

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 8, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the Speaker's gallery where we have 23 delegates that are attending the State Government Insurance Offices Conference being held in Winnipeg. The following countries are being represented: Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania, and the following Canadian provinces of Quebec, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Manitoba.

In particular, I would like to draw your attention to Sir Allan Sewell, Chairman of the State Government Insurance Office of Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.

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

I should like to also draw your attention to the gallery where we have 30 students of Grade 6 standing from McLeod School. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

We have 18 students of Grade 9 standing from Inglis School under the direction of Mr. Lazaruk. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin.

We have 30 students of Grade 5 standing from Lord Roberts School. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne, the Attorney-General and Minister of Municipal Affairs.

We also have 24 students of Neelin High School under the direction of Mr. Mitchell. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

We have 30 students from Birch River, Grade 9, under the direction of Mr. Warkentin. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions.

## READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**MR. CLERK:** The petition of Ingibjorg E.A. Hawes, Praying for the passing of An Act for the Relief of Ingibjorg E.A. Hawes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Report of the Provincial Land Use Committee, outlining Provincial Land Use Policies, copies of which will be distributed to honourable members later today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, awaiting possible presence of the First Minister, in the interval I'd like to direct a question to the Minister reporting for MHRC, and ask whether it is correct as outlined in a news report that Manitoba is one of four provinces that takes the most serious possible exception to the new Federal Housing initiatives? I ask the Minister that in light of the fact that Manitoba is being represented as being in opposition to recent Federal Housing Program changes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say to the Leader of the Opposition that I have not seen the report that he refers to. I will take a look at it, but certainly we are concerned, very concerned, about some of the representations that have been put forward by the Federal Government regarding the housing presentation that they have put forward so far. And there is a Ministers' meeting on Monday and Tuesday of next week, at which time we hope to solve many of those problems.

**MR. SCHREYER:** A supplementary for clarification, Mr. Speaker. Given that the new Federal Housing initiatives have been described by gentlemen of the same political party as the Minister, as representing an intrusion into provincial jurisdiction, and on the other hand have been described by the Federation of Mayors of Municipalities as an effort for the Federal Government to try to shift responsibility for housing programs to the Provincial Municipal Governments, which is a direct contradiction, may I ask the Minister whether either of these two positions represents the Province of Manitoba's attitude to the Federal Housing initiatives?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Regarding the housing, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that there is some indication with the presentations that the Federal Government have put forward to us, that they are not planning to be as much involved in the housing as they have been in the past, and they are certainly suggesting a shift of responsibilities in some ways regarding monetary and responsibilities, regarding jurisdiction of specifications, this type of thing. But regarding the intrusion that I think was spoken about in the House by the Leader of the Conservative Party and the Leader of the NDP Party, I think he was speaking at that time of the municipal services package that has been being discussed with the Ministers, and in that particular case it's the Minister of Municipal Affairs who handles that for us, and I would really prefer that he comment on that particular part of it.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** May I invite the Minister then to comment, as indicated by his colleague?

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

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** I wonder, Mr. Speaker, I was engrossed in another matter, if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would repeat his question?.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I'll repeat the question, in the expectation it will be taken as notice for reply tomorrow or at a later date, and that is to ask simply this: is it the position of the Province of Manitoba that recently announced federal housing initiatives constitute either an intrusion on provincial jurisdiction, as is being alleged by some or, conversely, that it constitutes an effort by the Federal Government to attempt to shirk its responsibility and devolve it off on to the provinces and municipalities in respect to housing? Obviously, both can't be right.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my involvement in the meeting scheduled for next Monday and Tuesday will be with respect to the Community Services Program which the Federal Government and the Minister responsible for CMHC are proposing in substitution of a number of existing federal programs, the NIP Program, the Municipal Incentives Grant Program. As an example, they are suggesting that Community Services Program be substituted for those programs plus additional programs. I requested a meeting with Mr. Ouellet in March of this year and it is not until early this week, after a meeting of municipal officials on June 1st, that a meeting of provincial Ministers was called for this coming Monday and Tuesday, to which Mr. Ouellet has been invited. There are a number of uncertainties that have been expressed by Municipal Affairs Ministers across Canada related to the amount of money available, the formula that is to be used for allocation of the moneys within the provinces, the amount of moneys available, the term for which those moneys will be available, so that municipalities do not enter into programs on a long-term basis when there is no guarantee that the moneys will be continued, that the program will be continued for a similar period of time.

We have a number of concerns about the proposed program which, I would hope, can be cleared up next Monday and Tuesday, and agreements can be entered into, so that some of these programs, particularly the NIP Program, which has been a successful program in the City of Winnipeg, so that municipalities can make plans to continue such programs.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance. My question flows from the announcement by the Federal Minister of Finance that a meeting of the Finance Ministers would be held in Winnipeg

in early July. I'd like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is in a position now, or in the course of the next few days, to table or otherwise indicate what the specific agenda items under discussion will be?

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the comment in question by the Leader of the Opposition, the meeting is to be held in Winnipeg July 6th and 7th. This is I believe the first time that the Finance Ministers have met outside of Ottawa. The agenda for the meeting is a start in preparation next week by representatives of the provinces. I would think that the agenda probably will be formalized to some extent at a date after next week and will undoubtedly be made public prior to the meeting of the Finance Ministers, but it would be probably two weeks before there would be an formal agenda fleshed out.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Minister, having expressed her opposition to collective agreement which permits a husband to see his wife in the hospital with pay, which is one of the issues in dispute in one of the strikes in Winnipeg, would the Minister similarly express her disapproval of the Builders Exchange attempting to eliminate clauses which have served this province well for many, many years, which is the cause of another strike in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would request that the Minister of Labour, in courtesy to her, be given time to reply. Mr. Speaker, I never said that she has to reply; I said that she be given time to reply. Apparently that doesn't even suit the Member for River Heights. I'd like to ask the Minister of Labour whether, having expressed an opinion relative to a work stoppage in this province, favouring the employer's position on an issue which is currently in dispute, will the Minister express her displeasure at the Builders Exchange seeking to put into the contract compulsory overtime which never existed in any previous contract?

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

**HON. NORMA PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I didn't express my displeasure at having time off for paternity leave; I said that I had three children and my husband managed to attend his work without having to be paid for his days off.

With regard to the second I respect the process of collective agreement and I have no intentions of interfering at this time.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, then can I ask the Minister of Labour whether she was misquoted when the newspaper quoted her as saying she disfavours such a clause in a collective agreement.

**MRS. PRICE:** I have not seen the article, Mr. Speaker, so I can't comment on it.

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

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Hydro. In terms of his announcement of the \$300,000 feasibility study for the western power grid, could he indicate whether there is any initiative or undertaking to extend that study to include the mid-western continental United States as part of an export power grid to be tied into that arrangement — any initiative to undertake a similar feasibility study in relation of that kind of project?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, there are running parallel to the western power grid studies negotiations being carried on with the United States directly, not the United States per se, USA, but with the utility structures in the United States And Manitoba is, and I'm sure the other provinces are too, and particularly British Columbia who have a north-south tie and have traditionally had north-south

ties, that there will probably be individual negotiations but not on a four province basis with the United States is there anything planned. It is similar to the Canadian study.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is aware, can he tell u if he is aware whether the United States Government per se, particularly the office of Vice-President Mondale, has been contemplating or undertaking proposed plans looking into a power grid that would connect Manitoba or the Prairie Provinces in with the mid-western States in terms of a sharing or an exporting of power? Is he aware that any such initiatives are being undertaken on that part? Is there a reciprocal initiative on the part of the Canadian government to examine this and what role is Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Government playing in these discussions?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, there has been an initiative taken and public statements made in the U.S. and by the Canadian Energy officials that we have welcomed but I have replied to these inquiries before by the Leader of the Opposition of a similar nature with regard to trading or renewable resource export concepts being developed on a nation-to-nation basis which we welcome and welcome their initiatives in this area. But my reply would have to be the same again that the first thing that is going to happen, and that has happened traditionally, is that a particular geographical area in the United States, with a series of utilities in it, is going to be the most likely thing to happen. With that realization in mind, we have been pursuing very actively in the United States, primarily through Manitoba Hydro, negotiations to tie in to systems that will allow us to the most likelihood of the earliest possible tie-in for a diversity exchange in the mid-western United States.

The other plans, the more global plans, that are being referred to by the U.S., by Vice-President Mondale, and by the Federal Energy officials in Ottawa, tend to be of a more global nature — no conflict, they are quite parallel. I'm just saying that the first pay-out, if there is any, is going to be from the direct negotiations that are going on between Manitoba interests and the U.S. utility interests in the mid-U.S.A.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the statement by the Finance Minister that there is a parallel examination going on, one on a national level and then one on a direct utility-to-utility basis, would the government be prepared, through Manitoba Hydro or through the government, to recommend to the national governments that perhaps these initiatives be narrowed down to deal with the regional mid-western connection between, say prairie regions and the mid-western regions, to determine whether a total grid connection would be of some value and that financing could be received from the governments for that kind of grid or at least to do the feasibility study to see if it would connect in with the proposed western grid?

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, we would have to have a look at it and determine whether in fact it will likely serve the better interest for Manitoba and for the better planning for short and long range for Manitoba but we have a similar parallel, again a situation in the western power grid. You have what's called this IPACE Study — Interprovincial Advisory Committee on Energy — that has been looking at a national grid right across the country, and the western power grid studies are running a bit parallel to that as well, but only because we can see more likelihood of it coming to reality. And that's why we're focussing on the mid-U.S. direct negotiations, because that has a good chance of coming to reality.

We have no hesitation and will capitalize on anything that comes out of the discussions on a national basis. It's just that in the short run, these studies that have been going on were carried on by the former government, the government before that, and the pattern and understanding and knowledge of the systems is really well a part of history now, and the people that are involved know the directions and the best practical directions to go to obtain these tie-ins.

The overall national co-operation makes it easier, but doesn't displace the effort that has been made and, as a matter of fact, will do nothing more, really, in the final analysis than assist us when we do find the ultimate feasibility in our minds. All this is going to do is make it easier for us to get through the NEB, and that has been a problem in the past, getting through the National Energy Board. Now if National Energy Board and the federal authorities in the U.S. are in general agreement that it's in their best interest to exchange and utilize their renewable resource energy; that's all to our good; that will shorten the last chapter in getting the inter-tie.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in very few words, in agreeing with the summary by the Minister of Finance, I'd like to ask him nevertheless whether he can indicate that any discussions, systematic

exploratory studies by both Canada and the U.S. which would be compatible, not incompatible, but compatible with any direct utility-to-utility negotiations here and directly south of us, can the Minister indicate if in response to Vice President Mondale's formal request to Canada that exploratory studies take place with respect to time frame and amounts; can the Minister say whether Manitoba has been formally requested to join in the study, or to provide information, or lend whatever assistance it can to expedite this requested study? In other words, has anything happened?

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, the answer would be that most of the correspondence of that nature would be on a utility basis rather than through the Ministry. That has tended to be the pattern in the past and that has not changed. I assume there probably has been an exchange on that basis but, in overall terms, let me say that what is happening on a national basis, whether it's Manitoba Hydro or the government, we welcome the opening to encourage their participation and in turn to shorten the time frame under which negotiations can take place, and we'll certainly provide them with everything that's within our grasp to make that happen.

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the statement made yesterday on the CBC program, 24 Hours, by an official of the Environmental Control Branch, that regulations governing the handling of anhydrous ammonia are virtually a hodgepodge in Manitoba, and that the situation in the province is hazardous, that there should be licensing of the handlers, will the Minister now acknowledge that there should be a general review by her department of this situation with the view to eliminating, reducing the hazard and possibly bringing in regulations to reduce the risks in the use of this handling of this chemical in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Brandon East that repetitive questions may very well be such as to not lend to the best type of question period. The Member for Brandon East, I suggest, has been asking these questions for quite some time.  
The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, the person that made the remarks on the CBC program last night is an environmental engineer, and while he said he was an expert, he is not an expert in occupational health or in mechanical engineering, so I can't account for his . . . If he disagrees with what I have said in the House, then he disagrees with the experts who are giving me the advice. I have a full report on the controls, the training, the handling of the product; I will be happy to discuss it; I look forward to discussing it with the gentleman across in my Estimates, and further than that, if they would like a copy of the report, I will be happy to give it to them this afternoon in the Estimates.

**MR. EVANS:** I thank the Minister for her answer. I look forward to receiving a copy of the report although I regret her attitude towards the employee and his professional opinion. Is it correct, Mr. Speaker, that the employee in question, a Mr. David Ediger, is now being harassed by the Minister, her Deputy, and the Executive Assistant of the Minister of Mines and Resources, even though he was given permission to appear on the program by his immediate superior?

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

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, there is not to my knowledge, and as I left my office at 2:30, there was not anybody in my office who had had any direct conversation with this gentleman; nobody has. I have not spoken to him either.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, given that statement by the Minister, can the Minister assure the House that this civil servant will not be fired or demoted for simply giving his professional opinion on a very serious matter?

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

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to make an announcement of a non-political and I'm sure a non-controversial nature. Last evening the members on this side of the House played their annual ballgame against the Legislative press corps, and after two years of suffering rather humiliating defeats, I'm pleased to announce that last night's contest was a 17 to 6 victory for the members on this side of the House. Without taking our last bat, I might

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

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to place a question to the Attorney-General, and ask him when he would favour this House with the report that he promised the Honourable Member for Inkster concerning the investigations that members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have been doing on members of this Assembly. As an ex-member, I want to know whether I am one of those that is being investigated.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, as soon as I have received that report from the RCMP, I will answer the question of the Member for Inkster.

Mr. Speaker, while I am up in reply to a previous question from the Honourable Member for Brandon East, I am now able to, on behalf of the Minister of Highways, indicate that we will support the introduction of public transit services for the handicapped in the City of Brandon. The service is to be implemented July 1st, and the province will pay 50 percent of the operating costs of the service plus a capital grant towards the purchase of a specially equipped bus for the service.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That is welcome news by the Minister of Urban Affairs, that he is carrying out a policy that was announced last year by this government, and it was a promise made by this government, and I respect the Minister's view in the matter. I would like to ask the Minister whether it's the intention to assist with the purchase of one bus — I heard it in the singular — but there was some possibility of purchasing two buses and I was wondering whether I heard him properly. Was it one bus or was it two buses for the handicapped?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in answering that question I would point out that we are following the policy of the previous provincial government with respect to provision of handicapped persons both in the City of Winnipeg and the City of Brandon, that policy, of course, having initiated when I was with the City of Winnipeg Council. I congratulate the previous government for agreeing with that policy, Mr. Speaker. The request at this time, Mr. Speaker, according to my understanding is for one bus.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** I can't resist a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Urban Affairs, Municipal Affairs, whether at the time when he was responsible for being on certain committees of City Council, including the one that had to do with innovative public transit services with respect to the handicapped, could he indicate if he recalls whether, in addition to the work that he did on that, that there was a standing budgetary invitation by the province to urban municipalities to attempt to bring forward ideas, practical ideas for innovative expansion of public transit services?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, as a result of initiations on behalf of the City of Winnipeg at that time there was such an offer that was agreed to by the previous Provincial Government, and I again congratulate them for that.

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

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up on that and ask the Minister if he has a similar announcement forthcoming in relation to the Town of The Pas and the Handi-van service functioning in that community?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of a request for Handitransit service in the Town of The Pas.

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

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Attorney-General and it's with respect to the issue raised by my friend and colleague regarding the RCMP investigations. First, I'd like to know by way of clarification if the Honourable Minister advised the Assembly that he was relying for his information in this regard upon revelations to be made, or disclosures to be made by the RCMP presumably in response to a letter or some other communication he'd addressed to them?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Honourable Member for Wellington wasn't here on the day that the question was asked by the Member for Inkster but the question as I recollected was whether or not the RCMP were carrying out any investigations of members of this Legislative Assembly for security reasons, and that question can only be asked of the RCMP authorities in Manitoba. I would point out to the honourable member that the RCMP are responsible to the Provincial Government for their activities in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. CORRIN:** A supplementary, I would ask the Honourable Minister if he is aware of the MacDonald Commission that is presently looking into these matters on a national scale, and I would ask, in view of the fact that there is a commission presently appointed to look into these affairs, whether he would consider addressing his request for particulars of information to the honourable commissioner as opposed to directly to the people responsible for the administration of the force in the Province of Manitoba?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is correct that the national security issues are matters in which the RCMP report to the Solicitor-General, but I think we can at least expect a general answer from the RCMP in Manitoba that I can make available to the Member for Inkster.

**MR. CORRIN:** Might I suggest, with respect, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side, I think all members of this House would appreciate a specific as opposed to a general answer with respect to this pressing matter.

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, you know the honourable member contradicts himself. In a previous question he's suggesting that it really was a federal issue and was before the MacDonald Commission and perhaps I shouldn't be inquiring into it. Now he's asking for a specific answer and I can assure him that I will get as specific an answer as possible within the jurisdiction of the RCMP in considering their responsibility to report to the Solicitor-General on national security matters.

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

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I address my question to the Acting Minister of Renewable Resources or perhaps the Acting Acting Minister, whoever may be present. It relates to the grounding of the ferry which serves the community of Cross Lake. Given that this ferry is out of commission as reported in the press as a result of being grounded on a rock or reef when it was being transferred from the Jenpeg site to the Cross Lake run, can the government report when this ferry will be back in operation and if they will have personnel working on that ferry who know the channels in the area and can avoid this kind of accident in future.

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

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I'm pleased that the member has brought up the question about ferries that have problems, etc. I will take the question as notice and give the honourable member an answer.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the Minister confirm that he has been requested by the mayor of Gillam to travel to Gillam

for the purpose of meeting with the Fire Brigade so as he can acquaint himself first-hand with the seriousness of the fire protection situation in that community, and if so, can he indicate his response to their request?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, at the same time as I received the request from the mayor a letter was on route to the Council explaining and outlining the various positions that we thought were available to the LGD Council and their voluntary Fire Brigade. I had instructed my staff to contact them today in order to determine their attitude, their response towards the letter and I haven't yet received that information, but having received that information I'll then be able to determine what will be necessary to meet with them.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then confirm that if their response is negative that he will indeed shortly be travelling to the community of Gillam so as he can. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I suggest that's a hypothetical question.

**MR. COWAN:** I'll rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister intend to travel to Gillam at all in the near future?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I hope to travel to Gillam some time in the future.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question to the Minister was in the near future.

Can the Minister also, at this time, inform the House as to any contingency plans that have been developed to supply Gillam with fire protection services in the event of the mass resignation of the fire brigade?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I also suggest that may be a hypothetical question. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance, to remind him that a long time ago and on more than one occasion, he undertook to table with the House, a statement showing the inheritance problems involving a certain lady whose case he cited, I think it was at the time of the Budget Speech, and did undertake to bring in information dealing with the assets and the taxable value of the estate.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I hadn't lost sight of the member's question, and had thought that perhaps either on one of the tax bills or on my Estimates, that I would bring in this information since it is of a more or less general nature relating to taxation. And unless the member opposite wants it immediately I would still plan on doing that, in view of the fact that we will be into the Estimates fairly shortly and we are in fact in the position, I'm almost I think pretty close to closing debate on one of the tax bills.

**MR. CHERNIACK:**

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the point made by the Minister of Finance, but I would point out to him that the reason we ask questions is to obtain information, and part of the reason for information is to be able to debate matters with the Minister. So that the longer he delays giving this information, the less opportunity he gives me and other members of the House, the opportunity to review his reports and to make use of them in debate, so I would ask that it be done as soon as possible and not wait for a moment propitious to him.

May I also ask him, I assume as acting leader, to pass on to the Minister for Consumer Affairs, firstly, my thanks for the information he sent over to my desk yesterday dealing with the Bell Canada and the recruiting for employees to go to Saudi Arabia, and point out to that Minister that he undertook to give more information than he sent and that is information of the nature sent to the Telephone System dealing with customs regulations and visa application regulations, which would have to be dealt with by proposed applicants for the job.

The Minister of Consumer Affairs, I refer to Page 3141 of Hansard, specifically was asked for

these and undertook to supply them, so that I wonder if that message could be passed on so that the additional information and indeed all information could be tabled.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take it as notice and it will be on the record for the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who is planning to be back in the Legislature tomorrow. In any event, whichever is the earliest opportunity, we'll draw it to his attention.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Housing. In announcing the transfer for closing down the activities of the Leaf Rapids Development Corporation, can he indicate whether Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, which has taken up that responsibility, intends to proceed with its application for a development agreement before the Committee of the City of Winnipeg to get approval of that development agreement?

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

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, we plan to proceed with the development agreement on that I believe he is talking about the south St. Boniface piece of property — after the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation have had a chance to examine it. At the present time, we are not satisfied with the agreement or the proposal the way it is at the present time.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the Minister indicate whether Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation intends to continue working with the Citizens Consultative Advisory Groups that were developed to work out these development agreements and uses of the land under the aegis of the Leaf Rapids Development Corporation?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** We will continue to work with any group that the Leaf Rapids Corporation has been working with. I'm personally not aware of the names of those groups, but I will find out. We have just had the Corporation for a little more than a week.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister perhaps when he is investigating, determine whether the Board of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation intends to fulfill the commitments that were made to the private citizens involved in those groups, that they would have first option for purchase of land within the south St. Boniface program at a reduced rate or at a below market rate for the development of housing?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will check that.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Would the Minister of Labour reiterate to the public and to the Builders' Exchange, the position of the Conservative Party as expressed by the Member for Fort Garry, the Minister of Health, on March 9, 1977, in Hansard, "We don't favour the concept of compulsory overtime. I say that where there is good labour relations, you don't need compulsory overtime." Would the Minister reiterate that to the Builders' Exchange and to the people of this province, so that the people know that the Builders' Exchange are proceeding in a manner distasteful to the Conservative government?

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

**MRS. PRICE:** Not having read what my honourable colleague has written or discussed it with him, I will take it under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, has the position, the politics of the Conservative Party with regard to compulsory overtime — and of the government — changed since March 9th of 1977 to the knowledge of this Minister?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed, I should like to introduce to the honourable members 40 students of Grade 5 standing from Gillam School under the direction of Mr. Smith. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Churchill. On behalf of the honourable members, we welcome you here.

Thursday, June 8, 1978

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

The time for the question period having expired, we will proceed with the Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, before I call the Orders of the Day, before the elusive Honourable Member for Brandon East leaves the Chamber, I wonder if he is prepared to proceed with the bills that are standing in his name in Private Members' Hour, also the Member for Fort Rouge. If he is, then we will be having Private Members' Hour today. Very well, it is agreed then that at 4:30 the House will adjourn for Private Members' Hour.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY — LABOUR

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen:** Lady and gentlemen, we have a quorum. When we broke off on Tuesday, well I guess it was Wednesday a.m., at that time on my list I had the names of two members: the Member for Kildonan and Selkirk who wished to speak. Now I see the Member for Inkster is indicating he would like to speak.

Would the Member for Kildonan like to lead off or would he want me to go to the Member for Inkster to start with?

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

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right, the Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for permitting me to intervene at this time because, Mr. Chairman, intervention is what we are talking about. The Minister has pretended that she is remaining completely aloof from the labour disputes and the issues between the protagonists that are taking place in the Province of Manitoba at this time. Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister needs any confirmation from me that my entire history in labour relations has been that the government should not pass laws which would take away the freedom of the parties and I have never suggested that that be done. I would not pass a law saying that the Builders' Exchange should be required to hire, nor would I pass a law saying that the employees should be required to work. I gather that she will and has said so and eventually when the Builders' Exchange, if they start losing this strike, come down to the Minister and start pleading with her, her answer will be, "The situation has now become drastic; people are starving in the streets," which is what she said would be her criteria and therefore she is going to intervene and when she intervenes, as sure as God made little apples, she will intervene on the side of the employer, on the side of the Builders' Exchange.

How do we know that, Mr. Chairman? We know it by the Minister's actions. Not more than two days ago, with respect to another matter, another issue which is in dispute between the parties, when the Retail Clerks and the Safeway stores are arguing about whether a man when his wife is having a baby, should be able to get a day off so that he can be with her at that time — with pay — which is a legitimate matter in dispute, and whether the Minister agrees with it or not, it is legitimate, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that I would venture to guess that 99 percent of the employers in the Province of Manitoba would let the man go home and receive pay because it's so obvious a case where a man should get that time off. But it is in dispute; it is an issue in a strike and what the Minister did was come down four-square on the side of the employer in that strike despite the fact that she said that she will not express any opinions as to the issue in dispute because she is pretending, Mr. Chairman, to stay out of this dispute.

Now what she's doing with regard to the Builders' Exchange, is not staying out of the dispute at all. She is aware that her government has frozen construction, that there are, therefore, many unemployed craftsmen and very few jobs for those craftsmen to get so that the bargaining position is all on the side of the employer and therefore the employer has seized this Conservative laid plan for giving them an opportunity to try to break their union security and they are using it, Mr. Chairman, because the issue in this dispute — one of the major issues in this dispute, there are two of them

— are not demands of the employees, they are the demands of the employer: One, that you take out the union hiring clause which is needed by craft unions throughout this country and which has been the way in which labour relations have progressed in this province and secondly, that you implement compulsory overtime.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as distinct from the Retail Clerks' dispute where she said that she thinks that such a provision would be ridiculous, she chooses to remain studiously silent about her position with regard to a clause containing compulsory overtime and the insistence on the Builders' Exchange of trying to go to the heart of union security with regard to carpenters and with regard to electricians.

We're not even asking her, Mr. Chairman, to declare a new situation. We're not saying to her that she should do anything to force the employees to go back to work which Mr. Sherman surely implied. Last year his policy was not "no intervention", not at all, Mr. Chairman. I'll read you what Mr. Sherman said at the time of the Griffin Strike, the Labour spokesman for the Conservative Party: "Now, that being the case, Sir' it's polarized to that degree where he and the head of the union, Pat McEvoy, cannot effect any more progress or the conciliation officers so appointed cannot effect any more progress and whether the company and its representatives — and I include its legal counsel — cannot effect any more progress. Sir, it seems to me that since the livelihoods of these people are at stake and they are the prisoners of the situation, not of their own making, is there not some reasonable justification for suggesting that consideration should be given to removing these antagonists from the arena?"

Now, Mr. Chairman, the former spokesman on labour relations was prepared for the state to remove these antagonists. I want the state to remove Atkin from the Builders' Exchange because he is causing this strike. He is the — and I'm going to use the words stubborn, bullheaded, polarized person who will not let this strike be settled, who on previous occasions came to this committee and indicated his position with respect to the unions and such and it's that protagonist, Mr. Chairman — and I wouldn't suggest it, no, never, I would never suggest that you ask the parties to remove one or other of their leaders. But according to Mr. Sherman, Mr. Chairman, according to Mr. Sherman, labour spokesman for the Conservative Party, if there was a stubborn antagonist, the government should remove him from the scene. Well, I identified the stubborn antagonist; it's Mr. Atkin. —(Interjection)— Of course not, but you guys got to . . . No, but you've got to let . . . I'm not asking you to pay attention to me. I'm asking you to pay attention to you, you who have run around saying how you have fulfilled all your promises. Here is one of your promises: you are going to remove the antagonist from the scene. And I ask the Minister to declare —(Interjection)— no, of course, Mr. Chairman. I ask the Minister to declare that the government is opposed, as was the Conservative Party position a year ago, that they are opposed to compulsory overtime, that they do not believe that this is necessary in a collective agreement. I'm not asking them to say that they don't believe that the parties should be free to negotiate it because both of us took that position and that's what we brought about because previously some lawyers had held that the government imposed it.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to ask the Minister of Labour to tell the people of Manitoba and the Builders' Exchange that we, the Conservative Government — and I want the people of Manitoba to know it too — don't favour the concept of compulsory overtime. I say that where there is good labour relations, you don't need compulsory overtime. There has been no problem with regard to overtime in the construction industry; there were good labour relations. I say, Mr. Chairman, all I'm asking the Minister to do in this dispute is to do what she did in the Retail Clerks' dispute, state her opinion — in that case it was on the side of the employers, in this case it would be on the side of the employees. Now that's the difference, Mr. Chairman. This government is committed to helping the employers; this government is not engaged in non-intervention. This government is engaged in intervention for the employers and right now they know that in order to help their employer friends, the Winnipeg Builders' Exchange, that they should be saying nothing but in order to help Safeway, they should be telling the public that the union demand, or the union request — and what a terrible request, Mr. Chairman. Here is this horrendous request, that when my wife is having a baby, I should be permitted to leave the store and go to the hospital and that I should have not have that time deducted from my work for a period of . . . I don't know what it is. Is it one day or two days? —(Interjection)— One day.

Well, Mr. Chairman, what we did have is the Minister saying that that was a bad request. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting to you that that is not a serious request, however, I am entitled to my opinion; the Minister is entitled to her hers. Right. Why will the Minister not express her opinion in the same way when it favours the employees with respect to compulsory overtime? One reason, one reason, because her and the rest of you are willing to help the employer and you're trying to hurt the employees. That's the reason. —(Interjection)— No, that's the reason. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I didn't put the words in her mouth. The words were spoken by her herself. —(Interjection)— She certainly did express her . . . in this committee.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** She just said what happened in her own home.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, she gave the opinion that she does not favour such a clause.

**MRS. PRICE:** I did not make that statement.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, will the Minister say that she will not have people work compulsory overtime.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Can I stop the Member for Inkster for a moment and ask other members if they would show a degree of courtesy to the person who is the recognized speaker? The Minister of Labour would like to interject. Would the Member for Inkster permit her?

**MR. GREEN:** Fine, certainly.

**MRS. PRICE:** The member in charge of Housing said correctly what I said. I did not say I disfavoured. I said that I had had three children and my husband had not had any extra pay or did not deem it necessary. I did not say I disfavoured it at all and if you'll read the record, you will see that that is correct.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, Hansard is on the record.

**MRS. PRICE:** That's fine, you read it.

**MR. GREEN:** The Member for Churchill asked a question: Does she consider such a clause to be desirable and her answer was — and it will be on the record for her, none of us need say what it was. What the press got from that answer and what any reasonable person would get was that if I didn't need it, obviously it's not necessary.

**MRS. PRICE:** Come on, you know, the members of the Conservative

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman' Party are saying, "Aw," but that's not what was communicated by the Minister, that's not what is communicated by the Minister through the media to all of the people of the Province of Manitoba. What was communicated by the Minister through the media to the people of the province . . . I wonder whether the Minister would be just as tactful in saying, I wouldn't have anybody work compulsory overtime. I wonder whether she would make the same kind of statement? She won't, and the reason is, Mr. Chairman, because that statement would fly in the face of the Builders' Exchange, the other statement flies in the face of the Retail Clerks. Is there any doubt whatsoever, can any reasonable man doubt that the people of the Conservative Party as we've been sitting through this committee are antagonistic to everything that unions demand and favour everything the employer has done. That has been what has happened in this committee, Mr. Chairman, that is what has happened in this committee since we have sat down. We had talk about drones, we had talk about people not wanting to work, we had talk about dirty unions, we had talk about —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Chairman, and that entire Conservative Party attitude, except when they were in opposition and when the member wanted to make a statement, when she said, ' they would do something, the New Democratic Party was doing nothing, but on March 7th there was no reticence on the part of the Conservative Party. We are against compulsory overtime. Would the Conservative Party please communicate their opposition to compulsory overtime to the public of Manitoba and to the Builders' Exchange in particular?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The next people on my list are the Members for Kildonan, Selkirk, and then the Member for Gladstone.

The Member for Kildonan, then Selkirk.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to follow another aspect in respect to strikes and lockouts. Has the Minister of Labour portrayed her feelings to the brewery workers that she can offer them conciliation services in respect to the lockout that has taken place in the brewery industry?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, we have offered our services but up to this point they figured that they would

rather go it on their own.

**MR. FOX:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear a word. I had nothing but yapping from the other side and so would the Minister of Labour kindly repeat what she had to say?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, our department has offered their services to the brewery strikers and employers and up to this point they would rather go on their own in their conciliation efforts.

**MR. FOX:** Can the Minister offered an opinion whether she feels the lockout is justified?

**MRS. PRICE:** I wouldn't offer an opinion on that. I am one that is representing both sides of the fence and I'm certainly not going to make any statement to that effect.

**MR. FOX:** Can the Minister indicate what the dispute is in respect to the lockout?

**MRS. PRICE:** Not having been brought into it, I can't give you any statements to that effect.

**MR. FOX:** Well, were there any conciliation services prior to the lockout?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, there wasn't, not by our department.

**MR. FOX:** Was there any indication by the companies in respect to the lockout?

**MRS. PRICE:** Nothing at all, Sir.

**MR. FOX:** So therefore the workers were just told that there was no longer a job available?

**MRS. PRICE:** I couldn't tell you, I had no dialogue with them whatsoever, neither did my department until just yesterday. We offered our services and they said at this point they would rather continue on their own.

**MR. FOX:** In respect to the Construction Industry Wages Board, can the Minister offer a date when it last met and if it made any recommendations?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm informed it met just a few days ago.

**MR. FOX:** That's the Winnipeg board. How about the rural area board?

**MRS. PRICE:** They've all met.

**MR. FOX:** They've all met at the same time. Has there been any recommendation in respect to the heavy construction board wages?

**MRS. PRICE:** Pardon me?

**MR. FOX:** Has there been a recommendation in respect to an increase for the heavy construction wages?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes there has.

**MR. FOX:** Can the Minister tell us what it is?

**MRS. PRICE:** Not at this particular time, I can't.

**MR. FOX:** You mean you have a recommendation but you're not informing us what it is?

**MRS. PRICE:** It hasn't been discussed yet. At this point I'm not prepared to say until it's been discussed.

**MR. FOX:** How about the Construction Review Committee, has it met?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'm informed they met recently and they have given us a report too although I haven't got it. I can probably get it for you but I haven't got it here.

**MR. FOX:** Okay. You say the Labour-Management Review Committee will be meeting shortly?

**MRS. PRICE:** I believe they met yesterday. Yes, they met yesterday. I haven't had any results of the meeting at this time.

**MR. FOX:** Have there been any changes in the composition of that committee?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, there hasn't.

**MR. FOX:** Except for the resignation of the chairman.

**MRS. PRICE:** That's right.

**MR. FOX:** Did the Minister attempt to retain the services of the former chairman, Professor Woods?

**MRS. PRICE:** Did I?

**MR. FOX:** Yes.

**MRS. PRICE:** Did I what?

**MR. FOX:** Try to retain him as the chairman?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I didn't. I think in a population of a million people that we surely must have somebody that's very well qualified to fill in that position and in fact we have names — and this is the consensus of the people that are on the board also — there are some names, as I mentioned the other day that have been brought forth and I'm sure they were discussing them at their meeting yesterday.

**MR. FOX:** The Power Engineers' Advisory Board, I understand it doesn't have a full composition at the present time. Can the Minister indicate how soon it will have one and when it will meet?

**MRS. PRICE:** I mentioned again to you on Tuesday, I believe it was, that there hadn't been one when I came into office but it's just about completed now and I'll have the names for you. I have these others for you that you were asking for.

I have the list of boards and committees that the Member for Kildonan asked me for. The boards and committees as they are set up at present, the list of members of boards and committees, the list of boards and committees that had expired at the time I took office, the boards and committees appointed since I took office and the date of the last meeting held by the boards and committees.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you. —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, we don't have at this moment but I was just saying to the Deputy Minister of Labour that we will have to table the exact information to the Clerk at least. —(Interjection)— Yes, then we can put it into Hansard. There is a fair amount of material there. I will ask the Member for Kildonan, is that satisfactory to he and his colleagues?

**MR. FOX:** Well, I haven't had a chance to look at it and I don't intend to look at it right now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No, but other members of the committee, is it all right if we go from Hansard as far as that material is concerned or do you want it all copied for each and every individual member? Is Hansard satisfactory to the rest of the members? All right.

The Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** That's all at the present time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, the Member for Selkirk.

Thursday, June 8, 1978

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just pose a few questions to the Minister as to procedure. In the event that the Minister receives a report from a member of her staff under any of the provisions and Acts that are relevant to her department, that there is an infraction of the law, for instance, the Operating Engineers' Act, could she just advise me as to whether she then refers all such complaints from her department indicating that there is, in fact, an infraction to the Attorney-General's Department for further legal opinion and prosecution?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, not in every case. We try to conciliate them in some and I haven't had any others of that nature since I came into office, other than the one for Brandon, you know, Simplot and Hooker.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I would like to just ask the Minister on another area and I believe that this is the correct area to raise it and if you feel that it is not, Mr. Chairman, interrupt me because I don't want to spend the time of committee if it is better to deal with this on another item. Insofar as orders of the Labour Board dealing with unfair labour practice, where an employee has been dismissed due to unfair labour practice and the board in fact finds that that is the case and orders the reinstatement of the employee in the employee's employment, I want to just share with the Minister my view that there is a serious loophole in existing legislation. The legislation states "reinstatement in her employment," and of course the intent is that the employer will be required to reinstate the employee because the employer in fact dismissed the employee unjustly.

I have a situation in mind where an employee was ordered to be reinstated by the Labour Board in her position as a hairdresser — well, I must correct myself, — in her employment. Her employment had been as a hairdresser and the intention, I'm sure, of the legislation was that the employee in fact would be reinstated in the position that she had held but instead the employer saw fit to reinstate the employee in a position which was totally non-relevant to that of her former type of employment, not similar to her type of employment, but in employment which she was not equipped to carry out and in working conditions which were of such a nature as to really cause the employee to, well, in this case had to quit because of physical pressures which came about as a result of the alternative employment.

So I say to the Minister that I am concerned, I know it's not the Minister's fault, but I would like to bring to the Minister and obtain her comments because it seems to me that there is a serious flaw in the legislation. Either that provision should be withdrawn from the Act because it does lead employees to feel they have certain rights and then to find out that that right can be easily circumvented by an employer, or the provision should be strengthened so that the intention of reinstatement, certainly during the period of union organizational activity, would be done during that period of time. Because in this particular case, after two full days of Labour Board hearings and after obtaining an order for reinstatement, that's what happened in this particular instance, to no avail, to a great deal of expense to union and to employer too — both sides were — yet really nothing was achieved in represented by legal counsel the final result because of the vagueness of the wording of that provision in the Labour Relations Act.

I understand that there have been a number of other similar types of incidents and I would just like to have the Minister's views on that.

**MRS. PRICE:** I haven't had anything of that nature brought to my attention but I would certainly be interested in your giving me the specifics that you would like and we will definitely look into it. I haven't had any of those brought to my attention.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Good, I will do that.

**MRS. PRICE:** Thank you.

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

**MR. FERGUSON:** Mr. Chairman, I was wanting to bring this up when the Member for Inkster was here. He wanted to talk about the clauses of the negotiation between the retail store employees plus the stores and he spent a great deal of time on one particular clause. I was wondering if maybe the members on the other side would like to mention some of the other 101 clauses that are under discussion, if they want to cover them all one by one?

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before we leave this item, the Minister stated in a reply to the Member for Kildonan that she seemed to know nothing about the issues that were at stake

in some of the industrial disputes that have broken down and I wonder if the Minister has received reports on progress of wage negotiations prior to breakdown, say at the brewery workers or the retail stores. Is the Minister listening or . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, thank you. Has the Minister been made aware of and received a report, which I think the Labour Relations Act calls for, I think it's two weeks prior to the expiry of the collective agreement, and had she been made aware of the state of the collective bargaining up to that time, say in some of the disputes that we've had, and we have right now?

**MRS. PRICE:** Firstly, I would like to tell the Member for Logan that his constant referring to me as "knowing nothing" I take exception to.

**MR. JENKINS:** I didn't say that.

**MRS. PRICE:** I would like to tell him that I have had reports on it but at this point, as I mentioned, I am not about to discuss it. It is of a confidential nature and I'm not prepared to discuss what decisions they are at at this point.

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, Mr Chairman, if the Honourable Minister feels that I insulted her, I apologize. I didn't say that she knew nothing. If she will read Hansard, she will find out that I didn't say that she knew nothing, but if she wants to assume that she knows nothing, that's her business. But what I asked her was, if she had had the reports. I didn't ask her what was in the reports. I asked her if she had received the reports, simply that.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I have.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Is the Member for Logan finished?

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, I've finished for the present.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Minister did give the committee a breakdown of the SMYs for this particular appropriation that we're on. I wonder if she could make available to the committee similar figures for all of the department broken down?

**MRS. PRICE:** I'll give them to you as we go into them; I've got them all, if you like, as we go into each department.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Could I interrupt the Member for St. Vital. The Minister has offered to do it as we go through the Estimates. Would you and other members of the committee prefer that she have them listed on a sheet and distributed?

**MR. WALDING:** We have made similar requests of other Ministers in Estimates, Mr. Chairman, and we have received, usually at the beginning of the consideration, a complete list so that we can make our comparisons with the previous year giving . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Can I just read them off to you. I have them here. I don't have them on one page, I've got them according to departments. Would that be satisfactory or would you rather them on one sheet?

**MR. WALDING:** I wonder if the Minister could have them duplicated and made available to the committee, it would be appreciated.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I can do that.

**MR. WALDING:** Could the Minister give us an idea of how many employees there are in the Department of Labour at the moment?

**MRS. PRICE:** About 210.

**MR. WALDING:** And are there a number of vacancies in the department or can the Minister give us the total staff complement?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, as I say, about 210 is what we have on staff. There are 20 vacancies.

**MR. WALDING:** So out of 230, there are 20 vacancies or . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. WALDING:** . . . just under 10 percent. Can the Minister give us the comparable figures for last year?

**MRS. PRICE:** I will have to get them for you.

**MR. WALDING:** Will the Minister get them from any particular date, say a year ago or September 30th?

**MRS. PRICE:** When would you like them from?

**MR. WALDING:** A convenient date, I don't want to make things too difficult for the Minister.

**MRS. PRICE:** Oh, you mean when I will give them to you?

**MR. WALDING:** No, no, of what date? Does the Minister plan any particular date to give us?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, you tell me what you would like and I will give them to you for that date.

**MR. WALDING:** Then perhaps a year ago at the end of May would be a convenient comparison.

**MRS. PRICE:** All right, last May, fine.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister tell us whether those 20 positions that are presently vacant are frozen?%

**MRS. PRICE:** No, there are some that aren't going to be refilled but there are others that are in the process of being filled.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister give the committee any indication of what the vacancy rate was when she took office?

**MRS. PRICE:** It really hasn't change. It's approximately the same now outside of the recent resignations, it's pretty well the same.

**MR. WALDING:** I would like to move on to a slightly different subject matter, Mr. Chairman, and ask the Minister if she can give the committee the reason why Mr. Goodison was fired from his position.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Goodison was offered the opportunity to stay on in his position. The Premier had called him in prior to my coming into this portfolio and asked him if he was prepared to adopt and live with the philosophies of this present government and he said, "Yes," but he really wasn't prepared to and he and I could not get along, that's all.

**MR. WALDING:** Was it the Minister who fired Mr. Goodison or was it the Premier.

**MRS. PRICE:** It was the Premier but with my consideration.

**MR. WALDING:** Did the Minister then recommend to the Premier that Mr. Goodison be fired?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I did.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister tell us whether she found Mr. Goodison incompetent to carry out the work?

**MRS. PRICE:** No, I did not find Mr. Goodison incompetent to carry out his work, but Mr. Goodison did not want to work with me.

**MR. WALDING:** Is the Minister then telling us, Mr. Chairman, that it was Mr. Goodison's decision to leave?

**MRS. PRICE:** It was not Mr. Goodison's decision to leave but it is my responsibility to see that the department is run in the best manner and I found that I was not getting his co-operation.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister inform the committee in what way Mr. Goodison was failing to co-operate with her?

**MRS. PRICE:** By certain information that I was given that I don't care to elaborate on. I can just tell you that Mr. Goodison himself was not surprised. He was the first one, when this government took office, that made a public statement to the press that he expected to be the first one to be fired, so he must have felt that he wouldn't be able to adapt to this present government's philosophies.

**MR. WALDING:** Did Mr. Goodison fail to carry out the Minister's instructions, Mr. Chairman?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Goodison neglected to give me information that was necessary for me to carry out my position.

**MR. WALDING:** Was this information that the Minister had asked for or . . . ?

**MRS. PRICE:** In some cases.

**MR. WALDING:** . . . or had she just expected Mr. Goodison to come up with this?

**MRS. PRICE:** In some cases it was; in some cases it wasn't. I can only say that there was certainly enough evidence to see that our working conditions to it were not compatible and we could not work together.

**MR. WALDING:** Had Mr. Goodison expressed any opposition or resistance to any of the Ministers' policies?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Goodison expressed his opposition to some of our contemplated moves. He also gave me documents that he wanted me to sign which I very luckily had the foresight to ask somebody else about them first which was not in the best interests of this government. It was then that I really knew that I had somebody that was working against me.

**MR. WALDING:** So then the Minister is telling us that she is of the opinion that Mr. Goodison was working contrary to the Minister or the to the Department or to the government?

**MRS. PRICE:** To all.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you.

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

**MR. FOX:** Would part of the non-cooperation include recommendations by the then Deputy Minister in respect to the Power Engineers' Act and the enforcement of it? Was that part of the issue there was disagreement on?

**MRS. PRICE:** I had no liaison with Mr. Goodison at all with regard to that. The only connection we had was when he removed my personal files from my department, my office, had them duplicated, took them out and gave them to Mr. Warren to read on his show. So you can take that for what it's worth.

Thursday, June 8, 1978

**MR. FOX:** Did the Minister, upon taking office, have any kind of communications with the rest of her staff and did part of that communications include having a briefing with Mr. Goodison?

**MRS. PRICE:** A briefing with Mr. Goodison with regard to what?

**MR. FOX:** Well, you took office, did you not meet your staff and . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** I met my staff, yes.

**MR. FOX:** Well, the Minister originally said she had no communication with Mr. Goodison. I'm asking her if she . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** On the Simplot and Hooker incident, I didn't. That took place at the end of December. By that time there was barely a speaking arrangement between the two of us.

**MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, I have some supplementary questions to those advanced by the Member for Kildonan and those advanced by the Member for St. Vital. I was particularly interested in the remark made by the Minister to the effect that the former deputy was unable to adopt — I believe the term was adapt — to certain philosophies that were apparently subscribed to by the new government. I was wondering whether she could elaborate as to which philosophical tracks she was referring to. What were the areas of difference? What couldn't he adapt to? What couldn't he adopt?

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't care to elaborate on them. I gave you a clear enough picture that there was not a workable arrangement possible between the two of us and I think it was my prerogative if I couldn't work with him to have him replaced.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, with respect, I would suppose that it was within the Honourable Minister's prerogative to, as she says, have him replaced. But given the fact that this man is apparently an individual with considerable experience, a man of, I think, a highly thought of background in labour relations and one who I am advised is now associated in a very senior position in intergovernmental affairs in Washington, it would seem pertinent that not only the members of this particular committee but the people of Manitoba know what deficiencies he manifested, what the Minister and her colleagues observed in his conduct, in his thinking, that was somehow detrimental to the people of this province. He now represents far more people in a far more important position, I think, and I, for one, am very interested in knowing what it is that she finds so objectionable, so abhorrent.

**MRS. PRICE:** I am sure that Mr. Goodison is very knowledgeable in the labour world. He didn't have any experience in government so you can't say that he was fully qualified in that position. He had been there just under a year. The Deputy Minister that I have now is a man of 18 years experience and he has had considerably more experience.

**MR. CORRIN:** Is that the reply? I would remind the Honourable Minister that we're not talking about a matter of personal relations here; we're talking about governmental employment which implies a very different standard.

**MRS. PRICE:** There has to be a relationship when somebody works as closely as a Deputy and a Minister, there has to be a close relationship and, as I said, by the end of December, there was barely a speaking relationship so we certainly could not conduct the affairs of the Department of Labour in that manner.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well then, that implies the philosophical impasse. Now if there was a philosophical impasse, which was so significant as to create that sort of schism as between the Minister and the former deputy, I would think that, as I said before, it is in the interests of all Manitobans to know what, if any, differences could be so significant as to cause the severance of the employment of the former deputy.

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't think it's necessary to delve into it that deeply for the citizens of Manitoba.

It's not going to change the working conditions or the conditions of the Province of Manitoba by telling it something of the personalities of the former deputy and myself. I don't see any relevance at all.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, I do, because it implies to me that if you are unwilling to tell us why you severed your relationship, I must say that it implies some culpability being admitted on your part. I would suggest that he has made certain public pronouncements — I'm sure you're aware of them and I'm not about to repeat them — but I think it's incumbent upon you at this point, being the Minister and being responsible for the affairs of your department, to give us some idea as to what you found objectionable. This is not a matter — and I stress — this is not a matter of personal compatability and if that is what the Minister is turning it into, I suggest that all the members of her department hold onto their hats because presumably anybody that you will become incompatible with will perhaps fall subject to the same sort of victimization.

**MRS. PRICE:** I would like to tell the Member for Wellington that since Mr. Goodison has left the department, the atmosphere of the whole Department of Labour is far better. Now they are going around the Norquay Building with a cloud lifted, as most of them referred to, so don't sit there and ask me about conditions for the detriment of the people of Manitoba. It has improved 1,000 percent in my department since he has left.

**MR. CORRIN:** You know, Mr. Chairman, this is probably reminiscent of days long gone by. I suppose in days gone by when there were absolute monarchs and when people were given authority and that authority was unquestioned and it was endowed upon them, as it were, for life then I would presume that these were the type of responses that any person, citizen within the realm would receive. But we don't live within that sort of system any more. We live in a democratic system and it's the right of the people of this province to know why certain key personnel within the service of the government of Manitoba are released. Now, I'll help the Minister along. She indicated that he failed to give her certain vital information. Well, that's a very, very serious allegation. I think that's a considerably serious allegation because that implies that the Deputy Minister was very unprofessional, very undisciplined and was working, I would think it wouldn't be unfair to suggest in this context, that perhaps he was working in a subversive manner. Now, if that is what the Honourable Minister meant to imply, and I think that's a fair inference from the statement made from her. I think she should give us some idea of what type of information it was that he failed to provide her with.

**MRS. PRICE:** Can the Member for Wellington sit there, or any of his colleagues that are sitting beside you, sit there and tell me and my colleagues that there has never been a senior official when the changeover of government occurred eight years ago that there wasn't any senior officials either let out, or quit, or demoted?

**MR. CORRIN:** If that were the case, and you felt that such a demotion or, if that were the case, such a demotion or termination were unjust or unfair or undeserving, then you would have the same opportunity as I'm being afforded this afternoon to question one of the former Ministers. Now if that were not done — I don't remember any such allegations being made, but I wasn't here but I didn't read about it — if that were not done I have to presume that you didn't feel that to be the case when you found yourself in the position I am today, in opposition.

But today I am a member of the Legislative Assembly and I'm before you in Committee and you have a responsibility, not to me, but to the people of Manitoba to answer the questions I put to you. Now I asked you what sort of information did Mr. Goodison not provide you? What did he fail to provide you? What was the issue?

**MRS. PRICE:** I have told you that going into the personalities of it is not necessary at this point. I think that the Member for Wellington, if you'll look back on any deputy who has taken an oath of loyalty to a government and then would take government files out of the building, I think his moral purity would leave a little to be desired.

**MR. CORRIN:** You hit the nail right on the head — very apropos my point. If that person took an oath — now that person is one of the chief officers, was one of the chief officers of the Province of Manitoba's administration. That person took an oath and as such, being in a position of trust, as he was, a fiduciary capacity, any breach of that oath is a very very very serious allegation and one that may be actionable if you were to make such a statement outside the House in a court of law. I would suggest that it's a defamatory statement. Now I ask you to . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Excuse me, may I interject?

**MR. CORRIN:** . . . put proof before the Committee. This is not a personal matter. You keep thinking that I'm suggesting this is a personal matter. You're suggesting it's a personal matter. It's not a personal matter. It's one that transcends mere personalities. You indicated that he failed to give you information. You indicated that he couldn't adapt to your government's philosophies. You won't tell us what your government's philosophies are. You won't tell us what he did to fail to adapt to them. You won't give us any idea of what information he failed to give you. You did tell us that he spoke to the Premier, Premier Lyon, and he gave Premier Lyon his undertaking that he would be committed to those philosophies and that he would do his utmost to work within the context and the confines of the philosophies of the new government.

Now something is amuck and amiss and I suggest to you very very respectfully that you owe it, before you assassinate the character of this individual, you owe it to him to put the matter on the record, to give us some advice and information as to what philosophies he couldn't adapt to and what information he failed to give you. And if you indicate that he took files out of the office, I think you should be very specific as to what files those were in order that all the members of the public, and Mr. Goodison, can be aware of what it is you allege that he stole from the people of Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Goodison himself phoned Peter Warren. I heard him on the program, and said, "I have files on Hooker and Simplot and a memo to the Attorney-General of Mrs. Price's." And Peter Warren said, "How long will it take you to come down with them?" And he said, "About twenty minutes." And the next day Peter Warren read them on the show. Now if I'm tainting his character, he did it himself.

**MR. CORRIN:** Was that before he was fired, or after?

**MRS. PRICE:** Shortly after, but it doesn't matter when. The fact remains he took an oath, and I would like to remind the Member for Wellington that Deputy Ministers come under the Premier, and if you'd like to discuss him I would suggest you leave it till the Premier comes into his Estimates.

**MR. CORRIN:** The Premier would be much more forthcoming and forthright in his responses, I can assure you that. But I don't think that's the point. You have made certain allegations and if you in your responsible position as Minister of the Crown are going to make allegations, I suggest to you very strenuously that you have to be able to sustain those allegations in a court of public record, and we're in such a court today. I suggest to you that if you're going to make statements that you can't verify and substantiate that you should refrain from making statements at all.

**MRS. PRICE:** Should !!!

**MR. CORRIN:** Now you indicated that he asked you, or he tried to get you to sign documents and you indicated that you asked somebody else with respect to the contents or nature of these documents and they advised you that you shouldn't sign them, and you regarded that as being an act of subversion, I suppose, on his part. Perhaps you regarded it as an act of negligence, as evidence of negligence or some sort of professional incapacity on his part. But you indicated you asked someone else. Who is the person you asked?

**MRS. PRICE:** I am not prepared to tell you.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, was it the president of Great-West Life? —(Interjection)—

**MRS. PRICE:** You talk a little ridiculous.

**MR. CORRIN:** Well, if she refuses to tell me I can start to speculate.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister responsible for Housing on a point of order.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** The Minister has given the reasons why she felt that there was no relationship or speaking between she and her Deputy. She has said that three or four times and given some of the reasons why, and the stupid questioning that's gone on is fine to a point, but when you add Great-West Life I think, really we're going to a point in this Committee that is unnecessary. The

Minister has answered on three different occasions that there was a situation between she and her Deputy that was not good. She's given some reasons why and if the Member would turn to one of his colleagues here, the colleague beside him, who was a Minister, and ask if it was like that between he and his Deputy would the Minister have done the same thing when he was the Minister. I assure you he would have. —(Interjection)— She's answered all the questions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I might point out to the Member for Wellington and all members, what is before us is the expenditures of the department, and the day-to-day workings of the department and not personality conflicts. Under the Minister's salary, each and every member of the Legislature can voice his or her opinion of the way that that particular Minister is handling the department, but what's before us is the day-to-day workings of the department. Administration, as the Member for St. Vital points out. The Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these matters do pertain and bear relevance with respect to the proper administration of the department in question. Certainly if the department is being administered on a, I won't suggest that this is, but on such a capricious basis as may have been implied in the remarks of the Minister, then I would suggest that we all have cause to be gravely concerned about the future of labour relations in this province.

Now, with respect to the point of order raised by the Minister responsible for the Housing and Renewal Corporation, I would indicate that I was in fact being somewhat facetious in asking her whether it was the president of Great-West Life. But I note that if the Minister stonewalls and refuses to answer what I thought to be not an unreasonable question, obviously one has to conclude that if she refuses to ask the Deputy, she asks someone with whom she confides a great deal of trust, with whom reposes a great deal of confidence, then I would suggest that I would be very concerned as to know who that individual would be. Frankly, I presume that that person would not be outside of government, but if that person were to be outside of government I would be, I think all the people would be, very interested in knowing, and I certainly didn't expect that it would be the president of Great-West Life. But I suppose if we're going to finesse little games and we're going to fail to give responses to what are not unreasonable questions, then this will imply the sort of thing that we're now getting bogged down in today. So I ask her again, if not the Deputy Minister, if she felt that that person couldn't be trusted and she was seeking outside counsel from other parties, I would ask her whose counsel did she seek? The Premier's? I mean I would accept that if she were to say that she sought the counsel of the Premier, the Leader of her Party.

**MRS. PRICE:** I am not prepared to tell you who I sought advice from. I don't think it has anything to do — around this table — to be made public. It was interdepartmental.

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

**MR. FOX:** Just one more question, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Can you get a mike in front of you?

**MR. FOX:** I keep forgetting. Just one more question, Mr. Chairman, and that is in respect to the Mr. Goodison's dismissal. Can the Minister tell us whether there were any remunerations in respect to the fact that he was given no notice or was there notice given and can she explain the terms that the dismissal incurred?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, he got his proper remuneration and it was satisfactory to him. There was no arguing about it whatsoever with the Civil Service or the Department.

**MR. FOX:** Did that include any pension benefits?

**MRS. PRICE:** He was just here less than a year so I don't know what he would have accrued in that respect, but I do know that the settlement was favourable to him, there was no dispute whatsoever with him.

**MR. FOX:** I see, thank you.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister. Has the Minister received a report on the current negotiations between the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission and the

unit representing the employees of the Commission as required by The Labour Relations Act?

**MRS. PRICE:** I haven't had any report to that effect.

**MR. JENKINS:** Could the Minister tell us when the current agreement between the Liquor Control Commission and its employees expires?

**MRS. PRICE:** I would have to take it under consideration and give it to you, I don't know.

**MR. JENKINS:** Would it be less than two weeks?

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't know. I will find out and give it to you.

**MR. JENKINS:** Could the Minister also check and see if such a report has been filed as is required by The Labour Relations Act between the bargaining unit and the Liquor Control Commission?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, I will.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. During the opening or just shortly after the opening remarks when asked to the vacancies in the administration area of 1.(b)(1), the Minister replied that an administrative secretary in Thompson had not been replaced and that their department didn't replace the assistant Deputy Minister. . Am I to assume from that that last year there were two Assistant Deputy Ministers in the Department of Labour?

**MRS. PRICE:** Only from last August.

**MR. COWAN:** And could the Minister then inform us as to the functions of those two ADMs?

**MRS. PRICE:** One primarily dealt with the administration of the department and the other one dealt with the labour relations. Now the one is dealing with both primarily.

**MR. COWAN:** Can the Minister tell us which one was let go, the one that dealt with the administration

**MRS. PRICE:** He wasn't let go; he was promoted to Deputy.

**MR. COWAN:** I'm sorry. Can the Minister then tell us which one was promoted to Deputy thereby resulting in a vacancy, the one that was responsible for administration or the one that was responsible for labour relations?

**MRS. PRICE:** The one that was responsible for administration was promoted to Deputy.

**MR. COWAN:** And in that instance then, does the Minister feel comfortable or satisfied that one ADM can handle the jobs that two ADMs were handling since last August?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, apparently there was only ADM prior to that and I don't really know why there was two ADMs. There wasn't really enough work for two and they admitted that too. So this is how we will operate.

**MR. COWAN:** So in that case, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is saying that the reduction of the position of one ADM does not adversely affect the running of her department in any manner whatsoever.

**MRS. PRICE:** That's right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1)—pass; 1.(b)(2)—pass — the Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Mr. Chairman, in (b)(2) there is a reduction. Can the Minister indicate what the reduction is, and where?

**MRS. PRICE:** In consulting and advertising.

**MR. FOX:** That's \$2,000 is cut down in that particular area, is that it?

**MRS. PRICE:** It's more than \$2,000; \$12,000.

**MR. FOX:** Oh yes, sorry. Could the Minister give us a breakdown of this particular Other Expenditures?

**MRS. PRICE:** Professional fees,—8.5; furniture and furnishings for office—2.5; printing and stationery supplies—29.3; postage, telephone and telegraph—5.6; computer related expenditures—8.5; automobiles— —2.8; advertising exhibit—1.0; publications—1.8; freight, express and cartage—0.2; travelling—11.0; other miscellaneous—5.0; educational assistance—0.5.

**MR. FOX:** Those were figures in thousands, is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, they are, yes.

**MR. FOX:** So that the Minister is indicating that there was 8.5 for professional fees. Can she explain that?

**MRS. PRICE:** There was one consultant that was there that we are not using on a regular basis now. He's coming in on a per diem rate.

**MR. FOX:** I see. But there is no reduction for the amount that is being asked this year?

**MRS. PRICE:** In the advertising and the consulting, yes, and that is the difference that you see.

**MR. FOX:** For both, because the Minister indicated there was one . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, the sum of both.

**MR. FOX:** . . . \$12,000 reduction that she indicated was for advertising. Does she now . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** And I said consulting too.

**MR. FOX:** Oh, and consulting, I see. Okay, thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Logan, did I see his hand indicating he wished to ask a question on this, or make a statement?

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, the Minister stated that \$12,000 was advertising. Are we to assume then that the other \$7,000 is consulting fees? Is that correct?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. JENKINS:** Fine.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(2)—pass — the Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** We're dealing with the general administration of the department. Could the Minister advise us who the advertising agency is for the department?

**MRS. PRICE:** There wasn't any agency used. It was the advertising office that we worked through. We haven't done any extensive . . . and there's been some, as you know, in publications that are regular ongoing. That's part of the advertising but there weren't any agencies used.

**MR. EVANS:** Is the Minister not planning to engage in any public relations or informatinal program throughout the year in the administration of her responsibilities which would require the use of an advertising agency, whether it be disseminating information of industrial safety or disseminating information on any other aspect of her department, apprenticeship training or the Women's Bureau's

Thursday, June 8, 1978

work, etc. I believe the Women's Bureau had put out some material in the past and I believe the Honourable Minister did table in the House the other day a report which was prepared, I believe, by the Women's Bureau. So therefore I wondered whether if there isn't any at the moment, is it not the intention of the Minister or are there no plans of the Minister or her department to engage in some kind of informational program and therefore utilize the services of a public relations or an advertising firm.

**MRS. PRICE:** Not through an agency. Each division has its own advertising expenses you'll find as we go along.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can appreciate that but if that is the case, then there are funds allocated, I would gather from the Minister's answer, for advertising this year and if that is the case, can she indicate, even though it is itemized separately, does she have any idea of any approximation of how much will be spent on advertising? There must be some . . . I appreciate it may be broken down by the various branches or divisions but she or her Deputy or someone, the accountant perhaps, would have some global idea of what is going to be spent this year.

**MRS. PRICE:** We will have to go through each division for that answer for you.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, I could ask it in each division but I don't know whether I want to go to all that detail.

**MRS. PRICE:** Or else we can sum it up and give it to you.

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, if you could sum it up, I would appreciate that and also indicate then if you have . . . I wasn't sure from the Minister's answer whether she said they would not be using the services of an advertising agency or that if they did want to use one, they would secure that agency through the advertising audit office.

**MRS. PRICE:** We do only through the audit office. We don't use any advertising agency, and we won't be.

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, well, my understanding is that that office co-ordinates the utilization of advertising agencies. My experience is that they have assigned agencies in the past or they tended to distribute the work around among the various agencies and I was just wondering if there had been any indication, if you wanted to do some work, who your agency would be. But I gather you don't have any agency.

**MRS. PRICE:** No, well we really don't have that type of advertising anyway. Our expenditures generally consist of advertising and publications and that type of advertising which really doesn't require an advertising agency to set up.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Logan, then St. Vital.

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, the Minister stated that 8.5 was for computer services in the Other Expenditures. I wonder if the Minister could inform us if there are any other computer services in any other divisions of her department and, if so, could she indicate them when we come to them? Could she also give us who they are contracted out to?

**MRS. PRICE:** This pertains to our payroll and it's all through the Manitoba Data Services.

**MR. JENKINS:** That's the only computer services that are in the department.?

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Vital, then the Member for Churchill.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Logan asked the question that I was going to ask. Could the Minister tell the committee what the total appropriation is for computer services for her department for this year as opposed to last year?

**MRS. PRICE:** We would have to total them up for you if that's all right.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister mentions that the \$11,600 reduction in this item was a reduction in advertising and a reduction in consultative services. Is that the full amount responsible? Does the full amount come from those two areas?

**MRS. PRICE:** I didn't get your last sentence, I'm sorry.

**MR. COWAN:** I'm sorry, I'll repeat it. Does the full amount, the full \$11,600 reduction take place in these two areas, advertising and the use of a consultative service?

**MRS. PRICE:** Which figure are you referring to?

**MR. COWAN:** The Other Expenditures, the \$98,000 last year and the \$79,200 this year. Excuse me, \$21,000.00.

**MRS. PRICE:** As I mentioned earlier, that's the consultant fees that we had and the advertising.

**MR. COWAN:** I would ask the Minister then, Mr. Chairman, what the purpose of the consultant was and was? what the purpose of the

**MRS. PRICE:** I don't know what the purpose of the consultant was and we don't have him now on a yearly basis, we have him on a per diem. It was pertaining — I shouldn't say I don't know what it was — it was to do with the apprenticeship training and he would come in from time to time but we felt that we didn't need it on a yearly basis and now he is retained on a per diem.

**MR. COWAN:** Is that consultant, Mr. Chairman, still being used presently by the government for the purpose that he or she was being used for in previous years?

**MRS. PRICE:** Well, we haven't had the necessity for the apprenticeship but we are using him in other — he's still the vice-chairman of the Labour-Management Committee and he is hired back on a per diem, which is agreeable to him.

**MR. COWAN:** Does this, Mr. Chairman, then indicate a reduction in the apprenticeship program? Was it consultants . . .

**MRS. PRICE:** No, it doesn't.

**MR. COWAN:** Then to delve a bit deeper into this, Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the consultant was dealing with the apprenticeship of the . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I have to interrupt the Member for Churchill and mention that it is 4:30 and it is Private Members' Hour. In accordance with Rule 19.1, Private Members' Hour, I am interrupting committee for that and we will return at 8:00 p.m.\$

### SUPPLY — HEALTH

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. A. Kovnats:** I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to Page 43 in the Estimates, Department of Health and Social Development. We are on Resolution No. 64, Clause 8, Item (2) Personal Care Homes—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Just one question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister can give us the percentage of the nursing staff broken down between registered nurses, licensed practical nurses, nurses aides and orderlies for the proprietary and non-proprietary nursing homes?

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

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** I can't at this moment, Mr. Chairman; I'd have to get that information and bring it back.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister. Perhaps he could just consolidate remarks that he's made in the past, but it concerns the closure of several of the private nursing homes, I think five of which happen to be in my constituency. There seems to be a lack of definition as to what will be done to both the facilities and structures that they are contained in, and whether there will be any attempt to replace them or provide for alternative care in those same areas, for the ones that have been abandoned.

And secondly, if there will be any further closures based upon new licensing standards?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the facilities that were closed numbered six, and as I indicated to the Committee the other night, they were the Ablecare, Arcadia, Baron, Cole, Regina Haven and Stradbrook nursing homes. There were reductions of beds in three other nursing homes in Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie — two in Winnipeg and one in Portage la Prairie — and then a revised rating which applied to three other nursing homes, two of them in Winnipeg and one in Middlechurch, which also resulted in a reduction in beds.

Now, for those that have been closed and indeed for those whose bed totals were reduced, we have agreed to look very favourably, consider very favourably, applications to either remain in business or return to business in a proprietary capacity. We have had under discussion the total number of beds that would be considered and of course that is a contentious and an uncertain number at this juncture, because it has to be related to the whole picture, and the guidelines and the ratios with respect to the population generally. But in view of the fact that we were looking at a total of something very close to 300 in the number of beds closed, we have talked in terms with those proprietary operators of licensing them to resume operations in new premises, simply premises that meet the required standards of personal care home care, in the neighbourhood of 300 beds. They have asked for a bigger, a broader spectrum than that. A number of those operators have indicated a very keen interest in returning to the field as proprietary operators; they have requested a bigger bed total than that, something that ranges all the way up to something in excess of 500. We haven't authorized that as yet. We have talked in terms of 300 as a replacement for the beds being closed, but we recognize that economic viability in that particular field dictates the view.

You can't be discussing with an operator the logic of a care home in which the bed count or bed total is too low; it's got to be fairly substantial to make the operation viable. So there's a question there that hasn't been entirely resolved. Philosophically, we have taken the position with them that we are not opposed to proprietary operations in the personal care home field and that their applications will be acknowledged and will be approved as they come forward, up to a certain total bed count and within, of course, the necessary standards under the Public Health Act and other such legislation and regulations.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it then, the decision of the government is first to allow a replacement bed total in the proprietary area; and secondly, as I understand it, he is indicating that there is going to be a fundamental change in the policy of perhaps allowing for further licensing of private or proprietary care homes in the personal care field which is a substantial change of policy from the previous administration approach to it, where I think licensing was frozen for a period of some three or four years, I think, was it not? So that, can he tell us more precisely if there is a change in the policy in relation to proprietary care homes and how are they proceeding to develop the standards and the mode of operation that would govern the expansion or new direction that he seems to be indicating taking place? Will this be just restricted to the owners whose properties have been closed down, or is it a sort of general broad-based invitation for re-entry of private operators in the personal care home field?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, it's probably necessary to be more vague and less specific in my answer than the honourable member would desire or even deserve, but I can't be precise and purely specific in my answer at this juncture. The invitation is certainly not restricted simply to those proprietary operators whose operations either have been closed or phased down in size. I wouldn't say that change in policy is one in which we've come 180 degrees to a declamatory position in which we're saying we want to invite proprietary operators to come back into the field on a mass scale. What really has emanated from our discussions within the government and our discussions with operators in the field is a position in which we have said we are not opposed to proprietary ownership and it was our belief that the previous administration was not enthusiastic about proprietary operators in the field. Whether it could be said that they were opposed to proprietary operators, I wouldn't be prepared to go that far. But I think that one would recognize that they were not enthusiastic about proprietary operations and therefore were not going to encourage any further ones.

The policy has changed to the extent that we are not intending to close the door or the opportunity to proprietary operations. We're not actively out recruiting or cultivating proprietors. In fact we've had a great many applications from potential and interested proprietors and it certainly is not going to be possible or practical to deal with the applications that have flowed in since late 1977 because if we did we would be putting ourselves completely out of whack in terms of the general guidelines and the ability of the taxpayer to pick up the province's share of the operating cost and to protect ourselves against possible difficulties in the future if some residents in those proprietary homes ran out of resources. So all we've said thus far is that in closing the time expired proprietary operations and phasing down the size of others we are not articulating a policy which says we don't want proprietary operators. We're prepared to have proprietary operators in the field. The first ones we're going to look at are those who operated the facilities which have been closed down, but other applications have come in and are being processed but they're not moving very far at this juncture.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate that while there is a policy, I guess, of passive acceptance it sounds like, would probably be a way of terming it, has any attempt to establish quotas or numbers per year that would be allowed to be built both in terms of public or private personal care beds? Could he indicate to us, for example, what the growth pattern he foresees will be, and the number of units that would be shared both by public and private institutions and how that will relate back to need?

I'd also perhaps add to that whether there has been any initiative to develop non-profit personal care facilities sponsored by community organizations or social or religious organizations to provide sort of a third option in this area and if there's been any attempt to encourage or stimulate organizations such as this to enter into the field and provide an alternative as opposed to the simple proprietary or public form of operation.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, my approach and our approach is one that envisages a mix of the three. The third option is very much a part of the present government's considerations. As far as the total spectrum is concerned and guidelines we haven't to this point deviated from the guidelines which were being followed by the previous administration which was approximately 94 beds, personal care beds available per 1,000 population in excess of the age of 70, or was it 65? — I think it was 70. We haven't deviated from that guideline, Mr. Chairman. All I can tell the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is that the whole subject is in fact and indeed the subject of a study that is being undertaken at the present time by officials in my department and persons from whom I'm seeking advice on the basis of their knowledge in the field, out of which will come recommendations which I will then distill down to a position that I'll take to Cabinet within the next very few months, hopefully during this summer, so that we can lay out clearly for the legislators of Manitoba, and the people of Manitoba, the government policy and position in this field during this calendar year of 1978 that can be reflected, or at least the first stage of which can be reflected in our Estimates and budget process next fiscal year. I don't have it down to a final and definitive recommendation yet. I envisage one that would not be too far different from the guidelines that have been in effect for the past several years, but would be a mix of the three options to which the honourable member refers.

While I'm on my feet could I just answer the other question that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked me with respect to the standards in proprietary homes. They will be monitored as standards of all personal care homes of whatever category are through on site inspections carried out by staff of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the staffing patterns are monitored and maintained in check through reports that are made to the Commission and that are checked back against payroll records.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, there were some other questions tied into that I'd like to pursue. One is that when the Minister says that the guidelines are established for approximately 94 beds per 1,000 over the age of 65 or 70, I'm not sure which — 70 at the present moment — I would like to know how that relates to the particular age structure of Manitobans because I was particularly struck by figures that the Statistics Canada released which shows that Manitoba has probably the oldest population in the country. In other words, we have probably on a percentage basis more older people, or people who are becoming older quicker, than almost any other province in the country with the exception, I think, of one other in the maritimes somewhere that is equally advancing in age with the rest of us. In other words, a much higher proportion of our population is now over 65, or rapidly approaching it, which seems to put a little bit of a bulge in the requirements. It would be important to know whether the standard that's been set forward, the 94 out of 1,000 is based

upon some kind of national average or some national criteria that doesn't take into account the special circumstances of the province in relation to our own, I guess, relatively peculiar or certainly more specialized problem that we do have a population of people who are ageing and that it will require some special efforts in this area.

The second question that I would raise with the Minister has to do with the location of the personal care homes. One of the things again that has struck me is that as we move into the construction or replacement of the older homes which have been closed down, most of which were in a central city location, because of land values and other costs the temptation would be to place the alternative facilities or replacement facilities out in suburban areas where land costs may be cheaper and more facilities may be available, and yet oftentimes the central location is more convenient and serves a population which again if you look at the statistics, a very high proportion of older people live in the central part of the city, and as a result there is a certain connection between friends and relations and so on in these areas which, if removed to a fairly distant suburban location, creates some panic.

I know many cases, Mr. Chairman, in my own riding where people who have been offered beds in personal care homes outside of the central city refuse to take them simply because they prefer to stay at home where they would be close to friends or relations or to people that they knew, rather than move a very far distance where they would feel totally isolated and out of keeping.

In respect of that, I would ask the Minister a question about the sort of facilities that would be available, or could be made available through some of the housing programs or through the personal care programs that would be not only designated for those residents of personal care homes, but would be available for those, say, older people who do need hot meal service or some of the other enriched programs that could be available through a personal care facility, which would enable people to stay in their own homes. I am thinking again, Mr. Chairman, I hate to be totally, you know, parochial, if you like but in my own constituency there were plans with the major expansion of public housing programs on the corner of York, to develop a major enriched program, whether it be a day hospital and hot food facilities which would not only serve the residents of those areas where there is a personal care component, but would also be available to people in the surrounding areas so that that would be sufficient to enable them to stay in their own apartments or their own suites without having to make the major transition into a personal care area. Now all those facilities have been in effect closed down or have been stopped, and I'm wondering if in the replacement program that the Minister said he is encouraging, where private operators are being given licenses now to replace those that are closed down, if there's any attempt to help them or support them in developing, as they develop new food services, or recreation services, or therapy services, whether those would also be available to residents in the surrounding areas who need them, and that it would also save, ultimately be a major cost saving, because it would mean that for many older people who need, not a full range of personal care services but only a partial range, they can have them supplied by those new replacement facilities the Minister is now prepared to license.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is quite right when he points to the particular phenomenon in Manitoba of a relatively rapidly growing aged proportion of our population vis-a-vis populations in other jurisdictions across the country. At the present time, as of 1976, which is the last year for which complete statistics are available, about 10-½ percent of our population in Manitoba was over age 65, and projections indicate that by 1985 that component, that community will constitute about 13 percent of our population. The province of Saskatchewan is in approximately the same kind of statistical position, but in terms of other Canadian provinces generally, we are relatively high. The size of our aged population is increasing more rapidly as a growing component of the overall population than is the case on a percentage basis in all other Canadian provinces, I believe, certainly in most other Canadian provinces with the exception, the known exception of Saskatchewan, which is about the same as Manitoba. So we face a very clear challenge and responsibility in this province in preparing the necessary support services for the future for that kind of a social and socioeconomic change.

As far as the locations of the intended new personal care homes are concerned, this is something that may create problems of the kind alluded to by the Member for Fort Rouge. I can't at this juncture tell him specifically where the proprietary operators whose facilities were closed down are in each case intending or hoping to build, but it's correct to suggest that the likelihood is that certainly the majority of them would be building in property areas other than in the very high-cost property area of central Winnipeg. If that is going to pose difficulties for potential residents, then it's something that my office and the Commission would want to examine very carefully in relation to each of those proposals and each of those projects before final approval was given. I don't profess to know as much about the personal care homes in the Fort Rouge area as my honourable friend does for obvious reasons, but I know that with respect to the personal care homes in my own constituency of Fort Garry, and with respect to my own family and my own family's experience with elderly relatives

in personal care homes, the precise geographic location of the personal care home has never really been a major problem or a major consideration. In fact, it's never even been a major part of the decision. There are many many residents in personal care homes in Fort Garry who don't live in Fort Garry and certainly in the case of some of my own relatives, they were in and have been in personal care homes in various parts of greater Winnipeg not related in any way to the particular neighbourhood from which they came. So, except in the case of specific ethnic communities, which is certainly something that I recognize, where the communion of ethnic spirit and communication is a critical factor, I don't anticipate that this would be a major consideration for too many residents. If the Member for Fort Rouge has reason to think otherwise, then I would certainly be glad to hear from him, to have his advice on the subject. I think probably the bigger problem, the one that's greater than the question of where the residents of the personal care homes had formerly lived, is the question of where the staff in those personal care homes live, and the problem for some of them of transportation back and forth to different parts of the city.

Now, I'm not suggesting to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge by any means that it would be fair, reasonable or logical to consider locating residents formerly from personal care homes in the core area of Winnipeg, or central Winnipeg, into personal care homes in other parts of the province, but I believe that, you know, within reason, within the Greater Winnipeg parameters and perimeters, the precise siting or location of the home is not in the cases of most of the residents, a critical part of the equation.

The other question raised by the honourable member had to do with parallel programs or corollary programs or substitute programs for the personal care home concept, ranging from enriched senior citizens' housing to other services and programs that he mentioned such as services and programs in the area of recreation and food, meals, therapy services, etc. Yes, the subject of personal care home capacity, personal care home bed totals, guidelines and ratios, has to be considered and is being considered in the context of services to the elderly in our community generally, and will not be divorced from the consideration of services and programs that can function to keep elderly people in their homes if that's where they'd like to be, and I believe that's probably where most of them want to be although there's no doubt that some of them desire to go into personal care homes. But the majority would like, no doubt, to remain in their homes as long as they are able to do so, and the program that we will ultimately hope to structure and present to the people of Manitoba, which is being worked on at the present time, is one which takes into account very seriously and very critically, the need to respect that ambition, that legitimate desire, and that legitimate policy, so that there would be a network of services that we could view as the component parts of the general policy we want to pursue, and the actual construction of a personal care home bed would just be one part of that.

Wherever there can be enriched citizens housing to do the job; wherever there can be services to the home, extension of home care and ancillary services of that kind to do the job, in my view that's preferable. That obviously takes money, but probably no more money than building additional personal care beds does, and in many cases, demonstrably less. For that reason, we have protected our whole home care service, the existing home care service this year. Even under the general buffetings of restraint, Mr. Chairman, it's still operating at the same level that it was and there are still new possibilities, new services, available to applicants, new opportunities for applicants to receive home care services without any diminution of program size or standard. It's imperative in my view that that kind of service be maintained at all costs, notwithstanding the pressures of restraint and be expanded as reasonably and practically as it can when our resources permit. That's very much a part of our current thinking.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take up with the Minister just some of the assumptions or at least, guidelines that he seems to be putting forward in terms of the planning for personal care homes.

The first issue I would raise is the one of location, or perhaps maybe to use a better word, the kind of community in which the personal care network services are located. I do disagree with the Minister, when he says there is not any consideration or concern about where one is located when one goes into a personal care home. I say that, not on the basis of any hard scientific evidence, although I am sure there must be some around, but I could say, Mr. Chairman, that probably with the constituency with the highest proportion of personal care homes of almost anywhere in the city — I think at last count, I had something like 17 or 18 in the boundaries of my constituency — and having visited a lot of them over a period of time, it should be recognized that one of the most serious problems related to people going into personal care homes, is that if it's a long distance or if they are uprooted from an area in which they have lived for a long period of time, they immediately lose contact with the church they might have attended, or the clubs, or community

organizations that they might have been a part of, also lose contact with friends, and as a result have no resources other than those in the home itself. And that simply becomes the universal world in which they occupy and that can become a very debilitating experience. I think one of the things that is most important for people at any age, is to maintain a degree of relationships and contact with all kinds of people, with the outside world, to stay vital and active in a variety of ways. And that becomes much more difficult when you find yourself uprooted from an area or from people that you've known, and that where you're familiar, so you end up simply becoming kind of occupying a bed in a home where you may acquire some new friends in that place, but you have no outside interests.

And unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the process also works in reverse, that oftentimes the community takes no interest in those in the personal care homes, that it's oftentimes very difficult for those who, let's say a personal care home, I know several — and again I'm using my own area — where there may be churches and so on nearby, but there is no connection between the two, and there is very little visiting, very little contact, and very little exchange of people, so that they are almost sort of isolated in that new community, that the personal care home becomes sort of an island unto itself without any open avenues of community relationship or community contact. And that's certainly my feelings, Mr. Chairman, that that is one of the most serious problems for the personal care homes themselves. They can provide clean facilities, and good food, and proper medical care, but what is often missing is any ongoing human contact, or personal relationships, and an ability to still stay a very much part of the world. So I think, Mr. Chairman, that in the review that the Minister is indicating, that it would be worthwhile to take a look at that, and I would suggest if I might, that the planning, the development of personal care home programs should be done on a community basis. And that rather than simply doing it by taking aggregate numbers — you know, we love to play with statistics I guess, and particularly in the health and social care field — it seems to be almost a predilection to sort of say let's make planning on the basis of 94 beds per thousand, you know, that's a nice hard figure and becomes fairly abstract very quickly and it loses its context.

And I would suggest that the format for the planning, if I can be so bold as to suggest or offer advice, in terms of planning for future numbers of personal care homes and the facilities, should be based upon looking at what's happening in St. Vital or Fort Garry or Fort Rouge or St. Boniface, or West Kildonan, or wherever it may be, but those are communities which have distinctive features to them that they have a network of existing community services, and that the personal care home planning should be fitted into those, should become part of that and that the planning should be done on that basis.

Similarly, it's easier to do in the rural areas, because the towns have a community of their own, and I think oftentimes they work better for those reasons.

In the city, which can become pretty indifferent and can become pretty anonymous in many ways, I think that that kind of planning should take place in relation to how does the personal care home program, both in terms of new beds themselves and also in ancillary services, fit into the communities in which they are going to be placed.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that it may take a little more sophistication in the planning implementation of the program, but I would think from the point of view ultimately of the health and the well-being of the residents of those homes, it would be a far more preferable way of doing it, and we'd be doing a great deal of service by trying to introduce that kind of planning and implementation, that looks at it, at the neighbourhood if you like, in which the program will take place.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are ways of doing it, that the revised planning the Minister indicates is going on, if it was formulated in those terms you might find that there would be some substantial cost savings in this respect, and I would reiterate that the programs that I have seen work successfully in some American cities, is one in where the personal care home itself becomes a resource centre for older people in the total neighbourhood and the community, that it isn't again simply a separate facility serving only those within its own walls or corridors, but that the kind of services that are built into a personal care home, whether it's private or non-profit or public, the food service, the therapy service, the counselling services if they are there, the medical services, the visiting doctors, are themselves an important resource that if there was proper planning on that neighbourhood that I talked about, could then be utilized by hundreds of other people in the community, that someone who lived two blocks away could come and get a hot meal, someone who lived three blocks away could come and use the therapy service, someone who lived five blocks away could perhaps use some of the medical staff that come in from time to time for medical review purposes. And that perhaps the planning of that personal care home could be really not just again as an isolated item but as a resource centre, and that through that you could sort of add or complement to the present home care program by ensuring that those services are available. And I emphasize particularly the medical ones, the meal services, and the therapy, both the physical

therapy and other forms of therapy programs that the personal care homes could elaborate. And by adding a little bit extra to those homes themselves, they will then enable or provide an important service to a lot of other people, hundreds of people, I would suggest, in the area. But it only comes about if you're planning it the right way. If you're simply planning in terms of an isolated hostel situation, then you're only going to plan for those numbers of people in that hostel and no more. However, if you plan for a few extras, and there is some tying links into the churches and the senior citizens homes and other community organizations and say, now this personal care home will provide additional services to people in the area, they'll come to use it, then there would be less demand I would suggest for building the bed type personal care home operation.

So I would like to advocate if I might, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister in doing his revision, look at that perhaps in a different way of planning and implementing the program to get perhaps a more human and personal kind of service to the home itself, but also to provide an additional service and facility in these neighbourhoods, and I would say it's particularly important in central neighbourhoods.

I would make a case for my own constituency in this area. There are substantial numbers of older people. I have parts of my own constituency right across from the Legislative grounds here and just across the river, where 30 percent of the population is over 60 years old, not 12 or 13, but 30 percent, and going higher. And many of them don't need full facilities, but they need partial facilities, they do need a certain —(Interjection)— in Winnipeg Centre, all right, I'll bring the Member for Winnipeg Centre in on that calculation. I'm prepared to broaden the scope, but there are very high concentrations in these areas, and if we're pulling the personal care homes out and aren't replacing them with anything, then these areas will really be left without those additional services, which would be a very serious problem for many older people in the area. You will then force them to perhaps go into a personal care home when it's not absolutely necessary, they will still be able to maintain in their own living situation, simply because of the absence of those services.\$

So I think, Mr. Chairman, there are some pretty practical and good reasons for considering how we might review the personal care home program in a wider context, look at it as a community service and particularly concentrate on some of the real issues that are taking place now in these areas right around these buildings.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 2—pass — The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to take part in this debate, especially that the Minister is saying that the present government is reviewing its policies but has not any firm policy as of this date. I think that maybe I could pass on some suggestions to the Minister. I certainly agree with most of the comments of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

I think that first of all when we deal with personal care homes, I think right now what we're faced with as the first priority is that we have enough beds, I'm talking about total beds, I'm not making any division. I think that also very very important is the standards. I think that's probably the most important, and then of course the cost is always important but I think that we should have enough beds, that doesn't mean that we should throw money away, it should be run with the standards maintained but economically as possible.

Now, I am a bit concerned. The Minister is suggesting that they will change the policy and they will bring the profit motivated non-proprietary nursing homes, and I feel that the — and here again I must say that this is not an ideology hang-up — I think that the ideal thing that would serve Manitoba very well, is the non-profit, it's not a government, it's a kind of a private personal care home where they run their own show, but it's a non-profit personal care home. I doubt very much, and I'm not talking about the people working for nothing in health institutions, but as much as possible I think it should be non-profit. If the present government is not ready to go along with that, if they feel that yes, they should encourage the non-proprietary profit oriented firms to start personal care homes, I think then that this is dangerous. It might be the easy way out. It might be that they can back away, they can stay with the freeze of not building personal care homes, leaving it up to private enterprises as they say, but then in the long run I think the standards will suffer, and I am not aiming at any of the people that are running personal care homes here, I think they have done quite well.

But there is a danger that if you switch to proprietary profit-making personal care homes, you are going to have the same problems as you have in the United States, because then people are interested; when they're in there as a business, you can't blame them, they want to make a buck. And you make a buck, if you're — especially the way it is paid — the Minister will say, "Well, it's going to be terrific. We're going to have three in there." The way it is, they will have to find a formula; either accept the present formula or another formula, or say, "Well, we'll give you the same per diem rate as the median in the nursing home." And then, if you want to make a dollar, you've got to start cutting corners.

And I want to repeat, I am not making this accusation in Manitoba. I think that the proprietary nursing homes have been well run, but it is certainly a temptation there's quite a few books on the market about the United States, and there's been all kinds of scandal in the United States — if my friends said, "Well, we believe in free enterprise in all things, and this is it," then I'd say, "Well then, be consistent; let them build private hospitals and then you will have the same problems they have in the United States." I still say what I said when I was sitting on the other side; I think that if at all possible, the health services rendered to the people of Manitoba or any people of any country, as far as I am concerned, should be in a way to make money on that. I'm not saying to make a profit on people's suffering and people in the hospital, because this is something that more and more . . . there are universal programs and I certainly don't think that this is the right way. Why change the people that are in there now? — it was never felt that they should be kicked out. One of the difficulties that we had with them, they never wanted to open their books, and I would think that at least, if you let them bill, make darn sure that you will be able to monitor the standards in there, because that has been very difficult in some of the institutions. They told the government it's none of their bloody business, to get out. There is no way that you can start paying the per diem if it's a universal program; you can start paying that if you can't monitor, if you don't know if they have the proper staff.

So, you are doing that in the hospitals, and you certainly should do at least as much in the personal care homes. I would suggest my honourable friend to be very careful, not just to change and to say, "Well, it's a different government; we change; we believe in free enterprise; " as I say, as far as I'm concerned and as far as I know the other colleagues that were Ministers during the former administration, I don't think it has been a hang-up as far as we're concerned.

Now, I think that unfortunately the previous government decided to go too fast, and all at once, in taking over the program of insuring the personal care homes. That caused a lot of trouble. It was very tough on the Manitoba Health Services Commission and on the government; the intentions were good, but I think it was a mistake, looking back now. Things are looking up now and things are a little better. I would say, especially this government, and I'm sure the Minister will agree with me, the Minister of a Conservative government, I would think that we would have to be careful that we shouldn't say, "All right, the government will be responsible for all type of care, hostels and so on," and we are paying the shot for hostels. I'd like to see those phased out because it is too costly. And then the suggestion would be, if you'd take care of those people that need more health care, not those that could be at home, because there are some people that for some reason or other would like to be — they couldn't be at home under the Home Care Program, but they'd sooner be in a hostel. This is something that the Minister could review, and that might be an idea. This would not be covered, and might be something that he could farm out to the private sector and say, "Okay, run these places." Unfortunately, and this is true, the former government was weak in that we didn't have enough of those and we didn't have enough for the people that had the money; they had no place to go, because we didn't have the proper programs, as far as I'm concerned. This was something that we were reviewing.

But I would again suggest to the Minister to go very easy before he changes the policy too radically, not to think that this is a question of ideology and the Conservative government automatically has to do the opposite of what the New Democratic Party in power would have to do.

Now, I also could not agree more with the member that just spoke, the Member for Fort Rouge, when he's talking about location. I felt somewhat like the Minister at first, that it wasn't quite that important. I remember reading about the ideal village or town that they were going to build in the United States, only people over a certain age. Well, it doesn't work like that. It's been tried, the people meant well, and you say, "What a better place, we'll take them in the suburbs where they can breathe fresh air; there's no streetcars or buses or anything like that, or kids yelling." They don't want that. They don't want that. That's the end. They might as well say, "Well, you know, we're finished living." And in fact, I remember that the St. Joseph Hospital wanted to build a facility further, and then I think they were talking about exactly the same place, because people were used to that corner. For anyone — I'm not talking about senior citizens now — to move is one of the most traumatic, it's recognized as one of the most traumatic experiences there is. You can move from a shack into a castle and it's a traumatic thing.

I remember when there were more personal care homes needed in St. Boniface and we weren't very happy — well, maybe I'll let that part go — but anyway, the government was instrumental in the Grey Nuns purchasing the St. Boniface Personal Care Home on Archibald; I remember some of the members in Cabinet, and I won't name them, so therefore I think I'm all right if I divulge some of the suggestions there. And it was a big battle, it went on for some — people thought that it was awful to put them in a street where a block from there there was a track. And you know, there hasn't been one complaint. That place is full and there's a waiting list, and they love it. And the same thing, as I say, the St. Joseph one at the corner near the bridge — what is it?

is is Salter Bridge, or what is the bridge where St. Joseph Hospital is? Is it Selkirk? Right around there, there's not a worse corner for traffic and so on, but they love it, and I think it is very important. It's not just the people that are travelling to see them; that is important but that's secondary; it is the people that are living in those facilities. And you know, you can send them five miles in a new district — well, you might as well send them out of town. They don't recognize anything at all and it's not home any more. They're used to a certain area, and I think that this is right; they like to be downtown where they can go for a short walk and go to Eaton's or the Bay or anywhere and it's not very far. They don't even need a bus, those that are well enough.

Now, I was pleased to hear the Minister talk about all the good things that we should have, the enriched services and so on, but I can't, although I want to sympathize with my honourable friend, I can't think of anything else but lip service at this time, because that's all it is. There is a predetermined freeze on construction of personal care homes and we know that we need some personal care homes, even more so because there is a reduction in some of those social programs that we had, and also because some of the nursing home workloads — mind you, I think that's not one of the decisions that I would criticize because it was you know, don't take a chance at all, which you can't fault in somebody that honestly is trying to do a job. And then you think, well, should I stall a bit and keep them open a bit until we build new ones, because where are those people going to go? It might even be worse. And the Minister chose the different — not solution — but took a different decision than I did at that time, and as I say, I wouldn't fault him, but that would indicate that we need even more personal care homes.

I think that one of the things that we want now, this is the part that I'm mostly interested in, and it's not something new, it's the words of the Member for Fort Rouge when he talks about community planning and the people around an area — and that is — mind you it was far from finished, but I think it was in the right direction — it was the District Health legislation that we brought in. Although we were going to start in the rural area, it's going to be very hard, but it's not impossible. And I think that you should see the day that there would be districts right here in the Greater Winnipeg area, although that might come, as I say, a little later. I think there is a pattern now of having certain hospitals — instead of having large hospitals — I think that it is pretty well accepted there shouldn't be any hospitals with more than 400 beds. And again, no hospitals in the city should be less than 200 or so. I think that now we have, by accident or otherwise, some hospitals in pretty well all districts once the Seven Oaks Hospital is built, and then personal care homes working with the others, and then the day care. This is what I'd like to hear a little more about.

There's home care and day care for the elderly. I was pleased to note that the Minister said that those that are there will not be cancelled. I think there was one in my constituency that was one of the pilot projects that came in, by the way, before I became the Minister, Mr. Chairman, so I can't take the credit for that. And it's been working quite well, after making a slow start of handling the people — I guess we learn by experience — the former Minister was a little too cheap to give enough money for transportation and it was felt that that is an important thing if you have day care for the people. You have to find a way to get the people there, or they won't go.

And now, Mr. Chairman, that brings me exactly to the point, something that I mentioned before, where I said that I was very disappointed in the action of the Minister. At the time he told me that he didn't know that there was any money in the budget, that it was just approved in principle, and I'm referring to the Youville Foundation. I found exactly where it was; it's not gone, it was last year, and in fact it's a line here. It's the \$150,000 under Other Health Services Program, so there was something last year; it's the last line. Mind you, it's going ahead; we're fortunate. But I think it is unfair to let the volunteers do the whole work. I don't think the way my friend from Fort Rouge spoke is aware of this, but this is exactly what he was talking about. This is the community getting together to make sure that the people do, if at all possible, what they can do, what they want to do. It's not dealing only with people once they're on their deathbed; it's working with the well elderly. It is working with the programs that we have such as starting with Medicare; it is Medicare because they refer them to doctors; it is social programs; it is home care; it is Meals on Wheels; it is day care for the elderly; it is recreation, we hope.

The other thing that disappointed me in the area where the Reh-Fit program is going to be billed. I thought that we would have tried to combine these young people and older people to work together on the fitness and for the well elderly. That is exactly what the Youville Foundation is, to try to keep the people as economically as possible, because you direct them in the right place. They would know of all they need. If they are satisfied, you find out their need, you have some volunteers — if you paid people as co-ordinators and volunteers to keep in touch maybe with 10, 15 people — it could be, and in fact, it was meant to be volunteers. And these people would know the information if this person, an older person, needs a bed in an acute care hospital, and that's something that the people don't realize. They figure that after 65, well then, don't bother us — don't go in an acute bed hospital because you need a personal care home. Mind you, some of the hospitals have

been burned badly before, they have had some people that should be in a personal care home, so they are leery of letting these people get in their hospital because then they might stay too long. Now it will be a little different, because at least they'll get some money to help them run their hospitals; they'll get \$7 a day for these people.

But the case is that people over 65 years old need acute beds, and for a short duration of time; then if you find out and treat something immediately, like you would do with somebody 25 or 40, well then they'll go back and enjoy their life. They're not finished at 65. So this is something that should be done. They need the care of a doctor immediately, and this is something that in the past has been a little more difficult to do. The medical profession also are trying to rectify that, because that was a weakness in their system before that not that many people wanted to give more of their time to older people.

So I think that with this Youville Foundation and going in the community planning as the Member for Fort Rouge said — and the District Health, where they might need different things it wasn't regimentation, it wasn't numbers, it was by necessity most of the people served in that area by a program such as Youville Foundation would be from around that area. But there could be somebody from outside. Now, what we've dealt with, at no time was it felt that people should go to a certain doctor. This is the freedom of patient-doctor, and nobody wants to change that. And it's the same thing with hospitals. At no time will you say you'll stay — I guess a good percentage of the people will go around their home; it's natural, but then others will go mostly with their doctors, and it might be at the other end of town, so there'll always be a mixture of that. But of course, home care cannot work like that. You can't have somebody from McPhillips Street that will go in St. Vital to get home care, because you're giving a service in their homes and it has to be co-ordinated.

When I said it was lip service, I wanted to make something quite sure. I'm not suggesting that the Minister is not sincere; I know he is sincere on that. But the government that he represents, it is lip service, or it might be something, that a year before the election, then we might have a few programs like that; but I would hope that we would not play politics at the expense of our senior citizens in this province.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this is something that I was going to cover and I think there's no better time than now because we were talking about this; I would like the Minister to tell us if they are going on with what the former government wanted — and the MMA had suggested that also — I don't think that that had received the final approval of the Provincial Government; but the department was in the process of setting up or preparing the thing for a geriatric care unit and the Manitoba Centre for Studies in Geratology. Now this is something, Sir, that I think that we had dealt with the Federal Government because the Federal Government had a certain amount of money for what they called Projects of National Significance. I don't know if we had the formal okay, but it was felt that this would qualify and most of that would be claimed; and Manitoba had left unclaimed \$7.5 million' a certain amount of money. At a certain time this was coming to Manitoba — there was a deadline for it — and some of this money was going to be taken over by the DREE development of the Health Sciences Centre. This Manitoba Centre for Studies in Geratology, I think, was in Phase II or III, and it was felt after when talking with people, that it should be moved to Phase I. This might be why one of the costs had gone up.

But this is something that I think the Minister is very much in favour of and this is something that the MMA is; and this is something, by the way, that we have been chastised by the present Premier for not doing anything on that, or not enough, I guess. I don't know if he was aware of what we were trying to do and what direction we were going.

In fact I think it was during the last Session — this is the Tribune of May 10' 1977 — "One of the greatest challenges in health care and one that the NDP has failed to meet is geriatrics," he said. "Manitoba needs more alternatives to institutional care for the elderly such as day centres to take the strain of acute care hospital nursing homes which are full to capacity."

Well, I don't accept those remarks of the First Minister. I could tell him and I can make comparisons, and the Minister can also make a comparison — I'm sure it would be available from his staff — of where we're going in this field, in Manitoba, although it is very little and certainly not enough. But I think that, in fact I know that it's been cited as an example, the direction that we're going by people from eastern provinces, and people expert in this field, I think they've looked at what's been going on with Dr. Skelton and some of these people, and the good work they've been doing.

This was filmed and shown across the country, pointing out what Manitoba was doing. As I said I don't remember the name of the doctor who is an expert on this, who came here and who talked about this and who always pointed to Manitoba, as to what they were doing.

Now, there is an awful lot more we can do, but I think we are going in the right direction; and I would hope that this will not be only lip service from anybody — not just the government, from us, or these people delivering these services — and I would like the Minister to meet with the Youville Foundation and to find out how they are making out; and maybe untighten the belt a bit and the

purse8tring-s and if they need some help at least give them the encouragement that it deserves and then follow; and if they need some financial help to be able to do a little bit anyway. Because it would be a pity that the government, which is charged with delivering the health services for the people of our province, would have to have it done by the volunteers.

So, Mr. Chairman, with these added remarks, I don't think there is much more that I have on this item of Personal Care Homes. I'd just like the Minister to tell me where they are going with this unit, the geratology, that the former government was trying to set up. Apparently that was a victim of the freeze also at the Health Sciences Centre. Does that mean that we will not qualify and that we'll lose these millions of dollars from the Federal Government, on the construction of this thing?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge for their perspectives and their suggestions and their constructive criticism of the personal care home situation; and the government's approach to it. They are certainly helpful suggestions and all will be valuable in helping me with my officials, of working out a reasonable cost effective and a humane policy.

On the geratology project, I can't report good news to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. It's still where it was when the government assumed office. It is one of those projects for which the operating costs in some of the specifics had not been fully worked out and it has been caught, generally, in the deferment posture and freeze of the present year, where capital construction projects in this field are concerned. But it is still very much a subject of discussion and was, in fact, in part at least, a topic on the agenda in Regina this week involving Deputy Ministers of Health, a meeting that was attended by our own Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development for Manitoba, and we hope to be able to take advantage of the federal funds available.

But I am not in a position to assure my honourable friend that we are . . .

**A MEMBER:** Is that still possible?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, it's still possible, that we're taking advantage of those funds at the moment. It's still possible but it would be honest to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government is becoming a little impatient about it.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, that's what I meant, it was supposed to be a deadline.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes. There is a deadline on it and they're becoming a little impatient and our province and I believe some others are attempting to have a deferment of the deadline so that there is a longer time available to take advantage of it. We're working on that and I will continue to work on it, but that's the best I can report to the honourable member at the moment.

On the Youville Foundation, yes, I certainly will meet with representatives of the Youville Foundation again, although I already have met with two or three of them, including Mr. Justice O'Sullivan and representatives of the Order of the Grey Nuns. So I have some familiarity with the project.

The honourable member is quite right. At an earlier point in our Estimates, the question of the Youville Foundation came up and I think it was suggested at that time that there seemed to be an omission of a provision of an appropriation for the Youville Foundation. My response to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was that there was no provision in the Estimates last year for it, although I know that it was certainly under active consideration by him. Well, there was no provision in that section of the Estimates, but the honourable member is correct, that in the other health services' programs appropriation of the Estimates, there was \$150,000 provided for 1977-78. Originally \$180,000 had been approved in 1976-77; and then for 1977-78, \$150,000 was provided.

At that juncture, I believe that certainly in the formative stages of the concept, the original intent of the Youville Foundation was not voluntary and it was not envisioned as a voluntary program. It would have involved the use of paid coordinators who would have had a caseload of so many patients, for which they would have been responsible.

There certainly were major difficulties with respect to the cost and the fact that the medical staff were concerned about losing contact with their own patients. This is my information, the information I've been given' Mr. Chairman. As a consequence, there was some considerable reserve on the part of the previous Minister, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, to plunge headlong into it; he was certainly approaching it cautiously; and that to date has been my position on it.

Although I understand that it is, at least, in conceptual form, going ahead. I don't know that

any active machinery is in place at the moment, but the Grey Nuns, I understand, are going ahead with it. They are going to handle the funding requirements themselves or through their own sources of support. But I will certainly discuss it with the principals further.

I felt that a pretty careful and cautious approach to it was justified on the grounds of some of the difficulties to which I've already referred, that were reported to me as having been realistic and legitimate difficulties that were encountered at the time.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's where it stands at the moment, and we'll be watching the progress of the Order with the project. They haven't requested any money of us. In my contact with them to date — and it's included face to face meetings — there has been no request from the principals of the Foundation for government assistance. That being the case — as in many instances, Mr. Chairman, — governments are not overly anxious to rush into the breach and proffer funds.

But the concept is certainly worth examination and I'll certainly maintain contact and communication with those principals and see what their ambitions and their attitudes are in the coming months.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 2—pass. Item 3—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, would you consider calling it 4:30? It's just a minute or so.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** In accordance with Rule 19, Section 2, I am interrupting the proceeding for Private Members' Hour and will return at the call of the Chair.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to object to that course of action except that there are members in the other Committee who are presuming that we are adjourning at 4:30, and I'm sure would wish to be here. So if it's all right with my honourable friends, we're going to wait until 4:30 arrives before we proceed with Private Members' Hour.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Either that or we'll debate the suggestion.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Well, we can always debate a point of order. That's the old stand-by.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe I could use the minute then to straighten out this Youville Foundation, that it is true . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No, it's passed. The item is passed.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Oh, you've passed it. You're not in the Chair. Okay. Well, we've achieved what we wanted, it's 4:30.t.or4 9rgjç1\$

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** While we're waiting for the hour of 4:30 to arrive, may I draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where one of our most loyal visitors is seated, a gentleman who has watched almost daily the proceedings of this Chamber for the last number of years. I still don't know the gentleman's name, but we welcome you here again this afternoon.

**MR. SCHREYER:** I wonder, Sir, if I may I have your indulgence to comment on your observation. The gentleman in question is perhaps a fine example of interested citizens, interested in the operations of government, but moreover who also brings with his interest in this Assembly, a wide background of experience over the years in farming, and also in working in a pulpwood camp, farming in Saskatchewan, pulp cutting in northeastern Manitoba for many years.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now under Private Members' Hour, can I have an indication; do you want to carry through the order as it stands on the Order Paper?

**MR. JORGENSON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

#### PUBLIC BILLS — SECOND READING

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

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I suppose over the past two years there has been no topic which has occasioned more discussion or more words expressed in this House than the question of the raising of age of majority for drinking in the Province of Manitoba. I think, Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are doing our second tour of duty in this particular campaign, we would be somewhat hard pressed to provide for any freshness or newness of approach. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I was more inclined to sit back and listen to the words of the other members, perhaps certainly the ones who weren't here in the last Session, to see what new information or knowledge could be brought to the subject, perhaps to alleviate in part, some of my own concern that my vote of last session perhaps was not the right one, and if I may recall members' attention, I voted against a similar bill last year. I was given some reason for cause, mainly because my wife thought I was dead wrong when I did it and almost locked me out of the house for the weekend, being a high school teacher, she expressed concern. And certainly there were many of my constituents who had similar opinions, feeling that that vote was not the right one to take, and I guess there was no issue in which I received more reaction, seeing that it was somehow lining myself up with the devil to vote against raising the drinking age.

So I must confess, Mr. Speaker, to having some moments of pause and hesitation and wanting to listen to the debate from a new perspective and a new way ' and to understand perhaps more specifically what really the honourable member who sponsored this bill and those who supported it, really wanted to achieve. Well, it wasn't too difficult to discover what they wanted to achieve, Mr. Speaker, but I must confess after having listened to all this, they haven't convinced me that the solution they are proposing is the answer to the problem. I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker.

There is one thing that has been missing totally from any discussion or presentation I have heard from the advocates or supporters of this bill. They have committed, I think, Mr. Speaker, the cardinal sin of any legislator. They have not spoken to those who would be mostly affected by the bill. I would think that the member who introduced this would be most upset and concerned if the Minister of Agriculture had brought in a bill dealing with cattle, and had said, "I haven't spoken to the beef cattle producers." I suppose he would be equally upset — so would the Member for Pembina, and the Member for Wolseley, who were more than outspoken in their praise of this bill if the Minister of Health had come in and said, "I'm bringing in legislation, but I haven't talked to the doctors or the nurses, or the patients, or anyone else involved in the medical field." Because as I listened to this debate, Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the presentations of all the supporters, read their comments, it struck me that the one group of people that no one had bothered to talk to, consult with, are the young people who in fact are going to be most directly affected by this bill. Lots of endorsements from the school trustees, parents and teachers, but nothing from the young people. —(Interjection)— well, not even the teachers, not a lot of teachers — well that's not true. Teachers have spoken to me and talked to me, and they said that they had spoken to teachers, and they said that teachers were concerned about kids coming into the classrooms, too much drinking —(Interjection)— well, let's not get personal.

But the fact of the matter is, that no one said — I mean, there were some anecdotes, one member said, "I have a nephew," another one said, "I know a guy who once went to a pub in some town, I know somebody else," but no one has ever convinced me that they have gone back to ask those most directly affected. Yet there is an old time honoured democratic formula, which is those who wear the shoes know when they are too tight. Those who are most directly affected by this legislation should be the ones who at least have an opportunity to express their interests and concerns and reactions to the bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, taking that as a point, I for the last week and a half, have spent a good part of my days visiting high schools in my own riding, and other high schools. So I guess in the last couple of weeks, I have maybe spoken to 300 or 400 young people, both who are students and who are also working. And said, "Okay, what about this bill? What do you think about it; is it going to work, does it make sense?" And it was a tribute, Mr. Speaker, I think to the common sense and good sense of most young people that the discussion and debates that followed, revealed I think to my mind, a much better appraisal of the problem of drinking amongst young people than anything I have heard expressed in this House, and the kinds of responses and solutions and proposals put forward by young people, perhaps made an awful lot more sense than anything I've heard so far in this debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would undertake not just simply to repeat I guess my own values and concerns I expressed last year, but partly to, if I might, relate some of those things I have heard to members in this House who are going to vote on this bill, to convince them that a vote for this bill would be the wrong vote, to let the consumers and those people directly affected. I particularly address my remarks to those who supported it, because in the one case there is no disagreement on the

part of anybody, and that is that drinking is a problem, that the incidence of use of alcohol and the abuse of it is a problem. It's a problem that is serious amongst young people and they know it. It's also serious amongst many other people and they also know that, and so one of the first questions that comes back, "Why us? Why are we being singled out? Why is it that all of a sudden you've picked upon us as being the only ones who have the problem? Why aren't you also initiating steps for everyone of the other age categories, or group of people in the community who also have drinking problems, and are suffering some of the real ravages and abuses of alcohol? Why are we so special?" Well, I said, you know, I've heard speeches. I think it was the Member for Wolseley, I'm not sure, maybe the Member for Pembina said, "You're not emotionally mature at the age of 18." I think it was one of the members that said, "That's the reason." But somehow we have to consider that the people are. . .

**A MEMBER:** It was Frank Johnston.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well maybe it was Frank Johnston; I'm not sure who it was. It was one member opposite who said that people aren't emotionally mature. . . I think it was the Member for Sturgeon Creek, the Minister for Housing said, "I know kids from Sturgeon Creek and they are not emotionally mature and therefore they're not prepared to do it in one year." So the students came back to me and said, "Is one year going to make a difference?" They also said another thing which I think we should all recognize, that chronological age has nothing to do with emotional maturity. That emotional immaturity or maturity is not necessarily related to how old one is; it depends on one's own personal makeup, and there are all kinds of features to it. There are as many sane and rational and common sense 16-year-olds as there are 40-year-olds. I wouldn't attempt to say that there are more or less but there are as many, and I don't think that there is more common sense amongst middle-aged or older-aged people than there are younger people, so why have we singled them out, they say. I thought that was a pretty fair comment.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the next question is, is the answer to the problem of drinking simply to raise the age? There was a student this morning who had done a little homework I guess, and she said, "Look, how much money did the Province of Manitoba make last year on alcohol?" I said, "About \$75 million." She said, "How much do you spend on education, treatment, information?" I said, "Well, the budget for the AFM was 4.9 million last year, it's been cut this year to 4.06, which represents a very small minuscule proportion of that." And she said, "Do you realize that in our school, and it's true in the others, that there is no alcohol education going on, that never is there sort of any attempt made to deal with the problems of alcohol and its abuses. There is also very little attempt to deal with a lot of the other personal moral issues." But she said, "Why is it, that before you've tried those other solutions, that all of a sudden you're reaching on age? If you really think it's a problem with young people, why haven't you gone through the other steps?" And she said, "Look, there are some kids in the school who are alcoholics, but do you know something? We don't know who to talk to about them, we don't know where to send them, no one has ever told us what kind of treatment is available, who should do the counselling, and who should deal with their parents and families."

Mr. Speaker, the kids in the schools know more about the problem than we do in this House and yet we have the nerve in part to prescribe for them. They know what the problems are, they understand what the problem is, they're not avoiding it, they're not shirking it, they know exactly what's going on, but they're saying that we have shirked our responsibility by not doing the responsible proper thing to deal with the problem as it should be dealt with. That's the message that's coming through. They're saying, "If you guys in that Legislature, you guys and the one lady, really are concerned, then do a proper job. Take that \$75 million and do something about alcohol treatment. Don't give us nothing but a superficial program. Don't give us just a token program, do something serious in the schools. Come in and really show the problem, give us the proper treatment, and counselling, and education. Do something with our parents because it's oftentimes the parents who are avoiding the responsibility." I had a group of 200 students this morning say to me when I asked them what they do in terms of the problem in the homes, they say, "In many cases, the ones who understood it best were the ones who had parents who are prepared to talk to them and deal with them about it." It was very much a family responsibility, it said, now you're trying to legislate something for us.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there is some wisdom that's being spread there which has nothing to do with the measure, because if the honourable member had come in and said, "I think drinking is a problem and I want to put forward a bill or resolution or a series of steps to meet that problem in all its complexity and difficulty," that I would have supported him. But to come in and simply say, "I'm going to solve the problem by raising the age one year," I think, Mr. Speaker, it is either a ploy or it's just a symbolic act. It's not a real serious effort to come to grips with the problem of drinking amongst young people or amongst anybody else. I think it's a subterfuge. Anybody who

says that that is a solution to the problem, simply doesn't understand what's going on, according to those who are most directly affected and impaired by it.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what many of them say is, "Look, do you really think by raising the age it's really going to help? That's not the problem." I said, "I've heard people say in this House that the real problem is down there at 13 and 14 and 15. They don't want an 18-year-old buying booze for a kid who is 14 or 15." And they said, "Your legislation won't make any difference. If you are really trying to stop that, it's a useless piece of legislation." They said, "If you want to stop the abuse of alcohol, do what other members have suggested, do something with proper identity cards, do something with proper inspections in the pubs. Get tough with the regulations, enforce the law, make the law work, and then come back and tell us that the law should be changed, but don't start changing the law until you have actually attempted to make it work."

That's what they're saying as well, and for us to go about and say, well, let's change the law and make it 19, they say, "We'll get around it, it's easy." Because if you look, if you can go to the Liquor Commission or the pub when you're 17 or 16 and pretend that you're 18 and get away with it, by raising it to 19 is not going to make any difference. Do you think you grow a big beard when you're 19 that you didn't have when you were 18? Do you all of a sudden look more mature now? It will not make any difference, Mr. Speaker, and if the members don't understand that, then they're doing a dishonest service to themselves by not coming to grips with the problem, because that's what the young people are saying, that your bill won't work, it just won't work.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, they went one step further. They said, "You know, what one of the real problems is, is that the liquor laws of this province in fact are designed to promote the use of alcohol with young people, that the way we've designed our liquor laws is designed to promote the use." I'll give you an example. A young girl says, "Sure, I'm 18, and I went to a pub last night. I didn't want a drink so I ordered a coke. Do you know what they charged me? A buck and a quarter. For another 10 cents, I could have bought a mixed drink." The reason why? Because those pub operators and hotel operators don't want kids drinking cokes, they want them drinking draft beer or mixed drinks, and there is no place for young people to go in this province to have a good time, to socialize, where they are not really being forced into a drinking machine. That's the basic problem, and when they say, give us a place to go which has some social relations, that's true, it is true, I don't know what it is, but they say that the liquor laws say you can't go and dance in these places. You know, you've got strict laws, you've got to go sit down in a pub and you can have a little bit of music, but the liquor laws are not designed to allow people to walk around, they're not designed to let them have a dance, they're not designed to encourage compatible relationships, to encourage people to get together, to encourage them to have a good time. What they're designed to do is to encourage them to drink as much and as fast as they possibly can, and that's one of the reasons why we have drunk kids, because our liquor laws are wrong. And so if the honourable member wants to deal with the problem of drinking with young people then I would ask him to bring in a motion to change the liquor laws.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member . . . Pardon me.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would say, let's get serious about it. I mean, all right, I'm with you. I'm saying, why use this age problem? Why don't we look at the liquor laws and see how they can be re-designed to bring about a better kind of environment and a better kind of system that won't encourage simply drinking? Go back to your friends the hotel operators and say, "Hey, let's re-design the laws so that we could have places in this city and this province which aren't designed simply to pour as much booze down your throat as fast as possible at the highest price." Because that's the way the system is designed now. And the figures of the Liquor Control Commissioner are before you: 14 percent profits last year; \$75 million to the Provincial Government; \$40 million to the Federal Government. We have a vested interest in drinking in this Legislature, in this government, and we are being hypocrites if we're saying that we're going to solve the problem by all of a sudden raising the age one year.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it really is a form of hypocrisy if that's the case of it. If we think we're going to deal with the problem in that way then we really are creating a dishonesty. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that —(Interjection)— Good idea. I think, Mr. Speaker, what the Honourable Minister has just showed me makes a lot of sense, that kind of card. Then let's do it. Why don't we do this first before we start raising the age? Why don't we play straight with young people and try these things first? Why don't we change the liquor laws? Why don't we do the I.D. Court? Why don't we do the proper inspections? Why don't we do the proper education and counselling information and then if it doesn't work, then let's put the age up to 21 where it really belongs if that really is the issue. But let's not deal with a superficial minor token symbolic act and then be able to walk away from the problem and say, "We've done our duty."

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that if we pass this legislation there is going to be one

message that will come very clear to a lot of young people, and that is that they will not feel that this Legislature, the people in it, either understand their problem or care about it, or bother to consult them. And that's a mistake made by proponents and advocates of this bill. They haven't taken the time or the interest to talk to the people most directly affected, because if they would, Mr. Speaker, they would find that they were getting a proper response, that that constituency knows what it wants, and all we're doing by this bill is to say, "we're not interested in what you have to say."

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask members to vote against this bill, not because we're for drinking or for drunkenness or for anything else but because we think that there are an awful lot more sensible effective ways of dealing with the problem of drinking. The Minister of Education could properly provide answers. The Minister of Highways could provide answers. The Attorney-General could provide answers. But they haven't provided answers so far. As soon as they provide the answers I think they will receive the genuine and honest and responsible support and endorsement of young people, but simply to provide support for this bill will simply say that all we're interested in is hypocrisy.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake with a question?

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge submit to a question? I wonder could the Member for Fort Rouge indicate to us whether he agrees with the previous government bringing in legislation namely, reducing the age of majority from 21 to 18?

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House when it was brought in. I think that probably the Act at that time was a proper Act across-the-board for 18. It goes back to the answer that has been provided before, that if we're going to change the age of majority we change it in all respects, and I would simply point out to the Member for Rock Lake again as an additional example of hypocrisy, that his own Task Force on Reorganization has recommended that the age at which a person becomes an adult in front of the Criminal Courts — they're recommending it goes down to 16, while we're talking about raising the age to 19. Now if there was any act of contradiction it's in that one act alone.

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

**MR. ABE KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin that Debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, the Freedom of Information Act, Bill No. 6 — the Honourable Government House Leader.

### **BILL NO. 6 — THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT**

**MR. JORGENSEN:** If I may, I'd like to speak on this particular bill, Bill No. 6. Mr. Speaker, the bill that was introduced by the Member for Fort Rouge is the third one that he has introduced in as many years, and although he hasn't changed his opinions on Freedom of Information Acts — to tell him that I haven't changed my mind either, that I think that the Freedom of Information Act is as bad a piece of legislation today as I thought it was three years ago. And simply because other jurisdictions are introducing Freedom of Information Acts — my honourable friend, you know, he's speaking of contradictions — he argues that other jurisdictions are introducing Freedom of Information Acts and so therefore they must be a good thing. Well, on the bill that he just concluded speaking on, other jurisdictions are introducing amendments to increase the drinking age from 18 to 19. Now why isn't that just as good an argument as the one that he presents in this particular instance? Of course it isn't. And neither argument makes sense as far as I'm concerned. I don't want to deal with it on the basis of whether or not it's a good thing in other jurisdictions or not, but on its merit as to whether or not it's a good thing for the Legislature of Manitoba to introduce.

I don't know how one can deal with this subject in any other way but to pretty much repeat what has been said in the past, and it's been said on several occasions. I don't want to traverse the ground that was covered by the former Minister of Mines and Resources, the Member for Inkster, who I think gives very cogent arguments as to the reason why a Freedom of Information Act will

not in fact achieve the noble purposes that are set out by the proposer of this particular bill, but more pertinent to that is an article that appeared in Harvard Magazine a couple of years ago after some experience with Freedom of Information Act.

I don't like to project what will happen. What I would like to do, however, is to go back and give some indication as to what one person thinks of The Freedom of Information Act in the United States and how it has affected the operation of government there. I say to my honourable friend that a Freedom of Information Act perhaps makes more sense in the kind of government that we find in the United States than it would in the parliamentary system that we have here where the executive are constantly and daily available for questioning.

This article was written by — and this one should appeal to my Honourable friend for Fort Rouge because it's written by someone whom I'm sure he understands, an academic. It's written by Warren Venice, an authority on management systems and organizational development. He's president of the University of Cincinnati and that should immediately attract my honourable friend and perhaps lend some credence to what he writes in this particular article. And I'm going to quote from him because I know that my honourable friend wouldn't listen or wouldn't believe anything I said, but I'm sure that he may believe the experiences that this man relates in this article about how the Freedom of Information Act is working in the United States. I commend the article to my honourable friend; I'm going to simply quote from certain sections of it that I think are very pertinent.

He says, "I dislike secrecy. I think the prophet Luke was right when he wrote: Nothing is secret that shall not be made manifest; and I believe Emerson's Law of compensation: In the end, every secret is told, every crime is punished, every virtue rewarded in silence and certainty.

"At the same time, as a practical administrator, I am convinced that those well-intended goldfish-bowl rules will have unattended results worse than the evils they seek to forestall. They are likely to produce more secrecy, not less " — and that's the point that was made by the Member for Inkster — "only more carefully concealed and, on top of it, so hamstrung already overburdened administrators have to throw their casts into deeper confusion. For secrecy is one thing, confidentiality is another. No organization can function effectively without certain degrees of confidentiality in the proposal steps and discussions leading up to its decisions, which decisions should then, of course, be open, and generally will be.

Then he goes on to relate the experience of a Nixon government moving heaven and earth, seeking to restrain and even imprison the New York Times' editors in their determination to publish the Pentagon Papers. And the editors themselves gave a demonstration of secrecy that really taught a lesson to the Nixon administration. The Times won the right from the Supreme Court, under some continuing criminal risk, to resume publishing those assertedly secret studies of Vietnam War decisions, yet the editors themselves surrounded their preparation of these stories with a secrecy and security that the Pentagon might have envied: renting a secret suite of hotel rooms, swearing the members of a secret staff to total secrecy, for weeks confronting them like prisoners, restricting their communications to an elite handful with a need to know, and setting the stories themselves in sequestered closely guarded typesetting machines. Thus the ultimate challenge to official secrecy was performed in ultimate private secrecy.

What the Times' editors knew, of course, was that every decision-maker knows instinctly, the mere fact that discussions becoming known at the wrong stage of the procedure can prevent a desirable decision from ultimately being carried out.

He goes on to relate several instances in his own experience where confidentiality having been breached destroyed the intent of his university to achieve what he considered to be, and what the faculty of the university considered to be a desirable result, and in each case because of a leakage, because of lack of confidentiality, the aims and the desires of the university were destroyed.

Then he goes on also to point out that the entire introduction of freedom of information legislation was brought about by the Watergate disclosures, and then concludes that portion of his article with this cogent observation: "Eavesdropping to protect presidential confidentiality led to the greatest hemorrhage of confidentiality in American history and to the ruination of many good men."

He goes on to point out a rather humorous incident that took place when Krushchev was being interviewed by the press in New York at a New York press conference. He says, "It is reminiscent of Krushchev's answer in his New York press conference to one of the written questions handed to him: You were close to Stalin. What were you doing during all the crimes you later exposed? And Krushchev was livid with rage. 'Who asked that question? Let him stand up.' And nobody stood. And then Krushchev said, 'That's what I was doing.'"

He points out, he says, "We are left with a paradox. The more we establish internal truth, true openness, true candor, true levelling within an organization and its hierarchy, the better able it will be to define and defend the proper areas of external confidentiality."

Then he says, "Among the colleges, one result is already clear. The Buckley amendment is laudable in its attempt but henceforth school and college administrators are going to be chary of putting any very substantial information into any student's record. What will be set down will be

so bland and general as to be useless. For example, the college entrance officials who want to make a considered judgment of an applicant's overall merits, if, for example, he had threatened to cut a teacher's throat but had not done so, he could scarcely be described as possibly unstable; a student or his parents might sue. He concludes his article by saying this: "What I am saying is that in the long run we are likely to get better government, better decisions if we focus our energies on finding leaders whose innate integrity, honesty and openness will make it unnecessary for us to sue them or ransack their files later." Attorney-General Levy, it seems to me, cuts into the heart of the dilemma in this observation. A right of complete confidentiality in government could not only produce a dangerous public ignorance, but destroy the basic representative function of government. But a duty of complete disclosure would render impossible the effective operation of government.

**A MEMBER:** They're hard words, Warner, hard words.

**MR. JORGENSON:** And that is written, I might add, after Freedom of Information legislation was introduced in the United States. It's an analysis of the results of the kind of legislation that my honourable friend is attempting to promote in this Legislature, and I say to my honourable friend, that I don't have the same mistrust of public officials as he seems to have. I didn't have that kind of mistrust when my honourable friends were on this side of the House, although I disagreed, perhaps violently, with some of the things that they were doing. But to continuously assume that those who hold the reins of power are so distrustful that they must have legislation to guide them every step of the way, is to do what Mr. Benes said it will do; it will just simply hamstring the operation of government. If a government cannot provide open information, if they refuse to give the kind of information that the public seem to want, or if the opposition in this Chamber seem to want, there are ways of dealing with that kind of government. I said that when I was in opposition and I'll say it again. The public will make that decision.

I don't like to take the responsibility of governing out of this Chamber, or out of the hands of government, and placing it in the hands of the courts. For what are we elected if it is not to carry the public trust, if it is not to carry on the responsibilities of government. And a government simply must be able to operate in some degree of confidentiality or it will not be able to operate at all, and my honourable friend should be aware of that. Perhaps he is a little bit removed from the possibility of forming a government, and perhaps he is better acquainted with some of the people in Ottawa than I am. Maybe that's what worries him, and maybe he has cause for worry, I don't know. But one thing, there's one essential difference between the way we operate here and the way they operate in Ottawa. They don't have unlimited opportunity to question the executive as we do here during the consideration of Estimates. Their Estimates are . . .

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** . . . are conducted in sequestered committee rooms and there is an almost incredible stricture placed upon members in the manner in which they are able to question not the government, not the Ministers — oh no, they don't dare to question the Ministers — but departmental officials. So they don't have an opportunity to get information. Perhaps there is a good argument that can be made for a Freedom of Information Act in Ottawa; we don't have that situation here. We do have an opportunity to question the executive; we do have an opportunity in many different ways, during the question period, during the Estimates, during the consideration of the bills, Orders for Return, questions on the Order Paper. That may not satisfy my honourable friend, but I think it runs a pretty wide course and provides a pretty good opportunity for the people of this province to get the kind of information that they want.

Government, in its wisdom, decides certain information is confidential — and I posed that argument in the past and I'll pose it again — then the government must take that responsibility, and I think a government that does that is prepared to take that responsibility either in the Chamber or at the polls. What more does my honourable friend want in a parliamentary democracy? It's a lot more than they've got in Ottawa, and perhaps if there is a Freedom of Information Act to be introduced that's the place it should be, unless the rules are changed in Ottawa. But they are open here, and my honourable friend has the opportunity to examine and to question and to get information. All he has to do is to take advantage of it.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Would the honourable member permit one question? In enumerating the methods by which information can be obtained under parliamentary democracy, he implied that there was one difference as between practice here and in Ottawa, and as I understood him it was that allegedly

in Ottawa, quite apart from question period, etc., that there is no opportunity to question the Minister at the time of Estimates considerations in Committee. I'd like to ask the honourable member if in fact he meant to say or imply that Ministers are not available to be questioned on consideration of Estimates in Committee?

**MR. JORGENSON:** Perhaps my honourable friend makes a distinction that should be made. My experience has been that Ministers are never there to be questioned outside of the introduction of their Estimates, and from then on the questioning is posed at the departmental officials with very limited time strictures.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The debate stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Is that right?

**MR. FERGUSON:** Mr. Speaker, I had adjourned it for the Honourable Member for Morris, so it's wide open.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**BILL NO. 12 — AN ACT RESPECTING THE CITY OF BRANDON**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very short bill, An Act respecting the City of Brandon. The comments that were made by the Member for Brandon East, I note that he congratulated the City of Brandon for providing the means through this bill to acquire further funds for the Brandon University to operate. We have on this side perused this bill and sought the satisfaction of the officials of the City of Brandon, which I can understand automatically pleases the Board of Governors of the Brandon University insofar as this legislation is conceived, and having perused those particular facts, I also always like to say that on second reading, that we are prepared to recommend it to Committee, and if by any chance there is any one or any persons that may have any objections, they will have that opportunity when that time comes.

And so, Mr. Speaker, without any further ado, we are prepared to allow Bill 12 to go to Committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Human Rights Act — the Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 33, second reading Public Bills, The Venture Investment and Research and Development Corporation Registration Act. — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. (Stands)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend an Act to Incorporate The Brandon General Hospital — the Honourable Member for Brandon East. (Stands)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend an Act to Incorporate The Wawanesa and District Memorial Hospital Association — the Honourable Member for Rock Lake. (Stands)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, the Resolution — it's an open resolution. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** In view of the hour, I wonder if it would be the disposition of honourable members to adjourn, or call it 5:30.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I see the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is back in the House. —(Interjection)— 5:30? Is it the pleasure of the House to agree to call it 5:30? (Agreed) I am leaving the Chair then; the House will resume at 8:00 o'clock in Committee of Supply.