

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 12, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Before we cut off for the Private Member's Hour we had the Member for Transcona speaking. Does he wish to carry on at this point? THE Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to conclude by asking the Minister if she's in a position to answer some of the questions I had raised before and which she took as notice, and also if she could answer some of the questions that I had raised on Friday, which she took as notice again.

Specifically, did Mr. King, the Deputy Minister appear or speak via telephone on the Peter Warren show regarding the Simplot and Hooker Chemical exemptions, and did he provide a technical opinion which was contrary to that of the former Deputy Minister, Mr. Jim Goodison, who presumably also was offering a technical opinion with regard to the requirements for Simplot and Hooker Chemicals? That's one question.

Secondly, I was wondering if the Minister could get us a copy of the Anhydrous Ammonia Handling Manual from the private sector which the Member for Pembina was talking from and which apparently he has received. I've not received it and I've not had a copy of it. I was wondering if the Minister or the department has a copy of those voluntary guidelines which the industry has, and I was also wondering whether the Minister feels that the voluntary guidelines, which the industry uses, are sufficient and that the province doesn't require the development of provincial regulations, as is the case in Saskatchewan, which make the guidelines compulsory.

And three, are there contingency plans for large-scale crises regarding anhydrous ammonia which might develop, causing a massive leak of anhydrous ammonia, and again I refer to the situations put forward by the Member for Lac du Bonnet regarding a railway car being derailed or an accident involving a freight truck hauling anhydrous ammonia. So, I was wondering if the Minister had any specific answers to those questions which had been raised on Friday and again today?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Well, I'll try and go in the order that the Member for Transcona has asked me. He made reference to Mr. Rabinovitch and wanting me to table his letter. First of all, it was a letter from him to me and I think that he quoted in the newspaper what his reasons were for quitting and I think that should be sufficient. With regard to the remarks also made by the Member for Transcona about the Member for Pembina speaking, I didn't know the member was going to speak, but I've sat in on many of the Estimates so far and there has been a number of my colleagues have spoken in regard to some of the Ministers' Estimates, and there wasn't the sarcasm and the making him so upset as it appeared to make the Member for Transcona. I would like to tell the member also that we have the training course of the Imperial Oil in our department. It's about four inches thick and we can get one book and make it available for your caucus if you would like.

I would like to emphasize while he didn't think that all the distributors were being trained' distributors are trained before they handle the ammonia.

You've also made reference that you haven't received any results from our investigations. I think it takes a little longer than — it's approximately a week since we've started on it and when we have something to tell you we'll do so.

You made reference also to the Education and Research Branch of my department, the workplace safety and you figured that the functions were being emasculated. Well, I can assure you that we are maintaining the status quo that we had since the positions were vacant when the former government was in office. It's still the same number of people that are running the department.

The Education function will be handled largely by the safety and health inspection personnel in the regular course of their duties. The former Executive Director did a good deal of seminar

Monday, June 12, 1978

and educational work which will now be handled, as indicated, by the Safety and Health Inspection Branch. The Director will have the resources he needs. The education is carried on by a number of people. We have 16 inspectors to do this and have done in the past and we are going to be reorganizing some of the department to make it a more efficient and workable one than we feel has been. The research is being done by the Hygienic Branch and by Dr. Krywulak who is highly specialized in his field. The general research is being done to some extent by the Research Branch of the Department of Labour as well as in the Hygiene and in the Occupational Health.

There's a medical student also that is on staff right now and he's conducting research in the mining, including the lead absorption. Anhydrous ammonia does not come under the Workplace Safety and Health Act as the Member for Transcona seemed to think. It comes under the Steam and Pressure Plants Act and it's administered by the Mechanical and Engineering Division. The Workplace Safety and Health Act is a separate division. Under this appropriation anhydrous ammonia should not be discussed in the Workplace; it should come under the Mechanical and Engineering which we haven't come up to yet.

I'd like to point out to the Member for Transcona, it's in our Annual Report for this year, there's a considerable number of safety training functions. Approximately 2,100 short safety sessions were provided averaging one hour each, as well as 155 longer sessions, half-day and full-day, that took place in 1977, so there has been considerable training in that respect.

I also have the compensable fatal accident cases by Workers Compensation Board for 1960 to 1977 that was requested by the Member for Transcona.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Minister wish to read this into the record or just table it and then have it supplied?

MRS. PRICE: Well, I would like to point out one little fact, that we've had 34 deaths in 1977 and that is the lowest from 1971 when there was 33. The lower than that was in 1963, so I think that we're well on the way to improving the safety measures in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. This is the compensable fatal accident cases settled by Workers Compensation Board by year, encompassing the years 1960 to 1977, and the Minister will table this and I'll have copies supplied to members from the Clerk. In 1977, the number of total fatalities settled was 34, in 1976 it was 35, and then it was in the 40s prior to that.

MRS. PRICE: What I would like to read into the record, being as how we are having considerable dialogue on the anhydrous ammonia, is that there were three deaths by fire in 1977, eight by tractors, six by farm machinery, eight drownings, one exposure to cold, eight suicides, four electrical asphyxiations, one aircraft death, and another accidental death, but not one due to the ammonia.

A MEMBER: Not one?

MRS. PRICE: Not one, except the one, pardon me, in 1976, 1977, and that took place in the parking lot. It wasn't a farmer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure to what total the Minister is referring to. Are these the accidents reported for claims with the Workers Compensation Board or . . .

MRS. PRICE: Those are farm accidents.

MR. EVANS: These are farm accidents, all farm accidents that occurred in Manitoba, for whatever cause.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the list that was tabled by the Minister from 1960 to 1977 is Compensation Board records.

MRS. PRICE: I would like to answer some of the questions that were presented by the Member for Brandon East. Firstly, I would like to say, if I appear to be, I am not being on the defensive, but I did say the first time you asked me about looking into it, I did tell you that I would, and we are.

Monday, June 12, 1978

We are well aware and equally concerned, as you are, about the effects of anhydrous ammonia, and it's not that the product is becoming more dangerous, as we realize, it's just becoming more widely used. We are making numerous inquiries into the preventions of them. There are no more investigations being carried out — there wasn't any more carried out in the past than are being now. The code and the regulations, we don't find that there is anything the matter with them, they are clearly and well laid out. Dr. Krywulak has been busy with his studies in occupational health, he's attended an occupational health conference just recently, as did Mr. Elias in our hygienic department in industrial health.

We have a letter that has just been made up by our director of the mechanical engineers, and that is going out to all companies that are handling anhydrous ammonia and renewing some of the restrictions and the regulations before them. They are all itemized in the letter. I believe one of you were asking if we were discussing anything with Saskatchewan. Our counterparts in Saskatchewan are being contacted on a regular basis with members from our mechanical and engineering department, and our director said there is very little difference in the enforcement and their work is very similarly carried out. The main difference is that we have professional engineering expertise to examine the plans and to carry out certain inspections at the final stage of construction with qualified boiler and pressure vessel inspectors.

The Member for Brandon East also was inquiring about the Environmental Branch. That particularly deals with pollution of the air or the ground. The investigation is usually done after the fact in the case of the oil, gas and anhydrous ammonia spills. The Department of Labour, on the other hand, deals with the safe construction and operation according to recognized standards and codes.

I don't remember which one asked me about the workplace safety, I think it might have been the Member for Transcona, and we're still in the process of co-ordinating the activities of the various areas involved in the workplace safety and health. We feel that there is enough administrative support people on staff in the divisions branches to meet the needs of the division without filling the vacant administrative officer position which had been proposed for the Administrative Research and Education Branch. There's one administration officer II, one clerk V, which is office manager level, and five other administrative secretaries or clerks. Once we're able to consolidate these branches in one location, we will be able to make it even more efficient. We started out, we had six different locations that they were in. I think we're down to about four now — we're down to two now? — and they'll be all located in one department in a couple of months, all in the Norquay Building. That's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. On the list of speakers, I have the Member for Wellington, followed by the Member for Pembina.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that we're all quite agitated and concerned about the recent revelations about the possible dangers, the potential dangers of this particular substance, anhydrous ammonia. I must admit that I, like probably many others, am not familiar with the properties of this particular chemical and frankly have become quite confused by all of the discussions and rhetoric surrounding the question over the past week. For that reason I think it would be beneficial to the committee to have some clarification as to the nature of the regulations and requirements pertaining to the substance. We've heard a lot of talk about codes, voluntary codes, we've heard some talk about regulation, and I think that all of us are somewhat confused as to which aspects of the safety requirements that have been imposed are voluntary, and which are enforced by legislative sanction. So, with the Chairman's indulgence, what I would like to do is, using Mr. O'Morrow's memo which the Minister was kind enough to distribute towards the end of last week, I would like to deal with the various items under the heading "Summary of Training and Code Requirements for Anhydrous Ammonia Facilities", and establish which of these requirements are as a result of voluntary sanction and which by way of regulator legislative sanction.

Perhaps, dealing with the first one, this is No. 2 actually after the supply company's requirement that there be attendance of dealers at training and safety seminars. The second one is something called ANSIC 61.1, and it's described as "Safety Requirements for the Storage and Handling of Anhydrous Ammonia".

I was wondering if the Minister then could indicate to the committee, whether or not this is a code that has been adopted by reference in legislation or regulation, or whether this is a code standard that is applied but has not been adopted?

MRS. PRICE: Are you through? I'm going to just answer your questions in one fell swoop.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, that's the first question. Thank you. Well, we could go through the third item then, if you wish to continue to bank them. It just takes a simple answer I think. Is it the Minister's

Monday, June 12, 1978

wish that I continue, or would you just like to say "yes" it's legislative or "no" it's voluntary?

MRS. PRICE: Just carry one, and I'll answer them all, if you don't mind.

MR. CORRIN: Well, the other one, is the Board of Transport Commissioner's General Order 0-33. These regulations presumably are federal. I don't whether or not they're enforceable by the Government of Manitoba, how they pertain to enforcement within our provincial boundaries, and if the Minister could indicate to us whether they have legislative sanction or whether they're voluntary.

The next one would be described under item 4, CSAB, (5)(1), Code for the Construction and Inspection of Boilers and Pressure Vessels, again the same question in that respect.

Since those are all the requirements that are listed in Mr. O'Morrow's statement or letter or memorandum, I would ask for the favour of a response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Wellington wish to have the Minister answer now, or do you wish to carry on?

MR. CORRIN: I think it would be more useful to the committee's purpose if we had a response so that we knew what we're talking about. I admit that I'm somewhat confused. I'm sure I'm not the only one at this table. I mean if you want me to editorialize, I suppose I could by reference read into the record a transcript of a radio show that was broadcast on June 9th on CBC last week and although I won't go into any sort of expansive discussion of that, I might say that there would appear to be some real confusion as to what is voluntary and what is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we get a little order at the far end. If the Member for Selkirk and the Member that often wishes that he was from Selkirk, would quit their conversation, and let the Member for Wellington carry on. And the former resident of Selkirk now the Member for Minnedosa, who sometimes wishes he was back in Selkirk. The Member for Wellington, would you please carry on.

MR. CORRIN: I might refresh the Honourable Minister's memory, she might recall that last week she was of the opinion, when discussing this matter with a CBC interviewer, that the regulations in Manitoba and Saskatchewan were identical, and it was the opinion of the interviewer, the reporter that did the investigative report that was broadcast, that this was not true. That particular researcher indicated that Manitoba's code was voluntary and was established, by industry, whereas Saskatchewan's code was part of the legislation and therefore tougher. You might even recollect that there was a quotation attributed to Jennie Smythe of the Saskatchewan Department of Labour, whereby Mrs. Smythe indicated that the industry was in business to sell products and not to enforce good handling procedures for the protection of the public and noted that the Saskatchewan Government had taken the position that that was the responsibility of government. I would think therefore that it's quite pertinent that the Minister clarify the record if the record has become confused. If there is obfuscation, I suggest that the Minister take this opportunity to put things straight, indicate to us where the differences lie between Manitoba and Saskatchewan and as I said, where we rely on voluntary sanction and where we rely on legislative sanction.

Is the Minister now ready, I won't go on if the Minister is not ready.

MRS. PRICE: Well, if you're through, I'm going to wait until you are through. I'm not going to keep answering question . . .

MR. CORRIN: No, I was just speaking while you had the opportunity to confer and get the data, please proceed.

MRS. PRICE: It's too bad the Member for Wellington wasn't here this afternoon to hear the Member for Pembina. He gave quite a thorough explanation about anhydrous ammonia that you wouldn't be so confused as you mentioned that you were. The regulations are all in the Act, and they're available for the member to read. MAND, means mandatory and the ANSI stands for American National Standards Institute; B 51 is under the Boiler and Pressure Code and both of them are mandatory. With regard to my statements on the television, I did not say that they were identical and I also had said in the House that they were similar to the rest of Western Canada, have all adopted the code nationally, where Saskatchewan put their own regulations in, but they are quite similar.

Some of the regulations, somebody was asking about some of them, I would like to mention that the tank cars come under the railway property. That comes under the Federal Department of

Monday, June 12, 1978

Transport, an accident, if it pertains to something in that vicinity, is investigated by the Federal Department of Transport on Labour. The populous in a town is the responsibility of the Council. In the case of an accident in the town, the Town Council would be instructed by Federal Inspectors. The Manitoba Department of Labour Inspectors would be present if notified of the accident but they would not have authority on the railway property. The Federal Government are also involved in the environment.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. CORRIN: Excuse me, I have a supplementary question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the procedure of this committee, is to bank questions, and when the questioner is finished asking then we get the Minister, if she wishes, to answer and then we go on to others. I will add your name to the list — the Member for Pembina. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, did I understand you to say that the procedure of the Committee is to bank questions or is it the wish of the Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it's the wish of the Minister, but she asked him twice, to the Member for Wellington, "Are you through?"

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I could just speak to a point of order, surely in the instance of the Member for Wellington he posed a number of questions. As a result of the banking of those questions the Minister presented an answer which related to the questions posed. Surely it is now in order for the Member for Wellington to ask a supplementary question relating to the answers that he received from the Minister rather than being placed at the bottom of the list. Otherwise we're going to miss out on a complete sequence of questions and explanations and the whole process becomes intermittent and distorted. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that you would allow, since the Member for Wellington — I understand his question is supplementary to the answers provided by the Minister — that you would permit him to ask his supplementary question now rather than 45 minutes later when we may have gone on to other matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Wellington, is your question supplementary to . . . The reason I'm trying to do this is that if the Minister receives questions from a member for approximately ten minutes and gives a five or six minute reply it gives that particular person an opportunity to think up another ten questions and we don't give other members of the Committee a fair chance to get on the list and a number of them have said to me, "How come I have to wait an hour before I can get on the list?" So I'm trying to move along from member to member and move as frequently as possible. The Member for Wellington with a question related to the answer that you have received.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we thank you for being so solicitous in this regard. We had no idea that you were as concerned about our welfare as you would now indicate. Mr. Chairman, the Minister was so kind as to provide details as to what was mandatory under legislation. She indicated, and just in order to assure that the Minister and I are of one mind on this, she indicated that ANSİK 61.1, which is No. 2 on Mr. O'Morrow's summary, and CSAB(5)(1), which is No. 4 on Mr. O'Morrow's summary of training and code requirements, were in fact enforceable by way of legislative sanction, and quite frankly I'm pleased to hear that because that, of course, implies a very different sort of standard and I think then we're in a position to ask the Minister now, as a result of that, what sort of enforcement methodology is employed? What does the regulation in this regard require of the user or the dealer or the distributor of this substance? I ask this question because as I think we'll all appreciate in these circumstances one presumes the enforcement standards will be objective and the sanctions that were imposed would hopefully be effective from the point of view of the public's interest.

MRS. PRICE: They got all this, they're reading from it.

MR. CORRIN: Since the Minister is banking questions and she's referred in her response to a review, I might ask how her department — how she contemplates doing the review? What the terms of reference will be when conducting the review process?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: I think if the Member for Wellington looks at the memo from Mr. O'Morrow he will see down near the bottom of the first page the requirements that the distributor has to have. Before he can work at the place they have to submit their plans and before the installation of the equipment is even allowed it has to be checked. We have our inspectors going out on a regular basis, at least annually but it's generally three or four times a year that they go out. I think that the memo that he has in front of him is quite explanatory.

MR. CORRIN: No, I think, with respect, Mr. Chairman, the Minister missed the point of the question. Perhaps I didn't make my point very clearly. The question was directed to the enforcement standard. In other words, what sort of punitive sanction, if any, is imposed on a person who offends the regulations? Normally when there is a legislative statute, when there is sanction, there is some requirement of law, there's a punitive enforcement standard. In other words if you breach the regulation you may be required to pay a fine and in some cases you may even find yourself facing a jail sentence, and I was wondering in the case of these two regulations what the standard was. Is there a fine for a first infraction and a larger fine for a second infraction? Is there an injunction? Is it possible for the Minister to order a stoppage of work or business if there's flagrant disobedience of the regulation? What is the standard?

MRS. PRICE: They are closed down if they don't comply with the regulations. There was two, as you'll note in that report, closed down already because they didn't comply and it isn't a matter of fining, if they are found not complying they are closed down.

MR. CORRIN: This is with respect to any infraction? Any infringement of the regulation code there would be automatic stoppage and there would be an injunction enforced against the company or operator in question?

MRS. PRICE: Within reason.

MR. CORRIN: Well, excuse me, I'm not — you see, again the Minister leads me on to another question. She says, "Within reason." I mentioned a standard, the objective standard. I presume that the regulations must set some sort of standard unless the Minister is telling me that the current regulations leave everything within the latitude of the Minister or the department or the inspector, for that matter. I'm wondering who it is that has responsibility. Is it the Minister, or is it the courts, or is it an inspector, and what are the parameters of this thing? Frankly, I would probably be very pleased to hear that an inspector, having reviewed a particular situation and found a breach of the regulations, could in fact enjoin an operator from dealing further with the substance, but frankly I'm not absolutely certain that such a punitive standard would apply and I think it's . . . Could the Minister clarify that and advise us what latitude there is within the department for enforcement? The Minister did say within reason, so I presume that there must be a subjective standard and that must reside with some person, either an inspector or the Minister herself or perhaps even the Cabinet.

MRS. PRICE: I'll take that question as notice. I'll get an answer back for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Earlier on this afternoon the Member for Transcona went into a considerable discussion about the fact that, and I think I quote him correctly, and he said that I should become the Minister responsible for anhydrous ammonia because I had, you know, been able to get a certain amount of information which was not available via the Executive Director I presume of the Research Department in your department, and the whole general tone of the conversation had the innuendo that you, as the Minister, weren't doing your job properly.³

And Mr. Chairman, I just would like to take particular exception to that because the information that you received from your department was, in all probability, as complete as what was available. And I think what the Member for Transcona has possibly failed to realize, is that for the first time in his term of dealing with the Manitoba Government, in his former position, whatever that may have been, he has run into a situation, where industry, the industry responsible for the commodity under regulation has undertaken to provide and to adhere to a series of standards and codes without, without — and I emphasize the "without" — without the heavy hand of government requiring them to do it. I think the Member for Transcona found that to be quite shocking, that this industry, these

Monday, June 12, 1978

irresponsible corporate giants could possibly regulate themselves and supply safety courses to distributors, to fire departments, to police departments, to EMO, to various other organizations in the community without having been directed from your department to do so. I realize that with his line of political philosophy that is a difficult concept, that anybody in business or in industry would be responsible enough to undertake a voluntary training program and adhere strictly to the rules and regulations that are available to their operations from the three sets of regulations that the Member for Wellington has so kindly requested whether they are required to be enforced or not.

I don't find any particular fault in the fact that I was able to obtain a package of information which was unavailable to the Minister because I was personally involved in the ammonia industry some years back and I still have a certain number of contacts with the industry. The type of information that I gained is available to anybody, probably even the Member for Transcona, should he have inquired, would have been able to find out that that in fact is what the industry is currently doing. But given the mentality of only the government is responsible and only the government can control everything, and only the government should control everything, I understand that he would find fault with the Minister in being unaware because maybe her department did not know that the companies were doing that, on their own, voluntarily, without any directive from the government. I find no particular reason as to why the Minister in this particular case should necessarily have known that that program was going on, because it wasn't directed from her department to undertake a safety program, it was voluntary by the industry. It was voluntary by the industry because they want to develop an industry that is safe for the customer and for the people who are handling the product and they have a very self-serving interest in doing that, and that is that they want to sell their product, and the way that they can sell their product is to have the best safety record possible.

So they've undertaken to follow completely the codes under the three Acts that are available, and they've gone to considerable length in training courses, considerable expense in training courses, they've supplied safety equipment, and I think the industry is to be commended in their initiatives in safety without the heavy hand of government directing them to do so — you must not have an accident, as we would have the Saskatchewan department saying. You know, we've got the basic same regulations in Manitoba, and given the level of usage in Manitoba compared to Saskatchewan, I will venture to say, right here and now, that our safety record is superior to the safety record in Saskatchewan. And I find no particular fault with the Minister in this instance in not having the type of information that was available to me, because my contact was directly with industry. The Minister's contact was directly with her department officials, and there's a good possibility that in the majority, because there was no directive to find out such information, in the majority probably her department did know that there was a comprehensive safety instruction program ongoing with the various companies.

Now, the Member for Wellington, in his comments, was wanting to know what areas of the Act were immediately enfo

cable by putting a padlock on the facility, I assume, is what he was getting at. Well, I wonder if he would want to shut down a facility. What I think he'd probably want to ask is if a facility can be shut down in handling anhydrous ammonia if during the day their water baths suddenly become empty of water and it was a proposition of bringing some water. I suppose he'd want to know if they should be padlocked for a week because they didn't have water in their tanks. You know, it doesn't matter what regulation and what Act you have and what codes you have to abide by, there's always discretion. You don't padlock them for having long hair, you know, you have to padlock them for something that's fairly major and a danger to the safety of the general public.

So, you know, when the Minister mentioned that probably, I believe was the thing, I think she was answering in all sincerity, that there are some things that you would give the given dealer a few days to remedy. For instance, the Highway Traffic Department gives you 14 days to fix your brake lights on your vehicle and then they'll ticket you if you don't, and that's discretion. That's what the Minister indicated was available in the Act, and I think that was a satisfactory answer to most people. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: I think maybe my colleague, the Member for Pembina, was not in the House the very first day that the Member for Brandon East asked me about the anhydrous ammonia and the training programs. I had direct contact with some people in the industry and I stood up in the House

Monday, June 12, 1978

and went at great lengths to tell the member about the training programs of the Imperial Oil, as well as others, but the Imperial Oil, the extensive program they have, the visual aids and all the products they have towards training, and that they have them readily available to loan any other companies that might be interested in having them. The very first day I gave that information to the Member for Brandon East.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems that we've had quite a discussion about a product that up till now didn't seem to have much notoriety, but in any event, I'm going to talk about it from the farming aspect. I've used this product for 20 years. For those who don't know, it is in a liquid form stored under pressure, you submit it to the soil through a cultivator sort of a deal, or whatever you want to use, but it's induced into the soil in a gas state. This is basically where your problem arises if you happen to have a broken line or if you happen to get too close and aren't using care and caution, which can happen at any time or place.

I think the rules laid down by Mr. O'Morrow can basically cover most of the safeguards that are required. The storage of this product in practically all areas in rural Manitoba are on the downwind side of any towns, villages, or whatever they are, and in many cases these storage places are established out in the rural areas on a railway siding or something well removed from any population centres. They are surrounded, by regulation, by a mesh wire fence. The piking, valving etc., is all inspected. It must be up to a specification before the place is allowed to operate. Face masks, gloves, clothing, etc., are not mandatory to be worn, but anyone that is using the product, directly involved in loading or unloading, where there may be a pressure build-up, when you are uncoupling something along this line, you may get a touch of it, but in most cases, I would expect in all cases, the accidents that are happening are due to the fact that it's human error. I think that if you will check the statistics now as against the amount of product being used and the amount of accidents that are happening, you will find it compares very favourably with many of the other products that are being used today.

A great deal of comment has been made about transportation. Here again, transportation is made with pressure vehicles under inspection. They are equipped with electric brakes; they are up to the specifications of the ASMF, and everything here again is being done that possibly can be done to ensure that there is safe transportation of the product. I would expect that this spring, in the Province of Manitoba — I don't know how many, I think the Member for Pembina quoted today the amount of product that has been used and the amount of accidents that have occurred. I think the only thing that we can bring out is the fact that there is going to be a fault due to the individual handling of the product, he may become overtired or whatever. Our good socialist friends here always believe that anyone doing anything should be licensed, they should be inspected every 25 minutes, so long as it provides a job for another bureaucrat. I can assure you all, that if you want to start putting farmers on the 32-hour week and if you want to start inspecting and licencing, well, they will certainly go along with inspecting. But if you're going to license every individual person that's being involved — I would challenge our honourable friends that are raising such an uproar here, the Member for Transcona, the Member for Wellington, etc., to go out in the rural area and have a look at the operation of the thing, become a little bit more informed as we have to do when we start talking about a few things that happened in the City of Winnipeg. We at least, I hope, are a wee bit more informed than what you fellows are, because you seem to think that all you have to do is sit in here and yap for about three days, where possibly an afternoon might be an enlightenment to you to go out and just see what's going on. You probably could clear up a whole bunch of your uncertainties in two or three hours, watching the operation in place.

Getting along with the training aspect, here again, the rural population are not fools. The people that are using this product are making a special effort to learn the rules of the game as I said. This isn't a new product. It's been in use I think — the first time that I ever used an anhydrous machine was in 1946 or 1947. That's 32 years ago, and we've used it off and on with more frequency now that we are growing a lot more rape; it's an easy way to get the high nitrogen into the soil.

I would like to point out that in comparison to many other products used, I don't think that the accident ratio is as great. I would ask the honourable gentlemen that are voicing so much concern, to go out and inspect the rural plant where they're delivering the product into these transportation vehicles, follow the thing around for two or three hours, see what goes on. I am sure that a lot of your suspicions, your uncertainties or fears could be allayed and you would find that the product is being handled as well as it can be handled, regulations are in place. We don't need any more bureaucrats telling us what to do; we don't need licencing. There is a lot of common sense unbeknown to some of my honourable friends in the rural areas. They're not out to kill themselves in handling the product; I think they'll get along just about as well as a lot of our other friends will. Thank

you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Virden is next.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, I'll just follow up with pretty much what the Member for Gladstone said but just familiarize this Committee — I think I had some duties in the rural the latter part of last week we were in this, and we are still in it. There are five farmers at least on this side of the table that have used anhydrous ammonia in excess of 20 years, and as I watch the Imperial Oil, Cargill, and the Co-op distribute this nitrogen, I say there's as much danger when they put gas in the fuel tank, a lot more danger there than there ever possibly can be with anhydrous ammonia. Why are we sitting here day in — and night out, talking on this subject that has no danger there's more of my people been hurt or died from sprays and many other things on the farm, than they ever have been from anhydrous ammonia. So why? For God's sakes, come out to my farm this fall or next spring, and see how simple this goes on. Just use a little common sense; if you can drive your car down the road, I think you could use anhydrous ammonia; you may be a danger to the public in your car, and maybe you would be by using . . . but you know, you would have to work on it to get hurt by it, you sure as hell would — and I think it's ridiculous — three or four days. I'd better go home for another week and let you blow your steam off and maybe you'll get down to work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet is next.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I know that the members opposite have a degree of experience with respect to the use of anhydrous ammonia, but I think that what they are not appreciating is the fact that members on this side, who have no experience at all and don't presume to have, though some of those which have already spoken would like to know the answers, and the Minister has not been able to respond to their questions. As a matter of fact, as far as I am aware to date, the best response we got on the question is from the Member for Pembina. So I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that anyone can fault the members of this side who are putting the right kind of questions and are merely seeking answers and some assurances, that the Department of Labour, under the Workplace and Safety and Health Program, is on top of the situation and protecting the public interest. That is all that is being asked for.

Now in the absence of answers from the Minister, we have a very prolonged debate, and I agree with the Member for Virden, that we have been on this subject for a considerable period of time, but only because we're going around the mulberry bush. We don't have the answers coming from the department, we have answers coming from MLAs who are not Ministers, and that makes the whole difference in terms of the procedures of this committee. It is not the Member for Pembina whose salary we are going to be asked to vote; it is the Minister of Labour, and she has a department and I am sure that that department is able to bring forward the information that is being sought by this committee. We don't need the assurances of the MLAs on the other side with respect to the safety or otherwise of anhydrous ammonia. What we need is some answers to the questions that have been put. So it is totally unfair for the Member for Pembina and the Members for Gladstone and Virden, to try to under-rate the questioning on the part of the opposition because those questions are very sincere, and the questions stemming from an incident by the way as I understand it, an incident that took place near Brandon not so long ago, where had the wind direction been other than what it was, it could have been a serious situation. So, I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Brandon East or anyone else who has raised the question, is wrong in raising it, and if there is no danger that's fine, we should know that, and if there is an element of danger then we should know what kind of provisions are being brought forward or exist to deal with that problem.

So we don't need the admonitions of my rural friends opposite, we are well aware of where the answer should come from, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUKE: Mr. Chairman, we've been told by a number of people that they have handled anhydrous ammonia and undoubtedly they've handled it as farmers. I'm wondering if the people who say that they are experts in this field, know the details of the death at Paul's Hauling, if they understood what happened there, and the person who died didn't know, that's the point, the person who died didn't know about anhydrous ammonia, saw a leaking tap, went to explore it, assuming that he could take a look and he inhaled a very lethal gas and died. That's the point. That person didn't know. —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: They should ban automobiles.

MR. PARASIUK: No, all I'm saying is that this person was working in a yard where anhydrous ammonia was being handled, was curious, saw a leak, thought he could investigate it, rather than keeping away from it, went to it, which is often a normal reaction on the part of people. It wasn't the industry at that stage that decided that they would tighten up their own internal regulations here. It was the Federal Department of Labour Safety Inspection Officer who pushed for tighter education of the staff who are involved at a place, and it was, and I'd invite the experts to go check. —(Interjection)— No, I think that's an important function that that person performed and I do give the industry credit for responding, and I think the industry may, in fact, be dealing with the way in which it is handling the material quite well, and I think that those people who are used to it, may be handling it quite well. But no one's answered the question of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, are there contingency plans if there's a large scale leak? What if the wind isn't blowing in the right direction? I don't know what to do, I don't know if our learned experts here know what to do because we are dealing about a public safety problem, and it doesn't relate to those people in the industry, it relates to the community at large.

Now, we've had other instances where tank cars overturned, and you've had a chlorine gas cloud float over a community. Then it becomes a community problem, and that's the concern that the fire chief at Dauphin expressed. It is that type of concern that people have been expressing, and I think given the large scale increase in usage of anhydrous ammonia, and the fact that larger amount are being stored, larger amounts are being transferred, this is a very valid set of questions to ask.

Now it may turn out that some of the members opposite don't want to spend the time on it, but I would think that those people who are involved in Dauphin, the people who raised their concerns, the next of kin of some of the people involved are in fact concerned. And I notice, and I can appreciate the comments of the Member for Pembina, I think where possible you can have a lot of industry procedures, but my point is that the industry won't take into account the larger public health and safety issues which in fact have been raised by other people. I think that in that instance it's important for the government to take a look to ensure that the public safety, the larger public safety aspects have been looked at and are satisfactory.

And we still haven't been told if a contingency plan exists. We still haven't been told whether in fact people who might have to deal with an emergency are in a position to do so. And the Member for Pembina said that I shouldn't be critical of the department or I shouldn't be critical of the Minister because he got information that the Minister or the department didn't get, and probably couldn't get, or didn't get because it wasn't directed to do so. Well, I would like to point out to that member that questions regarding anhydrous ammonia were raised four and five weeks ago. I would expect that if these questions are raised —(Interjection)— No, they weren't all answered, with all due respect, and I think you should check through Hansard carefully on this, that's what —(Interjection)— No, no, I think that if you read through Hansard, if you look at the record, you'll find that those answers weren't provided. —(Interjection)— I'm not talking about the farmers per se, and that's one of the things that the Member for Emerson has a hard time fathoming, I think he's been programmed to say one phrase throughout this evening's session and I'm talking about the public health aspects. And I think it's important for those to be raised.

Now if in fact the Minister is saying that the regulations and programs which the Member for Pembina has raised, if in fact these are sufficient from the public health perspective, then I think it's incumbent upon us to look at those regulations which we have not seen, which she has said that she'll provide to us, and analyze them and determine whether in fact that's true. But we have had to wait four or five weeks to get hold of them, and I think this arose out of very straight forward questioning. I can recall when the Member for Brandon East first raised it, raised it in a manner that sought information, was given answers, sought more answers, it's a normal process in the Legislature and it operates well. And I think that after four or five weeks of questions and answers, we are starting to get some answers, so obviously the procedure is working, obviously they're working. But the question is why aren't we getting answers from the Minister? And that's a very important point that we are raising. I still have not received an answer as to whether in fact there are contingency plans available for a large scale leak of anhydrous ammonia near a settled community. Do we have such plans available? Is the Emergency Measures Organization in charge of it or would that be something that would be left to the individual police or fire departments in a community? That is a very critical question and it still hasn't been answered, and it's been asked a number of times already.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. PARASIUK: Is the Minister going to respond to that last question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: First of all, these men keep saying that they are not getting any answers, the Member for Transcona, the Member for Wellington, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Member for Brandon East. You've been getting answers given to you in and out of the House as the Member for Virden has said for a number of days now. I don't know what you're expecting for answers. You were given the report from my department. You've been given sensible oral reports from my colleagues this afternoon and again this evening and you're still not satisfied.

The death that happened in 1977 happened when your government was in office, and I wonder what you did. You didn't make any loud noises and create big waves like you're doing now when that death occurred, and I don't know why you're going at it at this strength now. The man that died last year, died while trying to repair the fitting on his truck. He worked for Paul's Hauling, and he was trying to repair the leak using a vice grip instead of using a wrench and he went in alone, where the regulations say there should be two men, but I don't hear any of you people making loud noises about that, nor did my colleagues hear you last year when the accident happened.\$

With regard to contingency plans' I would like to advise the Member for Transcona that that is the responsibility of the municipality. If they want contingency plans, they are the ones that look after it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I really don't want to prolong the discussion on the subject of anhydrous ammonia, but you know, I've been in the House for — (Interjection)— No, I don't know all about it, —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, you see, the interjection by the Member for Emerson is the reason why we've been sitting here for so long on this subject, because with all respect, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister of Finance and others who've been in this Legislature for many years, I don't remember as many interruptions from the government side of the members of the opposition when they are trying to ask questions or to debate a subject.

Well, you see, Mr. Chairman, it is very unusual in the review of Estimates for members of the government side to sit there, intimidate members of the opposition who have a responsibility to the taxpayers of this province to keep the government honest. We were told this when we were in government. We were told that the purpose of the opposition was to keep the government honest and that is what we are trying to do. We've got an item which is \$2.4 million And you see, this interjection again, you see, is something that I consider unparliamentary. It's a procedure that we've not been overly accustomed to. It's grown up in this particular Session, and it is this reason, Mr. Chairman, that we're here so long, because members opposite continue to debate. I enjoyed the presentation by the Member for Pembina, I learned something. It was a good presentation, and I say it was very good. But I think it's incredible that a backbencher on the government side take 10, 15, 20 minutes to do this. I have no objections, but if I were the Government House Leader, I would be very concerned that the backbenchers on the government side were the people that were keeping us in committee.

The Government House Leader the other day said, well, when we want to get on to the next department or whatever, it was up to the opposition. You know, if we'd stop talking, we'd get on, but I would submit, Mr. Chairman, it's not the opposition that's taking up so much time as members on the government side, and particularly when you get comments like we're now getting from the Member for Emerson, who causes to be more concerned perhaps than we would be otherwise. Certainly making hostile, aggravating remarks which, in my humble opinion, does not lead to enlightened, rational debate and discourse, with the Minister who is here asking the taxpayers of Manitoba for \$2,420,500 for workplace safety and health, and if the members opposite, the members of the government side want to continue to goad and intimidate with their remarks the members of the opposition who are trying to keep the government "honest," then I would say we'll be here a great deal longer than we would have to be otherwise. We'll be here a long, long time, Mr. Chairman, we'll be here a long, long time. I say, Mr. Chairman, either there's got to be more order here or else we're never going to get through this in due time. Well, you see, the members are already interjecting, "oh, yes, we will," showing they are going to force some type of closure, they are going to force some type of closure, they are going to intimidate us some how or other to get through this.

Mr. Chairman, the living, walking, horror story from Roblin is going to tell it the way he sees it about his horror stories from Roblin but, Mr. Chairman, it was inferred that there are more accidents, people die for other reasons and so why are we so concerned about anhydrous ammonia. You know more people died in automobile accidents, so maybe we shouldn't be concerned with

anhydrous ammonia. Well that type of reasoning just doesn't follow. If more people are dying in automobile accidents, we should be very concerned about attempting to lessen automobile accidents, whether they be on the highway or in the city. It has nothing to do whether there are more accidents in some other field of endeavour than anhydrous ammonia, it has nothing to do with the requirement for people elected by the citizens of Manitoba to bring into play any regulation that might increase the level of safety and I think this is what is expected of us, and again I don't know why the Minister and her colleagues, the backbenchers on the government side are so defensive about the matter.

The fact is that while the farmers in Manitoba may be very competent in handling this, and maybe there are companies that are training their employees, the fact is that there have been a number of incidents in the last year. The Minister of Labour says, well, you know, this accident that occurred at Paul's Hauling at Brandon last year was while we were government. All right, so it did. I would also point out that it was the New Democratic Party that brought in the workplace safety and health legislation because we wanted to provide the basis for improving safe conditions in this type of situation. So be it. But we've had an incident in Dauphin. We've had an accident in Killarney. Fortunately no one was killed. We had the recent accident in Brandon, where members of the RCMP and Emergency Measures Organization had to scurry around the east side of Brandon and down the lower road to Shilo to warn people that there was a low-lying mist coming at them known as anhydrous ammonia and that if they saw it they should get out of there but fast. Well, we're talking about therefore people who don't know what anhydrous ammonia may be. We're talking about innocent residents, innocent citizens who may be just minding their own business and an accident should happen to occur in their particular town or their particular place of abode, and therefore it is important, Mr. Chairman, that we go beyond what the corporations do. I'm not suggesting that the corporations are irresponsible, not at all. I commend them for whatever they've done. I'm sure the owners of Paul's Hauling are very concerned and are very, very determined that their employees are going to know everything there is to know about handling this material, and that anyone they deal with should know about this material too because it can be very fatal. So I'm not calling the corporations irresponsible. I commend them for any efforts they have engaged in to educate people in the handling of this.

But I think we have to recognize that they have a function. They have a purpose, and their purpose is to sell the material. Someone mentioned that at certain times of the year they're so busy that the drivers even work overtime and they don't get very many hours of sleep and accidents do happen. Well, I think, you know, right there is something to be concerned. How many hours of sleep should a driver of a truck —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Roblin is interjecting again and the Member for Emerson is interjecting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, including the Member for Roblin, will you please give the Member for Brandon East the courtesy of being listened to?

MR. EVANS: So we must understand that the purpose of those corporations that produce and handle this product is to sell and they do have a very short season, as we were told today by the Member for Pembina. We happened to know that before anyway but there is a short season. And there are problems with drivers not getting enough sleep. And we were told this, I believe, if I heard the Member for Pembina properly this afternoon. The fact that they didn't have enough sleep is one reason why you can have accidents. So, you know, it seems to me that that is an area that the Minister and her staff might wish to be concerned about. I'd like to know what the Minister has to say about the number of hours a truck driver hauling anhydrous ammonia — is there some regulation or is there some stipulation by her department as to how many hours of rest that a driver must have before he goes out with another load? Well, this is not unusual, Mr. Chairman, because these types of regulations are in effect in many types of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I'm suggesting that we can't depend on the corporations or the companies alone to fulfill the role. The problem is much bigger than any one company. Sure, let the company do what they can, and that's good but, you know, we have to go beyond that. I have been advised by a number of people in this area that there should be clarity of regulations, that there is duplication and overlapping of jurisdictions, federal, provincial, municipal, that there is a bit of a hodgepodge with regard to the regulations and that they should be clarified. Maybe that will mean less regulations than more to clarify because everybody seems to have their regulations, but it has been suggested to me by someone in the field who knows something about this that it would be worthwhile for the Minister to consider the licensing of handlers of this material and I think it's incumbent on the —(Interjection)—you know, Mr. Chairman, here we go again. You know, I can hardly hear myself speak for certain members opposite interjecting —(Interjection)—Well, either we're in a democratic legislative assembly or we're not. Do you want to shut me up and say let's go on? Fine, that's what they do in Russia. You guys are so concerned about Russia but you're doing a damned good

job of being the dictators. You're doing a very good job of being dictators, Mr. Chairman, and I think, Mr. Chairman, it's incumbent upon you to keep some order in this Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, please give the member who is recognized by the Chairman the courtesy of being listened to.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that it is incumbent upon the Minister to recognize that the situation is likely going to get more serious in the future. This was not something I dreamt up; this is something that I was told by someone who believes he has some considerable knowledge in the field, and that person is not a civil servant either. So I'm conveying that to you. So I have very specific questions to the Minister. One, I would like to know whether — as I've indicated a minute ago — whether there is a regulation or some type of suggestion made by the department, if not regulations, is there some suggestions made by the department to the truckers of this material that the drivers have adequate breaks from handling the material because it is a very short season and there is a tendency to drive very hard to sell the stuff at that time. That's No. 1.

No. 2, does the Minister have a report on the recent accident in the east end of Brandon and, if she does, would she be prepared to table it at this Committee? That's the second one. And the third question . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just before the Member for Brandon East carries on, I can't pass up the opportunity to ask the Member for Lac du Bonnet if he would show some courtesy to the Member for Brandon East?

MR. CHERNIACK: On that point of order, it's usually the members opposite that are antagonizing him but . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order it's very difficult not to respond to the Member for Emerson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will get your opportunity. The Member for Brandon East, please carry on.

MR. EVANS: Yes, I don't know whether the Minister heard the second point, and the third one, I was wondering if the Minister could advise us if she has that information from her staff, what were the circumstances surrounding the accident in Killarney. I believe a farmer was transporting the material from a plant to his farm and there was an accident, I believe, on a bridge. I don't know the details and I wondered if the Minister could tell us what the circumstances were regarding this particular accident. So those are three specific requests. that I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour. . You're on the list, but there are two before you.

MRS. PRICE: I agree with the Member for Brandon East that it was his government that brought in the Workplace Safety Act but I think he's under the wrong illusion — the anhydrous ammonia doesn't come in under the Workplace Safety; it comes in under the mechanical and engineering department.

Secondly —(Interjection)— It was in effect before the Workplace Safety came into being. The hours of rest for truck drivers would come under the Highway Traffic Act but I can assure the honourable members of the opposition that one thing that this government won't do is legislate sleep so . . .

And with regard to the accident in Killarney we have not had any report of it so I can't tell you anything about it. There's been nothing sent in to our department.

MR. EVANS: There was one other one that I'd asked whether. . .

MRS. PRICE: You asked one for the east end corner of traffic.

MR. EVANS: Yes, the tabling of a report on that one.

MRS. PRICE: Do you have anything on that? The east corner of Brandon? Do you know of an accident there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was that to the Member for Brandon East? Does the Minister understand your question that's outstanding?

MR. EVANS: Yes, I'll just repeat . . .

MRS. PRICE: Could you be more specific about this accident because the director doesn't seem to know about it either.

MR. EVANS: Yes, well this is the one that occurred a couple of weeks ago where on a Friday morning, I believe, and it involved the railway tank car and we discussed it.

MRS. PRICE: The one where the car pulled away? The one that we were discussing in the House?

MR. EVANS: And I'm wondering does the department, does the Workplace Safety and Health Division have a report on this which includes the Mechanical and Engineering I see, and if there is a report, would the Minister be prepared to table that with the Committee?

MRS. PRICE: I'll take it as notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I think, perforce required to harken back to some of the questions that I asked of the Minister earlier in the evening. Members on the opposite side seem to consider the conduct of members of the opposition to be scandalous I note —(Interjection)— scandalous is the term. Well, I think that they should appreciate that the reason that this particular aspect of debate has been, if it has been so protracted and prolonged, it's only as a result, as my learned friend from Transcona said, and Lac du Bonnet as well, that as a result of the Minister's seeming — I won't say inability — but I will say seeming lack of motivation to respond to the questions that are put to her. This question has been before us a considerable amount of time and I don't think, for instance, when I ask a question about enforcement standards that there's any good reason why the Minister of the Crown should not be able at this particular juncture to respond candidly, openly and quickly, and advise us of what sort of standards of enforcement are in fact in force in this province. As a matter of fact I would even allow her to say that if the standards of enforcement were not up to snuff, were in her opinion not sufficient, it would be well within her purview on the conduct of her office to suggest that that were the fault of the previous government and not the present one. But that's not what she said. She takes questions as notice that one would think she would have at her fingertips, and I don't mean to be brutal but I suggest that that is what is protracting these proceedings. So I for one again want to find out what these standards of enforcement are.

How do we know that the public interest is safeguarded? The Member for Pembina' who seems to be providing some sort of reasonable assistance to the Minister, indicates that the industry is largely under some sort of voluntary code. The Honourable Minister has suggested in response to questions from me earlier this evening that there is in fact legislative sanction. Now there seems to be a lot of confusion over this point. I pointed out that the reporter, the investigative reporter at CBC seemed to be doing somersaults and cartwheels over this point. There's been lengthy examination and there still is not before this Committee or any public forum an accurate detailed answer and I think that's really what we're trying to drive at. I appreciate that there is an American National Standards Institute safety requirement that is somehow adhered to in the Province of Manitoba. What I do not know is whether it is made mandatory under legislation and, if so, and I believe that is what the Minister told me — she said that it was mandatory — then I ask what in fact is the enforcement sanction? What happens if somebody breaches this particular regulation? You know, some of the people seem to think that we're launching, that we on this side are launching a diatribe against farmers. Not so. I for one would willingly preserve the life of a farmer as much as the life of any urban Manitoban and when we hear about situations that entail the possible great risk to hundreds, if not thousands, of rural residents as a result of the possibility of spills of this particular substance I think that we should all become quite concerned and I think we should become quite inquisitive of what standards do in fact apply in this respect in this province.

This isn't a question, as some people have suggested, of bureaucratizing the farm. I mean that is an irrational response to a very serious problem. We're not trying to bureaucratize any farm. What we're trying to do is quite simply make sure that people down on the farm or in rural communities are not exposed to unnecessary danger. Now one would think after two, three, or four weeks that the Minister would evince the same concern and she would do so at her Estimates. The Minister invited us during the question period not too long ago to ask these detailed questions during her Estimates. I very definitely remember the invitation because that's what it was. She asked

Monday, June 12, 1978

us to refrain from asking detailed questions during the question period in order that they could be more properly put in this forum. Well, that is what members on this side are now and have been for some time attempting to do but without any affirmative response. We're seemingly unable to get a detailed definitive response as to what the standards in this province are. Now, I have noted that there is confusion between the responses of the Minister and other members, and I think this is quite significant as well. I will allow that the Member for Pembina has given us what I consider to be a fairly comprehensive statement with respect to handling of this particular chemical, but I would suggest that there seems to be a bit of confusion, yes, as between the responses of the Minister and the Member for Pembina. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Now, one of the members I think, tried to make a point of the fact that, as he said, accidents resulting of human error have no place in the halls of government — somebody said it's like driving a car, you know. Well, first of all, I don't want to belabor a subject, but we do license drivers. Driving in this province and everywhere else that I know of is a privilege and it is administered by the state, and that is because although the automobile is not as inherently dangerous as anhydrous ammonia, it's still in the hands of an untrained individual and does present a possibility of grievous harm. It can be the instrument of grave harm if not properly handled.

I would suggest in a situation where we have a substance which, because of its very nature, it's so inherently dangerous, that because of one human's error in handling, many hundreds of thousands of human beings could be killed or injured, then I suggest that it's quite reasonable to expect that —(Interjection)— hundreds or thousands, if we're talking about a city the size of Brandon, and a substantial leak of gas in that area, obviously we're talking about a risk to thousands of people; that is what we're discussing and that is what we are trying to safeguard. So I don't think it's beyond the realm of reason to ask this Minister what standards in fact are in force in this province, and what she and her department are able to do within those guidelines.

Now I also asked her earlier, what terms of reference she would be establishing for her review. She has indicated several times now, in the media, in the House, and here, that there is a review ongoing, and I must say that I presume that that indicates that she is concerned, but I don't think it's untoward of members on this side to ask what the terms of reference are. Surely, there will be some terms of reference established for the review, and surely there has been enough time to give us some general guidelines in this regard. So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister again to provide us with this information in order that we not find ourselves stuck on this particular item of the Estimates and that we would be able to move forward as expeditiously as possible perhaps the Minister having heard that can respond and we can move forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour wants to respond first; the Minister of Finance is next.

MRS. PRICE: I can't see how the members of the opposition can sit there and say that they have not had definitive answers. You've had answers to everything that you have asked about, as to what the regulations are and how they are enforced, and I have answered them. My department has ensured me the regulations are being enforced; the personnel, the mechanical engineers and in the workplace safety, assure me that the regulations are concise, are appropriate, and they are being very closely enforced by the inspectors. I have told the gentlemen numerous times that I have answered these questions, and I think I have now answered all the questions that I intend to answer about anhydrous ammonia.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of discussion going back and forth here as to whether questions are being answered or not answered, and I get the impression that even if they are answered, the answers may not be acceptable, in which case they are deemed to be not answers. But in total now, the other departments and Labour, we're now up in total in Estimates' time to 235 hours. At one time we had a limit of 90 hours on Estimates until a matter of 3 or 4 years ago. The Member for Kildonan will recall changes that were made wherein we eliminated the hours but then decided to run two committees, and to go to unlimited time, and also put in a section clause 65(15) in the rule book to be applied if and when deemed necessary or desirable. Inasmuch as we've reached this limit which now is at the point of setting an all-time record for time total, and we still have a number of departments to go through in the Estimates, and a number of I am sure will take us into the position where we're probably up to 300 or more hours on Estimates, compared to the old 90-hour limit. We have spent at this time in Labour, about 16 hours probably

out of that, which again is fairly close, I guess probably more than has ever been spent before; perhaps it is or isn't.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, in accordance with 65(15) of our rules, I am going to move, seconded by the Member for Virden, that the entire Estimates of the Department of Labour, except Clause (1)(a) be voted on within a period of two hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is non-debatable. All in favour? Yeas or Nays. Call in the members. *Committee retired to the House*

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw the members' attention to Page 42, Health and Social Development. We are on Clause 7.(d)(1)Salaries—pass — The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Prior to the Private Members' Hour, Mr. Chairman, the Minister had started to mention the results of the Management Audit, which was initiated last summer. The Minister seemed to have expressed some opinion that the results of this audit led to some improvements in the system. I wonder if the Minister could expand briefly on this subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Before I do, I'd like to make one correction. When the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre asked me late this afternoon what the populations were in the three juvenile facilities: The Manitoba Youth Centre, Seven Oaks and Agassiz, and I gave him the current figures, I said those were yesterday's figures. I wish to correct that, Mr. Chairman, they were the figures for Friday, June 9th, yesterday being obviously Sunday, June 11th. The figures that I gave the honourable member and that are now on the record are for Friday, June 9th. I just want to make that one technical correction.

The Youth Centre was the subject of some wide ranging assessment, and perhaps unofficial criticism and examination from time to time in recent years as a result of some difficulties that seem to be experienced there on occasion, and the result of some particular incidents that developed and received some publicity. I am not suggesting that it was the subject of criticism by experts, but it fell certainly into the category of those situations and conditions in our society and in the public domain generally, which are continually the subject of criticism by non-experts. And as a consequence, it was much in the news at one time and of concern to the previous Minister and certainly of concern to our party in opposition, and concern to me when I assumed the stewardship of the ministry. And I met early in my period of responsibility with my Deputy-Minister, Dr. John Banmen, on the subject of the Manitoba Youth Centre, and what was happening there and what the directions were, and what, if any, the difficulties were.

A management audit was undertaken and implemented last year, 1977, and ranged over a wide area of the Youth's Centre's function and operations culminated in a report that was made to me on the 16th of November which contained a number of recommendations for improvement of the situation at the Youth Centre. There were recommendations that identified difficulties perceived by those in the department and in the system who had carried out the audit under the initiation of the Deputy Minister. Those recommendations had to do with delineation of discipline, delineation of lines of authority, delineation of directions of handling and administration of the population in the Centre, the whole question of access to medical, psychiatric, and psychological services for residents, the question of the length of stay and comparative lengths of stay, the staffing patterns at the institution, procedures for admission, staff morale, lines of communication and inter-communication among the staff, and upward and downward from the directing administrative personnel and subjects of that nature.

The audit produced a number of recommendations. Basically the objective of the audit was to make recommendations relative to the following areas of concern: the purpose of the Centre and an overview of its operation, structural reorganization, institutional procedures, policy and planning activities, and agency liaison. The completed audit, as I say, Mr. Chairman, was submitted to me on November 16th. A number of the recommendations were approved and in consultation with my Deputy Minister and subsequent consultation between Dr. Banmen and the superintendent of the facility they were implemented either totally or in part, and have been in practice at the Youth Centre since late last year.

The result has been extremely gratifying. The perhaps most significant and dramatic result is seen in a reduction in what has been pretty much a chronic and perennial condition of overcrowding at the Youth Centre. In terms of average number of residents per day we have seen where in January, 1978 over 1977, there was an increase in that figure of 3.54 residents. In February of 1978 over

Monday, June 12, 1978

1977, the Centre achieved a decrease of 13.4. In March of 1978, as compared to 1977, the Centre reflected a decrease of 13.2 and in April, 1978 as against April, 1977, the totals reflected a decrease or reduction of 27.56 residents.

One area that was examined very closely had to do with child welfare and peak residence of those who were in the Youth Centre under Child Welfare legislation and by comparison, those who were there under the Juvenile Delinquents Act, and under the previous policy of weekly court review, the peak daily count for child welfare residents through January, February and March of 1978 ranged from 61 to 75; in April and May of 1978 under the new 14 day accountability to court procedure, the peak daily count stabilized at 53. Under JDA, under the previous policy without monitoring, 1977 peak count ranged for the period January through May, between 128 and 142; this year in 1978 under the new weekly probation monitoring procedure, it has ranged from January to May between 118 and 126.

Staff absenteeism has improved substantially based on sick time. In 1977, for the 8 week period March and April, there were 225 days absent recorded; 1978, the corresponding 8 week period, 133.5 days absent, for a reduction in sick time of 49.5 percent. Overtime is substantially down. In 1977, overtime in March and April totalled 740.5 hours; the corresponding period in 1978, 157.5 total hours.

The regular staff turnover rate — this is resident units we're talking about — has improved. The pre-audit yearly turnover, 1976 and 1977, approximated 50 percent. The post-audit turnover for six months has been 5 out of 70, which projects to a yearly turnover of 14 percent.

Security has been tightened substantially. The escape rate is probably the best indicator of these improved security procedures. From January to May, 1977, there were nine escapes by residents from the premises. From January to May, 1978, one escape by residents from the premises. There has also been a noticeable reduction in property damage at the Centre since the implementation of the audit recommendations. So that what's happened, Mr. Chairman, is that the audit itself identified, produced some definitions of specific problems which were met in concept by the development of a new approach. That approach was implemented and I would suggest that the results speak for themselves, at least thus far, in terms of an improved record relative to almost every facet of the Youth Centre's operation.

As I've suggested, the audit has resulted in improvements up to this point, but that's not to suggest or to imply that this is the end of the matter, that we're satisfied, and that we feel now that we can rest on our laurels. On the contrary, the Centre will pursue a number of objectives on a continuing basis. Those objectives are as follows, Sir. Institutional security The staff, in concert with officials under the Deputy Minister will develop and maintain clear and precise security guidelines; in the field of resident and staff safety, we intend to implement effective safety practices and remove or modify safety hazards; in the field of emergency response, we intend to outline procedures, resources and equipment and develop staff familiarity and competence through regular, scheduled practice; in the field of programming, we intend to involve juveniles in recreational, educational and social programs appropriate to individual needs and institutional capabilities, perhaps more so than was possible under some of the overcrowded conditions of the past; in the field of community liaison, we hope to develop an effective liaison with all agencies responsible for the provision of institutional and resident goods and services; in the field of staff support, a vital field to be sure, we intend to provide professional and managerial support and resources for staff training and development, improved skills, interaction with residents and liaison with outside agencies.

Over and above that, Sir, there have been institutional procedures invoked, there have been planning and policy activities arranged and invoked, there has been some structural re-organization and the total restructuring has resulted in more consistent supervision of juveniles and has streamlined daily operations to provide more recognition and accountability for cottage staff. There is not the question, at the present time, that may have existed in the past as to where the lines of authority culminated, where the fulcrum of discipline reposed, and who was running the plant, if that in fact was a condition contributing to some of the malaise or some of the perceived demoralization that was reported upon in a number of instances in the past. That does not exist today. As a consequence of a positive response to the management audit by the administration of the Youth Centre and the very conscientious implementation of recommendations such as those to which I've referred and others, there now is a better, tighter, more efficient operation from the point of view of discipline, authority, respect, communication and understanding. And that applies not only to the juveniles who are detained there, but throughout the staff generally.

So I think, Sir, although there are still some question marks that surround the Manitoba Youth Centre, that substantial effort has been made and substantial success has been achieved in improving some of the threats of the past to an effective and well-balanced operation. There is no question that overcrowding is one of the worst and most destructive contributing factors to proper morale and proper discipline. I suppose that overcrowding is a product, a result of factors and conditions existing in our juvenile justice system that spill over into other areas that we have to look at and

we can't really tackle the overcrowding problem simply by dealing with the Youth Centre situation by itself and in isolation. But there have been some things done and it has been possible to attack the overcrowding situation to a degree through measures implemented at the Centre, and the results of that campaign along with the other recommendations to which I have referred, I think speak for themselves.

There have been numerous repetitions, particularly in the media, of the question over the past few years, directed to the previous Minister, and directed to me, as to what really is the purpose of the Manitoba Youth Centre, and what is the definition of its role, and are we really ambivalently mixing two or more functions in that facility. I want to say for the record, Sir, that in the view of this government and in view of this Minister, the purpose of the Centre is to provide care, custody, and assessment of juveniles, and treatment upon request. It's not basically a treatment facility. Specific functions within each of these broad guidelines will be carefully detailed.

The Centre also acts as a shelter for uncontrollable or neglected juveniles admitted under the terms of The Federal Juvenile Delinquents Act and The Manitoba Child Welfare Act. I think that the re-establishment of security and stability at the Centre has gone a long way to minimize some of the public criticism of the past. The goal in the re-establishment of those conditions has been the achievement of the philosophy of correcting unacceptable juvenile behaviour, of getting back' or perhaps that's the wrong term, but of re-emphasizing the concept of the Youth Centre as a component of a system that is aimed at correcting unacceptable behaviour, an approach, a philosophy that perhaps has not been as practical to apply in some situations as we would have wished. So that's the current situation on the Manitoba Youth Centre, Mr. Chairman. I can't at this juncture propose to the honourable member and members opposite that this government is contemplating the construction of another facility for errant, uncontrollable or unsheltered youth. We believe that the Youth Centre can be made to function and to dovetail into the juvenile correction system properly and effectively, and that with the lines of function and lines of purpose properly defined, there need not be the kind of muddying of the waters that perhaps all of us contributed to in rushing to judgment of the Youth Centre in the past.

But there's one thing certain, that overcrowding must be avoided if the facility is going to work, and it's in that area that perhaps the most meaningful and significant results with the broadest ramifications have occurred. We need the support of the entire juvenile justice system and the support of a positive and constructive philosophy among those practising in the juvenile correction system to ensure that we can keep the population at a reasonable level so that we don't continually reinvent the problems that overcrowding brings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with things which were somewhat nebulous, it is often difficult to evaluate whether your efforts have been worth anything or not and sitting listening to the Minister, I can come to the conclusion that some of our efforts in this particular area have paid off. But it is worthy of note that the Minister keeps emphasizing that overcrowding of this establishment is one of the things which mitigates against it fulfilling its role.

It was established, initially, the Minister says, as a place of assessment rather than to hold people for any length of time, and I understand that he is in a position that he can't assure us that we can look forward to the day that all CAS children will be removed from this establishment. My personal preference and goal was to try and develop such a system. But it should go on the record, Mr. Chairman, that what the Minister has just reported to the House and the people of the Province of Manitoba is that we didn't need any outside experts to carry out an analysis of what should be done when problems arise.

I wish to give public credit to the people who really were involved in ascertaining what the difficulty was and to make concrete recommendations as to how to resolve the problems: Dr. John Banmen, the Deputy Minister, and Mr. Stu Hunter, Director of Correctional Services for Juveniles, and Mr. John Bock, and others I will admit at the moment but nevertheless Mr. John Bock, the Acting Superintendent of the Manitoba Youth Centre. But in giving credit to these individuals and in carrying out an analysis and making the recommendations to the Minister, now that he has followed through on, has reconfirmed my faith in the ability of these people to perform professionally and to do good work.

But the Minister earlier today alluded to some difficulty in the Youth Centre, and I also want to mention this briefly. But I think the Minister would agree that in the final analysis he has to accept the responsibility for what occurs within the system, and while I have the highest of regard for the staff, I didn't come across anybody who could walk on water. And the former superintendent of the Youth Centre, Mr. Gerhardt Suss, did as best he could, I thought, with the resources we were able to deploy for his benefit.

But the changes which have been brought about have been a long time in coming. Maybe the

Monday, June 12, 1978

Minister recalls that the march that took place on the Legislature a good number of years ago, before confrontation and banner waving was the mode of expression of the day, where people wanted the juveniles out of the Youth Centre or the Vaughan Street Detention Centre, what it was called at that particular time, so we have made some inroads.

But this is somewhat in contradiction to what the Minister said earlier, and I don't want to go back to that item, Mr. Chairman, I would be out of order. But the Minister has emphasized that the way to deal with these young people properly is to try to deal with them in an uncrowded position with a capable, competent staff, and the key to this is the deployment of people out of this institution to probation and such services which would keep them out of there as much as possible and yet the Minister has placed less emphasis in his budgetary requests than on keeping people in institutions.

Perhaps the Minister can comment on just exactly where the long long delay stands relative to the new Act which was supposed to have replaced The Juvenile Delinquency Act. The priorities of the Federal Government some four years ago was that they were going to revise The Juvenile Delinquency Act by a new Act called The Young People in Conflict with the Law, but it kept slipping down to Capital Punishment and The Gun Law. It always seemed to be bumped aside. And I know in this regard the staff of other departments of Health and Social Development in this particular area were actively involved, in fact were leaders in the field, and made positive definite contributions to the revamping of this Act. I wonder if the Minister could advise us at this time where this particular revision stands?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the so-called young offenders' legislation is still in the hands of the Federal Solicitor-General, the Honourable Jean-Jacques Blais, and has not surfaced in final proposal or presentation form either to the Parliament of Canada or to the Ministers of the respective provinces responsible for child welfare and for juvenile corrections.

The meeting that I attended in Ottawa in early March of Provincial Welfare Ministers was largely committed to consideration of a new method of funding, commonly known as block funding, as we all recognize it, in the social services field, but it also contained an item on the agenda, Mr. Chairman, under which the Solicitor-General was to appear before the Provincial Ministers and deal and discuss with us the proposed young offenders legislation. I had been familiarized with some of it prior to going to the meeting, because of course the Deputy Minister of Corrections had received a good deal of preliminary material on the proposed legislation and had discussed it with me, but the opportunity was most inappropriate as it turned out, for consideration of such an important and profound subject at that particular Federal-Provincial meeting. It was on the bottom end of the agenda, it followed a period of two days of pretty intensive argument about the pros and cons of block funding — most of them cons as far as the Province of Manitoba was concerned — and there was neither spirit nor inclination, nor in fact sufficient information, to inspire the Ministers at the conference to launch at that juncture into an exhaustive examination of what the Solicitor-General was proposing. It was requested by many of us at that meeting that he detail his proposals and his response to some of our already recorded objections, and communicate with us and our Deputy Ministers, and the respective Attorneys-General of the provinces in the intervening months prior to trying to reach any consensus among the provinces on the legislation itself, and that's where the process stands at the present time.

I'm not certain whether the Solicitor-General intends to introduce a proposed bill into the House of Commons before he meets with or consults further with provincial Ministers. I cannot testify to the preciseness of his intentions in that regard, but certainly the process at this juncture stands at the point where we want more input, more discussion, more consultation — when I say we, I mean the majority of the ten provinces, but far a majority, in fact it was very close to being a unanimous position — prior to proceeding with endorsement of a legislative concept of this kind.

Our biggest objection I would have to say, seems to be the financial one. The proposed legislation implies and involves a substantial amount of professional service and input from the provincial corrections and court systems themselves, which is going to cost taxpayers in all provinces additional to what they have been previously assessed in this area, and there has been no firm guarantee or commitment up to this point to my knowledge, from the Federal Government, as to how this whole service is going to be funded. Certainly if it's going to be lumped into the general block funding for social services, we would have to object very strenuously to that. If Ottawa is proposing a separate block fund, or cost-sharing, for servicing of young offenders and meeting the needs of the juvenile court system, then that's a different thing. But that has not been spelled out in terms of dollars and cents, in terms of how much Ottawa envisions it's costing the different provinces, in terms of how much financial support we can expect from Ottawa, and so at this juncture although a worthy concept, the whole proposal is hung up in unresolved questions, and unresolved matters of dispute.

Monday, June 12, 1978

I would expect there would be some progress made on it this year, but whether it will come before Parliament recesses for the summer, and in fact whether it will come even before the call of the next federal election, is a question mark. There will be progress made on it nonetheless, because the provincial ministers themselves, who wish to exchange wider consultation among ourselves as to what the strengths and weaknesses of the federal proposal are, but I can't give my honourable friend anything more definitive on it than that at this juncture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, thus far we've had a very peaceful sharing of exchanges about how well things are going. I'd like to take a somewhat different tack because I have a suspicion that below the surface there are some things going on that the Minister isn't telling us about which have some pretty long range implications for the provision of juvenile services in this province. And that if what my suspicions bear out, then I would have some very strong objections to the directions in which we're going, and I would say my suspicions are grounded, one, on the general fact that most of the things that this government is doing to cut costs usually end up in the reduction of services, and I would have to assume just because it's been 100 percent consistent up to now, that the same kind of tricks of the trade are being employed to find ways of cutting back services in this area as well.

Now let me start off first, Mr. Chairman, by raising with the Minister two matters that appeared in that great historical document, historical only because I don't think it will have perhaps any practical effect, and that is the Task Force on Reorganization. But they do have two very serious recommendations concerning this area, and it would be important to either have the Minister totally disagree with them now, or at least indicate how foolish he thinks they may be.

One is the question of dividing the program up into two different arms of service, allocating the adult offenders responsibilities to the Attorney-General; and the second, taking the juvenile program and applying it to the community operations division of the Department of Health and Social Development, which would seem to me in part, Mr. Chairman, to go against the grain of the integration that took place a few years back to try to bring together the question of corrective services in some form of co-operative and jointly reinforcing fashion.

Beyond that, the one that disturbs me even more, is the recommendation and I hope it is not being treated seriously, and that is to reduce the age and majority of young offenders down to 16, so that they will now be eligible for appearance in the adult courts at the age of 16 as opposed to 18. The reason of course, Mr. Chairman, you'd recognize the irony of that particular recommendation itself, that while most members opposite have been arguing with great vehemence and passion of the need to raise the drinking age to 19, we have a Task Force that is recommending we reduce the age of majority to 16, when it comes to appearance before young offenders in the criminal courts. Now aside from that peculiar irony which I find one that maybe is suitable for members opposite, the fact of the matter is that it would obviously be a cost reducing measure that the government could undertake if it felt so disposed, because it would immediately force a large percentage of its clients, people to deal within the adult court system. The problem of course with that is that the ability to provide corrective services and facilities in the adult system are probably just as woeful there, or perhaps more woeful than they are in the juvenile system, and that there would be a number of, I think very dangerous repercussions arising out of that move.

I would hope that, Mr. Chairman, the Minister might be prepared, before we get down to some other more specific questions about this area to indicate that he proposes to dispense quite quickly with those particular recommendations that have appeared from the deep thinkers that obviously spent at least fifteen seconds glossing over the question of juvenile care in this province and the kind of recommendations that they have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if Corrections is going to be divided, and that certainly hasn't been determined by the present government and won't be until the government has an opportunity to vote itself very intensively after the conclusion of this Session to a wide, wide number of recommendations in the Task Force Report, then the logical way, it seems to me, to divide it would be between the juvenile category and the adult category. And because of the responsibility of the Department of Health and Social Development in the whole childcaring field it seems to me that Juvenile Corrections could naturally, perhaps even should naturally, gravitate to the Department of Health and Social Development, whereas Adult Corrections I could see as logically or coming under the aegis of the Attorney-General's department. But, as I say, that's a Task Force recommendation which has not been analyzed by the government and there is no conclusion on it as yet. I merely suggest that if the experts in the department and in the system recommend to me that that's the

preferable way to proceed in the field of corrections, then I would think that that's a logical division and a logical alignment, Juvenile to Health and Social Development and Adult to Attorney-General. \$\$

As for a reduction in the juvenile age, there's nothing of that sort contemplated by the government, Mr. Chairman, and as far as I can tell there's nothing of that sort contemplated in the Task Force Report — excuse me, not the Task Force Report, in the Young Offenders' legislation. I think the Young Offenders' legislation proposes leaving juvenile ages where they are, and it leaves some flexibility to the individual provinces. In this case it would mean leaving the age at eighteen.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister gave me some satisfaction, but not totally. First, on the question of the reorganizing of the department. As we make our way through the labyrinth of these Estimates, the indication that I get from the Minister is that the question of dismantling the Department of Corrections then is under serious review. What does disturb me about it is that, as is the common case in this Task Force Report, there is absolutely no evidence, rationale, supporting documentation, or anything else to demonstrate why or how it would be an improvement, and I gather from the Minister's remarks that he would want to consult at least with some experts, I think was his word. I would be interested in knowing exactly who he intends to consult with. Obviously the Task Force didn't consult with anybody, or if they did it was very few. We, of course, don't know because we have such an open government that they don't like to disclose exactly who they talk to and therefore we don't want to get into that issue. But the issue is in this question we don't now who was in any way consulted or talked to in this area and therefore we have no way of knowing what the basis for the recommendations are, and I would be interested in knowing from the Minister whether he intends, before any steps are taken to dismantle the Corrections Department, to open this up for some discussion with those in the field, not just in the Civil Service itself but those who are in the broader field of corrections and in the broader field of juvenile care and treatment — whether there is any intention to solicit their opinions and determine whether they think the division into two separate wings would make any sense, and I would ask the Minister when and if and how he intends to do that kind of consulting.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the way the process will work is this: the government will examine under the initiative or the leadership of individual Ministers the respective recommendations relevant to each department. At that juncture I would assume that there would be some recommendations that commend themselves to individual Ministers and so the initiative for serious consideration of some of those recommendations by the Executive Council generally, will go forward at that point.

Others will have the strenuous objection of individual Ministers and so the initiative for rejection of them will go forward at that point. Those that are determined worthy of further consideration I think, and I'm just sketching what I would assume to be a logical scenario here, would be carried further by the individual Ministers in terms of exploring all the positives and the negatives related to them. If it comes down to a point where the Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services is considering the Task Force recommendation to divide Corrections into the form referred to by the honourable member I would then begin intensive consultation with my Deputy Minister and my staff, with the Family Court Judges, Juvenile Court Judges, with the Social Workers, with the Director of Juvenile Corrections, with Probation Services and officers, and weigh the evidence carefully. I would also appreciate the advice of persons who have occupied the office of political stewardship in this field in the past, including the former Minister.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I notice that in that invitation he didn't include opposition critics as part of those whom he's prepared to take advice from but he'll probably get that free anyway. He'll have that — put that right down on it. Who knows?

Well, Mr. Chairman, on the matter then of the reorganization of the department, I assume then that we simply have to go on the grounds that we're in a holding pattern and that the question of the future fate of the Department of Corrections really is in abeyance until this divinity takes place — prosecution, or division, or whatever it may be. I still think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be of some value before that takes place, and if there is to be the kind of consultation that the Minister indicated he would prefer to see happen, that something more than we received in this document in front of us, this Task Force Report, be provided.

I think he would admit that one paragraph suggesting that this is the way the world should go is not sufficient grounds for making major changes of that kind, and if there is to be any form of open discussion then it means that we obviously have to have more available to us, particularly I suppose the recommendation would have to be — the conclusion at least would have to be drawn that what is now in place is not the optimum or maximum mechanism for getting benefits and that therefore something better has to be produced; therefore I think it would be useful to receive exactly

what that assessment is as to what is wrong with it now in order to make improvements or changes on it.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise with the Minister the question which I think, again, I detect a common thread running through these Estimates, and that is that the emphasis, increasingly under this government's stewardship, is towards heavier institutional care, and away from community-related care. And if I read these Estimates properly, it would indicate that there has been a direct freeze on any further expansion of community residential facilities, a total freeze on any further development of alternative care facilities other than those in the big institutions. We heard the figures given this afternoon for the Agassiz and the Seven Oaks and the Youth Treatment Centre; it would strike me, Mr. Chairman, that the numbers of children in the care of these facilities have gone up dramatically. I would be interested in knowing what the comparative numbers reveal over the past five years.

It would strike me that there has been a rejection of the philosophy that the best way to deal with those who are in difficulty under the Juvenile Act may be best cared for in their community setting where they can receive some degree of normalcy as opposed to a heavy institutional setting. I know that pleases some members of the government organization because it's easier to control these things that have their seal on it, you know, buffalo emblems — you can do your organizational game when you have complete control of the institutions. But it does strike me as a little odd for a Minister who has professed his adherence to the concept of volunteerism, to the role of the private sector, to the responsibility and role of getting people involved, that in fact under his stewardship, at least in this area and in other areas, is moving towards more state control, if you like, state institutional care in a lot of areas, and that that seems to be the direction in which we're now going.

I would provide by way of evidence, the proposals that are now being developed, I gather, for the institution of the Remand Attendance Centre, which would be another form of government institution which would provide basically a day work facility for young offenders, and that the moneys used to support this facility would be drawn from the budget that would normally be allocated to the private agencies working in the field or to the community and group facilities, which means there was direct transfer of funds from the so-called volunteer private community sector, back into the government sector under this kind of program. And it would strike me, Mr. Chairman, that that's a little odd if you take what has been said in the past by the Minister concerning his interests in promoting the community volunteer private sector over and against the government sector. Either his speeches are wrong and his actions are right, or his actions are wrong and his speeches are right. And I think we should probably get the two in some kind of accord, because it certainly doesn't seem to be that way now.

What I would like to have from the Minister — which he has not yet supplied, by the way, Mr. Chairman — I think I asked — when did we start these Estimates, six weeks ago? I think on the first week of the Estimates I asked if he would provide us with a listing of the grants that the government intends to give to external agencies and the different fields it supports, and make the comparisons between the 1978-79 grants and the 1976-77 grants. That list has yet to be provided, and I would certainly hope it would be available, Mr. Chairman, before we proceed much further, particularly before we get to the Alcohol Foundation section, where we have some other interesting observations to make.

But that list is not available, so I can't say definitively, but it does strike me while there is a freeze going on as far as the private volunteer sector is concerned, that there is a degree of building up in terms of the government institutional care sector, which is a contradiction, I believe, in what the Minister has stated. So I would be interested in knowing what the actual funding arrangements are and whether he intends to transfer funds from one sector to the other in order to support this Remand Centre that is being proposed. There are some questions I think that should be raised about the Remand Centre itself, primarily — while it may have a useful service to provide, the question is, where the children will live when they're not attending it. It is simply a day facility. It does raise the question as to where the residential care will be provided for the children involved in the Remand Centre.

So I would be interested in knowing, Mr. Chairman, whether the direction which I think I detect in terms of the department is, in fact taking place. I would be more than pleased if there's a refutation of that. Secondly, what the commitment is to the funding of private agencies in this area, and also to the volunteer community sector — what plans the government has for adding or expanding to the institutional care and whether in fact it's putting more of the children into those centres now than in the past.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can't agree that the emphasis of this government or the province is to institutionalization. I think that it's precisely the opposite. We have, in the previous resolution which we were looking at — or not this same resolution, but under Section C on Probation and

Parole Services, we looked at the programs on voluntary probation officers, placement alternatives, short-term high impact program, remand attendance centre and non-judicial screening, and it was pointed out at that time that the appropriation being requested this year is substantially higher in that area than was the actual adjusted vote for last year. And the reason that the requested appropriation is up in that area generally, as I pointed out then, is because we've been keeping more juveniles within their homes, instead of putting them in institutions. We're using more probation officers. We have more voluntary probation officers and honorary probation officers in action in the field than has been the case in the past. And the population count at the Manitoba Youth Centre would bear out the argument that I'm making, that we're trying to keep juveniles in the community, keep them in their homes, the emphasis is very heavily on that end of the spectrum, rather than on institutionalization.

In fact, when we come to look at Adult Corrections and at External Agencies, I think the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge will see that there is tangible evidence articulated in the Estimates, of that kind of trend and that kind of emphasis. Further, in the area of Juvenile Corrections, as was recognized earlier, we're talking in terms of either 14 or 15, depending on the month you look at it, group homes in action in this field where juveniles are being cared for and controlled and corrected, but in a residential group home environment that is certainly not institutional in any sense of the word.

Over and above that, I think perhaps the honourable member is mixing two responsibilities, perhaps to the criticism of and the detriment of the Ministry of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services. We don't have the responsibility for committing juveniles to institutions. It's the court that makes those committals, the court commits them to institutions, or if the courts, plural, commit them to institutions, that's the way it is. We are hoping to keep them out of that system and repair them within the framework of their homes, or at least within the framework of the group home environment as widely as possible. But as I said earlier in response to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, neither the Director of Juvenile Corrections, nor the Superintendent of the Manitoba Youth Centre, nor the Minister or Deputy-Minister of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation can do it all. We're only one component in the system, and if the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge wants to suggest that the government as such, should be looking at initiatives and reforms and new directions in the whole system of justice and corrections in the juvenile field, then that's one thing, and I accept the legitimacy of that position. But to expect the Ministry of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services to do it, is unrealistic. We're doing what we can with those kids who don't wind up committed to institutions by the courts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is jesting with me a little bit, because some of the things he said I think can only go under the category of comedy, particularly when he talks about the fact that it's not really the responsibility of his department in terms of committing juveniles. It's true that the court makes the commitment, but the court can only commit when there's a place to go to. And one of the tragedies that takes place in this province are the number of children that have to be raised to adult court because the judges simply say there are no resources for juvenile facilities left, that they have exhausted the possibilities and therefore they have to raise the child into the treatment of the adult courts, and I think you can go to a number of decisions and statements that have been made by judges in this province in the past year indicating that. I think if he looks at the record, he would see the incidence of that taking place. So when he says somehow that the ministry has no responsibility in this area, then surely he has to be jesting because the fact of the matter is that while it is the courts that dispense, it is the responsibility of his department to provide the facilities and services in which the dispensation takes place. And if they're not there, then the courts are faced with some serious dilemmas, and oftentimes the only way of resolving a dilemma is to raise the child into the adult court and use those services which many judges obviously are loath to do but oftentimes do not have recourse to do.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that that is something that. . . —(Interjection)— That's right, but that's what they are forced to do because there aren't the facilities there, and I still think that the questions that I asked weren't specifically answered. First and primarily is whether the introduction of things like the Remand Centre will mean that funds will be transferred that would normally be going into placing people in community residential sites are now being used to provide for the operational support of these kinds of institutional cares. I think that was a very specific question that I had which the Minister didn't answer, which really I would like to know, whether there is money being transferred from the one sector into the other in order to pay for that service.

I think as well, Mr. Chairman, just to continue that line of thought, I know it's relatively futile to make any comprehensive recommendations for change in the juvenile care, because under the conditions we exist under in this province, that would simply be a waste of breath. What I do think

Monday, June 12, 1978

would be worthwhile talking about, Mr. Chairman, would be to look at some of the specialized services that are not available at the present time and what intention there is to institute them. In particular, I am thinking of the specialized treatment centres. First, there is the problem that we still face with, I think the Minister described them, the uncontrollable child. There has been suggestion that the Psychiatric Centre will be built and will supply some service. It is my understanding, however, that the psychiatric service provided to the Health Sciences Centre is really not prepared to accept or provide treatment to the most difficult of these cases, really the ones who have extremely erratic behaviour or unacceptable behaviour at the same time that the government I believe, I could be corrected, has been reducing the number of placements out of province in some of the frontier camps, the wilderness camps, that previously provided placements for these children. I'd like to know where they're going, Mr. Chairman, what kind of specialized treatment facilities are presently available in this province for the juvenile offenders who have extremely uncontrolled or erratic behaviour, and what kind of attention they are presently being given, and what kind of service can they expect to receive other than simply plumping them in the institutions that they are I believe presently contained within.

A second question that I would raise in that respect is the degree to which the freeze that we now have has limited the range of community intervention in the juvenile field. Will the personnel that we have been talking about, additional personnel under the Probation and Parole Services, where will they be assigned? Are they going to be assigned again to providing for further community intervention in these areas, or will they simply be provided to service these institutional care arrangements?

The third question I have, and I confess it doesn't come under the entire jurisdiction of this Minister with two or three three Ministers — it has to do with the conditions of juvenile delinquents and offenders in places like the central core of Winnipeg, where the range of, incidence of juvenile delinquency is substantially on the increase and the problems with sniffing and the rest of it are becoming even more widespread. I have yet to hear any announcement from this government of any of its own strategy to attack the problem. Several programs have been cancelled in the core area of the inner city; there's been nothing to take its place. I'd like to know, Mr. Chairman, what this Minister, who professes and I take his word for it, believing in preventative care or dealing with the need to meet the problem before it becomes a matter of police or courts, whether he has any intentions in this area to provide for intervention of services in these areas. -

The fourth area, if he wants further comment, has to do with again the problem that we discussed in Question Period this morning, the total lack of facilities in northern Manitoba and remote parts of Manitoba. The conditions still exist where juvenile offenders who are apprehended in northern Manitoba have to be flown to Winnipeg, detained in the Youth Centre until such time as their court trials are called, and then sent back up north again, totally removed from whatever context of community or family that they may have had. It seems to me that's a highly inefficient system, and it appeared to me, and it can be corrected by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, that there was talk at some time of a changing into The Pas, Thompson, developing youth treatment centres, facilities in those northern regions. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that that's been another casualty of the freeze, that we now go through the kind of I think a reasonably absurd situation, it's a tautology, but let's say quite an absurd situation, where we are now having to transport children under the Act long distances, pull them out of their community context, have them remand in the youth centre for sometimes 2, 3, 4 months, and then ship them back for trial, and then ship them back again, and that is what I am basically and simply saying that there is no facilities in northern or remote areas of the province to deal with them. So the Minister wants some areas where I think direction should be going and corrections be made to the Department of Corrections, that I would be interested to know if he has any inclination to move any of these areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) — The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked me about the impact in terms of cost of the Remand Attendance Centre Program, and whether it would have a harmful effect insofar as resources are concerned on any initiatives to expand community facilities, group homes, and the like, for juvenile offenders or in the juvenile offender field. The answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is no. I think I can assure the honourable member that that is not the case, that the Remand Attendance Centre is part and parcel of the overall program and determination of the department to deal with juveniles with this kind of problem before they come in contact with that part of the system that all too often results in their institutionalization. In fact, part of The Agassiz Home for Youth Unit at 415 Charles was really operating as a component of that juvenile offenders' facility, and it was given up from that component and made over into the Remand Attendance Centre. It is now where the Remand Attendance Centre is located. The reason for that was because the facility and its use in that form was considered more advantageous both from the point of view

of the juveniles involved and the juveniles potentially involved, and from the point of view of the distribution of available resources to operate it as an attendance centre rather than a part of a holding facility for offenders.

The honourable member asked me about the problem of severely emotionally disturbed juvenile offenders, those who need psychiatric treatment. We're not placing very many outside the province today, in fact the extra-province placement totals are down substantially over what they were previously. I think we have about 20 outside the province at the present time, maximum, which is a great deal less than has been the case in recent years. We're still looking for a psychiatric centre facility for this type of juvenile, and all I can say to the honourable member is that it is a recognized need that I am working on, my department is working on. We can only move so far so fast with the resources that we have; it is not a part of our spending program for this year, but it's certainly a facility that is necessary and that I intend to pursue.

As for the additional probation personnel and where they're assigned, for the most part they are assigned to working in the community at the community level, although some are directly attached to individuals who are on probation. But when you get to the point of wholesale activist intervention — I don't know whether that is what the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is advocating, but that may be the point at which we take divergent paths from a philosophical point of view. We're not — and when I say we, I mean the government, is not actively looking for ways to practice wholesale universal prevention in the field of juvenile behaviour. There are obvious situations and instances related to family difficulties where that kind of activity is called for and justified, but we are not crusading in the field of prevention. We find it difficult to reconcile that with our contention, that you run the danger of reaching the a point where prevention becomes intervention and intrusion, and where the essential responsibility of the family is so eroded that there are as many negatives that result from that kind of activity as there are from anti-social juvenile behaviour itself. Now I agree that that is a philosophical point we could spend hours debating, but I am trying to answer the honourable member's question. We're not crusading in the field of prevention.

The honourable member asked me about juvenile problems in the core area, what are we doing about them. The Ministry of Corrective and Rehabilitative Services is not primarily responsible for taking social initiatives in that area of Manitoba, or in any other area of Manitoba — that would be the responsibility of the Department of Health and Social Development, and certainly under the community operations division of that department, we are attempting through a continuation of the programs and services that are in place, and some additional funding in that particular field this year, to serve the families and the children of that neighbourhood. It's a massive dilemma, a massive problem for the province, as I'm sure the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge well knows. There are no overnight solutions short of pumping countless resources in dollars and personnel into disadvantaged neighbourhoods, and even then you're not assured of measurable results related to the amount expended. We're hoping that programs of communication and relationship through the regional services offered by the department will develop in time to take care of the majority of those problems, but if the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has solutions short, as I say, of pouring in resources that we don't have, I'd be very glad to hear them.\$

I personally favour some initiatives in the field of community development and in the field of amateur sport and recreation that I have been discussing with my colleagues, and which I would hope that we would be able to mount during the lifetime of our administration, but this year's program from a spending point of view is set and there's not much leeway in it for 1978-79.

The problems of the juveniles in the north who have to be flown down to Winnipeg to be dealt with judicially are the subject of a joint study which is under way at the present time between our officials in child welfare and the officials of our Corrections Department. The north is in need, and will be receiving some additional support in the way of juvenile facilities. We're looking at a juvenile facility in The Pas, which is very much in the planning stage, and we have added some staff man years to our field staff in the north. We have a report coming in at the end of June on some of these problems generally, including problems in the core area. There was a contract staffer who was assigned to develop a specialized overview and review of core area problems for the department that is forthcoming very shortly, and the report from the joint study of child welfare and corrections on the problems of juveniles in conflict with the law in the north is also expected to reach my desk fairly shortly.

So those studies and explorations are under way. We can't introduce any initiatives without having some fairly substantial facts and conclusions in front of us. I for one would be extremely hesitant, even if I had the resources in my departmental budget, to rush in with premature self-styled proposals or solutions to some of these problems. I expect that it would be necessary for me and for us to take the greater part of our first year to try to identify and then examine the challenges that we face, and see how rapidly we can move from there. So this really is the stage at which we're occupied this year.

On treatment and facilities and resources for abused children generally in the north, which was

touched upon this afternoon in questions during question period, I can only repeat for the honourable member what I've said earlier in my Estimates, and that is that I can consider the field of child abuse as a major priority area for intensive work by this government. We've certainly not attempted to suggest that in what we're doing this year, that we are grappling the problem to a standstill, this is only a start. It is, though, I feel, an achievement of sorts in that we have been able to move in an expansionary way in the campaign on child abuse, albeit limited largely to more urbanized areas of the province, but there's no question that the resources being added in Winnipeg for the campaign against child abuse will be available to persons who need them on an emergency basis in the north or in other areas of the province, and our child welfare workers in those areas are apprised of that fact, that emergency help can be requested and obtained from the expansionary component in Winnipeg in that respect. In the future I would hope to be able to continue expanding in a broad way in the campaign to build up our capacity to cope with, reduce, and to come as close as possible to eliminating the unpleasant challenge of child abuse.

That's where we stand as of June of this year, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge will be patient and permit us to move as quickly as we can in the months and the immediate years ahead to get some of the programs in place that will reflect my concerns and the concerns that are shared by my colleagues in all of these vital areas. But we haven't been able to jump into them in this first year, as a new government, limited by the budgetary considerations which we have felt we were limited by, and in that interim, I am leaving no stone unturned to have the problems identified, examined, and distilled down to recommendations that can come to me within the next few months.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I can tell the Minister that I probably have the patience to wait him out, I'm not sure the people who are directly involved in the problems we're talking about have the patience, because they've been waiting an awful long time already. It's neither he nor I that are suffering under the kinds of conditions that exist, which this part of the department deals with the consequences of, not the causes of. And that is the difficulty. I don't know if there is much room for patience, particularly when you hear the Minister say that as far as his government is concerned, they don't believe that they are in the field of, what was it? — crusading for prevention. It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, as a very odd and curious statement to make, particularly coming from a government which professes the philosophy that it does, where it seems to be constantly telling us that there's too much government around, and yet the fact of the matter is that the heaviest hand of government comes when they have to start apprehending people, incarcerating people, institutionalizing people and containing people. That's when government really has its most direct infringements upon liberties and freedoms.

Therefore, it would seem to me that if there was any place where one should put their emphasis, it would be to provide those conditions so that people can avoid coming under the heavy hand of government, whether it's at the Youth Treatment Centre or the Juvenile Court, or even sort of in a group home. If they can escape that by receiving the kind of opportunity or care earlier on, then it would seem to me a much better way of fulfilling the philosophy that I hear expressed constantly, than following one of building up, sort of nice, white-shirted kind of bureaucratic organizations to deal with the problem after it's already become, and then you have to incarcerate people.

Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that if you really look at the figures and statistics in this province, that you want to start looking at who is in the Headingley's and the Stony's and the new maximum securities in Selkirk, it's the kids who were in the juvenile system five or six or eight years ago. There's no prevention going on. Once they get in the system, once you're on the circuit, it's very tough to break out, and in fact you then become pretty much a system problem for the rest of your life. You're in and out of jail or in and out of institutions or in and out of somebody's care for an awful long time after that.

So when the Minister tells me that he's not in the mood or the inclination to crusade in the field of prevention, I found that an exceedingly odd statement to make, because if there had been any Minister who I thought might have taken this up as his first line of priority, it would have been in that area, that that's where the emphasis should have gone, and that he would have been far more reluctant to start building new institutions and new centres and new facilities and everything else if he felt that he could try to cope with the problem of young offenders and juvenile offenders before they became problems.

So Mr. Chairman, I make that as a statement because I feel that maybe we've got our priorities turned around, and I think I understand why in part, that it's much easier, particularly in terms of dealing in the professional mold, to kind of talk about the treatment, responsive kind of service deliveries, than it is to deal with the prevention community side of things. It's much easier to handle, you can build buildings, you can incarcerate people, you can hire probation officers, and they can say, yes, we'll make sure that we keep them out of trouble, than it is to try to use some imagination

to find ways of coping with the problem.

I just bring to mind a couple of examples of something I saw just this spring when I was down in the United States, programs being developed in the City of Baltimore, for example, where they are taking young people, basically giving them houses to live in to develop models of work style programs in those houses, where they become sort of self-supporting communities in their own right, where they begin to develop their own capacity both to pay for themselves as well as to take some command or control over their own lives, which I think stands in marked contrast to the direction we're going in here. That really has a preventative community emphasis to it, that they're trying to give people a chance to sort of correct themselves before they become so-called problems. Here we seem to be much more, perhaps in an older fashioned way, or a more traditional way, seem to be concentrating on the problem end of the spectrum as opposed to the prevention end of it.

So what I'm suggesting to the Minister that there are ways of doing it, and I don't think we need all that much more studying. I know it will come to the House Leader as aggreat surprise to hear that his favourite academic is not recommending more studies or investigations to be done, but frankly I think there already have been enough. I don't think we need to know that much more about what needs to be done. I think I could — if the Minister wanted to give me six hours — I could probably pile his desk about 12 feet high with a variety of stuff that has been looked at in terms of the problems in the core area and the problems in northern Manitoba. I would recommend to him, I guess, for his reading, the studies done by Mr. Blakeslee in the Management Secretariat on the problems of native people migrating to the central part of Winnipeg. The problems are pretty clearly diagnosed at that point, I don't know how much more you have to look at than the statistics that appeared in those. Those were frightening enough. I guess if you really want to be frightened, you could go further but those were frightening enough in terms of those problems.

So I would want to relate, perhaps in a more anecdotal way, the kinds of things that are beginning to take place, not just in the central city, but there is a basic spread of the kind of problems beyond the old traditional, central city, core area of Winnipeg.

One of the things, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister, because of his total responsibilities, will have to face is the fact that the social difficulties happening in Manitoba can no longer be confined to kind of that walled-in area called the core. They are spreading substantially beyond those. I think that if he would consult with members who represent areas in some of the northern parts of the city, I suppose the Member for St. Johns might come across some problems, and I know the Member for Winnipeg Centre does, and I do myself. I can give you an example, last Friday night in the garden spot of the city called Fort Rouge where one of my neighbours found two young native fellows in their backyard, sniffing, and the problem, the difficulty was, the only people they could call were the Police. That was the only recourse that they had. Here were two young kids who were in the backyard, sniffing, it was only the cops that you could call because there was no one else around to help. Clinic doesn't do it anymore because they've kind of been told to clean up their act and quit fooling around in all those exotic areas and they're scared that they're going to be cut off funding, there isn't that kind of mobility pattern. You can't go to the Main Street Project, they just stay in the strip, so what happens if you come across a group of kids who are sniffing on Mountain Avenue, where there is a lot of it going on or on River Avenue or Stradbrook or in the west end of the city, where it's all going on. There is no one to call upon. There is no service, no response, no prevention. There is the odd thing working out of a church basement, so when the Minister says it's a big, complex, difficult problem, yes it is. And it's going to get bigger and it's going to get more difficult and more complex the longer we wait.

It seems to me that we're putting in an awful lot of waiting time at this stage of the game. I frankly have to tell him that I don't have the patience for much more wool gathering in this area, because I think it's becoming far too serious in this city.

If the Minister feels that this particular Ministry of Corrections isn't the proper vehicle, he is Minister for the department called Health and Social Development. He's got a lot of other troops in his battalions that he could set forth. Maybe it isn't setting forth more troops in the battalions that he's got, maybe he's got to start funding sort of alternative means of working in those communities. I can tell him because I perhaps have, in some ways, a closer touch with some of the private agencies working in the field, like Sister Mac, who is located in the Member for Winnipeg Centre's area. Go and ask her and find out how much help she gets from the Provincial Government, and yet she has a pretty interesting program going with young people in that area, I can tell you what she gets, almost nothing.

If you want to look for a place to put your dough where it's going to do some good, start looking at some of these agencies rather than cutting them off or shortening them or freezing them. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, if I had to make a choice, I would accept the curtailment of some of the other activities on the public sector side if it meant that more money was going into some of these agency approaches which do things in a messier way. They don't fit the organizational charts in quite as neat a fashion,

but I think they're getting the job done a little bit better and if they're given some more scope they may have work to do.

I can go through some of the areas they are treating in the alcohol, drug abuse areas, being cut off, 40 percent, 30 percent, being cut back, it doesn't sound to me like a great deal of attention going on in these areas.

So, Mr. Chairman, the point I'm trying to make to the Minister was that I think the direction we're going is basically 180 degrees opposite to where we should be going, and that the audit reviews and management reviews and organizational reviews that seem to be such a large part of the activity of this government at the present moment, I think will substantially lead, ironically enough, to further and more state type operations, all done in the sake of management. I mean I read this Task Force report. You know something, Mr. Chairman, these two documents imply more state control than anything I saw in the previous government, all done in the name of control, audit, management, but there's certainly an awful lot more control there than anything I've seen that was done in the previous government, and I'm an objective observer of both. I don't have a hang for both of them. And yet that seems to be the condition that we're coming under, the situations, and I still haven't heard, other than this description of further studies, further management, if there is any intention to go any further in the fields than where we are at the present.

If I sound a little out of patience, I am simply because maybe we've just waited far too long. I simply want to caution or provide at least a warning, as I see it, that to follow the recommendations in here and to follow the directions you're going, really means that you're contradicting your own rhetoric, that you're going to result in more institutional care, in more state control, in more kind of strings being pulled by the Minister as opposed to allowing for that kind of private initiative and private resourcefulness that the Minister likes to make speeches about. And I think if he looked at them carefully, he'd find that's exactly where he's headed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Before we go on to other items, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could ask his staff to look up the following figures, and I would caution him as to whose figures he uses in this regard. The number of juveniles who were apprehended; the number of juveniles who were placed on probation of different kinds; the number of juveniles in institutions in the juvenile system; and perhaps we could address ourselves to this when we get back to this item. I understand there are other matters to the attention of the Chair.

The House Leader was trying to catch your eye, Mr. Chairman. That not being the case, we'll proceed.

I, too, was somewhat surprised that the Minister would suggest that prevention is not one of the first priorities in dealing with young offenders. It reminds me of a story that was told to me one time by a chap who had visited in India, and he's standing there and two fellows were pulling drowned people out of the Ganges River. One of them turned and was going to take off, and the other said, "where are you going?" He said, "I'm going to go and find out who's throwing them in." Really this is what this whole area should be about, after performing a function to protect the public in removing those young people who are either a danger to themselves or others, nevertheless to analyze. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood. . The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Winnipeg Centre was speaking. He had the floor. I don't understand on what basis you're taking the floor away from him. I don't know what rule gives you that power.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I took the prerogative on the suggestion from the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: . . . I had stood up to catch your eye and then I was going to sit down because I thought the House Leader was trying to catch your eye and until such time that he did catch your eye, I was putting on record a few questions that I have of the Minister. I understand the rules of the House that I have the floor but nevertheless the House Leader has been attempting to catch your eye, so I sat down when you asked me to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on the same point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm not aware of any rule which entitles you or the Speaker

Monday, June 12, 1978

to take the floor from any person except to hear someone who wishes to speak on privilege or on a point of order, and on that basis, as I understand, the Member for Winnipeg Centre had 30 minutes within which to speak and is speaking. Now, I think he can be interrupted by a point of order or a point of privilege, but I'm not aware of what other matter he can be interrupted on on committee, not even 10:00 o'clock is enough to take the floor from him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. JORGENSEN: I believe that you acted on the suggestion or not the suggestion but on the fact that the Member for Winnipeg Centre was resuming his seat when you called the Member for Crescentwood, but if that isn't enough, then I rise on a point of order and ask you to recognize the Member for Crescentwood, who has a motion or at least a vote that has to be placed and that's a portion of our rules, that a vote that is called from the other committee has to be taken in this place. And that was requested to be taken in this place. The Chaian is here and wants the report of that particular vote. It's as simple as that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns on the same point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. I do understand the rule is, and I don't even know which rule it is, but it is clear that when a vote is to be taken and is challenged, it shall be taken before the whole committee and not by separate portions of the committee. I understand that, but that does not mean that it is intended to interrupt a proceeding — a person speaking — and the only way, as I understand it, and I still stand to be corrected, that a person can be interrupted when he has the floor is under a point of order or a point of privilege. Now the Honourable the House Leader has stood up and said, "I ask you to recognize the Member for Crescentwood." But, Mr. Chairman, that's not a point of order.

The point of order to me is clear, and I'm on a point of order now. There could be a point of privilege, but I don't believe that anyone can use the point of order or the point of privilege in order to interrupt proceedings that involve another person to speak or to make a motion. This member has the floor, and until he's through and sits down, you then recognize whomever you see, I understand that rule clearly.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . the Member for St. Johns was not aware of the fact that the Member for Winnipeg Centre was resuming his seat, when you called order, and if I'm mistaken in that, why then I invite him to continue and conclude his remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre. Does the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre — were you resuming your seat?

MR. BOYCE: There's two members on the floor, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre, you have the floor.

MR. BOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairma.. I'm quite familiar with the rules of the House, and if I had been asked by my colleagues to run out the clock, I would have gotten my speech out that I haven't given about Greece for about three years, I would have given that an run out the clock until twenty to. Nevertheless, I had, the Chairman is absolutely correct, I had yielded the floor — it wasn't because I was asked for the floor, it was because I yielded the floor. No person can rise, the Member for St. Johns is absolutely correct, a meer cannot be called to order to recognize another member, but nevertheless it was obvious, and this has happened before, Mr. Chairman, where the other committee has stormed in and interrupted a member in speaking when he was trying to do his job, as they did with myself. And I was quite prepared to yield the floor and I do yield the floor.

MR. CHAIAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, as the Government House Leader says that I am here to report on activities in the other committee.

The Minister of Finance, in the other committee, moved that the entire Estimates of the Department of Labour except Items I.(a) the Minister's Salary, be voted on after two hours of debate, in accordance with Rule 65(15). The members of the committee requested Yeas and Nays, Mr. Chairman. I have, therefore, recessed the proceedings of that committee at 9:25 and that section of the Committee of Supply, sitting in Room 254, to allow you to conduct the Division on the question,

Monday, June 12, 1978

Mr. Chairman. Would you conduct the Division?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

Yeas 26; Nays 16.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried.

Gentlemen, Honourable Members, on the loge on my right, I would like to introduce Mr. Tom Lysons, MLA for the Vermilion-Viking Constituency of Alberta. Would you welcome Tom Lysons, please.

MR. JORGENSON: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Meer for Raddison.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Matthews, that the House do now adjourn.

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