

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 27, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — TOURISM AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. I'd like to refer the members to Page 77, the Estimates of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, 1.(f) Manitoba Film Classification Board, 1.(f)(1)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could get an explanation from the Minister about the manner in which the Film Classification Board was turned over. Now, if I recall, I'm not sure exactly how many months ago, I don't know whether the present Minister was in office at the time but I recall some peculiar goings on, namely, first of all, the Chairman, Barbara Weselake-Mills was sort of summarily axed and the entire Board, as I recall, was turned over.

Now, you know, as one who has been in the political arena for awhile and has also studied political science, I accept the principle that any Board or Commission should reflect government thinking, especially if it's in a sensitive area. I'm not sure this is a sensitive area, politically, but perhaps it could be or it has potential explosive aspects. So I don't challenge the right of the government to change the members of a given Board. I believe that is their right and I believe that it is in their best interests to ensure that the people on the Board reflect government thinking.

But I was just wondering if the Minister could explain what government thinking is here, in the sense of why there was a wholesale turnover of the Board. It strikes me that a logical position would have been to replace two-thirds of the Board or a majority of the Board with Conservative appointees and then to operate on that basis. The reason being that presumably continuity is of some importance, that people who served on the Board, some for a number of years, know the ropes, know the routine, have experience, have made a contribution to the Board, and presumably when you throw a whole score of new faces onto any Board or Commission you wind up with a bunch of new people who don't know where to go for the meeting or what the order of business is, or what the routine is.

I wonder if the Minister could indicate why this was handled as it appears to have been handled, from my point of observation, that everyone on the Board was replaced and the Chairman was fired. Could she comment on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: I am glad that the Member for Elmwood knows and understands that people are, Boards and Commissions are revoked with changes of government. I would like to tell him that the change took place prior to my coming into this portfolio. The precise reasons I cannot tell you except that, as you have stated so well, governments do in their best wisdom make and revoke appointments in the manner that they feel is best for the good of the present government.

I don't think the continuity in this particular type of work is too important, but I'm afraid I can't add too much light on the why's. I know they weren't appointed for any particular length of time so I believe that it was something that has taken place before in all governments, and I'm sure it will take place again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, if I may. Who appoints the Chairman of the Film Classification Board? Is it the Minister or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council?

MRS. PRICE: It's an Order-in-Council.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So then, Mr. Chairman, it would seem that regardless of whether this Minister was Minister of this department at that time or not, she was party to the Cabinet process which resulted in the change of Chairmen.

MRS. PRICE: That's right. Yes, I was.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So therefore, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister can not really plead ignorance to that then.

MRS. PRICE: I'm not really pleading ignorance. I'm just saying that it was the Cabinet's decision. They felt it was in the interests of this government to replace the Board. I'm not pleading ignorance to it when it is an Order-in-Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I was wondering whether, in the Minister's term, and in the past — let's say, in the Minister's term — whether any new terms of reference have been given to the Classification Board, whether any sort of philosophical matters have been raised with her, or whether any practical problems have been drawn to her attention? Has there been any change in the manner in which the Classification Board has operated?

MRS. PRICE: No, there isn't. It's running in the exact same manner it has been since, I think, 1974 when it started. 1972, I'm sorry.

MR. DOERN: So we're not seeing then any tightening up of the Board in terms of procedures or philosophies, or we're not about to see a Conservative view or Conservative philosophy imposed upon the cinemas in Manitoba?

MRS. PRICE: I hope with some of the pictures that are being released that there would be a more conservative view, and I use the small "c". There have been no changes in the format and there are none going to be, I'm sure.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister indicate again what the classifications are? Just a quick run through, because I had a question to ask in that regard.

MRS. PRICE: You're referring to the ratings. There's General, that's for anybody to attend; Mature, that anybody can go but it has a mature theme. Mature, not suitable for children — doesn't restrict anyone but it's information for parents so that they will be aware of, you know, what type of picture it could be. There's the Adult with parental guidance and that's restricted to over 18 or children under 18 with an adult. And there's the Restricted Adult that's closed to all under 18 because of the sex and violence that is in these particular movies. And, the last two that I named are the only two that are in restricted classes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Now, if I could just get back to the sort of so-called lowest or first or broadest category, the General. I just wonder if the Minister could explain as to children. Is that assumed to be suitable for all children let's say up to the age of 18 or whatever the age cut off is taken to be? Is that a category that assumes that any child with or without an adult is capable of enjoying that type of a film?

I wonder whether there are any jurisdictions that have another category either hyphenated or in parentheses or a separate category that's considered to be for young children.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: The General is the most common and there isn't any in Manitoba.

MR. DOERN: Well, then I would just cite a personal experience. My daughter is six years old so she's just at the point where, you know, on occasion she's going to movies as opposed to watching television and a few weeks ago I decided to take her to a film which I thought would probably

be too advanced for her but had the General category stamped on it, and I admit this is a very young child we're speaking about. And, it was Lord of the Rings. Now, that is a sophisticated fairy tale, I suppose. I haven't read it, but most people are familiar with it but, when you look at the classifications in a cartoon form, and considered a General category presumably suitable for children and I assumed it would be too advanced for my daughter but I assumed that she would enjoy it in the sense of a film of that type. But, in taking her to the film, although in the last analysis she enjoyed it and was willing to go back, there were some very frightening parts in the film. I mean, there were some scenes with a very, I believe, a brilliant production. I understand the whole movie was first of all shot with actors and then the cartoonists and animators and worked from a totally life production of it and it was really a brilliant film, but there are some very frightening parts in it in the sense of horses with red eyes and frightening and awesome

characters, etc. So, you know, I'm simply saying that it just strikes me from that experience and, you know, I also subjected myself one Sunday afternoon in a birthday party to seeing the Love Bug, about a VW and so on. I'm getting some nods of the head, you see, from the other end of the table, and I'm just saying this is a parent's sacrifice. That was a more suitable fact it was 100 percent suitable, whereas I believe that the other film that I mentioned was not suitable for young children — suitable for children, generally correct in terms of category but not suitable for young children maybe under 10 or something. So I'm simply suggesting to the Minister, I just make this as a suggestion that she might take under advisement, that it might be desirable to develop a category within the General category that would be considered to be suitable for children. I realize this is a moving speech but I see that I've brought tears to Miss Bayer's eyes. She is a bit of a softy though. So I simply make that as a suggestion to you, Madam Minister, that perhaps within the Adult category there should be a category for young children — I don't know what the cutoff would be — under 10, or under 12 or whatever . . .

MRS. PRICE: Within the General category.

MR. DOERN: Within the General category, or another category, General — Children, General (Children) or Children, that therefore the parents of younger children could take a child to the typical Walt Disney type in terms of impact on children as opposed to what could be a terrifying experience. It would be suitable for older children but not for younger.

MRS. PRICE: Well, I think perhaps what the member is saying is worthy of looking into, and I can appreciate what he is saying having young grandchildren myself now, and I guess it's pretty hard to find a full-length movie that doesn't have some type of scare into it; such as Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs — there was some in that, but I take your suggestion seriously and we will talk about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm glad the Member for Elmwood got back to some common sense because his initial comments about Motion Pictures expressing a political view via the Manitoba Film Classification Board was certainly, in my opinion, one that didn't really make too much sense to me. I don't know what he was imputing but I did want to put on the record for my own constituency that we are concerned about the marquee advertising. I feel that under No. 3, if you have a staff and you have 14 members or so on the Board, some getting a per diem rate, and they have terms of reference which they're supposed to follow — I would suggest the maintenance of the theatre and advertising inspection. I would like to see them expand their role in the future because we had a terrible time, and we still do, on what we call the defacing of the Portage Avenue retail section where we had the Eve Theatre where children would come from the Y and YWCA and have to examine the marquee of the old Eve Theatre and see all this nonsense that was there, and certainly it was a type of awareness that most parents did not want for their children, and we have the Downtowner Theatre which is near the Winnipeg Free Press which advertises constantly, far more than what is available on the inside.

MR. HANUSCHAK: How do you know? How do you know?

MR. WILSON: Well, the Marquee de Burrows seems to impute that I have been inside the theatre. I can assure him that I haven't.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm just asking, how do you know?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Again, I am reflecting the concerns of my constituents as a good MLA, and we would like to see that there be some control and measure of standards if you are going to have adult theatres on a main avenue. Because it seems to me that the City of Winnipeg, who does not have a \$70,000 budget, and I appreciate that most of this is picked up from licensing of the theatres and what have you, I would like to suggest that this Board take a look at taking over some of the role that the City Councillors and Inspectors have to perform if, under the terms of reference under (3), which it indicates to me that they have an inspection and they have some sort of clout over the individual theatres, I would like to see this new code of advertisement, in other words, truth in advertisement. Because if the Downtown theatre had anything of what they suggest on the outside they would be closed like the Venus Theatre was and I would like to see that.

I am also concerned, and I say we have no control, but it's very alarming that many shows under Adult Parental Guidance are on a per seat basis. For instance, The Deerhunter now is playing at the Garrick and they want \$4 for every seat, yet children can go and there is no children's price. You also have the event of a \$1.49 show now for children under the age, I believe, of 13, and this raises some concern even though it's inflationary times, with me, as to some study being given of the profit motive. Because unless there is going to be some sort of inquiry as to whether one or two people control all of the movie houses in the city, or why there is no competition amongst the pricing of these children's . . . adults, they can think for themselves. There is such a thing called consumer resistance, but I can't see where children have much choice and I really feel if they are going to show General movies that it is starting to get to be out of sight for the people of my constituency, anyway, to begin to get well over \$2 just to see a movie theatre. And it is a shame that the movie theatre phenomena is slowly escaping from the average person in the City of Winnipeg.

I just wanted to put those few comments on the record and I am really concerned about what I consider to be exaggerative and sometimes false advertising on the main thoroughfare of our city, which to me is, like the arcades, certainly a black eye to the tourism people and tourists that come to our city, because in most cities these particular industries are located on side streets or located in certain sections of the city, with the exception of maybe Toronto; it used to be on Yonge Street but it has since closed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: My colleague had brought this to my attention before we came into this room this evening and I, in turn, spoke to the Chairman of the Classification Board and there will be an inspector checking the marquees.

I would like to say, though, things are looking up, that five years ago there were four of these skin-flick types of theatres and now there is only one.

A MEMBER: There must be a change in government.

MRS. PRICE: So things are looking up.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, with reference to some of the earlier comments made by the Member for Wolseley I would like to ask the Honourable Minister for her views. Firstly the Honourable Member for Wolseley has suggested that the Film Classification Board should have more "clout" was the word that he used. And I would assume that what he is suggesting is that this Board continue, not as a classification board, but in fact become a censor board. So, therefore, my question to the Minister would be, is that the Minister's wish that the Classification Board do in fact become a censor board.

And then later, the Honourable Member for Wolseley made another rather interesting suggestion, and I would appreciate hearing the Minister's views on that. Does she plan to recommend to the Minister of Urban Affairs, who in turn can bring whatever influence he has upon the City of Winnipeg, to zone the city into various areas, setting aside an area for movie theatres which will show films of a type that the honourable member has suggested — you know, the skin flick and the like — to confine them to one area —(Interjection)—

Now, the Honourable Member for Pembina says "shame on me", and I'm surprised to hear that from him, who said last night that the greatest tourist attraction in Winnipeg is massage parlours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina on a point of order.

MR. ORCHARD: I would like the Member for Burrows to withdraw his last remarks. He cannot attribute that to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to withdraw that because that was the remark that the honourable member made from his seat — speaking out of order while I was speaking last night. So I'm not going to withdraw it. —(Interjection) — I believe that I still have the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina on a point of order.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it's a point of order the Honourable Member for Burrows is a blind, bald-faced liar. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order. I would ask the Member for Pembina to withdraw.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw from this committee before I withdraw that remark, because I did not make that statement. He is a bald-faced liar.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns on a matter of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: It's a privilege of the House, and I do not think that the Member for Pembina can withdraw from a committee and get away with what he said. He must withdraw this statement or, Mr. Chairman, you must report this to the Speaker, and there should be a motion to have him expelled. And that is the procedure. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Pembina not try to make his own rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest the Member for Pembina withdraw his remarks.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, if my remarks as attributed by the Member for Burrows are part of Hansard, as he can prove, which he cannot do then I suggest he withdraw his remark.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not a debatable thing. I'm asking the Member for Pembina to withdraw his remarks.

MR. CHERNIACK: Unconditionally, Mr. Chairman. Unconditionally, those are the rules.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, who has the authority, the Member for St. . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. It's not debatable. Will the Member for Pembina withdraw his remarks?

MR. ORCHARD: As to the fact that the Member for Burrows is a bald-faced liar. Is that what you want me to withdraw?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want the Member for Pembina to withdraw those remarks.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, under a great deal of reluctance, I will withdraw my remarks that the Member for Burrows is a bald-faced liar.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on a matter of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns on a matter of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: It's a privilege of the House. I do not think that there can be any withdrawal that is conditional or prefaced in any way with any softening of the statement. He must withdraw the remarks without any other comments related thereto. I believe those are the rules, and Mr. Chairman, I see you have the Rule Book there and by all means, let's enforce the rules. But I don't

think that the member should be allowed to get away with making statements. He speaks when he is not being recorded and says all sorts of things, and then when it's thrown back into his face, he wants to go onto the record in this way. Mr. Chairman, I think he has to withdraw it unconditionally and without qualification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns has a proper point of order. I ask the Member for Pembina to withdraw unconditionally and not repeat. The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, not only has the Member for Burrows attributed remarks to me that I did not make, but also the Member for St. Johns has made those remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It is not a debatable issue at this stage of the game. I would ask the Member for Pembina to withdraw unconditionally.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the remark that the Member for Burrows is a bald faced liar. That is unconditional, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If the need to debate that issue should arise again in the course of the consideration of these Estimates or at any other time, we'll deal with it again then. My question to the Minister is, is the Minister in agreement with the suggestion offered by the Honourable Member for Wolseley that the city should be zoned into areas within which theatres showing movies of the kind that he had described should be confined. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Well, the fact that, as I just mentioned, that the movie houses of that nature have reduced from four to one, I feel that we are on the right track. There is only this one left on Portage Avenue and I know it is a sore head to you. With regard to your question, would I consider bringing in a Paper to my colleagues saying that we should get rid of this type of movie, etc., I don't think I would. I don't believe that we should be intruding in people's lives. I think that people should be allowed to decide for themselves what they want to see and what they want to do and I don't really approve of the intrusion. While I don't agree with the movies, I think it's up to an individual. And, if there's enough people feel like I do, the last house will be closing because nobody will go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, personally I want to agree completely with what the Minister has said about the question of censorship and the question of taste and public acceptance. The fact that there was a reduction from four to one is a result of a policy established by the former government, and, I believe, carried out by the present government. I believe there are no changes. And the reduction is therefore not a result of government action but rather, I believe, a result of public rejection or apathy or disinterest in going to see those movies.

Now, frankly, I believe if they want to see them, they should have a right to see them and frankly again, I think that the theatre that accommodates them should be a decent house. It should not be shoddy. I think I heard the word shoddy, although there was talk at this end of the room and I didn't quite hear the word. But shoddy or sordid, I think I heard something like that about the nature of the building, and I think all our buildings should measure up to certain standards. I am not sure that I, well it's not a matter for provincial jurisdiction, but I'm not sure that I would be wanting to prosecute the way it has been done in order to close one of the theatres. But as I say, that's not a matter of our jurisdiction. As to the others, I frankly didn't know there were four, and I must thank the Member for Wolseley for bringing it to my attention and that of the entire public, that there is one remaining and where it is located. So that people may become even more interested because of his bringing this to our attention.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister, since she has answered the question of the theatres, whether her government agrees with the suggestion from the Member for Wolseley that would seem to impose a form of control on prices to be charged by the theatres. I would say with great astonishment that if the government agreed, then I don't quite know what the whole concept of free enterprise and competition fits in. Now, since I consider that the Member for Wolseley is a spokesman, not only for those who elected him, but also for the party which supports him and

sponsors him, then I would attribute to him and to his party the comments which he just made, and if the Minister wants to reject his comments on behalf of the government, I give her this opportunity right now, because I would think that any responsible group would not include his philosophy in its philosophy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: The Member for Wolseley was speaking his own thoughts; he wasn't representing the government, I assure you. Firstly, the theatre owners set their own prices and again, it's just like the type of pictures — I think that if they charge more than the market can bear, then they will find that their theatre house will be empty, so I think that has to be left in their hands — that's their prerogative to set their own fees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I wanted to suggest that I realize that any suggestion of a combines or anything is a Federal problem and if the marketplace and the consumer resistance from the adult community, expressing an alarm at what they're charging the children. I think \$1.49 is too high, even in inflationary times, and in many cases a per seat basis, there's no differential between adults and children. I'll direct, as I say, my own comments and my own thoughts to the Federal authorities who are in charge of examining any situation where it becomes monopolistic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1(f)(1)—pass; 1(f)(2)—pass. 1(g) Grant Assistance \$1,065,800 — pass. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. Would the Honourable Minister give us a breakdown of the \$1.065 million?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: It deals pretty well all with the horse racing industry. Would you like me to tell you point by point? I can.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. PRICE: The purse support at Assiniboia Downs is 848.8. Thoroughbred Breeders' Incentive Programs 61.7. Manitoba Great Western Racing Circuit 54.7, Manitoba Standard Breeders' Incentive Program 28.0, Manitoba Sires Stakes Program 10.0. Then there's general operating and administration 62.6 for a total of \$1,065,800.00.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. Mr. Chairman, so when we're comparing the 1.065 million shown in the Estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year, that is — and then if we compare that with the \$912,000 for the fiscal year about to end this weekend, that \$912,000 includes the same items as the Minister had read out for us just now.

MRS. PRICE: Right.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Minister then explain to the committee the rationale for the 15 percent increase in grant assistance to the horse — because essentially it's a horse racing industry, is it not?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And there's a 15 percent increase or more, perhaps more. Well, just a very quick calculation, the difference is \$155,000 — yes, it is more than 15 percent. Could the Minister explain the rationale for this rather significant increase in the grants, given the government paying lip service to restraint, and so forth?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it's \$153,700, and that's due to the increased support to the Manitoba Horseracing Commission resulting in the raising in the formula that they had for purse

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, but the Honourable Minister still has not really answered my question. She said, "The raising of the formula." Could she now explain the rationale for the raising of the formula, given the government paying lip service to restraint?

MRS. PRICE: Well, I think, to the Member for Burrows, the reason that this was established was because of the hardship it was placing on the owners of the horses. They were not able to attract the best of the racers, and by improving the formula for the purse support, it in turn improves the gate receipts, which in turn improves the tax to the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Member for Burrows finished? The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the fact is that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Member for Burrows finished? —(Interjections)—
Would the Member for Burrows address his remarks to the Chair?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was waiting with baited breath for a lesson in Conservative arithmetic from the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We are dealing with 1.(f)(1) — the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I thought his lesson in arithmetic was going to be related to 1.(f)(1), or I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, 1.(g)(1), but if it is not, I suppose we can ignore the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a little more detail about the justification for a 17 percent increase in grant support. Is the government prepared to invest more and more money in order to get greater returns, is that the justification for the increased support or is there another reason? Because there could be all sorts of investments that could be made to bring in returns to the government, but the reason I don't quite grasp as being a justification that this department is not a revenue producing department, I should think, but, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs is as its title denotes, and not for purposes of raising revenue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: This is a formula that was established and it was raised .5 percent, from 7 to 7.5 for the reasons that I had just mentioned. The horse owners were not getting enough to operate on. It hasn't been raised for some time; they needed it in order to attract a higher class of thoroughbreds to our horse racing, which in turn will stimulate the racing industry and, as I say, bring back more dollars to the government.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it would appear then that the government considers that subsidizing the private industry of horse racing is a justifiable program of government. Here we find reductions in hospital care; we find reductions in all sorts of budgetary items of which we've discussed time and again, and now we find the government, through this department and with this grant, an increase of 17 percent is subsidizing the private enterprise system in regard to horse racing.

Now we heard just in connection with the previous item, that the marketplace determines what it is that people want, and now we're told no, the horse breeders need more money, so they're getting it from the government.

Now I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, — and it's not for this Minister necessarily to have to justify the government's increase of 17 percent for horse breeders; and what is it, 2. something or 5 percent for other programs of much greater social value, in my opinion — but it would be interesting to hear a justification for a 17 percent increase in moneys to horse breeders, who apparently demanded in order to have their horses race, and to what avail? Is it to create a greater gambling opportunity, is it the gambling that is so interesting for the government to support, so it gets additional revenue from gambling? And I'm drawing a comparison, Mr. Chairman, between what we discussed about movies and freedom of choice and lack of control, and now we find horses and gambling, something

which justifies a greater increase of grant in that department. One would think that the government could succeed in doing what the Member for Wolseley wants it to do, and that is to accomplish a reduction in prices for children in movies by giving grants to theatres based on the per capita attendance of children on condition that they lower the prices to children in theatres.

By the same token, I'm pointing out inconsistencies and the Minister being part of the Treasury Branch is responsible for all these inconsistencies, the fact that it appears that the government, through the University Grants Commission, has forced tuition fees to go up in the universities, and at the same time is increasing its subsidy to horse breeders by 17 percent.

MRS. PRICE: There's one little point that's being overlooked, and that is the tax revenue that is derived from the horse racing industry. This year we will have \$3,400,000 return; next year we expect to have \$3,600,000 return; so that is a little different than what you can look on whether it's education grants, or cultural grants, or whatever. We get a much larger return than we are paying out.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's fine. One of the members opposite just said, "It's a good investment." So, we are now looking at this department of government as being a revenue producer, bringing in \$3.4 million against, I suppose, an expenditure of \$1 million, so that's a good investment. But, Mr. Chairman, if the government wants to make money there are ways it could make money. It could increase tuition fees even more than it has done; it could cut other services even more than it has done.

I am asking the Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, whose work I would think should be devoted to improve the social and cultural atmosphere in Manitoba, whether she considers that grants to horse breeders are made in order to produce increased revenues, and why she has not suggested to the Cabinet that this portion of her budget be turned over to the Finance Department in order for it to arrange to get big revenues. I am trying to get the Minister, Mr. Chairman, to justify the entire program involving horse racing, which I think she would be prepared to do. But if she limits it to increased revenue, then she's saying "Well, we increase our expenditure by 17 percent, but look, we'll be increasing revenue" — I don't know whether it's by 17 percent or not. But if that's the justification, then it doesn't belong, to my way of thinking, in the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs.

MRS. PRICE: I would like to point out to the Member for St. Johns that the spin-off in tourism is very great. It's one of the highest areas that we have in tourism — the attraction that we have from the people south of the border, especially, that come in — they come in in droves to stay from the States because of the horse racing industry. While we not only made \$2 million on that, we generate great spin-offs as far as the tourism and the . . . so I think there's a lot to be said for it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Now we're dealing, again, with revenues from tourism. And since the attraction of horse racing is, to my way of thinking — and I may be completely wrong, I wish the Minister would correct me if her opinion is different — is the gambling attraction. I'm wondering the extent to which the government has looked at other attractions for tourism and in gambling and inducement to come and gamble? Has the government made any investigation in opening up a Las Vegas of Canada in Manitoba?

MRS. PRICE: I believe that the Member for St. Johns having been an AG here, knows that that decision would come from the AG's department for any legalized gambling in the province.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have not been an Attorney-General, but I would say that the government . . .

MRS. PRICE: Pardon me. I thought you were.

MR. CHERNIACK: It's all right. But I was Minister of Finance, and therefore was concerned with revenue, and I would think that the government of Manitoba can make decisions. And it's not just the Attorney-General off in a corner somewhere that would make a decision, it's the government that would make a decision, and through the Attorney-General, opens up certain opportunities for entrepreneurs, free enterprisers, to come in and start developing an industry which would produce revenue in tourism. And I have to tell the Minister — I would fight very strongly against that, but

I think it's consistent with what she has said in justifying these grants and the support of the horse racing industry to go further and to look at other revenue supports. And let me say, Mr. Chairman, that having been on the government side for eight years, I was never happy with the revenue that we attracted from gambling and I was not happy, and am not happy, with the horse racing. So she can't throw it back at me to say "Well, you did it for eight years". The fact is our government did, and I for one wasn't happy. But now I have the opportunity to challenge her and say to her, if it is justified to put in additional moneys and investment in order to bring in more tourists and more revenue to Manitoba, then why hasn't the government gone further, and investigated the broader question of gambling as an inducement to tourists?

And I would point out that there are even some places which do what I criticize, where they don't allow residents to enter gambling establishments, only tourists that come in. I think Puerto Rico is one . . . or, there are some places that . . .

MRS. PRICE: Nassau.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, well then, maybe they've made an investigation already. I'd like to know, has the government in its 17 months of government started to look at the question of increased revenues from tourism and taxation by other forms of gambling inducement for tourists?

MRS. PRICE: The suggestion would come to the government through the Attorney-General, as you have suggested, but to date there has not been any suggestion in that regard as far as I know.

MR. CHERNIACK: I did not suggest it would come through the Attorney-General. I did not, and it needn't come through the Attorney-General, it could come from the Minister of Health. It could come from anywhere, and that's not my concern, not being a member of the Treasury Branch, to decide where the suggestion comes from. But what I said was that the government, through the Attorney-General, could legalize certain forms of gambling. But it's a government decision that would have to be made. I am reassured, and pleasantly so, to learn that the government, to the Minister's knowledge, has not started that kind of investigation. But I must say again, that I believe that it would be consistent with the support of horse racing and increased grant assistance of 17 percent, for it to be doing these other things which I consider bad and I'm wondering that they haven't gone that far, and when they're going to get there.

I guess at this stage I shouldn't ask the Minister for an answer, because obviously she is not herself prepared to propose that, even though she is Minister of Tourism. So that to me is reassuring. I know now that one of the members of the Treasury Branch is not promoting further investment in gambling opportunities for tourists.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that I wholeheartedly agree with the Member for St. Johns. I find this a somewhat startling increase in terms of the fact that there's a 17 percent increase in terms of the horse racing industry at the very time when we're getting a hold-the-line type of budget of 5 or 6 percent in health and education. I find that very hard to grasp and appreciate.

I also think that probably the strength of this line in the government Estimates is perhaps a direct result of lobbying by some of the members of the Conservative Caucus, perhaps foremost among them the Member for Virden, and other members who are very strong supporters of the sport or industry of horse racing. I want to ask the Minister specifically — and I don't know whether she's answered this already or not — but given that she's increasing the grants in this area by some 16 — 17 percent across-the-board, is she going to also at the same time increase taxes? Is there going to be any offsetting tax increases in addition to the grant, so on one hand she's giving money away, but is she also going to be taking money back, for example, from the horse racing industry in terms of dollars and percentages?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, there is a net increase of approximately \$153,000 that we are giving them, but in return the figures that I gave here was that we are expecting \$200,000 minimum more because of the increase from 7 to 7.5. And what we are giving them is really their own money.

MR. DOERN: I'm not quite following the Minister there. Last year, compared to this year, how

much more are you giving them, and how much more do you anticipate receiving in increased income?

MRS. PRICE: The net increase that they're getting due to the increased support in the raising of the formula for the purse support is \$153,000, and the return that we're going to get is \$3.4 million. And then this year, we expect a minimum of \$3.6.

MR. DOERN: You're arguing, based on projections, that first of all you are giving them \$250,000 and hoping to receive \$200,000.00.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, but bear in mind, the Member for Elmwood, that they have been having problems in attracting superior-type horses to race, and it is to our advantage to work along with them. They have needed it and it has been very closely looked at and it was very important that we raise the purse maintenance in order to keep an attraction of high quality breeders and etc. here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, just on that point, Mr. Chairman, I suppose like most members I go out to Assiniboia Downs once or twice a year in the summer time and have a look. I wouldn't want to consider myself an expert on fine horses, but what effect has there been at the gate in terms of two things over the past two or three years, like how much has been wagered and how many people have been in attendance? Because my impression is that the way they've been promoting horse racing, they've had tremendous increases of patrons and I don't know whether the average person is really concerned as to whether the finest horses in Canada or in the United States are running. I think most people, they'd bet on any old nag and as long as it comes in, that's all they care about. They don't care whether that horse is setting records that are internationally recognized, whether the horse is beautiful to look at. You put up ten old horses and people bet on them and I think that's all that most people are concerned about.

Could I ask the Minister to answer that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: There were 541,000 people that placed bets last year, to the tune of \$48,500.00.

MR. DOERN: \$48 million?

MRS. PRICE: Oh, \$46 million, I'm sorry.

MR.: That is last year.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. DOERN: Does the Minister have any figures for the past year or two previously?

MRS. PRICE: Yes. 1977 was \$42 million; 1976 was \$24.8 million; 1975 was \$18.4 million.

MR. DOERN: How about people — you're indicating that in two years, the gate has doubled, practically, from \$24 million, it went from \$18 million to \$24 million to \$42 million to \$46 million. In two years, you've had almost a doubling and in three years you've had almost a tripling, two and a half times, so there's been tremendous increases in wagering.

MRS. PRICE: The results of an increase in the number of days of racing — in 1975, there were 70 days, '76 there were 77 days, '77 there were 123 days, and '78 there were 129 days, and this year they expect to have 130.

MR. DOERN: Given that, does the Minister have figures on the number of people? She gave us 540,000 — does she have some figures the last couple of years?

MRS. PRICE: I don't have them.

MR. DOERN: All I'm saying on this point is that there has been a tremendous increase, I assume,

in the number of people who attend the races, many of them American tourists, people from other provinces and, I guess within a radius of a couple of hundred miles. There's been an extension of days. You know, it looks like a fairly rosy picture, and in spite of that, it seems necessary for the government to increase its grant. I ask the Minister whether we're ever going to get to a point where we will not require any grants to this industry.

MRS. PRICE: I don't look on them as a grant; it's their own money that we are giving them back in order for them to be able to produce better results for themselves and, inadvertently for the government. And as I mentioned before, the extra racing days certainly just enhance the tourism industry, and I'm sure that you people from across the other side are just as interested in developing our tourism industry as we are. Whether you're sitting on the Opposition or not, I'm sure that it's to everybody's value, economically, to see that tourism is enhanced in the best way we know how.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think there are a few points that should be brought out here. First of all, the Member for Elmwood mentioned that there's one person on our side of the House that knows more about horse racing, I think, than anybody does, and that's the Member for Viriden. And when I was first appointed Minister of Tourism, one of the problems that I had a great deal of difficulty with was understanding the different formulas involved with horse racing. The Member for Burrows probably can confirm my anxieties along that line when he was Minister, and after a great consultation with the horse people, the thoroughbred people, the Standard bred people, talking to the Member for Viriden, meeting with the different people from the horse community, I think I finally understand that. But one of the things that should be pointed out very clearly to the members opposite when they feel that we're increasing the grants, they shouldn't forget that they voted for that increase in the Legislature last year.

When the Federal government got out of the pari-mutuel betting to the tune of half a percent, we were asked by the horse people and it was agreed to by the track, that we would include that half percent in our particular funding to them, and we would pick it up by legislation. So what happened last year is, the Minister of Finance brought in a bill, into the Legislature, which the members voted on, and there was no discussion, I might add, on it, very little with regards to this particular feature, and the half a percent which was dropped by the Federal government is now being passed on in this particular vote to the horse people. So it's not as if we're depriving any hospitals or any personal care homes or anything like that of any funds that they've got coming to them. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that a number of years ago the former Minister of Tourism, the Honourable Rene Toupin at that time, sat down and was concerned about the amount of wagering that was going on at the track. And in order to try and increase the wagering, and the Member for Elmwood just mentioned that there was a substantial increase, they reduced the amount or the take as far as the track is concerned, and as far as the horsemen were getting, to, I believe, by something like 2 percentage points.

At that time, we saw a dramatic increase in the track betting because people have maintained all the while that the lower the take, in other words, the more that you can give back to the people that are wagering, the more wagering you will have, and as a result, in the final analysis, the better revenue for not only the horse people, but also for the province of Manitoba. So that was done by the former administration. All that has happened here is that half a percent which the Federal government has dropped has been passed on to the horse people because of the Federal government getting out of that particular field. The total take was not increased, so we've got half a percent there which was dealt with in legislation last year, which the members had a good opportunity to debate with, and there's nothing strange about that.

Number two, the 1.25 percent, which is basically the majority of this money, the previous Minister, before the Member for Burrows there, the gentleman that dealt with the reduction in the total take at the track agreed to pay the horse people 1.25 percent for the different incentive programs that we're talking about. However, the formula somewhere went astray and they paid 1.25 percent, and I'm speaking off the top of my head here, for the first ten million dollars, and after that, they only paid one percent. This was a bone of contention with the horse people, who said that they deserved the extra .25 percent which had been promised to them and had not been able to rectify that particular problem. It is my understanding in these particular Estimates that has been rectified. So there is no dramatic increase in the funding, even though it might look like it. It was done last year, they were given additional moneys by special warrant because of the Act that was passed in the Legislature by all members of this government.

Now, further to the few comments the Member for Elmwood made, I will tell you, I would be

very careful if I was he, to make the statements he did about running some of the calibre of horses that he's talking about. We've got two problems, and maybe I should just say, and I'm sorry that he's left right now, what we should do is, and I think we should suggest this to the track people, to once a year extend — instead of having 130 racing days, we should have 131, and that last day, when it gets a little colder, we should have a sway-back derby for the Member for Elmwood. And I think what would happen there, is we would see the Member for Elmwood and maybe a few of his friends sitting out there watching a bunch of old swaybacks running the swayback derby for Russ Doern. And I think maybe that's what he wants, because when you're talking about running a proper race, and in order to attract the calibre of people that want to come out and bet on the different horses, you have to have a good calibre.

And one of the problems that the track has faced is the devaluation of the dollar. The purse maintenance is such that when people bring in their horses from the States, they're getting — when they win a purse of \$2,000, they're only getting \$1,600.00. And they're very concerned about that. So I should point out that, number one, this was enshrined in legislation a year ago, it's nothing that this government has put in or changed, we're living up to commitments of the previous government; and number two, I think the horse people would be very disturbed if they thought for a minute that they could run just any old horse out there. They're a very proud lot, the thoroughbred people go to great extents to upgrade their horses, to try to run the best possible horses out at that track, and I think they would take great exception to the remarks from the Member for Elmwood, because they're proud and they're proud of their horses and proud of their particular industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Not directly related to grant assistance — and perhaps the Minister may find a more opportune moment some time before committee rises tonight to deal with the item, but this deals with the question which I had put to the Honourable Minister last night, which she had promised to respond to tonight, I believe, and that is an explanation of the reconciliation statement shown on page 76 of the Estimates book. If she's prepared to do so now, that may assist us in dealing with this item and with others.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: All right. I'll go down point by point for you. The Racing Commission 1978-1979 supplementary Estimates: Racing Commission Thoroughbred Purse Maintenance Grant — increase of .5 percent offset by pari mutuel tax increase of a like amount, \$239,900.00. Additional provision for life guards, parks branch \$86,400.00 for a total of \$326,300.00. Transfer of functions from Executive Council — increase in Minister's compensation to provide a salary of 15.6 is \$7,800.00. Transfer of functions from and to Economic Development to reflect exchange of administrative support positions in the Deputy Minister's office \$16,800.00. And the offset is \$13,500.00. Transfer of functions from Labour and Manpower, transfer in three of filled ministerial support positions, Executive Assistant and two secretarial is \$447,700.00.

Transfer of functions to Fitness, Recreation and Sport includes salary and other expenditures. Policy and Program Development department administration SMY 4 amount \$69,700.00. That includes one administrative support, one planning analyst, two management analysts. Administrative Services, there's three administrative support and one departmental accountant for a total of 4 SMYs at a cost of \$59,100.00. Personnel management services, one administrative support and two payroll supervisors for a total of 3 SMYs at a cost of \$36,500.00. Transfer to of functions to Fitness, Recreation and Sport, community recreation branch, all program and support staff except one were transferred to the Parks branch. There was 38.3 SMYs for a total of \$1,199,500.00. Now the total for the whole thing is SMYs \$49,300.00 and the amount \$1,364,800.00. Transfer of functions to Mines, Natural Resources and Environment includes salaries and other expenditures. Research and data services, one planning and program analyst, one administrative support and a .39 term administrative support for a total of 2.39 SMYs at a cost of \$69,800.00. Administrative services, one administrative officer, 6.26 administrative support and one internal auditor for a total of 8.26 SMYs for \$122,100.00. Personnel Management Services: two administrative support for a total of two SMYs in 41.8. Parks Branch total: 592.04 SMYs; the cost \$12,426,600.00. Capital Parks Development, there's no SMYs, and the cost \$2,510,500.00. Other transfers of staff: 2.0 SMYs, \$32,400.00. The total SMYs is 610.17; the amount \$15,203,200.00. Transfer of functions to Agriculture; transfer of a vacant library technician position back to the Department of Agriculture, one SMY, for a total of \$10,400.00. Carry-over of Capital Authority for Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets; Ethnic Cultural Projects \$20,400.00. Centennial Centre Corporation \$156,400.00.

Tuesday, March 27, 1979

Historic Restoration and Construction \$67,900.00. Manitoba Horse Racing Commission \$50,000.00. Multicultural Assistance Program \$100,000.00. Museum of Man and Nature \$100,000.00. For a total of \$494,700.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I thank the honourable minister for giving us this explanation. Was there not any provision in the carry-over of Capital Authority for the Dauphin Ukrainian Village or will that appear elsewhere, or does it not appear at all by way of capital assistance?

MRS. PRICE: I am informed that there isn't any specific provision for that. Are you talking about the . . . no, I don't think it's the Dauphin Museum. What was that one for. . . ?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I may not have the correct name, but I could take the honourable minister to it; it's just north of the park gate on the west side of No. 10 Highway.

MRS. PRICE: I am told that they haven't applied yet but it would be eligible under Ethnic Capital Grants Program . . . Acquisition and Physical Assets; but they haven't applied yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister, when she was giving the breakdown of the grant assistance in this item here which has increased approximately 17 percent, does the 17 percent apply across the board or could she give us an actual breakdown of what the percentage increase was say, to Assiniboia Downs?

MRS PRICE: Are you back on the horse racing?

MR. JENKINS: Well, we're still on that item; Grant Assistance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The item is 1.(g).

MR. JENKINS: The Member for Burrows asked you for some information that was requested last night, but as I am speaking to the item that we're under right now which is 1.(g) Grant Assistance, and the minister gave some figure of \$848,000 of a grant to the Assiniboia Downs, I would like the figures last year, or the year previous, because I want to know what percentage the increase was, whether it was 17 percent increase across the board or are some . . . the Thoroughbred Horsebreeders Association received 64.1; what did they receive the previous year? The Manitoba Standard Breeders Association, Administration, and the various other ones that she gave in the breakdown.

MRS. PRICE: The purse support at Assiniboia Downs in 1977-78 were \$420,000; the estimated for 1978-79 is \$787,000.00. The request for 1979-80 is \$848,000, for an increase of 7.8. The Thoroughbred Breeders Incentive Program is 66.9 for 1977-78; 1978-79 61.7, and request for 1979-80 is 61.7. The Manitoba Great Western Racing Circuit is 54.7 for 1977-78; 1978-79 and 1979-80 are all the same; all 54.7. The Manitoba Standardbred Breeders Incentive Program for 1977-78, 1978-79 and 1979-80 are all 28.0. The Manitoba Sire Stakes Program is \$10,000 right across for the three years. Administration for 1977-78 is 69.1; the estimated for 1978-79 is 65.3; and the request for 1979-80 is 62.6, for a decrease of 4.1. The total for 1977-78 is 649.2; the estimated for 1978-79 is \$1,007,100; the request for 1979-80 is \$1,065,800; for an increase of 5.8 percent.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister said that the increased grants hhat the stock breeders are going to receive is to improve their stock. How is the minister going to measure the improvement in the breeding stock in the Province of Manitoba? Is her department going to be in on this criteria of improved racing stock in the province and how does the minister see this

coming about? Is it by importing breeding stallions and brood mares into the province and are we just going to take the word of the other stock breeders association that they are going to improve the breeding stock in Manitoba?

MRS. PRICE: We have a very capable horse racing commission. They keep in very close watch with them, and I would like to also make mention of the fact that we are just in the process of establishing a study group to look into the future of both the thoroughbred and harness racing in Winnipeg and the rural areas.

MR. JENKINS: Is the government then anticipating bringing in brood stock under this program or is it going to be looked after by the horse breeders themselves?

MRS. PRICE: Well, that is one of the things that will be looked into by this study group that is being formed. That is the reason we're having one is to get them to look into all the different facets of the racing industry.

MR. JENKINS: What does the minister anticipate then that this committee will be recommending to the government, that they get into this field, or they improve the stock — what does she anticipate this group is going to recommend to her? I know that's a bit hypothetical, but. . .

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it is hypothetical and I don't think I can answer at this time until the study group has come back to me, but we are just in the process of forming it now and it won't be too long before they are back to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(g)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Another item, Mr. Chairman, since the minister is stating that this item of increase brings in extra revenue, has the minister, or the Cabinet, the Treasury Bench, given any thought to offtrack betting as has been suggested I believe in several other provinces as a form of revenue that might accrue to the government?

MRS. PRICE: The offtrack betting falls under the federal government and the Criminal Code, and I believe that that is being studied right now but there hasn't been any studying done on the part of the Government of Manitoba at this point, or any decisions made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Horse Racing Commission, I would take that it's operating expenditures — that's under General Operating — that's \$62,000.00. Is that essentially the costs Of the. . .?

MRS. PRICE: The general operating in administration is a net figure of 62.6.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The net figure of 62.6.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Then the gross figure will be somewhat higher than that which is paid. . .

MRS. PRICE: It's approximately double.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It's approximately double. And the other half comes from where?

MRS. PRICE: The fees and licenses that are collected.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So that is about \$125,000.00. Could the honourable minister indicate how many SMYs are in the Horse Racing Commission?

MRS. PRICE: There is one executive secretary and the rest of them are all seasonals, stewards and grooms, etc.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Is the executive secretary also the chairman of the commission?

MRS. PRICE: No, he isn't.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Those two functions are separate?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Is the executive secretary a year round job or is it seasonal?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(g)—pass. Resolution 106, item 2. Tourist Branch, 2.(a)Salaries \$563,000—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: You will note, Mr. Chairman, that as opposed to the previous items which we have dealt with, the major ones anyway, from (b) to (e), both inclusive, we had seen a reduction in the Salaries item for the forthcoming fiscal year. In the Tourist Branch the reverse occurs. There is an increase of practically \$41,000, from \$522,300 \$563,000. Could the honourable minister give us an explanation of that?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, that's replacing the position that was seconded to the Parks Branch of a marketing officer, and also the annual increments come ho \$21,000, with 19.6 for the marketing officer and then the general increase, 21.1.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps rather than go through this single question and answer dialogue, if I could. I would like to put a number of questions to the honourable minister of which she could make a note, and then answer them collectively.

With respect to the tourist industry in the Province of Manitoba, the first question that comes to mind, Mr. Chairman, is the number of non-resident travellers which we had had in our province during the calendar year of 1978, the year which had just ended three months ago. We know that in 1976 there were just a shade over 3 million, in fact, 3,061,000 non-resident travellers to be exact in the Province of Manitoba and the committee, Mr. Chairman, would like to have the similar figure for 1978. And we also know, Mr. Chairman, that those 3 million non-resident travellers in Manitoba in 1976 spent something in the order of \$112.5 million in our province so we could want to have the comparable figure for the calendar year of 1978.

We also know, Mr. Chairman, that despite the fact that in 1976 we saw a decline of United States visitors, a net decline of United States visitors visiting our country. But to counteract that, we do know that in that year there was a modest increase of 1.7 percent of American visitors entering Manitoba. So we would want to know how that figure for that year compares with the similar figure for 1978?

And if the Minister could also give us the figures for the calendar year of 1978, showing the number of other Canadians visiting Manitoba, which in 1976 was in the order of 1.87 million, and we would want to know what that figure is for the calendar year just ended?

Then, of course, as the Minister I am sure well knows, that to attract tourists it is important to have comfortable, inviting, attractive tourist accommodation facilities, and we would want to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the inspection of tourist accommodation facilities is still being continued by her department; and secondly is the classification of accommodation facilities continuing?

And, Mr. Chairman, I think the Committee would also want an updated report on the reception of our classification system for accommodation facilities, which was quite well received by a number of other provinces of Canada, and we would want to know whether the Minister has any knowledge of whether the classification system which we had established has been adopted, and whether the other provinces are continuing to follow it' and use it?

We would also wish to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, whether this branch of the Minister's department is offering prospective developers of new premises assistance in the planning and the development of their tourist industry facilities. And I think it would also be helpful if the Minister could indicate to us what the level of investment — the amount that has been invested in new construction and repair work for hotels, tourist cabins, restaurants, and the like, in the province of Manitoba, either for the calendar year just ended, or for the period that her government has been in office, or at least some 12-month period within that 17-month span of time, whichever figure might be most convenient for the Minister to provide us?

And perhaps the Minister could also tell us the number of Manitobans employed in the Tourist industry? In 1976, there were in the order of 15,000 to 16,000 Manitobans employed in the tourist

industry, and we would like to know what that figure is at the present time, or the most recent figure that the Minister may have available, that is, in the tourist industry in total, because of that 15,000 to 16,000, over half we know were employed in the accommodation sector itself?

And I would also wish to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, whether this branch of the department is providing or at least if she does have a travel industry development staff within this branch, which existed prior to October 11, 1977, and if there is one does it continue to provide counselling aimed at insuring that operators get the best value out of their resources; cut wastage to a minimum; maintain good financial control; get maximum value in marketing dollars?

And also, Mr. Chairman, we would want to know whether this branch of the department is continuing the offering of training programs, both for prospective and existing operators in the tourist industry? We would also want to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Provincial Advisory Committee on Hospitality Training and Education is still in existence? And perhaps the Minister may want to comment on it and the assistance that it is offering her in the operation of her department?

And then, that brings us to, I would suspect, a fair portion of this branch's expenditures, namely, tourist marketing by way of media advertising, both within and without the province of Manitoba, and perhaps the Minister could comment on that, and indicate to us the types of, and the extent of, advertising that she is conducting in the various provinces of our country as well as in some of the states of the United States of America. And I think, what would be of prime concern to us is the media advertising program that is being conducted in the neighbouring provinces, the two to the West in particular and the states to the south, North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and wherever else the Minister may be conducting her media advertising campaign?

As well, if the Minister could comment on the advertising campaign that she is conducting to attract the tourist industry to Manitoba from beyond the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; namely, I'm sure that the Minister would know that contacts had been made in countries in Europe beyond the United Kingdom, in Germany, as well as in Japan across the Pacific ocean, and whether that campaign is still being continued, and to what extent?

And if the Minister would also inform the Committee of what, if any, tourist promotional films she may have produced, or if not whether the films that had been in circulation — there were about 12 of them prior to 1977 — whether those are still being used?

And one final question and I'm not quite sure, Mr. Chairman, where I should ask it because from comments made in the House — not during this Session, but during the previous one — we were advised that this particular program was being discontinued, and that is the publication of Manitoba Moods, which in my opinion I think served a very useful purpose and function in attracting tourists to our province in that it did have quite an extensive subscription list — well over 20,000, in the order of 30,000. And the Minister will recall that her predecessor did indicate that the publication of it is being discontinued. And if the Minister either under this appropriation or if she could tell us that it can be more properly dealt with elsewhere, then we will wait until we reach that item, indicate to us what the present status of Manitoba Moods is?

Those, Mr. Chairman, are some of the general questions that I wish to pose to the Minister with respect to this particular branch of her department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: I wonder what the Member for Burrows would say if I asked him to repeat his question?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the first question . . .

MRS. PRICE: I'm only teasing, I don't want to go through it all again.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I can.

MRS. PRICE: Firstly, the first figure you mentioned of 3 million visitors to Manitoba, and you classified them as foreign, I'd like to correct you .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Non-resident, I'm sorry.

MRS. PRICE: Non-resident, I would like to tell you that they are comprised of Canadian, American and foreign.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That's right, not resident of Manitoba.

MRS. PRICE: You wanted to know about 1978? The Canadian was 1,744,000; American was 942,600; the foreign was 19,300; for a total of 2,706,600.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So there has been a significant decline, of about 10 percent?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, there has. I believe all of Canada is experiencing the same problem, and we all have the common problem with our deflated dollar, for one thing.

I will go into the advertising program a little more fully as I go along for you.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain how the, as she has described it, the deflated dollar would detract a tourist from coming to Canada and in particular, Manitoba?

MRS. PRICE: Why would it?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes.

MRS. PRICE: Well, they are losing over 15 cents on their dollar, aren't they, for every dollar they spend.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Is it not the other way around?

MRS. PRICE: Oh, I'm sorry, I've got you twisted. As I said, I'm going to go into my advertising for you in a minute, if you'll just let me I listened to you, so it's your turn to listen to me.

You asked me about the rating system. I would like to report to you that the Hotel Association is looking after the rating system solely, and it's working very well. In fact, the other provinces are looking to us as a model province, and are contemplating following in the same manner.

You asked about improvements in the construction industry. Last year it was \$6.3 million that was spent.

Now you asked how many employees there were supported by the tourists coming into the province; it's approximately 18,000.

You asked me about the overseas advertising; at present CJOT is handling that, however, we are having a feasibility study on it to see if we can become more active in that as our dollars become available.

You asked me about films. We have just released one film, and we have two more about to be completed.

A few of the reasons why we are having more problems attracting more American tourists is because of our high costs in Canada and in Manitoba and we have a lack of competitive products here that they have there, so there is a problem. Since 1973, I believe, there's been a steady decline in the American tourists coming over here, so this year we have stepped-up our advertising campaign some \$300,000, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, in order to stimulate the traffic from across the border.

MRS. PRICE: I can give you a breakdown, the in-province campaign we're spending 26.6 percent of our Budget. We are really working on encouraging people to do their vacationing, the residents of Manitoba to vacation in Manitoba and we have quite a stepped-up program in that direction. The Canadian Campaign is 16.7 percent and that is in Saskatchewan and north western Ontario and you know, and not too far away from Manitoba where we feel it will be the most effective. United States Campaign is 56.7 percent and the bulk of that is immediately south of the border, the Dakotas and Minnesota and some in Iowa but not going down into Texas or Florida or California.

MR. HANUSCHAK: There are a couple of other points that I'm sure the Honourable Minister would want to respond to but in a barrage of questions which I had bombarded her with, I realize she may have missed one or two. One is the counselling assistance to the tourist industry in Manitoba, training programs and the provincial advisory committee on hospitality training and education.

MRS. PRICE: The provincial advisory group I'm told, we work through them in some of the training programs and in an advisory capacity.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And the present status of Manitoba Moods?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, you had mentioned that the subscriptions were somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20,000 to 30,000, they were 15,000 and the loss in revenue, the deficit for the three years was some \$246,000.00. It's a pretty rich program. I agree with you that Manitoba Moods was a very nice publication but it really was not in the benefit of Manitobans to waste the taxpayers money like that when it should really be in the private enterprise and let them handle it and we did. The reason we are late is because we did listen to people who came in and offered tenders to produce the magazine. However, none of them were satisfactory to us and I would like to tell you that we are in the throes of returning the people's subscription money and by the end of this month, it will all be returned. **MR. HANUSCHAK:** So in other words, Mr. Chairman, nothing has happened over the past, at least twelve months because the last issue was published at least 12 months, 13 or 14 perhaps.

MRS. PRICE: Before I came into this portfolio there had been a directive from the former Deputy Minister to hold off the refunding until private enterprise was called in and asked to bid on the possibility of continuing Manitoba Moods but as I say we've had one as late as two weeks ago but we just didn't feel that they were the proper people to handle it. They didn't have the facilities nor would they maintain the high standard that the publication was.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, how does the Minister assess or evaluate the effectiveness of her media advertising program? For example, and this I don't know because I don't believe that the Minister has told us or if she did' I must apologize it has slipped my mind. I don't know whether the Minister is advertising solely through the print media or also resorting to radio and television but whatever it is on what basis does she determine whether she is getting value for her dollars spent in the various types of advertising outlets?

MRS. PRICE: I think you asked what percentage of the advertising was done through the news media?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No I'm sorry. I'll rephrase my question. No, my question is, how does the Minister determine whether she is getting value for her dollar in her media advertising expenditure? I'll give the Minister an example.

Let us say that she spends "X" dollars on advertising in the Minneapolis-St. Paul newspapers and the advertising program runs its course. Then how will she, and I suppose she will be committed to that expenditure for the year because likely she will have to make some contractual commitment with the paper to run her advertising, how will she determine whether come next year she should spend the same amount of money or more or less on advertising in the Minneapolis-St. Paul newspapers as opposed to radio or television either in that city or elsewhere or in another newspaper and that sort of thing.

MRS. PRICE: What we do, we have coupons attached to the advertising in the different news media which is composed of about 85 percent of our advertising campaign. We count the coupons and we follow up on all the coupons that come in so that we know where the return has come from, what place it has come from, and we work very closely with our research department, too, to keep abreast of the returns.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that may give the Minister a handle on the effectiveness of a newspaper advertising. Well first let me ask her this, is there any advertising being done by way of radio and/or television?

MRS. PRICE: Yes there is in both.

MR. HANUSCHAK: There will be no coupons coming back from that form of advertising indicating the effectiveness of it. How will the Minister measure its effectiveness?

MRS. PRICE: Well there's been an ongoing market analysis for the past eight years going on in the department and quite effectively. They know people that are passing through, just going right through the province, they know the people who are just staying overnight, for one night, they know whether they have come from Saskatchewan into Manitoba or from Ontario in here, or from the south into Manitoba and they keep a count on all of it through their research.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well yes, perhaps there's something missing in the Minister's answer or if she

did state it it escaped me. I understood the Minister to say that you know, that she has a mechanism, a structure set up to keep count of the number of visitors entering our province. But how does she know whether visitor A came in response or was motivated or influenced by a radio advertisement or a television advertisement or whatever, in order to know whether the expenditure of whatever number of dollars, say on television advertising, is justified and warranted for the next year. Because the Minister may find that radio advertising may be completely ineffective or may be more effective than spending 3 or 4 times as much on television advertising or whatever.

MRS. PRICE: I'm sure that the Member for Burrows having been the Minister of Tourism at one time, I'm sure that the format hasn't changed very much from when you were in that capacity. We rely on some of the figures that we get from Stats Canada and also from the border crossing and as I say, from the coupons that are attached to the news media. There's any number of ways and it's been going on for the past 8 years so I think that was in your time also.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well whatever the system of assessment and evaluation, they have been in existence in our time, that's one thing. But on the basis of that you know I can't just conclude that the same procedure is being continued by the present government because I have no recollection of any plank in your party's platform, when you ran for election, wherein you stated that you're going to continue certain practices and procedures of this government. I think that, by and large, your platform was one of change so therefore I do not know to what extent you have changed the system of government and hence my question.

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned to you, we are focusing very heavily on travel within the province and we are going to be doing a thorough research in that particular area which is something that is new since you were there. It's something that we are really going to concentrate on — Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister says that she's going to concentrate on keeping Manitobans within Manitoba to spend their vacations here and I think that's a very good tact for her to follow. But has the Minister at the present time or her department any figures on the exodus of Manitoba visitors to other parts of Canada, the U.S. and other parts of the world, season by season? Because I think that if the Minister figures that she's going to be able to keep Manitobans here when the weather is like we have outside, you know, and the warmer climes elsewhere in the world, one only has to go to the airport to see the returning planes from overseas, from Hawaii, the Barbados and other warmer climes to see the people coming back with the tans and you know where they've been. You don't even need to have any statistics, you can just tell by the colour of their faces where they've been, they've been somewhere where you will receive a tan, so the program that she's concentrating on I think would have to be a program for the warmer months of the year to keep the people in Manitoba and visiting here. And I think it's a good program to follow, I think that there are many parts of Manitoba that I haven't visited and I intend to visit as many as I can.

I also would like to ask the Minister if there's been a reversal of the policy in the Tourism branch because the branch was previously cut quite severely last year from its expansion and I see now that it's expanding by at least half a million dollars. Is this a reverse in the policy of the present government from when they came into government, say 16 or 17 months ago? And how does it relate to the tourist statistics? Is it the stark facts of tourist life that we are not getting the tourists because we haven't been doing the promoting elsewhere. And I think that the Member for Burrows has brought out a good point.

It's all very well and good to say paper clippings, that's one way. But I know you can travel across the International Boundary back and forth and unless people actually call into the tourist facility right there to pick up the necessary documents, the Minister said, I believe the other night that they do have a questionnaire for people — how long are you intending to stay, what did you think of things in Manitoba? I've seen the federal one and I've seen the provincial one. The same thing applies if you are travelling across the inter-provincial boundary east or west. Unless people actually call into these facilities and ask for maps and brochures and other things and of course that is part of the standard procedure. But how do you then relate those figures, and it's all very well to count on Stats Canada but Stats Canada is only being fed figures that we are feeding them because after all they don't have the mechanism for ascertaining how many people come into Manitoba, go out of Manitoba. And these are some of the questions that I would like the Minister to deal with. And another question I have is, the Minister stated that she has, I believe, one new

film already completed. Is that correct? A new tourist film already completed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The HonOurable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. JENKINS: And two in production?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. JENKINS: Then I would ask the Minister, since the new owners of the Lord Selkirk are anticipated renewal of the sailing season on Lake Winnipeg, whether any of this tourist promotion in the visual media — and it would have to be on T.V. — since you're producing these productions, does it deal with the potential of tourism on Lake Winnipeg with the re-advent of the sailing season of the Lord Selkirk? Also, since these people, and the government, felt that they couldn't make a go of it — the present government — I would ask the Minister if they are working with the new owners in promoting the restart-up of the Lord Selkirk, and if there are projected, and there might be a possibility, a very distinct possibility, that due to a very short shipping season that we have here in Manitoba, that there might be grants available to the new owners to pick up some of the part of the losses that they may suffer? These are some of the questions that I would like the Minister to give us some answers to.

MRS. PRICE: First of all, Stats Canada doesn't use our figures. They use their own figures, plus the figures they get at border crossings.

With relation to the film that has just been released, the name of it is "Catch Our Good Nature", and it's a film on fishing. In fact, the boys in the department are so pleased with it, they . . . wanted to show it to you people during our

A MEMBER: Have you no girls in this department?

MRS. PRICE: What did I say?

A MEMBER: Boys.

MRS. PRICE: Well, I mean, these particular boys right here. They're so excited about it that they wanted to show it to you, but I thought it was a little unusual that we use that format, so I had to stop them.

I would like to assure the Member for Logan that we aren't helping to finance or subsidize the people for the Lord Selkirk and they have never come to ask for any help. They seem to be able to be making it on their own.

MR. JENKINS: I asked a question, and the first part of the question — in the two anticipated films that you have in production — and I'm not faulting the government if they do, because I think it is a tourist attraction — is there any thought of advertising in the films of the potential of Lake Winnipeg travel? And I don't look upon that as a grant. I look upon that as part of the tourist promotion of the department. There are other private enterprise operations in Manitoba that I think should be also mentioned. There are some of our festivals too that are of very good promotional value for people, the Dauphin Festival, the Mennonite Festival down in Steinbach, the one at Gimli. There are many in the province, and are these being worked into the visual program that will be going out to other parts of the country and foreign parts of the world where we hope to attract tourists.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I would like to assure the Member for Logan that we are showing all different types of our waterways and the different types of festivals and the Folklorama — things that are attractors to Manitoba, we are showing them.

MR. JENKINS: And the Lord Selkirk — is that also included?

MRS. PRICE: The only thing that we are doing for the Lord Selkirk at this point is distributing their literature — we are distributing literature in everything that we do for any operation we are doing for them, but nothing specific.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Madam Minister, you have indeed disappointed me. I was here and I was looking forward to having an opportunity to seeing your latest film. The next time that I visit Harold Einarson's barber shop, one of the owners of the Lord Selkirk, while I'm getting my hair cut I'll be able to see your film — he's cut my hair on and off for the last 35 years, and here I was . . .

MRS. PRICE: That's why he can afford to take over the Lord Selkirk.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I suppose . . . I suppose . . . I suppose. Which says something for the barbering industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass. 2.(b)—pass. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe that with reference to tourism in general, I think it was, in response to some of my earlier questions, the Honourable Minister did give a percentage breakdown of advertising. However, I would suspect that this is where advertising falls under, and so therefore, would the Honourable Minister give us a breakdown of the \$1.3 million under Other Expenditures?

MRS. PRICE: You're too fast for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b) . . . or 2.(b) . . . \$1,311,400 — the Honourable Minister. .

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I can give you a breakdown of the major expenditures that are in that. There's the fees for brokerage charges on shipping promotional matter, clipping services, film services, etc. are \$28,000.00. Printing of promotional materials — \$80.7. Postage, telephone and telegraph — \$18.4. Rental of booth and equipment at trade and sports shows — \$20.8. Computer costs for enquiry service — \$19.4. Automobiles — \$20.1. Our advertising is \$978,400.00. Travelling costs — \$55.8. Training seminars, hospitality, etc. — \$32. And that's the major . . . and then there's a few little minor things that I haven't got listed.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, how much was advertising again?

MRS. PRICE: \$978,400.00.

MR. HANUSCHAK: \$978,400.00.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw the members' attention to the fact that if they do not get recognized by the Chair, this would not come on the transcript. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Honourable Minister give us a breakdown of the \$978,000 as between out-of-province and in-province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: The in-province is \$26.6. The Canadian campaign is \$16.7. The U.S. campaign is \$56.7 — and that's out of the \$817,000.00. The other major components are the media advertising and major publications, motion picture productions and marketing exhibits. That makes up the difference.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe that the Minister has some further explanatory comments to offer.

MRS. PRICE: The estimated budget for the tourism advertising is \$817,000. The breakdown of it is: in-province advertising — \$160,000; Canadian advertising — \$72.7; U.S. advertising — \$487.9; production costs — \$65.4; specialized and co-operative — \$31,000, for a total of \$817,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)—pass. 2.(c)—pass — the Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Can we get a breakdown, Mr. Chairman, of the grant assistance and to whom is a grant assistance made?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, the Tourist and Convention Association of Manitoba — \$146.3, the Manitoba Hotel Association — \$59.1, and special tourist attractions — \$35,000, for a total of \$240,400.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. The Tourist and Convention Association . . .

MRS. PRICE: The which?

MR. HANUSCHAK: The Tourist and Convention Association was \$146,300.00.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: As compared with . . . yes, I believe she answered me . . . and last year was what?

MRS. PRICE: That was the same as last year. There's been no change.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, and what was the Manitoba Hotel Association compared with last year?

MRS. PRICE: \$59.1, the same as last year. And the special tourist attractions, I'll add that there's no change in that, either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)—pass. Resolution 106. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,114,800 for Tourism and Cultural Affairs, Tourist Branch—pass. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I would move the committee rise.

MOTION presented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: I would like to suggest that the committee rise. I concur with the Member for Burrows.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the will of the committee to rise? (Agreed.) Committee rise.

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 51 in the Main Estimates, Department of Health and Community Services. We are on Clause 4. Institutional Services Item (e) Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders. (1) Salaries—pass. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for The Pas. R. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, this particular item has some relationship to questions I've been asking the Minister for a long time relative to the new Correctional Institution at The Pas and I wonder if the Minister could indicate if and when a decision will be made on that matter, and will we be aware of this decision if and when the government makes it, in the next few days or could the Minister give us some idea when that decision will be announced.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be pleased to try. The question of the immediate problem facing us at The Pas with respect to juveniles, I believe, can be met and is going to be met on a temporary basis. I have asked my colleague, The Honourable Minister of Labour to get

me an opinion with respect to a proposal we had to utilize the superintendent's trailer in The Pas complex for juveniles so that they would be separated from the adults in the institution and we're prepared, in fact on the threshold of making that move, but we've run into some difficulty through particular legislation under the, or regulations under the responsibility of the Minister of Labour and he's attempting to clear that roadblock and expedite that arrangement for us.

With respect to the Correctional Institution at The Pas generally, and the challenge there, I can tell the Honourable Member for The Pas that the government, Cabinet has met on this matter on a number of occasions, discussed it on a number of occasions, the most recent being this past Saturday and that a revised and modified concept for a Correctional Institution at The Pas is imminently to be laid before the government by the Minister of Government Services. That is expected to take place within the next very few days, so that I believe I can assure the Honourable Member for The Pas that we are literally on the threshold of a solution, that there is agreement on the part of the members of the Treasury Benches, that The Pas Correctional Institution problem and challenge has to be solved and has to be solved this year, and I expect to be able to make a firm announcement for his edification and that of the community and that of the province, generally within the next very few days.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the situation I think has been discussed a number of times within the Legislature, somewhat within this particular committee and this minister's Estimates. And certainly steps were being taken and the minister has been burning the midnight oil for a year and a half on this issue, and I'm glad to see that he still has (1) some oil left and (2) that they may be making a decision, which is very promising, Mr. Chairman, that a decision might be being made and, Mr. Chairman, I would be very hesitant to give final approval to this minister's Estimates until that decision is forthcoming and an announcement is made by the minister or by his colleague, the Minister of Government Services or by the First Minister, in terms of exactly what the government intends to do, both on the issue of the adult correctional facility, which was already contracted, or already let for, and on the issue of the juvenile detention, which work had been quite a ways down the line a year and a half ago. And, Mr. Chairman, at the end of this month the permit to have the temporary trailer facilities that the minister is going to use now to use one of the trailer's to house juveniles separately, the permits for trailers in fact runs out in the next few days and I'm not sure why the Town Council at The Pas has not been making more of an issue of this than they have. I suppose it's because there are a number of Conservatives on Town Council at The Pas, and they don't want to embarrass the present government; they want to be kind to them in the short time they have left, Mr. Chairman.

But, Mr. Chairman, I can't see us passing this department and the Minister's Salary until some indication of that decision is forthcoming from the minister, because he has been making now a commitment to that decision. It's been a top priority now for a year, and sort of the final, final dates that the minister has given himself on numerous occasions; more recently it has been by the end of this month, and that would give the minister till Friday, I think, to make a decision and to make an announcement. Well, Mr. Chairman, it would be very difficult for him to make an announcement to the House on Saturday and so, Mr. Chairman, I would be hesitant to, for example to allow the Minister's Salary to go by by Friday, if in fact we're to that stage yet, if in fact this decision hasn't been made, an announcement hasn't been made by the government,

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member feels so inclined I suggest that he employ that strategy on my salary, not on this particular item. I just would also like to point out, for the information of the Member for The Pas and members opposite, that the Brandon Correctional Institution, which is fairly representative and reflective of the Taj Mahal, as far as correctional institutions go, was originally to cost the taxpayers of Manitoba something between \$5 and \$6 million.

The estimate I have on it now is that when it's completed and admittedly the situation was affected by last year's summer-long construction strike, but nonetheless the final cost on that institution is going to be about \$8 million. So I just want to apprise members opposite when they talk about the delay at The Pas that we are not about to ask the taxpayers of this province to continue to pour millions and millions of dollars into other correctional institutions when we are already committed for \$8 million at Brandon. We are attempting to solve the situation at The Pas and we have got a big bill to pay right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, since I was involved in this particular institution at The Pas, in terms of going to the extent of actually looking at the plans and discussing with departmental

people and the architect, in fact, the nature of these plans, because I know, Mr. Chairman, that the attitude of the Cabinet was that unless in fact the facility was a simple functional spartan that in fact it would not get approval.

Mr. Chairman, the concept at that time, and I'm sure the Attorney-General must have made some points in this regard, was to in fact have both a courthouse and a correctional facility to be built at The Pas, and what the present government is doing is in fact going to delete — probably, it appears from the Minister's comments — that they're going to delete the courthouse section of the plan, even though the fact that when the Attorney-General was in The Pas he did say that he was concerned that pretty soon the judges were going to refuse to use the old facility because the facilities were so run down that it was not as functional as a courtroom, and the Attorney-General did express that concern at The Pas that someday the judges were going to stop using that facility.

So what the present government has done is in fact cancelled the contract that was let. They are facing a court suit now of half a million dollars — over half a million dollars — from the company that had the contract to proceed. The Minister's revised estimate was a million and a half more and I assume he put in that the increased cost of construction since the tenders were not met and that he put in that figure the cost of the court case. In fact, it's going to cost the people of Manitoba money because of that decision by the government.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I was able to see from the plans for The Pas was that you had a very simple functional and spartan operation within the fact that you have to contain people. And, Mr. Chairman, it always costs something to construct a facility that in fact can contain people, that people are not able to break out of.

The present situation, I'm sure the Minister knows, is unworkable. It is a situation with temporary trailer units that are just not functional for this kind of purpose. It is costing the Minister extra funds in terms of staff to look after those facilities and to look after inmates there. It has cost the Minister a lot of money in terms of further study and investigation to come back to the same decision that was made previously, although the decision was made to delete the courthouse from that operation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what the Honourable Minister would like to have people believe. It is my understanding that his colleague will be recommending to Cabinet then, perhaps tomorrow, the correctional facility part of the operation and a somewhat reduced correctional facility, if I am to understand him correctly, although I am not sure where any reductions or savings can be made and still have an institution that in fact can contain people.

So, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his comments and his concern, and the fact that he considers this a priority, and I look forward to an announcement from him or his government this week, and certainly if that announcement isn't coming by the time of the Minister's Salary debate, then certainly I would like to talk on it for a considerable length of time at that time if they have not yet come to a decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister first introduced his Estimates I asked him for certain figures, as notice. I wanted to know, in the different lines in this area, the staff man years which were deployed in this particular area last year, and those occupied in those staff man years, and the current situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders, we had, in 1978-79, 241 staff man years in the complement. In 1979-80 there is an increase of 10-½. We will have 251-½ staff man years. The breakdown includes 64 for Agassiz, 37 for Seven Oaks . . . Excuse me, these are the staff man years for the breakdown for juvenile institutions, the Directorate Office and staff training and relief. 64 for Agassiz, 37 for Seven Oaks, 134-½ for the Youth Centre and 16 for administration, for a total of 251-½. I'd like to point out that the figure of 64 for Agassiz represents an increase of eight over 1978-79. The figure of 37 for Seven Oaks represents an increase of one. The figure of 134-½ for the Manitoba Youth Centre represents an increase of 3-½ and the figure of 16 for administration represents a decrease, a reduction, of two, down from 18. Two positions abolished were positions for assistants to the director, for a combined total of 251-½ this coming fiscal year against 241.

MR. BOYCE: And the vacancy rates for those two figures, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SHERMAN: The vacancy rates, Mr. Chairman, I'll supply you with in a minute. I think what we have, in total, is, at the moment, of that 251-½, there are 10 vacancies. I will have to ask my officials to give me the individual distribution of those vacancies, but 10 of those 251-½ positions are vacant but will be filled.

MR. BOYCE: And of the 241, Mr. Chairman, then? I had given the Minister notice of this when he first introduced his Estimates and I had anticipated he would have had the staff prepare these.

MR. SHERMAN: Of the 241, Mr. Chairman, there were 12 vacancies.

MR. BOYCE: Now, for us to properly understand what the Minister intends to do with this money that he is asking the Legislature to approve, perhaps the Minister could advise us just exactly how he has been involved in developing policy and programs relative to the Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders.

I wonder if the Minister can advise the House on how many occasions he has consulted with the Solicitor-General of Canada in this regard.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I can deal with the question the honourable member asked me first on the 10 vacancies, three of them are at Agassiz, four of them are at the Youth Centre and three of them are at Seven Oaks.

In answer to his second question, my consultations with the Solicitor-General of Canada, up to this point in time since my assumption of this Ministry, have been concerned with the proposed new federal juvenile offenders legislation and have not been specifically directed to programs in the juvenile field other than the proposed legislation itself, which, as the honourable member knows, includes a number of proposed new approaches and concepts in the field of Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders. It also carries with it an implicit financial commitment, a financial burden which has to be picked up by somebody, and Manitoba's position to date has been not much different from the position of my counterparts from the other provinces across the land, and that is to ask Ottawa who is going to pay the cost.

MR. BOYCE: The Minister didn't answer my specific question; I asked him how many times he had been in consultation with the Solicitor-General in this regard. Perhaps the Minister could advise the House what different policy that he is recommending vis-a-vis the recommendations of the prior administration.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question as to the number of times I have discussed this with the Solicitor-General, the answer is twice. I have also discussed it with my colleague, the Attorney-General.

Insofar as the approach of this government to the policies and programs in the field as they were in place at the time of the prior government's leaving office, I would advise him that the biggest change has come about in the approach to the operations of the Manitoba Youth Centre, where an audit which was launched under the previous Minister or under the previous government was completed and was acted upon, an audit which addressed itself to problems of administration, operation, function, objectives of the Youth Centre, which focused in some substantial degree upon the question of authority and discipline and direction.

There were a number of suggestions emanating from the audit which certainly recommended themselves to this government, and they were implemented under the Ministry of Corrections as it existed prior to our absorbing it into Health and Community Services. They essentially have produced a result that is best measured in a better record, better performance of the Manitoba Youth Centre in its essential function as a holding institution for juveniles, and in a better reflection of discipline and line reporting control.

We felt, and I think there was considerable public sympathy for the feeling, that there were problems in terms of the definitions of authority and lines of authority at the Youth Centre. There were problems in terms of discipline. There was a question as to who was in control, the Administration of the Youth Centre or the Youths who were temporarily incarcerated there. That question has been cleared up and resolved. It's the Administration that's in control, and I think that the establishment of that clearer definition of discipline has been not only productive from the point of view of the relative ease of operations of the Youth Centre itself but certainly from the point of view of the youthful inmates who are detained there, who in the past perhaps did not have the sense of order and direction that all young people require and that young people in their condition require more than most.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, it's always a pleasure to hear that something that you started is succeeding because, as the Minister said, it was as a result of action taken by the prior Administration that the problems are being solved, and I, for one, don't intend to be involved in irresponsible criticism. This Minister and no other Minister is going to solve all the problems — problems that occur from time to time — and I don't intend to try and make political mileage with this very important function of governments in our society. I will not follow the example given to this Legislature by the Member for Wolseley who tried to contribute more to the problems than solving them.

But, Mr. Chairman, it's passing strange that the government has chosen to include these functions in Institutional Services. The Minister said earlier that he is not that much apart from his colleagues in other jurisdictions; I say he's diametrically opposed to most of them as his First Minister is relative to some problems he's discussing on the west coast. The consensus world-wide in this area, as pointed out and documented at the United Nations and other areas — in fact, the Inspector-General in the province filed a report on what was going on in a couple of European countries, and people will admit that until such time as we get those youngsters back closer to the community then we're not going to solve the problems, and when he includes such functions in Institutional Services — when he says the Administration's in control, I would commend to the Minister a couple of books in complex organizations because you will always have these disagreements within institutions which detain people. You know the treatment custody dichotomy that the debate will continue under this Minister and he will be expected to exercise his judgment to see that the public interest is served as best as possible. It should go on record, Mr. Chairman, that I for one would not take that much credit for having solved some of the problems at the Centre. I think the compliments should go to this lazy, inefficient Civil Service, the fat Civil Service that we keep hearing about. The instrument that they used to carry out an evaluation was done, as I recall, with reference to the Dauphin institution. They've developed a management tool and subsequently they modified, the staff modified it somewhat and applied it to the Youth Centre and I will give credit where credit is due. I think an awful of credit has to go to John Bock. I don't know if Mr. Bock is still at that institution or not but it was under his leadership that many of the problems were solved. So, for the Minister to get up here and posture that he has been responsible for some of these shifts, I think it ill behooves him.

But, Mr. Chairman, the difference — I won't get involved in repetition. The Minister brings out the 5.2 to the 8 million relative to the Brandon. I suppose we could discuss this under almost any item because it's involved with juveniles and it's involved with adults and it's involved with probation and parole services and the rest of it.

But, Mr. Chairman, in 1969, and I have to admit, in 1970, in 1971 and '72, '73, governments had done precious little in this particular area and one of the prime examples of what hadn't been done is best epitomized by the situation in The Pas. When I said the other day I'd walked out of the office. . . I wish I had kept copies of the fire commissioner's report relative to the old correctional institution in The Pas and published them. That is the way I think government should function. Because, Mr. the Conservative Government and the New Democratic Party Government for a number of years, had done absolutely nothing as far as maintenance of that particular building was concerned. And, this was true of the whole system. There was in place a ten year redevelopment plan with guidelines and the suggestions of how the system could be upgraded and if this Minister is trying to convince the public of the Province of Manitoba that the money isn't well invested then I say once again, he's being irresponsible.

With reference to the Brandon Jail, it was built at the turn of the century. It's 100 years old. And, he talks about — well, his original figures were \$5.2 million. So if we project it the same way at 100 years' lifetime for that particular institution, if you amortize your \$5.2 million at government rates over the 100 years, you're talking about an annualized cost of some \$70,000 to \$75,000 a year. So, don't come up and throw figures to try and confuse the electorate because I think there are some areas that we can discuss in a more responsible way in this House.

You know I don't know the difference of Conservative philosophy relative to corrections or an NDP philosophy relative to corrections. I think it's a joint responsibility. So, if we could take that kind of gobbledegook out of our discussion perhaps we can come to grips with some of the problems. Because in this area I am sure the Minister would be the first to admit, he needs all the support he can get to try and do anything in this particular area because it is very difficult to attract the money to do something with it. They'll give the Minister of Highways in Cabinet — and I know, I was there — \$30 million more to build roads or they'll put up \$20 million to subsidize beef or we'll put \$25 million into Saunders Aircraft, or we'll put \$100 million into the CFI or we'll do this, that or the other thing, but it's very, very difficult to convince people that this is an investment

in the future.

Those people who were in government before they were defeated in 1969 know that the only reason that the Youth Centre, as good or bad as it is, exists is because of public pressure with the old Vaughan Street Detention Centre. We had a local Black Hole of Calcutta and I gather it was one of the first marches on the Legislature was the churches and everybody else got involved and came down to the steps here before the government started to draw up the plans for the extent facility. Because governments all across Canada are, in my view, not investing money in an area which they could eventually save money.

You know, it used to be, Mr. Chairman, that in dealing with people who were in difficulty you'd take every politician's blind nephew and everything else and give him a set of keys and call him a guard and say, go to work. Well, in Manitoba we're very fortunate. In an awful lot of — well, not so much in the juvenile end of it, but when they first started out this was true, a lot of people who were in the system were returned servicemen. So, we were fortunate in this regard.

But now we have to talk about what we're going to do — not for this year, not for next year, but for ten years from now. And if he wants to talk about Brandon, we can't talk about the average daily population — my colleague the Minister of Public Works was asking the Minister. He talks about average population. This is a ludicrous figure to use, because you have to build for maximum populations and you can't add to the system every year, so you have to try as best you can, project on how big a facility you're going to have to have for the period of time that you're going to amortize the building. So, you know, if the Minister wants to go that route, I'm quite willing to get involved in that kind of debate, but I don't think it serves the people of the province at all.

And in talking about staff once again, if you wanted to build a hydro camp, you'd get workers to go there, you'd put up a tarpaper shack and people for some reason or other would go and live in them and the wind was whistling through and everything else and they do it in lumber camps and everything else. You can't get people to work in those kinds of conditions. So, built into that system out in Brandon, it's quite a complex facility in the first place.

I for one will have to support the Minister with his 5.2 or his \$8 million because I think it's a necessary expenditure. I'm sorry to hear that cost escalations are such that they have gone from 5.2 million to 8 million during the construction period which would be about 20 months now I imagine. And, of course, this gives me cause for concern. But, nevertheless, I think that the tendering process was followed. The Minister can perhaps correct me if I'm wrong or if he has found something onward that was done. It was done by the same people that he is at the present time receiving advice from, so that we collectively have to bear the responsibility that the costs have escalated.

With the staff man years that he has mentioned here throughout the system, that he has cut a couple of people from the administrative staff from the Assistant Director level, I think one of them was . . . he mentioned . . . Well, perhaps they can function for a while without these support people, but that all depends on what the minister intends to do. If he intends to be actively involved in determining how young people will be dealt with in this province, then he can't do it by cutting his staff. Because when he tells me that over the past 18 months he has only been in consultation with the Solicitor-General twice, I really wonder just exactly how much input he will have in what comes out in the young people in conflict with the law legislation, which the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman, had as a matter of priority some six, seven years ago. They had three priorities: they had young people in conflict with the law, gun control and capital punishment. Well, these three things just got turned around and they went capital punishment, gun control, and they still haven't solved the young people in conflict with the law.

And we get people chipping away at making recommendations that we should superimpose the adversary system in dealing with youngsters, and we really haven't had a proper debate on this issue. There are different models around the world that I think we in Manitoba should look at, and in this regard there are more reports on differences of opinion and recommendations to the minister, somewhere in his office, I don't know, maybe he's got them stored over in the new garage or something, because there's nothing emanating from the government that they're doing anything in this area. You know, it's fine for the minister to stand up and make the type of remarks, which he is good at, his selling hamburgers approach to things, but nevertheless there's been absolutely nothing emanate from the government as far as policy in this area.

And the minister and I can get in arguments of . . . he can do with fewer staff than I did or he can build a better institution than I did or I should say the former administration because it wasn't myself. But he should know that the people in Manitoba are entitled to some direction, some leadership. I know this goes against the grain of Conservative philosophy because they think if you stand back long enough, you know, long enough, some Greek god or somebody is going to come along and solve it or the problem will go away. But there's evidence, overwhelming evidence that this isn't the case, this isn't the case, and the same staff that is advising the minister was advising

the former administration and their efforts and their recommendations and suggestions proved to be valid that the numbers are going up.

And another item on the minister's Estimates, over on psychiatric services, we spent considerable time talking about one item, which the government without even giving it a proper test in the light of day scrapped. The minister uses a different word, he calls it "suspend support". But effectively this would be like the "kiss of death" unless they changed their policy to try and keep people out of the institutions in the first place, because there are many people who would suggest that this is the only logical approach to the problem, why these youngsters are getting into difficulty — prevention.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, in this area, if the minister could advise us . . . let me go back just a bit. I think he had said earlier today about an organizational chart. Has the minister got an organizational chart of how the whole department is structured and where this fits in? I had seen one somewhere, but I don't seem to have a copy of it, so perhaps the minister could tell us whether he has a copy with him, or he will provide it for us.

One other question that perhaps the minister could advise us on. Salaries, there shows under the item, \$930,000, Recoverable from the Federal Government. Could he advise us how much, if any, is recoverable under Salaries of personnel?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the organizational chart, I don't have one with me. I have made them available and as a matter of fact, they were distributed through Information Services, but I certainly will get one for the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

With respect to his reference to the minister's posturing about the Manitoba Youth Centre and the improvement there, I dismiss that as politicking. I recognize that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre is in a difficult position. He was minister of this department when it was a department for some three years and he is in a difficult position. He has very little to criticize that can't be laid at his own doorstep, and I recognize that, but I think it should be noted for the record. He talks about cutting of staff and he talks about cuts and cutting. He's looking at an increase of 10.5 staff man years, and in the crucial areas, we believe, yes, that the Ministry of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services was top heavy with bureaucratic overlay, was top heavy with administrative overlay, and that's where we're cutting, in administration. My Assistant Deputy Minister, Dr. Tavener, my Inspector General, Eric Cox, and my Commissioner of Corrections, Hans Schneider, can do the job, with John Bock, Doug Lawrence and Jerry Dragen, and with the others who are in positions of responsibility in this division. We don't need the bureaucratic administrative overlay that the previous government had.

He talks about the Brandon Correctional Institution. I would remind him that we're on (e) Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders.

MR. BOYCE: You raised it; you raised it.

MR. SHERMAN: I raised it because you tried to relate the situation at The Pas to a kind of a overly frugal approach of this government to juvenile detention and juvenile detention facilities. He talks about prevention. I would remind him that we're dealing with care and treatment of juvenile offenders. We're not talking about prevention. Prevention is an entirely different area. He's doing the same thing that a dozen of them have done for two weeks, on these Estimates, Mr. Chairman, and we're not going to sit still for it forever. I think we've been very co-operative and very tolerant, but they exploit every single line to deal with any item that they want to. If he wants to talk about prevention, let him wait till we get to prevention. If he wants to talk about Brandon, let him wait till we get to the care and treatment of adult offenders. We're talking about care and treatment of juvenile offenders, that means offenders; that doesn't mean prevention. That means somebody who has offended against the law and now must be dealt with. We're talking about providing care and treatment for the residents of Juvenile Reception and Rehabilitation Centres. We have boosted the Budget, we've boosted the staff man-years, and he says that, you know, that's not good enough we're cutting, because we cut two administrative positions out. Well, I can tell him that we want that manpower and womanpower where it counts in services and treatment and security, not sitting in offices with papers stacked on their desk and their feet stacked on their papers. So don't let him try to get away with the kind of artificial pose that he's taking in opposition which is constructed out of an indefensible position. I know the reason he's doing it because they went through three years of it, they left us to inherit a correction system that was bloated, overspent and to some degree, in a shambles. They left us with a Youth Centre that was in disarray. They left us with two or three Taj Mahals going up in this province that were built, or were projected to be built

at two and three times the cost that any sensible government would have built them, and he stands up there and tries to make a case out of his role in opposition.

So he may point to my role as posturing, I point to his as politicking and pretty darn weak defense for their record. He talks about the average daily population of these institutions being a ludicrous figure to work from. Well, if it's such a ludicrous figure, why does his colleague the Honourable Member for Elmwood stand up in Question Period and ask me what the daily population at Headingley is? If it's that ludicrous, why do they ask about it all the time? It's ludicrous in comparison because if you look at the average daily population of these institutions under their administration and look at them now, particularly in the adult field, you'll note a pretty sharp reduction. The pretty sharp reduction we're using probation services to the fullest extent we can. In the juvenile field seven out of every ten juveniles on probation is being dealt with in his or her own home.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us just deal with the facts, with the records, with the challenge that we were left with, with the relative shambles that we were left with, with the deficit that we were left with, with the problem of getting this province on-track financially in such a way that we can support what we've got. And let's not try to paint pictures about a great philosophical dogooder approach that was developed in this field by the previous administration and that this government has turned it's back on.

What did he do about the young offenders legislation? He was in office for three years. Did he make so much headway with the Solicitor-General? That isn't what the Solicitor-General told me nor is it what my counterparts across the country have told me. He knows that it's complicated to work out new young offenders legislation to replace the Juvenile Delinquents Act and to deal with the other component; the people, the children, the youngsters who come into contact with the Child Welfare Act. He know the difficulties but he's trying to smoke screen the issue by putting that kind of argument across because he's got an indefenceable opposition position. I'm prepared to debate these Estimates with him reasonably and responsibly but I'm not going to tolerate that kind of politicking from a no defence position.

As far the Salaries go they are up. The Other Expenditures are up, the staff man years are up. On the Recoverable from Canada \$930,000, 50 percent of it is for the per diem for Agassiz and Seven Oaks. The other, \$767,000 is salaries. The other expenses are \$186,000 are recoverable from Ottawa. I trust that answers the former Minister's questions. .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister uses his usual ploy. You know when he hasn't got anything to say, he says it loudly. You may recall, Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I talked about his staff reduction on one item — the Administrative item. I got his figures where his increases are but, Mr. Chairman, the figures were \$767,000 and the Minister was kind of muttering there when he was running out of steam because his argument is really ludicrous that I'm in an indefensible position. My position is very defensible. And when he talks about the Solicitor-General, I don't know to whom he was talking to. The Solicitor-Generals I talked to aren't there now, it was Frances Fox and Warren Allmand but nevertheless I don't know if he's had conversations about the contribution of Manitoba . . . —(Interjection)— Those yahoos have they got something to say, Mr. Chairman, if they have I wish they would stand up and say it. —(Interjections)—

But, Mr. Chairman, I had thought we could use a reasonable approach for this particular item when I had said that that would be my preference. But nevertheless the Minister choses otherwise and my inclination would be just to pass the item because time will tell just exactly where his philosophy and his programs are taking us. The Minister knows absolutely nothing about the program and he just demonstrated it. This is talking about offenders he says. He knows nothing.

A MEMBER: You're an expert.

MR. BOYCE: More so than anybody over there. —(Interjections)—

MR. FERGUSON: We've been listening for an hour and we haven't heard anything yet.

MR. FOX: Get up and make a speech. Sit down Bud. Let him have the floor, he's so anxious.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: We are going to continue with the debate, Mr. Chairman, are we?The Minister, you

know, it's strange they can run around the province saying we're nincompoops, we're wasted, when that ding dong in the corner seat over there that I'm a Communist. And we're supposed to roll over and play dead and I'm supposed to listen to gobbledegook that that gentleman over there opposite just came out with?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: The point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I just ask you for a ruling with respect to the terminology just used by the Member for Winnipeg Centre in reference to one of the members on this side and I ask you whether that is a parliamentary expression?

MR. FOX: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One point of order. Would you mind we'll just have a ruling on this one?

To the honourable members, "gobbledegook" is not considered unparliamentarian. It might sound a little distasteful but it is not considered unparliamentarian according to Beauchesne.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan on the same point of order?

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say there is a heck of a lot of provocation going on from the heckling. Now I think that some of it is enjoyable and sometimes, you know, in order, but I do think that some of those members who have been really very vociferous from their seats, should be given the opportunity to say their piece and not to heckle the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, who I think is trying to do a job, and so is the minister. Now if the others want to participate, they should so indicate to you and you should give them the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: In the interests of good taste, even if it isn't out of order, I withdraw the remark of "ding-dong". But, Mr. Chairman, all I was doing was — not very well, I suppose — mimicking the minister, that he talks about offenders. You know, inadvertently, the Conservative members opposite get away from their prepared text and they truly reveal themselves and the minister reveals his ignorance in this particular area, or something more dangerous, their policy, because when he says that prevention doesn't enter into this particular item, he begs the whole deal with juveniles. The idea isn't to take them in there and lock them up; it's to keep them out of there in the future, so it is a preventative program and that's what it is supposed to be all about. Now the minister has told us tonight it is not; they have changed this policy relative to young people, and I think the minister should stand up and tell the public of the Province of Manitoba that all the Youth Centre is now, is a place to lock juveniles up, it's a detention centre — we've gone back to that term — and all the other facilities are detention facilities for juveniles and it is well set up in institutional care because that's what it is. There's no prevention, there's no attempt to cut down the recidivism rate, that his philosophy is bent towards incarceration and not trying to prevent them returning to these institutions. . .

MR. SHERMAN: That's rehabilitation, and you know it.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister from his seat says: "That's rehabilitation, and I know it". Well, we're learning a whole new set of words from the minister in his Estimates. Now we've got a new one, that rehabilitation is limited to locking people up. Suspension and monitoring, we've had those definitions under other areas. So the minister accuses me of poiticking, well, that's his prerogative, and the voters next time will determine who should occupy the pew.

I had thought that we could discuss this in more of a co-operative spirit, but nevertheless the minister has put me in a position where now I've got to sit down at night and think about writing sentences like: "the muffled cadence of jackboots" and things comparable —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon?

MR. ORCHARD: Did you sell your jackboots?

MR. BOYCE: Maybe you should talk to some of your colleagues on the front bench there and find out who I'm quoting.

But, Mr. Chairman, we're not going to get the kind of answer out of the minister I thought we would be able to get under this particular item, so that unless somebody else has something to say on this side of the House, I would just pass the item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, if I can make a few brief remarks about this particular area. I don't think it shouldn't go unnoticed that members on this side of the House consider the care and treatment of juvenile offenders and the whole juvenile justice system to be one of priority, one that requires a great deal of attention by the government, Mr. Chairman, and that's why last year the minister and I together appointed a task force of juvenile justice committee composed of representatives from my department, his department, from the Chief Provincial Judge as the Chairman of the committee, people representing the City of Winnipeg, the department dealing with juvenile offenders. They have held a series of public meetings throughout the province during last fall, and have received many submissions from the public and we are, Mr. Chairman, expecting a report from the Juvenile Justice Committee some time within the next few months. I simply want to emphasize at this particular point in time that we consider the matter to be of extreme importance. It has not been an effective system. I don't particularly fault the previous government or anybody. That's something that is common I think to all of North America, that everyone is looking at new solutions to these particular problems and hopefully we will be able, as a result of this review, to implement some programs that will assist in the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to address a few remarks to the Minister of Corrections and also to the Attorney-General, because I drew to the attention of the Attorney-General almost five weeks ago, the Ombudsman's Report, and I have been waiting patiently since some time around February 21, or 22 or 23, for a response. Now a whole month has gone by and I suspect that what is happening is that the minister has taken no action or is sitting on a report into the allegations of the Ombudsman concerning violations of provincial and federal statutes.

Now, I cite as an example some comments made in the Ombudsman's Report, starting on page 29 on, indicating for example, that because of the placement of male juveniles, female juveniles, in The Pas, that it is impossible to provide segregation as required by law. That is one comment made.

On the very next page, there is a reference to the comments made by the Inspector General, Mr. Cox, and mentioning that there has been complete disregard to heed legislation which requires adults and juveniles to be held separately. And there is probably not another institution in the whole of Canada which so ignores the legal and professional requirement to hold juveniles separate from adults. Now those are the charges. And then there is an excerpt in here, provided, I suppose by the Ombudsman, indicating what the penalty is for these particular violations, and it mentions under the Juvenile Delinquents Act that, first of all the juvenile shall be placed in a separate home and then that any officer or person violating this subsection is liable for a fine not exceeding \$100 or for imprisonment not exceeding 30 days. And so on and so on. Also references under the Corrections Act to violations of a provincial statute, and on the next page, Violations of the Child Welfare Act, which says very simply, that children shall not be held in a lockup with adult prisoners.

Now I ask this of the Attorney-General, I asked him a month ago. He said he would take this as notice, and he proceeds to sit on this, and I, you know, I have to wonder just, you know, what is going on here. Whether he feels that he's protecting his colleague or he's too busy or what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Russell on a point of order.

MR. McKENZIE: Do I understand that we're now referring to the Attorney-General's department's Estimates what we're dealing with at the moment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, I could see some relevancy on the care and treatment of juvenile offenders. The consequences and the reference to the Attorney-General, I would believe would be out of order. But the actual reference to the care and treatment of juvenile Offenders I would rule to be in order.

MR. DOERN: On the point of order, I didn't hear your concluding comment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: References to the care and treatment of juvenile offenders of which the Honourable Member for Elmwood did make reference would be certainly in order under this

clause. The consequences and reference to the Attorney-General's department, I would believe would not be in order. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: On the point of order, we are dealing with Estimates of the government. The Minister of Health and Corrections is responsible for the management of certain departments, but if the Attorney-General has any contribution to make to government, it surely is in dealing with problems of government such as this. Now, the Attorney-General's salary isn't being questioned, but the government's item dealing with care and treatment of juvenile offenders is, and it's the entire government that can be asked or challenged for their statements or their opinions. As you know, Mr. Chairman, they don't have to reply, but certainly the honourable member, in dealing with care and treatment of juvenile offenders can deal with any Minister on that issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, let me just advise the Honourable Member for Elmwood that I answered the question he's asking at 8:05, so there's no requirement to ask the question again. The answer is in Hansard or he can check with his colleague, the Member for The Pas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a problem. I will continue to speak. That is a problem that I have, because I'm in two committees tonight, and I'm —(Interjection)— yes, that's right, I'm in the Tourism committee, for which I'm the lead critic, and I'm speaking in there, and I also am interested in Corrections and so I'm unable, by limitations, to be in two places at a time. But I will take the Minister's word for it. And I will —(Interjection)— I think I have the floor, and I simply say that I cannot be in two places at one time, and I may speak repetitiously and I will take the Minister's word for it. But all I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that I am not aware, and I will soon find out, as to what steps or what actions that the Minister of Health has taken to correct that situation. Maybe he laid out his plan of action, but I know the Attorney-General, who was asked questions to report on whether or not the government and the department was in violation of a series of provincial and Federal statutes. I know he hasn't said anything. I know he has not reported to the House, and so therefore we're still awaiting his slow but sure response.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to mention again — and again I have the problem of not hearing all the debate but hearing only portions of it — I know that on April 3rd, quoting now from an article in the newspaper a few days ago, that on April 3rd, that the Minister is required to rectify the situation in The Pas by the Town Council. That he has until then' next week, in which to get out of those trailers and I'm wondering whether he's going to meet that particular deadline. I also don't know whether my colleague from The Pas quoted from his own newspaper about the Minister's top priority, The Pas jail. Was that raised tonight? Because we know, we've seen all the articles about the Minister and how he's going to make this his top priority and —(Interjection)— Oh, he's still studying it. And that is one of the problems that confronts us.

Mr. Chairman, because of the manner in which that whole project was handled, we could have, at this point in time, be witnessing a new facility up north. And now we're in a state of affairs where because of the slowness of the government to act, which I think they're still exhibiting. The Minister of Health, the Minister of Government Services, the Attorney-General, they're still studying, they're still monitoring, they're still making up their mind about The Pas jail and about the Brandon jail, I assume. And you know, I say to you that there has been, first of all, a violation of the law in that state of affairs. They have continued to violate various statutes, and I find this particularly shocking on the part of the Attorney-General. He's the man who's supposed to be the defender, the number one defender in the entire government, to ensure that the law is followed in spirit and in letter, and he's not cracking a whip on one of his deskmates, who apparently, according to former police chief, now the Ombudsman, says that they are violating various statutes. That is one, I think, very serious consequence of this stalling.

The other thing is that in terms of construction, they halted a project which was planned at \$5 million and now we're witnessing a law suit. They stalled the contractor, Mr. Chairman, on The Pas jail. That was the first action. We awarded the contract in the sense of forwarded a Letter of Intent to the Foundation Company . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Repetitious questions and statements are out of order. This has been discussed completely, I would think, because from following the Honourable Member for Elmwood, it's exactly what was discussed previously.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, I'll take your word for it, I'll simply say, in short, that the price of stalling on that particular project, in my judgment, has been \$2 million; \$700,000 for the contractor in a lawsuit — we'll see how much is paid, we'll see how much the government is obligated for — and at least a 20 percent price tag in terms of construction costs that have risen.

But you know, the thing that interests me is that this Minister, I think, is first and foremost among all the Ministers as the man who monitors, the monitoring minister, and whenever we ask him a question, he gives us a similar answer; it's being studied, it's being considered, it's being monitored, and I would like to know whether there is any evidence on this item in the Estimates as to whether he can indicate which people are being given the task or whether he has taken on any new people in his department in terms of planners . . . —(Interjection)— . . . planners or researchers, because when I listen to all the government Ministers speaking, Mr. Chairman, we get the impression that the one area in which the government has added staff is in the whole area of research and planning. And I'm curious on this point as to why it is taking so long, why it is taking 18 months, and how many months more is it expected to take to come up with a decision on The Pas Correctional?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister whether he would be so kind as to answer that question, or whether he cannot or will not at this time?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Elmwood is incorrect when he suggested the only area where the government has increased staff is in Research and Planning, and I'm not sure that we have increased in Research and Planning. I'm sure we've increased it in Care and Treatment of Juvenile Offenders, and those figures have already been given to the Committee and to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

The total all-up cost for The Pas Correctional Institution in the original concept was \$6 million plus.

MR. DOERN: It was not.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the honourable member says it was not. I happen to have the prospectus in front of me. The total all-up cost of the complex was \$6,069,053.00. We believe we can do it for less than that. —(Interjection)—

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that that raises a point, that the Minister is stalling on that project because he is going to do it cheaper, and I would like to know in what way he is going to do it cheaper? Because, I have already said to him that he is first of all being saddled with a lawsuit, and secondly he has been confronted with additional costs. Now he quotes a figure of \$6 million; I'm quoting a figure of \$5.1 million, which was for the contract that was let; and I would like to know — I would like him to answer this point specifically — how is he going to do it cheaper? What is he going to eliminate from that project, is he going to make it smaller; is he going to use inferior materials; what is he going to do in order to make that cheaper? What did he find too rich for his blood in that particular project, and how many months — it has taken him a year and a half to study that proposal which he found too expensive — but in the meantime, because of delays, he has added a potential \$1.7 million more, which is another 35 percent to the cost of the project.

So could he, for the benefit of the Committee, indicate what he intends to eliminate from that project, because we've heard this before, but we've never heard what's going to be taken out?

MR. SHERMAN: No, I can't indicate that at this juncture, Mr. Chairman. As I answered earlier to the Member for The Pas, there is a proposal and submission coming forward from the Minister of Government Services that will answer that question, and that it is due to come forward to government within the next very few days, and was dealt with in part last Saturday. I've answered that question.

As far as breaking the law is concerned, I don't deny that the accusations of the Ombudsman are correct, I would ask the honourable member whether he thinks the law was only starting to be broken on October 24, 1977?

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say, that this has to be one of the slowest moving governments ever in the history of this province. They take 18 months to review a project — boy, do you call that action? I call that inaction.

The other area I would like to ask the Minister, was a question raised previously by the MLA for Fort Rouge, and that is his allegation and he quoted Justice Kimelman, who apparently said that the number of juvenile offenders being raised to Adult Court has doubled in the past year, and he said that the Judge said that one reason is the lack of proper treatment facilities for juveniles.

Now, we've had some discussion on this, and when we get the government taking certain actions, or the courts taking certain actions, the government will never admit, Mr. Chairman, that it's because of a shortage of space. They seem to have a hang-up in that regard, and they are in a real dilemma, and here's the dilemma: They have a restraint program, they don't want to spend money, they don't want to build facilities, and then they get themselves into a situation where it has an impact on the community, and they refuse to break through that psychological block, and they refuse to allocate the funds necessary to provide the needed facilities; and so it goes around and around.

And we'll deal with the Attorney-General in this regard when it comes to certain parts of his particular program, but in terms of the Minister of Corrections, and in terms of juveniles in particular, what is his answer to Justice Kimelman, that it is because of a shortage of facilities that juveniles are being raised to Adult Court? Now maybe he doesn't know what the impact is in terms of the courts. We heard what the Attorney-General had to say on this when he was speaking. He had first stepped into the breach and said he wanted tougher sentencing; now maybe tougher sentencing means also raising juveniles. But I asked the Minister whether he has any concern — the Minister of Health — about the fact that a prominent Judge has made this charge?

MR. SHERMAN: I could have concern, Mr. Chairman, if my colleague the Attorney-General hadn't already answered that question, and perhaps the Member for Elmwood was out in another Committee at that time. As I recall, the Member for Elmwood raised that question on Question Period, it was answered by the Attorney-General, it's in Hansard.

The raising of juveniles to Adult Courts, I'm advised by my colleague the Attorney-General and by my department officials, has nothing whatsoever to do with treatment facilities. It's related to other judicial factors altogether, one of which is the age of the juvenile hims himself or herself. The Honourable Member for Elmwood can look that one up in Hansard, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre

MR. BOYCE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the Attorney-General for his positive remarks in this area. We've got more out of his statement than we had from the Minister. I didn't hear the Attorney-General say whther he would be advising the House when we might expect this report because I'm looking forward to hearing from this committee . . .

MR. DOERN: Six months.

MR. BOYCE: I don't know if he was advised that I had made . . . two months the Attorney-General said. I had made available to this Committee those things which I had thought would be of some assistance to them because I felt at that time as I tried to convince your colleagte the Minister earlier that I think that we can accomplish more in a co-operative spirit on this particular item than by perhaps saying his mistakes are going to be worse than mine. But nevertheless he has chosen to deal with it in another vein. The Attorney-General was out of the House at the time and in my mind what the Minister responsible for this particular area did not seem to understand that prevention or lowering of the recidivism rate was actually a goal of the whole program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (l)—pass; (2)—pass; (e)—pass; (f) Care and Treatment of Adult Offenders, (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm glad the Attorney-General is here and I would like from the Attorney-General and from the Minister of Corrections whether there is any disagreement between them on policy as to incarceration and as to earlier release. That has been the subject of newspaper reporting as between judges and the Attorney-General in relation to the advisability of longer sentences, greater punishment because of earlier releases by the department. I would like to know what is the government's position on that — when I say the government, somebody has to speak for the government and I would like to know whether the Minister of

is responsible for early release with which the Attorney-General disagrees or whether they are acting in concert and in agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have some difficulty with the manner in which the temporary absence program, if that is what the Honourable Member for St. Johns means early release — with the application of the temporary absence program. We are in fact examining it and tightening it to limit some of the range of authority for granting temporary absences that has been in place and in existence in the past. The Temporary Absence Program is supposed to apply to persons convicted of non-violent crimes, crimes related to property rather than to persons. It's supposed to be applied to offenders who have reached the last 30 days or less of their sentences and it is supposed to be applied, obviously as responsibly and judiciously as is humanly possible to ensure that the release is useful to the inmate so that he or she might pursue job opportunities and have a place and a role in society to go to on completion of the sentence.

Also, the equally important consideration is, of course, that the person being granted temporary absence be judged to be ready for release, to be ready for absence from the correctional institution and ready for a return to society. Now in the past there have been some pretty broad parameters in place as to the signing authority for temporary absences, although I am not suggesting that is where the cause of error or discomfiture may have lain. We have tightened up that area of authority, reduced it now to the Director of Adult Corrections as the sole signing authority for approval and for signing of temporary absences and we have under the directorate and under the Assistant Deputy Minister, Dr. Tavener, and under the Commissioner Mr. Schneider, implemented a complete review of the Temporary Absence Program.

So my answer to the Honourable Member for St. Johns would be that we have been dissatisfied with the Temporary Absence Program. We have felt that it has permitted some people that weren't ready for release to be released and we think it can be tightened and improved, not only for the sake developmentally of the person being released but for the protection of society.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that after 17 months there should be a little more of a decisive report being made by the Minister. He started, I believe, by saying that he is troubled by the situation. I think he said that the people who were given the authority are being examined from the standpoint of whether or not there are too many or inadequate competence, these are my words, in making the decision and that is being examined. He concluded his remarks by implying that the situation has been taken care of, that there are a more limited number of people with the authority to grant these temporary absences. He gave us some general idea of what were the parameters and then I think he suggested that whoever was responsible for making the releases had gone beyond those parameters. He did not criticize those parameters but suggested that some people have gone beyond it and I therefore must ask him, have the parameters changed, what were the parameters and if they have changed, what are the parameters, or is he really saying that it is still under examination after 17 months? And I'm not accusing him of not doing anything for 18 months because I just did a rapid count and according to my count, it's only 17 months, so one should not accuse him of a year and one-half. And while I am saying that, Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at the Attorney-General and trying to remember a newspaper report which seemed to report him to have stated that in view of the releases taking place, that he would agree with judges that there should be longer sentences. He is, I think, shaking his head and I hope he will correct what I think was a pretty accurate report by me of what I read in the newspaper or at least in the headlines and I would very much would like to hear what is the correct attitude of the Attorney-General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the report which the Member for St. Johns referred to I think left a wrong impression which was corrected in the Legislature the following day when a question was asked of me, and I would refer him to Hansard of the following day. I don't think it bears repeating, it's in Hansard and my position was clearly stated.

With respect to this general problem I simply want to indicate that officials in my department are working closely with officials in the Minister's department to resolve concerns that have been expressed about this particular program and I think those are being worked out, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I can understand a Minister whose department is being reviewed,

saying, well, I just replied to that question an hour ago or yesterday and it could be found in Hansard. But I don't think it should be necessary when we are dealing with the question of corrections of adult offenders and I ask the government for the attitude of the Attorney-General, to be referred to some page in Hansard without being given the page or the date. It would have been simple for the Minister to say that he does or does not agree with the judges that there should be longer sentences because of the release program. It's easy enough, I should think, for him to inform us in this Committee rather than refer us to back to some unnamed occasion when he made a comment.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it is not for me to express in this forum whether or not I disagree with suggestions by judges with respect to sentencing. I indicated the following day that if the Crown is of the view that a sentence imposed by a judge is inadequate, that sentence will be appealed to the Court of Appeal, Mr. Chairman. If counsel for the accused are of the view that it is too severe they will appeal it to the Court of Appeal. Those decisions are made in the courts, Mr. Chairman, and it is not my responsibility to attempt to question sentencing of judges in this forum. If there is any questioning to be done, it will be done through appeals in the court process. .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I agree fully with the statement that the Attorney-General made now. But I still harken back to the fact that it was reported that a judge, and maybe more than one, stated that because of the early release program — now this is according to the press — he thinks he should give longer sentences so that it would take longer before early release program was brought into effect. I think it is a question of government position and on that I think the Attorney-General should be prepared to comment. Appeal - yes, when they feel the sentence is inadequate but to urge a longer sentence because another arm of the same government is releasing the offenders earlier is not acceptable to me, and I think it should not be acceptable to the Attorney-General — that's the clarification I was asking for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, I wanted to answer the question of the Honourable Member with respect to the parameters in the Temporary Absence Program. The answers to his questions to me are yes and yes. The question 'have the parameters changed - the answer is yes. The question, are we still examining and studying the final definition of the program, the answer is yes.

The parameters have changed from the original format which permitted superintenden of the individual institutions to sign temporary absences. And I say that without any implied criticism of the superintendents of the institutions. The parameters have been changed now to repose that authority solely in the office of the Director of Adult Corrections.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that the Honourable Minister and I must have different definitions of what parameters means. What he has indicated is that authority has been transferred from one person or class of persons to another. But I would like to know whether the . . . can't use the word parameters now . . . whether the conditions that should be taken into consideration in deciding whether or not to release a person, whether they have been changed or whether the reasons are still the same. And for all I know, it's just a different person that makes the decision. I hope I'm clear in my question because I thought parameter meant the limits and the extents of evaluation which are prescribed to be considered before a decision is arrived at.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, parameters means borders and can be applied to anything. And I am talking about the parameters of authority, the borders of authority have been reduced. Now if you are asking me about the parameters of the conditions, the parameters in terms of the factors that are taken into account, that is the part that is under review by the assistant Deputy Minister, and by the Commissioner of Corrections, and by the Director of Adult Corrections, and the other officials of the Corrections Division in concert with my office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the minister. I think he has expressed better than I did what we are dealing with when we are dealing with the meaning of the word "parameters" and I quite agree with him. Now what he says is: "There is no change in those conditions which are considered in deciding whether or not to release a person early." He said there is no change there. What has been changed is the signing authority, and he says they are studying the conditions, but if there is no change in the conditions, then by implication, he is saying that he was dissatisfied

with the way the former authorized people were applying the conditions. And that then means to me that apparently he needed a great deal of tightening up and there being no change in the conditions, then one would assume that a well run department would see to it that the conditions are applied in an even way to all persons. Now if that is being done by limiting it, then eventually we get to only one person doing it and you can be sure that it will be consistent.

But how long does it take to continue to study those conditions? People are in jail and people are out of jail, and it is still being studied. And you know, Mr. Chairman, I really must criticize this minister. Members on this side say: "Why, he's one of the best of the group, and he's trying hard". But I said the other day that I felt that he's carrying too much of a load and I think we're seeing evidence of that. I've never questioned his hard work and I have not questioned his truthfulness in reporting to us. But I must say that I am very much distressed by the number of times we are told that various matters are being studied.

Now there is no question, Mr. Chairman, that problems such as we are discussing, problems that this minister is dealing with are ongoing problems that are never solved and the method of dealing with them is a constantly changing one. But it is not enough, I think, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think we should continue to accept statements while we are reviewing this, that until we review it we're doing something or other.

There seems to be, either as the Member for Elmwood said earlier, too long being taken in studies, in monitoring, in reviews; it seems to be taking too long in too many ways and meanwhile things are happening. Life goes on. People are in jail that maybe should not be in jail. People are not in jail who maybe ought to be in jail. And it almost goes back to where I was saying only yesterday, I think, that the Minister did too little or too much, and I am beginning to think that there is lack of decision. And I can't accuse this Minister personally of lack of decision because he must have an awful lot of decisions to make and maybe ought to persuade the First Minister to pass some of his load on to the less encumbered ministers and relieve him of that.

But the department is at fault, and this Minister is the head of it, for too many monitoring, research, review. I don't know why it should take two more months for that committee that the Minister and the Attorney-General has appointed to make a report. It takes too long to get decisions. And people are being affected adversely by it. I am assuming it is adversely because I am assuming also that if they made decisions, then people would know where they stand. And if their decisions were wrong, at least we would be able to attack them and expose wrong decisions. But we cannot continue to listen to: "We're studying, we're researching", and we should sit back and wait. The Attorney-General said it would take two more months before they get a report from this committee. Well, that's not very good, Mr. Chairman. I don't know how long ago they were appointed and I am sure the Minister of Corrections can tell us how long ago they were appointed. But I'm saying, it's taking them too long. And one of the things that I believe is that it is a tactic of the government to delay decisions.

I have been told, and this I've been told just rumour mongering, that one of the methods that this government has used to delay decisions is to have too long an agenda and not deal in Treasury Board or in the old Management Committee with matters that need decisions, and the result is that you save money by not making decisions. And I think that they have learned that technique that not making a decision means you don't spend money, if you don't spend money, you reduce your expenditures and you of course reduce interest on construction.

And that's another thing, Mr. Chairman. It should not take seventeen months to make a decision about a jail to be built in The Pas, and there is still no decision. But what is accomplished is, they think they're saving money, and they are not, Mr. Chairman. They think they are going to study it and eventually come up with a better plan. The longer they study, the longer the problem will exist and it will not be a satisfactory solution.

The Minister for Manitoba Housing Renewal is here in committee now, and he has been accused of delaying the construction program for housing, and you know, that's an accusation that. . . Do you want to interrupt me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I just thought if I gave you an indication that we are on Care and Treatment of Adult Offenders and not in the department of the other Minister, without interrupting you.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your doing that, but I am talking about lack of decision making and I am talking about lack of this Minister in making decisions and I am comparing his lack in the decision making on jails with the government's delays and lack of decision making on housing. And I was going to say and conclude with my comparison that I can understand the program to stop building houses or to postpone building houses, or to delay or slow down building houses, but I cannot understand a decision to delay or postpone the decision to build treatment centres that are necessary and where apparently the law is being broken by the government's delay.

It is not satisfactory, after seventeen months, for him to say that the law was being broken before we became government. They became government because they convinced the people that they could do better management. Well, it's pretty poor management, Mr. Chairman, if after seventeen months they still haven't got a plan and a decision on a jail that was apparently committed by the previous government. It's all very well for them to have stopped it and said: "We will take another look", but seventeen months is a long time.

And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the treatment of adult offenders and the government's lack of policy which delays a positive approach to the treatment. We can then disagree with the treatment, but we find it difficult to discuss treatment when all we're told is that it's being examined, and that is my criticism.

I would like to see the government make a decision, a Conservative Government decision, with which we can debate and with which we may well approve, but I certainly don't see the justification after all this time, to constantly delay my reaction to their decision for them to keep postponing it by further study and further monitoring and further examination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to deal with what I consider to be a serious rift between the two ministers, namely the Department of the Attorney-General as exhibited in the Courts, and the Department of Corrections, in the question of temporary absence program.

One of the first things that I would like to. . . —(Interjection)— Well, I am sure the Attorney-General would like me to sit down because I'm sure he finds this embarrassing.

MR. MERCIER: Wish you would make some sense for a change; wish you would make some sense for a change.

MR. DOERN: Well, just wait and see.

MR. MERCIER: You haven't made any sense yet.

MR. DOERN: I wish you'd make some decisions. I wish you'd answer some of the questions in the House.

MR. MERCIER: We listened to you all last week; you didn't make any sense.

MR. DOERN: I wish that you would come around to give us some information when we ask for it instead of sitting on it, instead of doing nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister whether he can outline. . . My colleague was asking him about the temporary absence program which I thought might have been dealt with under (g), but apparently it's being dealt with here. Can he outline, under what conditions, and I throw this question into the debate because I had a discussion with a lawyer over the weekend. He said that they really do not understand, under what conditions temporary absences are granted, or under what conditions paroles are granted. I know paroles are federal, but I wonder whether there are actually some policy guidelines that the Minister can give us. And the one that really gets me is, how on earth can any person who is regarded as dangerous, achieve a temporary absence situation? It just strikes me that that is absolutely ludicrous. That people are brought into prisons, they are considered dangerous, and then they are let loose in the sense of given a temporary absence and then the next thing you know, they've bolted. Now I asked the Minister this yesterday, and he regarded this as a big joke. He thought that it was kind of amusing that somebody was loose who was considered dangerous.

Mr. Chairman, we have a system that is connected. The Attorney-General's department is directly related to the Department of Corrections. On one hand you have people who are in effect catching people who have broken the law, and on the other hand you have a department that is treating them. And I see a direct conflict, I think maybe an ancient conflict, maybe an irreconcilable conflict, but I think at this point in time in Manitoba, it's ludicrous that we have members of the courts being so dissatisfied with the policy of the Corrections Department, that they are in effect, considering

making really radical changes in the manner in which they are handling people who have broken the law.

And I cite two examples: Judge Graham Garson and Chief Justice Harold Giles, Chief Provincial Court Judge, where you have Judge Garson saying that he is so dissatisfied with the temporary absence program, that he is not going to accede to any more requests to allow temporary absences, because we're getting into a case where I believe that there is a mockery made of the entire judicial system. People are brought by law officers to Headingley Jail, etc., and within a matter of days, two, three, four, five, six days, some of them are being turned free; they are being set loose. And I must think that this has a completely demoralizing effect on policemen and on members of the Bench, because they are capturing people who have broken the law, they are sentencing them to jail, they go to jail; within 48 hours or within a week, they are being set loose. And I am saying to the Minister, because he indicated that he was going to discuss this with his colleague, has he in fact met with his colleague and has there in fact been any decision made on the part of the government to tighten up, because the Minister hinted that that in fact was going to happen? So I wonder if he could comment on that. Has there been any decision taken by his department in consultation with his colleague to tighten up or stiffen up in terms of temporary absences?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think there's one basic reality about this particular business that sometimes escapes all of us and that is that corrections doesn't create the problem. As the former Minister, the Member for Winnipeg Centre can tell his colleague, we get the problem after it's been created.

We have a situation, not so much in the juvenile area, but in the adult area, which is what we're discussing right now, where the jail population of the province has increased at a far greater proportion in percentage terms than the general population of the province. In 1974, or very close to 1974 and I don't think I'm out by a year on that, the adult population of our jails, the inmate population of our adult jails in Manitoba was 460. It has been, in the last three years, as high as something in excess of 800. It's been as high, I believe, as 850, but I stand to be corrected on that. It's at least been in excess of 800. At the present time it's approximately 700.

The problem is a complex one, as I'm sure my honourable friend knows. It's related to the whole judicial and corrections and sentencing and legal and rehabilitation system as it exists in the Province of Manitoba. It's not something that the Corrections Department by itself can solve. There are responsibilities that the correction system has after a person is sentenced to a place of incarceration. We have attempted to sieve through, as best we can, those persons, those offenders, who are deemed ready to be returned to society to look for jobs, or to re-establish themselves in existing jobs, at no danger to society; and obviously, occasionally, errors in human judgment are made.

I explained earlier, in answer to the question asked me by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, what in fact the actual parameters — because there was some debate over the term "parameters" — of the conditions for temporary absence are. And I don't think it's necessary to repeat those, but the two basic ones are (1) that the person didn't commit a crime of violence, or a crime against another person — it was a crime related to property and non-violent — that the person is considered non-dangerous, and that the person is in the last 30 days or less of his or her sentence. Now there are stories abounding of people who have been sent to Headingley, and six days later they're released; or have been sent to Headingley and turned away because they couldn't be admitted. I have no factual evidence of cases of that kind, Mr. Chairman, although I've seen references to them in the press. And there may have been one or two cases of that kind. But I can assure the Honourable Member for Elmwood that if there are they have been very very minimal, and I would say, with the immunity that the Legislative Chamber provides me, that they represented errors in judgment, if they did in fact occur. Because under the legislation, a correctional institution like Headingley is not permitted to refuse admission to an offender who has been sentenced to incarceration there.

What happens is that if the institution is crowded and there aren't available spaces, then an attempt is made to free up that space through the Temporary Absence Program, and the Temporary Absence Program should be applied in terms of the most rigid criteria, but occasionally, as I've said, no doubt there have been in the past and no doubt, as long as we have a Temporary Absence Program and as long as we have the parade of persons to jail that we have here in Manitoba, there will be errors made. But I suggest to the honourable member that those errors are minimal.

The particular case that he's referring to at the present time, I'm told by my department officials, involves an individual who is not considered dangerous. Now, my honourable friend may know some

authorities who consider that person dangerous, but my officials tell me that he is not considered dangerous. There is an area for dispute, and obviously an area for potential error. That is one reason why we've tightened up on the parameters of authority for granting temporary absences.

The most desirable and productive result of limiting the authority, centralizing the authority to the hands of the Director of Adult Corrections rather than having it diffused among the superintendents of all the institutions, is that through that centralization at least you get a uniform application of the rules, a uniform application of the concept; whereas when it's spread among a number of people, just as if it were spread among a number of people in this House, I think it stands to reason and is obvious to all of us that by human nature you would get an uneven application of concepts simply because of an uneven distribution of temperaments.

And so there would be judgments made in some cases by certain individuals that would not parallel the judgments made by others. And you've got this uneven distribution of temporary absences, an uneven determination of temporary absence qualifications. That's really what is behind the centralization of the authority for granting temporary absences so at least there will be a uniform application of the principles involved.

Insofar as the question raised relevant to my communication with my colleague, the Honourable the Attorney-General, and the communication between his department and the Corrections Division of my department in this whole area, I want to assure my friend in the strongest possible terms that that communication is in place, that top officials of the Attorney-General's Department and top officials of my department, including the Commissioner of Corrections, are in continual consultation at the present time with respect to the Temporary Absence Program and its application, and what changes are desirable from the point of view of society and from the point of view of offenders in institutions themselves.

But I don't think it should be overlooked that the jail population in this province has increased. I'm not going to comment on what the reasons are; they're probably multiple reasons. But while our population of approximately 1 million has remained at 1 million, our jail population has gone, as I say, from about 460 to something in excess of 800, and at the present time is around 700. In fact, I think the actual figure at the moment is 690. We have to look after them. We get them, we don't put them there. And we are in consultation with the Attorney-General's Department in review of the judicial system and its operations in relation to this problem, to see what solutions are possible.

I would just comment briefly on the point raised by the Honourable Member for St. Johns about the time and the delay. I think that, Mr. Chairman, our approach to these problems is entirely defensible over a period of 17 months, which has been a period crammed with problems and decisions for a new government. The previous government faced the same situation when they took office. I think they forget that they were in office for eight years. I don't know how many major decisions they hammered out in their first 17 months. The only one that comes to mind was the decision relevant to Autopac. As far as other programs and policies and decisions were concerned, they evolved over a period of years. Ours will too, and ours will evolve responsibly. And if it takes 34 months, it'll take 34 months. We're not going to make arbitrary, unilateral decisions which have unseen consequences just for the sake of making decisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: You know, Mr. Chairman, if I could summarize the Minister's speech which he just made. I think it came down to one point, and it was this: that he does not have adequate holding facilities in the province. He mentioned that he has a problem because of the rising population in terms of people who commit crimes in our society, and that he doesn't have places to put these people. So he said, I don't know whether he's heard what I just said, but he said in the last five or ten minutes that one of his fundamental problems is he does not have adequate holding space and that a lot of problems that he's encountering are related to that particular fact.

And I give him another example from the other day. Now we may disagree on the figures — he claims that Headingley is constructed to hold 309 people, I believe, but that he had from 320 to 360-odd people. Given his own figures and his own standards, he admits that the population in that facility was anywhere from 10 to 20 percent higher than it should be. But I raised with him the other day, and he didn't give us a reply, what is apparently a new study by the Fire Commissioner, which indicates that the maximum population in Headingley should be 250. I don't know whether he's had a chance to see that report, but apparently that is the recommendation; namely that Headingley should have no more than 250 people.

Now I just want to briefly, for the record, run over what our government did during our term in office, because we had some debate between that Minister and myself and the Premier and myself along the lines of "what did you do when you were in office?" I give you a very quick summary,

and then I would like to ask the Minister whether he could put down his record in 18 months in office. I mention the building of the Manitoba Youth Centre; the construction of the Woodsworth Building, which is related to the Attorney-General's Department; new wing and renovations to Headingley; renovations to the Public Safety Building; the letting of a contract for the Brandon Jail; the awarding of a contract for The Pas Correctional and Court House; the beginning of a \$3.5 million law court renovation, and the expropriation of land and the appointment of an architect for a Provincial Judges building.

Now you take a look at that, given what happened prior to our administration taking office, we, I think, did a lot in terms of trying to provide the necessary facilities. Now I say to this Minister, I'm giving him an eight-year record. He's been in 18 months. I ask him very simply, what has his government done in terms of making improvements, making renovations, and constructing new facilities to deal with the problem of corrections. Because I submit, Mr. Chairman, that one of the fundamental problems today in Manitoba is the lack of facilities. It's causing all kinds of headaches for the Attorney-General, and it's causing problems for the Minister of Corrections, but the government fails to act. The government continues to study. So I ask the Minister if he could put on the record, right now, what he has done in terms of providing the physical facilities that are necessary in the field of corrections? Could he enlighten us on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much whether those items that the honourable member refers to were accomplished in 17 months. I'll match our eight-year record with his eight-year record.

Insofar as his reference to spaces and places for adult offenders is concerned, I would point to the new Brandon Correctional Institution, where the previous government intended to incarcerate 68 persons, not counting, before the Member for Winnipeg Centre jumps up, not counting the projected plan to put the Kelly Centre in the basement. But in terms of capacity, of offenders not related to the alcohol problem, they were looking at 68. And I tell him that if he goes out there and looks at that Taj Mahal, looks at the space, looks at the structural provisions, the design that has gone into it, looks at the extra staffing that's going to be required because of the functional program and the layout of that place, that that was not going to go very far towards meeting the problems of overcrowding that we have and that his government had.

We are not going to waste that capacity out there in Brandon on 68 inmates, I'll tell him that. The functional program is being re-drafted to accommodate at least twice that number. We can't afford to put 68 people into a place like that where they can rattle around with all the space in the world and require, I think it's 28 more staff man years than was required at the present time. We intend to utilize every square inch of that to the fullest. That's the kind of thing that we've been wrestling with, because those are the kinds of things that we inherited.

Essentially, what we've been wrestling with is the economic condition and situation of the province, because our facilities for adult and juvenile offenders, whatever initiatives or thrusts, we can take in the social area, in prevention, in health and community services, all our health facilities, all depend and rest upon a stable economy in this province. And we found an unstable one. So we had to deal with the basement first, and the structure first, and that's what we've dealt with in these seventeen months. And if the honourable member doesn't think that there have been time-consuming hours and weeks of deliberation and study and concentration necessary to address ourselves to those problems, then he's sadly mistaken, because that's where the time and the energy has had to go, and it's on that kind of work that the edifices of the future will rest, and we're not going to rush into them until that basement structure is properly built.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me say with respect to the Headingley situation, my understanding is that the Fire Commissioner has disassociated himself from the report that the Honourable Member for Elmwood refers to, that it was not a Fire Commissioner's report. That is my understanding. I stand to be challenged on that, but my understanding is it was not a report undertaken or issued by the Fire Commissioner.

I repeat that the rated capacity for Headingley is 309, that the average daily population in 1977 was 360 and it was much higher than that the year before, and that the average daily population for the first 10 months of '78-79, that is this fiscal year up till the end of January, is 316. And I would offer to my honourable friend that that's an improvement. And, one of the things he asks me, what are we going to do about it? One of the things we're going to do about it is move people out of Headingley and into Brandon and utilize that space that's rising on the banks of the Assiniboine or the Assiniboine Flats in Brandon. We can take people out of Headingley and move them there, and help solve the Headingley overcrowding problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister keeps prolonging the debate, but he's finally given us some information. This is the first time that he has said that he's bumped into some structural problems at the Brandon Correctional Institution in the foundations. And I commend the Minister for addressing himself to this, because we certainly don't want another fiasco like the former Conservative government left us with, with the Red River Community College. I don't know what the final cost of that thing is, but it keeps sliding into the ground, and so I know full well what the Minister is talking about when you say you bump into structural problems and if it's gone 5.2 to \$8 million because of that. But Mr. Chairman, there's two things. I was just going to ask a couple of more questions.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, could I, just on a point of order, because I don't the honourable member to be in error.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. SHERMAN: I think that point should be corrected for the record, Mr. Chairman. There are no structural, physical structural problems with the Brandon Correctional Institution. I'm talking about the structure of Corrections of the Corrections program. It's got to be built on a base that we can properly maintain. I'm talking about utilizing the space in Brandon, and that the original functional program called for underutilization in our view, and we intend to utilize every square foot of it. But there is no structural problem.

MR. BOYCE: I think if the Minister reads what he said in Hansard tomorrow, he will find that he used the word basement. Now, he may have used that word inadvertently; nevertheless, he said in the basement. But there was no point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that we won't get involved in a hassle.

The Minister said himself that the —(Interjections)— we're getting all the authorities over there again. The projections, as I had said earlier, the Minister has confirmed them, that in 1974 we were dealing with a provincial population of some 460 and they're up to 850. Now there are two solutions to that problem, in keeping with the philosophy of the present government. One is to continue their economic policy until so many people leave Manitoba that the population goes down that they can accommodate all that they have in the existing facilities, or they can solve the problem as they did in British Columbia by just wiping out six months' backlog in the court system — which is well within the prerogative of the government — that's how they solved it in British Columbia.

But Mr. Chairman, I had thought we would finish this by 10 o'clock, but I just wanted to ask the Minister where the province of Manitoba stands vis-a-vis the Public Safety Building in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SHERMAN: Where the province of Manitoba stands vis-a-vis the Public Safety Building, Mr. Chairman, is where we stood approximately half a year ago, or three-quarters of a year ago. We took over the Winnipeg Remand Centre, operation and responsibility for the Winnipeg Remand Centre, as the member knows, and we're continuing to operate it. I would suggest that with some of the improvements that have been made there in terms of the interior and the equipment that it's operating relatively successfully.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I guess that's all we're going to get from the Minister, which is really nothing. Time will tell just exactly how well this too is being resolved, because that was a temporary arrangement. But when the Minister keeps harping on the population of 68 people in the Brandon Correctional Institution, it should go on the record that the staff that was deemed at that time necessary to handle this population was relative to the differences in the people being held and their legal status. We've heard much in this House over the years, and I will be the first to admit that we had the problem, the juveniles being in adult corrections. It didn't start in October of '77, we had the problem, we were moving to correct it. The law states that juveniles should be held in separate institutions, and we were advised in the interest of economics that in the Brandon area we would be filling the requirements of the law if they were under one roof, sharing common facilities in heating and eating and the rest of it, if they were separated. But people remember that in our system, unless there's a change in the philosophy of this government, that people are innocent until proven guilty, that under the law remand people have to be kept separate from convicted people. There are male

and female, so that gives you four populations on the adult side, there are four populations on the juvenile side. Now, and I will admit, that one of the difficulties in a region like that is that in one area you may not have anyone in there on a particular day. And I know that the people out there have been very responsible in dealing with that problem, because they have people on stand-by, as we do in many other places in the province where people are held in a remand situation, even prior to arraignment, in the facilities provided by the RCMP, that they have back-up temporary help.

But for the Minister to just toss out the number 68 in the Taj Mahal and everything else, is, in my judgment, irresponsible. So this 68 people is a maximum number in all the different components of that — or compartments, if you will — of that institution. Now if he doesn't want to address himself to the resolution of the problem of keeping juveniles mixed in with adults; if he wants to mix remand and sentenced people, you know, this is the prerogative of the government, and I hope that isn't what is implicit in what the Minister is suggesting. But we always seem to slide by the one rather small facility, which I happen to think has been well handled by a very small staff, and that's the Portage Correctional Institution for Women. I wonder if the Minister can advise the House in how this is functioning, and there were some dire needed renovations in that particular institution. Is there any amount of money included in this combined estimate of Capital and Current for the necessary maintenance, not renovation. I think that's an emotive word in our present financial situation as far as the province is concerned.

But there's a base line that you can't go below, and I just wonder if the Minister has included in his Estimates some of the maintenance requirements of the Portage Correctional Institution for Women.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, there are no maintenance requirements for the Portage Correctional Centre included in Capital, but I would have to check that with the Minister of Government Services. I can't give the honourable member a conclusive answer on that, but I will check with the Minister of Government Services. I don't recall that there are, but there are a number of items in that list, and I just can't answer his question precisely. As for the institution itself, I would agree with him that it is well-run, that it performs a very essential service, particularly for, well not particularly, specifically for females detained under the Intoxicated Persons Detention Act. There are counselling services provided by staff members at Portage, on the basis of individual needs. There are educational programs offered there. They include correspondence courses and adult education courses and literacy courses, basic literacy courses, they include courses in personal grooming and food planning and preparation, so that the life skills requirements of the inmates are recognized and the necessity for providing the greatest amount of training and direction in the available time is provided them so as to equip them for better opportunities and better compatibility in society on their release.

There is also considerable involvement at portage of outside agencies in the programs at Portage: Alcoholics Anonymous, the John Howard-Elizabeth Fry Society, both are active there. They provide visiting programs and they provide adult contact for the offenders who are detained there. The staffing pattern for '79-80 involves an additional half staff man year, so that it goes up from twenty and a half to 21.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain to the House on what basis they could just simply double the population at Brandon. Can he explain just how they arrived at that magic number? I mean, why didn't they triple it or quadruple it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, the configuration at Brandon called for individual cells or rooms, individual rooms for each inmate, called for considerable space for visiting and recreation and sort of counselling areas, and called for no utilization of the basement other than the projected plan to move the Kelly Centre or Alcohol Treatment Operation in there, which involved purchase of the Indian Residential School, and a considerable amount of renovation. We intend to utilize the space that had been designed for pretty expansive visiting areas and conversation areas to accommodate more inmates; we intend to utilize the basement; and we intend at this juncture to have two people in a room rather than one. There is plenty of room to put two in. These projected plans have all been worked out in keeping with the necessary statutes: The Public Health Act, The Fire Code and Safety Requirements. There is plenty of room to accommodate personnel there to that intensity, and to accommodate them safely and publicly.

The final figure for the capacity has not been set. At one point we started from the inherited position of 68, and we are looking at 91 — we were going to add 23 — subsequently that went

to about 121. We've had government services in my department looking at it almost continually this winter, and their present projections are that it can accommodate up to 150 safely and comfortably. Now this is going to have some impact on privacy, to be sure. People aren't going to be in private rooms, but the way it was configured, and the way it was designed, there were going to be required a very substantial additional number of security personnel — an additional SMY total which I think was 28 — and that is a lot of money on a continuing, round-the-year permanent basis, as the honourable member knows. If we are going to be spending that kind of money to put that kind of security personnel in there because of the configuration and design of the institution, then we intend to justify it by taking advantage of the space to put as many people safely and comfortably in there as we can, and our technical advice at this juncture is that it would be something between 130 and 150. That figure is not final.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I expected my colleague will make some comment here, but I just want to make this remark, that I think this is an incredible decision on the part of the government. A facility was designed to incarcerate 60 individuals, and that facility was designed, I think, primarily on the basis of a recommendation by a gentleman named McReynolds, who was considered to be perhaps the best consultant in the correctional field. He was brought in by the Member for Winnipeg Centre — well he was brought in by somebody — and that person then worked with the architects and representatives who were hired by the Department of Public Works. I assume that most, if not all, of the people in the Department of Corrections, who are in the Senior Civil Service were there at the time when McReynolds came to Manitoba, and developed a program which was then passed on to an architect to design this facility; and I recall quite clearly that it was said over and over again, that this man was the best in his field, and that he was going to design a facility that was in line with modern correctional practices. Now, he designed a facility generally described I think, and probably correctly described by the Minister of Health, and it was designed to hold 68 people — it had certain features, and so on. Now we have the government deciding that they can double the population — they went from 68 to 90, then they decided to go to 120, now they are going to 150 — the next thing you know they will be going to 250, 350, I mean, what is the limit? I assume the ultimate limit is that you jam people in and they can sleep standing up.

He talks about the Taj Mahal — we just heard descriptions of the Black Hole of Calcutta. I think it's anybody's guess as to which way we're going, and I say that I would like the Minister to explain who made the decision, who it was within his department who decided that they could hold so many more people — an increase of well over 100 percent from the original design — and if it was the gentleman seated before him, or some of the directors who aren't present, then I would like to know where they were when this facility was designed? I would also like to know on what basis we're moving to double and triple the population of these facilities?

I mean, is it simply case of seeing how many people you can cram into it? Or is it in line with any particular correctional philosophy or correctional program? Because given that we worked with a man who was considered to be foremost in his field, I want to know on what basis they're working? So I would ask the Minister if he could clarify that change in program and the basis of that change in program?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, it was done by officials of my department; the former Deputy Minister of Corrections, Doctor John Banman; by officials with him in the department; and subsequent to that by the Minister of Government Services and his officials and mine; and the new officials of the Division of Corrections in the Department of Health and Community Services.

The reason for the changes in figures comes about from the fact that we had not, at one point, made a decision with respect to the Kelly Centre Alcohol Treatment Facility, that I referred to earlier, therefore, there was a question mark surrounding the utilization of the basement. In addition to that we were concerned with the question of juveniles, and we were exploring the use of part of the institution for the accommodation of juveniles completely walled-off and separated from the adults, with a separate exit and entranceway, and that involved a number of juveniles that we had in mind, which brought the figure up to another level of about 123, I think it was at that point. The juvenile question has not been resolved, we're looking at it purely from the point of view of adults now, we're looking at it purely from the point of view of getting the best mileage out of it that we can, making the best use of the space.

As I pointed out earlier, the projected final cost on the plant now is estimated at \$8 million instead of the original amount, which was something substantially less than \$6 million; and in the interests of the responsibility that we have to the people of Manitoba to utilize that space in what

is an excellent facility in terms of design and building materials, I can assure you we feel that it is a responsible decision to utilize the space to the fullest extent of safety and health; and it can be used to the extent of approximately 150 spaces for adults, keeping in mind the requirements of safety and health. I don't think I can defend the decision for my honourable friend in any other manner than that, and on any other plain than that. We think it is sensible. Obviously, he doesn't.

Presumably, the previous government felt they were only going to put a few people in there — at least for the time being — and that they were going to solve the problem of jail populations by doing other things. We believe that partial solution to the jail population problem can be achieved by making sensible use of that space that's going out there. Now, how else I can defend that for my honourable friend, I don't know, other than to say that we consider it a sensible approach; if he doesn't, he's perfectly at liberty of course to record that attitude.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to reiterate that our government dealt with the corrections expert, and on the basis of his advice arrived at a figure of 68. I gather then that the Minister threw that out the window, and said to his senior staff, "I want to know the maximum number of people that you can cram into this facility?" That was the assignment given. He surely didn't say to them, "Just take a look at these plans and let me know what you think of them?" He must have said to them, "Here is your assignment. Pour in the maximum number of bodies into that space that is possible," and they arrived at a figure, but I say I don't know on the basis of what philosophy they acted. I assume that they acted on the basis of satisfying their Minister. Their Minister took a position that he wanted to double or triple the space, and the staff was asked to accede to that direction, and they did.

The other point I would like to ask is again on the juvenile wing. There's been some discussion on this. Is it true or not that the attachment of a juvenile wing to that jail would be a violation of Provincial Statutes and/or Federal Statutes?

MR. SHERMAN: I don't know, Mr. Chairman, there's obviously a sincere difference of opinion on that; I don't know. If it's a violation of the law, then we won't be able to put juveniles in there; if it's deemed that it's not a violation of the law because of the separation that would be insisted upon in any such configuration, then we will put them in there; but I can't answer that question, we may not be able to put them in there.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister clarify whether that addition for juveniles has been given the go-ahead in terms of a contract; is that now part of the design, and are they proceeding to tender?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, it wasn't going to be an addition, it was going to utilize a corner of the building, and there was going to be a separate entrance and exit built into that corner, so that the juveniles would not come in contact with adults at any time. My understanding is that yes, that that entrance and exit has been figured into the layout of the institution. It will be useful one way or another; it will be useful whether or not we can put juveniles in there, and the decision as to whether juveniles will be in there hasn't been made.

MR. DOERN: The Minister is indicating that he is going to build the facility, and then he is going to find out whether he should have, in fact built the facility. He's proceeding to construct for a purpose, and he does not know whether or not that is a legal purpose.

The other question I would like to ask him is how those juveniles will be fed? Will they be fed from a central kitchen, or will they have their own independent totally self-reliant component?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, we'll make that decision, Mr. Chairman, when we have a legal decision as to whether it's permissible to put juveniles in there or not. If it is, then whatever conditions have to be met, will be met. We believed that we could house juveniles in there. We appreciate the concern expressed by the opposition in this arena, and we are now double checking and triple checking to insure that we can do that. If it proves that we can't do it, then they won't be placed there. If they can be there, it will be because we're assured that we can do that and we'll then meet whatever conditions are necessary for meals and the other services required to ensure that they don't come into contact with adults.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, in this regard I suppose one just has to read my remarks in Hansard about

a half-an-hour ago with reuerence to the last point being discussed. But it should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the policy of the government is to double the population. And it should go on the record that most of the people in that area are in there more for foolishness than they are what most people would consider criminal activity except for those people who are in the first instance in a remand situation. People forget that everybody that goes into the whole criminal system starts out in the provincial system. They don't become a charge on the federal purse until after they've gone through all the appeal procedures. That when somebody is arrested, the cost of detaining that person is borne by the provincial government. And until that individual is tried and convicted he is deemed by law to be innocent. And that's the way it is. And a person might well know that somebody is guilty of a crime, but proving it is an entirely different thing, and we have some real — well, I used a word that was impolite or improper here earlier — we have some real lulus; and I can think of a number that have gone through the provincial system that are real dangerous individuals.

And, as it is with Adam it is with people, you get critical masses. It comes to mind a friend of mine was out of the country, and he happened to comment that in England in a particular situation in the interests of restraint they had cut back 1 million pounds relative to the correctional system. In one particular institution it cost them 2 million pounds to put the institution back together again after the place rioted. But, nevertheless, I think we've got on the record the government's policy. Their policy was reflected in the Public Safety Building which we inherited — and it took us a long time to change that — and we really couldn't get public support for the cost and, when the Minister says \$8 million, that's an awful lot of money. I admit that. But we couldn't get public support for changes in the Public Safety Building until people started to hang themselves down there. Now he's going to pack people in here. He's enunciated his policy, inadvertently perhaps, that he's going to lock people up. He doesn't see that, trying to prevent recidivism is prevention.

I would ask the Minister perhaps one final question on this particular item. Has there been any movement on the federal government relative to the cost to the province on Section 16(1) of the Penitentiary Act, which puts this cost of keeping people up until the time that they have exhausted all appeal procedures, they're a charge on the provincial purse?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: That question, Mr. Chairman, is still somewhat in limbo, I guess. We have not had any undertaking from the federal government, or assurance from the federal government, that they will pay. It's much in the same category as the juvenile offenders' legislation. There has been ongoing controversy between hawks and doves on the question, and there's been no resolution of it. But we are continuing to pursue it.

MR. BOYCE: Well perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's remark reminds me of one final thing, that perhaps the Minister and I during the summer months can take the trip up to Bannock Point. I haven't been there since they rebuilt the institution after the fire, and perhaps we can discuss some of the other items in a different *milieu*. I don't think there's any other questions on this particular item. Perhaps we could pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass. (2)—pass. (3)—pass. (f)—pass. (g) Probation and Parole Services. (1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just have one basic question here, and that is on the question of parole. We asked the Minister earlier if he could kind of indicate the basis upon which temporary absences were granted, and again I'm now quoting from a Winnipeg lawyer I spoke to who said that it's not clear to him on what basis they were given, and it's not clear to him on what basis paroles are granted. I wonder if the Minister has some simple formula that he can indicate as to how paroles are granted — whether there are criteria that he can give us.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as parole goes, as the honourable member knows, that's a federal responsibility. It's handled by the Federal Parole Board. As far as a absences, temporary absences, are concerned, I think that I have attempted to answer the question as to the criteria which are applied, the rationalization and justification for the temporary absence concept. The questions that we have raised, and others in the community have raised, and indeed the opposition has raised, about temporary absences, the change in authority that we have put into effect, and the general examination of the conditions involved in granting temporary absences that is being undertaken right now by the administration in this particular division. There are, though, two or three programs related to what the honourable member is asking about that I think should

be noted for the record, so that the impression is not left that we are concerned in our Corrections Division only with the care and attention and services available to offenders when they are incarcerated in our different correctional institutions.

We do have a major program area, and in fact the 1979-80 budget reflects a substantial increase in relative terms, in the amount of funding available for our program area in this section of government. We have the Volunteer Probation Officer Program, with which members opposite are familiar, and which the 1979-80 requested vote is \$55,000 compared to last year's \$40,000; we have the Remand Attendance Centre Program, which provides an alternative to prolonged detention for juveniles in remand status, as members opposite know, in which the 1979-80 vote requested is \$228,700 compared to \$224,000 — this is a program that substitutes home-based intensive supervision for detention. And we have our community programs, the SHIPS Program — Short-term High Impact — and Project Adventure, which is something of a new initiative. The total amount being requested for these programs in this vote this year is \$110,000, and last year it was \$25,000.

I might just say that the Project Adventure Program has as its objectives aims which are pretty wideranging. They deal with school and vocational training, recreational and special care training, individual and family counselling and they're aimed at selected juvenile delinquents. Initially, this service will be provided in the core area of Winnipeg, and then it will be extended to other communities. The SHIPS Program, Short-term High Impact, of course, is designed to reduce the length of time that selected offenders must remain under supervision of the Courts, and also it endeavours to equip those persons with the life skills necessary to put them back on their feet in society.

So, I do want to apprise members opposite of that, and have it noted for the record, that the program aspect of probation and parole services in our department, is one that is receiving increasing emphasis and increasing funding from the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (l)—pass. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, just in reference to this particular item, perhaps there's one thing that the Minister could give us — I imagine his staff has it ready for him — the staff man years in 1978-79 and now in 1979-80.

MR. SHERMAN: The staff man years are unchanged, Mr. Chairman — 181 and a half this year, and 181 and a half in the year currently ending. That's exclusive of contracts. There are three contracts in the marriage conciliation, Thompson Region and NorMan Region service areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(l). The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could have an undertaking rather than get over into that whole area of marriage counselling and the rest of it. Is it the intention of the government to continue that function under this particular item? Is there some intention of the government to shift that over to the A-G? When this whole section was spun out of the A-G's Department by the former Conservative government, the marriage counsellors were transferred over to this particular item. And with the changes in Family Law which were passed by the former government and amended by the present government, the intentions were unclear as to what the government intended to do with this thing, this component, which involves the enforcement of maintenance orders and things of that kind.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, they are really two distinct and separate operations. Enforcement of maintenance orders is the responsibility of the Attorney-General's Department. Marriage Conciliation Service is ours, and it's fairly closely related to the courts, of course, and to family counselling. We also, through our Marriage Conciliation Service, provide marital counselling for . . . well, premarital counselling for juveniles. The program includes parent effectiveness training classes and also provides for assistance to home economists to offer home financial training classes. But enforcement of maintenance orders really comes under my colleague, the Attorney-General, and if memory serves I think there were two persons, two SMYs last year, seconded to the A-G's Department specifically for enforcement of maintenance order purposes.

In any event, the government is deeply concerned about the need for achieving a stronger mechanism for enforcement of maintenance orders, as this is something that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre and I, and others, discussed at length during two or three different rounds of studies on Family Law, and I know the Attorney-General feels the same way and has expressed his intention to deliver a tougher, tighter, more effective enforcement of maintenance order

and he's working with his counterparts across the country to achieve some kind of reciprocity inasmuch as that can be achieved to get at that problem which is the basic problem, of course, for deserted wives and children. The maintenance order is no good unless the money winds up in the hands of the deserted spouse and children, and I would advise my honourable friend that I know the Attorney-General is working intensively on that problem. Through the enforcement of maintenance orders personnel that he has in the department now, there is machinery in place but he has, in the conceptual stage at least right now, a stronger and more effective mechanism that I believe he hopes to be introducing shortly.

MR. BOYCE: Well, the Minister is working on his second envelope, so I'll go along with his explanation. The next time around, he'll have his third envelope, I hope. But perhaps the Minister's staff has available, just briefly, a few statistics. This is a function of government which usually goes ignored, and when he talks about conciliation officers, they used to compile statistics on the number of cases that these people dealt with and the number of families that they were able to be effective as far as reconciliations were concerned.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Well, first off, let me say that in 1978, the marriage conciliation service directorate conducted 3,679 individual interviews, and 599 joint interviews, and prepared 145 reports for the various courts dealing with matters of child custody, guardianship, and right of access. There is a breakdown here on comparisons over a period of years. For 1978, the directorate shows a client contact for individuals in the office of 3,702; joint visits in the office 617; home visits 392; new contacts 2,088; re-contacts 2,908; counselling 1,956; court action 2,136 — that was client contact. For custody cases, office interviews, totalled 91; home visits 575 — I think I mentioned that earlier — and reports completed 136. There are other statistics of that kind.

I can say that in comparison with previous years, the figures compare favourably. There is no exceptional variation, there are variations in some specifics, but generally, the figures compare favourably and very close to those ranging back over the past five years.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted the Minister to put that in the record because it's but another example of the efficiency of a component of government to which little attention is given. And if the Minister has seconded two positions from this function to the Attorney-General's department, I would support it one way or the other, that they second a lawyer to this or the individual's over to the Attorney-General's department, because the actions used to be initiated in this particular line of the Estimates.

But, Mr. Chairman, through you to the House Leader, perhaps I could ask the House Leader for his advice. If we pass this item, and then pass under 4.(a), that which could be construed as the "office of the Assistant Deputy Minister and the office of the Commissioner of Corrections and resources for professional training of staff". We didn't pass that item but if we come at these Estimates again, that item would come back into the debate. So I wonder, Mr. Chairman, for the advice of the House Leader, if we could pass this particular item and then pass 4.(a), if this would be acceptable. Because if it is acceptable, I would pass it with no debate and I would like that to be intended as a vote of confidence in the individuals who are occupying these particular positions, as Assistant Deputy Minister, the Commissioner of Corrections, and the resources for professional staff training.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, before the Honourable, the House Leader responds, might I express my thanks and gratitude to the Honourable, the Member for Winnipeg Centre for those comments and for that vote of confidence in the Assistant Deputy Minister and in the Minister of Corrections, and in the senior personnel serving them in the office personnel attached to them, and in the component responsible for staff training. I am sure they would appreciate those remarks of the Member for Winnipeg Centre. They certainly have my confidence and my thanks for the loyal support that they demonstrated to me in this department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I didn't quite understand what my honourable friend was referring to. Was he suggesting that in conjunction with (g), under 4, that we also pass 4.(a)?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, I believe so. Just a part of it that relates to corrections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: This is a new year and we're integrating things into this particular resolution of 65, and it won't occur again that it will be considered in its entirety this year, I would imagine. But rather in the interests of not repeating ourselves, we have to pass that 4.(a) in conjunction with (b), (c), and (d). We still have that to be considered, so I would suggest that we pass (g) in its entirety and then that which is contained in 4.(a), referring to those positions which are outlined, and if that's agreeable. But just while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, in response to the Minister, I would like no one to construe it as a vote of confidence in the government, because they have announced their policy and the stress and strains that they are putting on the system and time will tell whether the decisions of the government are right or wrong. In my opinion, in many areas they are committing crass errors and time will prove me right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, lest there be any misunderstanding, I don't think that I accept it or acknowledge it as a vote of confidence in the government. We are talking about the Civil Service staff responsible.

While I am on my feet, I regret one oversight, and I wouldn't want the record to ignore it. When I was talking about programs under Probation and Parole Services, I neglected to mention the Non-judicial Screening Program which, as the honourable member knows, is an important program which permits us — through the funding provided — permits us to allow Probation Services to hire university students, final year university students, to perform screening and assessment duties for juveniles referred by various police departments. That program also is experiencing an increase, a doubling of its budget, from \$6.6 thousand in the fiscal year now ending, to \$12,000 in the fiscal year upon which we are entering.

MR. BOYCE: I'm glad that the Minister drew that to our attention, but briefly, Mr. Chairman, I would like no one to misconstrue the people on this side not taking hours and hours and hours to drag out the debate as a lack of interest, because it is not. The Minister has put on record the position of the government relative to this very important aspect of government, and it is our position that they are making errors and that the people of Manitoba will exercise their final evaluation of it some time hence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (g)—pass. Under Resolution 65, 4.(a)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (a)—pass.

MR. BOYCE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Only insofar as they refer to the functions of the people mentioned in the preamble to that section. There are other administrative costs which are included in that, so that the record should show that we're passing 4.(a) Salaries and the rest of it only relative to those people mentioned in the preamble to that section.

MR. SHERMAN: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, only insofar as 4.(a) applies to Corrections, but also under the Assistant Deputy Minister is the whole institutional service responsibility in the field of mental health and mental retardation, and those institutional services. So that the 4.(a) that we're passing right now only applies to the correctional side of the division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I understand that under Salaries, the health aspect of it under section (b), could still be discussed, and also under (c) and (d).

Resolution No. 66. 5. The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba—pass — the Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that my honourable friend wanted to complete the entire portion dealing with Corrections including the Alcoholic Foundation; that was the understanding that I had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, that is not my understanding. I went and spoke to the House Leader, and I said we'll pass to the end of the Parole and Probations and we would consider the Alcoholism Foundation tomorrow separately. That was my understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must proceed. The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, you may be asking, or anxious to know whether I would like to deal with the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba or not. I would, but I don't wish to be arbitrary about it. It was my understanding that we were going to deal with Corrections and that includes the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre obviously has a different impression. I would ask him whether he would not consider dealing with the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. We do, I think, in the interests of the House, want to complete the Estimates of the Department of Health and Community Services before mid-summer, and we have spent considerable hours and will spend considerably more hours yet, but I am not going to be arbitrary about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well I may suffer some physical impediments but I didn't think there was anything the matter with my hearing. I thought that we had an agreement that we would rise after we had considered Probation and Parole. We have a disagreement with what was said and what was heard. It puts me in the position that if they insist upon it I have to move that we reduce this item to one dollar. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay it. I thought we've handled this most expeditiously because I don't think that there is any advantage in prolonging the debate on the particular issue and we passed more items tonight in two hours than we passed . . . I made my position known, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre wants to put himself in the position of proposing that we reduce this item to one dollar. I recognize the frustration from which that suggestion would stem but I'm sure he doesn't want to put himself in that position because he has a great deal of interest in the work of the Alcoholism Foundation. So if there is no objection from members of the House and from my House Leader, I would be prepared to accept a decision for Committee to rise.

MR. JORGENSON: Before Committee rise I would like to make just one comment in respect to the time that it's taken with respect to the Estimates of this particular Department. We have now spent about 30 hours on this department and about half concluded. I have sat through most of the discussions on these Estimates and I must say that I don't think that we can allow the consideration of this department to go on intermittently and if it becomes necessary for the government to take what action is necessary in order to conclude them, that will be done. If however my honourable friends want to deal with them and deal with them in such a way that there is a sincere effort to pass the items and get them considered, then fine, we will proceed. Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that 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 Winnipeg Centre that the House do now adjourn.

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