

TIME: 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
ESTIMATES — CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. D. James Walding (St. Vital): Order please. Order please. We have a quorum, gentlemen; the Committee will come to order. I would refer honourable members to Page 34 in their Estimate Books, Resolution 64(f) Program Review, (1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the Minister would, Mr. Chairman, favour the Committee with an explanation as to this item, particularly salaries and the number of staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HONOURABLE J. R. BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Yes, Mr. Chairman, this particular component is responsible for program review and implementation. Now the Member for Swan River was pointing out to me that a year ago we had spent a considerable time talking about the plans for the upcoming year and some of these plans have been brought to fruition because of the efforts of this particular component. And as I mentioned at that time a number of people had been deployed over to our department from the Department of Education, Dr. Alan Hellyer, Mr. C. D. Bowen, and Mr. Miller, who were former school inspectors with the Department of Education. At the time that the people came over it was because of their past experience. I had actually asked those school inspectors who could help us in this area because of their familiarity with government structures and their familiarity with the communities and other experience; and the decision to ask these people to come over and their willingness to participate in trying to come to grips with some of the socially disruptive forces in our community has proved to be a good investment.

Now there are \$136,000 allocated for salaries in this particular area with the support expenditures of \$44,100. This includes the salaries for the program review directorate and the general offices and traveling costs relative to this component.

MR. BILTON: Is the Minister telling us that this \$136,000 merely covers one person or two persons or three persons — or what is the staff?

MR. BOYCE: There are a total of six staff man years and two contract employees, one until June of next year and one for the full fiscal year, so there would be six permanent staff man years, one term position and two contracts.

MR. BILTON: I notice there is an increase of a little over \$25,000. Does that show an increase in staff over last year?

MR. BOYCE: Well, there is a total increase in the dollars from \$109,000 to \$136,000 and this increase is for a full year's operation; also the negotiated increase in the MGEA level of payments.

MR. BILTON: Just one thing, Mr. Chairman: "co-ordinates research and develops' reviews and evaluates programs." Now that is a pretty high-sounding title. Just basically in layman's terms, just exactly what are these people doing? We have been talking about programs all the way through your Estimates, Mr. Minister, the developing of this and the researching of that and so on. Why one more?

MR. BOYCE: Well, as we have experienced in the past few days the misunderstandings which can arise out of people's figures differing, one of the things that is involved is the Criminal Justice Information System. Now it may seem a simple problem' but nevertheless to refine this component so that everyone is talking about apples when we talk about apples instead of talking about apples and oranges and bananas, this is one of the thrusts of this particular directorate and it is in co-operation with the federal government and some of these funds we hope will be recovered from them.

The member is doubtless aware that there is a new institution planned for Brandon that we hope to put in place in the near future. I am not going to be any more definite than that because of the problem in having gone to tenders a few years ago and being put in a position where we just couldn't start digging the hole. But to acquire staff and realign the personnel in the department and offer programs which are — I hate to use the word "meaningful" — but it is to bring out the programs which are in place in the correctional facilities more into line with those goals that are attainable. We talk about rehabilitation, but as is coming to the fore now, rehabilitation is a high-sounding word and in some areas the goals have been set higher than we can attain with the staff that are available.

I could perhaps make the point by explaining that if you design a program which can only be operated by a number of people who have doctors of philosophy and these people aren't available, there is no sense in even suggesting that you have it. So really we are trying to bring the level of program to a pragmatic level that we can come closer to realizing our expectations and this is what this particular component of the staff is involved in. When you talk about research I agree with the Member for Swan River' because if I hire somebody to build bird cages, when I come back a few months later, I expect to see some bird cages. I don't want books about bird cages or philosophy of bird cages, I expect to see some bird cages. And this is a challenge that the staff is facing, to come up

with some realistic measures of what we are actually doing in the correctional institutions and facilities in Manitoba.

MR. BILTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, through you to Mr. Minister, we have probation and parole services, care and treatment of juvenile offenders, we have care and treatment of adult offenders, and then we come on to program review. I am just wondering how necessary that expense is when you have the backup staff on those three that I have just outlined who are no doubt planning and working with these people and I am a little afraid that there is an ivory castle in here somewhere where you have got people sitting behind desks programming and programming and programming and confusing the people that are really doing the work as I have just outlined to you. Am I right or am I wrong?

MR. BOYCE: Well, hopefully the member is wrong. One of the problems of this area is that you're faced with a necessity of delivering programs as the system exists; but nevertheless as an example, hopefully we will have available enough of the copies from the Solicitor General's Office on the young people in conflict with the law which was tabled in the House of Commons here recently. So, when we talk about research or planning or review, then we have to see how these programs which are going to be of a different nature can be fitted into the existing personnel we have. This involves a considerable amount of work.

MR. BILTON: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman the Honourable Member for Swan River explored some of the questions I was going to raise. . . The first one . . . I'm looking through Public Accounts here and wondering if the Minister or his Committee or staff can advise me on Public Accounts where we can see how these funds have been managed and distributed. I fail to find them; maybe it's a new wing of the department that has just been established and it's not in the '75-'76 Public Accounts.

The second question relates to the questions of the Honourable Member for Swan River. We are asked to approve here an expenditure of some \$180,000.00. I'd like the Minister to give me some evidence of the usefulness of this particular 180,000 bucks. Can he show us one or two examples where this program review, the research or the review of or the evaluations is worth the \$180,000 that we are asked to pass here? Or is it . . . there's no positive decisions come out of the program. All they are doing is monitoring what's going on in the others. I would just like to justify the expenditure of that kind of money, and the other ones to show me in Public Accounts where we can find how the money was expended. .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: To the Member from Roblin's first question about finding the items in — I'd like the chap to pay attention to this — that in 1975, this was the first year in the formation of this Ministry and I would, at this time Mr. Chairman, take the member's question as notice, and in so doing I would like the staff to prepare a paper for distribution in the House where these funds, which are in my appropriation, were located in 1975 Public Accounts, because this is the only vehicle that members have available for testing to see where the money was actually spent. In the '76 Public Accounts it will actually set them forth line by line as compared with the Estimates which is the usual way of doing that, and in future years it will be done.

To the member's second question, what this component actually does? The Associate Deputy Minister returned from a conference with Deputy Ministers in Regina here the past week, and one of the thrusts of this particular component is to develop the papers and the contracts for negotiations with the Federal Government, you recall we announced here a few months ago that we had entered into a contract with the Federal Government, that they would actually pay so much for training their staff and our staff, to the tune of three quarters of a million dollars. Well, that is a considerable effort in . . . under one of the other items which is coming up for consideration. In fact, it has just come to fruition at the moment, in negotiation with the Federal Government, they have agreed to participate in a training program with Frontier College that they are, through another department, from Canada Manpower they have agreed to pay \$400,000 towards the involvement in the programs of the department. This is actually the staff capacity which deals with those kind of complex problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I wonder can the Minister give the Committee some evidence of the manner in which the other provinces are participating in this joint Federal-Provincial program. Are you working closely with British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario? Is there a close-knit program for all the provinces that are joining and sharing these federal dollars and are not going off in ten different directions, but working towards one objective? Or is each province going its own different way?

MR. BOYCE: This of course is why the Continuing Committee of Deputy Ministers meet, so that each province doesn't try to reinvent the wheel. One province will do one thing and another province will do another thing and then we share the information which is available through the instrumentality of the Continuing Committee of Deputy Ministers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(f)(1)—pass; 64(f)(2). Other Expenditures. The Honourable

Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the Minister could give us a brief word on this.

MR. BOYCE: Well the Other Expenditures are the usual expenditures of Office and Travelling Costs. I could give the member the details but it has actually been decreased from last year. It was \$45.7 thousand allocated and it is reduced to \$44.1 thousand.

MR. BILTON: I heard the Minister rightly saying that this included Travel. Where would these people travel? Would they not be attached to your office co-ordinating research, developing and reviewing and evaluating programs? Do they have to travel to do that?

MR. BOYCE: If, for example, some of these people have to attend a conference to participate in the working up of a contract or to finalize an agreement, then their particular travel is charged to this particular appropriation. It's a method of accounting for the travel of all the people within the ministry in a more detailed fashion than just having it in one line, Travel. This includes visiting the regions also within the Province of Manitoba.

MR. BILTON: Is this a travel item period, \$44,000?

MR. BOYCE: No, no, it's Office Equipment, Stationery and Supplies, Telephone and Telegraph and some computer costs from the Manitoba Data Services, which is charged to this appropriation for services done by Manitoba Data for this component.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, to the Minister through you, are you satisfied Mr. Minister that this \$44,000 for what you've outlined, Travelling and Office Furniture, now you're not buying Office Furniture every year. You spent \$45,700 under this program last year. Did you buy some more furniture this year? Did you buy more Stationery this year than you bought last year or what?

MR. BOYCE: When we talk about Office Equipment, can give you an example. If one of the staff here has one of those hand recording devices on which they dictate memos, that is actually under Public Works but it's charged against this appropriation. We pay rental back to Public Works for the equipment which is charged out to the department generally and some of it is specifically allocated to this particular appropriation.

MR. BILTON: Would it be fair to suggest, Mr. Minister, that this could be somewhat reduced next year when we look at it? Thank you very much.

MR. BOYCE: Why I used the example of one of those hand recorders, I sent mine back.

MR. BILTON: I'm glad of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: When you're talking about Travel Expenses, I was just wondering, do you include an expense account on your Travel Expenses? Is that where the Expense Accounts are taken into?

MR. BOYCE: Yes, if a person travels to a community, it's the mileage and hotel bills and meals that are charged.

MR. HENDERSON: It's really down from what it was before and the Other Expenditures are up so it looks as if you're probably not spending at a worse rate anyway than you were before because it's down. But when you look at that whole figure there \$180,800 for this same program year after year it does seem like a lot of money although it's not much considering the total budget, but it is a lot of money too. That's all I have to say on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(f)(2)—pass; (f) pass. Resolution 64(g) Staff Training (1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: You're being very courteous Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much. Again, may I ask the Minister, what is the number of staff under this heading and their categories? I notice it's down from last year, would it suggest the staff has been reduced and if it has been reduced, by how many?

MR. BOYCE: This is actually a reduction in staff. We had 11 staff man years in this particular component last year, Mr. Chairman and it has been reduced to six. And as I mentioned on the other item, this is where the delivery system, if you will, of what was planned for and developed and negotiated with the Federal Government, this is where it is put in place. And the agreement with Canada allows for 50-50 cost-sharing It includes a direct payment from the Federal Government of \$25 a day for every person within the system who is in a training program outside of the correctional institutions themselves, and a \$12.50 per day for people that are being trained in the institutions themselves, and on top of it, plus the 50-50, the Federal Government is paying the Province of Manitoba with this staff that's involved in delivering the training, \$50.00 a day for each Federal Civil Servant who is trained for their correctional or penitentiary services by this component.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I take it that this six staff are instructors and as instructors, where are their quarters and where do they do their training, that is, of the jail staff or probation officers or what have you, where do they do their training?

MR. BOYCE: The six staff man years, two of them are the co-ordinators, there's one in the adult and one in the juvenile who co-ordinate the program and the staff. There are two staff training

positions and two support staff. The actual training is done on contract so we're not building up a big bureaucracy within this, it is done by contract, which are paid 50-50 by the Federal Government.

The problem, perhaps if I just briefly, Mr. Chairman, explain the problem, between the federal system and ourselves within the next three years we have to have available some 700 trained staff to deal with the federal system and the provincial system. Through retirements and natural turnover, there is a considerable number of positions which will be available. It has become increasingly difficult to attract people to work in correctional facilities, both by the Federal Government and by ourselves.

Hopefully, in developing what we have, what we took out, as mentioned by the Member for Roblin, of the whole research model implementation bag was the Staff Development and Training Program and what we are doing in Manitoba is unique in Canada and it's to try and alleviate that problem, to make it more attractive for people to enter the correctional system as custodial officers and other types of people that we need within the system.

I might say that we had a block ad here recently that we had in the various newspapers locally and outside of Manitoba and there were 250 applications to enter this particular thrust. So what we want to do is, number one, deal with the people who are in the institutions themselves, the people who have worked in the system for a while and we have a responsibility to them, some of these people, 10, 15, 17 years' they want to continue in the operation. So it is to work with them to help them keep up with what is going on in corrections and at the same time attract new people from other areas.

You can well realize that we would be in difficulty if we constructed a new system in which we were going to put 700 employees within the next few years, if they all came from the 18 to 25 year age group. So this particular thrust is across the whole spectrum. It's (1) to deal with the people that are in the federal and provincial system within the Province of Manitoba; (2) to attract a wide variety of people to the system so that we get a mix of age groups and people with different experience and professional training.

The suggestion has been made, for example, that one of the ways of entry into the system is that people who were in the mining industry who are approaching middle age and want to change their field of endeavour will be assisted in becoming correctional officers, so it is quite a complex involvement and all the people we have doing all of what I just mentioned are six people.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has got to do a great deal better than he is doing. I appreciate what he has outlined to us and I applaud his endeavours but he has indicated to us that under this item he had a staff of six and I think he mentioned when I questioned him, that two of them were co-ordinators, whatever that may mean, he did explain. But, to take this a point further, he said a moment ago that due to retirements and people leaving the service and that sort of thing, and I understand his problem, he's got a pretty rough situation to deal with, but when he's talking about a turnover of staff of 700 in the next five years in the correctional system, even if he trained 125 a year, which is a project in itself, he has never suggested to us in his remarks how this was going to be done.

What are you going to do for accommodation? What are you going to do for instructors that are going to instruct these 125 men, or the 700 men within five years that he mentioned?

There's no way, there's no way has he got the personnel at the moment, nor in these Estimates is he showing us any accommodation that he is going to be able to handle these people. Experience is the greatest trainer that anyone can have and in the past I think it's reasonable for me to say that our penal institutions and our jail institutions, men have come in at the one end and have gone through the various phases of practical training, for the use of a better term, and ultimately become men who made a career in that particular occupation. Obviously that is being abandoned if he's talking about preparing 700 men in the next five years for this particular service.

He spoke of mining people from Sydney and so on and so forth, where the mines are closed down and that sort of thing, and you'll get some wonderful people from those areas, Mr. Minister, and I applaud your thinking, you'll get some real down to earth, common sense people who will fit into this program and do an excellent job. But, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, you've got to show us something to prepare for that program and there's nothing in these Estimates to suggest it, so why are you talking about it now?

I realize that there is an arrangement between Manitoba and the Federal Government and my colleague from Roblin asked if the four western provinces or other provinces were co-operating under this setup, what are they going to do about staff? Is there any thought being given to the use of the facilities of the RCMP at Regina which have a training setup second to none, where these men could go? If you have talked about this, why didn't you tell us?

A MEMBER: It's too hard to do.

MR. BILTON: But the Minister has got to give us a better answer than he has given us so far. If he's talking about bringing 700 men, and women probably, into the system to take care of our situation which is developing here over the next five years, he's not preparing for it in these Estimates, the way I see it.

MR. BOYCE: The Member for Swan River, it almost sounds like he was involved in planning this.

MR. BILTON: No, you didn't tell me.

MR. BOYCE: Of course we haven't finished with it yet so now I'll give you an answer to your further questions. It didn't seem to me to make any sense that we start hiring a bunch of people to do that which is already done in other areas. As a specific for instance, the meer, from his past experience, knows that if you put a gun in somebody's inexperienced hand and tell him that there's somebody beyond that door with a gun and I'm going to open it, 99 times out of a 100 you open the door and the fellow starts shooting.

So in training people for response teams, it is in co-operation with the RCMP, that particular job is done within the system. The crisis response teams are trained in the correctional system through the co-operation of the RCMP. The search programs are done by the RCMP.

So when I say we have six people deployed, the people who are deployed are people who are familiar with the capacity of the system to provide the programs without hiring additional staff, that there are, in my judgement, competent people within the Province of Manitoba to train many of the people. There are some capacities that we haven't got; they have to go to Regina or somewhere else to pick up this training and this is included in the program.

So that there are programs which are offered in conjunction with the Red River Community College and other community colleges and instructors are already there. The experience that they gain will be gained by working in the institutions themselves, whether it's a federal institution or a provincial institution. And hopefully, if we can go further with the exchange programs that we have, that we can actually exchange some of the staff between the federal and the provincial system and between the provinces themselves in this program.

MR. BILTON: The Minister still hasn't satisfied me. If my memory serves me right, it was either \$16,000 or \$18,000 that the federal and provincial government together set up to research the setting up of this development of staff for correctional systems, am I right on that?

MR. BOYCE: Eighteen thousand.

MR. BILTON: That's been spent, the plans are laid down, they are written down and they are ready to go. What are you going to do about them?

MR. BOYCE: Do it.

MR. BILTON: Where? You haven't told me. You've got four of a staff; you've got six training staff and two of them are co-ordinators and there's been \$18,000 spent to set up the program and to all intents and purposes, Mr. Chairman, that program is now in place but the Minister can't tell me how and where he's going to train the 700 staff in the next five years.

What are the recommendations from that committee set up federally and provincially that you spent \$18,000 on?

MR. BOYCE: If and when the Legislature approves this amount of money, as the Member has pointed out, we spent the \$18,000 developing the programs and we are ready to go.

MR. BILTON: Why isn't it here?

MR. BOYCE: It is here, the details of the program, you know, we don't print the details of any program in the Estimates. The first place that we are ready to go is in Brandon and the co-operation of the Federal Government, from their standpoint they call it the Western Judicial District of the Province of Manitoba. It so happens it is coterminous with the Westman Regional Development Area and other provincial jurisdictions and the programs are all set up to start as soon as this money is authorized, in co-operation with the University of Brandon, which is already there, the staff is already in place. They are ready to provide the programs as soon as we authorize these people, then the people will be selected from within the staff. We want to start within the staff first because I think we have a responsibility to those people who have dedicated, 10, 12, 15, 20 years to the system. So they are all ready to go in that particular area in co-operation with the University of Brandon and the Keewatin Community College in Brandon. The courses are all designed, if the meer wants me to give you the course hours, the staff can find me the details on any particular component. It's a three level training program and will be initiated in Brandon starting April 1 if this money is authorized by the Legislature.

MR. BILTON: I thank the Minister for his patience. I wonder if I could ask him one more question. How many of the 700 do you plan on recruiting as of April 1st when these Estimates are approved. That is, how many are going in for training in 1977 - 78 to meet your commitment of 700 under a five-year program? How many have you got lined up, or how many do you plan on . . .

MR. BOYCE: It's approximately 100 I'm advised.

MR. BILTON: Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you to the Minister, I believe he said that the program was on the basis of \$25.00 per day while they were training them outside the institution and \$12.50 a day inside the institution, is that correct?

MR. BOYCE: That's correct, yes.

MR. GRAHAM: That is the Federal input into the program. I wonder why it would be cut in half

once you got into the practical training program?

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is money that has been allocated to the cost of running the program, the people are on salary already. This was negotiated with the Federal Government and this what they have agreed to pay, for the cost outside of the institution it was \$25.00 and \$12.50 a day inside the institution for provincial employees. For federal employees they will pay \$50.00 a day for the training program.

MR. GRAHAM: Did the Minister at any time in his negotiations with the Federal Government object to the schedule that was set up?

MR. BOYCE: Well, when the member says "object," when you are negotiating with somebody to finalize a contract, it is a situation of *quid pro quo* and this is what the final arrangements were.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I find it rather strange, to me, I figure that the most important part of any training program is the actual field work that is involved, and yet we find here the Minister was quite agreeable to cutting in half the federal participation in a training program. I don't know, he must have some reasons for agreeing to absorbing a greater portion of the cost of the training at that stage of the training program and I would just like to know his reasons for accepting that.

MR. BOYCE: The reason for accepting that particular part of it, Mr. Chairman, is that negotiations were relative to cost of providing the program and the cost of providing training outside of the correctional institutions is higher than it is inside the correctional institutions because the programs which are provided by the community college and the rest of it, are on contract. The cost of providing experience, by working with experienced guards the cost is much lower because you're not paying the guards additional salaries for training these people. Perhaps that should be considered.

MR. GRAHAM: At the same time the Minister indicated that most of the training would be done under contract and yet he realizes that that is a much more expensive program. Does he not object to that?

MR. BOYCE: No, I'm sorry, I don't recall having commented on what component would be inside or outside. Some of it will be inside the institutions and some will be outside. All I said is that that which is provided outside will be paid for at these rates and that inside will be paid at the \$12.50.

MR. GRAHAM: I have another further question of the Minister. I would like to ask the Minister, is the Minister taking any steps or has he any qualifications in the applications that he is receiving for these training programs, which would attempt to insure for Manitobans, job opportunities in the Province of Manitoba. And I ask that question at a time when we know that unemployment in the Province of Manitoba is rising at a fairly rapid rate, and yet we see very little effort here — I believe some reference was made to training people from Nova Scotia and other parts of the province. Is there any attempt being made by the Minister to insure that Manitoba people will have the opportunity for employment within the boundaries of our Province of Manitoba?

MR. BOYCE: Well Mr. Chairman, I didn't mention training anybody from outside of Manitoba, but I would ask the staff, if they're in a position to advise me on how many of the 250 applications that I alluded to earlier came from outside of Manitoba. As I said earlier, our first priority is to train the people who are already within the system. As far as the recruitment program and training people from without the system, we hope to attract the best possible people to work in the area, and these people will be hired in the usual way, through the Civil Service Commission.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that he wants 700 people trained in the next five years, he has announced that he is going to train approximately 00 this year, and yet he says that he has 250 applications. What is the screening program that he is going to use for screening out applicants for the job? Is there going to be any preference given to Manitoba people for jobs in Manitoba?

MR. BOYCE: As I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, the people who were hired in this program, or anywhere else in the Ministry, are hired through the Civil Service Commission. If the member is suggesting that we rewrite the terms of reference for the Civil Service Commission, perhaps this should be taken under advisement. I am told that 7 percent of the 250 who have applied for these jobs are from outside of Manitoba, seven percent.

MR. GRAHAM: When the Minister talks that way, I have to remind the Minister that we have had announced in the Chamber, and I'm not too sure whether it was announced in Committee or not, but there have been programs announced in this Chamber during my time of office, which have made extra-special endeavours to preserve for Manitobans, jobs in Manitoba, and I was just wondering if the policy that has been announced previously by certain sectors of government, is going to be employed in this particular section of government.

MR. BOYCE: Reference was made earlier by someone I'm sorry, I don't recall who, Mr. Chairman, from the mines of the Sydney area. Really, that isn't what I had in mind when I used the question of mines. I was thinking perhaps of something closer to home such as Lynn Lake, where I understand they're phasing out the mine in that community. Things being what they are, as I say, 7 percent are from without Manitoba, I think the member would agree that we should try and get the best people. If there is only 7 percent out of 250, I think Manitoba will be well represented when they are selected.

MR. BILTON: In view of what the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell had to say, my partiality towards miners takes my memory back to an old Sergeant-Major, and by God he was a disciplinarian, and he was a miner, so get 'em in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(g)(1)—pass; (g)(2) Other Expenditures. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, here we have a reverse of the other program review. We have expenditures up to \$200,000.00, its a reverse of the figures before, so there must be an awful lot of expenditures included in this item, because it's way more. And I just wondered if you would explain that.

MR. BOYCE: Yes. This is where the moneys for the contracts, outside of the institutions themselves, are allocated, and about \$95,000 is recoverable from Canada on this appropriation.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, but it's considerable money. Don't you think possibly some of the reason in having so many staff training programs and other things is because the guards aren't allowed to use a lot stronger discipline out there.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, "strong discipline" — in Canada, we have developed over the years, what is known within the system as a "firm but fair" policy. I don't want to focus attention on any particular events which have transpired over the past few years, but the staff within the institutions themselves, have handled many difficult situations which' in other jurisdictions have been completely blown out of proportion, and this is their policy, firm but fair.

Talking about the dollars, of course as I mentioned relative to another item, the arrangements are that we have to vote the money and expend it and then recover, because on these *per diem* rates that I referred to, we actually have to bill the Federal Government for those amounts, as I am advised.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, but Mr. Chairman, we go through a lot of research programs and evaluation programs and everything else, and I think myself that we could do away with a lot of the money that's spent in there if we just really went back to a much stronger form of discipline. It's just like when we did away with capital punishment, we have people who have no fear anymore because all they're going to be is put back in jail if they shoot somebody and all the rest of it. I have a feeling here that we're far too lax on our discipline around these places. I have a feeling that some of the times when they have riots and such like if they could just open up on a lot of them and shoot a few down, that we'd have a lot less trouble, and control in these jails where people are causing all the trouble they do. I feel that it might be rather tough for a few times but I sure feel it would make a difference. I just feel we're too lenient when it comes to what some of the prisoners do and the way we treat them. No wonder we have trouble getting staff and staff training and all the rest of it. I think if we just gave our staff a lot more authority, we'd have less problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64. The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: In that regard, I perhaps would come up a little short of the suggestion made by the Member for Pembina, but nevertheless, in philosophy, the staff really concurs with what I've asked them to do, that people within correctional institutions have to accept that they're there as a result of their own actions.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, but many of your staff were in there already when you did have capital punishment, and now it's done away with. So they've made a career of this, and they're there. This doesn't help them a bit. They probably are wishing they weren't in there now and it's going to be a bigger changeover of staff as long as you allow prisoners as much freedom and rights, as you call it, as you do now. I'm beginning to wonder if some of the time, some of the rest of us haven't a few more rights than some of those prisoners.

MR. BOYCE: Perhaps the Member for Pembina and I are completely out of order, Mr. Chairman, but you will recall that my position was that I am not an abolitionist as far as murder in the commission of a crime, or for hired assassins, so that nevertheless, this debate was resolved in another body, so I have to comply with the law.

MR. HENDERSON: I have to agree with you on that and I do know it was confirmed by another body. I just think it's unfortunate, because anybody that even escapes from a jail, even if he's likely to shoot somebody else, or kill people, he's got to be captured without any shots being fired and all the rest of it. I just think sometimes, when prisoners go out and cause the problems they do, I have to think what happened here in Winnipeg a while ago when officers went to take in this man in the west end there that used an axe. He was coming at them and they both shot him, I just think, well, they saved the government a lot of expense. They got rid of a man that was really a menace to society.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Member for Pembina and I both need you to call us to order because we're completely off the item.

MR. BILTON: One comment, Mr. Chairman, before we pass this item. I notice . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. BILTON: I notice the Minister used the term "firm but fair" and I would ask him in all sincerity to reverse the order, "fair and firm". I think that firmness, at that particular time, would probably help a

great deal. I agree with some of the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Pembina but by the same token, something's got to be done to eliminate the arrogance and the impudence and nonsense that the guards have to take from people that are put in there for punishment. They're in there for punishment, not to be pampered. I think the sooner the department takes a stronger attitude the better it's going to be for us all, and the prisoners included.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Chair does like to allow members a certain amount of latitude, but I would remind them that we are on 64(g) Staff Training, Other Expenditures. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: I just wanted, in all due respect, wanted to disassociate myself with some of the more stronger terms by some of my colleagues. I realize he has a herd of buffalo in Miami that comes over the bluff and they film a lot of these exciting scenes. I couldn't help but think of equating that to his remarks when he was talking about shooting them. However, could we have just a general idea what the \$200,000 is for? How much of this \$95,000 goes towards that?

MR. BOYCE: As I explained earlier, I don't know if the Member for Wolseley was here or not. Briefly, if I'm out of order in repeating myself, Mr. Chairman, the Other Expenditures, this is on the total program that I announced some of the details earlier. I was in negotiations with the Federal Government on a contract. The *per diem* rates recoverable from the Federal Government are \$25.00 a day for Manitoba employees who are trained outside of the institutions, and \$12.50 a day for those people that are trained in the institutions, and \$50.00 a day for training Federal employees. Through contracts with various existing institutions, such as the Keewatin Community College — I said they were going to initiate the program if the legislature votes me this money effective as of April 1st — we hope to initiate the programs and the cost of providing the courses, the programs, comes in this \$200,000.00. We have to vote the money and we bill against it, as these rates are — if a staff person is trained outside of an institution for five days they would be billed for \$125.00. If they were trained for five days in the institution, then it's half of that.

This is where the actual expenditures come. The usual costs of providing a service within the government, the stationery costs, \$30,000, moving people about, travel, \$40,000, the books, publications, video tapes and the rest of it, \$12,600, and auto mileage, \$8,500. Those are the kind of expenditures which flow relative to that \$200,000, and the contracts with the various institutions.

MR. WILSON: I thank the Chairman for bringing us back on track, because I think the Minister should go after the Federal Government for a greater share because this is definitely a federal problem, federal jurisdiction, and I think we were all getting a little off track' starting to resolve the retention or abolitionist question, so I suggest we move on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(g)(2)—pass; (g)—pass. Resolution 64(h) External Agencies. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Would the Minister explain that to us and would he tell us the number of staff that are involved and their categories.

MR. BOYCE: On (h)?

MR. BILTON: Yes.

MR. BOYCE: These are the grants that are made to external agencies and there is no direct staff involved in this. This is money which we allocate to outside organizations. There's an annual grant of \$100.00 which we give to the Canadian Congress on Corrections, and it is but a token grant which makes them eligible for certain tax benefits. We have supported this for a number of years. There is an increase from \$61,100 last year to \$66,600 to the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society. There's an increase from \$37,600 to \$41,000 for the Native Clan. There's \$5,000, the same amount we gave last year, to the Manitoba Society of Criminology. There's \$3,000, last year and this year, to the Open Circle, which is a community organization that helps people re-enter employment.

MR. BILTON: That's in Winnipeg?

MR. BOYCE: Yes. It's the agency of the Central Mennonite Committee. This is a grant we have made to pay their rent for a number of years.

Now Converse is a new program related to the community which we didn't fund last year, and we're going to fund it this year if the Legislature approves it, to \$16,300.

MR. BILTON: What?

MR. BOYCE: We had just started this up last year. The young people in conflict with the law, as an example. It's a federal statute and it gets off over into the, it floats around in the criminology societies and at the University and Bar Society, the Bar Associations and Law Societies, and really there was no way of getting it out to the public for them to have an input into what they think we should do with young people in conflict with the law. So they had just started this kind of a program last year, in trying to get the information out to as many of the community organizations as we could so that the average citizen would have some input in it. For example we circulated a number of copies of the paper that was put out by the Solicitor-General's Office about a year and a half ago to such organizations as the Regional Development Corporation so that they could distribute it with their membership. Because of the change in priorities we kind of held that for awhile, but now we want to

start it up again so that the communities and the people in the communities through their various organizations, through the use of ex inmates and other people, to talk to the people of the community about what they should be concerned about in the area of criminal justice. So it's a grant of \$16.3 thousand to the organization Converse which is involved in trying to get the average people in the community involved in deciding how the criminal justice should be structured for their community.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the Minister handles this fund personally; or does he have a staff that organizes and makes recommendations to him as to the distribution of this money to these various agencies?

MR. BILTON: No, we said when we first introduced our Estimates that external agencies and the auditing of the books and how the money flows is done by the Department of Health and Social Development external agencies but the request for funds come in and staff reviews it and sees if it does fit into what we are trying to do.

MR. BILTON: Fine, thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(h)—pass. Resolution 64(j) Human Resources Development Pilot Project. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Now this is a dandy, Mr. Minister. Let's have the full story on this one eh? We just don't understand what this is all about. Would you be good enough to enlighten us?

MR. BOYCE: Well, about a year or so ago there was a critical situation in the core area and through the Social Planning Council, the Child Guidance Clinic, the City of Winnipeg and a number of other community organizations, the school boards and others, they asked for the Government to do something relative to the problems in the core area. So the Government, in response to this urgent need, deployed some staff to try and keep youngsters out of mischief and in school, and this is where this particular moneys was allocated through my department. Last year it was \$50,000 that we allocated. This year it is \$55.3 thousand.

MR. BILTON: Is the Minister telling us that this small sum of money, the way things go these days, that there are people developing a pilot project now? Or did they develop it last year? And if it's developed now, how many people are working in the core area, on this particular project that you are talking about?

MR. BOYCE: The \$50,000 was for half of the year — the \$55.3 thousand is enough to provide this particular service up to June 30th of next year, at which time we think that other arrangements can be made. It is the actual deployment of people working with the kids. It isn't somebody sitting in offices. It's people actually out there working with keeping kids in school, and I'm advised by a couple of particular workers that there is 40 kids in school that wouldn't be in school if these people weren't in place in the core area.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, may I suggest this is where the volunteers are working that you talked about throughout your Estimates? Are these volunteer people that are working on this project?

MR. BOYCE: No, this represents moneys paid to people. There are other people in the community involved with them.

MR. BILTON: On a *per diem* basis eh?

MR. BOYCE: No on a contract basis.

MR. BILTON: Contract, eh.

MR. BOYCE: You see and we're not alone in this, there really hasn't been any emphasis given to crime prevention and we hope that by June the 30th that some of the events that are going on in the core area — as I mentioned earlier relative to another matter, the City of Winnipeg police have started what they call affirmative action and they have deployed people in the juvenile end of it in their constabulary to solve the problem from their viewpoint. We have co-operated with them in deploying other people to deal with the younger people and I really — maybe I shouldn't have this aversion of focusing, but I do have an aversion— one of the problems was sniffing in the core area, sniffing glue and the rest of it, and while we can't take all the credit for the decrease which has occurred, nevertheless it has decreased because of the concerted efforts of the different agencies, the City of Winnipeg police, private agencies, and this money that we're asking for here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I think the Minister should be congratulated on this particular sum, however, this definitely is not enough. You're not even putting a Band-Aid on the situation. Probably the Minister himself represents one of the toughest areas in town. He's got juvenile gangs on the corner of Spence and Sargent which are quite famous for their gang fights and what-have-you. What we need is an outreach program. And we need to save more than 40 students because any night of the week you can see 40 of them hanging around a 711 Store or any one of the corners. I just think the kids need something to do and I would like who you share responsibility to see the Minister of Health with in some of these areas some of the \$2 million, spring loose with he's hoarding in the Lotteries Fund and give these core area kids some recreation and make this grant \$250,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(j). The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: I don't know if that's within the prerogative of the Committee to recommend to the House that we increase this. I think we'd both be out of order. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(j). The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: One last comment, I would greatly appreciate if the Minister who retains this portfolio set an example like the Minister of Health does by giving so many goodies to his area, if he would turn around and set his area as an example for the freeing of juvenile crime in the City of Winnipeg. I think there are still a number of problems that have never been examined in his own riding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(j)—pass. Resolution 64(k) The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is rather encouraging when you see the increase here of some million dollars. And even though it isn't much of a balance when you see the profit from the Liquor Commission at \$51 million, but I wonder just what this increase curtails. Mainly I'm thinking of the Detox Centre at Brandon or the equivalent at Ste. Rose. Is this part of this million-dollar expenditure how successful are those establishments over the Matheson House program or the equivalent here in Winnipeg? Probably I could even carry it on further. I've been associated with people over the years, neighbours, and it's rather discouraging to see people that are losing their families, their businesses, because of this problem, and yet the \$51 million is coming in and just a very little bit of it is being put back into trying to cure or accommodate the problem that is created by the same vehicle that's making this kind of money. I'll stop there for the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, if I may, General Graham is Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Alcoholism Foundation and Mr. Puchlik at the table is Director of Finance for the Alcoholism Foundation.

MR. MCGREGOR: Well all right then, probably the most successful of all the programs that I'm aware of is indeed the Hazelton one in either Minneapolis or in Minnesota somewhere, and some of the people I've known have been that route. I understand they pay a sizeable amount of cash out of their pocket to go that route. And the thing that makes me wonder, because the percentage of success is greater there I believe than most of our established clinics, if that's the proper word — do we as taxpayers contribute anything to Manitobans who go the Hazelton route or the Dr. Johns? There on Clinic are many down in that area that seem to have a pretty highly successful cure ratio.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I'm familiar with the organizations that the member mentions. It is regrettable in a sense, I suppose, that the people who have been through the facilities don't rally round to tell how well we're doing in Manitoba. But nevertheless in this particular area the people who have been there their anonymity is respected. There are a number of people who for some reason or other avail themselves of other facilities because they may feel that the program in some other area is better suited to their needs. If the member will recall, a few years ago we had a very modest capacity in Manitoba' most of which was located in Winnipeg. In this rapid expansion of facilities in other areas than Winnipeg, such as the Sun Centre the member mentions in Brandon, I'm advised that the program there is working well, working well in the sense that people who have been in the facility in co-operation with other groups in the community such as AA groups and others, that they have come to grips with their problem. In some areas — I know that one of the programs that's offered in Santa Ana, California appears to be a good program which is practically duplicated here in Manitoba, and the fee there is \$100 a day. As best we can, within the Province of Manitoba, these programs are made available to the taxpayer without charge.

MR. MCGREGOR: Well how does the so-called Sun Centre compare with the establishment at Ste. Rose? Is that a different phase of a different progress in the cure of alcoholism.

MR. BOYCE: It's a different type of program. The All-Care Care Resource Centre Incorporated, through an agreement with the Alcoholism Foundation on a *per diem* rate does deal with people on a longer program, on a 28-day basis relative to any individual. The Sun Centre is kind of a different type of program. It's a Detox Centre.

MR. MCGREGOR: Then the local AA programs in smaller centres, are they in any way funded? Or are they local got-together organizations? Maybe I could suggest Virden as one, but one of those branches from Brandon.

MR. BOYCE: No, it is one of the requirements of Alcoholics Anonymous that they not take funds from any government source whatsoever for any reason. They want to be completely independent of any outside influence. Nevertheless they are very actively involved and they are relied on to a large degree' because in many communities they are the only organization which can be of assistance to an individual when he moves back to that community.

MR. MCGREGOR: Then what is the expression, "programs through community organizations"? What are we really talking about here?

Tuesday, March 29, 1977

MR. BOYCE: If you recall, when the Alcoholism Foundation decided to build a facility in The Pas, it was done with and through the St. Anthony's Hospital Board. The St. Anthony's Hospital Board was a Board that ran the Hospital. They actually expanded their Board to include other representations and they administer Rosaire House which is the component in The Pas, Manitoba, which deals with alcoholism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I reiterate the remarks of the Honourable Member for Virden, but I must point out that there's a million-dollar increase over last year, \$4,691,000. And I'm not quibbling about the money, not by any stretch of the imagination, because it's all for good cause. And I notice in the material that the Minister was good enough to give us, the Hospital Boards and Health Boards are co-operating, and the Salvation Army. I wonder — the patients that go through these institutions, is that cost charged back to the Foundation by the Hospital Commission?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOYCE: No, that part of it is not charged to the Hospital Commission. The services are provided by medical people under sessional fees; in other words they have a contract with doctors that they pay them sessional fees for doing the medical work in some institutions. So if a doctor comes in one morning a week, for example, to give people medical attention, he would receive a fee from the Manitoba Hospital Service Commission for that service, but the other services that are provided, room, board, counselling and the rest of it is where this money is charged.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I'm talking about hospitals as such, where we don't have any other facility to give the treatment that is necessary and the person is admitted to the hospital with a view to receiving whatever treatment is necessary under these circumstances. I'm wondering if that is charged back to this fund by the Hospital Commission.

MR. BOYCE: I thank the member for his patience with me this time. I misunderstood your question. No, if they are in a hospital for medical reasons then that bill is charged to the Hospital Service Commission. They may be assisted or helped as far as alcoholism is concerned by staff of the Alcoholism Foundation.

One of the things which happened a couple of years ago if you recall, Dr. Angus Reid, who works on staff at the University of Manitoba, has actually worked into the training of a doctors' program, an involvement with the facilities of the FM, so that people who are going through medicine will actually be involved with people who are in these institutions in their training program so that they will become familiar with that which is available outside of the traditional hospital treatment for people suffering from problems of alcohol.

MR. BILTON: Could I take it a step further, Mr. Chairman, and ask the Honourable Minister, the number of staff that are connected with the Foundation and their categories. And as a sort of a closing note, how many patients were taken care of last year?

MR. BOYCE: The total staff involved in the Alcoholism Foundation is 253.

MR. BILTON: What are their categories, Mr. Minister. Don't go down into deep detail, but . . .

A MEMBER: From Privates to Generals.

MR. BILTON: No, we've got the General, we've got him.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I have a sheet of paper here with some figures on it. I'm getting a little bit nervous about circulating documents, but if it's okay with the member, I will just read it.

MR. BILTON: Just the highlights, Mr. Minister. I don't want you to go right down to the kitchen staff and that sort of thing. How many people, for instance, do you have in the field travelling around the province, I presume, connected with the school program, giving instruction in schools. Does this come under this department?

MR. BOYCE: Yes.

MR. BILTON: How many people do you have doing this work in a preventative way, that are travelling around the province. This is the sort of thing I'd like to know.

MR. BOYCE: There's eleven in that particular program. The Alcoholism Foundation is organized regionally. You have the Winnipeg Region, the Norman Region, and the Westman Region.

MR. BILTON: And you have a Director in each area. Is that right?

MR. BOYCE: Yes.

MR. BILTON: That's fine. That's all I want to know. Would it be possible to give me the number of patients you treated last year, or took care of last year or assisted last year?

MR. BOYCE: The staff will get me that information, if any other member has a question. In 1975 it was 15,707, '76 — 16,037. That's in direct services to individuals. That doesn't include the other outreach program.

MR. BILTON: Just one final question, Mr. Chairman. Why do you need a million dollars more this year over and above last year. Is the situation that much more serious to require that kind of money?

MR. BOYCE: It is a serious problem, Mr. Chairman, but we are trying to expand these services as prudently as we can. As I said earlier, up until a few years ago, the only place that we had any facility,

was in the city of Winnipeg, so we're trying to expand these facilities in other areas so that we can actually deploy people out of hospitals, as one of the aims. Last year we brought on stream a number of facilities. It is planned that we will be opening one in Gimli. We have nothing in that particular area. East Kildonan, that other part of the City of Winnipeg, we have no facilities. We brought on stream the Christie Centre which is an out-patient facility in the city of Winnipeg, in October, so the full year's costs are included in the budget for next year.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister did tell us that he had a staff of 250. Do I take it that in this million dollars there's going to be an increase in staff, and if there is going to be an increase in staff, how many more does he intend to take on.

MR. BOYCE: Two hundred and fifty-three is the approved level if you vote these Estimates. Last year it's 233, so it's an increase of 20.

MR. BILTON: An increase of 20. Thank you, Mr. Minister. That's fine with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I'll be brief, Mr. Chairman. I think the Minister should be congratulated in moving forward in this area which he specializes in. At the same time, I would feel that he possibly should be talking to some of his colleagues in caucus to get on with some sense of priority. I'm one that believes that this is a service to people, it's a health problem, and I notice that the Federal Government is only giving you 800,000, where they got \$40,146,891.00 profits from us. I notice the Provincial Government got 51,790,000. I wonder if this Minister has thought of taking the czar, Mr. Syms, to task for all the money he wastes on that ridiculous advertising program of his, which would be better off spent in this particular area.

I also want to know why there isn't an area where they tie alcohol and drug abuse together, where one is a matter under the Criminal Code and the other is not considered. Are they in separate units? Maybe you could explain your Drug Abuse program and I'll just leave it at that.

MR. BOYCE: If the member recalls, last year we put through an amendment to the Alcoholism Foundation Act to include things other than alcohol. Prior to that time the mandate of the Foundation was more or less limited to problems related to alcohol. So we expanded it last year, and as they deal with other programs, perhaps we will make a more significant thrust in this particular area. One of the external agencies with which the Foundation is involved, is X-Kalay, which deals primarily with drug abuse. Another program which is funded partially through other agencies, in the core area of the city of Winnipeg, is Klinik, in the member's constituency. Another agency is Kiazan, which deals with drug programs. I should point out to the Member for Swan River, out of 253, 111 of those are in external agencies. Kia Z and the X-Kalay, the Salvation Army, the rest of them, these are external agencies to the Foundation.

MR. WILSON: Would the Minister care to comment if this program is doing more good for people with alcoholic problems in drawing out some of the dangers of drinking than the massive media program of the head of the Liquor Control Commission.

MR. BOYCE: Well, to use the expression, Mr. Chairman, "different strokes for different folks." The philosophy of the government is to try as best we can to put in place a number of different modalities, a number of different programs, so that if a person can be helped through one program, he will use that program. If he can be helped through another program, he'll use that program. Now, as far as the program of the Liquor Control Commission and their advertising is concerned, I really can't say whether it is effective or ineffective. I'm sorry, I can't judge that.

MR. WILSON: One of the suggestions of myself being a member, is that if you put these preventative outfits in the core area, most people that are involved in the business of — I use the term "abusing themselves with drugs" because it is self-inflicted — they have a tendency to figure that someday they're going to need a cure, so they have a tendency to live near these facilities. Wouldn't it be better, if besides these facilities, there might be some discussion with the hospitals because we're finding that we're becoming — I know there's problems in the schools — but we're becoming, and were for a while there, sort of the drug capital of Winnipeg because of the fact that the drug users seem to congregate around the facilities where they could get a cure. I wondered if the Minister would give some thought to having more of these — how should I say, for anybody that's involved with chemicals — have them be able to be treated at hospitals as well.

MR. BOYCE: Well, of course, there are hospital based programs. There are two programs at the Health Science Centre. One is the Alcohol Treatment Unit which deals with medical problems which become manifest in such things as DTs and the rest of it. They also have a chemical withdrawal unit at the Health Science Centre. Victoria Hospital and St. Boniface General, Grace, the major hospitals in the city of Winnipeg have programs and the people that go there are in need of medical attention in addition to having an alcohol problem.

MR. WILSON: So the statement from the Minister says that all the major hospitals have some facility to deal with people on acid trips or whatever you have. Is there any effort, under this section, for the Minister to advertise the dangers of mixing chemicals and alcohol. I've seen several times a policeman called out where teenagers have been — well the one I believe at the Constellation Hotel

Tuesday, March 29, 1977

where he was up on the standard about 150 feet attempting to jump — it seems that there should be some kind of a sign in the washrooms of the hotels pointing out the dangers of mixing chemicals with alcohol. I think a lot of these young kids don't realize that if they take speed and booze that it can lead to some very serious difficulties. It's a matter of education, again, there's no doubt.

MR. BOYCE: That's a very interesting point that the member raises and I'll convey his concerns, because it is an important point, to the Alcoholism Foundation to have them consider including such a program in their involvement in the community.

MR. WILSON: I just feel that the Hotel Association would be more than co-operative in putting up those type of warning signs. It's no extra cost to themselves, I'm sure. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(k)—pass. I would refer honourable members now back to Resolution 64(a)(1) The Minister's Compensation. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, before my colleague from Swan River makes his comments, due to the fact that we have two committees going, I was sorry I was unable to pose a question. I wanted to ask the Minister, in regards to the areas in which our juvenile delinquents are being kept, the Minister made mention of Spruce Woods Park. Now I understand there had been young people on correctional time out at Spruce Woods Park and I'm wondering if I heard the Minister correctly that it is not being used at the present time. If this is so, is it the intention of the Minister to use Spruce Woods Park as an area for young people spending some time to serve their term there.

MR. BOYCE: Yes, when we were discussing that particular point, Mr. Chairman, I had reported to the committee that the capacity of was 21 and at the present time it was closed. It has been closed this winter. The Director of Corrections is going to re-open it at the present time. We are planning on using it again this summer. It is being reopened. They're going through staff realignments to re Spruce Woods. open

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, do I understand there's going to be the same number again when this reopens. Is that the capacity, 21 juveniles, that will be held there?

MR. BOYCE: Spruce Woods, when you say juveniles, it was usually younger people, but they were adults that were sent there. What I had said earlier, in response to another question, was in co-operation with my colleague, the Honourable Larry Desjardins and his staff, we've got a combined effort as far as a new camp is concerned. We're opening a new camp. And in fact, some of the senior staff, when we get a moment, we're going to Cranberry Portage to look at the efficacy of utilizing some of the space which is vacant in Cranberry Portage at the present time for younger people.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, do I understand, those that are going to beat Spruce Woods Park will be 18 years and over? They will not be juveniles?

MR. BOYCE: That is correct, I am advised.

MR. EINARSON: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, we've arrived at the stage where we're on the last item and that is the Minister's salary. Before I begin, I want to assure him I'm not going to ask for it to be reduced to \$1.00, but I feel that I should make a few general comments. It's been a very interesting session and I thank the Minister for his patience in many of the searching questions that we've asked, many of which, of course I must say, were not replied to to our satisfaction, but I need hardly remind the Minister that crime is obviously rampant in our province, and particularly in the city of Winnipeg, and it seems to me that all we need now is for the Mafia to move in and he's got a ready-made army of 8,000 youngsters or juveniles in the wings ready to go. The important thing, you know Mr. Minister, is that these young people, these juveniles who to some degree are your responsibility, are the citizens of tomorrow. I'm just wondering if society doesn't deserve better.

It's all very well to hold up the state to ridicule but the core of the problem, in my humble opinion and in the opinion of my colleagues in discussing these Estimates before we came into this room, is the lack of parental guidance, and somehow, Mr. Minister, you've got to find a way to get to the parents. It seems a pity that that should have to happen, but the parents of this multitude of youngsters are not confined to any particular part of our society. They're obviously a cross-cut of all levels of society, and the parents, and I emphasize "the parents" must be held responsible. It seems to me, Mr. Minister, that all the planning and the spending of millions of dollars that we've been going through will not provide a solution without the general interest of the parents. Somehow, we've got to get through to the parents.

Our society, the last few years, have been living on a level far beyond the scope that they've been able to handle, and I know that women have to go out these days to augment the earnings of the breadwinner of the house in order to meet many of the commitments. But I must say, in all sincerity, that I believe that with this happening, the juveniles are just running hog wild, and in many instances the parents have got to sacrifice their time and they shouldn't have to be told this. They've got to quit these trips abroad. They've got to stay at home, and they've got to be responsible for those children and they've got to take them behind the woodpile. I can't help but reiterate again that these

youngsters are the products of Manitobans and the Manitobans, whether they realize it or not, are paying dearly, dearly for the neglect of those children. Not in dollars and cents, but in character and status of those young people when they become the citizens of tomorrow.

Now is the time, when I think of a blind man last Friday night being attacked by five youths under the age of 18, there's something wrong somewhere. When I realize that a young man can go into a senior citizens home and try to rape a 90-year old woman, it's getting beyond all reason, Mr. Minister, and some way has got to be found to arrest this situation.

I'm suggesting to you that ways must be found to get rid of this pornographic material that we see in these stores, all of which is leading to this child delinquency, no question about it at all. Ban these obscene films, put a time limit on it if you like, but something has got to be done. There's got to be more co-operation with the police. This idea of them being called "fuzzes" and ridiculed and all this sort of thing, in carrying out their duties so that you and I can go to bed at night and sleep soundly and safely, they're not getting a fair shake. Here again, a program of education has got to be brought home and I would ask you to use what influence you can to get it into our educational system. My God, you know, it's not that many years ago that we didn't have police forces. Communities picked reliable individuals in the community and they kept the peace, and before very long we are going to have to be doing that in our country, in our city, in our province.

If parents don't get up off their butts and get behind what we are endeavouring to do as indicated in these Estimates, people, Mr. Minister, will have to make up their minds that they've got to be harsh to be kind, before it's too late. Parents and judges, policemen and teachers, correctional institutional workers, church groups, service clubs have got to be alerted to the critical situation that we are confronted with. It's all come out in the discussions. You've been criticized because you released that form the other day showing the seriousness of the situation. Even if it was only half, it's worse than it ought to be and I have faith in Manitobans, if it is brought home to them in the proper way, somehow, rather than hidden behind all these developing committees and these planning and all this sort of thing, get it out into the open and let the people know what is going on.

With those few remarks, Mr. Minister, I wish you well on behalf of my colleagues, and let's hope that your endeavours will be complemented by understanding of the people you are trying to serve. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I think the Meer from Swan River has said just about everything that I wanted to say, except that I do feel that we have to do something about the juvenile crime rate in the City of Winnipeg. Whether the figures were right or wrong, they were shocking and I'm sure that steps will be taken to improve the situation and give the youth of today something to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(a)(1). The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Just not to delay things, Mr. Chairman, at all and the Minister call me, through you, Mr. Chairman, if the question has already been answered, I'll look it up in Hansard when it appears. I was going to ask him under the item , but I unfortunately missed the item, with respect to the Work Camps that are operated in connection with the adult facilities, Headingley, etc. Do I understand that the number of camps has been decreased, I know the Falcon Camp, for instance, was closed some time ago. What camps are in operation, what populations are in them and how are they functioning? Is there any chance for expansion of that system or how does he look . . . ?

MR. BOYCE: Since the member's last experience with this particular department, I closed Bird's Hill also. It was just beyond repair, it was constructed temporarily, as a temporary facility. Spruce Woods is not utilized at the moment and as I advised the Member for Rock Lake, we are bringing it back onstream. It is contemplated that there will be another camp built in co-operation or initiated with the co-operation of the other side of the department for young offenders. The senior staff will be going to Cranberry Portage to see if we can utilize some of the space that is vacant at Cranberry Portage. I think that particular facility has a capacity of about 400 and there's 150 students enrolled there at the present time.

MR. LYON: There was, Mr. Chairman, a camp, I think it was a day-type camp that was operated a number of years ago, I think at Cormorant Lake to assist in the work program at The Pas Jail. I don't know if that work has been wound up long since or whether there is anything going on there now or not?

MR. BOYCE: Just while my Director is coming up, Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to advise the Committee that, if you will recall, the information that I circulated was but a piece of the information. I gave a breakdown of the programs, the staff man years, the dollars and everything else and I gave that to the Committee as but a piece of information. I also give the Members of the Committee an undertaking that has been confirmed by the Director of this particular component with Stats Canada, Mr. Prefontaine, that what has occurred will be explained in detail and I will table that report as soon as it is available to me, because in my eight years in this Legislature, I believe I am responsible to the Members of the Legislative Assembly. It has come from sources outside of the Legislature that perhaps I had some motives in tabling that, that was not the case.

Tuesday, March 29, 1977

I'm advised that they call it the Egg Lake Camp now and it is operational with a capacity of 28 and there's 27 in there at the moment.

MR. LYON: And the capacity of the other camps, Mr. Chairman, that are in operation today? Is Bannock Point still going?

MR. BOYCE: Bannock Point, to the Leader of the Opposition, we had a fire there some time ago and it was just reopened in the past year. Hopefully, we had tried to, last year, have a bus available to take members up for a tour, but then we got in Speed-up so that the time wasn't available. If Members of the Legislature are interested in going and taking a look at Egg Lake the staff would be glad to accommodate them any time at all. It is an excellent camp. It is run by an individual who is a farmer himself and has been a farmer for a long time and he has an excellent reputation within the correctional facilities and runs an excellent program.

MR. LYON: There was a further camp in the Duck Mountain, I don't know if it has been phased out or if it's operational?

MR. BOYCE: I'm advised that the one that the member is referring to has been closed.

MR. LYON: I take it there is no disposition, Mr. Chairman, within the Minister's department against the camp type of operation. I presume that in each case where they have been phased out it's been because of lack of population or lack of volunteers for the camps or whatever? Could he indicate generally if he and his department still favour that concept or if it's workable in 1977 as indeed it was in the sixties?

MR. BOYCE: The position of the Minister is that he is entirely in support of these particular programs. In fact there is one program which has already been developed in the planning stages that it would be in my judgement about six months away from bringing into production. It is a very complex project which involves a whole logging camp operation which would be — the details have been worked out with the unions, with ManFor and others, but economic conditions being what they were we were not able to proceed with this. Should the will of the people be that there should be a different Minister next time around, all of the plans are there for implementation.

A MEMBER: That's good, we'll take care of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64(a)(1)—pass. Resolution 64: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$20,688,700 for Health and Social Development—pass.

That concludes the consideration of the Department of Corrective and Rehabilitative Services. Is it the will of the Committee to hear the Minister of Highways opening remarks before we adjourn this evening?

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report.

ESTIMATES - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): When the committee rose for Private Members' Hour we were on Page 41 of your Estimates Book, Resolution 78(a). The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose at approximately 4:30, I had suggested to certain members of the committee that they should spend the dinner hour on their knees in meditation because of certain situations that were prevailing in the province and that I had also indicated to the committee that I had viewed with consternation a situation that was prevailing in my own constituency of Transcona in respect of Griffin Steel and the strike that was ongoing there.

I had also indicated to the committee that while my hands had been tied for a long period of time in negotiations that were proceeding' and that while I as Minister of Labour had been subjected to criticism both within and without this Assembly, that now I felt that my hands were freed and that I could document in this Assembly, the true facts, as I see them, of the situation prevailing at Griffin Steel. And at that particular time I suggested to my major critic, the spokesman for the Conservative Party in the field of labour, the Member for Fort Garry, that he should spend the dinner hour in meditation on his knees because of his approach to me as an individual and as the Minister of Labour. And as was documented in this House without my opportunity of rebuttal, that he and the members of this committee and the public at large, should now give to me the opportunity of, shall I call it "rebuttal", or should I suggest that I am now in a position . . . —(Interjection)— It's a swan song, yes, and I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa that if he would be prepared after I have spoken to introduce a motion asking my Premier to remove me from my position, I will accept it' and the decision that is made I will accept as well. But I want to say to my honourable friend, the Member for Minnedosa, that he is as a child, is not conversant with the facts as they are at the present time in respect of the situation at Griffin Wheel. And I can accept his incompetence and his lack of knowledgability but that, Mr. Chairman, is an aside.

The true fact is that while I have been criticized as the Minister of Labour and a trade-unionist by trade-unionists, by members of the clergy, by members of the trade union movement, I have not been able to rebut until today. I have sat in this seat as Minister of Labour, and I was in a position where I could not rebut. But I think the situation, Mr. Chairman' has changed within the last couple of days.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, as far as the situation at Griffin Wheel is concerned, and the strike, that the strike has been going on since September 18th of last year and it was not until February 28th of this year that the labour critic of the Conservative Party, or the Liberal Party, or the trade unions, or my own political party . . .

A MEMBER: And the caucus.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. That's right, and I just said that — really knew that there was a strike going on. Nonsense? I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it was not until February 28th of this year when management attempted to fight back under the process of free collective bargaining that my friends, and I take that very very loosely, that my friends in opposition including the Member for La Verendrye, knew that there was a strike on because, Mr. Chairman, it was not until February 28th when the company started to fight back, as is their right under the free collective bargaining process indoctrinated and legislated by this government, that there was any apparent concern.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, I say to the labour critic of the Conservative Party, where in heaven's name was he and his party between September 18th when the strike started and the emotional upset because management fought back on February 28th. I did not receive, Mr. Chairman, one word from the critic of the labour party of the Conservative government between all of that time as to the situation in respect of this strike. I did not receive from the trade union movement in Manitoba any request for intervention in trying to resolve this dispute. I did not . . . —(Interjection)— Oh, shut up. I did not, Mr. Chairman, receive from any of those people . . . —(Interjection)— Yes, my friend the Member for Portage la Prairie said that I should have been thankful that in that five months period I did not receive any concern of the Liberal Party, of the Conservative Party, the religious organizations who are now writing to me, or any other organization as to their concern over the five-month period that the members were on strike at Griffin Wheel. The . . . —(Interjection)— Oh, just a minute. —(Interjection)— It was not, Mr. Chairman, until there became an emotional appeal, an involvement by the politicians such as the Member for Morris and others, that there was any concern about this strike that had been going on for five months. —(Interjection)— Oh you, you don't even know, you haven't any emotions.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you and I want to say to this committee that I have sat back here and I had to accept the brunt of responsibility because of the ineffectiveness of the opposition in fields dealing with management-labour relations. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the ineffective red-headed leader of the Conservative party has on no occasion prior to the emotional outburst of February 18th asked me what I was doing to resolve the difficulties at Griffin Steel. They didn't give a

damn about those five months —neither did the Liberal party or the leader of the Liberal Party until it appeared as though it was politically advantageous to them because —(Interjection)—yes, after five months, you didn't give a damn for five months but it wasn't until such time as it became an emotional outburst, that management were attempting to fight back under the terms of our labour relations legislation to carry on in business. What was the position of the oracle, the spokesman of the Conservative party, Mr. Chairman? Condemnation of me because I was selling out to management and I could not deliver to management accordance with the Member for Fort Garry, terms and conditions for settlement. I want to say to my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, who accused me on one occasion when we were dealing with the matter of the safety of workers that I had sold out to the workers over management, and I'm going back to Hansard in a few moments to repeat the description that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has tried to. . . —(Interjection)— Oh, you keep quiet. . . as to my sell out to the trade union movement and then a couple of days later that inconsistent Member for Fort Garry criticized me, Mr. Chairman, because I was selling out to management. Now then. . . —(Interjection)— oh you don't know anything about anything. Now then, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you that despite the accusations of the Member for Fort Garry of a sell out to management. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to say, Mr. Chairman, as much as the Honourable Member for Lakeside attempts to dissuade me by his interjections that are nonsensical and nincompooish, I am not going to be deferred, I want to say to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry who accused me of selling out to the management of Griffin wheels that I did receive from the legal spokesman for Griffin wheel, not a bribe but a book that was written, I believe by the sister of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry dealing with the family of the Sherman dynasty here in the Province of Manitoba, and if I am the recipient of any bribery by the management of Griffin wheel, I suggest that the bribe is that the solicitor of Griffin wheel, did give to me a book dealing with the Sherman family and reflections by the Archbishop Sherman with recollections of those who knew him best, compiled by Joan Sherman-Weir, the sister of my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I read this biography or autobiography with a great deal of interest, and if this constitutes bribery because I received the same, I accept the thing despite the interjections, asinine conjectures of the Member for Lakeside that in this book which I have read and I had a great admiration for Archbishop Sherman and all of the Sherman family but when I read the book I felt that this so aptly described the Member for Fort Garry on Page 13. Now I don't know whether there's any significance with words — Page 13 — wherein Archdeacon Kelly Kent, a long-time family friend, once remarked after a visit that no one in the Sherman family ever listens; they all just talk. I think that is so appropriate of my honourable friend.

And then again, Mr. Chairman, if this is bribery, may I go on and I do this in all respect for the Sherman family and I was a good friend of the father of our colleague here in this Assembly, I go on to say that there is another excerpt from this book that I think that is so apt to be attributed to my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry. I want to use another excerpt from this book dealing with his mother whom I also knew —(Interjection)— yes, you wouldn't even know about it; you wouldn't even know about it because you are so unknowledgable of anything that goes on. But anyway, in this book that could be conceived as a bribery to me as suggested by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, his mother goes on to say her love for Ralph Sherman and her loyalty to him, never blinded by his imperfections— that's right, she was a Sherman and she wrote of her son. She accepted him as he was, gifts, virtues and shortcomings. Shortly after her younger son, Bud, was married, she asked her daughter-in-law, "How do you and Bud get along?" "Fine," was the reply and after a short pause with a delightful twinkle that so often appeared in Caroline Sherman's eyes, she replied, "That is good because I know it isn't easy — after all, he is a Sherman."

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have been accused of receiving any bribery from Griffin wheel, one of the bribes that I have received is a documentation of the Sherman family and an exposé in that book of the true significance of that man who has accused me of being on the side of management in Griffin wheel. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I want to say, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the receipt of this because I had every respect for the father of the present Member for Fort Garry and I want to say to him, despite what he has said, despite what he has said and the record in the Hansard and I hope before I am finished to be able to replace on the record what he had to say about my acceptance of presumed bribery in respect of management of the Griffin wheel.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do want to say to this Committee that one of the difficulties that I have been confronted with and I am sure that the Members of Opposition cannot conceive of those difficulties because they do not know —(Interjection)— That's right, that's right. The Minister of Labour has the biggest problem because the Minister of Labour is honest; because the Minister of Labour is knowledgable about what has been going on in respect of Griffin wheel or Griffin Steel or call it what

the hell you like, since January of 1975. The Member for Morris who is not in his seat but in somebody else's seat, is not — (Interjection) — I removed you? I think your electorate will remove you at the next election and I would congratulate them if they do. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to say and I say this in the — I may be heaping coals on my head — that neither the opposition, the trade union movement or indeed many New Democratic constituencies do not know the facts of the situation that is prevailing at the present time in respect of Griffin wheel. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to you and to all the members of this House, that I have been subjected to ridicule, that I have been accused of not adhering to the basic principle of a 40-hour five-day work week. I reject that and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is no one in this House who has fought more vigorously for the adoption of that principle than the present Minister of Labour.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I have been subjected to criticism by my own union . . .

A MEMBER: By your own members.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . by my own members, yes and I want to say not all my members but I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have been subjected up until now with criticism by so many because I have not, in their opinion, adhered to the principles that I have long been associated with insofar as the 40-hour work week. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my colleagues, to my critics and to the opposition that I have never ever deviated from my conviction of the 40-hour work week.

How did we arrive at the situation that we're in today when we're talking about compulsory overtime? Is this something new, Mr. Chairman? I suggest to you that it is not. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that in the legislation of the Province of Manitoba, that reference to a compulsory requisite insofar as overtime is concerned, was introduced in 1957 by whom? The Liberal Party, the Conservative Party, the NDP? I say to you, Mr. Chairman, if my critics would only take the time out to set aside emotionalism they would go back to the Employment Standards Act of 1957 where the then Liberal Party of the Province of Manitoba first introduced compulsory overtime in the Province of Manitoba, where they said "No employer shall require or permit an employee to be on work or duty for more than eight hours in the day unless they pay overtime." The word requires the key word that under Liberal legislation an employee could be required to work compulsory overtime at the whim and will of their employer. And incidentally, Mr. Chairman, the Liberals make provision for a differentiation between a male employee and a female employee, that the female — (Interjection) — *vive la difference* yes, . . . and I doubt whether the Member for Minnedosa really knows what the hell he's talking about because the difference at that particular time was that a male would not receive time and a half until after 48 hours whereas the female would receive it after 44. So I can imagine the bank manager of the Conservative Party would say, "*Vive la difference.*" Because that is the psychology of the Member for Minnedosa and the wholeruddy complete outfit called Conservatives.

And then, Mr. Chairman, in 1962 what happened was the Conservative government — (Interjection) — no, it was the oracle from The Pas, Jack Carroll who was the Minister of Labour then in 1962 — (Interjection) — where is he now? Out selling real estate and he could conceivably . . . oh, I won't go into him. But anyway, what did the Conservative government do? They brought in, in 1962, the same legislation requiring the same standards of a differentiation between 48 and 44 except that they say, "It will not apply to the lunch hour." I confess, Mr. Chairman, that we of the New Democratic Party made an error in 1970 when we continued the general phraseology of "required to work" before the payment of overtime. But what we did do at that particular time, Mr. Chairman, was to reduce the hours before time and a half would be paid in respect of the difference between male and female to equality between the two to 44 hours a week. Fault me, Mr. Chairman, that I did not realize the significance of the word "permit" in our legislation.

Then, Mr. Chairman, in 1975, this government established the principle of the 40-hour work week being the third province, as I understand it, in the whole of the Dominion of Canada to establish the 40-hour work week . . .

A MEMBER: Who were the first? Who are you referring to, Ontario?

MR. PAULLEY: No, no, they haven't got it yet. They haven't got it yet. The Province of Saskatchewan in 1944 and the Province of British Columbia and also the federal jurisdiction. But I want to say to my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, that he'd better look up the legislation to see the exemptions. In the Province of British Columbia, an eight-page exemption; in the Dominion of Canada with the 40-hour work week, 8 hours, an unending number of exemptions before the payment of overtime. Such is not the case here in the Province of Manitoba. And my honourable friends opposite and others condemn us and condemn me because we have not seen fit in their opinion to introduce a 40-hour, 8-hour day component in our labour legislation.

I reject, Mr. Chairman, completely the accusations that have been levied to me by my own union, the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, that I have not during all of this dispute attempted to bring about a rationale insofar as labour legislation is concerned. I want, Mr. Chairman, to refer honourable members of this House to a convention that took place not too long ago in Vancouver of the United

Steelworkers of America wherein it was stated that the labour laws of the Province of Manitoba were the envy of all jurisdictions on the North American continent.

I also want to say, Mr. Chairman, that while I have confessed to the House that the verbiage contained in the Civil Service Act escaped my attention, I want to say to this committee that long before the withdrawal of services by Griffin wheel, I and my department, were considering amendments to the employment standards legislation to withdraw the compulsory aspects of verbiage contained in the present Employment Standards Act. And I can go back and document that to last June. While I have been criticized or while this government has been criticized particularly by the Member for Assiniboia, that because we have not as yet introduced legislation to change the Employment Standards Act and while he and many in this House have not accepted my statements that we will be introducing legislation to remove that compulsory aspect presently contained within the Employment Standards Act, I want to say and repeat to this House that that is our ideal and that is why mention was made in the Throne Speech to overtime.

In conclusion for this portion of my introduction, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is so damn much phoneyism going on at the present time within —(Interjection)— garbage, yes, you're right. There's so damn much garbage going on at the present time, so much emotionalism that is going on by those who do not realize what the Department of Labour has tried to do to bring —(Interjection)— yes, a weak Minister with a strong head, that, Mr. Chairman, I want to say, I want to say to all of those who have indicated an interest in what has happened at Griffin wheel that they are not knowledgeable of what the Department of Labour have been attempting to do since January 1975 and that is the date of our first involvement. We did not, Mr. Chairman, await until the fight-back by management on February 28th but I and my associates in the Department of Labour have been attempting since January of 1975 to resolve the differences between CAIMAW and Griffin Steel and one of the barriers that we have been confronted with is the attitude or attitudes of the likes of the Member for Fort Garry, the Conservative Party who are wont to pick on any emotional situation prevailing at the present time to try and increase support. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to my dear red-headed friend, the leader of the Conservative Party, that it will be in vain. And to the Member for Lakeside, I know full well he's one of those types of individuals who attempt to pull straws out of the haystack and it won't do him any ruddy good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister's time has expired. Pursuant with the procedures of this Committee we will now proceed on to 78(b) Administration(I) Salaries \$328,900.00. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's not my intention to abuse the time of the Committee by replying to the Minister either in detail or in kind, except to make a few remarks for the record just to assure the Committee and all others who may be interested that we are supposed to be dealing here with the Estimates of the Department of Labour and not going through an exercise in self-flagellation by this performer who continually astounds us, Mr. Speaker, by his buffoonery in this Chamber. I must say that I have had some doubts in the past that the Minister could ever top some of his previous performances in this House, but you've got to say one thing for him, Sir, he is absolutely incredible! Just when you think he has committed the ultimate in buffoonery, he comes along and tops his own act. And he does it over and over again. Interestingly enough, it seems to consistently follow every year within 24 hours of the Academy Awards. Just an incredible performance year after year! I think that it should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's presentation, if it can be called that, was a flagrant abuse of the accommodations of the members of this Committee who are here to consider his stewardship of this department, a flagrant abuse of those accommodations and also an insult to this Committee.

We have a situation industrially in the Province of Manitoba today that is of considerable seriousness for the community and for the economy, generally. We have the highest unemployment situation in Manitoba that we have had in years, we have a position in terms of relative employment across the country that puts us now at the poor, have-not end of the scale along with the Atlantic Provinces, we have got a situation in Manitoba where there has been no job creation to keep pace with population, we have a situation at Griffin Steel to which the Minister has devoted virtually the full hour of his time in attempting to justify his activities or inactivities, and all we get from him is a solo virtuoso performance that ranks with the two or three resignation speeches and farewells that he has given in this House over the last four or five years and has nothing whatever to do with the problems facing labour and the labour community in the province. It's just absolutely incredible and totally unacceptable, Mr. Chairman, and I refer the Minister to some of the criticisms I have levelled at him in the past and ask him if he now compares the kinds of criticisms I have levelled at him with the kind of performance he gave tonight, whether he does not think that those criticisms have been justified.

He is supposed to be the Minister of Labour. I have said in the past he is no Minister of Labour, he is a Minister of big labour vested interests, that's what he is. He does not act for, speak for, or listen to the rank and file working men and women in this province. Many persons in the labour community in this province who have attempted to gain the ear of the Minister in connection with disputes and

difficulties have failed in that attempt. He has represented the kinds of power groups and interest groups at the head of big labour which constitute the base of his support. He poses as a Minister of Labour and represents only one side, one fraction of the industrial coin and he comes into this House to present his Estimates to us, Sir, and gives the kind of performance he gave tonight and then wrings his hands in despair because once or twice, I and some others have stood up here and criticized him as a buffoon. Well what does he expect when we get that kind of performance from him, when he is a buffoon. What does he expect? If he wants to be treated like a Labour Minister who is concerned with labour relations and industrial peace and progress in this province, let him act responsibly. Let him not come in here and put on that kind of a performance.

Sir, he says that the strike at Griffin has been going on for some five months and it wasn't until February 28th of this year that the labour critic of the Progressive Conservative Party showed any interest or concern. Well, Mr. Chairman, I reject that out of hand. Out of hand! There was a collective bargaining process going on, there were difficulties and disputes resulting as a consequence of no settlement in that process, and it was only right that the normal course of action that was being followed should be pursued. But once this House began to sit, and once the ultimatum was delivered that work was going to proceed, work was going to be restored at Griffin on the 28th of February, I started then as of that date, and I have the Hansards in front of me starting Thursday, February 24th, asking the Minister what he was going to do to prevent possible trouble on the picket line as of February 28th when it was intended that new hires would be taken into the plant. There was no point in crying "wolf" or injecting ourselves into a collective dispute prior to that time because there was no potential difficulty of the kind that became reasonable to expect once the decision was made for Griffin to go back into production. It was at that point in time that I asked this Minister what he was doing about 140 livelihoods that were pawns in a game that was being fought between two antagonists with particular interests to pursue and particular old enmities and old hatreds. It was at that point that I asked him what he was intending to do about it. I never asked him to settle the strike. I never asked him to impose a settlement. I asked him to invoke—

A MEMBER: Shut up and listen.

MR. SHERMAN: I listened to the Minister while he was speaking — I don't know why because I didn't hear anything — but I showed him the courtesy of at least remaining quiet while he was speaking.

I asked the Minister to invoke the top expertise of his department, of his conciliation team to try to get the two sides around the table so that the impasse could at least be met. That's what I asked him to do. He finally did that a few days ago and I salute him for that, for having involved, for having got the Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, probably the top conciliation officer in the province, Mr. Lou Plantje, involved at the conciliation level to try to break the impasse and I acknowledge the Minister's efforts in that regard. But he did it because we pressed him and pushed him and badgered him to do it. We didn't ask him to go in there and impose a settlement on anybody. We asked him to try to break the impasse, to try to see what could be done to take the two antagonists who have been fighting each other through five, six, seven industrial disputes over the past out of the arena and to put some people in there who could negotiate moderately and reasonably and put a top conciliator in there. Finally, a few days ago, we did that. Now, unfortunately, the impasse still apparently is not broken. He can't do much more than he has done but it took him an awful long time to do it and if the pressure hadn't been put on him in this House by this party and by others, he never would have done it.

So don't let him give us that nonsense, Mr. Chairman, that we sat around for five months and weren't interested. For five months, it was a normal dispute in the collective bargaining arena. It ceased to become one once the company announced that it was going back into production and taking in new hires. The Minister should understand that. He claims to be a Minister of Labour with some experience in the labour field. That's all we are asking him to do: to face the fact that the crisis and the crunch was coming and do something about it. He threw up his hands in despair or accused us of wanting him to intervene in the process. None of that was ever suggested or asked by any of us. We didn't ask him to bring in legislation. We said if you bring it in, we'll deal with it, but we never asked him to bring it in. All we asked him to do was use the experts that he's got here to try to get the two sides together.

Now we have the new twist and the Minister is saying that he had to bear all the anguish and all the slings and arrows of this misfortune because of the ineffectiveness of the Official Opposition in handling the industrial relations problems in this province. —(Interjection)— Well, how about letting us change sides. We can't do much about it when you sit over there and pose as a Minister and a member of a ministry and a member of a frontbench that isn't governing. What are we supposed to do? Run the province for you? This is really the ultimate in the political cop out, for this Minister to say that he has had to bear all these wounds and all this anguish because, to use his words, "of the ineffectiveness of the Official Opposition in dealing with province." Well you give industrial relations in this us the mandate to deal with those problems and we'll deal with them and a lot better than you've done in the last seven years.

Mr. Chairman, there are serious problems facing the industrial community, the labour community

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Order please. Now, there are remarks passing back and forth across this floor from people sitting on their backside. If you've got anything to say, make an indication to the Chair. You'll be recognized and you can make them. I don't think some of the remarks that are going back and forth from the seats of honourable members in this Chamber are doing anything to improve the debate in this House, and I want it to stop. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there are serious problems facing the labour community and the industrial community in this province and they cannot be dismissed and turned aside by the kind of fatuous indulgence in self-wounding that we saw from the Minister this evening. We want to know what kind of initiatives he is taking in terms of tripartite approaches to industrial agreements in this province, what kind of initiatives he is prepared to take in terms of generating jobs, creating job opportunities for the people we have in the job market who are unemployed and the people who are coming into the job market in this province, what he is doing to cope with the unemployment situation beyond discussing the matter with the Minister of Public Works. There is nothing the Minister of Public Works can do for him. There is nothing that department can do to help us out of that problem.

As I said at the time that the latest unemployment figures were released in the House, it's not make-work projects that are going to help us out of that situation. What we need is a program that is put together between the Minister of Labour and his colleagues in Industry and Commerce and Finance that will take the shackles off initiative and enterprise in this province so that business and industry can grow. The Minister of Public Works can't do anything to help him. He can put a few make-work projects together and all we're doing is taking it out of one pocket and putting it into the other. But the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Industry and Commerce could do something about it, by freeing up the incentive and the drive and the energy to get this province moving in business and industry and growth and expansion so jobs would be created in the private sector and some of that slack could be taken up. We don't have a word from the Minister on that. All we have is, as I have suggested, the kind of a hand-wringing justification for his long period of inactivity and timidity in the particular dispute at Griffin Steel.

Sir, there is the question of the hearings that the Minister has been holding on Bill 83, The Workplace Safety and Health Act from last session. There have been considerable new commentaries developed from a broad spectrum of the economic community with respect to that legislation and we would like to know what the Minister's present attitude is toward that piece of legislation, whether there will be an opportunity for some amendments to be introduced because it's a piece of legislation that I believe now deserves some amending.

The Minister, I know, will rely on the argument that he used before that it had unanimous passage in this House at the time it came before us, but I will simply rely on the argument that I used before, that it was a piece of legislation that was forced upon us in the pressure cooker of Speed-up, it was a piece of legislation on which we attempted to move about six amendments, we attempted to move about six amendments on it, and were unsuccessful. And we now have had the opportunity, as the entire economic community has, to look at it, examine the weaknesses and the difficulties and the flaws in it and the inequities in it.

The Minister must consider that some of those things exist himself or he would not have called for the kinds of hearings that he's been holding unless they're just window dressing, unless there is no intention on his part to act on them in any way. If he has been willing to hold hearings and if he is sincere about those hearings, then he must share our concern and the concern of those groups who have been coming forward to speak to him on that legislation. He must share the feeling that there possibly are some aspects of it that are inequitable and inapplicable and unworkable. And we would like to know what his intentions are in that area. We would like to know what his intentions are with respect to further examination of the Workers Compensation Act and possibly the eventual opening up of the entire Act for examination in committee hearings.

We have been waiting for some considerable time to hear from him in the area of occupational health measures independent of those that are covered in the Workplace Safety and Health Act.

We are concerned with the situation facing young people coming out of our educational institutions this summer and in succeeding summers looking for employment on a temporary basis to maintain themselves in their educational pursuits.

None of these things have received the slightest mention or notice from the Minister thus far in his presentation to this Committee as steward of the Department of Labour, and that, Sir, can only be described as a shocking travesty of a Ministerial performance, a shocking travesty of Ministerial duties. So, we're asking for a little less play-acting, a little less buffoonery, a little more seriousness about a serious situation for Manitoba which is falling behind economically in this country because

of the measures, which in some instances have been introduced by this Minister and his colleagues, and in many instances have not been introduced by them, despite the urgings of those of us in the opposition who can see, and have pointed out, the difficulties that are confronting our economy and our society today. We want some answers from the Minister as to how Manitoba is going to be turned around under the stewardship of himself and his colleagues on the front benches . . .

A MEMBER: It's not possible.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . and returned return to some degree of economic prosperity and promise.

A MEMBER: That won't happen under this Minister

MR. SHERMAN: This is the challenge that we put to this Minister, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest it's not too much to ask or expect of a man who professes to have been a servant of the industrial community all his life.

So, I would suggest that we move into those serious aspects of the Department of Labour and the Estimates of the Department at this stage, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask the Minister to address himself to some of these problems. The Griffin Steel situation is a serious problem for 140 persons whose livelihoods were involved. We asked for certain action to be taken there. We're satisfied that finally the Minister took that action.

Now, let's get on with the job of taking the action that's necessary to get the province moving economically. Let's get on with the job of trying to find a solution to the constant confrontation that occurs between this government and many other sectors of society when it comes to industrial settlements and industrial progress. Let's get on with some answers to the confrontations that take place between this government and the Manitoba Government Employees' Association, how this government deals with and handles its own civil servants, what it expects of its civil servants. Let's get on with some answers to the search for a better way to arrive at collective agreement, to arrive at industrial harmony and peace, better than the strike weapon and the invoking of that strike weapon. Let's get on with some examination of, and some answers to the question of whether we have not reached a point in society now, whether strikes in certain essential services must now be considered detrimental to the public interest at large, not in the interest of the public at large, and therefore situations which must be handled in a different way, different than the normal work stoppage and the strike process.

These are all questions that confront industrialized society across North America, no less in Manitoba than anywhere else in this continent. But we're not getting any reference to those problems from this Minister. We get no acknowledgement of the fact that those challenges even exist. They do exist and they're going to have to be solved if this province and this country and indeed if the Western industrialized world is going to prosper and profit and grow. That problem of confrontation of the ultimate weapon, the strike weapon and its indiscriminate use, as well as its discriminate use, is going to have to be assayed and assessed very scientifically by Labour Ministers across the length and breadth of the land, and that search for a better way than the invoking of the strike weapon must be spear-headed by provincial Ministers of Labour here in Manitoba and in Western Canada as in every other jurisdiction, and this Minister has as much responsibility to participate in that search as any other.

So I would like to ask him to address himself to some of those problems and some of those questions and get on with the business of dealing with his Estimates instead of apologizing for having fiddled while 140 livelihoods at Griffin Steel burned like ancient classical Rome. He fiddled during that dispute, let's get on with dealing with some of these other problems.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, how typical it is of my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, to dabble and doodle as he does, and maybe it is regrettable that it was in Hollywood last night that some people received an orchid merit of buffoonery. Because what my honourable friend attempted to do tonight in his opening remarks was to slough-off the involvement of the Department of Labour in Griffin Wheel and to pose a number of other questions that I'm prepared to answer to him and to his incompetent colleagues before the Estimates of the Department of Labour happen to be concluded.

First of all, may I say to the Member for Fort Garry, that I can answer without equivocation, without buffoonery, all of the matters that he has proposed. But I do think that first of all I should go back to the situation that prevails at Griffin Wheel because he and his colleagues, along with so many others have attempted to heap coals of scorn on me as the Minister of Labour and of this government, because of the opinion of the inept unknowledgeable labour spokesman of the Conservative Party. And, Mr. Chairman, I ask my honourable friend, I ask my honourable friend will he be honest, and will he disclose to this House the fact that he came into my office and apologized to me —(Interjection)— yes, damn near on bended knee, because he, after consulting with management at Griffin Steel and the Union, —(Interjection)— yes, you're damn right it's pretty low, and it's pretty low of the Member for Fort Garry to stand up in this House as he has stood up, a sanctimonious apostle of righteousness, without disclosing —(Interjection)— Yes, you're damn right you'll do it again and I'm going to tell you my honourable friend that I only wish that I had had a tape recorder to record exactly what you said to

me in my office. I hate Jekylls and Hydes and you are one.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Fort Garry came into my office and said to me, after a series of questions that he had posed to me in this House, dealing with Griffin Wheel, in which he had involved me, or tried to involve me' in answers, he came into my office and said to me, "Russ" — (Interjection)— as a matter of fact, he did. As a matter of fact he did. He came into my office, Mr. Chairman, and said, "Russ, I have not had the information until recently as to what you have been attempting to do to resolve the dispute at Griffin Wheel." And he' Mr. Chairman, and I give him the opportunity of denying it because what I am saying will be on the record of Hansard, and through Hansard, on the record for public scrutiny, and if perchance, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend wants me to repeat it, outside of the House, in order that he may lay charges against me, I'm prepared so to do. Because of the immunity that I have inside of this House I'm prepared so to do. But I ask my honourable friend to disagree or dismiss what I am now saying, Mr. Chairman, that he came in to my office and said to me, "Russ, I want to apologize to you for what I have inferred in this House and I now recognize, after consultation with management at Griffin and the members of the trade union involved, that you have, in effect, tried to do all that you can or could do to bring about a resolution." And my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry said to me, "Do you want me to publicly apologize?" I said, "No, Bud, that's not necessary." But in view of the utterances of my honourable friend tonight, Mr. Chairman, and the inference from him that I have been negligent in my duties to this province, I feel that I should put on record that incident in my office. And I want to say to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and all the members of this Assembly, that I have tried — (Interjection)— No, I didn't have any as far as you are concerned because I don't think you're damn well interested in what's going on at Griffin Wheel. —(Interjection)— How do you know it's garbage, you weren't there? I don't think you have within your capabilities the capability of discerning between garbage and anything else. —(Interjection)— Yes' that's right. I say to the Member for Lakeside, "Easy, Russ."

Mr. Chairman, I recognize and I'm sure that all members of this House recognize that my term of office is fast coming to an area of completion, and I am sure that the Member for Lakeside and other members in this House will say, "Hurrah." But I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, that since my involvement in this House since 1953, I have been honest and above-board and endeavoured to do, what I think on the basis of principle, is right. Condemn me if you like, fellow members, but you cannot take away from me the fact that I have tried to fulfill my obligations, to my constituency and to the population of Manitoba and this Assembly, to the best of my ability.

But aside from that, Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)— Yes, we shall overcome, and the only way in which we shall overcome is by honest assessment, by an honest approach of what we accept as our responsibilities of members of this Assembly. And if the Honourable the Member for Minnedosa feels that he is in here on a free ride at \$15,000 a year, or whatever the indemnity is, I say to he and his employers in the bank that he is wasting his talents if he has any talents.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in order that the record is fairly put to this Assembly, that my involvement with the situation at Griffin Steel started on January 18th, 1975. I didn't wait until the company started to fight back and picketers, some with babes in arms, sat down in the front of the entrance to Griffin Wheel. I had gone through the process long before that, Mr. Chairman. I want to say, that going back to those years' that the first difficulty that arose between management and labour at Griffin Wheel was not an imposition of management for compulsory overtime, but it was because of an edict of the union directed to their members that they should not participate in voluntary overtime for production in their work. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that prior. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we have agreed, mutually I believe, in an order of dealing with the Estimates as appear before us, except for the fact that we move off the Minister's Salary where there is the wide latitude to discuss all matters pertaining to the Minister's Department, and my understanding is that we're dealing with Item (b) Administration, and in fact, the Administration salaries involves the particular administration of his salary. There's room in the Estimates where we can speak about the specific item that the Minister obviously chooses to bend our ears on for the rest of the evening' but I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee members are here to deal with the Estimates of this Department in the order that has been accepted by all of us.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. We're dealing with the item as enunciated by my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, as to the administration of the Department of Labour, I, as Minister, am responsible for the administration of the whole of the Department of Labour and it is on that basis that I am talking, Mr. Chairman. In all due respect to my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, if he doesn't recognize that, then I suggest that his years in this House have been lost. That the Honourable the

Member for Fort Garry said on February 28th, "This man is not a Minister of Labour in the broad or necessary sense in my view; he is the Minister of a vested group in the labour movement, he is the Minister of big labour leadership, that's all he is. He is an errand boy for the union bosses; he is an

historical relic, he should be stuffed and mounted in the Museum of Man and Nature, he should be right up there alongside of Joe Davidson, the missing link."

Now then, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside— (Interjection)— yes, you're damn right it was beautiful phraseology from a nincompoop. But, Mr. Chairman, I say to you, the point of order raised by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside is invalid because I am responsible for the administration of the Department of Labour, I am the Minister and unless the Honourable Member for Lakeside is prepared to introduce a motion asking my premier to remove me from office, then I'm prepared to continue and there's no point of order by that man from Lakeside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, whether or not there is a point of order is not for the Minister of Labour to decide, it is for you to decide, Mr. Chairman. Now, Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, I thank the Honourable Minister for once again reading into Hansard that able and capable description of himself that was made by the Member for Fort Garry and I'm prepared to allow the point of order to slide. I'm just suggesting to the Honourable Minister that if he chooses to operate this way in his Estimates, then of course he cannot expect any difference from Members of the Opposition. That if we want to cover the waterfront on the item before us (a) Administration, then that's fair game with us, we're very amiable, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm prepared to defend myself as the Minister responsible for the administration of this department, yes, this department and get back to your seat if you want to talk. I'm prepared, Mr. Chairman, to defend the administration of this department despite the accolades heaped upon me by the Member for Fort Garry or the assinine statements of the Member for Lakeside. But I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, in rebuttal to the Member for Fort Garry who attempted to get off the track by bringing in other matters such as the involvement of my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, that after his involvement in the Griffin Wheel, that I at least should have the opportunity of establishing before this Committee my position. And long before a strike occurred at Griffin Wheel, I was involved as Minister of Labour. For it was I, Mr. Chairman, who appointed the Chairman of a Board of Arbitration that looked into a grievance dealing with the possible dismissal of employees at Griffin Steel. And that selection, I suggest, was a good one and the result of that selection was that Griffin Wheel had not the right to impose compulsory overtime on their employees.

Mr. Chairman, that was long before that guy who represents Fort Garry raised the question of compulsory overtime that I had taken that step. That arbitration board decision which was opposed to compulsory overtime was then appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench and Mr. Justice Hamilton upheld the decision of the Chairman that I appointed because he was the majority and then this Member for Fort Garry has the temerity to suggest that this isn't a matter of concern as far as I am concerned, that I conducted myself ineffectively or inefficiently as Minister of Labour.

Mr. Chairman, I have a complete chronological documentation before me of all of the involvements with myself as Minister, my conciliation officers, my deputy minister, meeting with both management and labour in an endeavour to resolve this dispute. And what do I get from the Member for Fort Garry, from members of the trade unions and others, criticisms because I've been sitting on my fanny and doing nothing. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if the population, if the trade union movement, if members of this Committee and the public generally only knew the hours that I and my department have put in to try and resolve this dispute, they would not be forwarding to me the criticisms that they have and even the Member for Fort Garry would recognize, if he's competent of recognizing, the number of hours of involvement that have been made in trying to resolve this dispute.

You know, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, on February 28th in this House, condemned me and I could not reply to him, in the type of verbiage that I think that even he was incapable of uttering except under emotional stress. But as one goes on in the field of politics, one becomes more and more cognizant of the fact that sometimes individuals go beyond all due bounds. On February 28th, my honourable friend accused me of being the champion of big labour; he accused me of being an incompetent Minister of Labour — and I accept that, in his opinion it may be so — he compared me as a trade unionist with a doctor of chiropractics, a former minister, and has that right. That, Mr. Chairman, was on February 28th.

I want to quote a couple of statements that my honourable friend made at that particular time and I do want to appeal to my honourable friend' the Member for Fort Garry, if he would do me the courtesy of really reading what he had to say at that particular time. I don't know whether or not my honourable friend was influenced by some external input or not. But he did say at that time that I was the champion of the labour movement and he said, Mr. Chairman: "And if the Minister denies, Mr. Speaker, that he is on a totally unreasonable, anachronistic, anti-management crusade, let us look at some of the legislation he has in store for us right now. Let us look, for example, at last session's Bill No. 83 which was for the protection of the workers at the workplace." And my honourable friend at that particular time went out on a tangent in support, not of labour but of big management and so the

story of February 28th and I will not repeat it at this particular moment but I may later, I will not repeat all that the labour critic of the Conservative Party had to say.

I then, Mr. Chairman, want to go on to what my honourable friend had to say about me on March 9th. "We don't want to see government intervene in the process of collective bargaining." And I don't either and I reject that. "The situation as the consequence of immovable positions having been adopted by certain individuals involved from both parties, both management side or government *cum* management side," etc. etc. And then my honourable friend goes on to say to me that in this particular case, I was taking the part of management in selling the union down the river by a presumed commitment and I say "presumed commitment," Mr. Chairman, in the feeble mind of my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry. And I say to him that such is not the case; it was never the case but here on one side, here on one side, that man who presumes to be the critic for the Conservative Party condemns me because I am the supporter of the trade union movement on February 28th; turns around on March 9th and accuses me of being the disciple for big management.

Mr. Chairman, I've been in the political game long enough to know that you're damned if you do and you're damned if you don't and I accept that. But, Mr. Chairman, may I say to you and to members of this Assembly, that this is the first time in the whole of my political career that I have been damned both ways, within a period of a week.

I want to say without equivocation to this House that I have indicated to management of Griffin Wheel that I oppose compulsory overtime and they have accepted my position. I have indicated to the representatives of the union that I have no inclination to bring about legislation of a compulsory nature to solve their differences and yet, Mr. Chairman, we have this Jekyll and Hyde approach of the honourable, the son of a bishop, who endeavours to confuse the issue that we are confronted with.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared and I don't give a continental how long the discussion on the Estimates of the Department of Labour take. I am prepared to answer all of his questions in respect of unemployment and employment but I do only wish that the Honourable the Member — and we have to use that phraseology in this House — I do suggest that in using that phraseology "the Honourable" Member for Fort Garry would be factual and that he would disclose to this House some conversations that we have had. I will match anything that he or any of his colleagues in his political party or the trade union movement or the religious orders who are writing me letters, and political movement as well who are writing letters to me asking me to get up off my fanny to have discussions take place between management and labour, I challenge them to look into the record and become conversant with the true facts of the situation that is prevailing at the present time in my constituency of Transcona. It is most unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that these groups are not knowledgeable, really, of what has taken place. They fault me as Minister of Labour because it appears on surface, through the media — and I have not taken part in any public debate because I've been knowledgeable of what's going on on both sides of the picture — but it seems to me Mr. Chairman, that I have been faulted for being silent. I know what has taken place, I know that we have been involved, as a department, since the beginning of 1975 in order to try and resolve the differences. I haven't had the opportunity until today and I intend to pursue it in this Committee, Mr. Chairman, until I have my story before this Committee and the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, the Honourable Minister's time has expired. Resolution 78(b)—pass; (b)(1)—pass; (b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; (c) Research, Salaries \$158,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$8,200—pass. Resolution 79 - Workplace Safety and Health; 79(a) Administration Research and Education (1) Salaries \$74,700—pass. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I cannot allow this item to pass without some comment . . .

A MEMBER: . . . vote it down?

MR. PAULLEY: No, but you would. You would because you're not concerned as far as employees are concerned at their workshop and this has been so ruddily evident of past Conservative administrations. But I, Sir, am not going to allow the asinine comments of the labour critic of the Conservative Party to pass without comment.

When my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, was taking part in the Throne Speech Debate, he saw fit at that particular time to criticize our endeavours insofar as the Workplace Safety and the Health Act were concerned. And also, at that particular time, the Honourable, the Member for Fort Garry, used the occasion to personally heap abuse on the Director of the Health and Safety Workplace Act, a man, Mr. Chairman, who had no opportunity of rebuttal in this House and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, how typical this is of those across the other side of the House.

The Honourable, the Member for Fort Garry now claims that the Health and Safety Act which was unanimously adopted by this Assembly a year or so ago was adopted unanimously because they didn't know what the hell it was all about. The inference there of course is obvious, that that outfit on the other side of the House who I presume are going to make an appeal to the electorate of Manitoba at the ensuing election, whenever that's going to take place, idly sit by and vote for something they don't know what it's all about. Now how in heaven's name can the electorate of Manitoba trust those

characters over there when they don't even know, by the confessions of the Member for Fort Garry, what they are voting about.

But I particularly want to say to the — no, that's right, Harry, tell him to shut up because he'll only get himself into hot water.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: But I say to the Member for Fort Garry and I say to all of the Conservatives that really it is indefensible to pick on a guy that can't defend himself in this House and that when the Honourable, the Member for Fort Garry, chose to pick on the Director of the Safety and Health Act of Manitoba, that he was going beyond all due bounds of propriety and fair play. Because what did he say, Mr. Chairman, on February 28th? "If the Minister denies, Mr. Speaker, that he is on a totally unreasonable, anachronistic, anti-management crusade, let us look at some of the legislation he has in store for us, right now. Let us look, for example, at the last session's Bill 83, the Workplace Safety and Health Act, the so-called culmination of this Minister's lifework. Well, we can be faulted for having voted for Bill 83 and I accept fault for that, but that's a coin that cuts two ways. This Minister surely was far more in favour of that legislation than we were. He is the one who introduced it and piloted it through the House, and that he is now going through antagonizing reappraisals of that legislation because he appreciates how impossible and how realistic it is going to be to impose in its present framework. Not only that, but it has so much reaction from such a broad section of the community that he has been forced to ask for opinions."

Mr. Chairman, when I introduced the legislation, I said at that time that I was hopeful that the total community would be involved in all aspects of safety at the workplace. But, "Oh no," said my honourable friend, "we had to get everything through at three o'clock in the morning," and then he went on to say, "Examples of that are placing workers on jobs which they are physiologically and psychologically suited for, interference with job assignments."

You know, Mr. Chairman, I have noted in the recent weeks that the Conservative Party, in concert with the Canadian Manufacturers Association and the Chamber of Commerce, have united in their efforts to try and dissuade the present Minister of Labour and the public generally from going forward with the Workplace and Safety Act unanimously accepted by this Assembly. — (Interjection)— Condemning the Chamber of Commerce in this respect? You're damn right I am, because they have no concern in accordance with their presentations made to the committee, other than the dollar figure. They don't give a continental about the life of a worker insofar as the workplace safety is concerned.

My honourable friend says it's not quite true, well, okay, give or take a little bit as to what he means by "quite" and I will accept it. But the fact of the matter is that despite the unanimous assent of this Assembly, the outfit, of which the Member for Minnedosa apparently now is the spokesman, does not want to proceed with a measure to protect the workers in industry. And I want to tell him, and I'll say it tonight — (Interjection)— Red herring, you're damn right it's a red herring. I say tonight without equivocation that as far as I am concerned, that you can go back to your masters, the Chambers of Commerce and the Canadian Manufacturers Association, and tell them that I am going to proceed as far as I can with the Act to provide for safety at the workplace despite the dollar figure of the bankers that you represent.

Getting back to my honourable — (Interjection)— yes, I'm stupid, of course I'm stupid. I am stupid, I admit that, but there are others who are far more stupid than I and maybe if that cap fits, you can wear it.

But, Mr. Chairman, when the Honourable Member for Fort Garry chose to heap scorn on the person that I had selected because of his knowledgeability as a director in the field of human endeavour, I think that it was beneath contempt. And what did the Honourable Member for Fort Garry have to say? "Now we have Victor Rabinovitch and who is this guy? Well, I'll tell you who he is, Mr. Speaker, he is a product in fact a refugee from the crumbling edifice of socialized business industry. That's what he is. He is an academic, not that there is anything wrong with that except that he is an academic who has never been out of the ivory tower, a trade union ivory tower at that, and he is coming over here, Sir, to tell us how to invoke and enforce workplace safety and health."

And that is not enough in any course, my honourable friend went off onto a tirade again condemning me and linking me with Joe Davidson — (Interjection)— Oh, Joe Clark, oh hell, he's — it's all right, I was just giving my indication of how some of us feel about that.

And my honourable friend went on to say: "He has never worked in industrial safety in his life, yet this is the man who is being put into a position to ensure and guarantee for the Minister of Labour that the culmination of his life's work, namely work," namely mine, "his classic poem, the Workplace Safety and Health Act is going to be put into place during his tenure of office as Minister of Labour. Well, Mr. Speaker, I imagine that what happened was that the structure in British industry came cruling and tumbling down.

"Sir, let me refer once again in passing to the aspects of this legislation which I think are very severe and very destructive and inhibitive of the work ethic, of enterprise and incentive, of progress,

not for industry, not for industry as such but for working people, for men and women in the workplace and in the factory and in the working places themselves."

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying, that this is the attitude and the approach of the Conservative administration to the workers in the workplace, a condemnation of legislation that they supported, and that the Member for Fort Garry chooses to take it out on a man of competence and knowledgability that we selected as a Director of the Workplace Safety Act.

And I want to say to my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, I want to say to his red-headed leader, let him go up to the mines of Northern Manitoba, let him go into the workplaces where, because of the ineffective provisions that have been carried on over the years insofar as safety at the workplace. . . . I challenge them to go into the workplace and say that we oppose even though we supported it a year ago, we now oppose the Workplace Safety and Health Act as legislated by this New Democratic Government of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this legislation that we passed is now legislation that is being considered and passed, partially, by the Conservative administration in Ontario and even in Quebec. The new administration there are looking forward to accepting and adopting the legislation that we passed last year.

So I say to the Leader of the Opposition, I say to the Member for Fort Garry, put your mouth where your utterances are, and say to the workers of Manitoba that we oppose the legislation that we voted for last year. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, in this possible year of an election, they haven't got the guts so to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 79(a)(1)—pass; 79(a)(2) Other Expenditures \$20,000—pass. 79(b) Mechanical Engineering (1) Salaries \$787,000 — pass. Order please. (b) Other Expenditures \$167,100—pass; (c) Occupational Medicine and Industrial Hygiene (1) \$171,400—pass;(2) Other Expenditures \$78,100— pass; Fire Prevention (1) Salaries \$332,700—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$106,800—pass; (3) Canada-Manitoba NORTHLANDS Agreement (a) Salaries \$28,400—pass; (b) Other Expenditures \$35,000—pass; (d)(3) in its entirety \$63,400—pass.

Resolution 79, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,801,200 for Labour—pass.

Resolution 80, Employment Relations (a) Employment Standards (1) Salary. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I notice it appears to be an inclination to pass a considerable number of items — (Interjection)— No, not in connection with my objections, Mr. Chairman, but because of the importance of employment relations in the Province of Manitoba that I think that I should at this stage in the consideration of the Estimates rise and deal with this particular section of the Estimates.

Despite all of the criticisms that have been heaped on this department in the field of fire prevention and the field of work place safety and the field of mechanical and engineering I haven't heard one word this evening from members opposite in criticism of what we are doing. But when we get into the field of industrial relations and it did appear to me, Mr. Chairman, that the ineffective, incompetent, unknowledgeable members of the opposition have taken thus far that it was incumbent upon me to indicate to the opposition what has been going on in the field of employment relations in the Department of Labour.

In my introductory remarks I indicated to the committee what the involvement was insofar as employment relations were concerned of the department and how we in our approach to these problems had tried to bring about a harmonious relationship between management and labour in Manitoba. And as we go through these Estimates, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that insofar as the Official Opposition is concerned they don't seem to give a continental —(Interjection)— Pardon? You agree with me. Then, if as the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek says, that if he agrees, or if the opposition agrees with the steps that we in this department have taken to enhance harmonious relationships between management and labour, why is it I ask, Mr. Chairman, that we are subjected to criticisms outside of this committee?

I've heard, and I am sure, Mr. Chairman, you have heard and you have read through the media, criticisms of our conduct as a department in trying to first of all, to prevent the strike say of Griffin Wheel, and then following that to take steps to bring a resolution of the difficulties between management and labour. On surface it appears to me that the Conservative Party express a concern and yet, Mr. Chairman, when they have an opportunity in this Committee to express those concerns what do we get from the Members of the Conservative Party in this committee meeting but chortling and laughter.

You know, Mr. Speaker, at the present time as I view the interest of the Members of the Conservative Party dealing with the important matter of employment relations I find that the Member for Riel, the Leader of the Conservative Party and the Member for Lakeside are having a football huddle about something that I am sure is divorced from the problems of a harmonious labour relationship in the Province of Manitoba. Then, as I look further to the back row of the Conservative Party I find the Member for La Verendrye, the Member for Roblin and the Member for St. James also

in a huddle and I feel confident, Mr. Chairman, that they are not discussing the problems of labour management relationships in the Province of Manitoba.

Oh yes, oh yes, Mr. Chairman, come tomorrow, or come after the passing of the Estimates of the Department of Labour, the Members of the Conservative Party will go out onto the hustings and try and convince the people of Manitoba that they are concerned about industrial relations. I can just visualize the Member for Fort Garry as I have tried to exhibit tonight by using his own words, will be saying to management, I am a friend of yours, and saying to labour, I am a friend of yours. He will be doing that possibly tomorrow. He has not refuted any of his diatribes or verbiage that he enunciated previously in this House. He has not suggested to me, as Minister of Labour or neither has any of his colleagues as to what steps they would take to settle the conflict in Transcona with Griffin wheel and CAIMAW. Oh no.

Would they accept compulsory return to work by legislation? I ask that. The Honourable the Member for Fort Garry posed a number of questions to me insofar as employment and other aspects of confrontation or concern in the industrial arena today. I ask him, the oracle of the Conservative Party in labour matters, if he were the Minister of Labour instead of me, what would his suggestions be to solve the problem that we're confronted with at Griffin Steel? I trust and hope that with this invitation on my part that the Member for Fort Garry on behalf of his party would give me an indication as to steps that they would take. Would he bring in compulsory legislation? Or would he adhere to what the Winnipeg Free Press indicated to me back in 1975 when after a speech that I had given to the Manitoba Federation of Labour that I indicated that I would not agree to compulsion in industrial disputes of the nature that we're confronted with? I ask my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, who among other Members on the opposite side are wont to pick up news editorials' whether or not he would agree with the editorial which appeared tonight in the Winnipeg Free Press in respect of compulsory overtime and the suggestion of that paper — for which I have no use — that we should not legislate in respect of compulsory overtime.

You know, Mr. Chairman, my days in this House may be numbered but I do want to say that I've always had the intestinal fortitude of putting my dollars where the cards are. And I say to the Honourable the Member for Fort Garry who conceivably could be the Minister of Labour if unfortunately the ratepayers or the taxpayers or the voters of Manitoba lost their senses and voted for that inept outfit on the other side of the Assembly and that he became the Minister of Labour, I ask him in all fairness, what would his approach be? He has been, as indeed his party has been, Mr. Chairman, just yapping little Pekingese dogs, figuratively speaking, on the sidelines, chirping away without offering any constructive criticism or any alternate suggestions which reminds me of days gone by when the present Leader of the Opposition sat over here and said to me on one occasion, "We have the responsibility to govern. We will govern. It's up to you to offer alternative proposals to our government."

Mr. Chairman, history has recorded that this New Democratic Government we have now, did offer alternate proposals to the ineffective Conservative Government of which the present Leader of the Conservative Party was Attorney-General. And as a result of our criticisms of that day against the ineffectiveness of the likes of the Attorney-General of that day, the present Leader of the Conservative Party, we are on this side of the House and I ask the Leader of the Opposition or the Member for Fort Garry an obvious question before we go into a confrontation at the ballot box, what is your alternative?

Mr. Chairman, thus far in consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Labour they have offered none. There has been no rebuttals. There has been no rebuttal from the ineffective Leader of the Opposition or any of his colleagues as to the position that the Department of Labour has taken or this government has taken in the field of labour relations in the Province of Manitoba. I think that it is evident and I'm sure that Hansard will reveal that they sat idly on their fannies when we were going through what they like to call outside of this House, one of the major crises that Manitoba is confronted with. So I challenge, I challenge the leader of the opposition to state now, where stand you and your ineffective party insofar as industrial relations are concerned in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 80 was read and passed.)

Resolution 80: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,363,800 for labour. — pass.

Order please. We have one more item to go. Now refer honourable members to Page 41, Resolution 78(a)(1) — Minister's Ministers' Compensation Salary and Representation Allowance. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I intend to be brief and I intend to be to the point. I did not wish to abuse or violate the rules and privileges and goodwill of this Committee any more than has been done by the Minister in his disgraceful exercise this evening. It would not be fair to my party, to the people of Manitoba, to my colleagues, to the fourth estate, to men and women of goodwill anywhere and

everywhere to remain entirely silent as these Estimates pass at this juncture, so I want to take just one moment of the Committee's time to explain our position for the record so that there is no misunderstanding and so that it will not be exploited unfairly and misrepresented and distorted by the Minister outside this House and outside this Committee the way he has attempted to do inside this Committee.

We came in to these Estimates keenly interested in challenging the Minister in the areas of his stewardship in this very critical field of Manitoba affairs. He came in to this Committee unprepared to accept that responsibility of stewardship and he has now, if he never did before, demonstrably made it plain to everybody in this Committee that he is not fit to be the Minister of Labour. He has come in here, Mr. Chairman, and made a travesty of what should be a serious report on his stewardship and a serious opportunity for us to ask questions and to examine the conduct of his office, the conduct of the affairs of the Department of Labour. He has rendered that exercise futile and impossible.

It has not been possible or practical to receive a rational or a reasonable answer from the Minister this evening. As a consequence, there has been no point in delaying the work of the Committee, abusing the accommodation and goodwill of members of the Committee by putting questions to him and delaying passage of these Estimates any further. There are going to be a number of pieces of labour legislation confronting us in the House before the session is finished. We will, and I will at that time, in examining those pieces of legislation and coming to a determination as to what position we will take on them, attempt to get at some of the critical questions in the whole field of labour relations that should have been examined on these Estimates.

But there is no way on God's green earth, Mr. Chairman, and I put it to you as a man of reason and good conscience, there is no way, I suggest to you, that we could have got any reasonable, rational sensible answers from this Minister tonight in this examination of these Estimates. So what was the point of asking him about Workplace Safety and Health? What was the point of asking him about Employment Standards, employment relations? All we would have got was vitriol, bitterness, bombast, personal attack, personal invective and self-justification, nothing to do with the questions and the issues that are specified here in the Estimates Book before us. I have never in my time in this House, which doesn't come anywhere close in length to the Minister's, I have never seen such a travesty and such a disgraceful performance of a Minister. I think, Sir, that this government has no alternative but to replace this Minister. He should have been replaced, in my view, two or three years ago. This isn't the first time I have suggested it but tonight, he has certainly given the evidence for all Manitobans that he is not fit to hold this office.

He asked us for suggestions. He says, "What would you do?" I'll tell you what we would do, Mr. Chairman. We'd fire the Minister. Our suggestion for the people of Manitoba is to replace that Minister and replace that government because we are not getting any answers and any reason and any sense from the Minister occupying the office today.

Sir, the interest of the Progressive Conservative Party, Party in labour management relations, in workplace safety, in job creation, in attacks on employment, in employment opportunity, in industrial training, the interest of the party in those areas needs no defending whatever. It certainly needs no exercise in self-justification just to satisfy the irrational goading of the Minister who has just sat down. The interest of the PC Party in these areas is on the record. Our desire to get this Minister to face up to the challenges of stewardship in these areas is similarly on the record. We don't have to defend that just to satisfy his whim in this exercise this evening. So, I want to make that clear for the record that we have a keen and crucial interest in determining what the solutions can be, can practically be, for the people of Manitoba in the areas that are covered in these Estimates and we must conclude that the only solutions, the only hope is for us to have the chance at stewardship that has been so badly advocated by the Minister in office at the present time.

Now I know, I am certain of the attempted misrepresentation that he will undertake because of the silence that we maintained as we went through these particular items. But I just want to underscore the fact for the record, Mr. Chairman, that we have more respect for the members of the this Committee than to subject them to the kind of personal attack and vilification that would have continued *ad infinitum*, would have continued unending all evening, had we given the Minister any more opportunity than he already got. So let us make no mistake about what kind of situation this Committee was being forced into this evening. We're not going to put up with that, and we are not going to subject the people of Manitoba to that sort of thing. We want to get on with the business of this province.

I suggested to the Minister in my response to his opening remarks that there were areas from which we wanted to hear from him, that there were areas of concern, the chief one being the critically high level of unemployment in this province at the present time, higher than it's been for years past, a position that puts us at the low end of the economic scale in Canada and to which his only response has been to hold some discussions about a couple of public works projects downtown with his colleague, the Minister of Public Works. Not even that has been a subject that the Minister has felt constrained to address himself to.

So we'll deal with those in our approach to the people of Manitoba outside this House and we'll deal with them in our approach to what labour legislation comes into this House in the remainder of this session. There is no point in trying to address ourselves to them with this Minister in this frame of mind, in this mood this evening. It is a futile exercise and one that's an insult to the people of Manitoba. We would like to get on with the work of insuring some progress and some prosperity and some profits for Manitobans. We can't do that mired down in this kind of exercise that we've had this evening. So that's all we have to say on the Estimates at this juncture, Mr. Chairman.

We intend to go forward from here regardless of what remarks, what response, what irrational misrepresentation will come from the Minister in this respect, we intend to go forward from here not wasting the time of Manitobans but doing a job for Manitobans. No thanks to all the difficulties that have been put in our way by that sorriest excuse for a Minister, an abysmal failure as a Minister of Labour, if there ever was one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, I appreciate his utterances, I appreciate that after much cajoling on my part that I have got the answer from the Conservative Party as to their approach to labour-management relations in the of Manitoba, which approach, of course, Mr. Chairman, as exhibited by my honourable friend, is the heaping of coals of scorns on the Minister of Labour of this administration, who has had more involvement in the field of labour than my honourable friend has had in any field that he has been delinquent in pursuing.

My honourable friend says to me that the reason that the Conservative Party tonight during the consideration of these Estimates, has remained silent was because of my personal approach in consideration of the Estimates, and his resentment that I chose to be a little aggressive instead of sitting back and taking all of the barbs that I have been having to take for a long time by my honourable friends opposite, and particularly the Member for Fort Garry.

In his remarks a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, he indicated that I had been less than sociable to he and the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party. Forgive me, Mr. Johnston. I wonder if my honourable friend would not agree that the ground rules were set by he, not me, insofar as our personalities were concerned, that they were not set when he chose on Monday, February 28th, in his contribution in the Throne Speech to attack me personally as he did. I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, whether my honourable friend will recall it, or whether he is capable of recalling what he said at that particular time, as to my person and my involvement, but let the record clearly say that tonight, for the first since the House met, that I have had an opportunity of rebuttal to the asinine, nincompoopish statements of the Member for Fort Garry. I refer to Page 197 of Hansard of February 28th wherein the member who has just taken his seat, and he should have stayed in his seat before he made such idiotic statements that he has just made, said this: "I have my share of grievances, Mr. Speaker, I suppose with almost every member of the benches opposite, nearly every member. But, Sir, the grievances I have against the other occupants of those benches pale into insignificance along the grievances that I have against the Minister of Labour. I think this Minister of Labour is the most bull-headed, pathetic, the most retarded throwback ever to masquerade in the office. I hope that won't be construed as criticism."

What in heaven's name is that type of an utterance, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that is indicative of the intelligence, or the lack of intelligence of the Member for Fort Garry. And I think also, going beyond his involvement and his statements, I think it is typical of the whole of the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba and I am glad to see that the Member for Lakeside agrees with me. I hope that that won't be construed as criticism.

Then my honourable dear friend, the son of a bishop goes on to say, "No wonder the old CCF Party never won more than a dozen seats when he was their leader. Mr. Speaker, here is a man who came out of the trade union movement who purports to be a labour union man and the rank and file cannot even get through his office door." He got through my office door, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated a little while ago, to make an apology to me that he hasn't made in this House. The door was open then, and I ask him to be honest. I don't think he's capable.

Here is a man who came out of the trade union movement, which I do and I make no apologies for it. I asked him to tell this House where he was and how accessible he was a year or two ago when the strike vote was taking place at Inco in Thompson. I want to say to my honourable friend and to the trade union movement in Manitoba, that it was this government that made it possible for them to have a vote, because under the previous administration of the Conservative government, they were denied that right, and we gave it to them. "This man is not a Minister of Labour in the broad or necessary step, in my view," he went on to say. "He is a Minister of vested interest groups in the labour movement, he is a Minister of big labour leadership, big labour leadership, that's all he is. He is an errand boy for the union bosses. He is a historical relic, he should be stuffed and mounted in the Museum of Man and Nature. He should be right up there alongside of Joe Davidson, the missing link. School children should be brought down on tours and shown the wonders of the palaeolithic age. You know, they

could have two hoary old crusaders up there, a plaque on the wall with a big question mark on it, and the printing should say, "Origins Unknown".

With that background, Mr. Chairman, is there any wonder, that I, on the first opportunity of rebuttal to that asinine representative of the people of Fort Garry choose this opportunity to state my position. Yes, laugh fellows, laugh. I suggest to you that with that background, I am justified.

I want to ask my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, who was it that gave to the trade union movement the right to speak up for themselves in the Province of Manitoba by the legislation that we introduced since becoming the government of the Province of Manitoba? I ask my honourable friend — he mentioned the MGEA in passing reference when he was speaking — who gave to the MGEA the right to speak as free citizens in a free society but this government, having been denied that opportunity by the government of previous years. Who was it, Mr. Chairman, that gave the right to workers in the Province of Manitoba, access to shopping centres, by changes . . . Yes, some honourable member over there says "Jake Froese". Mr. Chairman, that is very indicative of the knowledgability of the Conservative Party in the realm of labour relations. They don't know a continental or give a damn about the plight of the workers in Manitoba. Who gave them the right to picket as they're doing at Griffin Wheel but this government? Who changed the labour laws in Manitoba to remove ex-party injunctions in industrial disputes but this government?

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the interjectionists of my remarks, when they say "Jake Froese did this", indicate their stupidity and their lack of knowledgability of the progress that has been made on behalf of the labour movement in Manitoba since this government took office in 1969.

I had the occasion, the other day, to read the Labour Manifesto of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, at one of their more recent seminars, and Mr. Chairman, if those items were adopted, we would, in fact, turn the clock on industrial relations and the freedoms of the working movement in Manitoba, back 100 years or more. During this confrontation in my riding of Transcona, I have been accused of turning the clock back in respect of the 40 hour work week and the 8 hour day. I say to members opposite, who was it, and what government brought that into legislation in Manitoba but this government? I looked up the Hansards the other day to try and see whether the champion of the Conservative Party on behalf of the workers had anything to say at that time and I found that he did, Mr. Chairman. What did he have to say? "Pity the poor free-enterpriser that will have to pay time and a half for overtime after the 40 hour work week." That was the approach of the Conservative Party.

What has been the approach of the Conservative Party in respect of increases in the minimum wage of Manitoba, which now stands among the highest in the whole of the Dominion of Canada and is under consideration at the present time — standing at \$2.95, 5 cents less than the highest I believe in the whole of Canada. What was the reaction of that outfit on the other side of this Assembly when I made the announcement as Minister of Labour of the last increase? "Oh pity the poor free-enterpriser." The Honourable Member for Roblin, figuratively speaking, stood up with tears welling out of his eyes about the poor little merchant who may have to pay a minimum wage of \$2.95. He didn't seem to give a continental or a damn about the employee who was trying to get along on those minimum wages.

That is the sorry, sordid record of the Conservative Party in labour relations in this province. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek who has not taken part in any of these debates, chastized me very vigorously a year or so ago because I dared to bring into this Assembly a bill governing the safety of mobile homes, because I wanted, or did at that particular time suggest that those concerned should pay for a permit to pay for the cost of the civil servant that was performing the service. That was the objection. I'm glad to see that today the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek agrees with the extension of that proposition to take care of construction of prefabricated homes that will be going into remote areas. So maybe I got through just a teensy weensy little bit into the mind of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

My honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, as much as he wants to rant and rave about the Estimates of the Department of Labour that have been presented tonight, cannot and will not be able to establish on the public podium or anywhere else, the fact that he and his colleagues showed an utter disdain for the operations of the Department of Labour. But I'll bet you this, Mr. Chairman, that when the election is called — I'll be a participant although I will not be running for office, I can assure you of that — but when the election is called, I can imagine members opposite will stand up on the hustings and say how much they are in favour of the work that is being done by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labour. But will they, if they be honest, and I doubt their sincerity or honesty, will they be able to say that when we were considering the matter of the Women's Bureau, We were stony silent.

Every time there's a fire in the Province of Manitoba, how will the Conservative members of this Assembly be able to say that they had a concern insofar as fire prevention in Manitoba, when the Estimates of the Department of Labour concerning fire was passed without one comment by the Conservative Party? Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, if the headlines tomorrow indicate a further travesty, a further death as a result of fire, I can imagine that the Member for Wolseley, or other members of the

Conservative Party, will stand up and say, "What the hell is the government doing about it?" And yet, when they had the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, of saying something during the consideration of the Estimates and making some contribution in respect of the fire code, the building code, fire prevention, they were stony silent because they didn't like the Minister. Well I don't give a continental, Mr. Chairman, whether they like the Minister or not. That is their prerogative. I accept the fact, as suggested by the Member for Fort Garry, that he does not like the Minister of Labour, and Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say, I don't give a continental whether he likes me or not. But, he should recognize, and so should the Conservative Party recognize that they have a responsibility in opposition to make suggestions, — and I suggest they can't make constructive suggestions, I would agree with that — but I do suggest that they at least should make some suggestions as to — (Interjection)— That's right. And I say to the Honourable Member for Morris, I can produce a certificate of soundness of mind, and my Honourable Member for Morris cannot. — (Interjection)— It doesn't have to be updated.

Mr. Chairman, I can accept that and I think that is just along the line that I was talking of the approach of the Conservative Party, of their attitude and approach to the present Minister of Labour. And I don't give a damn what they think about me, but I do say to the people of Manitoba, it has been evident tonight in the passage of all these important items in the Department of Labour, that they don't give a damn for the people of Manitoba, and I'm going to tell them, the electors of Manitoba, whenever we're called to go before the electorate. It's very evident, Mr. Chairman, that this is the case, and no matter what the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Member for Morris, or any other member in this House now may say, it is evident, and Hansard will reveal that not one single contribution of criticism, of suggestions for improvement, was made by that ineffective, unknowledgable and incompetent group in opposition and I predict, Mr. Chairman, that unless the Liberal Party moves over' that outfit will continue in opposition as long as my lifespan on this earth continues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 78(a)—pass. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I understand you have to call the Yeas and Nays on that particular item, but I understand it won't be called tonight, that will be called tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be the first item Thursday in front of the committee meeting.

MR. PAULLEY: Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, that the House do now adjourn.

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