower which was chaired by a chap by the name of Dunfield, who was a very capable, competent man, I assigned an Assistant Deputy Minister of that particular committee at that time and as a result all across the country everybody else upgraded this committee. In co-operation with the Federal Government Manitoba is avant-garde in this staff development thing and hopefully most of this money will be recovered from the Federal Government.

As far as the increase is concerned, most of it is because of inflation and MGEA contracts negotiations last year and anticipated for this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: A big item, Other Expenditures, \$110,000. Over \$13,000 last year.

MR. BOYCE: That's the expenses of the program that I was just talking about, on this staff development type of thing, hopefully which a goodly part of it will be recovered from the Federal Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just wondering, who is doing the monitoring and evaluating of programs? If these programs are being evaluated by the various departments themselves I'm sure that the Minister is going to get every biased evaluation. I wonder if he could tell us who is doing the evaluating of these programs.

I would like him to identify the community organizations over here that he is speaking of and I am wondering just exactly what programs he is tearing out as far as co-ordinating manpower and training development is concerned. I wonder if he can give us some indication of the type of program that is carried out that is mentioned over here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: As I mentioned in my opening remarks there is a three-level-five-program type of development. What I would hope to do is bring this particular thrust to fruition in 1977 and in co-operation with the University of Brandon and Keewatin Community College we will have an undergraduate course in place and a postgraduate course in place and the technical course in place. These people that everybody keeps screaming at me that I should hire, who aren't available, will be available for working in these kinds of institutions.

MR. BROWN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the Minister really has answered the question that I've asked of him. Who is doing the evaluating for instance? What community organizations is he speaking of over here? And what programs under manpower and training development is he carrying out?

MR. BOYCE: If you will recall the Member for River Heights asked me a question in the Legislature about the names which were in a computerized program. Well this is part of it. There are in each community a number of people who are interested and involved in those things which have some responsibility. School boards, NCOs in charge of RCM Police Detachments, Regional Development Corporations, other public institutions which we hope to be able to communicate with so that when we have something to discuss with the community as we move towards a community-type of correctional system, these people will be apprised of what the thinking is, how they can make a contribution and the rest of it.

So it could be anybody. In the City of Winnipeg, for example, it could well be the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society. In Churchill it is the District Health Board. In Thompson the people who are mostly involved with this at the moment are the Board of Directors of the St. Anthony's Hospital. In Thompson it is the board of the hospital and a number of councillors on the town council. I don't know just exactly if the member has a more specific question. These are the type of community organizations that we'll be dealing with.

MR. BROWN: Well, yes, this still is a very big answer. I would like to pin it down to specific organizations and so on that it would seem to me are mentioned under this particular item. But if the Minister does not have this answer maybe he could give me this answer at some other time.

Then I'd like to move on to the evaluating of programs. Who is doing your actual evaluating of programs? Who is doing your actual evaluating of programs? How successful is your program? Are they putting in the best input? Who is doing the evaluating of the particular programs that you're carrying out?

MR. BOYCE: Well, as I said earlier in response to a question from the Member for Fort Rouge, it is competent staff who I don't question the professional ethics of. In their judgment the programs are being performed as best as possible and I accept their advice. Being a fellow politician you will admit ultimately that it is the public that decides.

But in the adult system - here once again when you say evaluate programs, who evaluates it? Well, I repeat, at the moment we're still subject to subjective judgment. The Federal Government has spent some three millions of dollars devising a mathematical model system, it's in co-operation or in the area of the CanJus system or the CanJus committee rather which is a Canadian criminal justice system information services. In co-operation with Systems Dimension Limited, they have devised a mathematical model which they are refining, and they will use such things as recidivism rates

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) harshness of sentence and all the rest of it, to try and evaluate mathematically, you know, how effective programs are. But nevertheless the utilization of this, you know, this type of a mathematical model I would hazard the opinion it is ten years down the road before they can refine it to the point where it will be of some utility.

MR. BROWN: I realize, Mr. Chairman, that a program such as this is extremely difficult to evaluate. I'm just wondering whether he is in contact with other provinces and so on, I imagine that they have programs of a similar nature, whether there was any comparison of notes to see whether this program is as successful as what it is in other provinces and I am fairly certain that the Minister is doing this. But then I wonder, can he tell us just what kind of training and development program he is in at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: I guess perhaps I could give a specific which might answer the member's questions. There are a number of different models of treatment such as key groups, or encounter groups, or behaviour modification or whatever so the senior staff determines what type of treatment the department will be involved, and these people have to be trained. You don't make a counsellor, you know, overnight. Now a number of years ago the Corrections across the country were shifted from the Attorneys-General, by and large, over to the Health and Social Development area by setting up a Department of Social Services or as we did here, setting up a Ministry within a department. Now I reported to you last year that a goodly number of our staff would retire within a few years, so the attraction of staff to be involved has to be against the knowledge which is available at the moment. So that if you're going to train people to deal with others' aberrant behaviour, if you will, in a way which they can go back into society as best we can, as best we can, I repeat, then these people have to go through a training period.

MR. BROWN: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister can tell me about how long a training program of this type takes as a rule or whether they start working immediately and are training while they are seeing patients, so to speak, or just what is the involvement, this particular training program?

MR. BOYCE: I'm going to get the latest on this one.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

MR. BOYCE: I am advised at the moment the initial orientation course for correctional officers or people moving into the system at that level is a two-week orientation course and then they take, over the next two years, they take 24 days each year as part of their ongoing training in the correctional system. But nevertheless if you're hiring professional people then you try and hire them at the level to which they purport to have some professional expertise.

MR. BROWN: Well then, Mr. Minister, after two weeks of training, what type of person who has had two weeks of training, what type of person could he possibly be able to treat? This seems to me a very very short period of time.

MR. BOYCE: Well these people in their two weeks of training aren't involved in treatment, they are correctional officers. There are four levels of correctional officers and they go through this training and promotional system. If somebody comes as a correctional officer into this system, he's given minor responsibilities within the system. He wouldn't be counselling somebody at this level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me come back to a point. I take the Minister's stand that the Program Review and Development is an important part of his program and anything that costs a quarter of a million dollars is important. Let me say that the usefulness about that kind of a division is to identify weaknesses and once they identify them, to get some solutions to them. Now let me say what I think are the weaknesses and then let the Minister tell me whether, through his Program Review and Evaluation, whether they are or not and if they are, what he's going to do about them as a base upon the evaluation.

For example, I would suggest that at the present Manitoba Youth Treatment

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) Centre, there is not proper psychiatric care or psychological care for the children who must stay in there for long periods of time. That it was not designed for that but that is the way it has become and therefore you've got young offenders, charged with juvenile delinquent offences, coming in from a variety of strange backgrounds who are really, not because of the inadequacies of the staff but just simply that they are not set up for that program, and therefore you have a number of children with serious disorders and behavior problems which are not being treated. And that's one area.

A second area which I think that that program evaluation should identify is the fact that the group home structure that has been set up as way of, once an offence has been tied down, have not been evaluated, there is no licensing system and that there have been charges made that many people use group homes as an entrepreneurial activity as opposed to a treatment activity. Now has the program review identified those weaknesses and if so are we going to get licensing systems, are we going to change the group home structure?

A third area is that in the holding schools, the Manitoba Home for Schools for boys and for girls, there really again is not a full-scale occupational program, a training program for them. If that's so, what are we going to do about it?

And fourthly, for the most serious cases of juvenile offences or offenders where they need a totally closed facility with very intensive treatment, we in fact are having to send kids to Arizona and Saskatchewan and Florida, sometimes upwards of cost of \$18,000 to \$20,000 a year, out of province because we don't have a proper facility in the Province of Manitoba or close at hand to use, and as a result we're not getting that kind of concern.

Now those are the things, totally as a layman, I would say that I think in that whole stream of treatment of offenders there are serious weaknesses. I'd like the Minister to confirm whether those are weaknesses as have been assessed under this evaluation and if they are so, has that evaluation now come up with a strategy or a program or some, even initial sort of initiatives to combat those weaknesses and to offset them.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would agree with everything that the Member for Fort Rouge says except I would change the word from weakness to problem. Those are the problems that is true. These are the problems of this particular Ministry, and it's to the solution of these problems that we try to move. Now implicit in the question is the assumption that, you know, that the solutions to these problems are available somewhere at the present time, and I think the member would be the first to admit that this is not so. There's many things that we can't cure. But nevertheless as best we can within the budgetary limits of the Ministry, also the availability of the professions to provide those services, is another limitation. And I'm not rationalizing or using this as an excuse because I share the member's concern in this particular area. And I don't want to say that some of these are over under the Child Welfare Act so they're not my responsibility. We're all in this room responsible as best we can for all the people in the province and we've got to move towards a solution of these problems.

Somebody mentioned earlier about, you know, staff's frustration, every once in awhile one of the judges ex cathedra from the bench in frustration says we have to have better forensic services. And I concur with them. We have to move in that direction and try and avail ourselves of the best possible therapeutic processes and the people to deliver those services.

The member mentions about group homes. I don't know if the member recalls an experiment in Ontario a few years ago where they gathered together a very interested group of people who spent full time living with these people. I don't know if you're familiar with the individuals who were involved and saw them a year later - they could have changed places. As I said earlier in this regard, I get accused of being once again a little conservative but I'd rather not get the people of the province . . .

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . Mr. Chairman, to say that the Minister should be careful because my wife at one point worked in some of those . . .

MR. BOYCE: Yes, I know she did, she did a good job, too. She can come

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) back to work anytime.

Anyway I would much rather opt, albeit I have to accept the criticism of the Member for Fort Rouge and some of the people from the bench, it is better for us to try at this time to build a strong foundation on which to build because one of the things is, in this person to person relationship, in dealing with aberrant behaviour, staff burnout is one of the biggest problems, and in trying to build career paths and places that these people can move through a system, I think if we can offer careers for people in therapeutic processes whether it be my ministry or some other ministry, I think we're well advised to move slowly. Nevertheless, as we bring onstream these different group homes--there's one of my problems, too, oftentimes very competent staff will leave my ministry and set up a private agency and then we fund it through another way and it's a staff development problem also.

MR. AXWORTHY: Okay, we now agree that we can identify some major problems and I'll concede to the Minister's wording of that.

Again I want to come to this point, though. First he says that there are budgetary limitations, okay; and there are always budgetary limitations, but there are a couple of questions that have to be asked. First, has this division or the people working in it come up with a set of proposals to Cabinet or that can be presented to Cabinet to overcome those budgetary limitations. And let me make this case for that, Mr. Chairman. That is that there is obviously a direct connection between the problems in treating young offenders and the eventual result is they become old offenders and that our adult institutions are probably populated by 80 percent of the people who came up through the juvenile delinquency racket; if you look at who's in Headingly most of them have had juvenile records before they got there, so obviously we're not effectively meeting that need. So we would probably save ourselves a lot of time and trouble if we met the problem early on rather than later on. So I'm saying that while I don't like to be sitting here advocating big expenditures, I am saying has this planning department, this planning program thing, said, okay, look, we've got some very specific ways, whether it's hiring three more psychiatrists or developing a closed facility for the treatment of highly disordered young juvenile delinquents rather than sending them off to Arizona where we now, I gather, send them or Florida wherever in heaven's name they go for a very expensive dollar, do we have some program in mind where the Minister now can either say, I'm going to be taking that to Cabinet in the next six months and I hope to therefore have some action on it? Are we a year away from it, are we two years away, are we six months away? Where are we at in terms of setting that priority, getting agreement from your colleagues and taking some action? I think that that's one set of issues. I think in terms of the overall policy planning one.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I also identified some problem areas, the Minister agreed with such as on the group home areas where right now some action could be taken in terms of the question of making sure that the group homes that were set up were properly supervised and licensed, so that they were not simply kind of rip-off places but were places that had some treatment for certain kind of offences in them. That's something I don't think takes an awful lot of effort or a long term strategy, it's something that can be done in fairly immediate terms simply by - I don't think you should have a group home frankly if it doesn't have some basic guideline and control as to what happens in that home. It should be done on the basis that you're not simply providing a roof over someone's head but you're also doing something in the way of therapy or treatment or care of a different kind of nature.

So I would raise those two questions with the Minister. First can we expect that as a result of his program evaluation review that the Government of Manitoba will be taking immediate action in the very near future on these problems and finding the solutions within the means over whatever time period they want? And secondly, can we expect some very immediate action on some of these very immediate problems?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: No comment, sir, I'm sorry, I didn't make . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

MR. BOYCE: The member asked a couple of questions and made a few statements and the statements I more or less agree with. The questions, you know, about the resolution of the problem - firstly, the member says that a goodly number of people in Headingley are there because they have had juvenile records --(Interjection)-- Yes, they've had juvenile records. I'll have to hazard a guess on this, but I think there's about 10,000 young people involved with the law in a year. We have about 4,700 - you know, this is another item actually - but 4,700 involved with the Manitoba Youth Centre, the Manitoba Home for Boys and the Manitoba Home for Girls. Most of these people do not go to Headingley and it is a result of the action that is being taken by these people in the juvenile system and has been going on for years, and I hate to admit it but even before this government got in here, because the probation department, I happen to have been involved with it as a private citizen within the community, and we had a number of foster children in our house and we did not provide therapeutic programs, all we provided was in loco parentis type of involvement. This, of course, is the discretion of the probation officer, is to try and locate people who can help these children, whether it's a voluntary probation officer or a person who can manage a group home or some parent who is willing to take a child into their house and help them, but to suggest that all of the people who are involved in the juvenile system end up in Headingley, maybe I misinterpret the member's statement, but most of these people, in fact we have a probation juvenile correction system which historically, traditionally has been second to none in North America. I sincerely hope that I can keep it so and move on with . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I still want to come back to some questions like what are we going to do - I guess that's what I'm asking - what can we do about these things? And, again, I, you know, go to the report that was commissioned, the Ryant Report which said, they had very specific recommendations about actions the government could take in terms of setting up more permanent foster home situations, looking at the group home structure, there's more recommendations than I could swallow here in one evening, but I think the Minister's read it as well as I have in terms of the treatment of foster homes, group homes. And frankly, Mr. Minister, there's a great deal of urgency in this report, because they say that there is almost a total lack of preventative child caring that offsets the problems really before they become serious, not only in the child welfare field but in the juvenile correction field and the whole field of care, so that's what bothers me, is really that issue that it seems to me that we keep getting lost in this area that we're evaluating, reviewing and assessing, and I'm still trying to come down saying okay, there's been this study, you've got a department that's spending a quarter of a million dollars doing the same thing, when can we expect some very specific actions by the Government of Manitoba in dealing with the problems that we've both identified and both agree on, when can we expect some proper allocations of budgets, whether it means altering the foster home program to set up permanent foster homes as they say that are trained to deal with a certain kind of child with certain aberrant behaviours or disorders or whatever it may be. That's all I'm trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, is to simply say, okay, what are we going to do now, when are we going to do it, how much is it going to cost, and what can we expect as members of the other side of the House so that we can't come back and ask the same questions next year? Can we get some bench marks so that if we have to clobber you next year because you haven't done it at least we know where we start; we say, you made this commitment this year, this is what's going to be done to solve these problems, so we just don't go through the same process next year and say, gee whiz and wring our hands and say there's a helluva lot of problems in this field and we've got this Program Review Department that's reviewing them again and we're right back to square one. What we want to come back and say, can you give us your plan of action between now and the time we meet next year, if we meet in fact next year?

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I wish I could give the member a definite timetable of you know, on such and such a date such a program will start, you know, the next program will start. I have to go back a bit, I'm just going to go a little bit and

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) come right back to your question.

I regret that the Federal Government chose to bring in two pieces of legislation in this field before they brought in the Young Person in Conflict with the Law, because I think most people in our society, as mentioned by the Member for Swan River earlier, you know, the crime rate has not dropped, a lot of people have good programs that seem reasonable and modest in the area of crime prevention, and you recall when the Prime Minister announced his intention to bring in wage and price controls and all the rest of it and asked different jurisdictions to constrain their budgets, he said that in the area of violent crime and crime prevention this wasn't going to apply. Now in co-operation with the Attorney-General and his staff, our staff is working to develop modest modalities of programs that we can put in place, but we have to wait until the Solicitor-General has a better idea of exactly, you know, what the federal commitment is going to be on this particular area. Because here again - perhaps I'm naive in this regard - I think that if all the provinces in co-operation with the Solicitor-General can keep politics out of it as much as possible that we can solve some of the problems. I said it facetiously in one instance that I've looked all the way back to the Regina Manifesto and I can't find a policy on this, and this is how we are trying to operate. So in the area of prevention we have modalities of programs. You know yourself that when you're planning something, all the staff gets all gung ho and gets it all down to the point that all they have to do is fill in the blanks and then they go . . . like this and you can't have that. But we are very fortunate because of the relationship between this Ministry before I got here, Mr. Hans Schneider was chairman of the deputy minister's group that met and then with Dr. Roy Tavener and lately with Dr. John Banmen in relationship to get these things going in co-operation with the Attorney-General's people. So in the crime prevention thing we have things that we hoped we've put in place and, of course, if I haven't got them in place next year the member will hit me with it. But in the modalities of programs relative to therapeutic process there is some movement but, you know, I can't give you a specific date when a program is going to start.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, under Program Review, I was going to wait till under the juvenile section, however, it seems to be the Member for Fort Rouge had asked where we're going and I'm more concerned with where we are at today. The Minister mentioned that there seemed to be some problem in locating people to manage these group homes, and I'm just wondering what type of advertising the Minister does in order to - he mentioned some of his staff are leaving the Civil Service in order to go into this and I refer to an article February 25th in the Tribune, Group Home's Established as Money-making projects by was quoted from Mitch Neiman, - and then my own particular problems were sort of emphasized in and that homes saturate the area which is the Wolseley constituency, and I would like the Minister to maybe give me some indication as to where we are going because --(Interjection)-- Pardon me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Well I was wondering if it is because the \$20.00 a day per diem rate is low or what is the problem in locating people to look after or manage these group homes? Maybe if he could answer those then I would go into something else. --(Interjection)-- Well I haven't finished but I didn't want to give you too many at once.

MR. BOYCE: Well relative to the rates, I'm advised that the rates vary from \$12.00 a day to \$41.00 a day and it is related to the intensity in which you know, the attention of the people have to be focused. Some children, as I mentioned earlier, all it takes is some people to be around. You may have noticed on CBC about a month ago, I guess it was, they had a program that was started by some people in the community - I forget, it's an Indian name - they showed this program on the Fort Alexander Reserve where a number of native children from the core area were being dealt with in the community. Now, as I said earlier, the rate does vary from \$12.00 a day to \$41.00 a day.

MR. WILSON: Well I wonder if you could explain - you see, the Member for Fort Rouge has said we shouldn't provide group homes just to provide a roof and he's got the same concern that I have that we have trained people and if you're advertising, what

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. WILSON cont'd) type of advertising do you do, is it through word of mouth, is it ads appear in the paper or what, because it seems to me that the comment in the report I'm reading that no financial vehicle for capital development of homes seems to be available and it indicates that they recommend that capital and operating costs for homes should be developed. What I'm looking for, I'm not completely satisfied with the setup the way it is. This isn't any criticism of your department but the group homes that you seem to be putting out or getting involved in seem to be concentrated in certain sections of the city and when you tried to put one in to East Kildonan the entire community was up in arms, and I think there should be some emphasis from the senior level of government to spread these out throughout the City of Winnipeg, and possibly what is wrong with the rural setting. Maybe you could give me some comment as to your difference in the urban setting compared to the rural setting because apparently there's only about 25 percent in a rural setting. I wondered what would be wrong with a rural setting compared to going into a particular residential area, because --(Interjection)-- Well, okay, what's bothering me is we have one at 234 Sherburn Street that you have five native juveniles in there and you have five social workers but everybody goes home for supper at six o'clock, a cook comes in and then a friend of the boys or something comes around and he's supposed to be the janitor, caretaker, or supervisor, whatever you want to call him, and it seems that every once in awhile they have particular problems because these fellows are allowed to move around - I guess they are on parole - and twice during my term of office they went berserk and the last time the guy smashed every window in the house, damaged the TV set, terrified the neighbours and the locksmith in the area had a land-office business for the next couple of weeks. And the home is still there and it's just not working out. I don't know whether - I want to be fair- but it just seems that in that type of setting, moving five native boys into a predominantly residential area, maybe they should be in a rural setting where they have more freedom to move around and enjoy themselves.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, it seems to be a normal or predictable reaction when someone wants to establish some type of a facility in a community that the neighborhood is a little apprehensive. I know that from the town of Thompson, for example, that the Alcoholism Foundation, I just draw this in as a parallel, the Alcoholism Foundation brought a number of people down from the area to have them go around and talk to the people in the River-Nassau area over there just to alleviate some of their fears.

If community corrections are going to work it has to be kind of a two-way street, it has to be that the community themselves accept some responsibility. I know on our particular street the houses that go on the market are acquired by the Health Sciences Centre and a number of people moved into this area who hadn't lived in an urban setting and, you know, such things as sleeping on the boulevards, they thought that it was a nice piece of grass and they slept there in the shade of a tree for a couple of months and then when they saw that other people didn't do it, you know, they quit. One particular family that moved there, their children used language which having spent some five years in the navy I was even a little bit taken aback by it, but the neighbourhood treated the young children in an understanding way and as a result of it when the people moved out of the area a couple of years later the children didn't use that kind of language because the community felt that it was part of it. And as I mentioned to the Member for Fort Rouge, I don't want to equivocate on questions but nevertheless the particular facility the member alludes to is not under my jurisdiction, it's under the Minister of Health.

MR. WILSON: I guess really what I'm trying to say, Mr. Minister, is what criteria do you use? We accelerated and we're congratulated for our efforts in post psychiatric work where we allowed all the programs to come into our area, we welcomed them with open arms, and all of a sudden the other agencies seemed to take advantage and I refer to the federal people put an ad in the paper for group homes and when you phoned up you had to be located in the downtown area or they wouldn't even consider you, yet the ad said we want people to look after so and so. So when you phoned up and told them you lived in St. James or St. Vital they weren't interested, they're primarily interested in the bigger homes downtown. What I'm saying is we're paying the same

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. WILSON cont'd) taxes as everybody else, and yet we seem to be because of the fact that we live in the downtown area, we seem to be getting more than our share of these group homes and it is raising a number of concerns, not so much your department, but we have a crisis teacher at both Gordon Bell and Laura Secord School for the first time, there is no room in the day care centres for the long-time families, the working single mothers because they've brought in large families of problem children into these group homes and then you get into it and you start examining it and you look at the rent before and the rent after, there's a letter here saying that it's big business, you've got one particular woman that's looking after about 40 children at \$20.00 a day, she's got about 8 homes in my particular area, you have to say are they getting the particular type of - you know in desperation, as you pointed out, the comment was to provide and find people that are willing to do this. Maybe under your planning section, and that's the section of your budget we're dealing with, maybe we have to examine and say well where are we going wrong, why won't these other communities accept some of the responsibility, and why isn't more emphasis given on a rural setting? And really under Program Review, and that's the section we're dealing with, I say as the Member for Wolseley, we're most dissatisfied with the concentration we have. We support if you would give us one or if - for instance, if you had four and you were to give us two and take two away, fine, but to continually despite the protests of people keep moving these particular homes in our area is unfair and I wanted to use this forum to be able to express that. So I'll close with those remarks.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there are 91 group homes of different types in the province. My Ministry has 13 of these homes, 7 are in Winnipeg and 6 are in the rural area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay this item 62 (b) any longer than necessary but there is just one question and I hope the Minister can answer it and it will satisfy me. This \$275,600 that we're spending under this item, could he tell the committee of a program that is now on the drawing boards and ready to go that this item is going to take care of, that's going to improve over things that were done last year. Could he explain to us some particular program that he has in mind, that this organization has developed over the last 12 months is ready to go?

MR. BOYCE: I mentioned I couldn't give you the breakdown specifically relative to the educational program. I think the educational part of it is one of the most costly ones. I have to add this up and see what the total is, 10 . . . \$110,000. \$35,000 of this is relative to the criminal justice information system that are referred to, and 20,000 is on the staff development side, and we've got 18,000 back from the Federal Government already on that 20,000, or an indication that they are going to pick up 18,000 of that 20. 36.2 is on putting people into place to see that the programs are delivered the way that they are established, and 18.8 is on ancillary costs relative to this. That's 110,000.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. You probably misunderstood me. I simply asked for a program that this organization has developed over recent months or the past 12 months since we sat the last time, that it's ready to go for the coming year that's included in these figures. Can we have a concrete program that's laid down described to us as to exactly what the department is doing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: As a former policeman, there is a couple of the thrusts on this that I think that the member would agree that is important to us, the Crisis and Prevention Program, and I guess this is the way the situation is, you know with open governments you have to report when somebody asks you a question that's relative to it.

If you remember the incident in British Columbia recently, the situation was some hostages were taken and one hostage was killed. Well it is necessary to have available people who are trained to handle crisis types of situations. The member having had

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) experience in this, I know he'll concur that you just don't take the average type of staff, albeit how well trained they are and ask them to handle a situation which seems to be coming more prevalent and expect that to be dealt with as well as if you had a specialized team that was available for deployment in situations of that nature. That is one specific program.

MR. BILTON: . . . Mr. Chairman, if I may. I thank the Minister for his comments and I appreciate his difficulty in answering my question but I asked it for a specific reason. It looks to me as though this department's going to grow like topsy and my interest at this particular time is that every dollar find its slot to the best advantage of the people we're trying to help, and I'm sure the Minister understands that.

There's just one other question that I would like to ask the Minister. Is he telling this committee that new people that come into his department that have to work with these young people to improve their characters and hopefully to come back into society that much better, is he telling us that he is recruiting these people through normal advertising and that he has individuals on his staff that can relate to those people, I don't think two weeks is long enough, but is this how he recruits his staff by simply advertising and a two-week instruction in the expectation that they will mold the characters of these young people back on to city street where they should be?

The other thought that occurred to me to finalize these remarks, Mr. Chairman. It has occurred to me that I wonder if the Minister with his counterparts in other provinces when they've met together in recent months have discussed recruitment from the Armed Forces, that is trained individual disciplinarians to augment their staffs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Well, once again, relating my answer to the member's past experience, he will recall that in the recruitment process with the RCMP, you started off in the barn regardless of whether you had a PhD or a BA or anything else and really this is how they start in Corrections, too. Many of the people who start on the floor have Bachelor of Arts degrees, Masters of Social Work and the rest of it. Nevertheless, there is always the balance between discipline and treatment, because I think the member would agree with me that one of the reasons that people are in there is because they have no self discipline.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable for Wolseley. The Honourable for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I believe the Minister would answer my questions a little further than he has. I talked about recruitment.

MR. BOYCE: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I thought I had answered recruitments, it's the normal Civil Service process, they're boarded and they go through the Civil Service Commission.

MR. BILTON: In going through the Civil Service Commission, may I go a point further, is there someone in the Civil Service Commission that examines their characteristics, that develops their suitability for the job we're talking about. Is that done?

MR. BOYCE: It's the same process that's been going on for years including while the member formed part of the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, again I probably alluded to the wonderment in the first statement when I said we were dealing with 15 million and I was attempting to derive sort of some kind of parallel to the Province of Saskatchewan and I felt, well this amount of money isn't all that bad and then as we go into the budget here I find much to my amazement, and as a new member maybe I will get used to it, but the Minister said the Manitoba Community Treatment Association in the home I referred to at 234 Sherburn was not under his department, it was under the Minister of Health, and in my report from the City Inspector he said that the boys are mostly from the Portage Home for Boys, so I would have assumed that the Minister was in charge of the Portage Home for Boys and as a result would be in charge of this particular probation situation.

The staff consists of five social workers and five juveniles and a night watchman and a cook, none of which live in. Some repairs need to be done to the home. Well that isn't the point. What I'm trying to get at is that in an evaluation of the neighbourhood from some very nice people would indicate that there definitely is a problem; these

SUPPLY - CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

(MR. WILSON cont'd) fellows don't shovel the walk, they don't do any cooking for themselves, they don't make their beds, they don't seem to do anything and I would think this was one of the kind of therapies that I'd like to see, and even where I go fishing, the trail going over to High Lake at one time used to be maintained by a labour force that always kept our parks and everything else . . . So what I'm saying is, getting back to this before I digress, at 895 Palmerston, again this house has six boys, it consists of six counsellors and a cook, none of the staff live in. Again we have, nobody seems to be living with the particular parolees or inmates, whatever you want to call them, and this has led to some problems of possibly, maybe we have to be a little more in the area of supervision, if there's some problem with staffing or what have you, then maybe I would support the Member for Fort Rouge that says we have to look at priorities and I just find it mind-boggling to think that I'm dealing with a \$15 million budget as I get into it, and I look at the gentlemen around here, they're paid for by the Minister of Health, they're paid for by somebody else, they really have nothing to do with the budget other than to supply us with information if we need it, and now I get into the half-way homes or treatment homes and I find that the Minister has nothing to do with them either so I really want to just indicate my displeasure at that particular concept. Also, it says that the people that are in there are unable to function in their own home. So that's fine, you move them into a residential area. They're chronic serious delinquency, they're isolative, and if there are no facilities available in their own province they're put into our particular residential communities.

I wish it was under this Minister's responsibility and I hope that some changes are made by next year so that I will at least know where to come and plan for my complaints because when I did complain to the Minister, he wrote the Free Press and said that Wilson's letter is misdirected. So I'm more confused than ever as to where I'm supposed to direct my complaints.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 62(b)(1)--pass, (b) (2)--pass. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, we have a substantial increase over here from \$13,400 to \$110,000, I wonder if the Minister can explain why we have such an increase in Other Expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I guess I was listening to the Member for Wolseley and I didn't know how to respond to him. I hope members are kinder to him as a new member than they were to me as I was learning the ropes. I would suggest as openers perhaps the Child Welfare Act might be good reading material. I thought I had answered the Member from Rhineland's question relative to the \$110,000.

MR. BROWN: Not that I'm aware of, I didn't ask this question so . . .

MR. BOYCE: The breakdown on this is, on the Criminal Justice Information System is \$35,000. On the staff development is \$20,000, of which we will recover \$18,000 from the Federal Government. That has already been committed. And the Program Review is \$36.2 thousand, and the Associated Deputy Minister's office which we just passed an Order-in-Council in January, is \$18.8 thousand dollars. And as I mentioned earlier, hopefully much more of this will be recovered from the Federal Government, they've indicated a willingness to explore the possibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder since it's after ten o'clock, how long were you intending to proceed. Would you accept a motion of adjournment, I notice that we're having trouble I think maintaining a quorum, I believe we're under a quorum now. Since it's after ten o'clock I would move that we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday)