

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 21 June, 1982

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Government House Leader.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I put the question on the motion to go into Supply, if I might make a couple of announcements with respect to Committee changes. I just might, incidentally, announce that the Member for Concordia will be away for a couple of weeks. He's finally had the call on his elective surgery for his ear. I'm proposing to substitute the Member for Inkster for the Member for Concordia on Privileges and Elections, and the Member for Inkster for the Member for Concordia on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

With respect to Law Amendments for tomorrow, the Member for Rupertsland substituting for the Minister of Education; the Member for Thompson substituting for the Member for Burrows; and the Member for Springfield substituting for the Member for Gimli.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed) The motion before the House is the motion proposed by the Honourable Attorney-General and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE BILL NO. 59 - SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, J. Storie: The committee will come to order. We are here to consider the Supplementary Estimates and Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983. The first appropriation number is No. 10, the Income Insurance Fund for Agriculture in the sum of \$17,500,000.00.

RES. NO. 10 - INCOME INSURANCE FUND

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the Minister of Agriculture, could he provide us with an estimate of how much of the \$17.5 million he would expect to cash flow this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that will depend on the sign-up in the program and the final details that the Committee is now working on in terms of all

aspects of the program.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Which, of course, brings the next question, Mr. Chairman. When will we see the program in its final form announced so that the beef producers in the province can make their choice as to whether they want to sign up?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, when the Committee has its details formalized to present to government in the process that they are now undergoing, then the honourable member and so will all producers of the province, be aware of the details of the program.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That is the normal answer we get from the Minister of Agriculture when something happens. I might remind him that his First Minister, as Leader of the Opposition, said that a program would be brought in without delay. It wouldn't be a matter of weeks or months; it would be brought in immediately. There was to be a pay out this spring. This is now the first day of summer and we're eight hours into summer in 1982 and we still are hearing from the Minister that, when he receives a report. Has the Minister put a deadline to his Committee, the Committee he appointed, and told them that he wants a report by a given date so that the beef producers in the Province of Manitoba will not have to wait all summer for some action by this Minister, particularly when his Leader has promised immediate action seven months ago?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the member talks of deadlines. I recall very vividly last spring, when the honourable member speaks of deadlines, when the government of the day announced a Hog Assurance Program in the month of April, there was an announcement made in this Legislature that there was a \$10 million program dealing with an income stabilization plan on hogs. It was not until September of that year that the program came into place.

Mr. Chairman, I should tell the honourable member that the parameters and the principles of the program were announced. There was an intent on the government in my announcement that there would be a pay out on the basis of people enrolling in the plan. The producer group that has been appointed has made recommendations or at least suggested to us that there may be alternative ways that they would prefer as producers that money be utilized.

I am waiting for their recommendations in this respect and when those recommendations come in government, of course, will make a decision on the recommendations that come in and the program will be announced. But, I should tell the honourable member that in terms of whether there be a pay out prior to any program, the Committee itself was split and, if the honourable member remembers correctly, that question he raised maybe six weeks ago, on that very issue. I met with the Committee and I would say quite candidly, the Committee was split pretty well down the middle in terms of whether an advance payment with no strings attached be made or the money utilized to better improve the ability of producers to

make changes in the program or join up.

Those suggestions were made to me and we are awaiting the recommendations of the Committee. It's my hope that by the early part of July that we will have some recommendations from the Committee and make a decision shortly thereafter.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then I assume from the Minister's answer that, within two to three weeks, we might have some detail of his much awaited hog program.

The Minister will excuse myself and my colleagues, as members of the Opposition, for being so highly critical of the Minister because he made reference to a hog program which was announced in April or May of 1981 and the final details of which were put together in September. I can recall clearly that individual who is now Minister of Agriculture sitting in the second row over here daily criticizing our Minister of Agriculture for dragging his heels, for not getting anything done. Now, ironically, Mr. Chairman, he has responsibility for a beef program that his Leader promised to the beef producers on very short order.

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

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the privilege is that during the election campaign - and I have read to the honourable member the press statements that the Leader of the Opposition, during the election period, when he spoke on the issue of beef stabilization and beef income assurance in terms of assistance to the beef producers of the province - nowhere in the statements does the Minister say that within two months there will be a program. He indicated to the beef producers that the government, if we were elected, would immediately sit down with the producers to discuss ways and means of implementing a program, not what the honourable member is alluding to, Mr. Chairman, and I ask him to correct his statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on the same point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: On the alleged point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to rule whether or not the member has a point of privilege, especially in view of the fact that his alleged point of privilege was not concluded with a substantive motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is quite correct. The Honourable Minister, by way of explanation to clarify his position, has made a statement but does not constitute a point of order nor a point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To get back to my remarks, the Minister of Agriculture now, when he was in Opposition, was highly critical of our Minister of Agriculture, my benchmate, for not bringing a hog income stabilization program to the producers of the province any more quickly than was being done. I find it, as I say, indeed ironical that this same member of the Legislature, now in a different role, has found himself having to live with statements made by

his First Minister that there would be immediate action, not months but weeks.

The immediate action that the Minister of Agriculture took was to dismiss the board or the group that were studying the Beef Income Program as appointed by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture of the day, and replace them with another board who have, with few exceptions, not met with the beef producers of the Province of Manitoba. We've tried to find out from this Minister of Agriculture if he required them to meet with the beef producers in public meetings to get the views of the beef producers of the province. We have received no answer other than that we know no meetings have taken place in rural Manitoba with the beef producers and we can understand from that only, that this Minister is afraid to have his appointees go to the beef producers and tell them what he wants to do, establish a compulsory marketing system and a 6-year program.

The Minister of Agriculture now is sitting here and we are - what? - seven months into this new government? —(Interjection)— yes, and I'm reminded that the payout was to be this spring and we're still, with the first day of summer, two to three weeks away from a program, if I understand him. Now he may want to correct that because he may just have been getting a report on which he will found a program in two to three weeks time, so that the program may well be September, October, November before it receives Cabinet approval from a rather difficult Minister, not being able to get things through Cabinet as quickly as he may think he can.

So the beef producers, contrary to the expectations that were raised during the election and immediately after the election by statements made by his First Minister, are going to in all likelihood wait close to a year for action from this Minister, the very Minister whilst he was in Opposition was so highly critical of our progress on a Hog Income Stabilization Program.

So we are waiting patiently and would expect that the Minister would have a deadline set for his Committee to report to him; obviously he hasn't. He's let them wait through the spring seeding when most producers are unavailable for direct contact. He's let that period of time go by with no report from his Committee and we want to know how quickly he's going to come out with the program. Is the Minister saying that in two to three weeks, in that first part of July, that his program will be announced, or is that merely when his Committee is going to report on their recommendations?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that will be determined when the Committee is ready to report its recommendations to government. I am hopeful that, as I've indicated, that there will be a program by that time. —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, the basic parameters of the program have been announced; the member may want to forget that. The principles of the program were announced in this House, Mr. Chairman. The Committee is working on putting those principles into action in terms of the details of the program. He may not like the principles of the program. They were announced in this Assembly and when they are through their consultations and their meetings with producer groups and producers throughout the province, they will be coming back to

myself and to the government with their suggestions and recommendations. Then we will see where we go from there.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then, the Minister is causing some confusion because it was my clear understanding that when the Minister struck this Committee and he received such adverse reaction from the beef producers of this province to the two aspects of that program, namely, the compulsory marketing and to a lesser degree but nevertheless opposition to the 6-year sign up terms, the Minister left every impression on questioning in this House that he was prepared to accept recommendations which would vary from the compulsory marketing aspect that he insisted upon.

Now he's saying, I believe, that there is no negotiation on the compulsory marketing aspect; that will be part and parcel of the program. So, why has he got a Committee just listening to the beef producers because every single beef producer that I have talked to and that has contacted me on this program, call it a farce?

The Minister asks how many I've talked to. I would say it's been about a dozen or 15 - because there aren't that many beef producers in Pembina constituency until you get up into the western corner of it - but every single one of them that have talked to me have asked, they have questioned whether the Minister really knows what he is setting up and whether he really wants to put a program in place that's meaningful help to the producers; or whether he's simply sliding back to the 1977 glorious days of his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, in bringing in compulsory marketing through the back door.

To a man, the beef producers that I've talked to will not sign up in a program that involves compulsory marketing. Now the Minister is saying that that's not part of the negotiation; that even if 90 percent of the beef producers say there shouldn't be any compulsory marketing, he is going to forge ahead and make that a prerequisite to the program. Is that what the Minister is telling us tonight?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member obviously, himself, may be confused in his own mind when he talks about something happening without the consent of producers. Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should recall that one of the basic recommendations that were made to us by the MCPA in their brief to government - the honourable member, if he wants me to produce the brief, I will read it once again as I have done in the past to him - that in terms of having an income assurance program on beef - and they have picked three sectors, Mr. Chairman - and the three sectors they picked were the cow-calf industry, the stocker industry and the finisher industry. The premiums at whatever level you picked varied from, say, a cow-calf insurance plan - and I take this from memory, Mr. Chairman, at about \$1.10 a pound - the premium payable by the producer was approximately 16 percent of the selling price of the calf at the time for an insurance of \$1.10 a pound. When you took that to the finishing end, where the finished cattle at 85 cents a pound - and I'm going from memory again - the premium would be somewhere, I believe, around the 8 percent of selling price to ensure oneself at that level. There were ranges

going in between in all categories.

Part and parcel of that program was that a minimum length of time that a producer should sign up in the program so that the program could be insurance sound. The minimum period of time, length of time, was six years. In fact, that was the minimum amount of time that was put forward by MCPA. The optimum length of time that they suggested in their proposal was not anything above six years, but it was 20 years, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for Pembina should be well aware of that proposal, because it ranged anywhere from six years to 20 years. The longer the producer enrolled in the program, the more actuarially sound the program became because then the fluctuations in the marketplace could be spread out over a longer period of time. From their point of view, on the insurance principle, a producer could insure himself over a longer period of time. So, Mr. Chairman, let not the Honourable Member for Pembina try to lead someone astray to indicate to this committee and to the people of Manitoba that somehow no one has made any proposals; no one has been consulted with; no one's views have been taken into account.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the specific issue that he keeps chirping about from his seat in terms of compulsory marketing, the honourable member should go back and read the Livestock Commission reports, the Royal Commissions on Livestock of the '60s and of the '70s which dealt with - and in fact, the producers have indicated that they wanted to see more equity in the marketplace between producers, so that producers who are selling cattle of the same grade and the weight structure and the like would be paid similar prices for the cattle that they market, instead of having the fluctuations from day-to-day sales that have been evidenced and, even today, have been evidenced.

People have contacted me and members have told me that livestock producers - just recently, a story was related to me and I'll relate it to the honourable member, where the market price in Winnipeg was running at \$82 to \$83 a cwt, Mr. Chairman; the market price in Toronto was running at roughly \$96 a cwt, a great spread - the producer said to himself, well, look the freight differential is that great between Toronto and Winnipeg and, maybe, if I put my cattle on auction I will at least be able to make up the difference. Mr. Chairman, he ended up selling his cattle, because he did not go to the packers and accept a deal of 82 cents, in the 70 cent range, losing hundreds and hundreds of dollars on the market of a dozen animals, finished animals by the way.

The MCPA when I met with them last, just a number of weeks ago, confirmed that they also want to see more equity in the marketplace as between producers when they market their cattle of the same grade. There is no doubt in my mind that there will be a difference of opinion on how that equity can be best approached and best be realized. But certainly, there is no opposition to the desire to have more equity between producers in the marketplace so that they receive a fair return as can be evidenced by the type and the grade of cattle that they market, so that there is no great fluctuation as between what producers receive, what price, because they may have some better ins or outs

with the purchasers of those cattle.

So, Mr. Chairman, that principle in terms of the Marketing Commission obviously will be a voluntary feature of the plan. Producers who join the plan will market their cattle through a central marketing agency, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— but, Mr. Chairman, the member shakes his head.

History has a sort of a knack of repeating itself, Mr. Chairman. He is from the Conservative stripe in this Legislature. I presume he doesn't want to recall when his colleagues, who were in a Conservative Government in Manitoba, brought in a Hog Commission, Mr. Chairman. Producers who marketed their hogs and decided to go through market and through a central marketing agency had to market them through the Hog Commission, Mr. Chairman. That was brought in. By whom? By whom, Mr. Chairman? It wasn't a socialist, left-wing, radical government; it was a right-wing Conservative Government that wanted to do something about the inequities that producers faced in the marketplace, Mr. Chairman, but the program was voluntary; this program is voluntary.

Producers have now an opportunity of a lifetime to sit down and work out the details of the program like they've never had, Mr. Chairman. There are 24 producers involved from all aspects of cattle production in the Province of Manitoba, from all regions who are involved in the consultation and the development of this program, unlike anything that has happened in this province, Mr. Chairman. This group is sitting down, talking with individual producers in their homes as a group, because there are 25 people working on it; there is not one individual or two individuals or three individuals. These people are from the grassroots of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. They come from all facets of the industry; from the cow/calf, some finished; some have small feedlots, even members of the MCPA.

In fact, the MCPA's record —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, he says, I hope so. They recommended two people to sit on the Committee, Mr. Chairman. There are three people on that Committee. I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I met with the executive members. I believe there are approximately 15 executive members of the MCPA - I may be out in my numbers - and they told me personally that they are very pleased that we have embarked on this consultation program and have their input in working on this program.

Ah, now the Honourable Member for Pembina says, it's - the problem with you, you don't listen, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member has his hungup preconceived ideas of what he wants to see or not to see in a program, Mr. Chairman. What he wanted, Mr. Chairman, is to put the government in a corner initially so that the government could make its pay out initially, because that was the thrust of their arguments, and then forget about the program. That's the thrust of the Opposition's argument. That decision and that consultation was made by the Committee and I have to tell you, they were split, Mr. Chairman, because they were split in their decision, Mr. Chairman, as to how that money should be allocated. We have said you utilize those funds in developing the program as best to assist producers in being able to meet the program that you put together.

So, the honourable members really don't like - you

know, they're not used to sitting down with producers - I may not like all that the producers have to bring forward, all the recommendations but, Mr. Chairman, at least we have sat down. We will work toward what we have said we would. We would immediately sit down and work with producers to bring about a program that, hopefully, the producers of Manitoba will want to participate in and will see some benefit in, Mr. Chairman. It will be voluntary and we will see what the producers come up with.

I don't want to prejudge at this point in time what the producers recommend, so that the Honourable Member for Pembina can stand up in this House and say, here you've already devised a program; you've already set the program in motion and that's all; you've closed your mind, so you may as well forget about —(Interjection)— no, Mr. Chairman. I told you that I announced the principles of the program. If you don't like the principles, that's fine, Mr. Chairman. Ah, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition is back here in the Assembly and I'm pleased that he's here.

He of all people, in 1977, said to the cattle producers, vote down the marketing plan that was being offered; that was being shoved down producers' throats when they were given a vote, Mr. Chairman. It was he who was on the hustings at the time and said that, "Look, it will be our government that will sit down with producers and bring about a workable plan." Four years of Tory Government, four years of neglect, good agricultural Tory policy, this is the Tory policy, Mr. Chairman, absolutely do nothing. —(Interjection)— I won't even deal with that; they'll come up with more.

Mr. Chairman, they don't like the consultation that is going on with respect to this program and it is, I guess, driving them up a wall. It's driving them up a wall that the producers of Manitoba have the opportunity of a lifetime to be involved in developing a program of long-term stability in their industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I believe the principles that the Minister referred to that were underpinning his program were the compulsory marketing aspect and the fact that producers had to retain the ownership of livestock right through from calves to slaughter and that it was a 6-year plan. Can the Minister confirm then that these principles, and perhaps others, were never open to discussion in terms of the recommendations that the Advisory Committee might make?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, all the principles are open to discussion. There are ways of accomplishing the same principles by dealing with it in other ways. When the honourable member talks about not being open, all the items are being discussed by the producer group in terms of how to achieve and continue to achieve those principles that were announced. It may very well be that it may not be necessary. There may be other ways of handling the 6-year aspect, as was proposed to us by the MCPA. There may be other

ways of dealing with that. That, of course, is being discussed by the producers.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister prepared to accept a recommendation from the Advisory Committee that would deal with such a thing as the central marketing? That if the Committee recommended that it be voluntary; that the producers have the option of using the central desk selling, that he would entertain a recommendation to that effect?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I won't prejudge at this point in time what the Committee will do or will not do or what my reaction will be, because then the honourable member can rightly stand up in this Chamber. If the honourable members says that he does not accept the principle of equity in the marketplace as between producers as being a principle that one would want to achieve, then I accept his position. But I believe, and I'll let the honourable member speak for himself, if he doesn't accept that principle — (Interjection)— pardon me? Yes, I believe that he can speak.

He probably doesn't accept that producers have not had equity in the marketplace with respect to the animals that they've marketed over the years. He maybe doesn't believe that has happened; that has occurred; that there have been great equities in the marketplace. If he doesn't believe that, let him stand up and say so.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, my simple question to the Minister is this; is the compulsory central marketing aspect of the program a basic immutable part of the Minister's program or is he open to modifications on the basis of recommendations from producers?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, all the principles are being discussed by the producer group. Whatever recommendations they come up with, we will decide as to whether or not the government can live with those recommendations.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps there is little point in pursuing this further. We seem to have received about four or five different answers to the same question over the past few weeks, going from it, first of all, being immutable to being under discussion and subject to recommendations. Now the Minister seems to be telling us, "Well, maybe it's open to discussion." I expect that what he is accomplishing is, that through delay and continued pressure he will eventually get the recommendations that he wants.

A couple of other questions to the Minister then, Mr. Chairman. Will the ultimate date of implementation of this program then depend upon how long it takes for the Minister to get the sort of recommendations that he seeks?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the producer group is meeting regularly. All the groups are meeting on a regular basis and I've asked them to come up with their recommendations as quickly as possible. It was my hope that all their discussions and the various points that they raised at some of the first meetings,

that they would like to have some further input from the department, some further information that they could analyze and some of the requests they have made, that by about the beginning of July they would be in a position to make recommendations.

At this point in time, I believe that the bulk of the work has been done. There is further information that the department has to provide them with respect to alternate programming to assist producers in dealing with aspects of holding their animals for longer periods of time - financing - those kinds of questions. There's more work to be done there as well as aspects on marketing. Those discussions are under way at the present time.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, will the Regional Advisory Committees be going back and holding public meetings with the producers to talk about their final recommendations to the Minister or to talk about the ultimate program that the Minister is prepared to recommend to his colleagues?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the Regional Committees will be dealing in a public way, with aspects of their recommendations and decisions that they have made. As to the timing of that, that is yet being discussed with the producer groups as to when they - they are now having discussions on some of the aspects from people they have contacted in their own way. Some are holding local small meetings; some are meeting in homes dealing with aspects that they are now discussing before they make their recommendations. It is my hope that when the final package is put together, they will go out and discuss it publicly.

MR. B. RANSOM: Exactly, what does the Minister mean by "in a public way?" Secondly, do the producers now have, or have they had, an equal opportunity to have input to the Regional Committees or are the Committees simply going out and speaking to those people which they select for contact?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am not about to sit down and follow what each Committee is doing. They have had our desires in terms of the way they wish to conduct their affairs in terms of getting public input into some of their ideas, some of the ideas that they've put forward: some Committees have held public meetings; some Committees have held what could be called as "kitchen meetings." So there have been various approaches handled by the Committees. It is my hope that, when the plan is put together, there will be meetings to deal with the aspects of the plan. How they will be handled, that will be up to the Committee.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I know that there is some reluctance among some of the members of the Committees to meet publicly and perhaps some encouragement from the Minister to have real public input might be valuable. Has the Advisory Committee requested that the Minister increase the percentage contribution from the government?

HON. B. URUSKI: That's some of the discussions that have been going on.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister advised the Committee that the 2 percent is all that he can get from his caucus?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, at this point in time, as I have indicated to the honourable member before, I will not start discussing all aspects of the program until I see the recommendations and I have further discussions with the producers, and I say that to the honourable member.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, then is the Minister confirming that the question of contribution by the government is not yet closed?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, all items are presently under discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no further comments. THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$17,500,000 for Agriculture Income Insurance Fund for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

RES. NO. 2 - LAW COURTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are continuing with Resolution No. 2, Law Courts, for the Attorney-General, \$85,000.00.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, just a word of explanation, the \$85,000, Mr. Chairman, which appears in Item Law Courts under the Attorney-General, is matched a little later down you'll notice by \$85,000 under Corrections and Probation Services. The two sums combined are the amount estimated to cover the first part-year's cost of the Fine Option Program which was in fact enacted by the previous government and it will be proclaimed and proceeded with in this year. Actually, the sum may be somewhat less than that, but that was the estimate at the time the program was first designed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, a question to the Attorney-General. Some few weeks ago he and/or his department announced a grant of some \$29,000 to the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties to which, I understand, the Attorney-General had made, in his terms, an eloquent speech some several weeks before. Has it been the practice of previous Governments of Manitoba to make grants to this association?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Chairperson, I turn to you for general guidance. I have no hesitation in answering the question, but it's my understanding that when considering Supplementary Estimates, we are considering the items that are listed. I have no other item here than the \$85,000.00. I want to know whether or not it will be open for any member opposite to question me, as the spokesperson for my department, on any one of the items contained in my Main Estimates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions or comments?

HON. S. LYON: No, I just reiterate the question. The practice of the House, to those who aren't familiar with it, including the House Leader, is that on Supplementary Supply it's wide open. You can ask any question. I asked a question about the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties; I'm waiting for an answer.

HON. R. PENNER: My advice is that it's not the practice of the House that when we come in Ways and Means to the Main Supply, then that is a "cover the waterfront" type of opportunity for members of the Opposition who may have forgotten to raise certain questions or something has arisen since to ask questions. But, on Supplementary Supply, one is expected to deal item by item with those issues which are contained within Supplementary Supply. I think we should have a ruling on that, not as I say because I have any hesitation in answering the question when it's asked. When Main Supply comes into Ways and Means, I will be pleased to answer the question, but I think we should have a general ruling here so that we know where we're going with the rest of the items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the general ruling would be that, in Committee of Supply, the comments should be directed to the Item that we're considering. The only exception to that, to my understanding at least, is when we're discussing the Minister's Salary. Seeing as none of these items fall into that category, I would ask that the questions be directed to the Item that we're considering.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, there are at least 100 different places where I can ask the question. If the Attorney-General, in the course of Supplementary Supply, doesn't choose to answer, is avoiding the answer to the question at this place, I can assure him I can ask it in a dozen different places. I can tell you, Sir, from my experience in the House on Supplementary Supply, the usual practice of the House has been, notwithstanding the bad advice from the Member for Springfield which is usually bad because he never did understand the House, has been to permit questions on the full gamut because they're going to be asked at the end of Supply in any event.

My honourable friend can slither, wiggle or whatever he wants, but he'll answer the question sooner or later. I'll guarantee that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no further comments. THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$85,000 for Attorney-General, Law Courts, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: I have a question that relates indirectly to Law Courts. There is a group in Manitoba known as the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties. The Attorney-General saw fit to convince his colleagues a few weeks ago that it should receive a grant of some \$29,000 out of the taxpayers' money of Manitoba. I want to ask, because this matter relates to

Law Courts and to the administration of justice in Manitoba, if there has been a precedent for that kind of grant heretofore?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Again I turn to you, Mr. Chairman. You have ruled on a point of order that I have raised, a point of explanation of procedure that I have raised. The Leader of the Opposition is too clever by half. If he thinks that we're a bunch of dummies, he can slide things through the back door that he couldn't get through the front door, I think he has been proven mistaken before and he should be proven mistaken again.

I have told him and I say again, that I have no hesitation in answering that question at the proper time and in the proper place. I, for one, will not be bullied by him and this House cannot be bullied by him. When he says you will obey orders, he has the right language but the wrong place. It is for the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, as the case may be, to rule. I, for one, will abide by that ruling. If the ruling is that I should answer that question, I'll gladly answer it. If it is otherwise, I will wait and I gave the indication I will answer that question in Main Supply when it's appropriate.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, in the interests of getting the work of the Committee done, will the Minister answer the question, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the Resolution pass?

HON. S. LYON: No, Mr. Chairman. I asked the question and I expect it to be answered. We're not yet in his kind of forum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

HON. S. LYON: There's no question to be put, Mr. Chairman. I asked a question. The traditional practice of the House has been for general information to be available on Supplementary Supply. If we are now to have a new socialist era where only the information that they choose to give will be given, then let the world know. This is the government that goes about the world and in Manitoba and says it believes in Freedom of Information and accountability to all. I'm asking a very simple question, Mr. Chairman, that can be answered here very quickly by the Attorney-General. If he chooses not to do so, he'll pay the consequences.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General on the same point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: I regret that the Leader of the Opposition should feel it necessary to threaten in this House. If he thinks that he can threaten me, you've picked the wrong target, Sir. You have made a ruling with respect to the relevancy of questions pertaining to things on the Supplementary Supply list and I will obey your ruling.

With respect to Freedom of Information, I have said and I will - the Leader of the Opposition can't understand but the other members do - I will answer that

question and I will answer it the first time it's asked in Main Supply when Main Supply comes into Ways and Means, the first time it's asked, gladly. There will be no holding back on that item.

Indeed, that item was - as it should have been - a matter of public record, but I will not be bullied by these kind of threats. There is a procedure to be followed. There are Rules of the House. There's a tradition in this House. The Leader of the Opposition makes it up for himself as it suits himself, but he cannot bully this House. That has to be established or this House can no longer be run as a House.

CHAIRMAN'S RULING

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. For the information of the House, it clearly states in our Rules on page 31, 64(2) that "Speeches in Committee of the Whole House," which includes Committee of Supply, "must be directly relevant to the item or clause under discussions."

The Honourable Attorney-General has indicated his willingness to answer the question under the appropriate item when it comes up for discussion in Ways and Means. I would ask that we could proceed and continue with the business before the Committee.

HON. S. LYON: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have made my ruling.

QUESTION put; MOTION carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think the advice that was given to the Attorney-General is erroneous. Inasmuch as I have sat in that Chair under a previous administration and far-ranging discussion was always allowed on this particular item. There has never been any discussion as to whether it was in order or out of order.

As a matter of fact the previous Minister, under Income Insurance Fund, made some remarks about a hog program that took place that has nothing to do with this program here at all and it was allowed to be discussed quite freely. I say to the Honourable — (Interjection) — is there any discussion? Wait your bloody turn. You'll get a chance.

Anyway, I'm just telling you what was done before, was perfectly acceptable before, and I can't see any reason why it isn't acceptable now and far-ranging discussion and debate should be allowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution before us is that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$85,000 for Attorney-General, Law Courts, Provincial Judges' Court, Item No. 2, Other Expenditures, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

HON. S. LYON: Ayes and Nays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ayes and Nays. All those in favour signify so by saying aye. All those opposed, by nay. In

my opinion, the ayes have it and the motion is carried.

RES. NO. 3 - REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Continuing with Resolution No. 3, Rehabilitative Services.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Community Services and the Minister of Finance some questions about this particular item.

The appropriation for Work Activity Projects in Main Supply, which is Appropriation 34.(d)(4), projects and asks for, Mr. Chairman, a budgetary figure of \$3,188,500 for Work Activity Projects for 1982-83. The comparable figure for 1981-82, Sir, was \$2,574,000.00. In other words, the request that is contained in Main Supply is a request for an increase of 23 percent in the Budget for Work Activity Projects in 82-83, over 81-82.

I have no quarrel with that requested increase of 23 percent. In fact, when we discussed and examined the Minister's Estimates during the month of March, Mr. Chairman, you will recall and I'm sure the Minister will recall and the record will show, that neither I nor my colleagues objected to that increase. It's a considerable increase; 23 percent, but in view of the importance of Work Activity Projects and in view of the situation with respect to employment in the Province of Manitoba and the difficulties faced by unemployed employables, not only in Manitoba but everywhere in the world, I was quite willing and my colleagues were quite willing to approve that budgetary figure for '82-83 and we have done so. The Minister's Estimates are passed and that item passed and he encountered no unusual difficulty in getting it passed.

Now tonight, Sir, we face a request from the Minister for a Supplementary spending sum of almost \$1 million - \$910,400 - over and above that which he is requesting in Main Supply. That figure, Sir, of Supplementary Supply that he's requesting would boost the increase in the Budget for this government program to 60 percent. In other words, from a Main Supply debate in which the Opposition accepted and offered its approval of a one-year budgetary increase of 23 percent in this program - and that's not an insignificant increase in any program, I think all members of the House would agree - we're now being asked tonight, Sir, to approve an increase in that program's one-year budget of 60 percent. I would begin my examination of the subject, Mr. Chairman, by asking the Minister for an explanation of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the member himself partly touched upon the reasons for requesting an additional amount and I do say, Mr. Chairman, that I welcome the members' support during our Estimates for that substantial increase and I agree with him that is a substantial increase. The fact is, the member touched upon the increasing level of unemployment. Those who seem to have the less training, the people who come from disadvantaged backgrounds, whatever they may be, are usually the first people out of work when there is a downturn in

the economic cycle; they are usually the last people to get a job when the business cycle swings upward.

So we are recognizing here, Mr. Chairman, as I guess we recognized later on in the Estimates where there's, I believe, some funding for an employment creation program. I believe that's the last item of the Estimates. It is part and parcel of the same thrust to hopefully put a few more people to work that may not be able to get employed otherwise.

I would also remind the honourable member that there was a substantial cutback in the funding of the Work Activity Projects in Manitoba in the year 1978-79. In fact, the figures went down drastically. Total costs in '78-79 were roughly - I'll just round these off to the nearest 100,000 - \$3.2 million. They were cut back substantially to - I stand corrected, \$2.9 million, then they were cut back substantially to \$1.8 million, almost a cut in half. In '80-81, the increase was up to 1.9 but that didn't keep pace with inflation. There was a much better increase in '81-82. What I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, I don't have the numbers with me, but if we put these in constant dollars, I'm not sure even if we add the 900,000 to the increase we suggested in the earlier Estimates that we're back to where we were in '78-79 in terms of constant dollars. In other words, we are recognizing two things: one, that the level of activity of the projects back in '78-79 was considerably higher than it was in '79-80, '80-81, '81-82 and although we have added money in the regular Estimates of '82-83, that still would not bring it back to the '78-79 level in real dollars, so we are recognizing that.

The other thing, as I said, Mr. Chairman, is that there is a great deal of unemployment. Unfortunately, there are some groups in our society who are hurt more by a downturn in a business cycle than others.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes reference to the cutbacks in terms of the overall budgets for Work Activity Projects during the late 1970s, but the fact of the matter is that reductions in Work Activity program budgets in the late 1970s were directly related to two very practical considerations. One of them was the fact that a number of Work Activity Projects in the spectrum at that time had been adjudged to be inefficient, redundant and unnecessary and therefore, they were eliminated. A second one is that there was an intensive examination of the Work Activity Project concept from the point of view of whether they were meeting the terms of reference and the objectives that were contained in the original concept for developing them or whether, in fact, they were becoming sheltered workshops; whether, in fact, they were becoming rotating-door operations for persons who were not prepared to go out and seek employment after being trained to adjust to the employment environment and whether, in fact, they were being operated in many respects, as I say, as sheltered workshops.

Work Activity Projects are not supposed to be sheltered workshops. They were not conceived as sheltered workshops; they were not designed as sheltered workshops; they are not intended as sheltered workshops. Sheltered workshops are in place under the Rehabilitation section and Community Mental Retardation section of the department's Estimates and the Minister is fully aware of that. Those are specific facili-

ties that are designed to meet a need encountered and experienced by mentally handicapped people.

Work Activity Projects are designed to take people who are socially handicapped, not mentally handicapped and not physically handicapped, but socially handicapped. I recognize that there are numbers of socially handicapped persons in our society; we all do. To take those people and to train them in employment environment skills, to train them in the atmosphere and the environment of work and a working day and working for a living and meeting time clocks and meeting responsibilities and meeting orders and earning a living. Given that training over a 16 week or 20 week or 26 week period, they are then graduated and moved out on their own into the work force, into the employment stream, to seek gainful employment. In fact, Sir, the record has been very good.

Overall, it's my understanding that across the spectrum of Work Activity Projects, some 30 percent of those who have been processed through our WAP Program in the past 10 years have achieved steady and gainful employment. In the case of Westbran, in Brandon, where a total of 1,485 clients have gone through the program since its inception in 1973-74, fully 600 are estimated to be now fully employed in regular jobs in the regular workplace. That's what the Work Activity Projects are all about and I know that the Minister understands that.

In the mid-1970s, there was a tendency to use them as sheltered workshops and to use them as revolving-door sanctuaries for persons who were not apparently motivated to take advantage of the training they received and then go out into the work community and seek employment; who were inclined rather to seek continuing and ongoing sanctuary and protection in the Work Activity Projects. As a consequence, the previous government and the department had a very intensive look at the whole program. There was considerable evaluation done and a number of specific, individual, geographic Work Activity Projects were eliminated from the spectrum. They were adjudged inefficient, redundant, and unsuccessful and also adjudged in some cases to have reached a point where they were being exploited for the wrong reasons. As a consequence, they were phased out of operation. But a number of Work Activity Projects, approximately five or six in number, remained in place and have continued to this day to remain in place.

Therefore, the argument about budgetary cutbacks is not a reasonable one. The budgetary cutbacks were attached to that evaluation that I have talked about, to that rationalization of the whole program. Now, we are looking at five or six Work Activity Projects, as we were in 1977, '78, '79, and the Minister is asking for a 60-percent increase in his budget this year. I have yet to be persuaded that it's a justifiable request.

Further to that, Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes reference to the fact that, in difficult economic times such as these, unemployed employables are liable to constitute that element of society which suffers the most. But the fact of the matter is, that the figures in terms of intake into Work Activity Projects in the last two or three years do not bear that argument out. They indicate rather that, to a substantial degree, the Work Activity Projects Program of the department over the past 8 to 10 years has been successful in reducing the

numbers of unemployed employables in our province, particularly in the area of Brandon and Westbran, particularly with respect to the Westbran Project. That, in fact, there are still unemployed employables in society but as a percentage of society, it is substantially less than it was a few years ago.

Whether this is because some of them have left the province and moved elsewhere, I cannot say. But I suspect that, in large part, it's because a great many of them have been reached by the program as demonstrated by the figures in Westbran and have been removed from the unemployed employable category and trained and equipped to go into the work force and get jobs and have succeeded in doing so. So, if we're working on a smaller base of potential clientele, once again, the argument for such a huge increase in the budget is unjustified.

Further to that, Mr. Chairman, the position that the Minister takes seems to be at variance with the position he has taken in discussions on this subject during the past three or four weeks during question period when I've asked him about the summary displacement of Mr. Doug Wark as Manager of the Westbran Project and his replacement, in an act of what was clear political patronage, by Mr. Mick Burke. The Minister, in responding to some of those questions, has attempted to make the case that the volumes of clientele being dealt with by the Work Activity Projects and particularly by Westbran have been substantially down in number in recent years.

If that's the case, what leads him to believe that those volumes are going to be substantially up in number this year justifying an increase of \$1.5 million in total, an increase of \$1.5 million in his budget? It would seem to me there is some inconsistency in his latest statements about needing that kind of money to deal with a potential volume of clientele when, in his responses to my questions, he has argued that the clientele is down from previous years.

HON. L. EVANS: The member touches on a number of important points and I welcome the opportunity to discuss this. I would, firstly, agree with him that these are not meant to be sheltered workshops but, at the same time, it's my view that - and by looking at some of the numbers - there seems to be too much emphasis being put on life skills development. I think this is one reason why they have become very very expensive. I looked at a figure in one project and the average cost per participant, if you divide the total cost by the number of participants, comes to something in the order of \$16,000-plus, which is a lot of money considering the fact that some of those participants are not there all year round.

So, I share the member's concern about the amount of costs that are involved in these projects, but I think if we put more emphasis on work experience and somewhat less on life skills development, and bring in some other innovations, I think that we can perhaps get greater efficiency than I was speaking of the other day; a greater productivity, if you will, although I'm somewhat hesitant in using that term.

There is no question that we have to increase the participant enrolment and while the figures show, and the member refers to them as being on the decline somewhere. I'd like to point out to him that many parts

of the province do not have any Work Activity Projects. There are no Work Activity Projects in the north, short of the one that's now been developed in the Pas. There's one that's being developed in the Pas currently, but apart from that there are none of these projects anywhere in Northern Manitoba. So the members should note that, that it's possible that we should look at those regions of the province where there's indeed very high unemployment ratios and they certainly are in some of the communities in Northern Manitoba.

The other point I would make and perhaps the member doesn't realize, or maybe he's forgotten, but the one project, we have one project in the City of Winnipeg which has been referred to as WHIP, the Winnipeg Housing Initiatives Program, and it's very interesting that the Winnipeg project is only barely larger than the Brandon project. It's just very marginally larger than the Brandon project which bring me to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the largest city in Manitoba that has nearly 60 percent of the population has but one project and the project is about the same size as the one in the Westbran area, says to me that there is a great demand, a great need in the Winnipeg area, particularly the core area where there's a great deal, there are thousands of persons that have migrated into the inner core from Northern Manitoba and rural Manitoba. We all recognize that and we are taking initiatives and I think both parties are cognizant of the social problems involved in this kind of migration and there's cultural disadvantages among other kinds of social disadvantages. So, in my view, there is a long way we have to go when you compare what's been going on in Winnipeg with any of the other projects. On a proportionate basis Winnipeg should be about 20 times the size of the one in the Westbran area, and yet it's really, as I said, about the same size.

So, Mr. Chairman, the \$910,000 that we speak of, the member should realize that those monies won't necessarily be allocated proportionately to all the projects. I can't give him a definitive answer as to what percentage goes where because we are in the process of an analysis of the projects but I would suggest to him, and I think he would make the same decision if he looked at the figures now, if he looked at the problems now, that a great deal of that money should go into the City of Winnipeg.

As I said, I think perhaps there's a case to be made for some other initiatives, in some other parts of the province where there are no projects. There are no projects in the eastern part of the province, for example, Mr. Speaker. We don't have anything in Beausejour or Lac du Bonnet. The ones that we have, the one in the Interlake is very very small, and mind you it's fairly new. So upon a look-see at what's going on, there is room, it seems to me, for some of these projects to be put in other parts of the province and certainly there's room for a great deal of expansion in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's all well and good but the Minister keeps referring to \$910,000; it's actually \$1.5 million. I know the item we're discussing is \$910,000, but the increase in this line of the Estimates in total is now \$1.5 million, if this \$910,000 is approved. That's an enormous amount to be applying

on top of a budgetary figure of \$2.5 million. The \$600,000 increase being requested in the Main Estimates would seem to me, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to be a fairly useful sum of money to be applied in the manner in which the Minister describes is necessary. To go beyond that to \$1.5 million is asking this Committee, or at least asking this side of this Committee at this point to do something that I regret to say we are not yet prepared to do. Certainly we're not convinced or persuaded that it is efficient, prudent and positive application of hard-earned taxpayers' money.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has referred to the Employment Creation expenditure and the request for \$10 million in this Supplementary Supply measure for that initiative. I have no quarrel with that in concept, although we will want to know what that Employment Creation Program is all about, what it consists of, and how that \$10 million is going to be applied. But it seems to me, Sir, that if we're looking just a few items down in this Supplementary Supply request at \$10 million for Employment Creation, that the Minister is asking the taxpayers of Manitoba, in a \$353 million deficit year, for a very very great deal when he's asking for an additional \$1 million on the Work Activity Projects side, over and above the \$600,000 increase we've already given him. Why, when his government is asking \$10 million for Employment Creation, which after all is the most important economic initiative that could be taken by this or any government in this country today, does he find it necessary to ask the taxpayers to lay out an additional \$1 million in the Work Activity Project field, when that field is going to get a \$600,000 increase anyway? I have not had it justified to me that this additional request of \$1 million for Work Activity Projects is acceptable in the light of the request that'll be coming a few items from now for \$10 million in Employment Creation. Is it not sufficient to ask the taxpayers of this province for \$10 million for Employment Creation without stretching it to \$11 million? The Work Activity Projects have already been granted an impressive increase in Main Supply and I cannot understand why in the circumstances of the day, economically speaking, we're asking not \$10 million for Employment Creation, but in essence, \$11 million additional spending for Employment Creation.

HON. L. EVANS: As I explained, Mr. Chairman - I don't know whether the honourable member heard me or not - but in my view, there are parts of the province where we don't have any Work Activity Project Programs whatsoever. I mentioned Eastman - there's nothing whatsoever in the eastern part of the province. Also, there are parts of the Interlake yet to be served; there are parts of Northern Manitoba - and this is nothing new, I suppose - but the amounts of unemployment in some towns and centres in Northern Manitoba is higher than you find anywhere in the south. There's no question that they are very, very high levels of unemployment in particular locales.

But I go back again to the fact that the Winnipeg project obtained \$1.2 million in 1978-79, that's about four years ago - \$1.2 million; in '79-80 it was cut back sharply to just over 700,000; in '80-81 it didn't even get an inflationary increase, it went up to 786,000; in '81-82 it went up to 921,000; it went up perhaps a wee bit

more than inflation. But the fact is, in '81-82, it was still below the level four years previous, \$1.2 million and in the meantime we were experiencing, I would guess, inflation running around 10 percent a year, so that the Winnipeg Project should be closer to \$2 million or over \$2 million now, just to be kept at the '78-79 level.

But, Mr. Chairman, the main point is that the member will only observe, that of the total expenditures last year in the year '81-82 on Work Activity Projects, the City of Winnipeg expenditure was well less than a third, whereas the City of Winnipeg has about 60 percent of the population. It's just incredible that the major city in Manitoba has one project. It would seem to me that either we should have a considerable expansion of the existing project under the existing board, or else there should be more than one, perhaps two or three or four in the City of Winnipeg and I'm thinking of the core area in particular.

There's a long way to go both in terms of loss of funds through inflation, as I said, plus the fact that there is no question that the level of programming in the City of Winnipeg is simply well under par. The level of programming is certainly nowhere near what it should be if you compare it with the other projects in the smaller towns and cities of the province.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says there are areas in the province, rural areas, areas in Eastern Manitoba, areas in Northern Manitoba, which have no Work Activity Projects and where employment-generating opportunities are necessary and I don't dispute that general perspective, that general statement. But it's very difficult to deal with this request for \$910,000 additional for Work Activity Projects without knowing, Mr. Chairman, what is entailed in the \$10 million request for Employment Creation Programs, because the obvious question one would ask is, why can't the Minister and his colleagues use some of that \$10 million request for Employment Creation to develop these opportunities and initiatives that he says are needed in Eastern and Northern Manitoba.

HON. L. EVANS: I guess when we get into the \$10 million item, we'll get into some of the details there that the member asks about; I can't give him the details of the breakdown of the \$10 million. But I would remind the honourable member that it's to the advantage of the Province of Manitoba to provide some employment training and therefore eventual employment opportunity through these programs as much as possible, inasmuch as they are cost-shared with Ottawa; inasmuch as we get back 50 cents on every dollar spent - and the member is nodding his head in agreement. So what we're doing here, I suppose ideally, we should put as much money as we could under this particular item because it is indeed cost-shared; this is not the case with the \$10 million.

So I just want to assure the member that there are plenty of people out there who can be usefully put into these programs but as I said, we want to put more emphasis on work experience for those people and less on so-called life skills development, so that we'll bring down the cost per participant. I think that's an efficient way to go and I certainly look for support from the member in that respect. I think that if we look

carefully - and I guess perhaps I'm repeating myself - at parts of the province and indeed the core area of Winnipeg, there's a lot of work that needs to be done to provide opportunities and work experiences and other employment development and training for the hundreds and thousands of people that have come into the inner core of Winnipeg over the past several years.

MR. L. SHERMAN: They may be 50-cent dollars, Mr. Chairman, but we're still paying the 50 cents. We still have to come up with the 50 cent piece in each case and I leave it with the Minister and with his colleagues that I think a substantial case can be made for employing part of that \$10 million that is being requested for Employment Creation Program to develop employment opportunities, even if it includes employment training, in those underserved areas to which the Minister has referred and that kind of an initiative could offset the necessity of this requested additional expenditure in the Work Activity Projects area.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister where, in general, the requested \$910,000 is going to be spent and I would like to know how much of it is going to be spent on expanding and developing the bureaucracy in creating jobs for additional personnel; whether they be political patronage jobs; whether they be friends of the Minister; whether they be of anyone from any walk of life. To what extent is that \$910,000 going to be spent to expand the bureaucracy and to what extent is it going to be spent to do what Work Activity Projects are intended to do and, that is, take the socially disadvantaged man or woman off the street and train him or her how to work and turn them into the workplace in 16, 20 or 26 weeks with a reasonable guarantee that he or she will get a job?

HON. L. EVANS: I welcome the member's enquiry because I can advise that I've told him that I've told the department categorically that I want to see funding go in such a way that ultimately it's the participants that get the major advantage. You know, if he would have looked back when he was Minister - or perhaps I guess it was Mr. Minaker who was Minister in the last couple of years - but if you look back at the last couple years at some of the projects, you'll find that the salaries of the staff were in the \$20,000 range on average and last year the participants were averaging barely over \$3,000.00. Now in some cases they get Social Allowance Supplement; it depends on the category they're in and so on, it gets sort of complicated. But in my view, if you take the one project, Westbran, I believe the average participant obtained \$3,200 and that person was only involved part of the year. You could take that person and subsidize him 100 percent at some minimum wage job, let's say at the new minimum wage level, which gives you roughly a little more than \$8,000 per annum and you could have put several times the number of people to work; the participants would have had more money. I don't know how much life skills training they would have had, but there's no question in my mind that we have to adjust the programming in order to bring down the overhead costs; we have to adjust the programming to ensure that there is no unnecessary, unwarranted, unwanted expansion in the bureaucracy.

I share the member's concern and I have expressed that in no uncertain terms to my department, that these projects must be run for the benefit of the trainees or the participants, not simply as a means of, you know, adding more staff and paying out more and more salaries. So I can assure the member that will be the thrust.

I noticed that - I guess he was the Minister involved at that time - there were some substantial staff cutbacks, but mind you those were related to the overall budget cuts. For instance at Westman, in the period of the cut from 1978-79 to 1979-1980, the staff level was cut from 19 staff to 13 staff; there was a cut of six and that was related to the overall budget cutback. But I might add, Mr. Chairman, the one reason that it was easy to cut back, I would submit, was because they were all on a contract and I think it's fitting that the staff should stay on contracts; that is my view. There is pressure now from the MGEA to make persons in the projects members of the Civil Service; I would resist that because I really think that we've got to take a very very hard look as we go along as to whether we want to continue them, as we will for this coming year, maybe in a modified form to get more efficiency. But if after these analyses, that I spoke of earlier, are conducted and we take another run at it, putting more emphasis on work experience and less on life skills development so that we can get more through-put of the trainees and a lower cost per participant for the taxpayers.

If we can't do that, then maybe we'll have to make some very drastic changes, you know, in a year from now; maybe either a very drastic change in terms of, well, perhaps changing the whole thrust of the program. I want to continue it as I'm sure the honourable members opposite want to continue to provide opportunities for the disadvantaged to help them get into the work force, to help them get off welfare and so on, but there is a limit to how much money we can put into this type of programs. I say when we're paying \$16,000 per participant as we are in some of the projects, that is far too much — (Interjection) — very little. But the \$16,000 per participant is just too high a figure, that was the average for one project last year.

So I share the member's concern and I want to assure him as much as I can that these funds are for the participants and we are hopeful that we will get a higher through-put and therefore the cost per participant, hopefully, will be reduced and that there will be more funding, more payment of fees or whatever the expression is, allowances, I guess, to the participants themselves.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, those so-called staff cutbacks that the Minister refers to were not staff cutbacks at all. Those were contract positions that reached a point of conclusion and fulfillment of the contract and that was the end of that particular person's association with this particular program. It was done, as I say, because the whole spectrum of projects was looked at and evaluated from the point of view of their effectiveness and their efficiency and the degree to which, as I say, they had become sheltered workshops and sanctuaries.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister is aware that there are six Work Activity Projects in the province at the present time, actually five with one new one to come at The

Pas. There's one in Westbran in Brandon; there's one in Parklands; there's one combined for Eastman in Interlake; there's one for the Central Region; there's one in Winnipeg; there's one coming in the Pas. So for six Work Activity Projects he's asking for \$1.5 million, which works out to approximately \$250,000 per project if my arithmetic is correct. Now to begin with, we know that it's been his intention up 'till very recently at any rate, to spend \$30,000 of that on duplicating the Manager's and Employment Services Co-ordinator's jobs, in other words splitting that dual function and creating another bureaucratic position, the salary for which would be approximately \$30,000.00. Is he saying that the other \$220,000 approximate in each case is going to be spent on the nuts and bolts of job training and that none of it is going to be spent on an expanded bureaucracy?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we can get more participants through these projects, which is what we'd like to have, it is possible that you will have to add staff in some of the projects; there's no getting away from that. It will depend on the kind of work assignments, the various projects that are undertaken as to how many foremen are required, how many people with skilled trades are required for supervision and so on, so it will vary. It is our hope that we will have a greater level of activity in terms of participants, in terms of training, so the cost per trainee will come down. Hopefully, the participants' allowances can go up but it's possible that we may need more staff if we have a considerable addition to the number of participants.

The Minister talked about when he was Minister that they didn't fire anybody whose contract was coming to an end, and so on. It is true, the six contracts were not renewed but this was as a result of a direct government cutback in the programs, not only Westbran, they cut right across the board, but the one in Westbran, as I said, was cut from 19 staff to 13. I might add they cut back on the participant levels as well, which therefore ultimately ended up at a higher cost per participant. I note that at that time, the executive of the Westbran Project was very concerned about the budget cuts, but thankful that the project was not completely cancelled in its entirety; that goes back to March, 1979. But I repeat, if you put more people through it, there is a possibility you may have to have some more staff but that we have to play by ear.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in pursuing this objective of creating an additional administrative position in each of the Work Activity Projects, can the Minister advise the Committee of what process and procedure is in place to find and locate those additional administrative personnel with respect to all six Work Activity Projects, possibly with the exception of Winnipeg where there are different parameters and responsibilities in place? Is he proceeding in an open, orderly, fair, competitive fashion looking for Project Managers in those sites which require Project Managers - and not all of them do by any means - and Employment Services Co-ordinators in those sites that require Employment Services Co-ordinators, or is he making these choices and decisions by himself, or with his Deputy Minister within the confines of his

own office?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I have now had approved by Cabinet a set of general policy guidelines which is in keeping with my intention of providing a higher level of activity in all these projects, so that we can get more participants, more trainees. What I plan to do, hopefully, after the Session is to meet with the staff in each project throughout the province to the best of my ability and we will be reviewing this.

The other thing I find is that some of the projects do not have active boards; in fact, the one in Winnipeg I believe, never has a board ever appointed officially by the government. To the best of my information the board is acting on a sort of month-to-month, year-to-year basis. I don't believe there was ever any formalization of the appointment of the Winnipeg Board and some of the other boards were supposed to be reviewed each year and reappointed, or whatever, and I find that this didn't happen.

In some cases I would say the government really neglected the projects, neglected the boards and I'm proposing to sit down with the boards as well, in these projects around the province and to discuss in detail how we may go about achieving what we want to achieve and that is to make these projects more meaningful and more effective than they've been today. I intend to give this a higher priority; it's something that I think is very important and, hopefully, with the co-operation of local people and all the staff, we will do this.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Why is the Minister even pursuing this course of action, Mr. Chairman? Has he ever talked to his Employment Service Co-ordinators in his Work Activity Projects? My information firsthand, from mouth to mouth, from personnel involved in the programs and in the department, is that it is not necessary to split that position and divide the two jobs and my own experience as Minister indicated as much to me, that most Project Managers spend two days a week managing the project and that's all that is necessary and the other three days a week they spend as Employment Services Co-ordinators and that is sufficient for that job; that is the feeling of the personnel in the division; that is the feeling of the personnel in these jobs.

They will tell the Minister if he asks them - and I doubt that he ever has - that they do their Employment Services work in three days and their Project Management in two. Why is the Minister creating new jobs? Why is the Minister looking for ways to spend additional money in a \$353 million deficit year and why is he asking us for an additional \$910,000 to finance that kind of frivolous approach to what have been very efficient projects?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the member brings up questions that I've already answered but the — (Interjection)— well, I have. Some of the members now talking from their seats haven't been here throughout the entire discussion this evening. But the fact is, let me answer the Member for Fort Garry by answering him with a rhetorical question. Why is it that we have a full-time Manager in Winnipeg?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is the Minister after all but I'm very pleased to answer that question. The reason why we have a full-time Project Manager in Winnipeg separate from the Employment Services Co-ordinator is because in the first place, you're looking at a volume of population and potential clientele that is enormously greater than that which exists in the other Work Activity Projects areas; in the second place, because we have a specific program in Winnipeg for training Mothers' Allowance recipients to be equipped to go into the workplace and that is a specific and an exclusive project and program; in the third place, because the decision was made some considerable time ago that the Winnipeg locale would be served by administrative officers in two specific categories of work, a Work Activity Project Manager and an Employment Services Co-ordinator; whereas the other ones would be served by one administrative officer serving in a dual function.

HON. L. EVANS: As the member thinks now, Mr. Chairman, he'll realize that if you have a project of any size you need a full-time Manager and the one in Winnipeg is barely, just fractionally, marginally, barely larger than the one in Brandon, no matter which kind of statistic that you look at and yet it has a full-time Manager. I might add, too, that the one in Brandon really had an executive assistant to help the so-called part-time Manager. So, Mr. Chairman, it's what you like to achieve. If you want to achieve more activity, if you want to achieve more meaningful programs, then it's fitting that you should have full-time Managers who are only concerned with managing these projects as you have in Winnipeg, and I think certainly the one in Brandon is about the same size. But I say again, it's not our intention to add substantially to staff; the intention is to put more participants through those programs.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out to the Minister earlier in this Session, the Minister's own departmental audit reviewed the positions of Work Activity Projects Managers and Employment Services Co-ordinators and concluded that it should remain as a dual position but there should be some elevation in salary to compensate for the dual role.

It has always been clear that the Winnipeg situation was exclusive and different. The Minister asked me, why is it different in Winnipeg? I'm telling him why; because that determination was made some years ago because of the larger caseloads and now, because the Minister himself and the Minister of Labour and Manpower is working on a job-training program geared specifically to Mothers' Allowance recipients, and there are a lot more Mothers' Allowance recipients in Winnipeg than there are in other Work Activity Projects sites.

The Minister's own department conducted an audit within the past two months evaluating and reviewing those positions and confirmed the duality of the role, the dual nature of the role and for that reason, there was to be a slight elevation in category of the administrative officer concerned from a Category 4 to a Category 5, I believe, which would call for a \$2,000 or \$3,000 increase in salary. No one would have any argument with that; I certainly have no argument with

that. But the Minister has flown in the face of that recommendation, gone out and decided to create another level of bureaucracy, on 50-cent dollars admittedly, but the other 50 cents is paid by Ottawa. I'm not so sure that the Federal Government would be entirely happy about throwing in a 50-cent piece for every one of those dollars necessary to support that ministerial whim.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the Opposition in this Committee and I'm sure the taxpayers of Manitoba would like to know what the Minister's rationale is for proceeding in this direction and would like to have an ironclad guarantee from the Minister that every single dollar that we vote on this requested appropriation - and I'm not sure that we're going to vote for one of those dollars yet - is earmarked for nuts and bolts job creation and not for creating another secretarial position, another clerk's position and certainly not another administrator's position.

If you need that, you've got it in the \$600,000 increase you asked for in Main Supply and received two months ago; you don't need another \$910,000 to pay for that, so we would like to know where that \$910,000 is going, Mr. Chairman.

HON. L. EVAN: Mr. Chairman, I think we have discussed this previously and I have indicated to the member that we should put emphasis on where there is the greatest need, and the greatest need in my opinion is right here in the City of Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg has a project that is barely larger than the one in Brandon. I have told him that five times over and yet, the City of Winnipeg has nearly 600,000 souls living in it. It is a focal point for migration of people from all over this province and there is an increasing amount of unemployment, an increasing number of disadvantaged people. If he wants to ignore the disadvantaged people in the City of Winnipeg let him get up and say so; let him get up and say he doesn't really care about the increasing problem that we have in the core area of the city; let him say he doesn't care about the disadvantaged people in Eastman or other parts of Northern Manitoba. That's what he's telling me.

I'm telling him that there aren't any projects in these various areas or that they should be larger, but the members of the Opposition don't seem to want to recognize that there is a need for that and, as I said, there is a long long way to go to meet the need that is out there. On the other hand I said, Mr. Chairman, that we are doing some additional analyses and we want to provide new guidelines so that we'll have a greater throughput of the participants.

At the present time, it's just not satisfactory. We have to have more work experience and less life skills training. I think it's as simple as that, to get a greater number of people through at a lower cost.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't accept the Minister's figures and on the basis of figures that he's provided the House already this Session, I see no reason why I should accept them. The Minister has had a great deal to say about managerial efficiency, the quality and effectiveness of management of these Work Activity Projects and particularly the one at Brandon, Westbran, particularly the managerial qualifications of the Manager there who summarily dumped,

dismissed, displaced from his job, embarrassed and humiliated by being replaced by a political friend brought in for reasons of political payoff.

I don't accept the Minister's figures. The figures he's given me earlier in this Session with respect to Westbran are not correct and therefore, Mr. Chairman, he asks a good deal of this Committee to accept his figures with respect to the WHIP Project in Winnipeg. The figures for Westbran clearly indicate that when the Minister talks about a reduction or decline in productivity, that in fact has not been an issue either for him, for his departmental personnel, for his Employment Services Division Director or for the administration of the Westbran Project.

He now points to this mythical spectre of productivity decline as a justification apparently for the kinds of changes he's trying to make in the overall Work Activity Project sphere and for the additional funds which he is requesting, but in fact, Sir, that productivity argument does not hold water and was not of concern to the Minister to the degree that he discussed it with any of his officials until very very recently. If he's discussed it with his officials recently, it's because he's has to create some kind of rationalization now for his request. But, in fact, the productivity at Westbran has not been in significant decline. There have been peaks and valleys, there have been variations from year to year based on employment situations, based on the population of unemployed employables, based on the welfare roles. But there has not been significant decline and, in fact, when the Minister tries to suggest that the cost of putting those clients through Westbran or any other Work Activity Projects in this province has risen astronomically in the past few years, as he's intended to suggest, he completely overlooks the fact, Mr. Chairman, that most of them have been adhering very closely to budgets which not have expanded significantly over the past eight years and have been maintained in the face of runaway inflation.

Therefore, to take the mathematics as he takes them and try to say that the cost of putting a client through Westbran or any other project has gone from \$4,000 to \$8,000 or to \$12,000, whatever figure he wants to use, ignores completely, Sir, the fact that in that same time frame that he's talking about, the inflation rate in the province has doubled. So there is no support for the Minister's argument that he must make these Draconian moves because of productivity decline and inefficient management.

In fact the records out at Westbran clearly show, Sir, that project was expertly managed, efficiently managed and very prudently managed from the time of its inception in 1973-74 right through to and including the last fiscal year 1981-82. The figures are clearly here in nine years of operation, Mr. Chairman, the Westbran Project operating budget has averaged \$750,000 annually; that's been the average. It's been as low, except for the initial year 1973-74, which was a start-up year when the budget was \$223,000.00. In the other eight years it has ranged between \$649,000 and \$927,000; it's averaged \$750,000.00. The total approved budget over that period of time has been \$6.5 million, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Doug Wark, the Manager of that project came in under budget by a cumulative total of \$1.1 million. On a \$6.5 million approved budget over eight years, he came in under budget by a

cumulative total of \$1.1 million. Can the Minister name me one other division of government, one other administrator in government that can point to that kind of a record?

In the period 1973-74 to 1981-82, in those nine years, Mr. Chairman, the manager whom he displaced, Mr. Doug Wark, was under budget every year except 1976-77. In 1976-77 he was over budget by \$142,000. In the other eight years out of that nine-year span, he was under budget every year and on one occasion he was under budget by \$200,000; on another occasion he was under budget by \$100,000; and in this last year 1981-82 he was under budget by \$88,000, Mr. Chairman.

I want the Minister to tell this Committee what his rationale is for saying that Westbran was poorly managed and I want him to tell this Committee why he needs an additional \$910,000 when Mr. Wark brought the project in last year \$88,000 under budget.

HON. L. EVANS: Now, Mr. Chairman, if the member really looks at the figures carefully - because I don't think the members opposite really want to hear this anyway - but he'll see that there's been a sharp reduction in the participants, those that have gone through the project, a very sharp reduction, while the costs have begun to increase and therefore, the cost per participant has tended to increase.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, as the member keeps on asking, what are we going to do with the \$900,000.00? I think we've gone around the mulberry bush four, five, six or seven times on that one and I don't see why we should keep on repeating ourselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no further comments, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes reference to the fact that the cost of the clients has increased and at one point in time during exchanges in the House, the Minister said to me and I quote from Hansard of Tuesday, May 25th, the 2:00 p.m. sitting, page 2676, "In the case of Westbran we have declined to an average participant level of only 56." Well, in the first place that's incorrect, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to elaborate on that point. But the Minister went on to say: "As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that gives you an average cost of \$12,000.00. That's not good enough and somebody has to speak up for the taxpayers of this province to look after their interests. Therefore it is our decision to separate the management in each and every case." That was the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, in the first full year of the operation of Westbran, which was 1974-75, the Consumer Price Index for Winnipeg and for Manitoba measured against the base year of 100 in 1971-72, was 123.4; in 1981-82 it was 235.5. In other words, in that eight-year span the Consumer Price Index virtually doubled in Manitoba; it went from 123.4 on the base of 100 set two years earlier, to 235.5.

The budget for the Westbran Work Activity Project never skyrocketed; it was between those parameters that I've described earlier, always an average of \$750,000 a year, so how can the Minister sit there and say that the cost of clients went to \$12,000.00? He doesn't take into account the fact that there was eight

years of galloping inflation there and yet the Manager of the Westbran Project was still putting that project through and on the rails consistent with a budget that had existed virtually since its outset and coming in under budget every year, ranging up to as much as \$200,000 one year, as I have said. How can the Minister argue that the cost of the clientele had gone to double or triple or whatever it was he wanted to argue - the \$12,000 or whatever - when he takes no account whatsoever of the diminished value of those dollars in that eight-year span? The cost of the clients going through in '81-82 was probably not one dime more, Sir, than the cost of the clients going through in '74-75 because the dollar was only worth half as much at the end of that eight-year span.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the Minister's comments on that, as I'm reminded by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that when the Minister was Minister of Economic Development he always used constant dollars but I'm not using constant dollars. I'm recognizing the fact here that they were devalued by virtually 50 percent over that eight-year span. So it is simply not fair, not accurate and not honest to say to this House or this Committee that the price of the clients doubled or tripled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 10:00 o'clock, I'm leaving the Chair to return at the call of the House. Call in the Speaker please. The House adjourns at 10:00, gentlemen.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: I believe that the custom in Committee, there is no adjournment other than a motion to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did not know there was any formal agreement that the Committee was continuing. I assumed that the House adjourns at 10:00 o'clock. The House is supposed to be adjourned at 10:00 o'clock.

With the understanding that the House is still in Committee, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: I think the reason, Mr. Chairman, that there is some misunderstanding is that we have basically not been following the rules previously and been allowing two motions to be on the floor at the same time, to go into Committee and to adjourn. Now, when we're faced with the correct Rules of the House, we find that there's a misunderstanding. I think you'll find, Sir, that when the Committee decides that it wishes to rise, the Committee will rise, and the Speaker will be called in, and the House will be adjourned.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, if it's the wish of the Committee to rise, a motion can be made, but if it is not the wish, we can proceed with the Estimates.

MR. B. RANSOM: That's what I said, when the Committee decides to rise, it'll rise.

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

The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, inflation or no inflation, the cost per participant expanded much greater than inflation. All you have to do is a bit of arithmetic and you divide the average participant level per year and divide it into the expenditures and you'll find that in '74-75, the average participant expenditure or the cost per participant was \$1,427; in the last year, '81-82, it averaged over \$16,000.00. So that, in a period of seven years, is far more than inflation, way more than inflation to go from \$1,400 to over \$16,000.00. That's far in excess of any amount of inflation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that is absolute nonsense. The Minister talks about the average participant level. Never mind the average participant level, take the totals; the totals are here, they're in your records and they're in my records. If you want them from your records, I'll get them for you. The totals are right here, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has said about four times in this House, and I challenged him on it in question period a few days ago that last year, 1980-81, we had an average participant level of 56 in Westbran. I tried to tell him then and I tell him again now and challenge him to dispute it, that the figure of 56 that he gives is the figure for the first four months of 1982. The figures for these projects are based on calendar years, not on fiscal years, although the budgets are based on fiscal years. The figures are based on calendar years and the figure of 56, which he refers to as this last year, is the figure of January, February, March and April in 1982. That's one-third of the year.

All things being equal, if you multiply that by three to give you the full year, you could project that we're working on a participant involvement in Westbran of 168 for 1982 - three times 56. It may not turn out to be 168, but on the basis of the first four months, that is a reasonable projection. The 56 was for the first four months of the year. It was not the figure for a full year at all in any way, shape or form.

Now, admittedly, the figure for 1981 was low compared to some previous years that that figure shows at 85. But in general over the past five or six years in that project, the figure of client participation has ranged around the 140-160 mark. In 1977, it was 244; in 1978, it was 162; in 1979, it was 122; in 1980, it was back up to 145; in 1981, as I say, it was 85; this year on the basis of 56 in the first four months, the projection is for 168, so there has not been that much deviation or that much difference. If you take those numbers and divide them into the budget for that year, which in all cases has averaged \$750,000 and if you allow for the fact that the CPI, as I say, has risen in the eight-year period almost by double, it is simply not accurate, not honest and not acceptable for the Minister to argue that the cost per client has doubled or tripled.

The cost per client is very little changed. The cost per client is relatively unchanged when you consider all the economic factors that have to be considered; that is, the total constant budget, the inflation rate and the average number over the past five or six years who have participated. The Minister takes the figure 56, tries to pass it off as a full year's figure and divides it

into an imaginary budget of some kind and comes up with his colossal cost figure. That is dishonest mathematics, dishonest arithmetic, Mr. Chairman.

I did not accept it in question period, I do not accept it now and I recommend to the House and the Committee that it does not accept it because it is not correct. The Minister is trying to create a defensible position for himself out of the indefensible. He's fiddling around with arithmetic and the figures are very clearly there in the records for those projects. I ask the Minister how he can argue that management efficiency has been lacking and that productivity has been under siege and that Draconian changes are needed with respect to Westbran or any of these other Work Activity Projects when we have a very clear record of nine years of excellent, efficient management by a Manager in the person of Mr. Douglas Wark, who brought that project in under budget in eight out of those nine years and who, in fact, was \$88,000 under budget in this last year, 1981-82? Can the Minister tell me how he can stand up in this House and he's said it repeatedly on Tuesday, May 25th, in answer to my questions, that we need good management at Westbran and therefore we've got to get rid of this experienced Manager and replace him with a friend of the Minister's.

I quote, Mr. Chairman, in responding to me the Minister said - it's on page 2676 of Hansard - "And I say it's time we got Managers of these projects who are business-oriented, and had some experience in meeting a payroll, and knew something." Later on in the same page, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said, "Mr. Speaker, I am telling the member that I have a responsibility to the taxpayers of Manitoba. The figures are here; the figures are here; the costs have risen astronomically in Westbran." On page 2677, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said, "If you have someone who's competent, who's available and looks as though he can do a good job then you utilize the person's services." Mr. Chairman, on the same page the Minister said, "The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I would be very remiss if I did not address this particular problem of Cadillac operations. I'm sorry to use that word but under the previous government this developed into a Cadillac operation."

Mr. Chairman, again and again the Minister brought under criticism in this House the managerial qualities of the longstanding Manager of that project, Mr. Wark, and tried to make the case here in this House that it was so poorly managed that he was going to have to replace him with an unemployed friend of his from a political campaign. I say to the Minister, how can you look at that eight and nine-year record in Westbran, look at the record of that Manager, look at his ability to bring that project in under Budget, look at his ability to operate in eight years of galloping inflation on what was essentially a by and large affixed budget and try to tell this House that there was inefficient management there and that he had to move him out, trample on him, trample on his dignity and his feelings, and move in some coat-tailing friend of his?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, as I've indicated to the members before, it's my view that the project in Brandon can be much more meaningful, can have a much higher profile, can put more participants through the project than it has. Now the member keeps on referring to the average or he talks about the total, he

said never mind the average, talk about the total. The total numbers are not that meaningful, because if you just simply add up all the people who come into the project or any of these projects during the year, you'll find some stayed for six months, some stayed for six weeks, some stayed for two weeks, some stayed for four weeks. You just can't add up the number of people that come in, you have to take at best the better figure; actually the better figure would be to actually compile the mandays or the person days, but we don't have that, so the most realistic figure is the average monthly level of participation.

Now the figure of 56 was for the fiscal year '81-82. The reason it's on that basis is that all the other figures that were given to me are on a fiscal basis, so we might as well compare apples with apples. The figure of 56, Mr. Chairman, is inflated because the staff didn't take off there the people who left each month. They just took those who were in the program at the beginning of the month, those who came in during the month, but they didn't take those who left during the month. So the figure 56 is too high; it should be 42. I checked this with my Deputy Minister last week and he agreed that 42 was the average number in Westbran. That gives you a cost per participant of over \$16,000.00. In 1980-81, the cost per participant was \$7,782; in 1979-80, the cost per participant was \$3,959.00.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the figures show a sharp decline over the years of participant levels and at the same time there was a big cutback when the member was the Minister but the last few years the costs have gone up. The costs have gone up; the participant levels have come down; therefore, the cost per participant in the last two years has doubled. I don't care what figures on the Consumer Price Index you want to use, the cost of living, the Consumer Price Index, has not doubled between the years '80-81 and '81-82. Yet the cost per participant here went from \$7,782 to over \$16,000.00. So there's no way you can get away from that; that is far in excess of the rate of inflation. Sure, every eight years or so you may get a doubling of the cost of living, but here we had more than double in a one-year period. I say therefore, this has become a Cadillac operation. What we need is dynamic leadership in all the projects and we've got to try to get more participants through, more trainees through these programs, all of these programs.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's figures are simply not correct and, as I've said, the figures for the project are not based on the fiscal year anyway. The figures are accumulated on a calendar year basis.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether he expects that his new appointee as Manager, Mr. Mick Burke, will bring the Westbran Project in under budget in eight out of nine years and, if so, whether he would consider that a good management job?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the criteria to be used, as I've tried to explain to the member a number of times, is not whether you bring it under budget. The criteria is the cost per participant, that's the criteria to use. How much value are you getting for your money? If you're bringing it under budget year after year, but

the costs per participant are skyrocketing to the moon, that isn't efficiency no matter what way you cut the cake. I say, when the costs more than double in one year per participant, that is not efficiency pure and simple. Bringing it under budget is just a phony way of looking at it; it has no meaning whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the other question, as we've indicated before, the person's on a contract subject to notice in two weeks. As the Minister of Labour has indicated, we're reviewing the position anyway. But what we want, whether we're talking about Westbran, or Portage la Prairie, or Dauphin, or Gimli, or Winnipeg, is a greater degree of participation. We want more people in all these projects, and we want therefore to see more money go into the pockets of the participants, but at the same time the cost per participant to be substantially reduced. We hope we can do that. If we can't do that, then we have to change the structure entirely, or maybe a year or two down the line to phase them out entirely. That's another alternative and maybe that might have to happen at some point if this is the best we can do.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, A. Anstett: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, over the eight full years of Westbran's operation, 1,485 clients have gone through the project; some 600 of those clients now are fully employed. Would the Minister tell the Committee whether he considers that an efficient or an inefficient management operation?

HON. L. EVANS: The factors affecting the employment of graduates, if you will, of these projects depend on a number of things. They depend on the various kinds of staff, the various kinds of technicians you have working for you, carpenters, electricians, foremen and so on. They also depend upon the employment opportunities in that locale.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister confirm that an employment success rate of 600 out of somewhat less than 1,500 which is 40 percent is substantially reassuring and substantially higher than the average percentage success rate that either he or his predecessor or I or, I suggest, my predecessor expected to get out of the Work Activity Projects?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the member is in the realm of speculation and hypothesis.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am not in the realm of speculation. I believe that when provincial jurisdictions undertake projects of this kind that they view a 25-percent success rate in terms of obtaining permanent employment for their clients to be a credible showing; a 30-percent rate is considered highly successful.

With the Westbran Project, we're looking at something in excess of 40 percent, in fact, 600 out of 1,485 is more than 40 percent and I ask the Minister whether he does not consider that a reassuring verdict on the success with which the Westbran Project has been managed, administered and run by Mr. Doug Wark for nine years.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the member is repeating himself and he's using numbers that I haven't - and making comparisons that I don't know whether I can accept as to what is a satisfactory success ratio. I'd tell you what a successful ratio is - when 100 percent of those people can go out and get a job. But the fact is, it doesn't depend on the level or kind of training or work experience they have, there are other factors at work and one of them is the degree of employment opportunities at that particular time. As the member knows and should admit, the levels of unemployment vary; they vary from year to year; they vary from month to month, from season to season; they vary from week to week.

So I would say if we had a Work Activity Project in some parts of Northern Manitoba, the people who come out of those projects to go into the so-called ordinary workforce would probably be smaller and that may not be a reflection on the kind of management or the kind of staff they have; it's a reflection on the employment opportunities. So the member just can't make bland statements about success ratios without taking into consideration all of the factors that are involved in the employment of participants later.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that 600 out of 1,485 representing the numbers that have moved successfully into permanent employment from the Westbran Project is hardly a bland statement. I wouldn't think that many persons connected with work projects or many taxpayers in Manitoba would consider it a bland statement either.

Mr. Chairman, the City of Brandon has always been very closely involved in the Westbran Project. In fact, the city's input has been extremely important to the success of that project. The park development, for example, is central to the project and to the City of Brandon's involvement. I would ask the Minister whether he consulted with personnel or officials of the City of Brandon before making his summary change in the management of the project.

HON. L. EVANS: The personnel in all the projects are contract people with the department, not with the city or municipality involved. I don't believe it has ever been the case that the City of Brandon per se has been consulted in the hiring and firing of different staff. I don't think the former Minister consulted with the City of Brandon when he laid off 6 out of 19 staff a few years ago.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess we can assume that the Minister did not show the City of Brandon the courtesy of discussing the situation with it, although it has been an integral and fundamental contributor to the Westbran Project since its inception and a tangible supporter to the extent of \$993,364.33 over that period of time, representing approximately one-sixth of the total budget of the Westbran Project over that period of time.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important aspects of the Work Projects is the variety of job experiences that they offer. It's always been deemed advisable that projects not be steered or directed in one specific line of job training or job experience. Just as an example, the programs cater to a broad spectrum of unem-

ployed and certainly seek to serve women as effectively as men, and concentration on one specific type of job experience or employment would in many instances impede the opportunities of one sex or another to find gainful employment. An example would be construction trades training where there's less inclination and orientation and perhaps even to some extent adaptability where women are concerned than that which is frequently exhibited by men. There could be similar examples on the other side of job experiences that catered more to women's ambitions and women's orientation than to males.

As a consequence, it's been very important to maintain a broad variety of job experiences in these projects and Westbran has been notable for that. The Riverside Park Development is only one of the experiences offered. There is concern expressed and legitimately so, because of the tampering with the project of which the Minister was guilty some five years ago, when he was Minister of Economic Development in the Schreyer administration, that under his heavy hand the Westbran Project will move almost exclusively into the area of low rent housing construction and the Committee would like some comment from the Minister on that point and the assurance from the Minister that he will not seek to manipulate the project in such a way as to direct it exclusively to low rental housing projects over which he can exert political control, but that he will permit it to continue to offer its services across a broad spectrum and a wide variety of job experience.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I among all people, if I've had any criticisms of these projects over the years, it is that: (a) they haven't given enough opportunity for women as compared to men; and (b) the work experiences tend to be of a very rudimentary nature with very little skill involved.

When the project in Brandon began, a great deal of the work was simply going out with little hatchets cutting down bush, cutting out trees. There was a lot of discussion in the community at the time that it wasn't good enough to pay people whatever amount, to hire people and to have people go out along the riverbank with little hatchets cutting the branches eight hours a day to get useful work experiences.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased that over the years the Board saw fit to put these people into work such as housing because there are far more meaningful experiences of a far wider range of occupational experiences. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, if anything, the projects tend to still be too much Public Works oriented. It's far too Public Works oriented and we have to give more opportunity for women in all of these projects.

As I suggested earlier, it seems to me that it may be a very good idea to start subsidizing people to have work experience in private enterprise. There would be a far wider range of experiences available, greater opportunities for women; so I can assure the members that I want to see a much broader area of meaningful work experience - down with bushwhacking.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the Minister has viewed with some greed and some envy for some considerable time the political potential of the Westbran Work Activity Project and he is known for that in Brandon. He is known for that in the Employment Services Division, he is known for that by the Opposition and he is known for that among members of the meeting.

In the mid-1970's, when he was Minister of Economic Development, he attempted to influence the development of the Westbran Work Activity Project and to steer it entirely into the direction of low rental housing construction, because it provided for him an easy captive political audience and that is a known fact in the Minister's background. The Minister at that time was reprimanded by colleagues in the Government of the Day; Ministers of Health and Community Services in the Government of the Day who asked him to get his hands off the Westbran Project and stay out of it, so he backed off. Of course, during our four years of administration, he had no access to it, but now as Minister of Community Services, he's got direct access to it.

I raise the concerns, Mr. Chairman, of many Manitobans associated with Employment Services Division. They are concerned that this Minister will attempt to exploit and manipulate that Work Activity Project to his political advantage. I say to him that we are not voting one dollar of this \$910,000 expansion until we have a guarantee from him that he will not steer it exclusively in the direction of that kind of project; that he will pledge to preserve before this Committee and before this House the very job experience spectrum that has been part and parcel of Westbran and should continue to be part and parcel of Westbran, including Riverside Park development and building construction, including City of Brandon Recreation Department projects, including Manitoba Housing and Renewal projects, including projects for the city at large such as the Winter Games, the Brier, Ducks Unlimited and service clubs, including projects for the Consumers' Association and the Centennial Board, including internal programs such as life skills, job clubs and driver education, including park fixtures for other Westman towns and including all kinds of varied experiences of that light, of similar description; that he will not attempt again in the future as he did in the past to steer it to the one limited narrow exclusive sphere which gives him some sense of gratification and political satisfaction, but which damages the objectives and the perspectives of the project itself.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I really thought a lot more of the Member for Fort Garry. I thought he could do a better job than what I'm hearing from his mouth. Look, you never thought much of me at any time so your views haven't changed really. How can they change? But, Mr. Chairman, I just totally reject this sheer unadulterated nonsense - the words that we've just heard from the Member for Fort Garry - total nonsense.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Brandon Sun apparently doesn't think so. I would remind the Honourable Minister that the Brandon Sun recently compared him to Richard Daly, Boss Daly of Chicago, as

an example of a political patronage dispenser. So the Minister can protest all he wants to, but I am telling him that there are people who are interested in the success of these projects who want that assurance from him, that he is not going to use it for political patronage, or any of the other projects for political patronage, that he's going to protect their integrity.

Mr. Chairman, I have one other question for the Minister. It is said in the House that the decision he made to separate the dual position of Project Manager and Employment Services Co-ordinator in the various project sites was a policy decision that was made several months ago. In fact, I was very careful to question him two or three times on that point on May 25th, Mr. Chairman, because I wanted to understand clearly what he was saying.

I now ask him whether he can justify that statement and that assertion with the situation existing in his own department among his own personnel which clearly points to the fact that he never made any decision about such separation and never held any discussions with his Employment Services Director or his other senior personnel about such changes or such divisions of responsibility until early in the month of May. The questions that I asked him on the subject, I asked on Tuesday, May 25th. He responded that this was a policy decision made several months ago. Well, even giving him the benefit of the doubt, let's say several is only three or even only two, that would take it back to February or March. Yet early in May I think, if the Minister checks with his personnel, he will find that they knew nothing of any such policy decision. They were not aware that he was going to be going about creating additional and artificial jobs into which to move personnel of his friendship and his choice. In fact, there is very clear indication on the record, Mr. Chairman, that no knowledge of recruitment of project managers for Work Activity Projects in Manitoba had been communicated to his senior personnel at all up to that point. Suddenly, when the decision came to summarily displace Mr. Wark in the early part of May and questions were raised in the House and in the media, he began to cover his traces. But up until that point in time, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest to the Minister, that no policy decision had been made, that no discussions had been held about productivity difficulties or productivity declines, that no senior personnel in his department were approached with a view to examination or evaluation or a discussion of any such course of action. Early in May, as late as the early part of May, his department personnel knew nothing of any search for project managers.

Once the patronage move on Mr. Burke was put in motion, the Minister then had to cover his traces and cover his flanks, but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to you and to the Minister, that up until that point in time there was no policy decision and his statement to the House that there was such a policy decision made several months ago was a case of misleading the House. I would ask the Minister to correct that statement and to withdraw it, to have the courage and courtesy of a gentleman, as a member of this Chamber, to admit that he made a mistake and to withdraw that assertion.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the member previously and I'm not going to repeat myself.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 3, the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I then have to assume that the Minister, feeling self-conscious and embarrassed about the error that he made, is by silence admitting that he was wrong, that he did make a mistake, that his statement with respect to a policy decision several months ago was not correct, was made out of excitement and pressure and emotion in the heat of the moment. I am prepared to accept that and forgive him for that, but I want it clearly on the record that his silence indicates to me that is what happened, that there was no such policy decision, but he quickly moved to make such a policy decision after his folly was uncovered.

HON. L. EVAN: Mr. Chairman, the member shouldn't take that from my decision not to repeat myself. As I explained to the members previously on other occasions, if there's been a discussion on any subject way back in the winter on a subject that I'm very interested in, which is to create, to expand the Work Activity Projects and to make them more meaningful and to that extent, we've had meetings with different personnel in the department back I think in December and January. I've had many discussions with my Deputy Minister on the matter and it's not up to me to talk to every individual, every director, every project manager in the province. I haven't had that time, but I can assure the member that I will be, when the summer comes, taking the opportunity to meet with many of the managers and visit the projects. Besides that, we intend to do some fairly in-depth analysis. So I am just repeating what I've said before.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I conclude, Sir, by saying that I think the Minister has seriously damaged the morale of the personnel in his division, that the Minister has seriously damaged the morale of the personnel in the Work Activities Projects in this province, that the Minister has seriously damaged the morale of the personnel in the Community Services Department, that the Minister abandoned his Employment Services Director in the debate, abandoned a longstanding loyal public servant in the person of Mr. Doug Wark, and in fact has done a disservice to this important field of activity by politicizing it to the extent that he has attempted to do so.

That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I'd have to say that we have not received answers to our satisfaction with respect to where he is headed on Work Activities Projects or what he intends to do with this \$910,000 that he's requesting. We do not wish to impede advancement of the Work Activities Program concept, but having voted him an additional \$600,000 on Main Supply and facing a \$10 million request on employment creation in this same Supplementary requisition, I have to say, Sir, that we do not feel, in the interest of the taxpayers of Manitoba or the persons who should be served by this kind of program, that he has justified his request for a \$910,000 Supplementary Spending increase in '82-83, and we will be voting

against that item.

I appreciate that we can't hold such a vote after 10:00 p.m., Mr. Chairman, but I would like to provide you, the Minister and the Minister's government colleagues, Sir, with notice of our intention to call for a vote to show our dismay at the actions of this Minister in the Work Activity Projects field.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, on this, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some general observations about what happened to the Work Activity Projects when these gentlemen across the way were in government.

First of all, they cut back sharply on all of the projects. They cut back very sharply; they've laid off staff. In Westman, they laid off summarily within a couple of weeks 6 people out of 19. It was Bud; it was the Member for Fort Garry who was responsible for firing six people in the Brandon area. Not only that, they cut back on the Winnipeg project, they cut back on Portage, they cut back on the MANWAP Project - Manitoba Work Activity Project. That was the name of the game: cut, cut, cut, lay off, lay off, turn down participants.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to that they ignored the projects. There are examples where the Winnipeg Work Activity Project has never yet to this day had its Board of Directors confirmed. It's never been officially appointed by the government. There are other cases where I can show from the files that government ignored the Work Activity Project. It was easier to cut them. That was the only time they paid any attention, to cut, cut, cut. Really, they'd liked to have eliminated them and as the records, as the minutes from the Westbran Projects show, the Chairman, the members of the Board of Westbran were saying they're so thankful that the Tory Government didn't eliminate them all together because they figured that they were going to be eliminated by the Lyon Government, by your government.

Mr. Chairman, it's our intention to make these projects more meaningful than ever before. We don't want them to be bushwhacking operations. We want them to be cost efficient per participant. We want them to be more meaningful for women. We want them to be more meaningful for all the participants. We want them to be better than ever before; that is our intention, to get more bang for the buck. If we can't do that, then I say we should fold our tent and go home, but that's my intention and I tell you that in all sincerity. If we can't achieve better performance than that former Minister of Health and Social Disaster did, then we should go home.

Mr. Chairman, if any member has any record of being a member of doom and gloom it's the Member for Fort Garry, because every time he came to Brandon it was to lay off people. They cut the hospital budget. They froze staff to the Brandon Mental Health Centre. People were laid off. They cut the budget of the Brandon General Hospital, and I'll bring him the clipping from the Brandon Sun where the director of the hospital says that there will be huge layoffs, 60-75 people. Well, I brought this when I was in Opposition, that the Member for Fort Garry laid off more people in my constituency than any other member of that side. Bud Sherman means "The Man with the Axe." You remember that advertisement, "The Man with the

Axe." The Member for Fort Garry would march into my riding and axe the people in the hospitals, axe the people in the Brandon Mental Health Centre. The bleeding heart from Fort Garry who so worried about Westbran, he laid off 40 percent of the staff like that. How many weeks' notice did they have? They had barely a month's notice; I think two and a-half weeks' notice.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please. I realize the Honourable Minister is trying to bring his remarks to the subject of Work Activity Projects, but since we had direction from the previous Chairman to be very specific and direct the remarks. After several minutes there, I was having some difficulty tying his remarks directly to Work Activity. I'd ask the Minister to continue but to try to keep the remarks to the subject at hand.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I want to reassure you, Sir, and the Members of this Legislature that this Minister and this government will do their very utmost to make these Work Activity Projects more meaningful than they've ever been, that there will be work experiences, a greater variety of work experiences, that there will be more meaningful work development experiences, that there will be more women involved and that we will get a greater return for participant, and I guarantee you if we can't do better than that Member for Fort Garry, if we can't do better than him, then I say we should modify these programs substantially or maybe even eliminate them, and I said that before; that is our intention.

Our intention is to get greater productivity. Our intention is to get more return for the taxpayers of this province and that is what we intend to do. I am hopeful that we will, but as I said, if we don't then we'll have to look at modification; but, Mr. Chairman, I will not go with an axe like the Member for Fort Garry and decimate the staff left, right and centre at this Work Activity Project.

You can look at the minutes of the Board of Directors of the Work Activity Project in Brandon and you'll see, they're just so thankful that the Tories didn't eliminate them from the face of the earth, let alone cut them back.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the latest display by the Minister's speech volumes, it needs no elaboration from me. It speaks very clearly and very distinctly of the embarrassment, the pain and the difficulty that he feels. You know, one is tempted to ask him on the basis of the remarks that he just made about Westbran, Westman and Brandon and everything that we did and everything that I did where the project was concerned. What happened to the Cadillac operation?

He stood in this House. He was clearly on the record as having justified or attempting to justify some of his actions there by virtue of the fact that this was a Cadillac operation in Brandon. Yet, what did we start with? A Mercedes Benz and cut it down to a Cadillac. I mean that's just absolutely absurd, that kind of comment.

When he talks, Mr. Chairman, about impact on personnel and not addressing these problems with an axe . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: . . . when he talks, Mr. Chairman, about impact on personnel and not addressing these problems with an axe, I wonder if he would sit down and have a chat with Mr. Doug Wark and discuss with him the nature of his vindictive action against Mr. Wark and the manner in which he summarily got rid of; but I wonder what he feels about the Manitoba Government Employees Association's investigation of that incident, of its protest of the way he acted, and I wonder what he thinks about the way his own colleagues in Cabinet and caucus have felt and reacted about the face and the image that he has put on that government of his through that one action alone. I'm quite sure there are many fair-minded members opposite, including the Attorney-General, including the First Minister, who were duly embarrassed by the face and image that the Minister has put on his government through that action.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me just say that we may not have done everything with and for the Work Activity Project Program that we would have liked to do or that is desired, but we never prostituted it. We never used it as a repository in which to place our political friends. We never attempted to use it as a sanctuary for political patronage and political payoffs and I would ask the Minister to ponder that morality and those ethics when he thinks about his earlier remarks tonight.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that we have no confidence in his approach to Work Activity Projects. He hasn't justified his request for \$910,000.00. He hasn't demonstrated that he approaches them with any integrity. He hasn't demonstrated that he approaches them from the perspective of anything other than as a means to dispensing political patronage. He hasn't justified his opposition and his contradiction of his own departmental audit and its conclusions on the dual position. So, Sir, when the opportunity comes, and it can't come until tomorrow obviously, we intend to vote against his request for an additional \$910,000 of taxpayers' money to support his political whims.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 3—pass?

All those in favour of the resolution please say, aye. All those opposed to the Resolution please say nay. In my opinion the Ayes have it.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: We want a formal vote of Yeas and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Rule 65(9) I will defer the vote until the next sitting of the Committee tomorrow, or whatever subsequent date, under 65(9)(1).

We'll now move to the next item, Resolution No. 4, Corrections and Probation Services, \$85,000; Probation and Parole Services Program Development.

RES. NO. 4 - CORRECTIONS AND PROBATION SERVICES

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for

Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Can the Minister explain to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, what the appropriation will provide?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as the Attorney-General has previously explained, the \$85,000 in this department is 50 percent of the total cost of the Fine Option Program. There's \$85,000 in the Attorney-General's Budget and there's \$85,000 under the Corrections and Probation Services line in these Estimates.

The intent is to develop a Fine Option Program, or really a better term would be an Incarceration Option Program, an option to incarceration. We're hoping that with these monies we'll be able to develop a program that will indicate alternatives to incarceration. What we'd like to do is involve community groups, individuals and hopefully give four adult offenders - not juvenile offenders, adult offenders - various community projects that they can work upon instead of going to jail.

In other words, we would encourage, through this program, the judiciary and everyone involved to allow people to pay their debt to society, instead of paying the fine in dollars to pay the equivalent thereof in terms of community work.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 4—pass.

RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$85,000 for Community Services and Corrections, Correction and Probation Services, Probation and Parole Services Program Development, \$85,000—pass.

Resolution No. 5, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Consumer Affairs

RES. NO. 6 - CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could just explain the area of expenditure of salaries that is covered by this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the expenditure of \$475,000 is for additional term staff for the administration of the Residential Rent Regulation Bureau in order to deal with the backlog that's anticipated as a result of the retroactive provision of the legislation to January 1st of this year.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, is this over and above the 23 positions that were originally projected by the Minister and if so, how many term positions are involved?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Chairman, the 23 positions that are in the Main Estimates were decided upon looking at previous experience with The Rent Stabilization Act, the amount of staff that existed at the end of that program. It's anticipated that there would be a

need of up to 15 term positions, which is what's contained in the \$475,000 in the Supplementary Supply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 5—pass.

RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$475,000 for Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Consumer Affairs, Salaries \$475,000—pass.

Resolution No. 6, Co-operative Development, Interest Forgiveness \$4,267,100, consisting of Canadian Co-operative Implements \$505,800.

RES. NO. 6 - CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. B. BANMAN: I wonder if the Minister could explain this particular item and in particular the CCIL one.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That amount represents the provincial loan to Co-operative Implements where the interest has been waived for the first five years and there will be no interest charged until the 1980 deficit that C.I. has of \$12,331,478.00 is eliminated, but that represents the interest for the fiscal year.

MR. B. BANMAN: On what balance does that interest relate to? In other words, what is the total loan that we're applying this interest against?

HON. A. ADAM: It would be on the last financial agreement package of \$2,975,000; the first agreement of 1978 was not a loan, it was only a loan guarantee and therefore there's no interest involved there. This would apply to the latest financial package where the three Prairie Provinces were involved, but this is our share.

MR. B. BANMAN: So this interest is being shown this way as really, I guess, a grant, if you want to call it, because you're writing off the interest and the government has to show that there is a cost to the company. At what rate of interest is this particular figure calculated on?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, the agreement, as arrived at with the three Prairie Provinces and the Federal Government, is that the interest rate would be the same rate as the Farm Credit Corporation and that will be subject to negotiation after five years, at which time it will be - the second five-year term - will be no greater than the Bank of Canada rate. The Loan Agreement is for a 10-year period; negotiable after five years.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: If I understand correctly, the province is writing off the cost of loaning the CCIL \$2.9

million. In other words, if the province goes out and borrows the money, it would cost the province in this particular instance in excess of \$400,000 - what is it - \$432,000.00. Is the Minister telling us that the rate of interest that this some \$400,000 represents is established by that agreement or that the province establishes the rate that we are looking at charging to the provincial coffers at this present time?

HON. A. ADAM: It's my understanding that the amount that is borrowed, the interest will be charged against the loan at the Farm Credit rate, whatever that is, and I am not familiar with what that Farm Credit rate is. This is supposed to be repayable after C.I. have eliminated their deficit, so the interest charges are waived until that time.

MR. R. BANMAN: To understand correctly, the Minister said that it will be reviewed in five years. Should CCIL not have a deficit to recoup those \$12 million because of increased sales and some other things that they hope to do, is the Minister saying that they will repay the province at the Farm Credit rate? Do I understand him right? I understand that, but now this money that's being written off here today; in other words, the request for the funds represents the cost to the Manitoba taxpayer of allowing these people to have a \$2.9 million interest-free loan. This cost to the Manitoba taxpayer is figured at what rate? In other words, what are you figuring this at now? Are you using the farm credit rate to figure this particular figure, this 400-and-some thousand that we are being asked to pass here tonight?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I'll have to take that as notice to verify it exactly. I understand the question that the member is asking and I'll find out if there is a different rate on that and provide the information for him at the next sitting.

MR. R. BANMAN: Further, dealing with the other item that we're being asked to pass here, again I guess I have to ask the same question. At what rate are we looking at establishing this figure? In other words, I believe this has to do with the \$29.5 million loan which will be given to the Credit Union and Caisses Populaires Movement.

Again, I would surmise that this money probably will be borrowed money and I'm wondering at what rate the province is computing these figures? Again, is it the same rate that we're looking at, the CCIL amount, or is it a different rate? Maybe the Minister could get that for us.

The other question of course that we have is, since the funds for CCIL have flowed awhile back, I understand - and the Minister shakes his head - but I wonder if he could tell us when it is anticipated both these amounts of monies will flow and whether this represents a full year's interest on that money or if it just represents a certain portion of that time.

HON. A. ADAM: It's my understanding that this amount represents the total interest-free loan for the year's period. That is my understanding.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Is it a full year, or ten months, or

nine months?

HON. A. ADAM: Well, the money hasn't flowed yet. This is an estimate and it will be adjusted at the end of the year. The money has not flowed yet until the final agreement is completed and that should be very very near completion at the present time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 6.
The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: In the case of CCIL, has the money flowed already?

HON. A. ADAM: Yes, except there were three payments. It was paid out in three installments; the first one being on February 10th was \$850,000; and the second payment was March 31st, \$637,500; and the final payment is to be paid after April 1st, I believe before the end of June it is \$1,487,500.00.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 6—pass.
RESOLVED THAT THERE BE GRANTED TO Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$4,267,100 for Co-operative Development: Interest Forgiveness (a) Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited, \$505,800; (b) Credit Union and Caisses Populaires Assistance, \$3,761,300—pass.

RES. NO. 7 - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The next Resolution is Economic Development and Tourism, Venture Capital Incentives, \$1,000,000—pass.
The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that this department has set up a Venture Capital Fund. I wonder if the backup Minister of Economic Development could explain to the House what criteria will be used before there is any Venture Capital expenditure by the government working with other companies?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the details haven't been completely worked out yet, however, the initial proposal was one that would operate in a similar fashion to Venture Capital Corporations in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. In those instances the funds which they received, come in through the corporate tax system; that is, those provinces collect their own taxes. In Manitoba, the incentives would be put into the corporation directly because we don't do the direct tax collection. The proposal has not yet been completed. There is still some work being done between the Departments of Finance and Economic Development.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that the criteria have not been put forward as to how the \$1 million of Venture Capital will be spent. If there is going to be direct capital grants of Venture Capital Incentives given to companies after the arran-

gements have satisfied the department, is the government intending to insist on equity in any of the companies that they will be dealing with because of the grants?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Mr. Chairman, that wouldn't be a criteria.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Is the department or government intending to dictate where companies will locate in Manitoba if the government is involved in grants or Venture Capital Incentives with companies?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I do not know of such a criteria although it may be that it might be considered. That is not at present a criteria.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 7, Venture Capital Incentives, \$1,000,000—pass.

RESOLVED THAT THERE BE GRANTED to Her Majesty a further sum, not exceeding \$1,000,000 for Economic Development and Tourism, Venture Capital Incentives \$1,000,000—pass.

RES. NO. 8 - EDUCATION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Next item, Education, Financial Support - Public Schools, \$2,000,000, (a) School Grants and Other Assistance \$2,000,000.00.
The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister can inform us if this is the \$2 million Special Grant to the City of Winnipeg School Division No. 1?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 8, Education, Financial Support - Public Schools, \$2,000,000—pass.

RESOLVED THAT THERE BE GRANTED to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$2,000,000 for Education, Financial Support - Public Schools (a) School Grants and Other Assistance \$2,000,000—pass.

RES. NO. 9 - ENERGY AND MINES

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 9, Energy and Mines, Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets, \$348,000.00.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: This is the interest charged on the \$2.8 million that's going into the Trout Lake Development and it was not included in the original Estimates, that was an oversight. This is the \$348,000 interest amount for that \$2.8 million. It's now included in Supplementary.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 9—pass.

RESOLVED THAT THERE BE GRANTED to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$348,000 for Energy and Mines, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, \$348,000—pass.

RES. NO. 10 - FINANCE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 10, Finance, Taxation Division, \$1,000,000, (e) Corporation Capital Tax Branch: (1) Salaries, \$300,000.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise us or confirm that these are positions that are going to be required to collect the payroll tax? Can he advise us of how many staff would be involved here, and can he give us an indication of whether the Federal Government will be co-operating in the collection of this tax?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Assuming that the Federal Government does not do the collections, we will be hiring up to 28 people. That is at this point we have, through Treasury Board, initial approval for up to 28 people. We have, as indicated previously, had correspondence with the Federal Government. So far we have not had an official answer to our request that the Federal Government collect the tax. We have had an unofficial indication that it will probably not do so.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Salaries \$300,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures, \$700,000—pass; Tax Credit Payments, \$2,900,000, Oh excuse me, that's a separate Resolution. The first two items Corporation Capital Tax Branch:

RESOLVED THAT THERE BE GRANTED to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$1,000,000 for Finance, Taxation Division, Corporation Capital Tax Branch: (1) Salaries \$300,000, (2) Other Expenditures \$700,000—pass.

RES. NO. 11 - TAX CREDIT PAYMENTS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 11, Tax Credit Payments \$2,900,000.00.

The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is the amount we estimate to be required in order to pay for the increased amounts payable because of the changes with respect to the Pensioners School Tax Assistance Program. There are approximately, an estimate I believe, between 17,000 and 19,000 extra pensioners who are eligible as a result of that change.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 11—pass.

RESOLVED THAT THERE BE GRANTED to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$2,900,000 for Finance, Tax Credit Payments, \$2,900,000—pass.

RES. NO. 12 - HEALTH

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 12, Community Health Services, \$758,900, (h) Dental Services: (2) Other Expenditures.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister

of Finance explain this, please?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, possibly we could hold this one for a few minutes while I get some further information. I thought I had it with me, I do not. Could we move on to another item and come back?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that's perfectly acceptable. I would just say to the Minister of Finance, I'm not looking for a detailed explanation, I'd just like to know whether this covers an age expansion or a geographic expansion or both?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: My recollection is that it covers some changes with respect to senior citizens, with respect to eligibility for some items and as well, covers a geographical expansion with respect to school children. But I will get back to you in a few minutes on it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we move on to the next item? (Agreed).

RES. NO. 13 - HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 13, Highways and Transportation, Air/Radio Services \$208,900. The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't see the Minister here so maybe the Minister of Finance might be able to provide answers on the Salaries portion. Could the Minister indicate the numbers of additional staff being approved under Salaries? What their job descriptions are?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I don't have the information here. I understand the Minister of Highways is in the building. I do apologize to the Committee for this, but I don't have any information available.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it the will of the Committee to hold this item as we did Item No. 12? (Agreed)

RES. NO. 14 - LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Labour and Manpower, General Administration \$100,000, (b) Administration: (2) Other Expenditures, \$100,000.00. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This item had been announced in the Budget and has to do with initial start-up funds for a Labour Education Centre.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the Minis-

ter could indicate to us where this centre is going to be and what's the nature of the centre, what are the objectives of it and how will it be established?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the proposal goes back some five or six years and more. It had been approved back in 1977 and then was delayed for a number of years. The purpose is to provide some training and education to people who are involved in the labour movement, and it had at that time been under the Ministry of Education. At this time we felt that it was more appropriate to come under the Ministry of Labour.

There is no intention of building any building for it. There is at this time a search in terms of school space and other available public facilities within the City of Winnipeg. It is expected that the bulk of the funding would be for salaries and books and that sort of thing, as opposed to any kind of money for any building. That is not the intention.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, at what group will this education centre be directed?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The criteria haven't been totally set up. I don't believe that there would be any group which would be excluded from the use of the facilities. I would presume that there would be the types of courses that might now currently be available in Eastern Canada and I'm sure the member is aware there are government grants made yearly to people going to college and, I believe it's in Montreal or somewhere in Eastern Canada. The difficulty with that type of a situation is that very few Manitobans can make use of it. With a facility here focusing on those issues, we would believe that we could more appropriately make use of those kinds of funds and more funds.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'm not very much wiser as to who the people are who will benefit from this program. I believe in his first answer the Minister referred to training and education of people involved in the labour movement. If that's the case, I'm wondering what is the rationale for taxpayers to be spending their money to educate people involved in the labour movement? Is he talking about teaching people how to unionize? Is he talking about teaching school children about the history of the labour movement? What's the purpose of this? Who's it directed at?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, it would be directed at anyone who wishes to attend and I'm sure that there would be courses that would be available for labour people; there would be courses available for management. I can't see any reason why other people couldn't, if they so chose, participate. It is certainly not intended for school children. It's intended as an adult centre for education.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, could we have some indication, some finer indication from the Minister as to whether or not nonunionized labour as such would

be welcome at this alleged school. I remember some of the antecedents of this school. It was part of the Manitoba Federation of Labour Program for some years, which the previous government saw fit to accede to. It was in our time not proceeded with, largely through a lack of money and because it was evident to all in that period that it would represent largely a duplication of services.

What new information has come to the mind of the Minister of Labour that would lead him to believe that this will not represent a duplication of services for courses that are already being given quite satisfactorily in other institutions in Manitoba?

As my colleague the House Leader has said, what really is the rationale for this, for the taxpayers to be paying for something that is essentially designed for organized labour in Manitoba, which represents a minority of the working people of this province?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, I don't know of any impediment to people other than trade union people to come to the college.

I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the public spends a great deal of tax dollars in our public institutions in training managers and other people in business practices and in areas of negotiations. This is a labour education centre or college - I don't see any reason why we couldn't call it a college - where people will be trained in labour matters.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, what pray, are labour matters?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There are many issues in which people who are involved in trade unions can use some education and training. You can certainly be made cognizant of the provisions of the various acts that govern employment in the province. You can discuss the nature of the collective bargaining process, all of those things; the economics involved in order that we have people at the bargaining table who are fully informed.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the National Labour Movement now is largely - the majority is now, according to figures that have recently been published, made up of Public Service Unions; in view of the fact that the largest unionized organization in Manitoba is now the Manitoba Government Employees Association, what are we talking about here? Are we talking about some special "college" that is being set up for the purposes of educating people in certain tactics of labour or union organizing, or what are we talking about? Where is the public interest going to be served in this expenditure?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I believe the public interest will be served in many areas, just one example being, that I am sure there will be a significant amount of education with respect to, say, workplace health and safety. There are a large number of areas where people in the working force and management could benefit to a large extent from that kind of education.

I would just give the Leader of the Opposition one example - a couple of examples I suppose - with which I am familiar as a person who was in the work force as

an employee for a number of years in the fire department. It used to be in this city, in this area, that fire fighters were expected to go into buildings wearing filter-type masks because it was too expensive and too bothersome to have the city go to the expense of filling the air tanks that they did have available. They had some of them available, but the filters were cheaper. As a result of that, a lot of fire fighters were in a position where there was a lot of respiratory illness and heart illness.

There are many examples that one could come up with in the area of railroad workers where certainly they are becoming much more aware of some of the dangers that they face in their jobs when there are incidents, either in the yard or on the road, etc., with the great number of chemicals that are out there. Those are the types of things, certainly in that area, that I would expect there would be some enlightenment on in this kind of a school.

I would expect that in this kind of a school, getting away from workplace health and safety, there would be a great deal of benefit to society as a whole, to the unions certainly, to management, to have labour people who are fully informed on the total role of collective bargaining; the consequences of what happens at the table; the consequences of what happens if there is disagreement; the difficulties that business faces from its perspective.

I believe that a more informed trade union movement and a trade union individual can only be of greater benefit not only to the union that individual represents, but also to the company and to the province at large. It is something that I think is important. We believed back in the '70s that it was important and we are just recommitting ourselves to that idea with this expenditure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, this item is \$100,000 in Other Expenditures. Is this a grant, by any chance? There doesn't seem to be any allotment for staff.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There has been nothing specifically designated yet. There's a proposal. We are looking at, first of all as I indicated before, renting some classroom space or trying to get space within the University of Winnipeg which would be handy to downtown. The funds would be for the purpose of having possibly a Director hired just to get the program under way. There is no finalization of the specific manner in which the college would be operated.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, will this by any chance be a grant to the Manitoba Federation of Labour to establish this centre?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I would expect that the Manitoba Federation of Labour would be very closely involved; whether it would be a grant to the Manitoba Federation of Labour directly is something that I would not expect. I would expect that there would be a grant to a college which would be established. The

college would have to comply with the Federation or whoever would establish —(Interjection)— the Leader of the Opposition says, a college for disruption. I believe it will be a centre for learning, where trade union people will be obtaining further education, which I am sure will be of benefit to them and to the rest of society.

The specific form of how the money will be spent in this year has not been totally decided.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has said that he expects that the Manitoba Federation of Labour will at least be closely involved. What other groups will be closely involved?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I would imagine that certainly the government will be involved. The Federation will —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I happen to believe that the public interest is served when we have people in the trade union movement, who have a more complete grasp on the governing legislation, on the role of collective bargaining, the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the Federation of Labour, as I have said before in the House, is an outright partisan group that supports only the New Democratic Party. It has compulsory check-off and all that kind of thing built into its system, so that it can support the socialist party in Manitoba. Are we now seeing the socialist party in Manitoba repaying the Manitoba Federation of Labour with \$100,000 of taxpayers' money so they can set up their own pet little college? Is that what we're talking about? —(Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 15.
The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: No, Mr. Chairman, we want some more information on this. The Minister of Labour is being conveniently vague. We want to know whether any of this money, directly or indirectly, is going to be paid to or on behalf of the Federation of Labour to set up the kind of college which he envisions.

Nobody in this House would question the fact that there should be facilities available for any working person in the province to obtain information, whether through community colleges, through universities, or any post-secondary or indeed any adult education source in our senior high schools or whatever, information of this nature which is generally available in the vast curricula that we have available to all of the people in Manitoba. Why are we getting into this speciality, with respect to a narrow interest on behalf of organized labour, which does not represent a majority of the working people in this province and which is really in the pocket of the NDP, or indeed is it the reverse? The NDP are in the pocket of the Federation of Labour

Now you know this mutual stroking that's going on is fine and dandy, as long as they're using their own money, but when they start to use the public's money, then we have a right to question.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition talks about compulsory check up. He knows that in fact any member of the MFL who does not wish to contribute to the NDP need not. That's not the same as the shareholder in the Royal Bank who contributes to the Progressive Conservative Party whether he likes it or not, because the Royal Bank makes the contribution and that comes out of the pockets of the Royal Bank shareholders. He doesn't stand up and say, boy, the Royal Bank is being undemocratic because they're giving money to the Progressive Conservative Party. He doesn't say that about Inco; he doesn't say that about the many corporations . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I ask the Honourable Minister to direct his comments more directly to the Other Expenditures provided under Labour and Manpower in this resolution?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I thought I was responding to a question by the Leader of the Opposition. I have explained what the purpose of the funds are. I should say that the purpose is basically the same as it was in 1977 when it was announced the first time. There's basically a similar intention with respect to that money.

At that time, I should say that the Opposition felt there was nothing wrong with it. Their critics stood up and said, this is probably a good idea. They've obviously changed their minds in the last four years. Be that as it may, it is the view of our party and of the government that an informed trade union membership is of benefit to the province and to the industry in which they work.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that the Minister's biases are apparent again. He keeps talking about the trade union movement which represents a minority of working people in this province. What about all of the working people in this province, some of whom, I can tell him as a matter of interest, would not find it compatible to go to a school operated by the Manitoba Federation of Labour and some of the people who are affiliated with the Manitoba Federation of Labour who may be friends of the Minister and his colleagues, but they're not the friends of the public interest in Manitoba and are not so regarded?

What about the working people of Manitoba? Never mind the trade union people of Manitoba who represent a minority of the working people. What about the working people? How broadly has the government canvassed this topic? How sure are they that there will not be needless repetition of existing courses which are readily available in the different institutions that have been previously mentioned? What has been done, in other words, to justify this expenditure other than a little stroking for the MFL, which I'm afraid is what this is all going to result in?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition would elaborate on those courses that are available. I should also point out to him that the Federal Government makes the payments to the

Canadian Labour Congress which fund its schools. The previous Progressive Conservative Government funded working people from Manitoba who went to the Labour College in the east. That school is in Ottawa. Maybe the member knows something about the choosing of nontrade union people that I don't know about. I certainly would expect that this college would not exclude nontrade union people and would welcome nontrade union people to attend. Yes, the Leader of the Opposition says it's public money and therefore he hopes that they wouldn't be excluded, and he's right.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise the Committee then where he anticipates that this college is going to be established? He's gone ahead and asked for \$100,000 here. How is it going to be spent? What plans does he have? I'm doubtful that the Minister really understands how this money is going to be used. It more and more appears to stem from the request that the Federation of Labour has made to make a grant towards the establishment of this college. How is it going to be used?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the request that came in was a request for a similar amount of dollars that had been suggested some years ago. I believe that was some hundreds of thousands - certainly, it was quite a bit more than what was granted.

What I would expect is that between now and the end of this fiscal year there would be a director hired together with at least one staff person who could work on a curriculum for the school in order that it could begin operating as quickly as possible.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek was asking whether it was for a building and I had indicated previously it is not for a building. We very specifically said that it is not our intention to pay money over for the building of a new building for this purpose. There are school facilities we believe to be available. We believe there are other facilities available, public facilities, and specifically we hope that something can be worked out with the downtown university, the University of Winnipeg.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has now said that there will be a Director and at least one other staff person. Who will be hiring the Director and the other staff person?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: As I indicated before, I would expect that there will be a college established. When the college is established and when the need is demonstrated, the money would be transferred once there was agreement as to what the purpose of it was.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, a college isn't just established. Who is going to establish the college? Is it going to be the government that's going to establish it? Is it going to be the Manitoba Federation of Labour that are going to establish the college? Is it going to be the University of Manitoba, the University of Winnipeg? How is it going to happen?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I would expect that, similar to the Canadian Labour Congress College in Ottawa, it would be established on similar lines.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is very reluctant to answer questions here. Unless he answers some questions, it's going to take some time because this is the Minister of Finance as well as the Minister of Labour, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Finance, we assume, is a person who is concerned about the expenditure of the tax dollars that he's going to collect from the people of Manitoba. One doesn't expect the Minister of Finance to simply include \$100,000 in his Estimates and then not provide answers for it when he's questioned in the Legislature. Had he stuck this into his General Estimates, he might have been able to get it through without detailed questioning, but he has identified this as something that came along after the regular Estimates were prepared. Something justified it in the Minister's mind that it was necessary to put \$100,000 into his Estimates. He can't tell us now how it's going to be used. I would ask him very specifically then, one by one, is this money going to go to the Manitoba Federation of Labour to establish a labour college?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Mr. Chairman. I thought I'd indicated earlier that I expected that there would be an institution established. There will be trustees and it will be that institution and the government which will deal with each other. As I said earlier, it would be established on lines similar to the CLC College in Ottawa.

MR. B. RANSOM: I'm afraid that still doesn't really answer the question for me. I don't happen to be as familiar with how the CLC College is established as perhaps the Minister is. He says he expects certain things to happen. What leads him to expect that those things are going to happen; that this college is going to be formed and they're going to begin to hire people? If the Minister has some plans as to how he's going to carry this out, why doesn't he just tell the Committee what his plans are?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the plans are not absolutely finalized and that's why we are expecting. We expect that there will be a college established; we expect that there will be trustees; we expect that there will be people from the university on that board of trustees. There will be some representation from government on that board of trustees and that only if we're satisfied that the college is going in a direction that we think is in the public interest, would we agree to pay funding to that institution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, in view of this - one is forced to use the term - almost kind of back alley arrangement that the Minister of Labour is talking about that he has with some amorphous group that he hasn't yet identified for the establishment of a college, by whom God only knows at this stage, for the purposes of teaching a curriculum that is yet to be

divined. When we get all of these maybes and expect to and possibles and so on together, why are we spending \$100,000 of the taxpayers' money, or setting aside that amount of money on behalf of the hard pressed taxpayers of Manitoba, when we haven't even got, according to the Minister, the foggiest idea of how it's going to be spent?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I find it strange that the members are taking all this news of this particular expenditure with such surprise when it was announced in the Budget some weeks ago. —(Interjection)— It certainly wasn't opposed at the time, it appears. I don't recall anybody complaining about it. The members opposite have, when they came into government, seen the proposal that was on the boards at the time. They chose not to proceed with it, but the proposal which is being brought forward now is similar in nature to the proposal that was on the table at that time. There is no final commitment by the government with respect to the \$100,000 and not all arrangements, in fact none of the arrangements, have been finalized. Therefore, it is difficult to be any more specific than I am. But it seems to me that it is not that difficult to understand what we are doing when I say that the proposal is no different, in principle, to the proposal that was before this Legislature in 1977. We expect to be proceeding with it during the year.

MR. CHAIRMAN, J. Storie: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, from this as yet imaginary college with an unappointed director and a staff of none, has the Minister been able to conjure up in his imagination where the student body is coming from? What number of students are expected to be appointed or to be enrolled in this imaginary college for which he's voting \$100,000? Or is this going to be Oz? Are you going to call it the University of Oz?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the member can again refer back to the proposal that was on the table, back in '77.

HON. S. LYON: Well, 1977 was five long years ago. We're now into one of the most horrendous Budgets we've had in the history of this province. Taxation on the people of Manitoba has been increased by \$130 million in a full fiscal year. This Minister of Finance is purporting to run a deficit of \$335 million, he said, and he's already voting in Supplementary Supply another \$40 million on top of that. God knows, it's going to reach close to \$400 million and adding new taxes all the time, the surcharge on personal income tax and so on. He says it's good enough for us tonight to refer back to some airy-fairy proposal that airy-fairy government had in 1977. Well, that isn't good enough, Mr. Chairman. That was a bad government that was defeated. It had a lot of bad ideas that had to be turned around and, Mr. Chairman, we want to find out what this government, if it's any different in stripe, is going to do, because if it's into the same bad old ways that bad old government was, it's going to be out on its behind before too long. We intend to be there with the shovels and with the brooms.

Now, we want something more than 1977 warmed over Schreyerism. What's this all about? If the Minister refuses to answer, he won't get the Item passed. I'll guarantee him that.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I have already explained what it's all about. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition chooses not to hear, that's his problem. But I have explained very carefully that; providing that the arrangements are made which are satisfactory to the government; that there is an institution formed; and that the trustees decide on how to go about spending the money in terms of hiring an administrator to set up curriculum and probably hire staff to help the administrator, then we are prepared to pay that money over as the previous Schreyer Government would have been back in 1977.

In terms of enrolment, that is something for us to be looking at in the coming year; that is not something that has been fully developed at this stage. One would expect that there would be at least several classes. I do not expect a huge building, a monument to the organization. I don't expect any building; I expect some space where courses can be set up for the benefit of the Manitoba public.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, how many of the Manitoba public, other than the leadership of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, have indicated that they have any vague interest whatsoever in enrolling as a student in this nonexistent college for which we are voting real money?

Mr. Chairman, I thought I had asked a question that was intelligible, even to the Minister of Finance. Perhaps, he could strain himself and try to answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No further questions? The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Labour talks about a college, an institution to be formed, for which this \$100,000 of taxpayer money that we are going to vote on and approve for him to spend. My question to the Minister is: does this \$100,000 represent the entire costs of this institution or this college, this freestanding entity that's going to do some sort of labour training that he hasn't yet identified? Does the \$100,000 represent the entire costs of this institution or college or whatever he wants to call it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It is not a freestanding institution.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Did I understand the Minister to say that it's not a freestanding institution? Is that what the Minister said?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: That's what I said.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then, if it is not a freestanding institution, with what is it aligned?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: In referring to freestanding, I

assumed you were talking about a freestanding building and it is not intended to have a specific building built for this institution.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then, where is this existing building or whatever building that is going to be used for this institution or this college, where is this building in the Province of Manitoba?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I will answer for the fifth time and I hope you listen this time, so I don't have to answer it for all the other people. I have said that we don't have a specific location for this institution; that we are looking at public buildings within the City of Winnipeg and that specifically we would like to have space within the University of Winnipeg, but that may not happen. We are hoping for space somewhere in a public building in Winnipeg.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So then, this \$100,000, if I can attempt to get some rational thought process out of the Minister, is going to partially pay for the rental of space at some institution in the City of Winnipeg, which may be the University of Winnipeg, and is it also going to pay for salaries of instructors or what is the balance of the \$100,000 going to do?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: One more time, I guess. I don't know why the Member for Pembina can't listen the first time. I have said a number of times that I expect that the money will be used not for instructors, because I don't expect to see classrooms in this particular fiscal year. I do expect that if we can come to an arrangement, if the institution is set up and if the trustees have a plan prepared, that we would be prepared to pay a grant to that institution to hire an administrator and an assistant to work out a curriculum.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So then this grant may well go to leasing space and paying for a director and an assistant to a director to set up a curriculum. Now, are we to assume that \$100,000 will be the amount of money that it will take to run this entire college or institution or whatever name the Minister wants to put to it not only in this year but in future years, or can the taxpayers of Manitoba expect this \$100,000 budget to turn into a \$200,000, \$300,000, \$400,000, \$1 million budget in the next year and the succeeding years?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, when the college is in operation, I would expect that it will cost more than the \$100,000, certainly.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Will the Provincial Government be paying more than \$100,000 to this expected more than \$100,000 costs of an operative college?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Any additional expenditures would, of course, be subject to the approval of the Legislature in future years.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Will the Manitoba Federation of Labour be also contributing funds towards this "to be established" college?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I would certainly expect so and I would also hope that there would be other sources of funding.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Where would the other sources of funding that the Minister expects would be forthcoming, what would be the source of those extra fundings?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It may be that there would be tuition fees, for instance. There could be other institutions, other trade unions. There may be some employer organizations; there may be some university associations; there may be other people who would wish to make contributions to a very worthwhile cause.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Since the Minister of Finance, in his capacity of Labour Minister, has seen fit to budget \$100,000 this year for an establishment process, has the Manitoba Federation of Labour agreed to match the \$100,000 this year as the Minister expends his money?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, it hasn't. I should say though, just to expand on the previous answer, that the CLC-run Labour College in Ottawa is partially funded by large employers in this country. So it is not something that is —(Interjection)— I don't know about the CPR. Maybe in lieu of taxes, but there are employers in this country and I believe in this province who recognize the validity of the proposition that we are all better off with a labour force that is more aware of what is going on, what its rights are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some questioning on the part of the Minister and his backbenchers about the position that our party would take with respect to this proposal. The problem is that we're having great difficulty in understanding what the proposal is in order to react to it, and the questions have all been directed at trying to find out what the Minister is getting into. I would be interested in knowing, Mr. Chairman, what he expects the cost of this proposal will be next year, the year after, even up to five years from now.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, to come up with a five-year Budget in these days of inflation is a very very difficult thing to do. I would say that the amount we are putting out in this first year is considerably less than had been proposed back in 1977 when the proposal for the Budget for a fiscal year was suggested to be in the order of \$250,000 to \$300,000 and at that time when that amount was announced the Conservative critic, the Member for Fort Garry said and this is in Hansard, Friday, June 10, 1977, quote:

"We welcome the Minister's announcement about the establishment of the new Labour Education Centre and we'll certainly watch with great interest the courses and the development of the curricula at the centre and the future as it unfolds. We hope that the centre in its curricula will take a broad and universal approach to labour and labour's role in society under the economy and that there will be strong emphasis on the need for tripartite co-operation, particularly

bipartisan co-operation between labour and management, but tripartite in that it should involve some government participation too in order that harmonious industrial relations can be developed and maintained in the Province of Manitoba, and to that end we believe that the centre can potentially fulfill a valuable service. Our position at this time would be one of interest and welcome and an ongoing interest in the courses developed and the way they are applied and the results in terms of labour and industrial harmony in the province."

I have said several times that we basically have the intention of setting up an institution that is similar. I know of no differences, as I said before, in terms of where we are heading with this particular operation and the one that was proposed in 1977, other than that it is the Department of Labour that is the co-ordinating agent at this time as opposed to the Department of Education back in 1977.

At this time, as I said before, there will be university involvement on the Board of Trustees. I would expect that there will be some government involvement on the Board of Trustees. I expect that the Manitoba Federation of Labour will play a lead role in terms of developing the focus of the centre or college in conjunction with the government. Again, I would hope and I would expect that the MFL would be contributing funds to this operation.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in how much this is going to cost because here we seem to have the Minister of Finance in his capacity as Minister of Labour making a commitment which he knows is going to grow, but he doesn't seem to know to what extent it's going to grow. Surely the Minister of Finance at least should have concern about the control of his expenditures. Now if that program was to cost \$300,000 in 1977, he's probably looking at least \$600,000 by today's standards and if it's that kind of expenditure that the Minister is contemplating, surely it justifies being laid out in more detail than the Minister has given us here. We learned more by hearing the Member for Fort Garry's quotation here from five or six years ago; we learned more from that than we did from what the Minister has told us.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, we haven't questioned whether or not this should be. We haven't been able to learn what it is. If there were details in 1977, maybe the Minister should review those and tell us what was proposed in 1977. Specifically, Mr. Chairman, are we looking at something? Does the Minister of Finance know that he's looking at something, the cost of which could easily run to \$1 million in the next two to three years?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, the costs will depend on how the centre develops. I can't say here today that for next spring or for next fall we will have so many courses, so many classrooms and so many teachers. I can't say we will have agreed that we can afford for next year to spend \$100,000 or \$50,000 or \$20,000 on any research material for the library for the centre. I can't say, as the Leader of the Opposition indicated earlier, how many people are prepared to go to this kind of a college. I can't say that at this time.

I do believe that there is an interest out there. I do

believe also that we will look at spending in the coming years on the basis of what the demand is out there, what the benefits we would view to be to the public from this kind of spending and what we can afford. We would look at all of those factors and it may well be that in the 1970s there was a feeling of belief out there that we could have a larger institution, a larger college, than we might believe that we can afford right now, but I cannot tell you that we will have a staff of 10 next fall or a staff of 5 or a research library that is one size of richness or another size of richness. We will have to look at it next year.

What we are doing now is recommitting a promise that we had made before the election, that this was one of the things that we would in fact be going ahead with if we were elected. We are going ahead with it. We are not going ahead with it on the same basis that was proposed back in 1977 because times are different. We are looking to go ahead more slowly with the operation. I believe that the way we are proceeding is a most sensible one for the year 1982.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister now just tells us that this isn't the same proposal as there was in 1977, after telling us before that it was. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely don't believe that the Minister knows what he's doing here. He's made a commitment to the Manitoba Federation of Labour - let's face it - because they've been asking for it. The Minister has made this commitment to them. It was an afterthought after he put his main Estimates together; it wasn't something that was identified as a need by the department or anything else. It came along as an afterthought in response to a request by the Manitoba Federation of Labour. He said, okay, we'll put in \$100,000.00. He comes here and can't tell us what it's about; he can't tell us if there is a demand for it. By his own admission, he doesn't know who's going to go there, he doesn't know who is going to be on the Board of Trustees, he doesn't know where it's going to be, he doesn't know how many they are going to hire, he doesn't know how much it is going to cost.

Mr. Chairman, why doesn't the Minister of Finance just delete about \$85,000 of this, commission one person to have a look and see whether there's a need for a labour college in Manitoba? Have an independent person do it. Find out what the need is. Find out what it's going to do. Bring in a report and if it says that there is a need for a labour college to be instituted along the lines of the CLC College, then lay it out. Bring the Estimates before the House that show really what the Minister wants to do and do it in that way, Mr. Chairman. That's the only sensible way to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 15, if there are no further comments, BE IT RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$100,000 for Labour and Manpower, General Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, let the record show that the Minister sat silent or dumb, according to your preference of words, in response to the legitimate suggestion that was made by the Honourable Opposition House Leader that the Minister doesn't really know what he's about, that this is nothing more than

an election payoff to the MFL. The Minister is wasting public money this year. He should do as he was advised by the House Leader; namely, get a report as to whether this institution is even needed. Otherwise, he's asking us to pass blind \$100,000 so he can pay off an election debt. That's not good enough for the people of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. That's all it is too and his CUPE friend sits beside him.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

HON. S. LYON: Yeas and nays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeas and nays. Good. The hour being past 10:00 p.m., the vote will be deferred until the next sitting of the House. Is it the will of the Committee to continue with Resolution 12 or how shall we proceed?

Resolution 13, Highways and Transportation, Air/Radio Services - the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate under Salaries the number of staff that are going to be hired under this additional funding and the job descriptions of that additional staff?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have to express a degree of regret in not knowing that we were going to deal with these items this evening. Therefore, I can't give a specific answer this evening but will undertake to provide the same on the first occasion. The Estimates before us have to do with the acquisition of the water bomber. That's the second item, which is \$3.4 million. The other Estimates, involving some \$208,000, have to do with increased staffing as a result of additional Air Division Fleet and Services which is largely recovered from other departments. It's almost a self-sustaining operation. That is the sum total of those two expenditures.

MR. D. ORCHARD: If the Minister can provide me with the additional staff, their job descriptions. I take it from his answer that Other Expenditures (b) represents the operating costs, fuel, insurance, etc., of having the third water bomber in operation for this fiscal year. The MU-2 is involved in some of the other expenditures as well. Are there any additional staff associated with the MU-2 being back in service?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, as I understood it, sometime ago when we did discuss the new water bomber and the reintroduction of the MU-2 back into the fleet, that we would have to have Supplementary Estimates to provide for the operational expenditures. From recollection, that's what I believe these figures represent but, to be specific, I can only commit myself to bringing forward that information tomorrow if the members find that acceptable.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, one other question for the Minister. Since the Salaries and the Other Expenditures total, if my quick arithmetic serves me well, some \$1,008,900, why is that not shown as an

entire additional appropriation required by Air Radio Services?

HON. S. USKIW: I believe it does show that there's an excess of \$1 million here. Then it shows the recovery from other departments of \$800,000 and leaves us with a net figure of \$208,000 of added costs to the department.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's the point I'm making, Mr. Chairman, because the Salaries and Other Expenditures are as a result of having a new water bomber plus the MU-2 back in service. At a time when the original Estimates were prepared, those two aircraft were not being budgeted for. Then where in the user departments under Supplementary Supply, do we find the recoverable of \$800,000.00? Surely, the Minister isn't telling me that the Departments of Natural Resources and other departments anticipated having another water bomber, the MU-2, back and budgeted funds for their operations without the Minister, whose department controls it, making that budget?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that the Department of Resources would have budgeted a certain amount of money relative to other year's Budgets with an inflation factor added that would involve either in-House or external operations. In other words, if we had our own planes then we would do it in-House. If we didn't, we would then be contracting with outside people, but the money would nevertheless have to be spent by those other departments. That's an assumption, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be fair to assume that the majority of the over \$1 million would result from operations of a third water bomber, and I would like to ask the Minister of Natural Resources if I had his attention.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would the Minister of Natural Resources care to confirm that when he presented the Budget, the Estimates for his department of firefighting cost, that he included costs associated with a third water bomber?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't recall the details on the water bomber. I know that the department certainly planned on having that machine in service and I assume that provision was made in it. I think that the item is properly reflected here, but I'm not certain. I'd have to take it as notice.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, basically the assurance I want is that tonight as we pass a total of whatever it's going to be, \$46 million, that we're not understating that request in Supplementary Supply by \$800,000, which are shown as a recoverable of additional expenses which weren't budgeted in the original preparations of the Estimates.

It seems to me to be a little strange that we would have a recovery built into other departments in drafting their normal Estimates appearing when the supp-

lier department, namely Highways and Transportation, did not see fit to include that \$1 million in costs in their department. My concern once again is that this \$800,000 has not been budgeted for by user departments and in fact the 46 million should be closer to 47 million.

Another question for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Is the department undertaking negotiations to sell the MU2?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that particular question is under review. We believe that we might be moving in that direction but we haven't finalized a decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No further questions.

BE IT RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$208,900 for Highways and Transportation, Air Radio Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

Dealing with Resolution 14, Acquisition, Construction of Physical Assets: BE IT RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$3,234,400 for Highways and Transportation, Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

RES. NO. 12 - HEALTH (Cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Continuing with Resolution No. 12, Health - Community Health Services.
The Honourable Minister.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I have some further information now. In accordance with the Throne Speech, the Children's Dental Health Program will be expanded in 1982-83 to include the present 13-year olds who turned 14 on or after January, 1983, in those school divisions currently covered by the program.

Consequently, the private dentists through the Manitoba Dental Association will continue to provide services in the 12 2/3 school divisions currently covered by them, and the department will continue to provide services in the 17 1/3 school divisions currently covered by the department. Approximately 5,400 children born in 1969 will be eligible for dental treatment.

This program expansion will cost \$438,900.00. Mention of the extended coverage for children born in 1969 was made and recorded in Hansard of April 26, 1982 when the Minister made his introductory remarks on the Dental Services Estimates.

Then there is also an estimated cost for Dental Nurse Student Bursary Aid and guaranteed college placement charges for 30 dental nurses. That's from September, 1982, that's \$320,000 and that's a total of \$758,900.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister

for the information and I fully appreciate his comments with respect to the additional budgetary provision necessary to accommodate the age expansion of children in the Dental Health Program.

The news about the Wascana College Bursary Program for dental nurses is new. There had been, as clearly as I can recall, no firm indication even during consideration of the Minister's Estimates that the bursary program for dental nurses was going to resume.

Is the Minister advising the Committee that a decision has been made by the government to return to the bursary program and resume the out-of-province training of dental nurses?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, there is a review of the two current programs that are in place now. That is the program being delivered by the Manitoba Dental Association and that being delivered by the Department of Health. It appears to be progressing in a most harmonious manner. The Minister of Health indicated he was confident that within the next three to four years through working together, that review will be able to produce the best possible children's dental programs available to Manitobans.

The dental nurse has become an important dental auxiliary in both the private and public sector. It now becomes necessary to reinstitute the Dental Nurse Special Opportunity Bursary Program and make arrangements for student placement positions at the Wascana Institute of Applied Arts in Regina. Regardless of the direction that the Children's Dental Program goes in Manitoba, it is necessary to provide for these nurses if the program is to be expanded and if we are to maintain even our present number of dental nurses because of staff turnover.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd have to ask the Minister, and perhaps he can't answer without checking with the Minister of Health. Does this mean that the government has terminated discussions with the Manitoba Dental Association of professional dentists of the province, insofar as delivery of services to rural and remote areas of the province is concerned. In the past considerable discussion had been held with the MDA with respect to serving those areas throughout the province which we all desire to see served.

For the moment, major urban centres like Winnipeg are excluded, but it was certainly a firm understanding between the MDA and the previous government that with the encouragement of permitting the MDA to participate in the delivery of this program they would be moving into those areas and through the professional dentists and their own nurses and hygienists, not only delivering the service, but in fact placing practitioners in a number of areas of the province that require them.

There has always been a longstanding prohibition in the regulations of the Dental Association against the use of the dental nurse in certain procedures. To my knowledge, that difficulty has not been resolved. It appears that this decision means that kind of discussion with the Dental Association has now been terminated. They are not going to be asked to deliver the service in rural and remote divisions and areas. We're returning to the polarized situation of the Dental

Association on one side and the government and the dental nurses on the other side, instead of achieving the mix and the co-operation that we were striving for.

The Minister's announcement with respect to the return of the Bursary Program certainly raises that spectre and I must say comes as something of a surprise.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat that it is the view of the government that it is necessary to provide for the education of these nurses if any programming is to be expanded and if we are to maintain even our present number of dental nurses because of staff turnover.

I would take the balance of the question as notice with respect to what is happening in rural and Northern Manitoba, remote Manitoba. I do not have the information available for the member, but I can pass those questions on to the Minister for reply.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the Minister of Finance would not have that detail at his fingertips. I understand that and it's really the Minister of Health who will have to answer those questions.

I wonder if we could hold that Item over until it's possible to examine it with the Minister of Health?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, if that is the wish of the member, I believe that is a reasonable request.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll set that Resolution aside and continue with Resolution No. 16, Natural Resources, Executive Administration.

RES. NO. 16 - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think the Items speak for themselves. I don't think they need much elaboration. Honourable members know that there is expense involved in respect to the initiation of a greater effort in respect to Garrison. We have a staff person from the Attorney-General's Department in Washington. That Item is not all that expensive. It's a matter of expenses down there in Washington for that gentleman. We have engaged a legal adviser in Washington. We budgeted for his salary. We have budgeted also for a Public Information Program involving two displays that will be shown throughout Manitoba on the issue, hired two teams of students who will be involved in those displays.

The budget also provides for a further Garrison leaflet and then there are expenses of the Garrison Focus Office in this building itself, the manning of that office by two staff and that comprises the budget, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have any breakdown of the other expenditures as to how much it would cost to engage the Washington lawyers; how much it would cost to run the Garrison

Focus Office, for instance. Has the Minister any more information to follow up on the questions which I asked him a few days ago about the summer employees who were expected to be touring into North Dakota to take the Minister's message there?

HON. A. MACKLING: Dealing with the latter question first, Mr. Chairman, no. As I indicated, the students will not be involved in presenting information in North Dakota at the early stages. Some time later, that will be considered.

In respect to a breakdown of the budget, I can indicate that these are Estimates only of the time that will be taken in respect to the staff person in Washington. We're estimating expenses there of \$10,000 or \$11,000. In respect to the American legal firm and of the individual and his partners, we're estimating approximately \$22,000. In respect to the public information program, displays, brochures and so on, media information, we're figuring about \$75,000; one-time grants for specific activities carried out by the Focus Office, an estimate there, a provision, for \$10,000; the two staff man years and expenses of the Garrison Focus Office, a total of \$51,000.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, has there been a change with respect to the summer students planning to go into North Dakota? I'm sure that I heard an interview on the radio with one of these students talking about the plans they had for taking the message into North Dakota.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman. I think it's still our concern, at some point that would be advisable, however, we think that first of all we should effectively provide information within Manitoba, insure that the material is suitable for presentation, then we will consider the use of that in North Dakota. We would want to make some contacts. It may be that would come much later in the year before that would be carried out.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, is it of any concern to the Minister that he has people hired under this program going on the radio giving interviews about what they're planning to do and that the information that they're giving is contradictory to the information that the Minister is giving here in the House?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't present when the students were interviewed. I certainly didn't indicate to them or hadn't tried to indicate what they must say if they're questioned. I believe that what they were talking about was reasonable. I think it certainly would be in our interest at some stage if the students, providing the material and the program is suitable, could provide that information south of the border. However, I haven't made that decision yet. It doesn't upset me that they think that's part of the program that's going to take place right away; that doesn't trouble me in the least.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it may not trouble the Minister, but I think the Minister perhaps should

have closer control over what's happening. I think there is some danger in having too many spokesmen on this subject. We know the dangers that there are of having different messages, different signals sent out from the government. I caution the Minister to keep some control over what's happening there.

Can he tell me, if he would again, the name of the firm that has been retained in Winnipeg and how much he expects the services of that firm will cost?

HON. A. MACKLING: The firm retained in Winnipeg for?

MR. B. RANSOM: Garrison advice.

HON. A. MACKLING: Garrison advice. We haven't got a firm retained in Winnipeg for Garrison advice, Mr. Chairman.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, could he give me the name of the lawyer then, if it's an individual person as opposed to a firm?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, this budget does not provide for a retainer or legal fees for someone in Winnipeg. Should that be necessary, we have expenses for the Focus Office in the amount of \$10,000 and that is a guesstimate, we don't know exactly what our expenses are going to be, but if we do need outside legal advice, outside of the Attorney-General's Department or outside of the legal advice we're getting in the United States, yes, it could come out of that and we could call upon, I think, two lawyers who have indicated their willingness to advise in respect to this, who are recognized as strongly interested and motivated in respect to the environmental issue of Garrison and I have had conversations with Allan Scarth, also Mr. Barry Bergh of Pitblado & Hoskin.

MR. B. RANSOM: Then no one has been retained in Winnipeg, as a lawyer here?

HON. A. MACKLING: No.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the efforts that the government is undertaking here are successful. They're certainly much more extensive than the previous government was undertaking. Time will tell whether they're any more successful.

HON. A. MACKLING: The other item, Mr. Chairman—do you want me to deal with the other item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can pass this resolution if that's all right and then we can speak on the other one.

BE IT RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$170,000 for Natural Resources, Executive Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

Continuing with Resolution 17.

HON. A. MACKLING: In respect to the other item, Mr. Chairman, that will provide for the start-up work involved in both The Pas Nursery Station and the expansion at Hadashville and will also involve some

work thinning and improvement in forest stands involving, although this program hasn't crystalized, utilization of Moose Lake Loggers or Manitoba Forestry Resources in that program that involves unemployment insurance, part-time employment to fill out the appropriate time frame and all of that we've budgeted for under that figure of \$1 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

BE IT RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$1 million for Natural Resources, Forestry, for the fiscal ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

RES. NO. 18 - EMPLOYMENT CREATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Continuing with Resolution 18, the Employment Creation Program.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, since we are going to be holding Health items for the presence of the Minister, I wonder if it wouldn't be advisable to hold Health and Employment Creation, and I believe you have another item dealing with the General Salary Increase, as well, if you would like to hold those three items and move Committee rise?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Surely we could proceed with these two items. They're not that lengthy. It's early in the evening and one would like to proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: I move Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

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

IN SESSION

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER, H. Harapiak: The Member for Flin Flon.

MR. J. STORIE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Energy, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow. (Tuesday).