



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

26 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Harry E. Graham  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXVI No. 54A**

**2:30 p.m. Thursday, June 1, 1978**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 1, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Before we proceed, I should like to direct the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 50 students of Grade 5 to 9 standing from the Miniota Junior High under the direction of Barry Cornish, Gayle and Steven Holden and Garth Field. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Virden.

We have 34 students of Grade 6 standing from Boissevain High under the direction of Mrs. Dueck. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

We have 25 students of Grade 5 standing from Lord Roberts School under the direction of Mrs. Stephenson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Attorney-General.

We have 14 students of Grade 10 to 12 standing from Portage Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Dave Froese. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris)** introduced Bill No. 51, The Metric Conversion Act.

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne)** introduced Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Provincial Judges Act (2); and Bill No. 42, An Act to Amend The Queen's Bench Act.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel)** introduced Bill No. 50, An Act to Amend The Tuberculosis Control Act.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital)** introduced Bill No. 49, An Act to Amend The Electoral Divisions Act.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** Well, Mr. Speaker, awaiting the Minister of Health, I have a question for the Minister reporting for the Farmlands Protection Board, and that is to ask the Minister, in the light of the statement made by the Director of the Board, Mr. Muirhead, that there seem to be transactions under way of recent date which, upon consultation with Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Federal Government, would seem to indicate that there are good reasons to look into the matter. I ask the Minister in light of that, and given that this Board now has no operating staff other than the Director himself, can the Minister indicate how these good reasons for looking into it will, in fact, be followed up on?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition — I really am not quite clear on the question that he is asking. If it's the fact that there are not enough individuals in place to operate the Board, or the Director is unable to, or if there are things — if I could get him to clarify it a little more?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to. My question to the Minister then would be, in light

of the statement by the Director of the Farmlands Protection Board, that there seem to be good reasons to look into the efforts by legal firms to acquire farmland in this province, and that there seem to be good reasons to check this out based on consultation with two other prairie provinces and the Federal Government, and given the fact that the Board has no operating personnel other than the Director himself, can the Minister give the House the assurance that in fact there will be adequate investigation of all of the facts surrounding the possibility of the large-scale purchase of farmland in this province by persons who may be in contravention of the existing law?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the honourable member opposite is well aware of the job of an appointed board, that they have been appointed to carry out the Act that is now in place and if they are having difficulty with it or with the individual not having enough staff that a recommendation should come to me from the board. I will certainly be having some discussions with the director in regard to this.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, taking the Minister's answer to mean that there will be an investigation as necessary, can the Minister give the assurance that there will be sufficient staff to carry out this function until such time as the legislation is repealed? — that as long as it is on the statute book it will be given adequate enforcement.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, as I stated, it is not my intent to act on or be involved in the duties of the appointed board; if they are having difficulty, then the report should come to me.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I wonder if the Minister would confirm the dismissal today of the Chief Operating Officer, Director of the Manitoba Rent Review Board, Mrs. Rosenberg, and could he give us the causes and reasons that were given for that dismissal.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member for Fort Rouge, the matter to which he refers was a notice to the executive director that the contract would not be renewed beyond its expiry date of June 30th. The reasons for this were related to the stage at which we are now in rent control process, and a review generally of the staffing patterns at the Review Agency and board which operates in conjunction therewith. It was noted that the senior staffing pattern in the Review Agency was somewhat heavy and that the organizational function that had been performed by the incumbent was largely complete and the operations were becoming a normal and routine matter from here on in. So we felt, Mr. Speaker, that this executive post could be eliminated and that the function of the Rent Review Agency could continue without difficulty.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would say that this is now part of his colleagues' policy on volunteer involvement in the administration of the state. But could he explain how the Rent Review Board will . . . will it now be operating without an executive director? Will there be some sort of a collegial or co-operative operation that will be done, or perhaps that Mr. Silverman might be seconded from his present post to occupy the executive director's office of the Rent Review Board?

But more seriously, could he indicate that we will not, therefore, be having an executive director appointed in this very crucial and critical time in the operation and maintenance of the Rent Review Program?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I accept the suggestions of the Member for Fort Rouge as to possible replacements. But I would repeat that we have determined that this position or post can be eliminated and that the senior Rent Review Officer will take over the guiding position and become office manager of the Rent Review Agency. I believe, and I'm advised that the work of the Rent Review Agency can continue on this basis and be effectively done.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary in the way of question. How does the Minister justify, or explain, or can he give some evidence to demonstrate that at a time when he is introducing very complicated de-control measures that will require innumerable references from

tenants and landlords on de-control aspects and on problems of dodging the rent de-control measures he's announced, which are already beginning to happen, that we will be without any form of executive head and, in fact, that the Rent Review Board should not be strengthened rather than be weakened, as he seems to be indicating is the case?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that a question of that nature may properly fall under the examination of Estimates. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I will restate the question then, in a very specific way. First, does the Minister have any intention of strengthening or improving the operation of the Rent Review Board at a time when the demand of its work will be increasing exorbitantly; and secondly, does he plan any legislative changes to either the Landlord and Tenant Act or The Rent Review Act in order to cover loopholes which will presently allow landlords to dodge or evade the de-control measures that he's announced?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the member's question is that, yes, we do believe that we will have the staffing pattern necessary to provide responses to the kind of cases that will be presented to the board; we're preparing for that, and the staff can be augmented as the caseload demands.

As to the second part of the member's question, we feel that the work and the way in which the board and the Review Agency will be staffed from now on, will tend to increase its ability to deal with landlord-tenant relationships. To that end, there will be amendments made to the Rent Stabilization Act and these will be presented to this Session of the Legislature because they are required in order to implement the program that has been already announced.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just correct an answer I gave this morning before the Public Utilities Board, when I was asked as to the membership of the Advisory Committee in Cabinet with respect to Manitoba Data Services. I inadvertently missed the name of my colleague, the Minister responsible for the Task Force who I must say is a very regular attender at meetings of the committee and I cannot understand how I could have missed him, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow-up the questions asked by the Member for Fort Rouge. Do I take it that the Minister is telling us that the failure to renew this contract had nothing to do with any inadequate performance on the part of the person, had nothing to do with satisfaction as to her performance on the job?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that in a simple one word response. The capabilities and talents of the present Executive Director were, in an organizational way, very important to the beginning and the setting up of this agency. The particular talents that are now required are more of an accounting nature and a routine nature, so it does not reflect on her abilities and the way in which it was set up.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the new position appears to be much less demanding in terms of talents than the previous position, may I ask the Minister whether the former Executive on the option of filling the new position which I Secretary was given the option of filling the new position which I gather would be a less senior position, was she given the option of taking that position?

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the determination was as I said at the beginning, simply that her contract would not be extended beyond its expiry date which was and is June 30th, and that the talents which were now required in the routine day to day operation could properly be filled by the Senior Rent Review Officer and that was the determination.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, then do I take it that this senior position and this senior person was not given the option of heading the new organizational structure because she happened to be in the unfortunate position of having been promoted before; that she was not given the option of taking this new position, is that what the Minister is telling us?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I told the House a few moments ago, that the

Executive Director post was eliminated. The Senior Rent Review Officer was considered to be capable of providing the office managementship and to provide the particular skills that are required in the operation of the agency.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. In view of the announcement by the Legal Aid Lawyers' Association to the effect that there have been de facto cutbacks in legal aid due to the fact that the Task Force recommendations pertaining to legal aid have not been finalized, could the Attorney-General advise the House as to which de facto cuts have been made in Legal Aid?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any announcements referred to by the honourable member and as far as I am aware the budget has not yet been approved by the board of Legal Aid and, in any event, I have not yet received a copy of it, so I will have to accept the question as notice.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Would the Attorney-General advise the House whether it is his intention to meet with the board of Legal Aid (Manitoba) in order to ascertain whether there have been cuts over and beyond that which have been already announced.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking me to confirm a course of action which I will be unable to decide on until I receive a copy of the budget that has been approved by the Legal Aid board.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney-General, in view of the indication that those applying for legal aid will be referred to the Attorney-General in order to lodge their complaints, is the Attorney-General intending to establish special machinery to deal with the complaints that will be forthcoming to his office?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member is well aware, my office is well equipped and experienced in receiving complaints.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the Honourable Minister of Health. Can the Minister confirm that many hospitals in the province are not hiring sufficient nursing and support staff to provide for replacement of employees on sick leave, authorized leave of absence and vacancies created by resignations and that this inadequate staffing is of grave concern to those responsible for front line health care in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then confirm or then deny that nurses in the province, either singularly or through their representatives, have indicated to him their concern in regard to the impact of the government's restraint programs and corresponding staff cutbacks and the effect that staffing shortages will have on their ability to perform their professional responsibilities?

**MR. SHERMAN:** A group of nurses in, I suppose, a leadership capacity in terms of public demonstration designed to make the profession's concerns known in a very forceful and direct way to the government, certainly have indicated to me that they have a number of concerns in the areas to which the Honourable Member for Churchill has referred but that's the only kind of representation I've had, Mr. Speaker. I would expect that kind of representation during negotiation proceedings which at one juncture seemed to have reached an impasse but now, fortunately, appear to be progressing much more smoothly.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you. As a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister then confirm that a number of nurses have signed statements that "as responsible nurses, they are unable to

guarantee both safe and adequate patient care due to unsafe working conditions and that they are doing so in response to increased patient loads resulting from staff cutbacks in the hospitals"?!)

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I was asked a question by the Member for Logan regarding an investigation into the lead poisoning. I had thought he had meant the new safety council that was being formed when in fact he had said the workplace safety. However, I do have the answer for him and I apologize if there was a misunderstanding.

I have a report from the department from Dr. Krywulak: "Medical surveillance is carried out in the workplaces where exposures of lead occur. Part-time physicians affiliated with four Winnipeg foundries and one battery plant submit blood for lead determinations to the industrial hygiene chemist on a regular two to three monthly basis. In addition, blood from Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting in Flin Flon is also tested. Most of the results in recent months were within normal limits with the exception of one small foundry where borderline and a few excessive lead absorption levels were obtained. About 500 persons were tested in 1977 and about 1,500 tests were done on these affected workers. The results are the early indications of exposure and these are interpreted by the physicians in conjunction with physical examinations. Where necessary, some men are pulled out from exposure and occasionally may receive treatment. If there are symptoms, prophylactic treatment is not desirable and has not been practised lately.

"For the industrial population at risk of 500, 58 persons showed in 1977 borderline levels of 0.08 milligrams per thousand grams of blood and over. These concentration levels required scrutiny of exposures and in no way were cases of lead poisoning. Anyone who is attempting to interpret them without medical due evaluation of people will err in his estimates. The laboratory results are not diagnosis and the diagnosis are arrived at by physicians slowly and with care.

"Only 10 persons from all jurisdictions in Manitoba in 1977 have been reported by the Workmen's Compensation Board as claims of excessive lead exposures. We compare well with other provinces. The data from other countries using different criteria and/or evaluations are not comparable with Manitoba figures. All in all, our program of the medical surveillance is good and will continue. Efforts are being made to speed up the delivery of written lab reports which in the past were reaching the physicians with some delay."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, back to the Minister of Agriculture, I would like to ask the Minister if he can indicate if and when legislation will be introduced with respect to The Farmlands Protection Act as it now exists and if he can also indicate whether an effort will be made to ensure that that Act can be adequately applied in the interim, between now and some possible amending or repeal of the legislation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is that it's a matter of government policy. Secondly, if the Act had been drawn properly in the first place, we wouldn't have had the problems that we now have.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, changes in the law, Sir, are a matter of policy no doubt, but to ask as to if and when there will be changes introduced, I ask the Minister if he can at least tell us that much and in doing so, can he also advise how the legislation as it is drafted and existing on the books, what that has to do with the fact that the board has no operating staff, an executive director and no staff? Just the opposite of the Rent Review Board which has staff but no director.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I believe The Farmlands Protection Act amendments were mentioned in the Throne Speech and, as I said, it is a matter of government policy and it will be proceeding as we see fit.

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister

of Consumer Affairs. Hearing the Minister earlier on a newscast indicating that he was well satisfied with the performance of the executive director of the Rent Review Board, if those comments were accurate as reported in the radio media, could the Minister indicate why she was not offered the lower position that is made open as a result of the change in staffing?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, to the Member for St. George, I have attempted to respond to questions in roughly that vein and I feel that I mentioned the particular talents that the executive director possessed and the reason I suspect for her being placed in this contract position in 1975 when the Rent Review Agency was established. It was a matter of organization and the starting up procedures.

We are now at the stage where we foresee a general phasing of the rent control situation. On the basis of our experience, having adopted a procedure and in recognizing the role now to be played throughout the final stages of the Rent Control Program, we feel that the position can be eliminated and it has been eliminated and that the senior rent review officer can fulfill what functions are necessary in respect to office management, as well as the senior rent review function which he now

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the fact that the executive director came from another job within the Civil Service Commission to take on this role in a temporary way on a contract position, in view of that fact was she not then given the opportunity to take on another position within the government, or the position that came upward?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that's a matter that will be dealt with in terms of redeployment and her interest and desire to take on other work within the government as it becomes available.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALD MCBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education, or Continuing Education, in light of his expressed concern about the Inter-Universities North Program. I wonder if the Minister could now confirm that the Inter-Universities North Program will now be restricted to three communities this upcoming year instead of 12 as in the past, and whether the number of courses offered this year will be 8 to 10 courses instead of 27 courses as in the past.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm those particular figures at this time.

**MR. MCBRYDE:** I wonder if the Minister would check into the matter and report back as to what is the present situation and whether he could also confirm that no courses will be offered within the Churchill provincial constituency.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour and ask her whether her annual report contains official statistics of her department on matters of health conditions and industrial hygiene within the province. Does this report contain official statistics of her department?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** I believe that's in 8 previous year, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. EVANS:** I gather the answer is positive. I note, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister the question whether this is accurate that according to her report of December 31st, 1977, for the year 1977, there were 1,761 analyses of lead in blood, of which 142 samples were over the maximum — 142 samples were over the maximum acceptable concentrations and 292 samples approached maximum acceptable concentrations. In view of that would the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that if he wants to debate figures perhaps the best place is in the Departmental Estimates. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that there is a problem of lead poisoning in existence in industry in this province, would the Honourable Minister undertake, through her Health and Safety Advisory Committee, to see to what extent she can upgrade the regulations pertaining to this so that the danger of lead poisoning can be lessened?

**MRS. PRICE:** I believe, Sir, the bulk of the report there took place in my predecessor's time. However, if there is any more pertinent information I can get for the member, I will take it as notice.

**MR. EVANS:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. According to a recent report appearing in the Winnipeg Free Press, which is not a quotation from the former director of this division . . . According to the report one company in particular, Canadian Bronze, there is information which indicates that the workers continue to be exposed to levels of lead which would not be tolerated elsewhere. In view of this, would the Minister undertake to use her office and the authority that she has under the Act to allow her staff to obtain information directly from the employees on their health conditions, rather than have to rely on reports offered by the company?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I thought I gave a fairly clear report from Dr. Krywulak, the recognized medical man in our department. However, as I just said, I will see if I can get further information for him, but I think I gave him a pretty thorough answer already.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources with respect to the fishermen of the Bloodvein, Princess Harbour area who are starting their fishing season this year. Can he guarantee them that the ferry will be operating to transport their fish, seeing that their fishing season is opening today?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Rupertsland, an agreement in principle has been established and one of our staff is in there today firming up the details of it. Right now, I believe, they are in there.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Tourism. Can he undertake to table the documents which he and his colleague, the Attorney-General, have referred to in their comments regarding legal opinions received from the Attorney-General's office and from outside sources regarding the Jarmoc Development Agreement? And can he also table the letter he and the Attorney-General claim that Jarmoc has written releasing the government from this development agreement?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, the legal opinions are ones which we solicited and we have got those legal opinions and I don't think at this time it would serve any purpose to table any such documents. I think that the agreements, or any other agreements that were reached by Mr. Jarmoc or anybody else with the Attorney-General's Department, is a matter between the client and the Attorney-General's Department.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, thank you. A supplementary to that question, in view of the fact that the Minister has referred to a letter which he has received releasing him from the development agreement, I would think it would only be proper that he table that letter so that honourable members could determine whether or not this is the case.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could table in the House, the name of the members of this task force that is working on the park planning for the Whiteshell and other parks in Manitoba, and their terms of reference in their plan for the future for our parks?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that that type of information may better be obtained by an order for return.

The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. THOMAS BARROW:** I direct my question to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Would the Honourable Minister please explain to the House exactly what he meant by an alternating system of doctors in the Snow Lake area?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The system that's been invoked is a rotation system of serving Snow Lake community through other doctors available to go in on assignments that I believe approximate one week at a time, and I believe most of the service to date, Mr. Speaker, has been provided by other doctors in northern Manitoba, not doctors from the south. But I would have to check to identify the precise personnel.

**MR. BARROW:** Is the Minister aware that they've only had a doctor there for one week, and the last doctor, it was several weeks since he had left? So they were four to five weeks without any doctor, even today.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of that. The program is co-ordinated under the Northern Medical Service, under Dr. Jack Hildes, who operates both out of the Health Sciences Centre in Winnipeg and out of various medical facilities in the north. And the assurance that I have is that doctors are being obtained to go in on a weekly rotating basis, succeeding each other. That program was only instituted within the last couple of weeks, as I indicated when the honourable member brought the subject up ten days or so ago, so I don't know how many doctors have been in on a particular assignment to this date, but I'll check into it further.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs an additional question or two concerning the Rent Review Board. When he states that the responsibilities of the board are now to be downgraded to simply a clerical or administrative function, could he tell us then whether the announcement that he made a month or so ago, that there would be a major system of monitoring of the Rent Control program and the behaviour of the landlords and the tenants in this respect, is now to be cancelled? Is there to be some other agency of government undertaking this monitoring function, or, more exactly, who will be responsible for undertaking the monitoring and investigation of the decontrol program?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I firstly, did not say that we were downgrading the function of the Rent Review Agency; I explained the reason for the phasing out of the office of the executive director, but that did not imply that we were downgrading the function. We are prepared to respond to the kind of monitoring activity that we have indicated we would undertake in the coming phases of the Rent Control program. We plan to do that; the agency is capable of doing that, and we have other changes, perhaps in respect to bringing more of the experience and knowledge that has been accumulated in the Rentalsman's office into play in dealing with matters which some anticipate will be major matters, that of landlord-tenant relationships and the program of decontrol by voluntary vacancy. But Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member, we have given consideration to these special functions and we are making plans to respond accordingly.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In respect to the last statement by the Minister, could he explain or tell how this arrangement that he intends to set up will deal with the problem of eviction of tenants under various pretexts by landlords in order to avoid the October 1st cut-off date? Can we expect legislation in this respect? Will there be guidelines set forward to provide for the clear enunciation of, under what circumstances evictions or forced evictions might take place, and may we also expect some legislative changes to The Landlord and Tenant Act to deal with that particular problem?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I think the kind of questions that the member is putting to me now might be more adequately dealt with in my Estimates review, which begins, I expect, this afternoon. I can merely say that the kind of responses that the member anticipates will be provided by means

of responding to complaints by tenants who allege that there has been harassment or intimidation or undue pressure in their vacating their suites. I do not anticipate that this will be a major new role for the monitoring agency to perform, but it may well be that there will be a volume of that kind of complaint, and it is with this in mind that we are gearing for the new phase in the Rent Control program.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the Minister then indicate that in this monitoring role that he intends to establish, that there will be proper provision for public information as to the kinds of cases and the kinds of problems encountered on a regular basis, so that there would be full information both to the members of the Assembly and to the public as to how the decontrol program is operating?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the member means by "proper provision" or what he would consider to be proper provision. I can only tell him that we intend to respond in what we consider to be an appropriate manner to the needs of the time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Before we proceed, I owe an apology to the Honourable Minister of Mines. Earlier today when I introduced a school from Boissevain High, I referred to them as coming from the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education; it should have been the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

The time for questions having now elapsed, proceeding with the Orders of the Day, the Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, before calling the Orders of the Day, I would like to announce that the Committee on Public Utilities will be meeting again on Tuesday to further consider the report of the Manitoba Telephone System.

**A MEMEBER:** What time?

**A MEMBER:** 10:00 o'clock.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ssupply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and Social Development and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chaii for the Department of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.\$

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY — CONSUMER, CORPORATE AND INTERNAL SERVICES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen:** Gentlemen, we have a quorum. We are on Page 19 of the Estimates, Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services. The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, and members. As Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services, it is my pleasure to introduce the Estimates of my department for the fiscal year, 1978-79.

The department provides a variety of services to the public and to other government departments. These services range from regulating public utilities, incorporating companies, clearing public offerings of securities, to handling consumer and landlord and tenant complaints.

Services supplied to other departments of government include the supplying of stationery and printing, arranging advertising placement, and the co-ordination and preparation of news releases to keep the public informed of government programs and services.

At this point I am not proposing an extensive legislative program for your consideration during this session. I now have under way a review of the statutes for which the department is responsible and the administration of these statutes and their effectiveness.

My officials inform me that federal initiative, such as a proposed Borrowers and Depositors Protection Act, the proposed development of an electronic payment system, new bankruptcy law, and to some extent, amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, will impact upon the legislation in all provinces. I expect that in due course of time amendments to existing Manitoba laws will be

advisable. It's premature to draw any firm conclusions as to what changes may be necessary, however, but I can assure members that all the provinces are working closely with the Federal Government in these developments.

The Personal Investigations Act, which is administered by the Consumers' Bureau, has been under study and amendments to update this statute are being formulated.

Dealing directly with the Estimates before you, the restraint program introduced by this government has affected certain economies within the department. This has resulted in an overall reduction of expenditures of \$143,900 from the 1977-78 adjusted vote. Despite this reduction in the expenditure, the department will maintain the level of services of the previous year, 1977-78.

In more detail, my Corporations Branch incorporated 2,398 new companies in the year ending March 31, 1977. This sustained high volume is indicative of the continued usefulness of the corporated vehicle for encouraging business in Manitoba. An additional expenditure of \$18,800 in salaries, is projected for the administrative services and Corporations Branch to maintain the current level of service.

This appropriation, in addition to the Corporations and Business Names Registration Branch, includes the administration and central accounting function for the whole department; and the expenses of my office, except for my salary as the Minister.

The Consumers' Bureau appropriation provides funds for the administration of the Consumer Protection Act, Landlord and Tenant Act, and the Personal Investigations Act. Demand continued to be heavy this past year for the services of the Consumers' Bureau and the office of the Rentalsman.

In 1977, the Consumers' Bureau received 1,816 formal complaints. As in the past, over 20 percent of these complaints dealt with automotive problems. A further 13 percent were related to home improvements, while another 14 percent were home entertainment and home furnishings complaints. Landlord and tenant complaints rose by 8.5 percent to 3,931. Over 40 percent of these complaints were related to security deposit disputes.

Dealing directly with the Estimates of the Bureau, the increase of \$39,600 in the salary appropriation is due to the usual salary adjustments of the pay plan. It is intended that their program will continue only to respond to consumer and landlord and tenant complaints. There has been no provision for any expansion of the services.

The Manitoba Gazette has experienced a heavy increase in printing costs over the past few years. The printing cost of the Gazette two years ago was \$69,600.00. The cost for the past year is anticipated to be \$81,500.00. The 1978-79 increase over the 1977-78 voted figure is \$36,200.00. Each year the printing of the Gazette is tendered and awarded to the low bidder. For the past few years and again in 1978, the low bidder has been and is D. W. Friesen and Son of Altona. It should be noted that revenue from the sale of advertising and subscriptions to the Gazette will offset the anticipated cost of the Gazette.

The Securities Commission is the next area of the department that I will deal with. The Commission is responsible for the administration of The Securities Act, The Real Estate Brokers Act, The Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act.

In the course of the year 1977, under The Securities Act, the Commission held 50 regular meetings at which the Commission dealt with a total of 370 items and applications under this statute. A total of 136 formal orders were issued including three Investigation Orders and 14 Cease Trading Orders or extensions thereof.

Under The Real Estate Brokers Act, as of December 31st, 1977, compared with the previous two years, the total number of registrations were as follows: For Brokers, in 1975, 560 registrations; 1976, 618; in 1977, 647. Salesmen registered, in 1975, were 1,842; in 1976, 2,450; and in 1977, 2,060.

As of December 31st, 1977, under The Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act, there were 97 mortgage brokers, 11 mortgage dealers and 29 mortgage salesmen registered.

The estimates of the Commission provide only for an \$11,700 increase in salaries again due to the usual salary adjustments and increased salary costs as a result of the last agreement with MGEA.

Moving on to the Public Utilities Board, the overall increase of \$46,000 in the appropriation is largely due to the increased workload of the board. The Public Utilities Board is an independent quasi judicial agency which in one form or another has operated for over 70 years. The Board administers several Acts pertaining to the regulations of public utilities, both private, municipal and Crown corporations. Some of the Acts administered by the Board are: The Public Utilities Board Act, The Greater Winnipeg Gas Distribution Act, the Gas Pipeline Act and The Cemeteries Act. The Board also administers portions of The Municipal Act pertaining to water and sewer rates, utility revenue deficits, utility reserve funds, street lighting applications and a portion of the Manitoba

Act. The Board also has an appeal function under The Highway Protection Act and The Manitoba Hydro Act.

A total of 96 board meetings and public hearings were held by the Board in 1977. There were 43 regular board meetings, 49 public hearings and 4 special board meetings; 287 orders were issued in 1977 as compared with 205 the previous year. This increase in work in response to demand has added to the Board's costs, particularly in the area of professional, legal, engineering and accounting services which the board uses to conduct independent investigations of rate increases.

Substantial savings have been effected in the operation of the Rent Stabilization Board. By retaining only a minimum staff throughout the year and increasing staff only in peak periods \$122,200 has been reduced from the 1977-78 adjusted salary allocation. It has been found that it is not necessary to maintain a large staff when such a staff is required only at certain peak workload periods. Most of the year, adequate service can be provided by only a core staff.

An additional \$85,000 has been reduced from Other Expenditures in Rent Stabilization through the use of personal delivery of notices rather than using certified mail delivery. A reduction in travelling and board expenses, a reduction in the stationery requirements due to on hand stock of forms being adequate to meet the demand anticipated in 1978-79.

The Board concerns itself with increases in rents and withdrawal of services from tenants. Where any violation of the provisions of the statute occurs, the Board can investigate it by way of a hearing after which orders are issued for compliance.

The following statistics reflect the activity of the agency: Over the Phase I and II period, 1,150 applications were made by landlords to increase rents above the amounts allowed by regulations; 382 landlords made similar application in Phase III. Of these applications, 450 (out of 1,150) and 77 (out of 382) appealed to the Board for Phase I and II and Phase III respectively. To date, tenants from 1,083 different buildings have lodged complaints to the Board.

In addition, the Board handles a large volume of telephone and walk-in inquiries. That these numbers have decreased significantly in the last six months is due to the landlords and the tenants familiarity with the legislation.

The Communications Division represents the balance of my department and includes the communications section under the heading of General Administration, the Public Information Services Branch, the Queen's Printer and the Advertising Audit office. The Telecommunications Development Branch has been combined with the Communications Branch for the 1978-79 fiscal year. The same basic telecommunications branch functions of development and co-ordination of telecommunications policies in Manitoba will be carried out in the communications branch. This combining of functions as well as general expenditure restraint has resulted in a reduction over last year of \$72,100.00. The elimination of funds for two vacant positions yielded a net reduction of \$47,000 while such economies as reduced use of outside professional services, reduced travel and the elimination of a formal printed annual report resulted in a further \$25,100 of savings.

The Public Information Services Branch continues to inform the honourable members and the public about government programs, policies, and achievements. Specifically dealing with the Public Information Services Branch Estimates it should be noted that the salaries for the Citizens' Inquiry Service, which directs telephone inquiries by the public to the proper government offices for them to obtain detailed information, have been transferred from the Other Expenditures appropriation to the Salaries appropriation. This was done to present a more accurate picture to the House of how funds are expended. The increase in total estimated expenditures of \$5,400 under Public Information Services is due to general salary adjustments.

The last branch of my department on which I will comment is the Queen's Printers Office. The Queen's Printer is responsible for the supply of printing and stationery to all government departments and agencies. Appropriation 7(a) provides for the salaries of the senior management and the printing brokerage functions of the Queen's Printer. The increase here is merely to cover annual increments and other general salary adjustments.

The Open Ledger operation supplies departments with stationery, reproduction and micrographic services. The departments are then charged for these services. No sums are voted for the open ledger as costs are offset by these charges. The overall decrease in financial authority of \$102,400 represents the anticipated reduction in expenditures by the user departments in the 1978-79 fiscal year.

The Advertising Audit Office operates under the general heading of the Queen's Printer. The office operates outside the open ledger but uses a similar recovery system under which all but salaries and operating overhead are charged back to the departments which purchase advertising media through the Advertising Audit Office. As a result of the restraint 8 program operating throughout all departments and agencies, the direct public sector advertising and production has been reduced by \$300 from the previous year.

Within this department, outside of the Public Utilities Board and The Gazette, only minor salary increases have been permitted. The Gazette and the Utilities Board must respond to demands and

have little control over the cost of providing these services. Wherever possible other costs have been held or reduced with the net result that \$143,900 has been reduced from the 1977-78 adjusted vote.

I wish therefore, Mr. Chairman, to recommend to the members the Estimates of the Department of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services for their consideration.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rossmere, the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Chairman, looking at the print format on Page 18, noting that there are nine basic entries, it would seem as though most of them coincide quite clearly with the format of Estimate preparation, which I have before me, with the one exception and that's the very first, General Administration. I ask the Minister, in trying to piece this together, whether it's a case of having taken General Administration, as we commonly knew it, and lumping in with it the Telecommunications Development Branch, is that basically what's happened? Because last year the vote for General Administration was in the order of \$568,000, and we note that in this format here in the Estimates, it shows up at about \$120,000 more. I can only reconcile that by noting that Telecommunications Development Branch was roughly that amount, of the difference, \$120,000.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I show in my column here for the year ending March 31, 1978, the previous year, \$686,700.00

**MR. SCHREYER:** That's right. That's exactly what I am saying ' but last year if you look at the format you'll see it was \$120,000 less than that, so something's been lumped in there.

**MR. MCGILL:** Yes. Well, telecommunications and communications have been combined in this year's presentation. Are you aware of that?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, that's what I'm asking.

**MR. MCGILL:** Yes.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, it's GSI . . .

**MR. SCHREYER:** GSI, General Salaries, yes, yes. Well, that part is easy to reconcile. Well, if it's been lumped in, then on that basis for this coming year, taking General Administration plus Telecommunications Branch, we would be looking at an amount of \$633,000.00. Now there must have been some service cut here or some salary, some personnel terminated, because otherwise the combination of the two, you would assume would be somewhere up in the \$700,000 plus area, but it's \$633,000.00. So, could the Minister indicate if there has been any discontinuation of a service or services?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, I can tell the member that last year Communications and Telecommunications had a total of seven staff man years. While they still, in their combined form, have a total of seven, funds have been provided only for four and a half staff man years. Of the two and a half staff man years, for which no funds were provided, one staff man year was for the communications' consultant position. This position was vacant for the two previous years and as there is no reason why the position should be required in 1978-79, the funds were eliminated. So that made a difference there. Another one staff man year of the two and a half, was the director of Telecommunications' position, which became vacant through the resignation in December of 1977; and by combining these communications and telecommunications branches and by having the Assistant Deputy Minister of Communications assume the responsibility of the director's position, it was possible to reduce the funds for this position, for 1978-79. So far this has worked satisfactorily.

**MR. SCHREYER:** That, Mr. Chairman, would account for about \$40,000, approximately. Now there is a differential of about \$100,000, I would think; so I'm wondering if there is some third or fourth item of any significance.

**MR. MCGILL:** The reduction of outside professional services accounted for a further \$16,000; reductions in travel accounted for \$4,800 and general reductions for \$4,300, so there would be

\$25,000 to \$26,000.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure I'm understanding the Minister. There was a consultant's position — a special consultant — which involved some estimate of expenditures. What was the estimate of expenditures that was there for the consultant's position, which was vacant for two years, and was not included this year? How much was it?

**MR. MCGILL:** \$25,000.00.

**MR. GREEN:** I take it that we didn't spend the money to a vacant position, so that is not a reduction in expenditures.

**MR. MCGILL:** But the money was appropriated.

**MR. GREEN:** All right. So, then what we are saying is, that the reduction that you're referring to, is not a reduction in spending, but a reduction from an estimate which may not have been spent.

**MR. MCGILL:** I'm trying to reconcile the two figures as they were in which the member . . .

**MR. GREEN:** But, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. What I don't appreciate is somebody saying that restraint has resulted in a reduction of \$25,000, when it wasn't spent last year, which is what we are getting in many many areas, and here is a perfect indication of it. That we cannot refer to restraint for a position which was vacant for two years, which therefore wasn't spent, although there was an item in the Estimates; and we are now suggesting that this is a result of a restraint exercise. Of course, that would apply to every other figure on the lefthand side.

I don't know whether there was a reduction in expenditures in the Consumers' Bureau. Where do you have it? In the Queen's Printer, from \$215,700 to \$214,800, because I don't know if we spent \$215,700 last year. It may be a reduction in Estimates and not a reduction in expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I don't really want to make a big issue out of it. What I object to is the issue being made on the other side. Because what happens, if you include it in the Estimate, it is possible to expend it and then you don't need a special warrant, and the effective change becomes, if you want the position you put in the special warrant. So if you're talking about restraint, and when you do I would merely ask the Minister — when he is talking about restraint — let's talk about expenditures this year and estimates this year, not estimates last year and estimates this year. Because the only way you know whether there is a saving, is not by the fact that you have reduced an estimate, but by the fact that you reduced an expenditure. I would . . .

**MR. URUSKI:** An actual.

**MR. GREEN:** That's right. I want to carry it forward because we had this in another department. I would like to know what the total number of staff man years, in this department, has been reduced by virtue of the program, what the staff man year complement was last year and what the staff man year complement was this year. I wonder if I could get those figures readily in the Estimates that we are discussing.

**MR. MCGILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, on Mr. Green's earlier point, we were attempting to reconcile the figures under (b)(1), I believe that's the item we're on.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That's right, we're still on 1.(b).

**MR. MCGILL:** And not getting into the debate as to whether this was restraint or not, but to attempt to explain the difference in the figures and I believe that was the question that was put here.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, those composite figures that the Minister is talking about are the figures that he is talking about when he said that through restraint we have been able to reduce the expenditures from \$3.6 million to \$3.5 million and one of those is moneys that wasn't spent last year. I mean, that wasn't distinguished when the initial comments were made and I now want to try to find out how much money is being saved through efficiencies. There is one that you've indicated that I'd like to go into because I frankly did think that personal service costs more than

postal service but you're going to convince me that that's not correct and that will be fine. If that's the case, then that's fine. I know that when we have to make personal service on individuals, it certainly costs more than mail service but maybe when you have a whole bunch of them, it's cheaper. However, you'll get to that.

What is the total staff complement last year as against this year? Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there is some policy change here because when we look at the Rent Stabilization, it has gone down double the amount that the department has alleged to save money. In other words, if you take out the Rent Stabilization which is \$200,000, the rest of the department has gone up by \$100,000 and I would suggest that the Rent Stabilization change is largely a change in policy, not in efficiency.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, if the member's question is in order on this item (b)(1), I'm advised that the staff man years for 1977-78 in the department totalled 189.17 and staff man years for 1978-79 total 192.48 overall.

**MR. GREEN:** All right. So what we have is over this year, I take it . . . 189.17 was this year's or last year's?

**MR. MCGILL:** Last year's, 1977-78.

**MR. GREEN:** And this year it's 192.48.

**MR. MCGILL:** That's right, yes.

**MR. GREEN:** For some crazy reason, I calculate there's an addition of between 2 and 3 staff man years through this great exercise of restraint. I'm sorry, but that's what the figures tell me. Perhaps I'm not reading them correctly. But I want to go further. What was the vacancy factor of the 189 last year? What was your vacancy factor last year? How many were the ongoing vacancies in your department?

**MR. MCGILL:** We can't give you that figure just . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, we've had it in other departments and we've been told that it's roughly . . . Can you tell me what your existing vacancies are? How many vacancies do you have in the department right now?

**MR. MCGILL:** Total?

**MR. GREEN:** Total number of vacancies throughout of these 192 positions that you've got, that you've increased this year over last year in your restraint program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** While they're checking into that, I would attempt to simplify it by putting it in this fashion. I asked initially for a reconciliation of the print format which the Minister gave me in large part, not completely but in large part. But it would be useful to know what the actuals are, to use a shorthand expression. The format always consists of the approved requests, monetarily and in terms of staff but what is authorized or approved and what is actually expended and positions actually filled is oftentimes significantly different, significantly lower usually. Do I understand the Minister to say that he doesn't have that readily at hand or that he does have the actual incumbency and actual expenditures for each of the nine components of his Estimates?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, first to respond to the Member for Inkster, I am advised that there are 9.5 vacant SMYs in the department.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder then if my leader will let me interrupt and while you're getting that other point which I think is very valid, let's have the actuals.

We were told that the general level of vacancy in other departments and throughout the government — and I'm not sure about this throughout the government but I believe that that was said and if it wasn't, it certainly should apply — was 10 percent. That would mean that there would be normally under last year's level of employment, 18 vacancies. Well, I'm going to be nice to the Conservatives — 18 vacancies. There are now 9 vacancies which means, Mr. Chairman, that not only have you increased your staff by three staff man years, but you've accelerated your hiring so

that you've got 12 extra staff to what was had last year if we assume a vacancy factor of 10 percent which is what they told us occurred in other departments and which I have no reason to believe happens differently here, and which I believe — and it happened in the Department of Mines when we went over those staff figures and these great restraints — which I believe is happening throughout this government, that because the so-called restraint program is on, departments are much quicker in restaffing positions; they are much quicker in making sure there are no vacancies because there is a terror within the Civil Service that if a position is open, it's going to be eliminated and, therefore, under no circumstances should a position be open. As a result of that, and it was confirmed by the Minister of Mines, the vacancy feature went from over 100 people to 50 people so there were approximately 61 new people — I can't remember the exact figure, I'm sorry — but there were approximately 50 new people hired to fill up vacancies that probably would not have been filled up except for this so-called restraint program. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I'm interested — and we'll have to get more particulars as we go down the line — I rather had expected that the staff complement in this department would have been reduced because there is a reduction in Rent Stabilization administration as there should have been. I think that the administration would be very heavy at the beginning but it would be reduced and perhaps some of what has occurred — and now I am involuntarily going to help the Minister — is that some of your previous contract people have been put on staff people so that this increase in staff man years may not be an actual increase in bodies but an increase in positions of staff people that were employed last year as well. We'll find that out as we go down the line.

But I say right at the outset, that the picture in this department, and it's a smaller department, is starting to have the same kind of scenario as we got in the Department of Mines, that yes, there has really been a change in spending but it's not business efficiency; it's largely philosophical, a reduction of \$200,000 in Rent Stabilization, or the winding down of an initial thrust program, which is not an efficiency, it's a change in direction, and an increase, Mr. Chairman, an increased rate of hiring, accelerated hiring to fill vacancies, in order to make up for the terror of restraint that exists throughout the Civil Service.\$

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, the member has made a number of observations; in respect to first of all, the 9-1/2 SMYs vacancy, the figure that was given to him. I don't know of any "terror" that exists in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, but I believe that over the years, and I am so advised, there is a relatively low turnover rate in the staffing patterns in that department, for whatever reasons. It may be just that it's a nice place to work.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, you know, I'm sure that your chief of the Rent Stabilization thinks so too, but she is not permitted to work there.

**MR. MCGILL:** I was intending to remark on the rent stabilization area and the Rent Review Agency; those are contract people, Mr. Chairman, and they are not part of the figures that we are giving you; they are contracts, they are not SMYs as counted. So, the fluctuations there the member agrees are necessary because of the volume of work and the number of cases which vary greatly from period to period, within each phase of the rent control. The Rent Review Agency last year had contracts varying between 30 and 35, while this year they're down to a variation of between 20 and 25 contracts, so there is a fluctuation there that takes place pretty regularly. But the vacancy rate which now exists is more related, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the traditional low turnover pattern of staffing in Consumer Affairs than it is to any allegations of a terror that is stalking the land at the moment.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** To bring this to an arithmetical head, if possible, last year the authorized staffing was 189, and I believe the Minister indicated that there was an average vacancy of 9, if I didn't misunderstand him.

**MR. GREEN:** There was no average; he couldn't give us last year's average. This year . . .

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, I'm asking him now, then, if he can give us an approximation of average vacancy . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Last year.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Last year. And then, I would just like to get a perspective on it. This year the Minister is recommending to us, in effect, 192. That being so, I come back to ask, what is the,

at the very present time, vacancy in the department?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, 9-½ SMYs is the vacancy at the present time. I am told that it tends to average about 10 percent. I'm sorry, 5 percent.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, I won't dwell on it; the question I'm putting to the Minister is that if the staffing authorization was at 189 last year, it is being requested for 192 this year; at this point in time there is a vacancy of 9, or 9-½, as the case may be. That would seem to indicate that there probably was a vacancy in that same order of magnitude 12 months ago. That would be a reasonable assumption.

**MR. MCGILL:** Well my advice, as I understand it, is that 5 percent seems to be a pretty average vacancy.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Okay; my last question on this aspect of it is to ask how many positions have been cancelled, then?

**MR. MCGILL:** The policy has been to hold vacancies as they occur, not to fill vacancies until the need has been reviewed, and other than the position of Communications Consultant, which became vacant because of resignation, other vacancies are simply allowed to maintain the vacancy until the need is demonstrated.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that's understood. My only point in asking the question in that way is that I realize that there is justification, oftentimes, for keeping a position on the books, even though it's been vacant for a year or two, and to not fill it unless necessary, but it's there to be filled if necessary. So, it's carried as an authorized staff man year. But, when you do that, Mr. Chairman, then it is necessary, under our financial administration, to provide, to vote the funds for that position as well, even though it may not be filled and the funds may lapse, but it's necessary to vote the funds. Isn't that correct? So, I'm asking how many cancellations, because that will indicate the approximate amount of funds that have been lapsed and not requested in the new year. Are we talking about two or 10, or somewhere in between, that have been actually cancelled and the funds not requested?

**MR. MCGILL:** For this specific appropriation that we're dealing with now, I am advised 2-½.

**MR. SCHREYER:** 2-½ staff man year and funds proportionate thereto?

**MR. MCGILL:** Yes.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I just want to make clear that I asked the question, "What was your previous vacancy factor?" and I did not get an answer for it; I was told he couldn't answer it. We only got an answer that it approximated 5 percent, when you realized that it's 5 percent this year. And indeed, Mr. Chairman, that may be right; I rather suspect that it's not. I rather suspect that last year's vacancy factor was higher than 5 percent and certainly, the administration here was not able to say that it was 5 percent, and I asked him, how much it was this year, we got to 9.8, the previous figure. In other departments, it was 10 percent. This particularly nice department, where everybody is so happy, and there are no complaints to the Labour Board, no problems associated with it —(Interjection)— I'd like to know, maybe it'll prove out that the 5 percent now estimated is right; I would like to know, and you will be able to get the figures from last year, what was the vacancy factor at the same time last year? Because that will be a significant feature to how many staff you're carrying and how many staff you're paying for.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, I think we've been responding to, sort of global figures here, under this particular item. It might be appropriate and give us an opportunity to get an accurate figure for you if we reserved that for salary consideration after we have gone through the various departments.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister, in his figures and the figures that he has provided us for the SMYs comparing 1977 to 1978, do those figures include the contract positions and any term and casual positions they may have within the department?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, not the contract positions. They do not include that.

**MR. URUSKI:** And they do include any term or casual that you might have?

**MR. MCGILL:** They do include the term positions.

**MR. URUSKI:** Could the Minister indicate how many contract positions were allocated to the department in 1977-78 and 1978-79, or how many have been eliminated or increased or what, in the provisions?

**MR. MCGILL:** While the staff are researching that one I can tell you that in the Rent Review Agency the contracts averaged 30 to 35 in the previous year and between 20 and 25 this year. Now, overall, we may have some other figures. Again we're getting into the total departmental positions.

**MR. URUSKI:** Yes. I'd like to ask the Minister as well, if they are having a problem dealing with the average vacancy rate within the department for the year? I will give him then a specific month, say, August or September of 1977. At that point in time, what was the vacancy rate within the department? It may be easier for the Minister and his staff to pin down, at that particular time, what was the vacancy rate within the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs? How many SMY's were vacant?

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, again to the member, that is a total figure for the Department of Consumer Affairs, and we'll be prepared to get that figure for August 31, 1977, I take it is your precise date?

**MR. URUSKI:** Yes. That's fine.

**MR. MCGILL:** We'll attempt to get that for you.

**MR. URUSKI:** That's fine.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a question or two on this particular line. I believe the Minister said earlier that communications and telecommunications had been combined for this appropriation. Did I hear him correctly then?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MCGILL:** Yes, that's correct.

**MR. WALDING:** Would the Minister indicate to the committee what is or was the difference between communications and telecommunications, and why they are similar enough to be able to be combined?

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, the Communications Branch has traditionally dealt with those matters of communicating with the public through the Information Services, through the Citizens' Inquiry Service, in general, that kind of communications.

Telecommunications dealt specifically with matters relating to telephone systems and matters of that precise type that dealt with the technology, and so forth. These two now have been combined under the . . .

**MR. WALDING:** I wonder if I could get a little more clarification on communications, Mr. Chairman. When the Minister is saying this is a matter of communicating with the public, is he speaking of some form of public relations function of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or of the government. Could he make that a little more clear, please?

**MR. MCGILL:** It involves providing an Information Service for all departments of government and for the communications which take place within that. It includes the services of the Queen's Printer

and the agency of the Gazette, all come in there, the communications general function.

**MR. WALDING:** I'm still a little puzzled, Mr. Chairman, when I see under different headings, on the next page the Queen's Printer and an appropriation for that; and also on Page 19, at the bottom thereof, a Public Information Services, which I understand is the branch that deals with the public relations of the government in the printing and publishing of news releases, voice clips and the like. Is there some split in the function involved here? I don't understand fully.

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, these are branches coming under the general heading of Communication and it's public information that is being dealt with here. The Gazette, the Information Services Branch and those services, generally, are under the general heading of Communications.

**MR. WALDING:** I'm still not clear from the Minister's remarks, Mr. Chairman, as why there is some appropriation under Communications and some more under Public Information Services. Why are the two separated?

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, the appropriations we're dealing with are general administrative functions, regarding communications, and the communications administration has to do with these departments that are listed below.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying to us that under this particular appropriation would be the salaries of the ADM who is in charge of Public Information Services, the Queen's Printer, the Gazette, etc.?

**MR. MCGILL:** That's correct, yes.

**MR. WALDING:** Then I would like to move on to the other part having to do with Telecommunications and ask the Minister if there has been any change in government policy, having to do with telecommunications?

**MR. MCGILL:** Essentially, no change in policy, except to combine functions and to eliminate the post of the Director of Telecommunications, which that function has been taken on by the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of Communications.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister give the committee an assurance that this administration is equally as supportive of the Canada-Manitoba Telecommunications agreement, as the previous government was?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this really comes under the item we're speaking of here. But we have had this kind of debate with respect to cable television and the matters relating to the rural licensees and our position has been in keeping with the terms of the Canada-Manitoba Agreement. Our position has been, all along, that we would like to see those terms respected by all agencies of the Federal Government.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for his reassurance. The reason for the question arose from remarks by opposition members, previous to the last election, on the subject of cable television and similar matters where the government of the day received the impression that some Conservative members were not at all happy with that arrangement, and would like to see it changed. I feel reassured to hear the Minister's remarks that they are in fact going along with the previous policy involved there.

I'd like to move on to a slightly different question, if I might. It has to do with the interconnection bill that was passed last year. The General Manager and Chairman of the Telephone System told us this morning that the bill has not yet been proclaimed. Does the Minister have any comment on that as to why that has not been proclaimed? Is there some preliminary work to be done or forms to be developed, or regulations to be drawn up? Or has it been a matter of government policy that that bill has not yet been proclaimed?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, this was a matter that was under discussion at the Public Utilities meeting this morning when we were dealing with the report of the Manitoba Telephone System and I think the bill really relates to MTS directly rather than to the particular appropriation that we're dealing with now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Perhaps the Member for St. Vital can ask that question next Tuesday.

**MR. WALDING:** No, Mr. Chairman, I asked that question this morning and I received from the chairman of the Manitoba Telephone System almost the opposite answer. When I asked it from the perspective of the Manitoba Telephone System, the answer that was given to the committee was that MTS was prepared to continue the development of interconnection, to draw up its tariff and to make application to the Public Utilities Board following the proclamation of the bill but that was what was in fact stopping the movement at that stage. I didn't, this morning, ask the Minister representing the government about it but I'm taking that opportunity to do so now and ask the Minister why the bill has not yet been proclaimed and what is the delay or is it a matter of government policy not to proclaim it?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Chairman, the bill to which the member refers, of course, was passed by the previous administration and, for reasons known to that administration, it was not proclaimed. There has been no new policy decisions made with respect to the bill. There may be some technical problems involved but up to this time, our administration has not seen fit to proceed with the proclamation of that bill. When that decision has been made, then it will be announced.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I am aware that the previous government did not proclaim the bill and I'm not asking this Minister to account for the actions of the previous government. What I am asking for is the policy of his government and since the government has now been in power for six months, I'm asking him the reasons for not having proclaimed that Act. He says that there may be certain technical reasons or difficulties. Can the Minister tell us what those difficulties are, if he is aware of them, or if it's the fact that they have simply not got around to considering the interconnect bill yet, that's another reason. Can he tell us why?

**MR. MCGILL:** Well again, Mr. Chairman, this bill relates specifically to Manitoba Telephone System's operations and the bill deals with the kind of authority that needs to be considered with respect to devices that are manufactured or produced or sold by companies other than the telephone system itself and the circumstances under which an interconnection should be permitted. No decision has been made with respect to that bill up to this time and so I'm not able to give you any further information on the status of the work that is being done in this area.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, is the matter under consideration by the Minister or the government or the Minister's department?

**MR. MCGILL:** The matter has been communicated to me that Manitoba Telephone System is considering this whole matter. The government has not as yet fully reviewed the problems relating to the bill and when it has, of course, it will be in a position to make further policy announcements.

**MR. WALDING:** I have no further questions at the moment.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster and then St. Johns.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to find out, Communications, whether that would relate to the Information Services Branch, that item.

**MR. MCGILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman

**MR. MCGILL:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the communications here in this area covers the administrative function of the Communications Branch and includes Public Information Services and this will be a separate item that will be covered as we proceed through the Estimates.

**MR. GREEN:** All right, Mr. Chairman, then that may explain one of the problems I had with Information Services Branch because it appears that salaries have been taken out of the Communications Branch and put into the Public Information Services Branch. At least there is an increase in salaries in Public Information Services from \$287,000 to \$336,000 which is an increase of roughly \$50,000.00. On the other hand, there is a reduction in salaries in Communications from \$137,000 to \$90,000 and at first blush, it would appear that there has been a shifting around. If I'm wrong, I would like to be told so.

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, the difference in the administration figures that we're on now, I guess (b)(1), is some \$47,000 and that difference is due to the maintaining of vacancies in the Director of

position and the Communications Development Officer position.

**MR. GREEN:** Well then I am being much more immediately compensating than I should because then we don't have an explanation, at this point, of the salaries increase in Public Information Services. I think during your opening remarks you touched on it, saying that it is more clearly shown. Perhaps there is a shift from contract positions to staff man year positions but there is a \$50,000 increase in Information Services.

**MR. MCGILL:** I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the salaries of Citizens' Inquiry Service were previously shown under Other Expenditures. I think if the member is looking now at Item 5 down there you will notice that there is quite a difference in Other Expenditures and quite a difference in Salaries.

**MR. GREEN:** Not quite as much as you're looking for. There's a \$25,000 difference in Other Expenditures; Salaries, you say, are not related to this increase. We're still short \$25,000 increase in salaries in Information Services.

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, part of the difference, part of the increase there is because of the transfer of Information Services salaries from the Other Expenditures to the Salaries line.

**MR. GREEN:** I had that at \$25,000 — from \$79,000 to \$54,000 is \$25,000 reduction in Other Expenses; add on the salaries of Information Services and it still leaves you \$25,000 to account for.

**MR. MCGILL:** Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, we are a little mixed up here and I suppose it's our fault for jumping down to Public Information Services' salaries here but I'm suggesting to you that the reduction of Other Expenditures from \$131,600 to \$87,400 accounts for a good part of the increase on Salaries, transferring that up to the other. You were looking at the Communications one at the top. Yes.

**MR. GREEN:** That's right; that's right. I see, what you say is that in Other Expenditures under Public Information Services there is a transfer.

**MR. MCGILL:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** From (b) to (a).

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, that's fine. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are now in the field where I can discuss this public expenditures for the propagation of political propaganda on the part of the now Conservative Administration which I think is a valid subject for discussion here. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago, or perhaps 10 days ago, I tried in what I thought was a very descriptive and demonstrative fashion, to prevail upon the Minister that he is using public funds for the purpose of selling the programs of the Conservative administration rather than for the purposes of making citizens aware of information which they need for the purpose of having the government services maximized by them which I think has been the traditional rationale for the expenditure of public moneys in this area. It's interesting, Mr. Chairman, that this area has not been subject to the kind of restraint in any event that has been given in other departments. Here is an area, here is a field where moneys could be saved and to, I think, the great satisfaction of every person in the Province of Manitoba and without any reduction in services. We reduced Rent Stabilization, which certainly people are affected by, from \$759,000 to \$552,000 and perhaps the Minister will do it without reducing services although I find it very difficult to believe. We've taken this propaganda department and increased it from \$418,700 to \$424,100 when there could have been an absolute reduction in expenditure with no loss, Mr. Chairman, of services to the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, this is what we would lose and when I say that I tried to demonstrate just what is happening in this area, I wrote to the Information Services after I read a document published by that department which referred to a speech that Mr. Downey made on how easy it will be to opt out of the Cattle Breeders' Program. Now, Mr. Chairman, this was a speech made by Mr. Downey; it wasn't even one that was made to the Legislature; it wasn't one that was made on the introduction of a bill. I want to know how the people of Manitoba are better off hearing Mr. Downey's views on how easy it is to opt out as against hearing Mr. Cherniack's views and my views on how terrible the bill is. I say, Mr. Speaker, with all respect, that the people of the Province of Manitoba are served more — and this is very subjective but I do it quite deliberately — by hearing how bad that bill is rather than how good it is. Now, I realize that is subjective and therefore it is rather

self-pleading to say that they are more interested in what I have to say than what Mr. Downey has to say or that they will profit more by hearing what I have to say or what Mr. Cherniack has to say than what Mr. Downey has to say. But, Mr. Chairman, I say that you should publish neither, that the citizens of Manitoba are not being served by the publication of this information, that what is attempted to be served is the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba. The Conservative Party should look after its own politics.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am bringing this up as an individual, I will readily recognize that previous governments have been as guilty as we are — as you are, I should say —

**MR. MCGILL:** As you are.

**MR. GREEN:** As we are, right, right. I acknowledge that. As we are and as you are. But how long do we have to continue this not two wrongs make a right, but ten wrongs make a right. How many wrongs do we have to compound on top of one another in order to correct this situation? I can, in small defence, Mr. Chairman, in small defence of myself, because I am responsible for everything that the New Democratic Party did, as a member of the Cabinet I accept responsibility for it, but it is well known — and you can check your records — that I did not use Information Services. I used them for taking material that I wrote, had done in my office and sent down to them for distribution or for the arrangement of media press conferences which I am prepared to have them do for anybody.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 19(2), the hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings of the committee for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m.

#### SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would draw the honourable members' attention to page 40 under the Estimates of Health and Social Development. We are on Resolution No. 60.(d)—Psychiatric Services, (1) Salaries. (1)—pass — the Honourable Meer for St. Boniface.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would care to break down the staff between Forensic Services, the Winnipeg Psychiatric Institute, Community Services to Children and Eden Mental Health Centre, please.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Winnipeg Psychiatric Institute involves 5 five staff, that is civil servants provincial staff, one psychiatrist, one psychologist, one occupational therapist, and 2 two activities aides. Eden Mental Health Centre is 4 staff positions, again we're talking about direct civil service provincial staff, 2 psychiatrists, one of whom is Medical Director and one position of which is vacant, one psychologist, and one social worker who is the Director of Social Services. —(Interjection)— No, that's it. Community Services to Children, 18 staff including 9 psychiatrists, 8 eight councillors and one secretary. Of the 9 positions for psychiatrists, 3 are filled on a full-time basis, 5 on a half-time basis and one is vacant. The 8 councillor positions that I gave the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, 7 are filled with incumbents who are deployed to the various regions: Norman has one, Thompson one, Interlake 2, Central 2 2, and Eastman one, so the other one would be attached to our Regional Office here in Winnipeg. Forensic Services 9 staff, Mr. Chairman. In adult Forensic Services, 2 full-time psychiatrists including the Director, one virtually full-time psychiatrist, 4 ½ days per week who is employed at Headingley Correctional Institution, and one full-time psychologist. Children's Forensic Services one full-time — well I'd better do it this way. . . Children's Forensic Services, 5 psychiatrists but only one of them is full-time, one is two days per week, 2 are 3 ½ days per week and one is one full day plus 2 ½ days per week. Children's Forensic Services, Mr. Chairman, still on that point, one full-time psychologist. I guess that's the list, Sir.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, for a number of years the courts have expressed a concern that in dealing with juveniles and others, but juveniles, as I recall, they've always felt there was a severe lack of facilities for emotionally disturbed children who perhaps needed psychiatric care rather than custodial care, and in trying to dispose of the cases before them, they've often referred to the lack of this kind of service within the area because the juvenile in question perhaps needed

psychiatric attention and should not be simply placed in a correctional atmosphere, or custodial atmosphere. Can the Minister make any comment on that at this time and does he have any plans to meet the concern expressed by the courts in the past?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I don't know that I can be much more enlightening to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks than I have been in earlier remarks that I have expressed on the subject and I leave the determination to him as to whether that was enlightening at all. I am working with officials in my department on hoped-for solution at the earliest possible time to the need for psychiatric beds for emotionally disturbed juveniles, adolescents.

As I indicated in examination of some of the resolutions already covered, we have not moved in terms of construction of a new facility such as the proposed 20-bed adolescent psychiatric facility that was to be adjacent to the Health Sciences Centre. I've commented on that and the decision to put that project in the same category as all other capital construction projects at the present time, that is in a holding pattern where we have to take them a step at a time as we feel the economy permits. That does not in any way militate against the efforts to find some beds and to locate them in an available facility; there are a number of sites under consideration and a number of subject areas that have been discussed. They range from efforts being made to free-up some beds in the Health Sciences Centre to full-scale examination of the possibilities of conversion of the old Grace Hospital, or part of the old Grace Hospital, to that kind of use. That is a current and ongoing study project among my officials and me, but I can't provide the honourable member with an answer or a conclusion at this point.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister was kind enough to give us a lot of flexibility, and you also, Mr. Chairman, for the children, so I think we've We've talked about these 20 beds covered that quite extensively. I don't think there's any point in rehashing this again. But in the announcement about two years ago, when these 20 beds were announced, there was also another 20 beds for senior people, and I'd like to know where that is. I think at the time it was thought that the 40 beds would be in the Harry Medovy place, and that was changed. We know about 20 beds, but what about the other 20?

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's in the same category, Mr. Chairman. When I talk about psychiatric beds, I've talked about them for juveniles and for adults; the honourable member is quite correct. The projections were for 40; 20 for adults, 20 for juveniles; I would like to get 40, if I can. At the moment, I'll take any that I can get. The kinds of explorations that we're embarked upon at the moment are directed in terms generally of 20 for juveniles in a facility or a site such as the old Grace Hospital, and six, or as many more as we can get, for adults in the Health Sciences Centre.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, just to save time, because we've spent a lot of time in this department and we're not finished — the same concern that we've had about the 20 psychiatric beds for the youngsters, the children, this institution could be used as a day facility for people coming in for treatment. The same concern that we expressed then, of course, would go for this other part of the service.

Before we leave this item though, Mr. Chairman, the Minister told us that the delinquent camp, I think, was proceeded — not necessarily in the same place, but there was another area. I wonder, in a few words, if the Minister can give us a report on that; how many patients, or clients, whatever? And then, the Minister could maybe tell us if that will help in the reduction of people that have been sent outside the province, also. We've covered that very briefly; I think there was just a mention of it.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. That Wilderness Camp — I think the honourable member is correct — perhaps it was cited for some other location, but it's at Elbow Lake, which is north-east of Lac du Bonnet. Am I correct? —(Interjection)— (Yes) It might have been intended for a different destination at one point, but it's at Elbow Lake now. There are 15 spaces, all occupied, I believe. The impact of that and community work has produced a substantial reduction in the number of out-of-province placements from some —(Interjection)— very close to 100, or 102, a year ago or two years ago —(Interjection)— Two years ago. It was 102, two years ago, to 23 at the present time, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, that's a bigger discrepancy than 15, but that's where 15 of them were.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** That's what I was going to say, Mr. Chairman. That is one of the parts that has made this possible, but you know, it might be misleading for somebody that really doesn't know

the details, or doesn't understand the organization, to think that 15 spaces will save 100 spaces out of the province. I think that that should be clarified.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (d)—pass; (e) Institutional Mental Health Services, (1) Salaries—pass; (2) — The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, there have been — unsubstantiated, I know — but there have been stories appearing in the press on and off, about the reduction of care in these institutions, staffing-wise, the quality of the standards, the food, the cut-down in services, even so far as the food is concerned, in the desire to cut expenditures. Although there is an increase here, it's a slight one. It's not enough to cover normal inflation rates, if you're talking in terms of feeding people in institutions, so that if they haven't got the funds, they're going to have to cut down something, and the concern we have is that they will be cutting down on such things as food. Can the Minister assure the House that that is not the case, and that the concern expressed by people is not based on fact, but on fear that something may occur, but the fact hasn't occurred? We, on this side, would like that assurance because I think the Minister will have to agree that to try to cut operating costs by reducing the staff ratios, or by reducing the expenditures for food and other services, the maintenance, the housekeeping, that that might indeed save money, but that hardly makes for the kind of institutions where people can and will get the proper treatment, either for long-term stay or for short-term stay.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the justification for arriving at the particular amount the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks sees in front of him stems is a substantial part from the balance unspent in that appropriation last year, and has nothing, in fact, to do with restraint. We have, of course, imposed the normal restraints on out-of-province travel, and that type of thing; on institutional programming personnel, the same as we have done within the department, but the appropriation and the level of the appropriation in terms of the food and other services being offered to the populations in the institutions has not been affected by restraint at all. There was \$400,000 unspent out of last year's appropriation, the actual vote of \$2.7 million, so we worked on a base of actual spending for 1977-78, which was \$2,333,000; that we used as the revised base for developing this year's appropriation which, in those terms, takes into account the normal price increases that we are facing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to give us a breakdown of the staff man years, both in the Brandon and Selkirk places, and their occupation; medical, or nursing, whatever?. **MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, staff man years for Brandon and Selkirk. In the medical category: Brandon 22, Selkirk 18; Nursing: Brandon 336, Selkirk 261; Social Services: Brandon 22, Selkirk 19; Psychology: Brandon 13, Selkirk 9; Other Treatment: Brandon 51, Selkirk 28; Resource Service Staff: Brandon 182, Selkirk 178; Education: Brandon 10, Selkirk 9; Term and Holiday Relief — that's contingency staff — Brandon 27, Selkirk 10.

So let me give the honourable member first the unadjusted totals: Brandon 663 and for Selkirk 532. Now, there have been some personnel transferred to Community Field Operations. Transfers to Community Field Operations for Brandon were 2 and for Selkirk were 11. So the adjusted totals in staff man years for Brandon 661, Selkirk 521.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, there is a figure he gave us for Brandon of 51 and the equivalent for Selkirk was 28. I didn't quite catch what that was. Was that a grab bag of all the other . . . ?

**MR. SHERMAN:** That category is shown as Other Treatment and it basically includes physio-therapists and professionals in that category. —(Interjection)— Well, professional therapists, yes.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** The Minister said professionals. Only professionals?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, the figure would include the professionals and their aides, apparently, Mr. Chairman. It wouldn't be all professionals but it would be people either qualified as professionals

or working as aides in that category of service.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Would the Minister be kind enough now to give us the population as of the end of 1976 and the end of December 1977, or later if he has it; I'd like to have it now, if at all possible — the latest that he has.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. For Brandon the population, December 1976, was 558, and for Selkirk it was 348; December, 1977, for Brandon was 571 and for Selkirk was 326.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, then there was a transfer. The population is roughly the same. I had 568. My record showed that at the end of December, 1976 Brandon was 568 — not 558. I don't know if there was an adjustment between that, but there is not that much.

**MR. SHERMAN:** 1975; it was 567; in 1976 it was 558.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, 575; I've got 595 for December and then December 1976, 568 so it has gone down a little bit. It seems to have gone down in Selkirk and gone up in Brandon. If my record is right for 1976, well then it's only three. So therefore that would seem to be that we have approximately the same staff. I know that we weren't too happy with the medical staff there. We tried to recruit, especially in Brandon; there is one less on the medical staff, there are 22 instead of 23. But this is the staff. Are there any vacancies at this time? I'd like to know the vacancies that are in this department, broken down as much as possible.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. As of May 10th, the vacancy level at Brandon was 55. It included 29 bulletin and 26 non-bulletin, for a total of 55. That was Brandon. The vacancy rate at Selkirk is 48; 27 bulletin and 21 non-bulletin.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** With this explanation, would that be, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, that the bulletin position — that the institution is trying to fill, while the others are left vacant at this time, or are they trying to fill all the positions?

**MR. SHERMAN:** We're trying to fill them in order of need or requirement. There is now no restriction on filling bulletin positions. The situation during the winter was that bulletin positions were frozen and non-bulletin positions were fillable, but each bulletin position had to be dealt with and go through the process of individual vetting and individual approval. That situation has changed; that embargo does not exist and the department has been given the right to work with the two institutions to fill the vacancies as necessary up to a certain vacancy level, in whatever category — either bulletined or non-bulletined. The total vacancy level for the two institutions is 100, which amounts to nine percent and that is flexible as to the particular numeral to be applied to the individual institution and it's flexible within the institution as to what the numerals should be for bulletin as against non-bulletin.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, does the Minister know or can he tell us whether the vacancy rate he just indicated — the 100 — how that is comparable with, let's say, a year ago?

**MR. SHERMAN:** My officials tell me that this year, as compared to last year, would show about 30 more vacancies in total — about 30 more vacancies as compared to the total last year.

**MR. MILLER:** Because there is no requirement that they remain vacant, is the Minister saying that the 30 more vacancies are simply due to the fact that they can't find staff to fill the vacancies — because there is no embargo on hiring, I gather?

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, I'm not saying that, Mr. Chairman. There is an embargo. There is a vacancy level that has been decreed for the two institutions in total, at this point, as 100. Therefore, we are looking at the present time at something slightly more than 100 vacancies. We are actively in the process of filling five of those vacancies right now, which will bring us down inside the 100 vacancy ceiling. Those five are actually bulletin positions at Brandon that we're in the process of filling which will bring us down inside the 100 vacancy ceiling. If it proves impractical and in any way difficult and unreasonable to operate at that level, well the department, and I, as Minister, will be in communication on an ongoing basis with Management Committee of Cabinet and Cabinet

itself to have that figure adjusted. But the vacancies that are there right now — all of which have developed through attrition — are vacancies that have been allowed to build up to the 100 vacancy ceiling. They have gone slightly beyond it in the last couple of weeks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, then can I ask whether the figure of \$16 million for Salaries shown here is based on that kind of vacancy level being maintained all year or whether that \$16 million is to reflect the possibility of a full staffing?

**MR. SHERMAN:** At the time the budget was prepared, Mr. Chairman, it was actually based on a somewhat lower vacancy level than that, so it's possible there could be some residual funds there. But it's also possible that we may need them, as we test the situation month by month in terms of staff.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite clear; I think I am; I'm not sure. The Minister said that there were in Brandon 55 vacancies and he broke these down between bulletin and those that were not bulletin — 29 and 26. He did the same thing in Selkirk. Then I thought he said that they were going ahead and filling the bulletin positions and the others if needed, but they had to come back to the department. Then the Minister told us, though, that there was a vacancy level, in other words, of 100. So that's practically the total. The vacancy is only 103, and the Minister said there were five being filled. So that would leave it at this 100.

Now, the only change in this is the Minister is saying that this is not frozen solid. In other words, if the institution can go back and say, "We need these people," and make the case, the Minister will go to Cabinet and Management and let them fill some of these positions. Is that a clear understanding of what the Minister said?

**MR. SHERMAN:** The honourable member is partially right. The fact is that from this point forward any vacancy occurring now will automatically be filled, no matter which institution or no matter whether bulletined or non-bulletined, because we are at the 100 vacancy level. Well, we are at 103. We are going to fill five positions which would make 98. There might be a little discrepancy of two vacancies in there but the last figures I was able to give you were May 10th and it's possible that on a current basis, actually this afternoon, that the filling of the five will only bring it down to exactly 100. I will check that. When we are at exactly 100, that's as far as I have to go. Any vacancy after that can be filled immediately.

But what I am saying to the honourable members is that if my officials and the administrations of the two hospitals come to me a month from now and say that a level of 100 is too high and were having difficulties, then, yes, I have the right to go back to Cabinet and ask to have that ceiling lowered.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, again I would like to ask the Minister . . . And I think I have been more than patient on this — I asked about two months before we started the Estimates, I asked the first day we started the Estimates and I have repeatedly asked — I would like to have the vacancies roughly around November 1st, when there was a change of administration and a change of Minister, of all civil servants and all staff man years, all the vacancies that we had in the department. And I was promised that and, you know, it would come in handy if we had it here. I hope we're going to get it before we finish the Estimates. It's not going to serve me too well if we don't get it then.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned. I don't want to exaggerate this, but let's look at the difference. The Minister is always saying, "We are maintaining. We are not improving as now, but we are maintaining all the services." Now, we had restraint last year and we kept the vacancies down, but there is a difference of 30. The Minister also said in this House, gave us his own personal commitment, that the staff-patient ratio would be the same, and it's approximately the same if you add the two that we had last year and this year. Well, no, that's the end of 1977, there might be more people now. The Minister gave me the last figure that he seemed to have, because I asked him to give me the latest one that he had; it was the population in these institutions at the end of December, 1977. And I think at the time he said, well, there were less people in the winter, maybe more in the summer; and since then we didn't have more facilities. I don't think there have been that many deaths and there are more people. There is a possibility that more people are there, or should be waiting to get in, because we haven't done anything for psychiatric beds in the general hospitals or in the acute care hospitals across the province. We haven't built any personal care beds.

So I am concerned that we are slipping. It might not be much now. I don't want to make a

federal case out of this at this time, but I want to tell the Minister that we're going to watch quite closely because the commitment that we had then is not kept. And as I say, there is not that much that I'm going to make a big case out of, but there are 30 vacancies more. And 30 out of what? A total of 1,000 or so, over 1,000, might not be too much. As I say, at this time I am not going to worry too much.

But that's not the only thing. I know the gentleman from Brandon West was quite concerned and my colleague also, the then the Minister of Industry, especially with the medical staff that we had in Brandon. We weren't satisfied. We were trying; we weren't too successful mind you but we were trying to recruit more for those areas. It was quite difficult but we were trying to get any psychiatrist that we could get. We hired them fast because we needed them all through the system, especially in those areas.

My other concern is that there is something that we are supposed to take the Minister's word for. I'm sure he is sincere but I don't know how this thing works. The Minister said, "If the staff of these institutions tell me we need more, well, I'm going to go back . . ." "You know, we need more. The welfare of the patient or the standards will suffer. Then the Minister — and I believe that — will go to his colleagues and then he will go to Management and get more — recruit more. But what guidance or what standards do they measure? Because just about a year or a year and a half ago the people in those institutions weren't too happy and the director wasn't too happy. I visited the Brandon institution and I was told that they were away down on staff, that they wanted more people, that they had been pretty well robbed. We had sent people; we had taken people there; we had reduced the staff but even then they were short-staffed before that. We had reduced the population; we were transferring people into the community, some of the staff to the community. In fact, we kind of slowed down on that and they felt that they were short-staffed. Now, it's the same staff. They told their Minister a little while ago that they needed more staff, that it was starting to be on the danger side as far as they were concerned, and now they are told, "If you need more; if you feel that the standard is going to suffer, come and tell me."

I would think that they would come in then immediately when the Minister issued that memo to their director, that they would come the next day and say, "We're in danger. The standard will suffer because we haven't got the proper staff." Either that or they feel that they were given other guidance, and maybe the Minister said to keep a certain standard but the standard must have been lowered. If the standard wasn't lowered and if they stayed with the same staff — it was honest then and is honest now and I have no reason to believe that they aren't as concerned — they would come immediately to the Minister and say, "We need more. We need more staff so you will have to go to your people and ask them to unfreeze that." You know, if that is not the case, then these are empty words. They don't mean anything and we're going to have to take them with a grain of salt. The standard must have been lowered or it doesn't mean a thing.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I have been back to Management Committee and Cabinet on two occasions and each time my request, which was based on the advice from officials in the institutions, was accepted and adjustments were made.

One had to do with the Manitoba School for Retardates in Portage, where the staffing freeze was lifted entirely. The other had to do with the present situation in Brandon and Selkirk. There was heavy attrition in the month of April. For what reason, I don't know but the vacancy level in Brandon on March 31st was 38 and on May 10th, as I told the honourable member, it was 55. So there was an attrition of 17 in the month of April and that began to worry my officials and me and we went to Management Committee and Cabinet and got permission to fill five positions right away, which is what we're now in the process of doing. And it was at that juncture that the 100 vacancy level ceiling was set for the two institutions, which works out to a rate of nine percent.

All I can do is assure my honourable friend that if a red light goes on again, I will be back there again and ask that that vacancy level be reduced from 100 to 90, or to 85, or to whatever the professionals tell me they need. I know the previous government was aiming for a vacancy rate of 10 percent, they didn't achieve it. I think they achieved a vacancy rate of about 6 percent but I believe they were aiming for a vacancy rate of 10 percent. We, in fact, are aiming for a vacancy rate of nine, and at a 100 vacancies in those two institutions, that's what it would be and anything beyond that we can fill immediately.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** It is some explanation but I'm not wholly satisfied. I don't question the sincerity of the Minister in this at all but the fact is. . . This famous red light that the Minister is saying,

when the red light goes then I'll go back to Cabinet. But the fact is that last year there were 30 less vacancies, 30 people employed out of 103 and the people were still not satisfied. They felt that because there had been adjustment before when we reduced the population, some of the people had been sent in the field, or you know, by attrition they weren't filled. . . The morale was quite low, to be honest with the Minister, and I felt it warranted a trip to Brandon to go and discuss with them. I met with the whole staff, the senior staff anyway, and they made the point quite clear to me that they had a shortage and some of them even came back to see me privately in the office and were even talking and threatening of leaving because there was no way that they could deliver the service, and that's with 30 more than they have now and the Minister is saying well, we will keep it approximately at this level.

Now I'm not debating what the government is trying to do. If the Minister said the Cabinet has decided, now if I myself feel that that's not enough, I will go back and get more, but the Minister is more or less putting the blame on the institution, and he is saying . . . I'm not saying that he's trying to hide that's not the point I'm trying to make, but he is saying well when the people in the institution tell me. You know we can have that pattern all through these Estimates — well it's going to be left to the hospital and if the hospital comes back and so on.

But these people - told me that at this time, I mean as professionals they really felt that there was a shortage of staff, quite a shortage of staff and we'll come back to the Portage. Portage, we were told there were 200 shortage of staff, you know, by the same people that are there but I don't want to mix things up because the next item is Portage. I want to just talk about Selkirk and Brandon. These people then tell us that there is a shortage although there were 30 people more. The Minister seemed to indicate, well they are satisfied, they've accepted that. Well, the civil servants have to accept whatever the government of the day decides. But, you know, should we question the integrity of these people or should I take it from that that they have been trying to con me when I was there, that all of a sudden they didn't need these people at all. I hesitate in making this accusation and I say that this is in danger now, especially if the Minister said that there were 38 in March I think, and it went all the way to 55. In a month that can come fast and then the Minister froze everything until they got this 100 percent, then they got a little lower than the 100 percent so they said well let's go to the 100 percent. But if you lose that many people a month, even if you try to replace them because you might as well say you know, forget this 100. I don't know why you're budgeting for a 100 more when you say you're not going to release them, I don't know what this is for. I don't know if it's to indicate later on that you saved money, that it has been better management and money was saved but I think this is false. This is why in a way I sympathize with the Minister. All through his Estimates he said well we're not finished with our policies, but in the meantime we're asking to approve Estimates. It is practically a guessing game. Now, today my colleague asked if this would represent the whole staff and if I understood the question it would be to pay everybody, the full complement and now. . . —(Interjection)— No. Oh, that's not counting the 100 vacancies, I'm sorry I had it backwards. Then that means that it would go to pay just the complement of people that are hired now. That might change, there might be more people in one area. If later on he comes back and he wants to fill in any of these 100 positions — I'm not talking about any future vacancies that happen, but these 100, all those 100, then you'd have to come and ask for more money.

**MR. SHERMAN:** There's some leeway in there, Mr. Chairman, because when the budget was prepared, or when this stage of it was prepared some three months ago, at that point in time we were basing it on a somewhat lower vacancy rate, then attrition took place at a more rapid rate than we had projected, so there is some leeway. In other words, we could bring that vacancy . . . Say we found we had to bring the vacancy level down by 10, 15 or 20, there's enough leeway in the budget to pay those salaries.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** There's not enough money to pay the full complement. If tomorrow the 103 positions were filled there wouldn't be enough money, but there is enough to pay a certain percentage if you have to dip in lower than that because — at one time they were lower, even more vacancies than that — that would give you a cushion. Well then, why is the Minister asking for the same positions if he hasn't got the money to pay for them? You know, I think that we should look at the cushion, it would be a little easier and it would be more realistic and more, well, I'm not going to say honest because I don't think this is a scheme to lower that but the thing is there's not enough money to pay them so maybe the Minister should say we are reducing 50 and keep a cushion of 50, maybe that should be done.

My first concern hasn't changed at all. As I say, the staff, the same senior staff that are there now were there when I visited Brandon, some of them were over to visit me privately, they wanted to talk to me privately and they were very concerned. Some of them threatened to leave because they felt that they were short-staffed and they felt that maybe we were going too fast. That, by

the way, is also true — and we'll come back to that — of Portage. It was felt that our policy of trying to depopulize these institutions and taking some of that staff, therefore reducing the staff and send them into the communities wasn't quite fair. They felt that you don't necessarily take, let's say the ratio is 1 to 5 or something, you don't necessarily leave 10 people and take 1 staff out. So, they were concerned.

This is my last concern, I understand the rest, but the Minister is saying well if they tell me that this is too low, they're 'not for the welfare of the patient, they cannot operate with this staff. Well, they've already told their Minister that. Sure, there was a change of Minister, a change of government, but they've already said that so if the Minister is saying tell me if you can keep the standards that you have now, that you should have, don't forget that we lost accreditation in Brandon for awhile also, and that was one of the reasons.

I don't know if the Minister really understands what I'm saying. How can he say well, it's up to the institution — I can't guarantee that they haven't — and the minute they tell me that's not sufficient staff, I will immediately and I make a promise that I will go to my colleagues and try to get this vacancy rate lowered. Well, that staff has already made their views known on this, so if this is realistic and if this is really what they understand and if this is really what the Minister means, well then he's got the answer, or, there has been maybe an unwritten understanding that the standards will be allowed to go down a bit because of the restraint.\$

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, there's enough money in the budget being asked for through the Legislature to pay 92 percent of the total staff man year complement. In other words to leave a vacancy rate of 8 percent. There's enough to pay 92 percent so, in other words there's enough to handle a vacancy rate of 8 percent and if everybody can live with this 100 vacancy ceiling . . . We're living with a vacancy rate of 9 percent which allows us 1 percent leeway. The previous government, as I've suggested, was shooting for a vacancy rate of 10 percent, so the approach hasn't changed all that much. We can certainly reduce that vacancy rate down if we feel we have to and it won't be related to money, if we feel we have to we'll reduce it down. There is leeway in there to reduce it down because of the fact that the budgeting was done on an 8 percent vacancy rate.

The honourable member asks me about the apparent lack of logic in the position that we're taking right now when it's drawn alongside the position that he faced where the two institutions, particularly Brandon, was telling him a year ago or more than that that they were understaffed and undermanned and they needed more people. I don't dispute that or doubt that for a moment. All I can tell him is that I visited Brandon about three weeks ago and they did not tell me that. Now that doesn't say that they won't tell me that, but they did not say . . . We looked at a number of things, a number of problems and a number of questions related to the need for some safe rooms and time expired part of the property and that sort of thing but, nowhere at any time was I confronted with a question about understaffing or difficulties in meeting their commitments because of the staff complement, so, I can only go on my experience up to this point in time. I may find myself in the same position six months from now as he did, but I haven't up to this time and through the Chief Provincial Psychiatrist and his continuing liaison with those institutions, I can assure the honourable member that I'm being kept posted very regularly on any questions, any issues, any concerns that arise and with the attrition that developed in April, that staffing concern did arise and that's what led to the latest decision.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I'm not going to belabour the point. If the Minister said that he hasn't been approached by staff, I can only surmise that they have been conditioned by what they've read in the paper about the restraint, the Task Force, or maybe some of the senior people in the department have said this is what we must do across the department and that's what you have to do, and they don't realize that they should run their institution, that the Minister is expecting them to keep the proper standard, and maybe if this is brought to their attention, I would imagine that they'll be over to see the Minister tomorrow.

Now, there's one thing I want to clarify. The Minister said that we were trying to keep 10 percent, the target of 10 percent. That was the government as a whole, I want to make that quite clear because in discussing with my colleagues I made it quite clear also that that was very difficult if not impossible in the health field and I was given that concession. And even in our own department there were some areas where we were cutting, that doesn't mean that we took every single department or sub-department or division and said this is what you're going to do, you're going to cut so much.

There's some areas that we felt, especially in areas like an institution and so on, I don't think at any time we froze any of these positions. It might be that they were told by our senior people to come down, but I think it was more realistic, around the 6 percent. The Minister is also saying — and the facts are there that we had at least 30 less vacancies than they have right now and

this is only six months ago and they were quitting, maybe that's one of the reasons. —(Interjection)— Yes, the attrition might have been, I don't know, I'm not going to start if the Minister is afraid of rumours, I'm not going to say it's a rumour, but there's a possibility that maybe there is discontent because people weren't very happy especially in Brandon, especially at the time Brandon lost its accreditation.

Then I'm going on the last thing and then I will sit down and as far as I'm concerned this item could pass, but I'm also remembering and, as I stated before, I didn't want to make a federal case out of that but I remember that a few short weeks ago the Minister guaranteed — and I thought it was odd at this time that the Minister should, and I think maybe he learned and he won't come in and say, "That's my personal commitment," because he can't always control things — that the staff-patient ratio would remain the way it was when he took office. Already this is not the case — not by much. Not that much but I want to light the red light and say, "Well, this is a danger signal and I hope it's not going to go too far."

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Could the Minister give us the external agencies and a breakdown of the grants.

**MR. SHERMAN:** On the external agencies, Mr. Chairman, yes. The Canadian Mental Health Association is one. It's a general purpose grant of \$33,000, which is the same as last year. The Eden Mental Health Centre \$750,700.00. Last year's vote was \$661,300.00. Those are the external agencies that are covered under this appropriation, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I am a little concerned that the Canadian Mental Health were left at \$33,000.00. That means that they will have to reduce their programs, maybe not that much, but in this year of inflation and so on, this is definitely a reduction. Especially in these days when we're not improving. We're lucky if we keep pat in some of the programs. I think that this is going backwards but it wouldn't be that much difference. I think that we all recognize the value of the Canadian Mental Health Association who has helped — I was going to say the government but — the people of Manitoba, who have done a lot of voluntary work and this is something that the Minister is very interested in.

The Eden Mental Health Centre, I wonder if the Minister can tell us what direction they had — what percent. Because they had staff; I think that there are certain staff — and we cover that under another item. The Minister talked about some of the staff but they have some of their staff, too, that are hired by the board. Is that increase for any new programs, for a bigger load, more patients, a larger population or has there been a reduction of the population of the Eden Centre and have they been told to cut down on staff and salaries and food, and so on? We have the same concern, because this is just a lump sum to run a certain hospital; that's what it amounts to.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the estimate here, for 1978-79, allows for increases to the 1977-78 adjusted level of costs, plus price increases for salaries only. Operating cost increases are to be met within the 1977-78 funding level.

The increase here really is a reflection or a translation of an increase in the per diem, plus the fact that there are some additional patients at the centre — approximately 10 additional patients.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** What's the total patients, roughly, if the Minister has that.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The total at Eden is 40, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Patients?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, 40 patients.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** And the staff other than those that are civil servants and that were covered under the other item.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I don't have that, Mr. Chairman. I'll try and get it. I just have the four who are Civil Service provincial staff.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering whether the Minister can tell us whether he is requiring agencies like the Eden Mental Health Centre to undertake to have a vacancy rate or cut staff in the same way as he is requiring of the provincial institutions such as Brandon and Selkirk or are these so-called "private" agencies not required to meet the same restrictions that apply to provincial institutions and provincial Civil Service — that is the provincial staff. I am wondering if there is a distinction being made because in the one case Brandon and Selkirk are run by the province and in the case of Eden it is run by an outside board, whether in fact they are treating it differently.

In other words, are two separate criteria being used and the provincial staff cut it down or have a nine percent vacancy rate or a ten percent vacancy rate. In the case of Eden, it's an outside agency. Let's not quarrel with them and we will give them the grant or whatever is required — maybe a little less than they asked for but they are not required to cut down staff.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the staff at Eden is the same as it was last year. The approach to these particular agencies has been one of communication from the government, laying down the directions and the intentions for restraint, urging the co-operation of the related boards connected with these external agencies in the restraint exercise.

Further to that, there is some control, of course, that we exercise through the per diem. That's really the most direct kind of control that we have in the termination of the per diem rate. Further to that, in the case of the Eden Mental Health Centre, because our psychiatrist is the medical director there, we do handle all the admissions and discharges.

So I recognize the import of the honourable member's question as to whether there is a double standard in place here and I can only say that we have made strenuous efforts to prevent any kind of double standard by the letters, the communications, the guidance that we have sent out in very clear terms to all agencies that are funded through this department, and through the rate-setting exercise on the per diems. That is really the only direct control we have. There has certainly been no increase in staff at Eden. They have not been instructed — nor do I think it would be proper to instruct them — to cut staff but they have to operate on a budget that is based on a per diem that takes into account the fact that everyone operating within the aegis of the department is under very close supervision. And since that is not possible with the external agencies, we have calculated that into the per diem agreements and expect that those rates will make it incumbent upon them to operate a very tight ship.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, what the Minister says is this: Because it's an external agency, he has no control and he has no authority to order them to have a vacancy rate but he feels no compulsion or he is not concerned at all about saying to Brandon and Selkirk, "Now, it's true you'd like 30, 40, or 50 more employees or staff, professional staff, because you think that it's needed but sorry, there is a restraint in government and we're going to cut you down."

In the case of Eden he can't say that because it's an external agency. He says they control it by the per diem. But if, in fact, Eden Mental Health comes along and hires some more professional staff, whether occupational therapists or physiotherapists, or behavioural modification experts, then it is almost *afait accompli*.

The Minister then says, "Well, this is what the board felt it needed and we will have to cover their per diem." So that there is, in a sense, a double standard. He feels they can't say to an agency, "Keep your patient-staff ratio at this level, which compares with the level I have now imposed in the provincial institutions." Because it's an outside agency and he can't say that to them but he, of course, has no compunction about saying it to the provincial institutions because they are his own institutions and he has direct control. But is he not concerned about a double standard developing here? The board of an agency may determine that in order to deliver a certain level of service — a quality of service — they need X number of people. And they will proceed to hire them. Having hired them, that's their cost and the per diem has to reflect that recovery.

Now, they can quibble about it when they start going over the books, but the net results, inevitably, the agencies have richer staffing as a rule and better standards and perhaps higher services than the provincial ones. And this has always been a concern to me because one is an external agency and there is a board of volunteers, they are somehow treated somewhat differently because they are somewhat at arm's length, even though their funding pretty well comes from government. Without government funding they couldn't stay open.

So I'm wondering whether the Minister really means it when he says that as an external agency he is really not in a position to say to them the standards they should maintain, or the staff-patient ratio they should maintain, or the quality they should maintain in their food services and so on. He can't say that to them but he can, indeed, and does say it to Brandon and Selkirk.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I'm not really sure what the solution is to that problem, Mr. Chairman, other than

government taking over and operating all these services itself rather than purchasing services from outside agencies. I imagine the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks may well have wrestled with the same question when he was Minister.

The board of the Eden Mental Health Centre is on a global budget and when we approach the determination of the funding that is going to be made available by the taxpayers to them for a given fiscal year, we take into account the very problem that the honourable member is alluding to, and base the increase accordingly. The increase, we feel, permits absorption of or accommodation of the cost increases and the price increases that an institution of this kind faces in providing food, care and services to its patients and price increases of a reasonable level or nature for those salaries — in other words, those positions — in existence as at the close of the previous fiscal year. And we're not putting anything in there to allow them to increase positions.

I don't know what other recourse we have, particularly on a global budget, except to watch it very closely. The approach really is no different from the one that is taken with respect to the Child Care Institution, from whom we purchase services. It's precisely the same dilemma there and the alternative, I guess, is for government to go into all these operations itself, or hospitals.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would remind the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks we have just a few seconds left before the Private Members' Hour.

**MR. MILLER:** Well, okay, then I'll speak fast. The increase was from 661 to 750, I don't know what the percentage is but it's a considerable percentage. That includes salary and expenditures. I'm looking at the increase in the institutional care at Selkirk and Brandon, and I don't think the comparable percentage is reflected in Brandon and Selkirk. So that in Brandon and Selkirk, it was imposed a lower increase than apparently was allowed to the Eden Centre.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, there was a 20 percent increase in patient population at Eden and that certainly didn't take place at Brandon or Selkirk.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Will we pass this? —(Interjection)— In accordance with Rule 19, Section (2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at the call of the Chair.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** We're now in Private Members' Hour. Is it the wish of the House to proceed according to the bills on the Order Paper?

### SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILLS

#### BILL NO. 5 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been in the House more than one term are familiar with this issue, and most of us have spoken on it before, but I would like to address myself to the comments made by the Member for Emerson because he has really put the issue in a slightly different way and I would like to directly respond to the problem as he sees it, and as some of the people supporting this legislation see it. I think in a nutshell, one can say that the issue in 1978 is as follows; namely, there is a problem with young people drinking primarily because some of them are attending high school after having a few drinks. That is seen as the problem, that is seen as the issue, and the solution offered by the Member for Emerson, although he would not be so reckless as to say it was an entire solution, but the positive step that he offers us as a solution is that we should raise the age, that that will help remedy the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Member for Emerson's riding somewhat; I have mentioned this before, but I have to mention it again, that this is an area that I know. He raised a peripheral issue; he said that he was worried about all these Americans coming up north, spending their money in his riding, and that one poor man who owned a pub or a bar had suffered to the extent of \$10,000 additional revenue or profits, and that is an interesting position, a surprising position. But as I say, I am somewhat familiar with his riding. I had family members there, I went to his riding as a child and took my vacations around the metropolis of Overstoneville, and I used to go with my uncle and aunt to visit Ridgeville and Tolstoi, Dominion City; and I also taught at Emerson Collegiate, so I am familiar with that riding. I also know that ever since the 1950s, people from Winnipeg frequently drove down to the northern United States to have a few drinks or to shop, and I also

know that the people in Emerson frequently, to this day I'm sure, still go over the border to visit some of the northern towns. So I say, that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker.

One thing that does concern me, though, is the fact that this is supposed to be a free vote; that does concern me, because I now speak as a member of the Legislature on an equal par with the other 56 members, and what concerns me is that, in effect, we have had free votes before and some of them have not been very free. "Free" is a relative term. And I say to the members opposite in particular, that on the two votes that we had, if my recollection and my figures are correct, that when we had a vote on an issue, a modest proposal in regard to the question of parochial schools, that the Conservative Party voted 17 to 1. On the drinking at 19 last year, if my statistics are correct, they voted 18 to 1. So, to me, this concerns me in that a free vote on two major occasions, on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party, has meant that one person has broken ranks. I say that that is a serious concern, and it leaves me with a sinking feeling when we are dealing with this particular issue.

I would like to point out that the teachers themselves, the people with the problems, as perceived by the Member for Emerson, at their convention, the MTS convention in 1977, defeated by a two-to-one margin, a resolution to increase the drinking age. These are the very people who apparently are pained and suffering and have difficulty with this problem. These are the people who know, because they are in the front lines, but they themselves, apparently, do not share the position as put by the Member for Emerson.

Mr. Speaker, I could read an article in the Free Press by someone named Glenn McKenzie, called "Raising the Legal Age is no Hindrance," what it does — in April — this article simply says in effect, "Regardless of the drinking age, the students can go out and borrow ID, or without ID they can go and get a drink. This has never been a problem for them before; it will not be a problem for them, given this proposed legisla

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus on the high school student and the university student, because I contend that the problem of enforcement is the same for somebody who is under age, as well as someone who is over age, when you are dealing with students. It doesn't matter whether they are drinking legally during the day, or whether they are drinking illegally during the day; the net effect in terms of the school and the classroom is identical, and that the real issue is one of enforcement — that's what I really want to deal with today — and that it is also, of course, one of education. And no member here will disagree that the question of enforcement is crucial, or that the question of education is crucial to the issue of the drinking age.

I say that the drinking student, regardless of whether he is in high school or university, regardless of whether he is 18 or 19, is a problem for the teacher and the school and the parent, but it is no more of a problem than the drinking employee who is of the same age, and who works in the office or the factory. That person, that young person, is a problem for the boss and the foreman. So, if we raise the drinking age to 19, or 21, or 65 — whatever we're going to resolve in this particular debate — there will still be students who drink. And when we come to drinking again, I remind you that there are community colleges, that there are universities, that there are technical and vocational schools, and that there are, of course, high schools, and that in all of them, the issue is the same.

So here is the real question, as I see it: What do you do with a student or an employee who has been drinking? That is the issue; that is the question. And the answer, Mr. Speaker, I think is very simple, in the case, let's say, of a student. If a person comes into a classroom, and they've been drinking, I assume that if the teacher perceives this and the student's behaviour is unacceptable, there are a number of courses of action that can be taken, on the first instance or on the second or third instance. A normal, intelligent response would be to reprimand the student. Another response, maybe a higher grade, would be to send that student home, or to call their parents in. A third response would be to expel that student from the system permanently; and fourth, if there is a serious, long-term problem in terms of an alcohol problem with the student, one could send them to AA. I mean, if they are alcoholics, that is where they need help; that is where they can get help.

So I say that that is how you handle the problem. You don't handle the problem by legislating; you handle the problem where it is, in the classroom. It is a job for the principal, for the teacher, for the parents and for the students. It isn't a job for the legislators of the Province of Manitoba. It's a case of dealing with that person. Teachers are not helpless to deal with students who misbehave or act in an unacceptable manner, or fashion. So that's the solution. The solution, Mr. Speaker, is discipline. The solution is a clear and a strong rational policy, over a weak-kneed permissiveness or a paralysis, in the face of this kind of a problem. The solution lies in enforcing minimum standards, and surely it is a minimum requirement for a person going to school or an employee going to work that they should be sober. That is hardly a difficult or unreasonable demand.

And there are problems with drugs not dealt with in this legislation; there's problems of glue-sniffing, and what are you going to do with all this? Ban it? Raise the age, prohibit alcohol,

prohibit drugs, prohibit glue-sniffing? Go ahead, prohibit all of it; but it is in the enforcement and it is in the education that the answer lies. Mr. Speaker, I say that no matter what age you select over 18, in the post-secondary institutions the problem is the same because the students there range into their 20s, their 30s, 40s, and maybe even higher.

And you know, I want to quote — — this is something I meant to put into my few written notes here — I want to quote from Evelyn Boyce; I believe that is my colleague's aunt —(Interjection)— No? Eleanor. Eleanor Boyce; Auntie Eleanor — Bud's Auntie Eleanor, who is a very prominent and highly-respected teacher in the Faculty of Education, and she had a saying, which I believe is right on, in terms of the application of this issue. She said, "It is not what you expect that counts; it is what you accept." So, if you expect students not to drink but you let them drink, what's the difference? But if you will not accept that kind of behaviour, then I think you can get somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, teenagers and students and adolescents have always consumed alcoholic beverages and will always consume alcoholic beverages, regardless of the legal drinking age. They have been drinking from age 14 and 15 for God knows how long; they drank when they were 14 and 15 when I went to high school in the 50s; they've been drinking in the 60s; they're drinking in the 70s, and they'll be drinking in the 80s and the 90s when they're under age, at 14 and 15. You know, a lady called me up about six months ago, and 16 and so on.

I got one phone call — no letters — on this issue; one woman called me, and she wanted to know my position. I said, "I am for drinking at 18." This woman said, "Forget it, I'll never vote for you again," or did she say, "I never have voted for you; I don't live in your riding," she just said, "I wouldn't support you if you were my MLA," or, "I'm not voting for you" if she lived in my riding — I don't remember what she said. She said to me — we had a discussion; we were about the same age; I said, "Look, lady," I said, "the friends of mine, my own friends, most people start to drink when they are around 15." When the drinking age was 21, the fellows that I chummed around with started drinking at 15. They weren't drinking night and day; they weren't drinking when they went to school; they were drinking on weekends, having the occasional drink. I said to her, "When did you start drinking?" She said, "Well, when I was 13." But she said, "You know, there's an 8-year lag," like there's an 8-year lag. If you make it 21, they drink about eight years younger. If you make it 18, they'll drink at 10. You know, Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. Her solution, her response to the Member for Emerson, is not to make it 19, but to make it 27, because you make it 27 then the kids from 19 and up will drink. That's her logic.

Mr. Speaker, enforcement, as I say, is also the key and it's up to the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission to do some enforcement. I think we need I.D. cards and I think everyone would agree on that. I say to the Attorney-General, if he's listening to this debate, that I believe that it is up to him to put some pressure on the Liquor Control Commission inspectors to see that young people are not being sold alcoholic beverages, in the commissions and in the beverage rooms and the cocktail lounges, that they are not being served.

It's up to the schools to enforce behaviour in their classrooms. It is up to people in businesses to enforce a sober policy in their plants and offices. And it is up to the police, and it is up to the RCMP, and again it's up to the Attorney-General to perhaps go after and encourage the law enforcement agencies to have a hard crackdown on drinking drivers, regardless of their age.

And similarly I think the Minister of Education, the Minister of Education I would say at this day and age, should make it known in no uncertain terms to all the school divisions, that he wants them to crack down on drinking in the schools, regardless of how old these kids are, that this behaviour is out of the question.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me be quick to add that it is only a very very very small number of people who are concerned. We're not talking about 50 percent of the student body, or even 10 percent, we're talking with the odd student who engages in this kind of behaviour.

In addition to that we need an educational policy, we need a broad policy in terms of drinking habits, to encourage people to allow people to drink, or not to drink, to drink in moderation. I think the MLCC has a right, an obligation to spend some of its millions of dollars of revenue in terms of educating people about intelligent drinking, and we need a crackdown on the drinking driver.

Mr. Speaker, in the last analysis I believe the vote will be decided on the basis of attitude, the attitude of the legislators in regard to young people, namely, do you or do you not trust young people, and are you willing to give them responsibility? Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a young person of 18 is capable of making a rational decision on voting and drinking. I believe that most young people are sensible and trustworthy.

So I simply say in conclusion, that regardless of the drinking age, whether it's 18, 19, 20, 21 or other, the problem will be the same for the student in the university or the high school, and it will be the same for the teacher and the professor and the principal. It will be the same for the young employee in the office and the plant and it will be the same for the boss or the foreman.

In terms of the young driver it will be the same for the police and the RCMP.

Mr. Speaker, the solution is the enforcement of the existing legislation and a program of education in regard to the proper use of alcoholic beverages. If I could quote from the great philosopher, Aristotle, who is admired by my philosophical friend and I, Aristotle once said: "*Medan agan*, nothing in excess."

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

**MR. LEN DOMINO:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I plan to vote in favour of this bill to raise the drinking age to 19. It's not because anybody in my caucus, any whip or anyone else has told me that I should, or that I have to, it's because I think it's a good piece of legislation and I think it will help to alleviate a problem we have here in the Province of Manitoba.

I met, just yesterday, when I was in the washroom — it seems that's where I most often meet members of the opposition and exchange ideas — I met a certain member in the second row back there, who has spoken recently on this piece of legislation and he said, "How are you going to vote?" I said, "I'm going to vote for it. I think it's a good piece of legislation." And he said, "God, you're the youngest member of this Legislature. You're turning your back on those young people. How can you do that?"

**MR. DOMINO:** I'm not sure, but I would suggest to him — I said nothing at the time, I just did up my fly and left — but I would suggest to that member, who is present here today, —(Interjection)— that I am voting for this piece of legislation because of that very fact that I do care about young people. I said to the Minister of Education, I think I am probably the person in this House, the two of us, who have had the most recent and direct contact with high school students — people in this age category — because I was a practising teacher working in a high school up until the end of February this year.

Now, I think we have to consider some very basic facts about alcohol when we're talking about this legislation. First, alcohol is a drug, and that's what we're talking about, people's accessibility to a drug. It's a drug which we know and is proven to damage bodies, to damage the human body, to cause damage to our society, and also it's an addictive drug. After you've consumed a certain amount, in a certain percentage of the population, you have virtually no choice, you have to continue consuming it.

I think it's a drug that causes a lot of trouble in our society. I want to quote from a book called, "The New Drinkers" by a man called R.J. Smart, who works for the Alcohol Research Foundation of Ontario. A lot of the facts I'm about to quote are from Ontario because they seem to do a lot of research and to have a lot of concern for this. Mr. Smart says in this book:

"A great deal of the evidence shows that when per capita alcohol consumption is high, problems such as alcoholism and liver sclerosis are also high.

"Countries with the highest rates of consumption, such as France, also have the highest numbers of problems with alcohol. When drinking increases significantly, it's effects result in more chronic alcoholic problems."\$

Another reference to the problem we have in our society with drugs, can be found in the non-medical use of drugs, directorate report, Federal Government report in 1975 when they estimated the cost to our society in economic terms every year, through drug abuse, alcohol drug abuse, was \$1 billion a year. We're probably all, as legislators who deal with people in our society who have problems, I think we're also all aware of the non-economic problems caused by alcohol. Those you can't really add up and calculate. The suffering and the emotional, and psychic damage, the physical deprivation and the emotional deprivation, and the shame that's associated with being the spouse or the child of an alcoholic, all these problems we have to deal with at all times. —(Interjection)—

The Member for Elmwood says deal with the bill. I think the bill, in a small way, deals with these problems. For, as a lawmaker I think it's incumbent upon all of us to do everything possible in our society to reduce the overall consumption of alcohol.

Now earlier when other members spoke they discussed the the motives behind lowering the drinking age in the first place. They suggested that maybe people were out to gain some votes. I wouldn't be quite that harsh. I don't think that was the motive. After listening to the Member for Inkster, I thought he delivered quite an eloquence and a reasoned speech in defense of lowering the age of alcohol. I don't agree with him, but I think he did a good job of arguing the case.

I think that probably the motives were ones that I could subscribe to and if I would have been here at the time I probably would have voted for lowering the drinking age initially because I'm in favour of greater freedom of choice, making people more responsible for their own actions. But after having seen the results of that I can't agree now, not the second time around. I think there will be members on the other side, and the member on this side who voted for lowering the drinking

age, who will probably change their minds this time around.

Now, the Member for Inkster used a powerful argument in defense of lowering the drinking age; an argument that's known in the literature as the Social and cultural model of alcohol in our society, where it's suggested that if you make alcohol more readily available and if you make it more accessible to people you teach them to handle alcohol in a more restrained and intelligent manner. But from all the evidence we see it doesn't work because in societies, like France and Italy where they have laws of this sort, they also have high rates of alcohol consumption. Whenever you loosen up the rules you invariably, in every society where it has been tried, you increase the overall consumption. And when you increase the overall consumption there's a direct tie with alcoholism and alcohol-related problems. So I don't think that works.

Let's take a look at what actually happened after we lowered the drinking age. The first thing that happened was that the 18 to 21-year olds, in that age group there was a drastic rise in their consumption of alcohol. The Member for Elmwood suggested that kids always drank and they always will drink. I don't think that's true. I think the statistical evidence will show that that age group drinks more now than they did earlier. Let me quote again, from Mr. R.G. Smart, again in his book entitled, "New Drinkers". He says:

"Lowering the drinking age not only legalized the status quo, it also resulted in a considerable increase in the consumption among those affected."

Further, Dr. A.B. Morrison, who is the head of the Federal Government Health and Protection Branch, quoting him from the Ottawa Journal of September of 1975, September 2, 1975. He said:

"Lowering of the drinking age in Canada to 18 years has undoubtedly been a major factor in the continued rate of increase in drinking, especially among young people." In the same article he goes on to say:

"Legitimizing alcohol consumption for a very large sub-group of the population has been damaging for it has made these people most susceptible to high pressures of the liquor advertising industry." That's the young he's referring to.

I'm sure I'm the only member of this Legislature who is directly affected by the lowering of the drinking age. I was not eligible to drink before that legislation was passed. The day it became law, I was eligible to drink.

I think these men who are experts and professionals in the field, I think they'd back up my own personal experiences at the time. I would admit certainly, that I was 20 years old at the time. I drank, and I drank illegally. So did many of my friends. However, the rate of consumption of alcohol increased drastically amongst my circle of friends and myself after it was legitimized under law. It's a fact. Other problems associated with alcoholism have increased.

Again, the Alcohol Foundation of Ontario suggests, when they did a survey of all the alcohol facilities in the Province of Ontario, the drying out places, the clinics for alcohol, that before 1964 the under 21 drinkers, there were no incidents of those reporting themselves or turning themselves in for problems concerned with alcohol.

In 1974, the 18 to 21-year old groups comprised already 4 percent of the population of those people turning themselves in for treatment, and that figure has increased every year since. They predict it will probably reach a height of about 15 percent within 10 years because it takes awhile for the social mores and norms to change.

I think also another devastating effect of lowering the drinking age was to increase the consumption of alcohol amongst those people who are just below the legal drinking age, the people who are 16 and 17 today. And let me quote here — now I'm quoting from a report called "The Alcohol and Young Drivers". It's a Federal Government report, it's called "Alcohol and Young Drivers," the impact and implications of lowering the drinking age, prepared by Dr. Paul Whitehead, our expert in alcoholism from the University of Western Ontario. Here's what he says in part of this report, on Page 53:

"In time with greater access to and prevalence of use of alcohol amongst the youngest licit drinker", that's the 8-year old, "the oldest illicit drinkers, the 16 and 17-year olds find it easier to acquire alcoholic beverages, or materials of identification from slightly older friends, classmates, and schoolmates."

I think there's no doubt in my mind, personally, that we have increased the consumption of alcohol among 16 and 17 year olds. Down the road, that's going to lead to more alcoholics, more broken homes, more problems, more beds in our hospitals are going to have to be filled with treatment of these people. —(Interjection)— The member sitting beside me mentions accidents, drinking and driving. There the statistics are really amazing.

A study done by the Insurance Institute of Highway Safety in an American institute two years ago, compared the drinking and driving and accident rates among 18 to 21 year olds in three states, Indiana, Illinois and Minnesota, those states that had left their drinking age at 21, compared those three states to three other jurisdictions, Michigan, Wisconsin and Ontario, who had lowered their

drinking age. What this survey found was that there was a marked increase — I'll even quote directly from this study: "The study showed that both single vehicle fatal crashes and night time crashes occurred more often in young people under 21 after the law had been changed. There was no comparative increase in areas where it did not change. The data shows that decreasing the drinking age probably allowed increased drinking opportunities for those under 18 as well for, unfortunately, this study also found increased accidents among those 15 to 18 who ought not to have been affected by the new law."

"The study showed that in the first year, the new law probably led to 29 additional deaths in Michigan; 28 additional deaths in Ontario and 13 in Wisconsin." If there's any truth at all, any validity at all to this kind of report, we have to reconsider — we just have to reconsider.

Let me quote further from this report, Alcohol and Young Drivers, what they say about drinking and driving. "Marked increases in the collision behaviour of young drivers are absurd, especially alcohol involved collisions and consideration in the report is given to alternative hypothesis that might account for the other, other than the lowering of the drinking age but, in the final analysis, the inference is made that the lowering of the legal drinking age had a real effect in increasing alcohol related damage and accidents among young people in the form of an increased incidence of alcohol related collisions."

This is not just my personal feelings although they certainly support my personal feelings. In each case, the report I was just referring to was financed by the Federal Government. It took a year and a half; they studied accident surveys and reports all across Canada; they had an extensive group of researchers working on it. I think it's a legitimate study. We have to consider this, we have to consider this when we consider the drinking age.

I think also another thing which the Member for Elmwood just pooh-poohed and passed off but he hasn't been in the high schools lately, he's been in here for the last eight years. Times have changed. We're facing a wholly different attitude towards alcohol in society and in many ways the children have changed too. Let me assure you that alcohol is a problem. I notice that school boards and some principals and other teachers in this province have spoken up and they've said that we need to change the laws but the only actual detailed study I could find is another American study. Again, a Michigan study done by a professor from the University of Michigan where they interviewed 354 practicing high school principals in the State of Michigan where they lowered the drinking age. And they asked them, "Have you got a . . ."

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, the honourable member has five minutes.

**MR. DOMINO:** Thank you. "Do you have any extra problems now because you've lowered the drinking age?" —(Interjection)— No, I won't and I've only got five minutes. Please, let me finish.

These 354 principals, 44 percent said they had more problems now with drinking at social and athletic events; 26 percent said they had more problems now with lunch hour drinking; 32 percent said they had more drinking during school hours and 63 percent said they noticed a marked increase in drinking with the 15 to 17 year old groups.

**MR. DOERN:** How would you handle it?

**MR. DOMINO:** I think that you've got to raise the age so that you take alcohol out of the schools, so that you don't have them swapping IDs so that you don't have the 18 year old student in the school acting as a . . . because the 18 year olds, the Grade 12s, are indeed an example for the other students. You see it all the time. If the Grade 12s do one thing, you know, if they all wear purple sweaters one day, before you know it, the Grade 10s are wearing those purple sweaters too. It's a fact of life.

I would suggest that what's got to happen is that we've not only got to raise the age but that the Minister of Highways has got to consider putting a picture on our driver's license because all the alcohol outlets in this province use the driver's license as the main, because they're instructed to, as the main identification. People pass them around. Go to the Westminster Hotel which is the closest hotel to where I live. I go in there for a cold beer at night and I see children who I know aren't the drinking age in that pub and I see them when they are asked for ID, they show a driver's license which has no picture on it. I would suggest we do what they've done in Alberta and in British Columbia and in Saskatchewan, we put a picture on it and we use one of those self-destruct negatives so that if someone wants to slit the plastic and pull the picture out, he can't do it because the picture goes black.

Well, let me suggest, I think it's working.

**MR. GREEN:** If you don't drive, you can't drink.

**MR. DOMINO:** Well, I would suggest that if you don't drive then you can avail yourself of an ID card that can be supplied by the government for \$2.00 or \$3.00 so that you can have a driving license type of card.

In the Winnipeg Tribune, January 28th, 1978, there was an article which discussed what happened in Saskatchewan after they raised their drinking age and after they started using picture IDs. Here's what I'm quoting from that article. It said, "Since September of 1976, when 19 was once again designated Saskatchewan's legal drinking age, the province's liquor licensing commission has noticed a marked decrease in problems arising from the under-age drinking in bars, due mainly to the new age limits and to the use of picture ID cards as identification in the pubs." I think that if we do the picture and we raise the drinking age together, we will find that we will . . .

**A MEMBER:** No more problems.

**MR. DOMINO:** . . . we will decrease the amount of drinking among those people 19 years and under and that in the long run — it's only a small step but that will make it easier for us to run our schools and it will also — if nothing else — people will become alcoholics three years later. If nothing else, at least we'll delay the process. Hopefully, as a society, we can mature, we can learn to handle alcohol and we can find other ways of reducing our overall consumption of alcohol because that's got to be the key.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood has already been in the debate.

**MR. DOERN:** I would like to ask the member a question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, the honourable member's time is up, unless he has leave . . . The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the consideration of this bill is to decide whether or not we should raise the drinking age not specifically to find out how old anybody is as the Member for St. Boniface has great concern. There's been quite a few speeches to date on the bill at hand regarding raising the drinking age. There have been several interesting concepts presented. The other day the Member for Inkster and the Member for Brandon East presented quite similar concerns in the implications of this Bill No. 5 and if I could be so bold as to summarize in a couple of minutes what they said in twenty . . . Their major concern in raising the drinking age from 18 to 19 was that it all of a sudden developed an inconsistency within the legal system whereby an individual who was 18 years old could enter into a legally binding contract; an individual who is 18 years old could be conscripted by the army and fight for his country; he could vote to decide in a lot of provinces and this one in particular who was going to represent him in government, but it denies him the right to drink at age 18.

Well, really that inconsistency I can live with, if it is an inconsistency in fact that's really a serious one. We can consider some of the aspects put forward by the Member for Brandon East and the Member for Inkster and at age 18, an individual can vote and he can decide who is going to govern him, who is going to represent him in the various Legislatures. Has that right of an 18 year old to vote caused any major problems in the country today, has there been any major upheavals or horrible changes in government? No, on the contrary. If anybody should have the right to vote, it probably should be 18 year olds because it is they who have the greatest amount of vested interest in the future of the country because they're going to have to be paying back the debt load that governments throw upon them through, let's say possibly mismanaged spending, both at federal and provincial levels. I don't want to get into an argument about the previous government's record on their financial abilities so I say "possible." That's the only reason I say possible; we're not considering your mismanagement now. But the voting age has not caused any problems at 18.

Now in terms of an 18 year old being able to legally contract to do such and such and a contract being legally binding, I know of not too many instances where that has caused any major problems within the legal system. I don't think there's been too many major concerns issued about 18 year olds subject to contracts.

In terms of being conscripted to defend the country, we've had the conscription age at 18

the whole time of World War II, some 40 years ago almost — and at that point in time the drinking age in the majority was 21 if it was not 21 throughout the entire of Canada. Now, did that cause any major problems for those 18 year olds in 1939? I suggest no, it didn't cause any problem. They weren't particularly concerned at age 18 when they were going to defend the country with the fact that they couldn't drink legally. That didn't really bother them; that was not a major concern of theirs. I maintain that should we ever get to the situation where 18 year olds are again to be conscripted to fight to defend the freedom that we enjoy in Canada that they're going to kick up a fuss immediately and say, "Hey, we can't be conscripted because we can't drink." That's going to be the furthest thing from their mind and it's an irrelevant point that the Member for Brandon East has brought up.

Besides that, as the Member for Seven Oaks so kindly supplied, when they are conscripted and they are a member of the Armed Forces, they have canteen privileges. So, you know, it's not an issue that has been tossed out as to the inconsistency. But, we deal with 18 year olds as far as their ability to drink goes and we analyse that as to whether it's caused any problems. Well, yes, it has, obviously it has. We have got a higher rate of class disruption as reported by teachers, school trustees, superintendents, caused by some 18 year olds who have the ability to go legally to a beverage room or whatever and consume alcoholic beverages and return to the classroom. It's been a problem. The problem has been expressed through statistics offered to the House by the Member for St. Matthews that alcohol involvement in accidents in youth has been at a greater level since the lowering of the drinking age; it's a considerably big problem. So what I'm trying to say to the Honourable Member for Inkster and the Honourable Member for Brandon East in particular, is that we have at issue a problem with 18 year olds drinking. It is recorded in a number of statistical studies and it is a logical step to take to raise the drinking age by one year to 19 in an attempt, in an attempt, to solve some of the problems caused by lowering the drinking age from 21 to 18.

As the Member for Brandon East so ably put the other night in the Estimates, the consideration of Estimates of the Housing and Renewal Corporation, he said, and I'll quote him loosely, he said that, "You know, we may have made a lot of mistakes in Housing and Renewal Corporation; we may have spent money wrongly; we may have housing that is empty and wasn't needed; but it was better, it was better for myself as the Minister responsible to do something for Housing rather than to do nothing." And that is the way he justified the mistakes he made. Well, we'll maybe buy that, we'll maybe buy that.

What we are saying today is that we have a problem with 18-year-olds drinking and what we are saying through this Private Members' Bill is that we are going to attempt to solve the problem by raising the drinking age to 19. We are going to come to grips with the issue and we are going to attempt to put a solution on the Legislature and the laws of the province, which will attempt to solve the problem of students drinking in high school, of the threshold age at which younger people can obtain alcoholic beverages, and I think once again the Member for Brandon East can't very well argue with the concept. If he is going to defend his mismanagement in Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation as being an attempt to do something rather than nothing, how can he not vote for a bill which is going to attempt to solve a problem of drinking among 18-year-olds in high school, etc., etc. The analogy fits in one instance; it must fit in the other.

The Member for Inkster in his presentation played dangerously with the truth, played very dangerously with the truth. He indicated in his speech that he had an 18-year-old daughter who, when this bill became law, would lose her job as a waitress in a licensed premises. Well, all I can say is that is playing very dangerously with the truth, because that is not correct, not correct whatsoever.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a matter of privilege.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. When the member says that I played dangerously with the truth, he is inferring that I knew something to be the case which I was misrepresenting.

It was brought to my attention that there is a grandfather clause in the bill after I spoke, at which time I acknowledged that she would not lose her job, that future 18-year-olds who could have had the same type of working experience that she had would lose their opportunity.

I acknowledged that I was incorrect. The honourable member should not infer that I tried to mislead this House. The matter is right in the bill, I did not realize it and when it was brought to my attention I acknowledged that that was incorrect. My daughter is today 19, on June 1st, 1978. Even if you take that grandfather clause out, you are not going to stop her working.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that I made an inference, but the record shows only one way that his daughter would not be able to work and it doesn't show in any other parts that the member corrected himself.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that he allow the member to explain his point and then if he has a matter of privilege he can raise it.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, he said that the record shows that I said this and the record does not show a retraction, that is what he said, Mr. Speaker. The member wishes to leave an inference with the House that I deliberately played with the truth, and I submit that that is a suggestion that I was trying to mislead this House. It is unbecoming of the member. Immediately it was brought to my attention that there was that clause, I indicated so that that would not affect my particular daughter. It would affect future 18-year-olds.

If the member can only make his presentation by trying to infer that I have misled this House, which probably has not been done by any other member of the Opposition in the 12 years that I have been in this House, that I tried to misrepresent something which I knew to be false, then the member must have a very poor case. If he was a man about it, he would retract that statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that he listen to the remarks of the member and then make his point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, and to carry on — the Member for Brandon East said. . .  
—(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The honourable member, I would hope that he would listen to what the member is saying and then raise. . . The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, if the member will tell you that he is going to deal with my matter of privilege I will sit down. He was going on to another point. I heard what he said about the question that I raised. He said and it will appear in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks that the member made appear on the record, any retraction doesn't appear on the record, and therefore he would like to leave with this House that on the record I was playing dangerously with the truth. He knows that to be not the case, and I ask him if he is a man about it that he withdraw that statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, the record will show that the Member for Inkster today retracted the remark that he said and that is fine. That is fine. —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Order please. I think the Honourable Member for Pembina misunderstands what is transpiring. The Member for Inkster is asking the Member for Pembina to withdraw the inference that he has left that the Member for Inkster has misled the House, and I would suggest that the Member for Pembina address himself to that question.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, thank you for clarification. The Member for Inkster has adequately explained his position as of three days ago that he didn't understand the bill, he didn't read that particular clause in the bill, and that the statement he made in his speech in which he indicated his daughter would lose the job, he believed it at the time. He corrected it at the time, although it didn't show on the record, and he has corrected it today, and I accept his correction.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to you that if the honourable member. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on the matter of privilege, and I am not looking at Hansard, but if he will look in Hansard he will see that I said, "My daughter told me she would lose her job if that bill was available." I never said my daughter would lose her job, but that is what she told me. I

believed it to be the case, Mr. Speaker, and I saw the clause that was changed, and I then indicated that future 18-year-olds would lose their job. .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I have listened very carefully to the words of the Honourable Member for Pembina and the Honourable Member for Inkster, and I fail to find any point of personal privilege in either the remarks of the Member for Pembina or the Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Brandon East in his presentation the other day indicated that he had the greatest amount of respect for the youth of the province, that he had a great deal of faith in their ability to be responsible citizens and to responsibly handle alcoholic beverages at the age of 18; and that by suggesting an amendment and anyone who supported the amendment to the Liquor Control Act to raise the drinking age from 18 to 19, it would show that anyone who voted for that did not believe that 18-year-olds were responsible individuals, and that in fact we had no faith in 18-year-olds if we supported the Resolution.

Well, I might say in comment to that, that that is not correct. In supporting a Resolution to raise the drinking age from 18 to 19 — I have had several conversations with a high school principal in my constituency. One of the problems that he had with the drinking age at 18 was with an enterprising — I suppose you would call him a free enterpriser, this young fellow — he was 18 and in grade 12 and one Friday night when there was a sock hop with grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, at his high school auditorium, this enterprising young man of 18 who was attending grade 12 and his buddy, who was 17 and attending grade 12, decided that they would set up a bar out in the parking lot of the school and they were selling drinks at a buck a shot to all the kids attending the sock hop. Now, he was a true capitalist because he was capitalizing upon an opportunity to make a dollar, and he was selling alcoholic beverages, and the net result of it was grade 7 students — and if you add seven plus six that was a 13-year-old student — several of them were quite inebriated. They were unable to control themselves and there was several messes throughout the building caused by bringing up a stomach full of alcohol, which they had no control over, and that is the kind of thing that we hope to eliminate by raising the drinking age from 18 to 19. Because the 18-year-old person in that instance, if the drinking age was 19 legally could not buy the booze to sell to the young kids. And that is a simple and clear fact.

Now, that is the actions of one irresponsible person who . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of. . .

**MR. GREEN:** Matter of privilege. The honourable member is now suggesting that the raising of this bill, is now trying to mislead the House and playing dangerously with the truth on the basis that this bill permits somebody to set up a bar outside of a school ground and sell liquor to the children.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** I thought the Member for Inkster had more sense than that. That isn't what I suggested. I am giving you an instance, if you would open your ears and close your mouth, I am giving you an instance whereby an 18-year-old, because he could legally buy booze, supplied minors at a school dance. —(Interjection)— Irregardless of the fact, if he is 19, if the legal drinking age was 19, he would have no access to legally buy the booze. He would have to get someone else to buy it for him, and I would suggest it would make it an awful lot more difficult for a high school student to set up that sort of a situation. So that is one of the reasons why I am supporting this bill. 'n further carrying on, I would like to relate an

incident of just some two weeks ago. The students in the Carman Collegiate held a Model Parliament. They had to determine four issues that they were going to present at their Model Parliament. Capital punishment was one and the drinking age was one; and the Member for Brandon East and the Member for Inkster say that, you know, we are considering the youth irresponsible if we raise the drinking age and that we don't consider that they can handle themselves. Well, I suggest to the Member for Inkster and for all members of this Chamber that the students at Carman Collegiate voted in their Model Parliament to raise the drinking age to 19. The students themselves made that measure. They recognize the problem and they recognize also what are we doing; we are suggesting to them via this legislation that you cannot drink until you are 19. We are taking one year of legal drinking away from you as a youth of this province. That is what we are saying, and what they are saying is that, okay, the benefits for raising the drinking age in terms of what

it will do to the peer group, to the supply of alcohol in grade 12, grade 11, grade 10, far outweighed the disadvantage of one year, of one year where we can't legally drink in a hotel. We are willing to make that sacrifice is what they said in the Model Parliament in Carman.

I would suggest that the youth of this province probably think that way in the majority and they have more important issues on their minds. The Member for Inkster says the youth will revolt if we raise the drinking age. I suggest that the youth of this province have an awful lot more important things to think about than whether they can drink in a pub at 18 or 19, that is the least of their concerns right now. They are more concerned about finishing their education, with becoming prepared for the future to take their place in society as wage earning and income earning people, and raising families. They are not concerned as dearly about the drinking age - as the Member for Inkster and others opposite who would try to distort the case.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair, and the House will resume at 8:00 o'clock in Committee of Supply.