



Third Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

28 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVII No. 63B

8:00 P.M. Thursday, May 17, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 17, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour will be a few moments late. The Department of Government Services will be held in Room 254.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for Labour and Manpower and the Honourable Member for Pembina in the Chair for Government Services.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — GOVERNMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. I'd like to refer members of Committee to Page 42, the Estimates of Government Services, Resolution No. 57: 1.(a) Minister's Salary — the Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I'm pleased to present the 1979-80 Estimates for the Department of Government Services to your Committee for review and passage. There have been no major changes to the structural operation of the department during the past year. However, the department is being expanded to include the Manitoba Data Services Commission and the Emergency Measures Organization. I should indicate that the Manitoba Data Services' move will be not formalized until a bill setting up Manitoba Data Services as a separate Crown corporation is passed in the House. It will be presented to the Legislature within days. The Estimates for the latter have been discussed, and has received passage in Committee during the Department of Municipal and Urban Affairs Estimate's presentation — that is, the Estimates for Emergency Measures Organization.

It is my intent in 1979-80 to improve the existing organization in such a manner, as to reduce operation with efficiencies and to streamline the bureaucratic processes by removing any excess red tape. Areas of emphasis will include the purchasing process, ground transportation, space consolidation, along with some amendments to the Land Acquisition and Expropriation Acts, and continuing improvements towards adherence to the Fire Commissioner's recommendations.

The combined 1979-80 Estimates, including Current and Acquisition/Construction total some \$45,518,200, reflects a reduction of approximately 25 percent from the \$60,647,100 budgeted in 1978-79. The major reduction arises in Acquisition/Construction, where some projects representing major capital works were either completed or deferred.

Other less substantial but significant reductions were achieved through increased efficiencies and General Administration, Operation and Maintenance of Provincial Buildings and Grounds, with major savings resulting from a decline in the requirement for such things, as office furniture and leased space due to reductions in the Civil Service. A modest decrease in the Gimli Industrial Park of some 4.25 percent also attributes to this decrease.

The Estimates for Supply and Services Division have been decreased substantially, some 90 percent, from approximately — pardon me, have increased substantially by some 90 percent, from approximately \$2 million to \$3.9 million in 1979-80 in the Estimates before you. This is largely brought about to provide for a Vehicle Replacement Program in the Central Vehicle Branch, and for price increases in the Office Equipment Branch and Post Office.

The Department is continuing the ongoing commitment of this administration towards increasing Fire Safety with priority given to those institutions where people are being detained or bedridden.

In the 1979-80 Estimates before, we have a total of some \$5,200,400 is budgeted for Fire and Safety. This compares to the \$5 million that was budgeted in last year's Estimates.

Major Capital Projects totalling some \$7,256,900 are budgeted for the 79-80 year, including completion to the Dauphin Provincial Building; the Brandon Correctional Institute; the Berens River School; the Red River Community College Remedial Program. Also included in this program is over \$5 million which is expected to be spent on the construction of the Environmental Laboratory, that is for the Department of Mines and Natural Resources.

Members of the Committee, this concludes my opening remarks, and I commend these Estimates of the Department of Government Services to the Members of Committees for consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I.(b)(1) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to pass the department without a comment, which would disappoint the members of the government benches.

I wanted to begin by welcoming the members of the department. I notice that the faces are generally the same, the hair is a little greyer . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I can interrupt the Honourable Member for Elmwood for an oversight. Of course, it is appropriate that the Minister acknowledge the departmental people present, and in particular case introduce a new Deputy Minister to Government Services, Mr. Boris Hryhorczuk, who has joined the department. His activities in the first several weeks of Provincial Government Services have been pretty well allocated to the flood fighting measures with the Emergency Measures Organization. Along with Mr. Hryhorczuk, of course, Mr. Keith McMillan, Mr. Steve Sohor and Mr. Neil Osler.

If I may, I'd like to acknowledge in a somewhat special way the work of the Acting Deputy Minister, Mr. Joe Brako, who along with his full-time responsibility as Deputy Minister of Highways, has been carrying this load as well. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I welcome the old faces — many are quite familiar to me — and I, too, would like to pay special tribute to Boris Hryhorczuk. I think I've known Boris for 10 or 12 years, back to the days when he was a Metro Planner, and I am one of those who holds him in very high regard, and I also want to commend him for making an auspicious debut. Most people who become civil servants or Deputy Ministers are sort of in the woodwork and very very gradually, if ever, reach the public consciousness, but he has started his period as Deputy Minister with a bang; he's appeared on television . . .

A MEMBER: Actually with a splash.

MR. DOERN: . . . with a splash, so I want to wish him well and I know that he will do a good job.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to begin with a general statement because it is in the administration which will be built either sooner or later, and that the government has an option of deciding when to bring these projects forward and also when to defer these projects. Now the Minister has made his opening statement. He has indicated that the department which last year was in the area of \$60 million in total, is now down to \$45 million and I believe that this reduction should be carefully examined because I think it is a combination of, as he indicated, the deferral of new construction and renovations and it is also the deferral of maintenance. I believe that in both instances the government is mistaken in its general approach.

Mr. Chairman, we are now in a general period in the province where we are suffering from high unemployment and, well, you know, the Minister of Agriculture says, "Balderdash", but I regard anything as over 3 percent, particularly when you get into the 5 and 6 percent region as high unemployment. There are some 30,000 people in the province; there are some, roughly, 900,000 people in the country, and this is very high unemployment.

In particular, though, Mr. Chairman, I want to mention that in terms of the construction industry in Manitoba, this is even more serious. So if the gentlemen opposite are not impressed with a rate of 5 or 6 percent unemployment, if they think that that is tolerable, I'm sure — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Agriculture says it's a statistic — it's merely a statistic. And if we had the time, we could perhaps bring in people from off the street who are unemployed, and they could tell their

story, as to how they enjoy, or how they suffer under unemployment; and I don't know if the Minister of Agriculture has ever been unemployed in his life. He may have been fortunate, he may never have experienced that. —(Interjection)—

But I can tell him that at one point in my life, I guess when I was about 19 or 20, I went through a period of unemployment, and I found it . . . —(Interjection)— I found it a very painful, very painful experience. It puts a person who wants to be productive in a situation where he doesn't want to be. It causes a person to lose a sense of self-worth. It takes somebody out of the productive sector and puts them into the unproductive sector, and I think that most people who experience it find it a depressing and an unhappy experience.

So if the members of the government have no concern for people who are unemployed, or don't feel that 5 or 6 percent unemployment is a serious matter, then I'm sure that they would agree with me that when you get into the realm of 31 and 32 percent unemployment, that that is something to be concerned about. And I'm referring now to construction unemployment, and I am quoting from a letter by Mr. Greasley, who is the Winnipeg Construction Association Executive Vice-President who provides this type of statistic to all and sundry, and he points out that as of late April, only a couple of weeks ago, the construction industry, according to their association, has 31.2 percent unemployment — a number of 10,400 unemployed.

And if there are 30,000 people unemployed in the province, then one-third of those people are in the construction industry. And, Mr. Chairman, one-third of the people in the whole construction industry are unemployed.

So I think those figures are shocking. Also, when we take the future projections about what will happen in the summer, in the good old summertime, then we find out that there will probably be an unemployment rate of, I believe, about 15 percent. So normally, one can look forward to a diminution of unemployment in the summer, down to 10 percent or so, but we're now looking at 15 percent as the projected figure, which is about 50 percent higher than normal.

So, Mr. Chairman, my point is this: Here is a department which should know what government requirements are, which by carefully planning its programs can either bring projects forward, or take them off, and again I am not saying that the government should simply undertake a whole series of projects and then attempt to determine whether any of them have any value. If the government has requirements, social needs, if there are requirements in terms of court buildings, general office buildings, hospitals, schools, etc., etc., these must be built at some point in time. . .

A MEMBER: Highways, bridges.

MR. DOERN: Highways and bridges of course. And if it is found that these projects, which are again a list of needs, compiled needs of the government, if it is found that at a particular point in time it might benefit the economy to move one of them up a few months or a year or two, then it is good business sense to proceed at that time. And if it is found that the economy is doing well, then it makes sense to forego or postpone these requirements.

Now I say at this point in time the government should be attempting to lower the rate of unemployment in the Manitoba economy. It should also be concerned about high unemployment in the construction industry. It should be attempting to retain graduates from the university if possible, and it should be concerned about out-migration which is very heavy at this time. We had figures given to us that some 10,000 people in the past year have left Manitoba and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is largely because of economic opportunities in other provinces. I mean, we know that our weather isn't the best and we know that some people leave because it's a little warmer or I guess basically a little warmer, since we have lots of sunshine, but sometimes not enough heat. And so that will always be constant; that will never change. Those who leave because they want to go to the good old USA or they want to go to Vancouver, or they want to go to Toronto, because there's more action in a big city or they want to go to another centre, they will always be there. It is when there is a lack of opportunity in terms of careers that we must concern ourselves.

I say this to the Minister and perhaps he would like to respond at this time, and then we'll get into some of the details, that the construction industry in this province is at an all-time low, and I am in fairly close touch with people in the architectural and engineering professions in the building trades, in construction companies and so on, and they are literally dying. And if you look for instance at architectural firms in the past twelve months, some firms have folded, some have split up, some have amalgamated, and some are leaving the province. Of the remaining firms, most people who are still in business, are in business because they are doing work outside of the province. They are maintaining an office here but they are sending their people out by plane or they are establishing offices in other parts of the country, or they're turning to developments on their own, they're

contractors, I suppose, developers, etc., etc. — that's of the architects and the engineers. We also know that of the graduates that an incredibly high number of university students are leaving the province, and in many cases, going to Western Canada. We also know that our normally poor sister Province of Saskatchewan is not poor any more, and that their economy is doing well, and they are drawing people from Manitoba. And the figures from about a year ago, I can't give them exactly, but I can give them approximately, was that in one case I think the entire engineering class left, some 25 out of 25, in the other case, the architects, out of about 25, 24 left.

So this is our young skilled people in this particular area. People in the construction industry are folding, pulling out, moving their offices. I think the Foundation Company of Canada, which is suing the department and the government, because of The Pas Correctional, they are winding up their operation here, and other people will do the same. They will access Manitoba, the way that Manitoba works with Northwestern Ontario. We service Northwestern Ontario from the capitol and from the province. And Manitoba will be serviced from Toronto, and from points west when there is some work requirement. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, people in the trades are leaving, permanently and temporarily, to find employment in other provinces.

So it's a very grim picture, and there is no relief in sight. And so, I simply say to the minister, I'm sure he may share my concern, but I don't know what he would propose in terms of trying to do something in regard to a major declining industry, and I would remind the minister and members of the committee, that the construction industry is one of the biggest industries in the nation, and I think if you take all the industries in Canada and rank them I think, if my memory serves me correct, that it is third. It is one of the largest industries in terms of dollar volume and number of people who work in it, behind banking and farming or perhaps something else, but the bankers have the bucks — we all know that.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's my general statement and I wonder if the minister would care to respond, then maybe we can look at some of the specific items that, I believe, should be advanced or for some peculiar reason are not being advanced at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Elmwood has expressed, I think, what we have all become to understand the particular position that he feels the Department of Government Services or position the Department of Government Services ought to take. What I've come to understand and appreciate is that the tremendous level of expectations that were raised among the very firms that he now speaks of with concern, as I do, whether it's architectural firms or the construction firms — when I look at some of the grandiose, and I say grandiose in the Albert Schver manner, that the former Minister of Government Services had.

I indicate, and put them to paper. For instance, we had and encouraged architects to think these are two additional Woodsworth Buildings, to be added to the existing Woodsworth Building, joined with a lower level building. Then of course that didn't stop him with the acquisition of the Great-West Life across the street and the O'Keefe property, there were several options such as this that we planned to build across the street. I would say without question bringing joy to the hearts of the architects and the construction industry, multi-billion dollar projects with office space that may serve the Pentagon in Washington.

My problem is that I could empty the Woodsworth Building today and put every person working in the Woodsworth Building into paid unused space. We have some 215,000 square feet of unused space, admittedly of different descriptions, and any government services — and that is not — I realize I'm inviting criticism, but out of some 7 million odd square feet of space that the government occupies, that particular figure is not out of line; it's something that is of concern to the department when we speak about space consolidation. We have to concern ourselves with that, but the harsh fact that remains is that, as per example, the Woodsworth Building has some 179,000 to 180,000 square feet of usable office space. At the same time I have some 200,000 feet of office space of various descriptions that is empty. So I'm using that merely to put in its proper context just what are legitimate levels of expectation to raise to encourage architects to actually plan on paper, to encourage architects to draw about redesigning of the grounds of the Legislative Building, which includes the utilization of all of Kennedy Street; a bridge across the Assiniboine River to take in that property there; one, two, three, four, five pools on the Legislative grounds; underground parking on the Legislative grounds. I can recall once admonishing the honourable former Minister of Public Works that he should consider a modest underground parking facility in around the buildings. I think that's still an appropriate project, and I think I even indicated to him at that time I would be prepared to call it the Russell Doern Memorial Parkade or something like that.

But when I see five, six pools, you know, on the Legislative grounds, plus the additional expropriation plans of the Great-West Life properties and all the properties on the corner of

and Osborne, the bank and the O'Keefe's property and the building of multi-storeyed office structures, plus the addition of two more Woodsworth towers, which by the way, Mr. Attorney-General, doesn't include your courthouse facilities yet. I'm beginning to appreciate why the architectural community all of a sudden has that let-down feeling when Harry Enns came around. I'm beginning to appreciate that.

But the fact of the matter is that we will build those facilities that are required for government services. We certainly would like to generate whatever employment we can, and through the spending Estimates of my colleagues, whether it's the Minister of Health and Social Development, we are proceeding with some 10, 11 personal care home units this year. We are proceeding with the major projects that I'm prepared to indicate that are contained within these Estimates. But I have to refute totally, and I regretfully have to inform the construction industry that it is totally unrealistic, totally unrealistic and highly irresponsible to suggest that the taxpayers of this province can do precisely what the member indicated we should not do — build for building's sake, using the adage art for art's sake.

We have sufficient space. We have particular renovation projects that I'm not satisfied that we are proceeding with as quickly as we can, particularly those relative to the Fire Commissioner's Code recommendations, but we are moving in those directions. They often involve a considerable amount of design work, renovation work, where people are currently housed and living in and it is always a little more difficult to work in on schedule. But I have to refute the kind of general statement that the Member for Elmwood makes as to the particular responsibility the Department of Government Services ought to have in terms of resolving the unemployment problem in the construction industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to, I don't think it serves any great further purpose to carry on in this line of the debate. I would prefer that we proceed with the Department line by line. However if the member wishes to carry on, of course, he is welcome to do so. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy debating with the Minister but I have to take strong exception to this whole series of falsehoods. I would call them more than that if it were parliamentary. That little display of visual aids is just an absolute pile of bunk —(Interjection)— absolute bunk, Mr. Chairman. A complete and utter falsehood put by the Minister. The Minister knows very well that there are all kinds of master plans. When I first became Minister there were all kinds of master plans for the future development of the Legislative area — well okay we are now going to have a little game. The Minister is going to run around and he is going to show these things and I hope . . . In fact, Mr. Speaker, I will pause while the Minister passes around the material here.

There are all kinds of plans on file that were there when I took over. There are plans from the Roblin era, from the Weir era, and many many years before that. Those are called, in some instances, master plans, and for the Minister to suggest that our government was going to immediately start building a couple of Woodsworth's buildings behind the Woodsworth Building is just completely untrue. It's totally untrue. Those plans were developed along the lines that some time in the future, when there was a requirement, that the government could develop its property in that fashion. The Minister knows that that is the truth but he is now completely trying to mislead the Committee and the media. You know it's all very amusing but it isn't true. The Great-West property, if the Minister wants to talk about that, the Great-West property, the Great-West Life Company is interested and was interested in developing the CN east yards and if so, would be interested in selling its property.

Now I say that if the Minister is telling me for a moment that he is not interested if the Great-West Life Company came to him during his term in office, is he saying in effect that he cannot take a position in the long run, for example in the next 50 years, that if space became available on the border of the Legislative grounds, like the Great-West Life Company, that he would categorically reject that possibility because he makes plans only for the present fiscal year? Is that what he is telling me? That he will not plan beyond one fiscal year, that he cannot look to the future, that he will not consider any long range plans beyond say his term in office of his administration, which goes another couple of years, that he cannot visualize anything beyond that?

Mr. Speaker, many governments — you know this building right here was planned on the basis of five million Manitobans. Well, let me tell you something, it was a bust, it was a bust if that's the basis of the planning done by the Rodmond Roblin administration. They anticipated that they were going to have millions of people streaming into Manitoba, and they planned this building in relation to that requirement. It didn't turn out that way. You know, Duff Roblin was the man who

planned the floodway, wasn't he? And he was ridiculed by everyone, and the Conservatives are delighted now that he was a man of vision, that he could anticipate future floods, future requirements, and that the \$63 million plan would some day pay off. Well Roblin wasn't building that floodway for one year, he wasn't planning that for 12 months, he was making . . .

A MEMBER: He was just keeping an election promise.

MR. DOERN: Yes, he was keeping an election promise. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. DOERN: So it was more than Elman Guttormson. Elman Guttormson was only one person. Practically the whole general public, and certainly the entire Liberal Party was down on Duff Roblin. So Duff Roblin made this estimate for a future requirement. Decades into the future — there's no way that that floodway would pay for itself in a couple of years. Now it has paid for itself — 29 years later, 29 years later, Roblin has been proved right. But how about the next couple of years later? I'm sure there are lots of Liberals around in the late 50s, who were ridiculing Roblin at that time. You know, just as the Minister is trying to ridicule our plans.

But, there is one vital difference, Mr. Chair man, between what Roblin did and what this Minister has just done today. Roblin said he would build a floodway. And he built it. We never said we were going to build those buildings. We said that those were future possibilities. We said that the Great-West Life property was a future possibility, that in the next 40 or 50 years — and why don't you pull out the correspondence, read the correspondence. I'd like to hear the correspondence. I'd like to see my signature on a number of letters and on a number of internal documents about why we should consider purchasing that property. Nobody was going to be interested in that property on the basis of building a whole series of government buildings which would stand empty, but if the government requirement was developed over a period of time, if the Province of Manitoba expanded in terms of its population and its resources, then there could be a future requirement.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is a phony red herring dragged in by the Minister, and any suggestion that our government was going to build two more buildings on that site is just completely false, and those plans, in terms of the Great West Life, were simply to demonstrate that if that property was purchased — and it wasn't by our government — that this type of a development could take place. It was for the schematic purpose of demonstrating future development on that site, and that could be 20 years or 50 years into the future. Well, we did not buy that piece of property, and I would be very interested to know whether this Minister would consider buying that property if it became available. TF250

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Committee, he could comment right now on whether he has had any negotiations with Great-West Life, whether they have made any suggestions to him, and also, if they did, whether he would consider buying their land for future development, or whether he would simply rule it out of hand because I'd be just interested in knowing what his position would be.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the department is constantly concerned and aware of if, and when, land within the vicinity of the buildings becomes available. I can indicate to the honourable member that currently at this time some possible acquisition of additional property is being considered, as it was always considered during previous administration times. The need for, and the potential requirements for future space, are as acceptable to me as the Minister at this time as it was to the Honourable Member for Elmwood. In specific questions with respect to Great-West Life, no, I've been in no correspondence or in any other way received any indication that the firm in question is interested in selling us their property, nor have we indicated in any way that we are interested in purchasing the property.

MR. DOERN: You know, would the Minister answer this question again? If he was now offered the Great West Life property for X millions of dollars, would he recommend it to his Executive Council as a worthwhile long-term investment of land banking and future requirements, etc. etc. etc., or would he not? Because it might be, Mr. Chairman, a once in a lifetime possibility to this extent . . .

MR. ENNS: I would suspect that this government, having faced, and no doubt will continue to face, the kind of concern and suspicion that any dealings this government has with Great-West Life would preclude that from happening.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm simply saying that I think any prudent Minister, who is the Public Works Minister, the Government Services Minister, who has as his responsibility the provision of space for government requirements, both immediately and in the future, must consider that land adjacent to the central government complex in the central city of the province has to give serious consideration because of the possibility that in the future it might make sense to have a centralized operation.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairuan, I'll say it just once. I think I said it last year about this time. The Department of Government Services, or Public Works as it was previously known, under this administration and under this ministry, will respond to those legitimate requests for space and buildings that I receive from client departments in this instance, whether it's from the Attorney-General's Department, whether it is from the Health and Social Development Department, and/or any other government agency.

We do not see ourselves as a prime developer, prime contractor, to build buildings for building sake, or, as much as we'd like to, to use the means that are always available to government to stimulate the economy for building buildings for which there has not been a demonstrable need demonstrated through the arduous procedure of Estimates, of setting up priorities by departments as to government's requirements. I do not visualize as the department's goal to ensure that we should take on that task as outlined by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and we will have to agree to disagree on that.

MR. DOERN: The Minister will then develop his plans irrespective and regardless of the state of the construction industry, that if he needs several buildings and the economy is booming, and the contractors are booming, and prices are high, he'll build them in spite of that fact. And if there's high unemployment, then he will at that time possibly defer his projects to add to that unemployment and to aggravate that unemployment. He will build despite what goes on in the construction industry.

MR. ENNS: Well, if the Honourable Member for Elmwood is telling me that if a school, a personal care home is needed, but if because high unemployment is prevalent in the industry, and the contractors are busy, I should defer that project, I should not meet the needs of the department that's requesting it. You know, he's telling me that I should be using the economic lever of the department to fill in the cycles, the peaks or the valleys of unemployment. I should build personal care homes or office buildings, not because government needs them, but because we may need them in the future, and it may not be prudent to build them when they're needed because there might be a high level of activity in the construction industry six years from now.

I'm sorry, I do not perceive that as being the role of the department. We will build facilities as the department responsible for the provision of space, as departments require them.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, no building should ever be built unless it's needed. That's just given. That is standard.

A MEMBER: What about the garage?

MR. DOERN: Yes, including the garage. We will deal with the garage. But the point is that the government sometimes has an option of moving up a project or deferring a project. Your government has deferred projects. Your government is deferring projects, many of which have a demonstrated need, and we will get to those very shortly.

Mr. Chairman, at this point as well, the Minister has been talking a great deal about the fact that he has 200,000 square feet of empty space. Well, Mr. Chairman, what is he doing about it? He had that amount of space a year ago. He has empty buildings and he is leasing additional space and buying additional space. On one side of the Woodsworth Building and the Court complex are the Land Titles; it's an empty building. The Attorney-General could use that building. It has been standing empty for a couple of years. You're the Minister; you know, you're holding that building empty. Why isn't it being used for court purposes? On the very opposite side of the Woodsworth Building and the Law Courts is the IBM building. We're buying that. So we have an empty building on one side that remains empty and we're buying another empty building on the other side. Well, I'm not sure that that is prudent planning. And if the Minister has empty space why doesn't he sublease it? Why doesn't he sell some of these buildings? I mean, what's the problem? He has been the Minister for the greater part of 18 months. There has been a lot of talk but there has been very little action, and I'm saying when somebody says that they have 200,000 square feet

the question is, what are you doing about it? You know, don't throw your hands up into the sky and say, "What am I going to do?"

It's quite obvious what you should do, and I'm just asking you what you have done? What have you done in the past 18 months, the slight interregnum of Sidney Spivak? What has been done to cut that down, to eliminate it or reduce it significantly, that empty space? And what are you doing right now? Like, are we going to be sitting here next year having the same conversation that you have 214,000 square feet of space? I'd like to know what has been done and what is being done to dispose of that space if it's surplus.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, and to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I indicated when I mentioned the amount of unused space that that's, I think, a constant challenge to the department. But when you have some 14,000—plus public servants, plus a large number of associated agencies of government occupying in excess of 7 million square feet of space in one category and another that changes for internal reasons, shifting around of program priorities, consolidations in some instances that take place. There will be always be, regrettably, a certain amount of space, some of it in various categories; some of it non-assignable; some leases running out at any given time. We're certainly constantly attempting to reduce this particular aspect of it, but the government signs leases and is obligated to live up to those leases. It's not always a question of being able to sublease to somebody on a short-term. The person from whom we're leasing the property has, perhaps, somebody else in mind 18 months or 12 months or 7 months when the government lease runs out, and is not prepared to look at a sublease tenant.

But the member is quite right, it's a concern to the Department of Government Services. Space allocation and the whole question of space is one that ought to be and is and will continue to be of major concern to the members of my staff.

MR. DOERN: I'd like to deal with a couple of specific requirements that will undoubtedly interest the Attorney-General, and then I'd like to move on into the subcategories of the department.

Can the Minister bring us up-to-date on the Brandon Correctional? The two that I want to deal with at this point — and there are many more but I will leave them for the last item under Number 6 — but just in general we're talking about needs; we're talking about space; we're talking about construction and so on. Can the Minister tell us when the Brandon Correctional will be completed?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that an occupancy date of September, 1979, could be realized from our point of view, provided that . . . We apparently are running into some furnishing problems. We suspect or we hope that they will be resolved very shortly, but the occupancy date of September, 1979, is being aimed for.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister confirm that the Brandon Correctional, which was, I believe, under our administration, I believe a contract was let for \$5.1 million or \$6 million — I'm not sure of the exact figure — it has now risen \$2 million because of delays, to \$8 million.

MR. ENNS: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the total project cost for the new Brandon Correctional facility stands at some \$6,915,666.00. General contract cost is \$5,486,000.00.

MR. DOERN: Is \$6.9 million complete with furnishings?

MR. ENNS: So I am advised.

MR. DOERN: And when the contract was let . . .

MR. ENNS: I am also advised, Mr. Chairman, that that was the original projected cost for the total project.

MR. DOERN: The original contract then, you're saying, was \$5.1 million?

MR. ENNS: That was the general contract costs. The total project cost was estimated and is coming in at \$6.9 million.

MR. DOERN: How much was the construction contract in 1977?

MR. ENNS: \$5,486,000.00.

MR. DOERN: And that is continuing?

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. DOERN: Can the minister indicate what deletions and additions were made to that building? I don't know if there were some deletions; there's now the addition of juveniles. Can he indicate what square footage was eliminated or what changes were made and what was added on?

MR. ENNS: There were no fundamental changes made. There were some internal changes made to accommodate juveniles or . . . no. I'm advised that there were no major changes made, Mr. Chairman aside from the original which took off the second floor, but that was provided for when the original contract was let by the previous administration.

The changes that are made are essentially in terms of space allocation within the building, but no basic structural changes were made.

MR. DOERN: In terms of The Pas Correctional . . . So you're saying in essence that the building is the same as originally designed; something was taken off and something was added on, but basically, it's the same.

Now, what about in the case of The Pas Correctional? I understand that the minister is still reviewing that. That that is still on the verge of being tendere, that what is going to be tendered is the jail portion, but not the court house.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it would have been my hope that at this time I could have made some firmer announcements. I've indicated to questioning in the House on several occasions that the project is under review, and when I say the project, I say inclusive of the court house.

There have been different suggestions made that the court house be not proceeded with at this time or that other facilities, existing building space be used or renovated for such use within the community of The Pas. But I can indicate to the committee that at this particular time the project in its totality is under review, including the correctional facility as well as the court house.

MR. DOERN: Can the minister indicate as well, since he's involved with this closely with the Attorney-General, whether he is buying and/or renovating some space in The Pas for juveniles, because the Attorney-General admitted when we were in Debate a couple of weeks ago that after three months. . . Well, let me try again. After a couple of months, because on February 20th the Ombudsman released his report to us and I guess a couple of weeks ago, about three and a half months later, two and a half months later, the Attorney-General indicated that he had examined the Ombudsman's report and that he had come to the conclusion that the province was in violation of several provincial and statutes into the holding of juveniles and adults. I don't federal s know why this took so long. It struck me that this would take probably a couple of days, or a week to determine, but it took two and a half months, and we're now at the point where there is a permit for trailers — which I assume the Public Works Minister has to keep getting renewed — the government now admits that it's in violation of these laws the government will continue to be in violation of these laws; the government will have to continue to get extensions of their trailer permits, and that will continue I assume for at least another year or year and a half at which time there will be a new correctional facility.

So I'm saying, can the minister bring us up-to-date on whether he intends to lease and/or renovate any space to break that juvenile/adult problem?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, juvenile offenders are currently being housed in alternate facilities. It is my understanding a legal opinion has been given to the Minister of Health and Social Development that if a facility provides completely separate access and totally, you know, not in any way connected with the other part of a building, it would conform with the law, the existing law, and under those circumstances, juveniles could in fact be housed in say a new correctional institute if the design of the building provided these conditions. That, I might add, Mr. Chairman, is also part of the current review that is taking place.

The Minister of Health and Social Development has to concern himself with the costs involved, not just the building per se, but the costs of service, of staff, of providing for an entirely separate juvenile facility, or designing a new facility in such a way that it is in compliance with the law, but at the same time can utilize the efficiencies that would obviously accrue if it could be accommodated in one complex, particularly the question of staff and supervision is of concern here. And we're dealing here in a case where I'm advised by the minister, my colleague the Minister of Health, that

we're talking about a population of 6 or 8 on an average, perhaps rising to 12 or 14 on odd occasions. But it would seem imminently sensible if we can, in keeping with the letter of the law, the particular recommendations of the Ombudsman, so design and construct a facility that would provide a separate entrance, total separation from the facility, total separation from the adult offenders, provision for this rather small number of juvenile offenders who, nonetheless, have to be looked after in this way.

MR. DOERN: Can the minister report on the status of the lawsuit — The Foundation Company was awarded a contract by our administration right in the last few weeks — that was long after the land had been purchased and the designs and plans, working drawings completed — contract was let and there was some dispute there and the new administration came in, deferred it for a couple of months, deferred it a little longer and finally, The Foundation Company gave up and now has slapped a \$700,000 lawsuit on the government. Can the minister report on what is happening in that regard?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, in the first instance it's not \$700,000, it's \$600,000, although that's sizeable. We're hopeful that in the current review I again would mention that there's every reasonable opportunity that that may be eliminated. The Department of Government Services is not being pressed by Foundation with respect to this matter. They have, as the Member for Elmwood indicated, made known their claim to us, but have given the government and the department every opportunity to see what will develop with this respect and, I suppose understandably, in the hope that they will be given every opportunity to be once again the successful bidder on the modified project.

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

MR. DOERN: Can the minister provide us with the Construction Estimates for The Pas Court House and Correctional as they were in late 1977 and as they are today? project

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the original estimated cost was in the order of \$6,069,053.00; the modifications that are being proposed and are under very serious review at this particular time are looking at reducing that amount by some \$1.5 million or \$2 million.

MR. DOERN: Can the minister indicate what he's considering eliminating? Can he indicate for example whether the floor space would be the same?

MR. ENNS: To begin with, I'm considering eliminating the judges' bed chambers. We're told that judges don't sleep in their court houses that much anymore in the Province of Manitoba anywhere in the north or here.

MR. DOERN: How many square feet is that?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to . . . you know, it would be erroneous of me to give that kind of information because we simply haven't got it; the modifications, the review is under way.

MR. DOERN: Well again, I wonder, can the minister indicate — you know, he threw out a figure, considering a \$1.5 million or whatever it was reduction. I'd like to know what sort of things are going to be eliminated other than a couple of hundred square feet for some judges' chambers? Is he cutting out a floor? Is he . . . ?

MR. ENNS: We are looking at the basic design of the building. The previous design had something like 38 corners to it for instance, Mr. Chairman, and every corner to a building adds to the cost of the building. If you can reduce the number of corners by half and design a building with 16 corners, instead of 38 corners, you reduce the cost. My friend has dealt with architects in the building trade and will appreciate that. And if you reduce the corners to 8, you reduce the corners you know furthermore. Now I'm not trying to simplify the building, but we are talking about a fundamental change in the design of the building incorporating the same capacity, by and large, in terms of inmate capacity, but looking at a split-level rather than the rambling lodge type plaza that we were contemplating.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know the minister's very good, very fast on his feet and

now he's coming up with this interesting architectural point about eliminating corners and if we follow his argument — and I've never heard that argument before incidentally, but it's brand new in the annals I believe of architecture and engineering — if we pursue your argument to its logical conclusion, as my colleague from St. Vital says, you have a round building, you have no corners.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, that . . .

MR. ENNS: That's been suggested, too.

MR. DOERN: Obviously, the minister is advocating a round building which, according to his knowledge of construction and architecture, is the most efficient building of all because every corner costs money, and to cut corners, Mr. Chairman, is to save money.

I have to inform him that we once considered building a round building, we once considered building a round building, and we were told that it is the most inefficient building that you could possibly design. It's a worst kind of building to design. Similarly, Mr. Chairman, we know that the Norquay Building, which your government designed, is the worst kind of design going — it's what is called, not very fondly by architects, "a rabbit's warren" — you have a central hall, and then you have offices on each side. Nobody likes it. It doesn't work. The best building we know is a square building and, you know, from one squarehead to another you will appreciate the value of that type of design.

So, Mr. Chairman, all I want to say here and then perhaps we can move on is that it'll be interesting to see what the comparative construction costs are of that particular building when it is finally tendered some two years, I suppose, after it should have been, all the while it being a need of government, all the while it being a need of the Attorney-General's Department, all the while the government being in violation of the law, and you know, I'm led to believe, by the Minister, that if it's needed, he'll build it, and he's not going to build anything that isn't needed. Well I say that I would never build anything that wasn't needed either, but when something is needed it should be proceeded with and I say that this is the best example of a building that is overdue and that its need was established years ago, and its original need, I suggest to the Committee, was established probably 10 to 15 years ago in the days of the Attorney-General Sterling Lyon, and the Attorney-General Stewart MacLean. But it took a long time to get it on tract and finally it was on the verge of proceeding and it was stopped. So I can't accept the Minister's argument that he will build needs and requirements, because I believe this is a good example of where he didn't.

And on the Brandon Correctional, I think that the Minister by his own admission reversed his position. He talked about a grandiose and extravagant designs and he just said that he was going to build the same building in essence that we had planned. So I think on first examination the Minister's comments are impressive but on greater examination some of them are just general rhetoric. So, Mr. Chairman, I think that may —

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, not to prolong the discussions, but let me remind the honourable member that the Brandon facility was well under way, and well into its construction phase at the time this administration took over. I can assure him that remodification to that design would have also taken place had the opportunity presented itself to this government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister whether the carry over of capital authority of \$5.7 million has been spent?

MR. ENNS: No, it has not been spent.

MR. WALDING: Would the Minister care to elaborate and tell us how much of it has been spent?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you were looking as the member is to the reconciliation statement at the bottom of the Estimates, I am advised that all but the \$5,742,000 as listed there has been spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b) — The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Then I assume, Mr. Chairman, that an amount of approximately \$25 million dollars

was spent on the acquisition and construction of physical assets in the 1978-79 year. Would that be correct?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that that is approximately correct, some \$24,721,700.00.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister whether that 5.7 million will carry over into the coming year or will it lapse and if so in what way will it lapse?

MR. ENNS: Yes, it will carry over, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b) — The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Don't be in too much of a hurry, Mr. Chairman. Can I ask the Minister then if the \$15 million in Resolution No. 61, includes the \$5.7 million?

MR. ENNS: Without not wishing to wanting to answer the questions as well as I can and the staff capable, but can we not proceed along with the Estimates in order? I'm advised for the member's benefit that it does not include the \$5.7 million.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'm still discussing the Reconciliation Statement, and that's the reason why I ask at this time and I assure the Minister that I would not repeat those questions when we did get down to Resolution No. 61. Can the Minister then confirm that he intends to spend in Government Services the \$45.5 million plus the \$5.7 million?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it will be all of that and with a distinct possibility of more in the sense that the commitments that we have made to departments are such that it's entirely possible that pending the staging of design plans, the staging of actual construction work, it's always a good possibility within the kind of department that we operate that supplementary dollars might well have to be found if projects, particularly some of the more expensive, elaborate renovation projects having to deal with the Fire Commissioner's Code, their recommendations, etc. in the various institutions that we are working on, for which design is proceeding reasonably well, should get onstream faster than might have been contemplated in these Estimates.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, if I follow the Minister correctly, he is saying that it was not \$60.6 million that was spent last year, because 5.7 million of that was not spent. So that the Estimate for last year should have been approximately \$55 million and that the government intends to spend \$45.5 million plus 5.7, so he told me, for approximately \$51 million. So the drop is not \$15 million \$4 , it's only approximately million. Would that be correct?

MR. ENNS: I am advised that in the fiscal year of 1978-79, where we started off with a figure at the top of the reconciliation statement of some \$53.9 million, the \$60 million is the adjusted figure which takes in these accounts; 480 supplementary estimates in Public Works, the allocation for an additional 465 for a general salary increase plus a transfer of some \$15,000 from the Executive Council which is the Minister's salary, another \$43,000 involving some Security costs at Assiniboine College, and then taking out the \$5.7 million which wasn't spent, brings the actual expenditure, I think the member is correct, down to that \$52 - \$53 million level.

MR. WALDING: So approximately \$54 million would be the amount that was spent in the 1978-79 year, can the Minister confirm that?

MR. ENNS: I'm sorry, I didn't get the question.

MR. WALDING: I'm asking the Minister if approximately \$54 million was spent in this department in the 1978-79 year?

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister then confirm that approximately \$51 million will be spent by the department in the coming year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have to indicate that the figure as indicated, total for the Government

Services, at the bottom of the Summary of Programs Sheet is \$45,518,000 and that is inclusive of the 5.7 million that we spoke of earlier to be expended, so the reduction will in effect from the \$53 - \$54 million to 45.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to just get that quite clear, Mr. Chairman, because —(Interjection)— in answer to an earlier question the Minister told me that the \$15 million in Resolution No. 61 did not include the 5.7. Now he is telling me that it does.

Mr. Chairman, it was because he told me it did not include it that I added the 5.7 to the 45.5 and came up with approximately \$51 million.

MR. ENNS: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that it doesn't. That it does not.

MR. WALDING: It's presently two to one now, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister then confirm or deny it, that he intends to spend \$45.5 million plus the 5.7 which he has carried over from last year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the intentions of the Department are to spend \$45,518,200 in the coming fiscal year 1979-80.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister in what way will the 5.7 million in authority lapse?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that \$5.7 million was capital that was voted in previous years and that, you know, in the new changeover to current accounting that kind of capital accounts no longer exist. We had fairly substantial capital accounts in this vote and in this manner in previous years. They ranged all the way from 1970 in terms of \$45,000 to over a million to a high of 1977 of \$16 million.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister will be aware that capital carryover from a previous year does not automatically lapse at the end of the fiscal year. We had some discussions a year ago on this very point with a number of Ministers including the Minister of Finance and the Committee was assured that measures would be taken to see that there would be no carry over in future and that there would be some lapsing mechanism, presumably by means of a Statute or Bill brought into the House. We haven't yet seen one. So it would appear that that 5.7 of capital authority still exists. The Minister told me a few minutes ago that he intended to spend it in the coming year, now he tells me he doesn't. Would he like to have another stab at it?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm told that in this particular instance this was non-lapsing capital. The nature of commitments to specific building or renovation projects — that the money is totally committed and in fact will be spent.

I don't know whether that helps the Honourable Member for St. Vital any, but we're also told that we will not see this kind of Capital any more either. But the money being committed to specific projects and dedicated to be used at the time of completion and the time for withdrawal on the account for these specific projects, that, in effect, even though the money has not necessarily been spent in the fiscal year 1978-79 it is attached money and we regard it as being the money that will be spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is now telling me that that 5.7 will be spent in the coming year. And I ask him again, is that in addition to the \$45.5 million that is shown in the Estimates?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, my advisors advise me that is not to be confused or is not part of the \$45 million that are in the Main Estimates of the department. This is carry-over commitments, responsibilities of commitments made in 1978-79.

Now, I suppose that's a moot point. Money, if it's being paid out in the year 1979-80, the member is quite correct; it's being spent, but for accounting purposes it does not figure into the \$45,518,000 that the department intends to spend.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What I understand the Minister to be telling me now is that he will spend the \$45.5 million that's in the Estimates for this department, plus another \$5.7

million, which is \$51 million in round figures.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that in effect what we will be doing is I will be paying some of last year's bills that, by nature, were not completed and were not called upon for payment in 1978-79, but that this \$5.7 million has to do with last year's commitments and does not change or alter the \$45,518,000 that we're talking about this year.

I think I understand what the Honourable Member for St. Vital is trying to help me understand, is that possibly this only makes sense to senior administrators in the department and not so much to you or I, that the money, in effect, will be spent, except that it's not being allocated or designated in this year's budget. These are moneys that we have owing relative to last year's overall \$60 million program; right? And/or previous years, I am even advised.

Just to use, as an example, Grand Rapids Fish Hatchery construction, which first moneys were allocated in 1974, for which there is still a commitment that we have to pay out of this \$5 million \$152,300 this year, but it's not part of the projects that are included in the \$45 million that I am allocating for this department. It's the nature of the beast that we have projects that carry over a three, four, five-year program, particularly if it's remedial work involved or renovative work involved that causes some of the confusion in terms of the figures.

MR. WALDING: I believe I understand, Mr. Chairman, and I think I understand the Minister's confusion as well, and mine to some extent. Really the only point here is that this department is not showing a drop from 60 to 45; it's showing a drop from 54 to 51. Now, it's the same money that's being spent, whether it's last year or this year. It would affect the total revenues by a certain extent, I suppose, and perhaps show that the increase in spending for the coming year is very slightly more than has been shown by the Minister of Finance.

The Minister did mention, in passing, that the transfer of function from the Executive Council was one Minister's salary. I wonder if he would care to enlarge upon that, please.

MR. ENNS: That was the provision for the salary allocation to, of course, my former colleague and predecessor, Mr. Spivak, who became the Minister of Government Services. There will be some lapsing of that \$15,000 in the sense that it wasn't fully expended. It will be determined when the books close on the department next March 31st. I can only assure the Honourable Member for St. Vital that I am not getting the residue.

MR. WALDING: Well, that was almost the next question, Mr. Chairman. I was going to ask the Minister, since we have already voted him one salary under Highways, whether he is going to get two salaries if we approve one under this department.

MR. ENNS: No such luck, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b) — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Would the Minister repeat for me or enlarge upon the transfer of function from the Department of Education for \$43,000?

MR. ENNS: I am advised that involves the security staff from the Assiniboine College, which previously was within the Department of Education and now, in keeping with the overall responsibilities of Government Services in providing for security services along with all other building-type services, that transfer was made from Education to this department.

I should add, the appropriate amount will be shown as deleted from the Department of Education's Estimates.

MR. WALDING: I ask the Minister whether that appropriation is under 2.(f) Security Services.

MR. ENNS: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: The Minister mentioned Assiniboine Community College. Does the department also assume responsibilities for similar functions at the other community colleges?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we assume similar responsibilities at such institutions such as Red River Community College, The Pas, Keewatin.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister by how many warm bodies has that increased the staff

of the department?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I could undertake to have that information for the member. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there was no additional staff increase to the department. In all instances, these were contracted services to security firms that provide this kind of service.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, in the case of Administration, we saw that salaries have increased. I assume there are no staff man year changes there. In the case of Project Management there is a reduction. Has there been a reduction in staff? Can he indicate how many SMYs there were last year and this year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there has been a reduction in this vote from 28 SMYs in 1978-79 to 23, down to 23, in the year that we're now considering, 1979-80. That accounts for the \$40,000 reduction.

MR. DOERN: I assume that there has been a sharp reduction in the number of projects. Can he indicate, roughly, how many projects there were a year previous and how many are in the department or are anticipated?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to provide that information to the honourable member. I am advised that staff does not have that immediately available, but we can perhaps make that available when next we meet.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister gave us some figures on unused space earlier on. I'd like to go over those again with him and maybe get the full picture on it. Can he give me the number of square feet that were unused as of the end of 1978-79 year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with these figures it ought to be kept in mind that there is some space that is categorized as non-assignable, but the total amounts were of the order that I had mentioned, some 216,783 vacant square feet of space. That involves both in leased and/or owned facilities of the government. That is it does not involve just actual government-owned space; it's also in leased facilities.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister if he can give us the corresponding figure for a year ago April 1st.

MR. ENNS: A year ago, Mr. Speaker, the corresponding figure was 233,000 square feet. So there has been a reduction from 233,000 to 216,000, or in percentage terms it represents 3.1 percent of total government space; last year the corresponding percentage figure was 3.3 percent. The reduction is not all that significant but nonetheless it's moving in the right direction.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister give the Committee any idea of what space was freed up by the reduction of some 1,500 civil servants that we have heard some of his colleagues mention?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the member will appreciate that the reductions, principally through attrition, took place throughout the Service and they do not necessarily reflect in reductions of a particular building or a particular facility that is being leased or rented, or occupied. The department officials are looking to see as to whether they can particularly specify a building or a formerly leased space that can be brought to the member's attention that can be directly identified as not being used now as a result of that reduction. There have been consolidations taking place, and I suppose certainly the overall space requirements of government, as such, have not kept increasing but have shown some decrease.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I have just been looking at the Department of Public Works' Annual Report and I notice that there is a Space Acquisition Branch that is responsible for the negotiation and management of rentals for various space accommodations required by government departments. Can the Minister inform the Committee how many new blocks of space were negotiated by the Space Acquisition Branch during the last year, 1978-79?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the member to allow staff to provide that answer for me.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I was interested not just in the number of new blocks, perhaps moreso the number of square feet that were leased during that year. Perhaps the Minister could find out for me.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have a figure, I'm advised that it totals some 35,757 square feet, for a gross rental cost of \$10,041.00.

MR. WALDING: Just the observation, Mr' Chairman, that the minister had told my colleague that he had sufficient space to empty the Woodsworth Building, and yet during the year he leased 35,000 square feet.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that the member will appreciate — and I did caution the honourable members that I was perhaps inviting that response from the member when I mentioned that, or used that example. The vacant space, of course, is scattered throughout the length and breadth of this province in leases that are running out, or in cases where employees have had use of a particular building and now no longer need it. It not necessarily is contingent on the fact of staff reduction. It's simply that many different departments have different requirements in different parts of the province, at any given time, depending on level of activity of a department in a particular portion of a province. It's simply not possible to equate, you know, the vacant space in the way that the member is suggesting, that I could in fact physically empty out the Woodsworth Building. It was used in my own style to bring to the attention of your colleague, the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the fact that in total, in the grander picture of things, that additional gobs of space were, at this particular time not the immediate priority of the government nor was it necessary.

MR. WALDING: I do thank the minister for those remarks and that clarification, Mr. Chairman. I know that my colleague, the former minister, also understood the situation in exactly the same way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just leaving this subject, I should indicate the members asked quite correctly for the additional new space that was being rented in the year under discussion or the previous year. I should also indicate that cancellations of lease accommodations, and this perhaps comes very close to some of the other questions, totals to some 112,892 feet, or a monthly rental gross figure \$34,587.00. So the acquisition of new space was in the order of 35,000 square feet, the cancellation of space at the same time was of the order of 112,892 square feet. So, again I believe that that reflects the situation that I'm sure the members are aware of is taking place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Well, part of my question has been answered by the minister's last comments. But approximately of that 210,000 square feet that is available throughout the province, approximately how much of that would be within the City of Winnipeg? I say this with the eye in mind of possibly assisting the department in finding tenants to sublet that space or whatever. What I am thinking of is part of that space, the Gimli Industrial Park or . . . I guess staff will have to look that up so I'll carry on.

Does the minister's staff or the Space Acquisition Branch negotiate and talk with Crown Corporations? For instance, are they truly autonomous? Does the telephone company and the Data Processing Centre, and say somebody like Autopac — do they go about their merry way or do they consult with the province to see if we have space available?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in the last 18 months there has been, and members are aware, concern expressed by the government and also to the agencies of government, such as the member refers to, about acquisition of new space and/or expenditures, and has therebeen a system of review through Treasury Board and the department for any space requirements or requests for space requirements made.

MR. WILSON: For instance, if we have 210,000 square feet available — without knowing the amount

that we have in the City of Winnipeg — I'm concerned when Autopac seems to be expanding in the Bank of Montreal Building, and I appreciate that they're autonomous and they have a Board and what have you. It would seem to me that as the former Meer for Elmwood envisioned that he hoped to put them all in one building at a great cost to the taxpayers, and I can see nothing wrong with them being in different branches unless it's completely computerized, and so I'll just leave that observation on the record without soliciting any comment,

It's been suggested to me that in the former Member for Elmwood's riding there is a building that the government leased, called the Snowdon Building. Is it true that the lease ran out and we renewed it again? And why would we do that — is that because the costs of renovations justify us renewing the lease again, or what would be the reason that we would take a government department into Elmwood rather than bring it into the core area of the city?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the member is correct, the lease for that particular building was renewed for a further two-year period, I'm advised.

MR. WILSON: Is that in part to justify the leasehold improvements that the government made at the time they signed the lease on that building?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that in part is the reason, and of course the continued need for the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2) — the Meer for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: . . . review these figures of the difference in lease space from last year to this year, partly based on answers given to the Member for St. Vital.

On one account it sounds like the minister indicated that they wound up, or gave up, 112,000 square feet, and then leased an additional 35,000, which would appear to indicate that there was 77,000 less square feet. However, on another accounting it looked as if there was 233,000 square feet leased surplus a year ago, down to 216,000, which is only a 17,000 reduction.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think if the honourable member will remember, the figures given with respect to the 233,000 versus the 216,000 refer to vacant space. The figures given about the additional acquisition of some 35,000 square feet of space, and the cancellation of some 112,000 square feet of space simply refers to acquisition of new space and the cancellation of old space, not necessarily reflecting on the occupancy or the vacancy of the space, if it's clear to the member.

MR. DOERN: I'm not following the member there, Mr. Chairman. What is the correct figure from one year to another? Do we now have 77,000 square feet less or 17,000 square feet less?

MR. ENNS: I would say that we have 77,000 . . . I think we're comparing apples and oranges, Mr. Chairman. We are dealing in the one instance with vacant space, and the relation to this year or last year. Last year, this time, we had 233,000 square feet of vacant space. This year we have 216,000 square feet of vacant space. That has really nothing to do with additional space or less space that we have acquired or cancelled.

MR. DOERN: Do I understand that there has been a 10 percent reduction in the number of civil servants?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to answer that question, not because I wouldn't want to but for accuracy's sake I think that question probably has been asked, and ought to be asked to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. Again, for accuracy's sake I think the general observation has been made that we're talking in the terms of some 1,480 or 1,500 persons. Now, whether that represents 10 percent, again, I can't properly answer that question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my point is this: That if there was a 10 percent reduction in staff, which I assume is approximately correct, or at least it's a figure being bandied about, if there was a reduction of that order, then there should also be approximately a 10 percent reduction in space, which would be of the order of some 700,000 square feet. And if those figures hold, then the government instead of winding up about 10 percent of its space, equivalent to about 10 percent of its staff, they haven't done very well because on one account they've either wound up 77,000

square feet, or on another 17,000 square feet. It's only a minute fraction. If it's 77,000, that's 11 percent of what it could have been or should have been, and if it's 17,000, it's only 2.5 percent of what it could have been or should have been. So I'm saying why didn't you wind up more space than you did.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the general validity of the honourable member's statements, but it simply doesn't work that way regrettably, I think it will reflect itself more and more. There are several factors that enter into it. In many instances leases are signed for a multiple year period — two, three-year leases being quite common, five-year leases also being quite common with Government Services. I can use, for example, if the press gallery decides to bar two or three of its members, I doubt very much whether their space requirements will be less within this building for instance. By the way, that flew over the ears of the press, but that's all right. I know that it caught the attention of the . . .

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just ask you this general question here. It's the only other one I have under Project Management. Given that there's been a reduction in the Budget, there's been a reduction in the staff, and presumably a reduction in the number of projects. Are all of these people gainfully employed or is there some busy work being undertaken, because I understand that there has been a sharp reduction in the programming of the department, both under Project Management and Design Services, and that given the fact that the government is not as active as ours, that you have architects and engineers and interior designers either undertaking busy work or odds and ends, or even have some high-priced talent doing, well I don't know about playing bridge, but drafting. You have architects drafting or engineers drafting or interior designers drafting, which is good in that it gives them work, but it's bad in that they're being inefficiently and uneconomically used. So I'm asking you — given that your department is less active — what is happening here in Project Management and Design Services? What are the people doing?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly that's a concern that I have. Certainly it's going to be a concern that the incoming Deputy Minister will have to address himself to, in terms of assuring himself and myself as the government, that staff is being appropriately utilized and that staff sufficient to our needs are there, and no more. I would also have to indicate that I think that there will be a number of matters that indeed have been deferred, often for cases of review as is natural when a new government takes over the reins from a previous administration. I would expect that there will be, in a number of areas, heightened level of activity taking place that will require the services of the staff that we are now speaking about. But that's a matter of management that I would hope accountability for will be presented to members of this committee when next we meet, meaning next year.

MR. DOERN: The Minister then, is not going to report on what changes have been made, or whether he's satisfied that in the past year or fiscal year that there has been a proper allocation of staff.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member knows that there has been a decrease of 5 staff man years in this division, and that represents a fairly hefty decrease in terms of the number of people involved, 28 to 23, and I'm assuming that that, to a greater part answers the member's question with respect to whether or not people within this division are employed or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, just one question before we leave this, referring to the announcement, I believe it is today, that the government intends to purchase the IBM Building, I think that's what it's called, can the Minister tell us what the square footage of that building is?

MR. ENNS: I haven't got that available to me at the moment. I'll have it available tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2)—pass; (c)—pass. (d)(1)—pass; (d)(2)—pass; (d)—pass. Resolution 58, Item 2.(a)(1) —(Interjection)— we could if you want — 2.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Could I ask the Minister which would be the appropriate section to ask about South Grove at the Portage Home?

MR. ENNS: Perhaps Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets. I'm advised that that would be the appropriate place, Item 6, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets. Resolution 61.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, my colleague has just pointed out to me or inquired whether it would not come under improvements to buildings and grounds and alterations, under . . .

MR. ENNS: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that that is not the case. These involve strictly housekeeping costs relative to the government-owned or leased buildings, as well as employees' housing units, but not the . . . Normal housekeeping costs for owned or leased accommodations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, before we continue, I just wondered if the Minister could indicate whether he has any particular, I realize that his aim is to complete the department but that won't be possible, but I was just wondering if he has any particular preference to complete another section or two within the next hour, because I personally would prefer to end the committee at a reasonable hour, namely at around 10:30 or 11:00, and I'm prepared to make some progress in that regard, but I wonder if the Minister has any inclinations in that regard.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm hoping that that isn't a veiled threat or outright blackmail. Or that he's not plea bargaining with me, we're not in court, Mr. Chairman. I would like to think that we would carry on without any pressure. I understand the other committee is still sitting, but certainly perhaps for another hour and make some progress. I would be more than prepared to, not insist on completing the Estimates, although I think they might well be completed, but perhaps we could leave the discussion of the Minister's Salary until tomorrow.

MR. DOERN: You see, I believe in civilized hours as compared to uncivilized hours, so perhaps we could go until 11:00 and see how our progress is at that time because I don't see any possibility of completing the Estimates for another couple of hours and I don't intend to stay here until 1:00 or 2:00 o'clock. But if the Minister is so inclined then we can do that but I regard that as barbarous, and I would hope that as a man of culture that he would also find that the case.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on (a)(1), there has been a reduction here of \$1.3 million. I regard maintenance as being a vital factor . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Is the Member for Elmwood speaking to . (a)(1)?

MR. DOERN: Yes. There has been a sizeable reduction in the amount of money available for maintenance and there has been a reduction in the salaries, which I assume means there has been a reduction in staff, and I want to say to the Minister that this could be a prime example of being penny-wise and pound-foolish. Mr. McMillan, who is the head of this department, has the subdivision here, which to I suppose most people has the least political appeal or the least sex appeal of Public Works. Maintenance is not regarded as an exciting venture. However, just as when one drives a car, if one doesn't maintain one's car and forgoes oil changes and other such general maintenance, all of a sudden it grinds to a halt and explodes. One saves money in the short run and then pays the ultimate penalty. So I wouldn't doubt, Mr. Chairman, that when they sat in Estimates and everybody sat around the table and they were looking for a place to cut, that this was thought to be a tremendous area where money can be saved, simply knock a couple of million dollars out, who cares about Maintenance, it's not important, and then all of a sudden at some point in the future, the chickens come home to roost.

I'm just asking the Minister here in general, how he thinks he can just eliminate senior personnel from this department and knock \$1.3 million off their budget because that might be a short run saving, but I expect it would be a very, very expensive and unwise decision in the long run.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Member for Elmwood, I think the reduction here is spaced throughout the division. In the particular one that we are speaking about, there's been a reduction of 2 SMY from 15 to 13. In some instances, positions deleted that were not filled in

previous years. There has been a general tightening up, if you like, of allowing departments and divisions to maintain positions and/or money allocations for those positions even if they were not filled.

The former Minister of Public Works is aware that that was a practice that he exercised and I exercise from time to time. But under the more stringent scrutiny as to the allocations of dollars, that overall practice, not just in this department but generally through ranks of government, that has been the case. I have to believe my staff when they indicate to me that they can operate and maintain those things that they feel are necessary to maintain with the staff complement that we're asking for here.

There's no question that there might always be a situation where additional moneys or additional maintenance might be asked for or desired, but a decision has to be made as to where optimum level of maintenance can be maintained, and in the interest of the taxpayers of Manitoba, at the least possible cost.

For the member's information, in this particular vote we are talking about a reduction of 2 SMYs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass; (a)(2)—pass; (a)—pass. (b)(1)—pass; (b)(2)—pass; (b)(3)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Further to what my colleague was saying, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister give an explanation to the committee of what is meant by preventative maintenance?

MR. ENNS: Under the preventative maintenance activity essential projects are undertaken which will provide required repair, replacement or upgrading of equipment in government buildings as well as structural, mechanical, electrical and life safety systems in government services buildings throughout the province. I just had it on the tip of my tongue right there.

MR. WALDING: Perhaps the Minister can go into a little more detail as to which 50 percent is being cut out of that budget for the coming year.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there is an amount of some \$475,000 that is in the Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets account, Resolution 61, that comes to bear on this particular vote and as such does not affect in a real way the substantial reduction as you see it in your printed Estimates.

In fact I'm advised that there is in effect, a slight increase here. It's concurrent with the kind of maintenance work that is being carried out, I suppose could be put in the maintenance column or could be put in the construction and physical assets column. The department, because of the nature of the maintenance work required, put this \$475,000 in the Resolution 61 column, and I'm advised that contrary to the decrease shown, it is in effect a slight increase when you total that 475 with the 279.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister tell us why it was moved to another appropriation this year and what sort of things are included in that \$475,000.00?

MR. ENNS: I'm advised that this came about, a new definition of the particular work activity involved, the definition being imposed on us by the Department of Finance as to what constitutes acquisition of physical assets and what constitutes maintenance.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'm intrigued as to what sort of things they are and what the definition is and how it is that the Department of Finance should be involved with preventative maintenance.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm constantly intrigued by what the Department of Finance does as well.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the minister knows that that's not an adequate answer. I asked him at least three questions there — he didn't answer one of them. Now, does he want me to repeat them all?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with maintenance costs. When maintenance costs become more of a major project that can be legitimately perceived as an acquisition of physical assets, the Department of Finance has indicated to us that we should then be showing them in

the Acquisition of Physical Assets Resolution rather than as ongoing regular type of maintenance activity. And it's just a question of definition of the work activity within the department that has run afoul with the kind of regulations or guideline directions given by the Department of Finance.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister again what sort of construction and acquisition of physical assets for a preventative maintenance nature?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose it would be this. If I were fixing a few tiles and doing a bit of painting around a government owned employee housing unit, that would come under regular maintenance; whereas if I was to build a verandah and a porch and perhaps put a new roof on, that would be considered as a major type of acquisition of physical assets and the Department of Finance says we should then show it in Resolution 61.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for his hypothetical answer. Would he care to be a little more definite and tell us some of the things that the \$475,000 will be spent on?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, it involves the improvement of surveillance and control of the Archives, Law Courts Building and the Woodsworth Building; it involves the paving of the parking lot, presently gravel; because of poor drainage, it involves roof repairs to the main jail and gym; the Implement Building at Headingly; it involves at Seven Oaks Centre, the supply to install a standby power system; it involves, also at the same centre, the Seven Oaks Centre, \$25,000 for construction of a new storage shed and implement garage; on 189 Evanson, that is the old Grace Hospital, \$15,000 to replace a floor covering on the fourth and fifth floors, and other repairs; again in the same building, it involves an additional \$10,000 for up-grading the lighting system; it involves \$12,000 to replace some window replacement on the Woodsworth Building; on the Legislative Building, some \$20,000 to remove old conductors and install new branch wiring; Agricultural Services complex, to replace incinerator scrubber; it involves at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre some \$14,000 to repair the recreation hall roof repairs; at Red River Community College, some \$15,000 to remove Simplex 27 Station Alarm Control and replace with 50-point Solid State Monitoring Control; again at Red River Community College parking lot, we need a fire hydrant in the Main Loop; Manitoba School for Retardates involves constructing a laundry chute; the Westrow buildings, some \$10,000; the Manitoba School for Retardates again, some \$5,000 to construct staff room and egress to exterior of the Laundry building; it involves again at the Manitoba School for Retardates to reshingle the Dairy Barn; it involves those kinds of projects, Mr. Chairman.

There are a number of others, but I think, see, the kind of systems that we're talking about here are all subject to that definition problem from time to time. Mr. McMillan just advises me that one perhaps better definition is where they are not repetitive. You know, repetitive annual maintenance, or semi, or the maintenance kind of costs are correctly shown or should be shown in the maintenance resolution, whereas major improvements or additional improvements to the physical assets of any of our properties should be shown under Resolution 61.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for the explanation. I understand better now what it is that the Department of Finance was getting at, and why they wanted that separation. I would just ask the minister — further to the list of preventative maintenance items that he gave us — which of those are being done on the instructions of the Provincial Fire Commissioner?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, of this particular vote and those that I mentioned, very few if none of them. There might be the odd, small matter that was raised or brought to the attention of the department through a Fire Commissioner's inspection, but the Fire Commissioner's recommendations are treated separately again in the acquisition/construction of physical assets vote 61 where we can go through the specific, more major renovations that are being proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just if the minister could sum up again. Is he indicating that although there's an apparent reduction from \$601,000 to \$279,000 that this is not the case?

MR. ENNS: Mr. McMillan assures me that that is correct, that it is not the case, that in effect, when you take the \$475,000 that now appears within the Resolution 61, that in effect, there is a small increase in this vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(3)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2)— pass; (c)(3)—pass; (c)(4)—pass — the Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I wonder if under this Section I could get some information. It says, Incidental Expenses, and I consider the government public washroom as somewhat of an incidental building to the Legislative grounds. Would you be able to find out under this Section what the yearly maintenance is of that building and how many months of the year it's open, and what hours is it open? I was rather appalled when walking home one day to notice a great deal of human waste in the doorway which was probably caused by people who had attempted to reach that facility during a storm only to find it locked. I just wondered what are the envisioned hours? I realize that there is some question as to whether the building in fact is needed in the '70s because it was built by the former Member for Elmwood during the hippie craze, and I wonder, does it serve any useful purpose at this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'll endeavour to have for the member an update report as to the operations of the facility that he refers to, the hours, costs, and if we have any information in terms of usage and demand for the facility. I'll have that information for the member tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Maybe I'll ask the minister, when you took over this particular department, do you find a lot of desks and chairs and stuff like that that could be sold at public auction, that are stored? What I'm saying is, do you utilize — is a lot of this office furnishing saved for future usage, or is there an indication that there's sort of a Crown assets wing of our government that disposes of older equipment as it becomes obsolete, or should I use the term. . . In other words, what happens to all the oak desks and everything else that were sort of put into moth balls by the former Minister under the former government? Are we considering disposing of them? Have we disposed of them? Are these not something that, if there is no plan to expand the Civil Service and the operations of government because of the fall season when most university students are looking for desks and that, you'd get a premium price for them. Has there been any consideration to having these sold at public auction, or are they still being kept in storage?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that under the Materials Branch Division there are indeed public auction sales, or lot tender sales, made from time to time. The branch normally, of course, circulates through all the departments of government prior to disposal of any assets as to whether or not there is any, you know, legitimate requirement or need for this government property. I think the member's comments are appropriate and will be noted in terms of whether or not excessive amounts of furnishings are being stored and then, all too often, are not really acceptable years down the line when perhaps new facilities are required, and for reasons of decor and what have you, you know, new furniture is often requested or required.

We have, for instance, — I can give the honourable member some information with respect to disposal activities in the year 1978-79, and we have a summary here of some of the activity by the Supply and Services Division of the Materials Branch that involved, for instance, in furniture, some \$182,020.00. Other items of some \$295,430.00. These amounts of furniture were redistributed internally within governments, as I mentioned, through solicitation of other departments. Sold by auction, outside and precisely on the point that the member raises, some \$217,276 worth of furnishings were sold by auction and by tender sales, some \$594,000, in other words, over half a million dollars. It gives the member some indication that — in general I don't think it would be fair to say that we are mothballing at all; we're certainly disposing of, in this instance, close to \$217,000 by auction, \$594,000 by tender, that amount of unneeded and unrequired government furnishings and/or other equipment, at the same time having redistributed internally some \$477,000 worth of this equipment.

MR. WILSON: Yes, under the improvements to the building and grounds, I wanted to thank the Minister for last year completing the bridge, the Osborne Bridge, the lighting of it and the walkway. This is, of course, leading into the Wolseley riding, and I realize the Minister had a sort of a quandry in that because I had suggested that the government consider having a floating dock, or something that not only the Paddle Wheel Queen, or during certain royalty visits, could be used to . . . I just think, because of the emphasis on boating in Manitoba in the last four or five years, and especially the last two years under our government, the new launching pads and everything, that it would

seem to me that I realize because I owned a boat last year that presented some problem to the Minister, but I wonder now that I've sold my boat if there's any consideration to having docking facilities on the Legislative grounds.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I first of all am vrry sorry to hear that the honourable member sold his boat. However, I can then indicate to him that our new Deputy Minister, Mr. Hryhorczuk, has spent a better part of his first three weeks of service to the government on, or above, or over, Lake Agassiz, and might be considerably more inclined to the suggestion made with respect to the building of dock facilities and/or anything to do with water generally. I take the member's question under advisement.

I must indicate to the honourable member in all seriousness, certain events are being planned, for instance, for Dominion Day, that will focus on the riverbank, the south part of the Legislature. I understand some ceremonies will be undertaken by citizens of Manitoba to mark Dominion Day, and they intend to use boats and/or docks to do precisely that. Whether or not this Minister can persuade my otherwise land-bound colleagues to consider a floating marina or dock at that particular point, is something I think that deserves every serious consideration.

MR. WILSON: I just wanted to close by saying that the reason I said that is that when I was on City Council we had occasion to come down by one of the riverboats, the River Rouge or the Paddle Wheel Queen, and it was a celebration similar to what the Minister is talking about, and I believe Mary Liz Bayer was with us at the time and we had to literally walk the plank and into a muddy area before we could, you know, have these VIP's attend a function at the Legislative Buildings, and I just felt that a city of 600,000 people should be able to hold functions in a sort of a first, or second class manner. In other words, I could envision that piles put into the river, even though they might, because of our icing condition, would only last four or five years, would be a worthwhile investment. I think they would be a lot cheaper than, and I stand to be corrected, but it was suggested to me that the former Minister had envisioned a large, floating barge on which the Royal Winnipeg Ballet and the Symphony Orchestra could play to the citizens of Winnipeg sitting on the riverbank. I wondered if there was a report available as to the Minister envisioning this large gathering on the riverbanks to witness the Ballet and the Symphony on a floating barge. Was there any such thing ever envisioned?

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The vision referred to was the Member for Wolseley's. If it's attributed to me, in my case, it would be a hallucination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member doesn't have a point of order; it's a point of clarification. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to the Member for Wolseley, in all seriousness, if he studies some of the master plans for the development that I referred to at the outset of my consideration of these Estimates he will indeed find that not only were barges, pools and bridges planned for that general area to do precisely that. Now, I may have to take back some of those earlier comments and, indeed, resurrect at least part of that master plan and build the barge or the dock for the Honourable Member for Wolseley, so that he can listen to the Symphony and to the Ballet and such other as the honourable member envisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Because of the improved launching pads and everything in Winnipeg I would be very happy to settle for some form of docking facilities at the rear of the Legislative Buildings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(4) — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, further to what the Member for Wolseley was asking about furniture and storage, and I'd just like to refer back to the case of the missing piano and ask the Minister if he can assure the Committee that the piano is being tuned regularly.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the case of the missing piano has been I suppose one of the motivating factors that led me to plead with my Premier to return to the portfolio of Government Services.

The piano still is not back in its rightful home, namely here in the Legislative Buildings. I understand, though, it's being refurbished and tuned. It apparently has awaited on some parts that were missing and took some time in replacing, but it would be my hope to have that all in place in the very next little while.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, further to the Minister's remarks that his department is involved in some preparations for Dominion Day. I would like to ask him if he is involved or the government is involved in any way with celebrations for Her Majesty's Birthday, I believe on Monday?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of any formal celebrations that the government or this department is involved with.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I recall the Minister's former colleague from Swan River, who was most upset one year when there was not a 21-gun salute for Her Majesty's Birthday and I assumed that when this government took office it would be most scrupulous in so observing the occasion. Is the Minister now telling me that they are prepared to ignore Our Sovereign?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have a problem, of course, I have a particular affection for the Czar in this matter but I am advised that the Department of Tourism and Recreation is the appropriate department that is involved in organizing these activities, and that, undoubtedly, is being done.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I remind the Minister that the Czar is not our head of state.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(4)—pass; (c)—pass; (d)(1) — the Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: No, on (c)(4), where would I ask . . . Maybe I should be asking under Supplies and Services, but I had filed an Order for Return which the Minister was kind enough to furnish me with. What will we use or where can we possibly, or would the Minister consider an overprint to these 10,000 brochures that were printed in regard to the Woodsworth Building? What will you be doing with the surplus copies of these? Is there any way we could have an overprint on the back page and still continue to give them out to visitors of that building? When the opening of the building took place the former Minister ordered 10,000 of these and I don't believe 10,000 visitors attended the opening and I wondered what the Minister or someone on his staff that they had done with the surplus copies.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, firstly, I would hope that the brochures are still being handed out to visitors coming out. I have never given any instructions for it to be stopped. I believe that the brochure, which describes the building appropriately, is and should be continued to be used for that purpose. I would have to check with the procedure and with staff at the building, but I can assure the honourable member that it has not been by my order that the handing out of that brochure is curtailed. I think it's understandable that new brochures to be printed would reflect the changes of the times, but I don't particularly think it would be required to worry about overprints.

MR. WILSON: Except that I believe it's a government policy. I have been concerned because a lot of times at some of the rural points you can still get collector's items with the Honourable Rene Toupin and others still involved in them. But when Ministers of the Crown put their picture and that in a particular document, it would seem to me that unless you have an overprint that the government policy is that it shouldn't be used in a current fashion, and that's what I am concerned about. You have no objection to them continuing to be given out even though the back page has a picture of Honourable Russell Doern at the back page, that doesn't bother you at all?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(4)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that the Minister is prepared to give out the remaining copies because there were 10,000 printed and I am sure that at this point in time probably 8,000 or 9,000 or more have been given out. They were for the purpose of giving to people who came to the building and wanted a tour or wanted something to keep as a memento of their tour of the building. And the Minister, I think, is adopting a much better policy, I suppose short of cutting out his picture on the highway map and pasting it onto this pamphlet, or having thousands of little pictures of himself printed up and pasted on, I think this is only a sensible policy, much more sensible

than what was done in the Department of Tourism, where far more expensive pamphlets were thrown out. And we're going to have an Order for Return; we're going to ascertain how much those pamphlets were worth because some of them were probably of the order of \$1 to \$1.50 per piece in French and yet there are no French pamphlets available. I don't know why on earth they were thrown out.

Mr. Chairman, getting back to 1979, I want to ask the Minister on item (c)(4) Alterations there has been a drastic cut in furniture and furnishings from an amount budgeted at half a million dollars down to \$96,000.00. Can the Minister explain how come there's been this incredible drop in this item?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that is, to a large extent, attributable to the restraint program, that the supply of additional and/or new furniture has been indeed, sharply reduced, but also I would assume that in a sense, and the former Minister would be understandable of this, that inasmuch as even in the previous year we were finishing the furnishings and completions of such provincial buildings at Dauphin and/or even perhaps some additional money at the Portage building, although that may not be the case, but there has not been the new expansion of new office space requiring new furnishings, and there has been a sharp curtailment of furnishings generally speaking, and greater utilization of those furnitures on hand.

MR. WILSON: Under this section, I wanted to just touch upon something. I wanted to thank the Minister for his greater utilization of the lounge and restaurant in the basement. There seems to be a better use of the particular facility now. I would like to table this because I want to quote from it, it says, "The whole project which included a new cafeteria for government employees and a new kitchen cost \$350,000.00. The lounge, restaurant and reserve dining room are expected to open early in April, and the cafeteria has already been completed." My question to the Minister is. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: On a point of order, is this a letter that the member is quoting from would he inform the committee what it is that he is quoting from.

MR. WILSON: I'm quoting from a newspaper clipping, it's actually a combined newspaper clipping, one is headed, "Room for Restraint" and which refers to the former Premier Schreyer and the Works Minister, Mr. Doern, having some difficulties over the expenditures of the government lounge. My question, to bring it u to date, and I will file it . . .

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order, the member should know that it's not necessary to table newspaper clippings, but he should just identify their source.

MR. WILSON: The point is well taken, but the point I wanted to ask is at the time of the construction of that lounge and restaurant, there was a sound system in there, and you can notice it when you look up in the ceiling, and I wondered, how far from completion is that sound system because I'm wondering if it's going to entail a great deal of additional expense, or could with a very limited expense there be taped or piped-in music for the particular restaurant and lounge.

MR. ENNS: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, there would be substantial expense involved in providing that sound system and it is not being contemplated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(4) — the Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Then the question I ask is that there was allowances made for this particular innovation originally, but there's no intention to complete the restaurant and lounge as envisioned by the former Minister?

MR. ENNS: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(4)—pass; (c)—pass. (d)(1)—pass; (d)(2)—pass; (d)—pass. (e)(1)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: There are some interesting recommendations in the Task Force Report, most of which have been ignored by the Minister, but some of which I intend to refer to. The recommendation of the Task Force report in regard to employee housing was that it should be eliminated as far as possible add adequate charges made for the remainder. So I guess the question here is, what is the policy of the Minister in this regard? Are we continuing to build and maintain employee housing, and in some cases there is just no alternative. You either have a home and maintain it, because there is no rental alternative. There may be nobody in close proximity, no town, or u available accommodation, so that you just can't eliminate it entirely, but what is the Minister doing, is he winding down as much as he can the number of government-owned housing and attempting to rent, in lieu of, and how can he account for this reduction here? Is this a reduction because of that policy, or how does he explain it?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the decrease is due to vacant housing units which will cost less to maintain as a result of staff reductions and reorganizations in line departments as being one reason for the reduction in this appropriation. I, in general terms, have to concur with the honourable member's remarks that while the department and the government is attempting to wind down or get out of the business of supplying employee housing in those urban settings where alternate housing is available, it's just simply more prudent to do so but we are also well aware, as the member has pointed out that in certain isolated areas, that cannot be done and we are maintaining the housing program that currently is in place in those situations. For the member's information, we have some 156 housing units of that description that we're currently responsible for and that we maintain. And there is no plan to reduce that number in those areas where it's needed.

But what has happened is that in some instances, in places alternate housing is that cannot be in any way described as remote or where in fact, quite accessible, but as a matter of practice, not just simply from the last administration but over the years, certain categories of employees have been supplied with housing, there has been and there continues to be an effort made in those instances where we are satisfied that the withdrawal of government-supplied housing presents no difficulty or particular hardship or does not in any way prevent the department or government activity involved to having a person on the job and in place because of the lack of housing. Then in those instances, we are indeed trying to get out of the business of housing.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we're starting to approach 11:00 o'clock and we're starting to get into some items which could lead to a prolonged debate. One is Security Services and coming up is the Central Vehicle Branch. I wonder if we completed this section here, Item 2., Resolution No. 58, if the Minister would be agreeable to adjourning or rising for the evening?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, let's proceed for a little while longer and see what we can accomplish.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting area that I would like to make some initial comments on and then save most of my remarks for the Minister's Salary, the question of Security Services. Because there has been some concern in the industry about the arrival of Metropolitan Security, which is now, I guess, purchased by and operated by Duff Roblin, and there has been a concern that contracts appear to be won in ever-increasing number by Metropolitan and there also is concern that some of the standard procedures that were in effect are apparently not being followed and that there are some new innovations, which were not in effect before, which are now arising.

As I said, I just want to make an initial probe here with the Minister and then go into this in some greater detail later. But one innovation which was not in effect before, which appears to be new policy on behalf of the government, is as follows; and that is that before when bids were called or tenders were called, people were invited to submit their figures. Then the bids were opened, presumably in public by the department, and the lowest bidder received the award. That, Mr. Chairman, leaves out the question of quality of service, which I think is something that really is difficult to measure, particularly in cleaning contracts. So that you get the lowest bidder and the result is that you often get a poor quality. You also buy a lower standard. That is a particular problem there.

You also have the peculiarity of some firms attempting to undercut their competitors and, in so doing, eventually dominating the industry. So that there is initial undercutting, then there is the

collapse of competitors, then there is a monopoly by a particular firm and then there is no competition and a skyrocketing in prices.

I want to relate to the Minister a very peculiar experience that I had, I as Minister, in terms of garbage collection, where you had a firm come to the department and say that they could not continue their services at the present contract and they asked for an increase in price. The man in charge, who was probably Mr. McMillan, I think decided or it was recommended to him and he recommended to the Deputy and to myself that the contract be tendered. It was tendered. People, I think, were getting about — I am now going to recall figures of three or four years ago — I believe they were getting something like \$1,400 a month on the contract. They asked for a price increase. They were told they couldn't have it. They wanted 20 or 30 percent increase.

We then called a competition. The same firm that told us that they could not operate at \$1,400 a month because they were losing money went in and, I think, bid at \$700 a month, a half of what they were getting before, a half of what they couldn't live on before. Down they went to \$700.00. I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, that, first of all, they got the contract. The game was called "Kill Your Competition", and I suppose today, although I don't know, that firm probably monopolizes the industry and the other people in the industry probably went bankrupt because this firm was able to undercut all their competitors and were headed in the direction of a complete monopoly. And then, I believe, after operating for a year or two, then wanted a massive increase in their fees. So this is a danger that exists.

Now, in the case of Metropolitan, I understand that there is a new innovation now in effect in the department, which is, in some ways, peculiar, and that is that whereas before, if a tender was called, everybody had to bid. Meaning, in particular, whoever had the contract plus anybody else who was interested. But in the past year or so a new innovation has been put into place by the Minister, and that is that the incumbent now has the special privilege, unbeknownst before, unique now, of being able to match the lowest bid. So that they are now in a very strong position. When the bids are opened, they are told what the lowest bid is. They don't have to bother to bid. It's no use bothering, because it's just a waste of time. They are then informed that the lowest bid is such-and-such and if they are prepared to match it then the contract is theirs.

So I ask the Minister, in the first place, is this now a standard policy of the Department of Public Works? When was it initiated and why was it initiated?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in response to the honourable member's question, I can indicate to him that that is not the policy of the Department of Government Services, nor has it ever been and nor is it our intention to embark on that. I am advised that that has been the case with respect to security services procured for the Corrections Department. The member will have to ask his questions of him, but I must indicate that there may be reasons peculiar to the services involved with respect to corrections, that there may be a case made for that, although I must share with him a belief that it escapes me at the moment.

We have, and operate the procuring of security services, outside security services on a strict tendering basis. I reject and I regret very much that the honourable member would wish to impute that in any possible way that there is a reflection on the tendering practices of the department, and particularly in favour of any particular firm whose owner or principal owner may have indeed had some involvement with the government of Manitoba in years gone by.

I remind the honourable member that when he was Minister responsible for this same department, this particular firm enjoyed a considerable amount of business. I haven't gone over the books to say whether it has increased by the amount that the honourable member suggests it has, or not. All I can say is that the firm of Metropolitan Securities enjoyed a considerable amount of business with the Department of Public Works when the Member for Elmwood was the Minister responsible. That business and the obvious aggressive nature of that firm hasn't changed much, with the advent of one Duff Roblin becoming a principle owner, I want to make it very plain though that the services in this instance adhere to a strict tendering practice and that I don't share the honourable member's concern about the imminent collapse of other security firms in the province.

By way of information, I can indicate to you that the Corps of Commissionaires provides the services in the Legislative Building, Law Courts, Edmonton and York, 1075 Portage, 1181 Portage, Red River Community College; Barnes Security Services provides the service at the major complex at Fort Osborne, the Robert Fletcher Building, the Agricultural Services Building, the Century Plaza facility; and the Metropolitan Security Services supplies the services at Brandon, the Manitoba Archives Buildings, the Highway Services Building, Westrow, Portage la Prairie, the Thompson Provincial Building, Assiniboine Community Colleges and Keewatin Community Colleges.

Mr. Chairman, once again, let me make it very clear that in the Department of Government Services, these services are contracted for on an open and fair tendering way and manner and the honourable member may wish to speculate as to what may or may not happen in the security

industry within Manitoba. I am somewhat at a loss or at odds without some concrete or constructive advice from the honourable member as to how I should operate differently. Is he suggesting that I should accept anything less than the low tender? That I should operate and award contracts to bidders other than the low tender in this instance? Because if he is, that of course opens up another whole area of problems.

I think that in acting in the interests of the Manitoba taxpayer, there is no other alternative open to a person responsible for the administration of the department other than to adhere to the tendering system.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, that's my very point. There are now apparently exceptions under which your department is not adhering to the tendering system. You are allowing incumbent bidders and contract firms to match the lowest bid.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on that point, I thought I made that very plain that is not the case. When a contract runs out all tenders are called and there is no preference given to the incumbent holder of that contract. I indicated to the honourable member that my understanding is that there has been instances of this happening within the Department of Corrections, not the Department that covers Government Services. I'm not aware of the reasons why. There may be specific reasons for the Department of Corrections undertaking that kind of an approach. I question them, quite frankly, and I'm prepared to take up with the Minister responsible, but I want to make it very plain that that is not the practice of the Department of Government Services.

MR. DOERN: Oh, I assumed that Government Services did in fact hire for the Corrections Department.

MR. ENNS: Apparently not, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: What other departments are autonomous in this regard?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member raises a good question. I believe that the Department of Government Services ought to be the responsible agency for the provision of this kind of service to all government departments and I take the question as notice from the honourable member and will make suitable enquiries.

MR. DOERN: I would then ask the Minister to refresh my memory. Has it always been the case that the Corrections Department did their own contract hiring, or is this a new innovation?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by senior members of staff, Mr. McGill, Mr. McMillan, and Mr. Brako, that that indeed has been the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN(f)(1) — The Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: I should indicate to be scrupulously correct in this matter that there have been incidences of isolated cases where either for reasons of time or for meeting an emergency where on a rotational basis the department has called in the services of security people to fulfill a particular job assignment without invoking the tendering practice, but that was done because of the nature of the emergency arising, that in the main and in certainly all normal contract letting the tendering system is adhered to.

MR. DOERN: Well sometimes, Mr. Chairman, the exception proves the rule and I would ask if the Minister can give us some examples of those exceptions where you simply appointed a firm as opposed to called for bids?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the one that comes to mind most readily and one that was indeed raised by members of the opposition in the House is one that occurred not so much under the auspices of the Department of Government Services, but indeed by the management and directors of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. When they felt they had a particular security problem, and I want to be careful not to wrongfully, you know, impugn difficulties with any particular security services, but there was reason to believe, at least within the management of Autopac, that part of their security problem lay with the security firm they employed, and for that reason made an instant, unannounced switch, at a given hour and a given date, and in that particular instance the Security firm chosen was Metropolitan and, as the member will recall, that was cause for question

and concern in the House. In terms of our situation, I'd have to seek advice of the department for any particular instance. I'm advised that in recent times we haven't had any of those kinds of situations arising.

MR. DOERN: In the case of MPIC, my impression was that they were directed by the Minister, or by the government, to employ a particular firm.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I invite the honourable member to ascertain that for himself directly to the General Manager of MPIC, Mr. Dutton. He will advise him that in no way, in fact, was he so directed and indeed, if you want to be absolutely correct, called on the carpet to some extent by the Minister involved, and I happened to be at that particular time the Minister responsible, or answering, for Autopac in the House, that in so doing he perhaps demonstrated some lack of political acumen. I didn't hold that against the Manager; that's not his business. His business is to manage Autopac and MPIC, and he in private conversation indicated to me that, on reflection, ought not to have perhaps picked that particular firm because it did, as I have already mentioned, create a bit of a stir in the House.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, that's, I guess, a matter of judgment as to whether that showed a lack of political acumen, or whether it demonstrated political acumen. Again, on the Corrections Department, can the Minister indicate which, let's say in the past 18 months, can he provide us with this information since that department is now long gone, which firms are being employed by the Corrections Department for transferring prisoners, taking prisoners to hospitals, youths at Headingley, or supplementary to Headingley?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to answer that information. That would have to be asked to the appropriate Minister.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister indicate, does he have any figures on — again, he did give us a number of figures — can he indicate in the past 18 months, in terms of Metropolitan Security, how many additional contracts they have picked up and also how many personnel they had 18 months ago. I'd like to know, let's say, 18 months ago, how many contracts did they have, how many do they have today, how many men did they have then, how many do they have today?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that will require some addition. I can provide for him an indication involving the year 1976-77, which indicated that at the facilities of Brandon, the Archives Building, the Highway Services Building, Westrow, Old Grace Hospital and Whyte and Vine was where the Metropolitan Security firm was employed, six contracts, I suppose. In the year 1977-78 the same firm had six contracts. In the year 1978-79 the same firm had six contracts. There has been no substantial growth in terms of individual contracts, although I see some expansion of the numbers involved. Again, by way of comparison, if we take the Provincial Archives Building, in 1976-77 some — and these are dollars, of the contract value, some \$42,700 was paid out to Metropolitan Security for provision of services. In 1977-78 that contract rose to \$57,000, and that contract now in 1978-79 is \$61,000.00. I must assume that that reflects principally increased costs in terms of wages and salaries that were contemplated in the contract and/or some additional staff. I can't break it down in staff numbers for him.

The contracts are written out essentially in hours, again, not particularly covering individual persons involved. But by the same token the Barnes Security Group at the Fort Osborne complex, which they enjoyed the contract in 1976 — the contract was worth some \$38,900; in 1977-78, \$49,400; and in the year 1978-79, \$50,700, more or less the same escalation of costs. In further response to the question, that particular firm enjoyed some six contracts in the year 1976-77; in the year 1977-78, four and in the year 1978-79, four. I don't think the accumulation of business by one firm is of the nature of the scale that the honourable member suggests, although I would not deny that undoubtedly some growth has taken place, but I again have no particular answer for the honourable member other than to say, or rather than for him to suggest that I should depart from the tendering system.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to see those figures, and perhaps for our next session, which I assume will be possibly next week, because I assume we're going to conclude shortly, I assume tomorrow is going to be Budget, and then there's going to be a lot of Budget going on the next week. But let's say for next week, could the minister just provide us with a simple total

of the number of contracts held by Metropolitan, the dollar value change from 1977 and the number of SMYs since 1977 for, let's say, next Tuesday, as an example?

MR. ENNS: Staff is taking note of the questions being asked, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Another question I want to ask here on security is: Is it a standard practice of the department to open the bids on security contracts in public? Now, I know, although I've never seen it, I'm told it's really a show that you have to see, that Sam Sims is the quizmaster and that all the bids come in, and with great flourish he opens up the envelopes, and then it's written down on the board and everybody is sitting there and they're all recording this — it's a bit of a show.

MR. ENNS: \$64,000 question.

MR. DOERN: That's right, which the minister would appreciate being a bit of a showman himself, and it's done with a lot of panache but it's all done correctly. It's all done according to tradition, namely, that the tenders are submitted and the bids are opened and they're recorded, and everybody's there on a given day at a given time, and they see what happens at the public opening.

Now, I assume that the same sort of activity could take place, or should take place here, although the government has all kinds of bids on a variety of ways. The Purchasing Department and so on, I don't know what they do with their thousands and thousands of bids and openings. I don't know how they handle it. But I'm told from someone in the security field, that they were taken aback at submitting a tender for a particular contract, and then discovered that it wasn't going to be opened at that particular time. Let's say, if it was going to be 5 o'clock that day, it wasn't going to be opened that day; it was opened somewhere within the following two weeks, and then the information sort of trickled out. Now, is it standard policy that on a given time and a given place, the contracts are opened and made public, or is it done in house, which would make a losing company suspicious of the fact that a winning company might have been tipped off or given another opportunity to match or better a low bid? That is the kind of concern in the industry. I'm just asking you, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, how are bids handled in the provision of security services?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that they are usually opened at high noon in the glare of the sun, and open to the public, particularly those who are, of course, directly involved and interested in being present. If the member has a particular contract that he refers to that was handled in another manner, then I would appreciate being made aware of that. My staff advises me that the procedure that the member outlined in some detail is precisely the procedure that's being followed.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, a final question here on this section, and then I will appeal to the minister to adjourn for the evening. I ask him this last question, and there's always a problem here, and I think that any minister in Government Service would face it and so would the director. And that is: Are contracts tendered on a regular basis, namely, in some cases I guess they've gone on for years and they're renewed. In other cases, I guess bids are called for regularly. But where you have sort of an uneven or variance in policy or a number of approaches — if you're going to adopt the practice or if you have the practice of calling for new opportunities in contracts, does the government have a standard policy whereby, let's say, they've decided to take all security contracts and throw them open to tenders on a regular basis, or do you have the policy where work is satisfactory, that you generally allow people to continue?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that with the exception of the Corps of Commissionaires, where we do not go to tender, that we are now and have been for some time going to regular tendering. I'm advised that contracts of two, and perhaps three year duration have a termination date to them, and that at that time, new tender bids are invited. The indication is that there have been instances in the past, or past practice has allowed in some instances a situation to develop where renewal of existing contracts or extensions were continued, but that practice has been dropped and the director involved advises me that we're as a matter of policy within the department, on a regular basis putting termination dates to contracts, and then calling for renewal. Though the average contract length is three years, there are also two year contracts available.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, in letting this section go, I would then once the Chairman passes

it again, appeal to the minister to adjourn because I want to be fresh tomorrow morning when the Member for Inkster harangues the government at about 10:30, probably followed by the minister himself. This is going to be something that shouldn't be missed and everyone should be up to the occasion.

MR. ENNS: Every time the Member for Elmwood appeals to me to adjourn, he, of course, makes it more difficult for me to do so, because to do so would display a certain amount of weakness and lack of will and courage and character on my part. I just mentioned to the honourable member a little while ago, that I was prepared to adjourn at this point, but now I have to face that difficult decision of bowing down to the pressures of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. It makes it very difficult. So we must proceed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, then I withdraw my suggestion that we adjourn.

MR. ENNS: Then I would suggest that we adjourn.

MR. DOERN: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRN: (f)(1)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, did the minister just mention in his answer to the last question that he does not tender those contracts that are held by the Corps of Commissionaires?

MR. ENNS: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. We follow in that instance the same policy that the City of Winnipeg, I believe, follows. We did this year anyway.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the minister why those contracts are not tendered?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that's a matter of longstanding tradition and history. We have regarded that particular group of employees and persons as deserving of some special consideration in this instance. I believe it initially began, I suppose, with respect to recognition of their veteran status, and that particular status has continued to be recognized by employing agencies, whether it's the City of Winnipeg, and/or the Province of Manitoba.\$

MR. WALDING: When the minister speaks of special consideration, is he suggesting by that that it could be done cheaper by one of the other companies as, for instance, the City of Winnipeg found out when it put it out to tender I believe this very year?

MR. ENNS: Yes, I'm suggesting precisely that, Mr. Chairman, although I'm not indicating that that indeed is the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Will the minister give us an explanation on (f)(1) as to why the amount is down some \$70,000 this year?

MR. ENNS: There has been a decrease in the SMYs from the year 1978-79 where we had 45 SMYs to this year's request to 36. That is the principal amount of the decrease accounting for some \$74,400.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Can the minister tell us in which category or classification are the nine less SMYs?

MR. ENNS: They are in the building guards positions - 5; 1 clerk, classification 3; 1 Administrative Officer, classification 1; 1 Term position, for a total of 9 SMYs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Can the minister tell us which locations the guards are employed?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would have to seek that advice from the department and perhaps answer him tomorrow. I'm advised that that's not readily available at this moment. We'll take the question as notice.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the minister if there have been any locations where the government has employed security guards that it has put out to private tender?

MR. ENNS: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I was yawning and I didn't understand the honourable member's question.

MR. WALDING: I'm asking the minister, were there any occasions where custody or guardianship of a particular establishment was done by guards employed by the government that were put out to tender and then transferred to a private security agency?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that I can provide more detailed information on this question to the honourable member tomorrow. There's no particular instance where this has happened, although in some sites such as Portage and at Thompson, there's been a mix, where in the past we have perhaps had several, that is, security provided by the department — there have been additions to that by the employing of some outside agency in this instance. But, I'll get the details of those instances.

MR. WALDING: Can the minister tell us whether that would account for the drop of 5 in the number of guards for this year, or whether there is some other reason?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that information will be made available to the honourable member when we get the details of this tomorrow, but I would assume that, in some instances, it is a simple question of reduction where we thought it was possible and indeed, and perhaps in some instances, in some of the 112,000 feet of space that has been cancelled, in terms of leases, where it is no longer required.

MR. WALDING: As far as these 5 guards are concerned, are they people who have been laid off or otherwise moved by the government, or is this an indication of something that will happen in the current fiscal year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the department, under my direction, will search out and seek out in those instances, and not necessarily in this particular field, but in many of the services that we provide, whether it's caretaking and/or other services to contract out to the private sector wherever it's available to us and where, in the judgment of the department, the work can be done to the satisfaction of departmental requirements and where, in fact, a work force or sufficient companies are available to tender and to bid for this kind of work.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the minister didn't answer my questions, so I'll ask him again.
As far as this reduction of 5 guards is concerned, have those 5 guards been laid off in the last fiscal year, or are they going to be laid off in this fiscal year?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm apprised that in each instance the 5 involved — they are currently vacant positions, vacancies arising out of resignations and, in no instance, is an actual layoff involved.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the minister the same question regarding the other 4 positions.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, again I'm advised that they are currently vacant positions that, in our judgment, need not be filled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1)—pass; (f)(2)—pass; (f)—pass.
Resolution 58: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$22,742,400 for Government Services—pass.

MR. ENNS: Committee adjourn. Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion Committee rise. (Agreed.) Committee rise.

SUPPLY — DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members to Page 60 of the Main Estimates, Department of Labour and Manpower, Resolution No. 78, Labour Division. We are on Item (f), Conciliation Services; (1) Salaries— pass — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, first we should welcome the Minister back to the balmy tropics after having just left what I understand is a fairly full-blown blizzard in the month of May in Thompson. So I'm certain the culture-shock, or the weather-shock, won't be too much for him this evening, and we do welcome him back.

When we were last discussing this item on Tuesday there was some comment as to the number of conciliations that were successful this year, and the Minister at that time said that they had a 77 percent success — and I'm quoting him — a 77 percent success, which I think is an interesting figure. And the Member for Logan at that time commented on that figure, but I think we have to put that figure in perspective. And can the Minister confirm that a 77 percent success rate in disputes settled with conciliation officer assistant without a work stoppage occurring is, well, tied for the lowest success rate in the last 10 years, the only other year being 77 percent would be 1973, and that by and large it averaged closer to 85 to 90 percent success rate — excuse me, I'd have to say closer to 85 percent. Over the last decade the conciliation service success rate has averaged closer to 85 percent, and this year dropped from an 82 percent in 1975 to 86 percent in 1976, to 79 percent in 1977, and 77 percent in 1978. And can the Minister explain in his opinion why there was such a low success rate in successful conciliations without work stoppages for the year 1978?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): I think possibly the same particular reason that we had, that the whole country in fact had some problems last year, I think the situation of coming out of the AIB had certainly a psychological effect on possibly all parties across the country, and that without question had quite a bearing on the feelings of all sides going into negotiations last year.

MR. COWAN: Yes, if I understand the figures correctly, these are October to October figures for the conciliation reports and the annual. The Minister indicates yes. Is there any indication of the efforts, the success rate of the efforts in the Conciliation Department, from the conciliators, since October of 1978 — that would give us a five or six month period — has there been any indication if this trend has been reversed, or if it is continuing in fact?

MR. MacMASTER: We've had, I don't know if it's exceptionally good, but it's certainly a very good record in the last five or six months.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, I think time will tell if the record indeed came about as a direct result of the removal of the AIB, ..., the removal of the wage controls or if it is another indication of the general levels of conflict and confrontation which seem to exist throughout the society around economic matters in the last number of years. Can the Minister indicate if we would talk about the Public Schools Act conciliations under this department also?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, conciliation services have been taking place in the education sector.

MR. COWAN: Yes, well then I think that we should take note also that while there were a fewer number of conciliations of course in 1978, in fact due to the fewer number of employers and employees affected by this particular section, the number of settlements with the Conciliation Officer's assistance as a percentage of the total is 63 percent and indeed is also a fairly low percent in comparison to other years. Although it is not the lowest percentage that has occurred in the last decade, it is near to that. So I think we have to make note for that and we have to hope that those conditions which are creating the sort of industrial climate that gives rise to work stoppages, either stoppages instigated by the employers which would be in the case of lockouts

which we saw a great number of last year, or stoppages instigated by the employees in the case of strikes. We hope to see that that climate reverses itself and we feel that it is incumbent upon the government to use its offices to help create a climate whereby the antagonism level is reduced and we have more successful conciliations and fewer resorts to work stoppages of any nature.

Can the Minister indicate if there has been any change in the methods of conciliation or if any changes in the methods of conciliation are being considered for the upcoming year or if we will be following basically the same pattern that has been historically followed in this field?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, in Manitoba we're blessed with some of the best conciliators in the country and I don't see any reason to drastically change their approach to conciliating or even to suggest it.

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Yes Mr. Chairman. Since the Minister has stated that, since October of '78 the percentage of settlements via conciliation has improved, I wonder if the Minister at this time, or his staff has figured out the percentage, whether the percentage has increased from what he gave us on Friday, prior to October '78, from October '77 was about 77 percent. What would the present percentage be, say for the last six months? Is it possible for the staff here to give us that figure?

MR. MacMASTER: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should be ashamed to admit it, Mr. Chairman, but I still don't know the procedure in conciliation. I've never been involved in that particular part, and I want to ask the Minister a very short and simple question. I understand in the strike effort, when bargaining bogs down, then he's brought in to try and make a settlement. Is that right? Good. Both sides agree to bring the conciliation officer in. Is that right? Both the union and the corporation. —(Interjection)— Either side. Either or both. But they both have to agree to bring them in, do they, or can one side do it?

MR. MacMASTER: One side.

MR. BARROW: One side. Well how do they choose, how do they choose the person they want to represent —(Interjection)— Pardon?

MR. MacMASTER: Maybe there is some confusion between conciliation and arbitration. We assign conciliation officers when we're requested and with arbitration, both parties of course, have to get together and agree on an arbitrator. There is a difference between arbitration and conciliation.

MR. BARROW: And then the conciliation officer can be sent in without either side actually coming to agreement of who he should be? Is that right?

MR. MacMASTER: They're appointed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARROW: They are appointed by the government?

MR. MacMASTER: By the Director.

MR. BARROW: Director of . . .

MR. MacMASTER: Of Conciliation Services.

MR. BARROW: I see. So then neither side has any say of who that person should be. I see.

Now, their salaries, the remuneration runs to \$200 an hour. Is this —(Interjection)— Not conciliation?

MR. MacMASTER: That's arbitrators.

MR. BARROW: I see. Then the conciliation officer is paid on an annual basis. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Since the Minister says that the conciliation services of his branch are also used by the disputes under the Public Schools Act, how many of the conciliation services that took place last year, how many was his department with the various divisions, were they involved with in the year October 1977 to October 1978?

MR. MacMASTER: 28 were initiated during that particular year.

MR. JENKINS: And of the 28, how many were they successful in getting both sides to come to an agreement, and how many were unsuccessful, where I believe under the Public Schools Act they go to, I believe it's binding compulsory arbitration. Am I correct? What would be the percentage that we were successful on conciliation and what . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I just make a statement. As Chairman, I guess part of my responsibilities are to see that everything that is spoken in the Chamber is recorded and if we have a procedure of questions and answers, we can get it all recorded for the record, which is, I would think, the intent. So if we would just proceed on that, if you ask a question and sit down, you might or might not get an answer, but I would suggest that that's the procedure that we follow. The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Nine were referred to arbitration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (f)—pass. (g) Pension Commission. (1) Salaries — pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Could we have a breakdown of the staff here in the Pension Commission?

MR. MacMASTER: There were 5 last year, Mr. Chairman, there are 6 this year. The positions are the Superintendent, the Senior Analyst, an Analyst, Administration Officer, last year they had a clerk-typist and this year they'll have two clerk-typists. There is a pension commission made up of citizenship members, Mr. James is the Chairman, Mr. Gajdosik is Vice-Chairman, and the members are Mr. Dubery, Mr. Battershill, Mr. Edgar, Mr. Corp, Mr. Friesen and Mr. Jacob. And there were 18 commissioned hearings during the year 1978.

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

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, of the five positions he had last year, were the five funded, no vacancies; and this year we have a staff of six, no vacancies, all filled? Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, I wonder if the Minister would give us a brief outline of the Pension Commission's role and how much success it has had.

MR. MacMASTER: Your pension commission in Manitoba is responsible for the administration and enforcement of the pension benefit pacts for Manitoba. Its objectives of course, are to promote the establishment and extension and improvement of pension plans. They administer agreements with other Canadian jurisdictions providing for reciprocal registration, they arrange for provision of information to employees concerning pension plans, they inspect and audit pension plans to insure compliance with the provisions of the Act. It's incumbent upon this commission to insure that promises made to employees and contained in the pension contract are delivered. This year they're going to be attending a great number of meetings throughout the province with a large variety of groups and peoples, organizations, promoting the pension theory, I guess. There are an awful lot of organizations that have not got pensions, do not understand what they are. There are groups of working people who do not have pensions.

The portability aspect of pensions has always been of some concern to myself and at the Manitoba Federation of Labour's presentation, their annual presentation, I spoke to them about my concern for this and hoped that they shared it and they certainly did. And we have had some good dialogue with the MFL, I think the unions have a fair role to play in assisting in promotion of pensions, particularly in the trades where they are floating and men are going all over the place. There are

just too many people coming to that sunset time in their life where they haven't established any type of pension and it's of concern to myself as a Minister and this government and our staff this year is going to be doing what they can to promote pensions throughout the province of Manitoba.

MR. FOX: Can the Minister indicate whether all employees\$

MR. FOX: Can the Minister indicate whether all employees pensions have to be registered with the Pension Commission, and if so, whether they have complied or whether there are some that are still outstanding?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, they all have to be registered with us and comply with us.

MR. FOX: Have they all registered? That's the next question.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, with the reservation that there might be one someplace somewhere that we're not sure of, that we don't know about, but by and large we think that they're registered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This Pension Commission, does that have any affect on the mining corporations: the Hudson's Bay Mining; INCO; Sherritt-Gordon?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, they are registered, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARROW: How does this apply then with the jurisdiction problem? Would it still apply even though the jurisdiction is a problem?

MR. MacMASTER: We have reciprocal agreements with other provinces, Mr. Chairman, which covers the specific instance that the Member for Flin Flon is talking about.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, here is a golden opportunity with a problem I have and I'm not sure how to solve it, but with his help I think I can do it. A miner who is worn out, suffered from a lot of injuries, whatever, he wants to retire before he's 65, or he hasn't got the 60 and 30 element. So if he just retires, then the drug and medical doesn't apply to him. So we have a gentleman who had four months to go — four months — and he was quite capable of working those four months to his age 65 which would have made these drugs available both to him and his wife, who needed this, and they come to an average \$150.00. The man couldn't speak good English; he was very hard to understand. He took his problem to different people and through misunderstanding he retired voluntarily, so the company just wiped their hands of him. So that man, through not understanding, is stuck with a bill of \$150 a month, that could have been settled by him working the four months which he could have done. Now what can I and you do to solve a problem of this type?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really don't know what to say. I don't know where the gentleman worked; I don't know what the circumstances were, you know, taking for a fact exactly what the Member for Flin Flon has said. I don't know whether this happened two weeks ago, or five years ago. The benefits that are outside are not the concern of the pension, but if in fact this took place, I don't know if there is anything specifically I can do, but I would certainly like to get the details and find out who it is, and find out why this in fact happened. I really don't know what I could do about it until I got the details and knew the entire story on this situation.

MR. BARROW: I appreciate what the Minister is saying and I understand. But if I agree to get all the details, the dates, the names, the circumstances, then would the Minister agree to look into a problem of this type?

MR. MacMASTER: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARROW: Thank you.

MR. FOX: I wonder if the Minister can give us some figures on the number of pensions that

have portability, also the kind of vesting there is, whether some have early vesting, some have late vesting, whether he has any breakdown on the pensions in Manitoba in that regard?

MR. MacMASTER: After 10 years of participation in Manitoba, full vesting is in place. On the portability, we'd have to dig through the files the numbers and the specific circumstances, but there is some reciprocal agreements in place. And then the third thing I could say, is that we're working with the trade unions right now in an effort to see if some — and I hate using the word "national" because I don't have the jurisdiction in other areas, but I think that's row down to. There's going have to be a really what it's going to be national understanding in relationship to trades, and starting with the unions themselves and companies and provinces. I don't know if that helps. If the Member has a little more detail of what he wants, I might be able to dig it out for him.

MR. FOX: First of all, in respect to portability, I would imagine the Minister was indicating that there is portability in respect to the Civil Service between provinces and also probably between the federal government. I was asking if there were any pensions registered in the private sector that had portability clauses in them and if he could indicate if there were any of those kind and also, in respect to vesting, he said there was 10 year vesting. Was that for the Civil Service or for the average for all pensions?

MR. MacMASTER: It's 10 years for certain and some have less. Now, I don't have the list of those that have negotiated something less. The only portability on companies — now I can do a little more research on it — that we're really aware of is intertransfers between companies, I mean the same company transferring maybe into Ontario, an employee, or back to Saskatchewan or out to B.C. We know that certainly is in existence.

But I think what the member is saying, from Dominion Bridge to Inco or from Safeway to some bakeshop, I don't know of any at the moment, but we could do some digging. It's just an area that too much hasn't been done.

MR. FOX: Is there some study and research into creating portability in the private sector pensions?

MR. MacMASTER: Could the member repeat the question?

MR. FOX: Yes. Is there some study or research into creating portability or how it could be achieved in the private sector?

MR. MacMASTER: We like to believe that we have, maybe not enough information, but we certainly have enough that we will be going out and talking to associations and businesses and industries. This particular year with, I don't know which comes first, the portability push or the actual establishment of pensions. There are just so many areas within society that do not have pensions, so it's kind of a double thrust sort of a thing. The portability is important to all of us and it happens to be sort of close to my heart. And the establishment of pension plans of some type at least to get them established and get them going in various areas is of concern to us too.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reason I approach this question is because as the Minister is probably aware, there is tremendous mobility in the labour market due to technological change and many other factors, including the fact that there's unemployment. And for that reason I think, because the Canada Pension Plan itself is insufficient to carry people, there would be a desirability to have more portability and also earlier vesting.

And I do know that in some instances, there are paid up annuities on decisions by employees to leave, but that always doesn't work out too well because it just doesn't give them the added benefit of carrying or increasing their amount as they go along in their years as they contribute to the pension plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was interested to hear the Minister state that his department will be making an effort this year to sell the pension idea to parts of the private sector, I imagine it would be mainly, where no pensions exist at the present time. And I was quite interested in what little information he did have on the portability. I imagine as the Member for Kildonan has said, that the portability in the main is between the public sector employees of Manitoba and other jurisdictions and in turn with the federal government employees. Does it also work the other way

down? Is there portability say, from government civil service, say, to the public service of the municipalities and cities within the province of Manitoba. Is there any portability in the pensions in that respect? Or are we again looking at a different type of pension?

And of the pension funds that we have in the province, and I realize that there can be many, many types of pensions, but is it possible for the Superintendent of Pensions, I guess that — do we have such a person in Manitoba, Superintendent of Pensions? — The the Minister can acknowledge we do through his office. Of the pension plans that we have, how many are administered by a joint union management set-up fund, as opposed to the pension plans where they set them up with a private insurer. I'm talking about. . . well, I know in the federal jurisdiction, which I'm perhaps a bit more familiar with, the railways have their own pension plan, which are in turn registered with the federal Superintendent of Pensions. And there is a time limit also given xy virtue of becoming registered where these pension funds must become completely funded.

In other words, that boils down to, I think as far as the two railways are concerned, I won't be around and I don't suppose too many of the members in this House will be around, I think it was some five or six years ago were given 60 years in which to completely fund the plan. And I realize that the pension plan that we have here for civil servants and government employees in Manitoba is not a completely funded plan, but in The Pension Benefits Act that we have now — and I just don't recall because it's a few years since we dealt with The Pensions Benefit Act but is there a time limit for new pension plans being set up to the day that they must be completely funded? In other words, I really think, and I may stand to be corrected, but I'm not aware of too many pension plans in Canada that are completely funded. And what I mean by completely funded, that for a dollar contribution by the employee, there is a matching dollar contribution by the employer at the same time.

Is this being looked at by the department? Because what happens over a period of time, I know in the two CNR and CPR pension plans there are over a billion dollars, I think, in each of the plans, one is close to a billion and the other one is over a billion dollars, and the company portion of paying that pension for the person when he retires only takes effect after that person retires. It will only be after 60 years duration that the plan will be completely funded, whereby there is a dollar-for-dollar matching at the same time into the plan. I'm interested to know if the Minister is thinking of that portion of the plan for pensions here in Manitoba.

One of the problems we suffer in this country is that perhaps when, in 1965, the federal government, the Minister of Health and Social Development federally at that time, the Honourable Judy LaMarsh, was pushing the idea that unfortunately many people were scared off from the concept of a completely funded pension plan. And while we have social services here in this country, we have them spread over so many baskets that really there are some people who are amply provided for in the pension schemes by the fact that they have contributions to the Canada Pension Plan, they have contributions to their plan, if they're fortunate enough to work where there is a pension plan in force, and they receive Old Age Security when they retire. But there are places, unfortunately, that the only pensions available, and there are still a considerable number of people, not only in Manitoba but all through the country that are not covered by pension plans, period. So it would be interesting if the commission, when it is meeting and deliberating, whether they will be coming up with any ideas. Perhaps the Minister has some ideas on some of the things that I have raised.

Another very good point was raised by the Member for Kildonan, and that is the vesting. I know it's a very hard thing to sell to young people that there should be vesting in a pension plan, when they're young and they feel that they can go here, there and everywhere, but does the Minister feel that 10 years is too long? And what is the age limit? Is there an age limit? Like I say, it's so long since I looked at The Pensions Benefit Act, but I believe it was either age 40 or 45 that the 10 year limit comes in, because the federal plan, I think, is up to age 40 before the vesting takes place and the limit of, I believe it's 10 years federally as well, as what it is here provincially.

But if the Minister could share some of his thoughts on this, since he has stated that he is very interested in the pension scheme, and I can assure him that there are members on this side of the House who are equally interested in seeing the pensions of this country being improved, and especially in view of the fact that there has been hearings on pensions and attacks on the concept of pensions by various groups in our society.

I think we all realize that the boom of the future is not going to be the baby boom, it's going to be the boom of the senior citizens because we are, with improved health facilities and the prolongation of life, we are having more and more people who are living past pensionable age. I think it was only 10, 15 years ago, as far as I know, the actuarial computations of the company that I worked for, the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the average age of a pensioner after retirement, which at that time was 65, was approximately I think 3 years, 9 months and so many days. That

was the average after the age 65. And that figure has jumped dramatically I know. I haven't the latest figures, but I'm sure that it must have at least tripled, if not quadrupled from what it was, say, 15, 20 years ago.

I know there's another concept that's come in there because now it is possible for people to retire at age 60 without a cutback in pensions, and I know this happens in various pension schemes. And so that again would put the age of those who, from the time of pension until the time of their leaving the mortal coil here, so that that time of pensionable years has increased. And it's the fact that we're going to have to look at this seriously in the future, and perhaps look at an amalgamation of many plans into, well, hopefully maybe the best would be a very much improved Canada Pension Plan with some much more stringent rules on the investment of the money that is being put in.

I'm not knocking that some of that money has been going to the provinces for development, but if they have been getting it at a very favourable rate, this province is in no. . . I'm not saying that this province was any worse offender than any other within the concept of the country, and we know the exception of Quebec where they have kept their money within Quebec Pension Plan, but I think that we're going to have to look seriously, and it's perhaps something that the Minister, as the Minister responsible for pensions here in Canada, when he's meeting with his federal counterpart as he will within the next few years, that perhaps his department should be doing a study on pensions and making representations at a federal-provincial conference which seems to be the vogue nowadays. I don't know what it will be like under a new government, but it seems to have been the thing for the last eight or nine years, that many of these conferences take place. Perhaps the Minister, when he's involved in one of these, could put this forward.

There's another thing I could ask the Minister, too. Of the pension plans that the civil servants have here in Manitoba, is it an integrated pension plan integrated with the CPP or is it a stacked plan? The Minister, I'm sure knows what I mean by integrated and stacked. Does the superintendent and his department, the pension commission, what percentage of the private plans are they aware of that are integrated and what percentage are stacked? So if the Minister has any thoughts on that and he can give us a few answers on some of the questions that I've asked, I'll just sit down now and let him reply.

MR. MacMASTER: In Manitoba, approximately 30 percent of the pension plans are trustee administered, but those 30 percent in fact represent the largest bulk of the people, if that's understood. The vesting in relationship to vesting, if you're 45 or over you can not take the vesting out. If you're under 45, you can take yours out and the company defers payment of theirs until you are 65.

As far as portability goes somewhat unsatisfactory to a — lot of people's opinion municipalities, within municipalities, if they're tied in with the provincial pension plan can there's portability there, but there isn't if they went to work for the school board. In my home town, if the employee went from the city to the school board, it's not portable.

The provinces and the federal government, on meetings that the member was suggesting, meet quarterly to discuss what's taking place across the country. Manitoba's plan is integrated with the CPP and we suggest without digging through all the files, that in the neighbourhood of 90 percent in Manitoba are integrated.

MR. JENKINS: And the Civil Service is integrated, and 90 percent, as far as the Minister is aware, are integrated. And I also asked the Minister if he was aware of any plans in Manitoba that are completely funded at the present time.

MR. MacMASTER: As far as completely funded goes, in pension plans normally where the employee is putting in his money, it's our job to assure ourselves that the company has, at any time, committed themselves to fulfilling their commitments to that particular fund.

MR. JENKINS: I believe there is an Act, I think, before the Legislature now — I think it's being introduced by the Minister of Education for employees other than teachers — I think it is now going to become mandatory for school divisions, for employees other than teachers to have a pension plan. I don't know if it has been discussed yet in the House, but it seems to me I — perhaps this is the wrong Minister to be asking the questions of, but you are the Minister that is in charge of the pension commission for Manitoba, the administration of The Pension Benefits Act, and I would ask the Minister then, I know the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 has a pension plan for employees other than employees, other than teachers, I beg your pardon, other than teachers, and they did have a pension plan for teachers, but when the TRAF came in, the board transferred its share of the money and its share of the funding, is being paid into the TRAF over a period of years into

the Teachers Retirement Act Allowances Fund. And I was wondering now, since it is going to become mandatory for school divisions employing other employees other than teachers, whether the government has given any thought to making a similar type of plan for employees other than teachers, much on the same basis as the TRAF. Because I think what has happened is, it's worked out to be a better pension plan for teachers than what they may have had with their individual divisions.

And since the Minister of Education is introducing this Act to make it mandatory, has there been any thought of absorbing these employees into a similar plan something like a TRAF?

MR. MacMASTER: I know at the moment, Mr. Chairman, that the teachers do in fact have their own plan and we believe that the majority of school divisions have pension plans in place for their employees. There may be some that do not.

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

MR. JENKINS: I just wish I could lay my hands on the Act here because there is an Act being dealt with during this current Session for school divisions, for employees other than teachers, that it will become mandatory that they do set up a pension plan. That is my understanding, and maybe I read the Act wrong, but it's one, I believe, that was introduced during the current Session by the Minister of Education, and it's just unfortunate that he's not here this evening.

But what I was wanting to elicit from the Minister was, if any thought had been given to making this a similar plan to what is — well, if it's not going to be a similar plan, to at least make it portable between school division to school division, even if it can't be portable between a school division and a municipal council pension employee plan, and is there portability now between. . . say, an employee of the Winnipeg School Division went to work for either the Seine River School Division or St. James School Division No. 2, would he have, he or she, have portability from Winnipeg, say, to either one of these divisions if they were transferred, or wished to transfer to that division?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, the teachers are portable to the best of my knowledge, but the school division ones are not in all cases. I can't give the member the specific areas that they are. I understand that there is some agreement within school divisions but it's certainly not mandatory that it be portable now within school divisions in Manitoba, and I think that's certainly not a satisfactory answer, but that is the way it is today.

MR. JENKINS: I know that this is a question of policy and the Minister doesn't have to answer, but is there any thought being given to making at least, since we're all, I think, agreed that we want to see as much portability as possible, is the Minister giving any thought to future legislation where it is possible, at least between similar industries, and I guess you could say that people in the public service, other than teachers of school divisions, would be in a similar industry, where it would be at least the most likelihood of these people transferring from, say, one school division to the other, they would be within the same field. The ideal thing would be if it was a provincial plan for all employees other than school teachers, but I realize that in the main you have to get pretty well total majority of opinion to make changes like this, but surely within that division of employees that we should be striving at least to get portability there because they're not likely to go from Winnipeg School Division No. 1, or St. James School Division No. 2, or Seine River, or River East, they would be lateral transfers more or less rather than vertical transfers, because I think in the main that these people would transfer from one school division in that type of employment rather than going to something else, so hopefully we would be trying to make the years of service carried out and try and get a uniformity within the plan, depending as much as possible, and if the Minister has given any thought to that.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, at the moment, Mr. Chairman, we do have permissive legislation aid to permit that type of portability. We certainly are encouraging it and, from our viewpoint as sellers of pension plans, we're continuously meeting and carrying on discussions on what we see to be the value of portability, but School Boards are elected people and I maybe can just leave it at that. They have their own thoughts on a variety of things, but there's no question that we're certainly encouraging it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (g)—pass. Resolution 78—pass.

Resolution No. 79: Item 3, Manpower Division; (a)Research (1)Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas. I'm sorry, the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Whatever, Mr. Chairperson. Well, I'll just ask the normal question at this point then, if the Minister can outline the staffing requirements and the staffing changes, and also if he could give us a title, because there seems to be some amalgamation in this particular department. I assume that part of this funding is for the Research Department that used to come under General Administration and was responsible for certain activities, and I would also assume that, having been put in the Manpower Division, that part of it will be also responsible for Research in regard to employment practices and employment trends within the province. So if he could just give us, seeing as how it's probably a new department, if he could just give us a general background of the activities of the department and the staffing, we can proceed from that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: There was 14 last year, Mr. Chairman. There is 14 this all funded last year, all funded this year, no year' vacancies except what might take place if somebody takes places. This particular department, the member is correct that it is somewhat new, and we have put upon them a tremendous amount of responsibility in a lot of areas. Just to read off a few of them: The Labour Market, Demographic Analysis, Manpower and Employment outlook, Career Counselling Information, Manpower Needs Assessment, support for Federal Manpower Training Agreements, Manpower Program Analysis, and Program Evaluation, and the outcome assessments of programs in place. They supply support service for the Labour Division, and they're called on occasionally for technical assistance for a variety of programming, and a variety of review of present programs and thoughts that may come up during the course of the year, and I certainly hope that there's many. They'll be giving us an idea of what we can really do with those types of ideas in relationship to turning them into meaningful programs.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could tell us where the 14 people came from, whether there were transfers from within other sections of the Labour Department, how many from Education, how many, if any, from Northern Affairs?

MR. MacMASTER: There was 10 from Education, 2 from Labour, and 2 from Economic Development.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I think that we'll probably still want to speak on (1), but we were both taking turns sitting up before you could notice us.

Mr. Chairman, under this particular section the Minister mentioned the federal Manpower support, and I wonder if the Minister could clarify this division of responsibility between his department and the department of colleges and universities, and how each one relates to the federal Manpower training cost-shared or the federal government sponsored training activities within our community colleges, whether that comes under this section or whether that is all done by the other Minister's department.

MR. MacMASTER: I think the member would find that under Manpower Planning and Development in (b) is where the federal programming in community colleges, that type of thing, would better be discussed.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain what he meant then when he said under this section the federal Manpower support comes in? What did he mean by that?

MR. MacMASTER: It's simply a support group that is called on by the Department of Labour, as well as Manpower. It's a body to one side that will do what it's called upon to do; I guess that's the best way I can describe it.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the way to describe it doesn't clarify very much of what this body to the side that it's called on, what it's called on to do. I wonder maybe if the Minister could give us some examples of what it has been called on to do.

MR. MacMASTER: They will conduct analysis when asked to, of course, of federal support and they will, when called upon, research and assist in preparing submissions to Ottawa, and if the Manpower Training needed analysing of some of their programs they will assist in that particular area, too.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder then if, for example, the cutbacks in the ABE Program would have been dealt with by this section at all in the past year.

MR. MacMASTER: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, then I wonder if the Minister could explain the labour and market analysis, how that relates to the community colleges section and their research work, and whether they do give statistics and figures to the community colleges to help them decide what programs they should give emphasis to, as new developments take place within the Manpower market in Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: When called upon, they will endeavour to determine Manpower needs and training requirements.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, how do the two connect? We have the colleges designing and deciding what programs to go into; we have this section doing an analysis, I assume, of the probable needs in terms of Manpower. How and where and when do they connect? How do they relate to each other?

MR. MacMASTER: This particular group work with the Canadian Employment Commission, Canada's employment commission, for determining manpower requirements and then the federal government, of course, purchases services from your community colleges.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So then this group, in conjunction with some federal people, would do an analysis and then the basic decisions would be made by the federal government, in terms of what spaces to purchase and what emphasis to give to the purchase of community college space; is that correct?

MR. MacMASTER: Our Research, hopefully, determines the emphasis and then the federal government purchases the required service.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder then if the Minister could explain the relationship between the Advisory Boards to the community colleges and their recommendations in terms of new training needs. For example, at KCC there are some representatives of mining industry, and hopefully of the forestry industry that are advising the Board, and yet it would appear from the answer of the Minister that the basic decisions are made quite separate from them. And I'm not quite clear, then, what their role would be if this section with the federal authorities, sets up some priorities and then the federal government makes a decision to purchase; what role would these Boards play then?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, you have your provincial-federal Manpower Needs Committee and you have your subcommittees of that, and you have your Advisory Boards in addition to that, and in amongst there is your Research people, who are working in conjunction with all groups, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can make it a little bit clearer to the Minister what I would like to have him explain to us, what I would like to be able to understand. How does all this jell into a decision as to what courses should be emphasized, increased, expanded, etc. and there's a number of groups that are dealing with this and I'm not clear how they all come together.

MR. MacMASTER: It's jointly determined by your Manpower Needs Committee, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, further to the question posed by my colleague, the Member for The Pas, how does all this jell, how does all this come together? I still do not think that I quite understand the Minister's answer because one would think that within this particular branch of the Minister's department, Manpower Division, the Minister would keep a close eye on the general demands of the community at large in terms of consumer products and everything else, and then as that relates to the manpower that is required to produce those products. But one doesn't seem to square with the other, Mr. Chairman, because we had noticed in today's press that industry profits had risen by 58.3 percent on an overall average. In some areas, the increase was as high as 300 percent, namely in the wood and furniture industries, it was 300 percent; paper and forest products profits also increased by almost 300 percent.

So what I'm saying is this, Mr. Chairman, that one would think that with the increased demands that there would be some increased attempt to create more jobs, to provide more employment, and hence to spread the benefits around so that it doesn't all just show up in terms of profits of the shareholders, but that the worker in the factory, that there would be more workers in the factories working, and that each of the workers would gain more benefits from this increased consumer demand. But it seems to be all going into the pockets of the shareholders, Mr. Chairman, into the corporate pockets rather than being spread over the community at large. It's really appalling to read that comparing the first three months of this calendar year with the first three months of the previous calendar year, the profits have increased by 300 percent. The profits, that's the net income of the various business concerns.

So it would seem that something is not being done which should be done to create the jobs for which there is a need, because our rate of unemployment does demonstrate that there is a need to create jobs, but obviously they're not being created, Mr. Chairman, that industry is finding a way of generating these profits in some other ways without creating jobs and thus spreading the benefits of the increased consumer spending, consumer consumption, spreading the benefits around, not only channelling them into the pockets of the investors, but also spreading the benefits to the pockets of the workers, by hiring more workers, or by paying them an increased wage.

Particularly in this day and age, Mr. Chairman, when we, over the past few years, we have been living through a period of restraint, when we have tried to keep increases in wages down to a certain level, keep the increase down to a rate of increase at a certain level, and so forth, and here we read a report, talking about a 300 percent increase in profit for the months of January, February and March of this year as compared with those of the previous year.

So I would like the Minister to comment on that because I would think that the Manpower division would want to keep an eye on that sort of thing, and if it would see that there is an increased demand in certain areas, that it would want to do whatever it can to inject and direct more manpower into that area to reduce the rate of unemployment and thus to put more dollars into the hands of the workers and that in conjunction with the production of whatever the worker is producing to generate more income for all concerned. But this doesn't seem to be happening because it's merely reflected in terms of profit and nothing else.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I think that jobs are being created. There are 10,000 more people working this particular year, and I suppose we could all wish that was 20,000. We hope that we're working in those particular directions and I think if we follow the philosophy of profits, I am sure that companies that are not making a profit are rather difficult to negotiate with and certainly have no thoughts of renovations or expansions. So when companies are making profits then there's always that possibility that there will be expansions, renovations, upgrading, more employment for people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned that one of the functions of this section was program evaluation and I wonder if he could indicate to us what evaluations they have carried out up to this point in time, and what are the immediate evaluations that the Minister is proposing they do in the immediate future?

MR. MacMASTER: We hope to evaluate all the programs that are in place with the thought of upgrading, or renovating them, or changing them or amending them, or bringing in new ones during the course of the year 1979.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister missed the first part of the question. What evaluations has this section done to date?

MR. MacMASTER: It's a continuous job, Mr. Chairman, of looking at all programs that are in place right now. There are none that have come right to a finality as of today.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, that's an awfully vague answer. I wonder, for example, Mr. Chairman, have they done an evaluation of the apprenticeship program of this section, of this department?

MR. MacMASTER: Not in total, Mr. Chairman. That type of evaluation and a look at the apprenticeship program will be taking place in the next few months, and I'm sure we'll be calling on the research department to help us.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if they've done an evaluation of the New Careers Program.

MR. MacMASTER: That's starting and ongoing, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if they've done an evaluation of private sector Youth Employment Program.

MR. MacMASTER: That's ongoing too, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Well Mr. Chairman, I wonder if they've done an evaluation of the Northlands Youth Travel Program.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this section has done an evaluation of the Youth Travel Program.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this section has done an evaluation of the Youth Travel Program.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure why the Minister doesn't wish to answer the question. Maybe he could explain that.

MR. MacMASTER: It's already answered.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister in his remarks, in his response to the question where the 14 staff came from that are currently occupying this Section, indicated that two came from Labour, I believe, that two staff positions. According to the Annuals of past years, it shows that the number of Research Division employees under the Labour Division range from six, a low of six last year to a high of 11 two years ago, and I'm wondering if the Minister can indicate which two positions they transferred into this department and what happened to the other four positions that were previously a part of this department.

MR. MacMASTER: The other positions ended up in administration of the Department of Labour.

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

MR. COWAN: Well, the other part of the question then was, which two positions came in then by job title, and perhaps to simplify the matter the Minister could just give us a rundown of the 14 different job titles or job positions that are in this particular section.

MR. MacMASTER: The two that transferred in, Mr. Chairman, were Economic Research Analysts.

The 14 positions are the Director, Senior Consultant, Education Consultant, Planning Program Analyst, four Economic Research Analysts — no, pardon me, four Planning Program Analysts, three Economic Research Analysts, a Research Assistant, an Administrative Secretary, and a Clerk Typist.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister indicated that this department provides Support Service to the Labour Division. Would this support service be along the lines of the responsibilities of the previous Research Department? By that I mean would it be putting together research materials on possible legislation, the effect of legislation, legislation that currently exists in other jurisdictions? Would that be one of the functions?

MR. MacMASTER: During the previous year — pardon me, in the future year, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure I've said in the House that we're going to be reviewing a great, large number of existing legislation, some of which all Parties in the province feel is somewhat antiquated and some that combinations of legislation might provide better service to the people. To specifically say which one of, or either of these people that might be involved in that, is impossible at this particular moment. There is going to be great numbers of people from all segments of society involved in the total legislation review during the year 1979. I think I've advised the members opposite, I'm sure they know that I suspect, God willing, and with a little bit of help, that next year there'll be a lot of proposed legislation coming out of the departments I'm responsible for during the Session.

MR. COWAN: Yes. That leads me to a timely question, and one perhaps the Minister can't answer, through no fault of his own, but we've been informed in the Budget Address that there might be a fall Session of this year, and at that time we were informed that it would be brought in to discuss and peruse and examine legislation in regard to the Tax Credit system. I just ask the Minister if there is any inclination on his part, or the part of his department or his government, to bring in Labour Legislation at that time, or changes and amendments to existing Labour Legislation during the fall Session?

MR. MacMASTER: I hate to be vague, but I think the answer, Mr. Chairman, directly is, I doubt it, unless there was a major amendment that very seriously required something being done that couldn't wait for whatever reason till spring, but generally speaking we plan on spending the summer and the fall doing a tremendous amount of reviewing, and plans often go astray, but basically the plan is next spring Session to bring in the legislation.

MR. COWAN: Yes. In his remarks, Mr. Chairperson, the Minister indicated that, unless there was one major amendment that would have to be brought before the House and passed, I assume, before the spring, and that leads me to the one area where the Minister has indicated that a specific review is taking place, and that's in the construction industry area, and we know that the contracts — and I'm not certain of the specific date — but that the contract for the construction industry begin very early in the negotiations year, I think maybe the first of the year, or within January or February 1st, which would mean that, if there was going to be legislation brought in in reference to the accreditation procedures, or in reference to the collective bargaining procedures, or in reference to the construction industry's process of determining the negotiations and determining their unions and the methods by which they collectively negotiate, it would have to be brought in in the fall if it were to be effective or have any impact on the upcoming negotiations, so I'll be quite specific and ask the Minister — I know he has indicated that he hopes the Construction Industry Review Committee brings forth a report very quickly. He had indicated previously that he was dissatisfied with the progress that had been made to date, that he was, in all fairness to him, that he was more satisfied now because they had decided, I believe, to meet every two weeks on a regular basis and that had pleased him, and that he was not going to go in and push them to come to a conclusion, but he did seem rather anxious for that conclusion to come forth, and knowing the structure and the timetable of the negotiations in this regard, it leads one to question whether or not he may be pushing them or not pushing them — that would be a wrong word — encouraging them to come forth with that report very shortly so that legislation could be prepared for the fall Session, if indeed we do have a fall Session.

So, my question to the Minister then, in specific, is there any inclination on his part to bring legislation in, specific reference to the construction industry in during the fall Session?

MR. MacMASTER: Not specifically, Mr. Chairman. That's why I left the back door open, to say that everything doesn't positively have to come in next spring. We don't know. I don't know if there's

going to be a fall Session. If, in fact, the Construction Review Committee are successful, it's quite possible that the fact that I'm prepared to promote it, might be satisfactory to them — I don't know. It has to get through the House, of course, before it's law. There's possibilities of so many varieties of conclusions they may reach that maybe legislation is not even necessary. You know, they may reach some conclusions amongst themselves which they're prepared to document in whatever manner they establish. So I can't answer it any farther than that, or any better than that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Under this area I would like to know if there is any thrust and any progress being made, or development in respect to the technological change that is taking place, and to see whether there are other ways and means, aside from the apprenticeship and industrial Training Program, to get industry to pay its fair share of the overhead costs of training people into the new technologies.

MR. MacMASTER: It's a point that I have personally raised, Mr. Chairman, not only in technological change which I know what the member's talking about, but also in expansion of existing plants where companies are prepared to expand. And the opportunity, we think, should certainly be considered for present employees in upgrading and training into getting into newer, better — well, we'll talk physically — if you have your building and you're putting a wing on it with machinery that's updated or more productive, we're certainly considering, and we're advocating, that companies should have a look at some of the people that are now within their plant, upgrading them and training them; we've had some basic discussions on that particular situation and we will continue to.

Too often, I personally think people are bypassed in opportunities for advancement, and it's just sort of a belief of mine that people that have served well should be given the opportunity to upgrade themselves within plants or exterminate, whatever the case may be. So, that's in consideration. I can't give the member a written proposal on how we're going, but my thoughts on it are as I've outlined to you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FOX: I appreciate that the Minister may not have specific answers. What I was really asking was whether there was any research being done to develop a program of selling this to industry. I believe some time ago I read where there was in some industries in England some pooling of resources in order to create a fund for training people into the technological changes that were taking place. Some employers do provide training programs. I do believe through the Workplace Safety Health area we already have a contact into the plants, and I would suggest that, with the rising investment in education — I don't call it a cost, but it does bear upon the economy of the individuals through their taxes — that there should be a greater investment by industry itself.

Too often they are just happy to take that product which has been trained someplace else. I know that we also do that to some extent by importing from other countries who have training schemes better than ours, and I was just wondering whether there was any research being done. I can appreciate that the Minister is interested in this and possibly has discussed it, but are there any programs at the present time doing any research through his research staff?

MR. MacMASTER: Not specifically at this particular moment, Mr. Chairman, but I know what the member's saying, and I take it for good advice, as it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Minister's, under this Section, expressed some desire in upgrading people so they could, in fact, move into more technical jobs, etc., and I wonder if he has made any representations to his colleagues or what action has been taken in terms of the federal government's cutback in the adult basic education programs. As the Minister is probably well aware, there are some occupation and some internal training in industry that they require Grade 10 for, some they require Grade 11 for, some they require Grade 12 for and yet, Mr. Chairman, there is a cutback by the federal government in those particular programs that would bring up the educational standards of people so they can qualify for trades training, or so they can qualify for training within the industry they are presently working so that that industry doesn't have to bring -- in people from outside but could in fact use the present existing employees if the opportunity were available. And I wonder, Mr. Chairman, what action, if any, the Minister has taken in that regard.

MR. MacMASTER: We have ongoing discussions with the federal government, Mr. Chairman, on a large variety of things, but I think the member might or might not agree that quite possibly a week today people might be in a better position to talk about what the federal government's future position might be.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'd prefer a little bit more specific answer in terms of what kind of action has actually been taken in terms of making sure that this opportunity for people presently in the work force or who could come into the work force is not being missed at this time. This has been going on for some time, Mr. Chairman. I wonder what action has been taken by the Minister and his department.

MR. MacMASTER: The Member for The Pas being a previous Minister of the Crown, I am sure is aware that the word "force" in relationship to federal-provincial negotiations is a word that quite often doesn't fit.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Without having that question actually answered, I would like to address a similar question. In terms, Mr. Chairman, of the internal industrial training, there is an opportunity within the province of Manitoba through the Department of Education called an educational equivalency exam and I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister sees that as an existing avenue by which people can upgrade themselves and show in fact they have Grade 11 equivalencies or Grade 12 equivalencies by taking this exam, whether the Minister recognizes that as a method by which people can upgrade themselves to take advantage of more technical employment opportunities.

MR. MacMASTER: I understand that that's a straight Department of Education thrust and I guess we can all agree that certainly to a degree, that the more basic education you have, it certainly helps in advancing yourself in, I suppose, most fields.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be willing to use his influence, the Minister indicated he can't use force of any kind at least in federal-provincial negotiations, but I wonder if he would be willing to use his influence to ensure that that education equivalency exam is recognized within Manitoba industry. Mr. Chairman, this is a case where people in fact upgrade themselves, or learn themselves and then go and pass the test that shows they know as much in that particular grade level as a person who has completed high school in that level and thereby should qualify them to take a trades training or apprenticeship within the industry they're in, or a special industry training program that requires a certain grade level, and whether he would in fact use the authority vested in him by his office to ensure that that is a recognized instrument and that people who do upgrade themselves are not being pushed aside because of some unrealistic expectation or for some reason the inability of an industry to recognize the equivalency of these particular exams.

MR. MacMASTER: Knowing the member from The Pas as well as I do, I think that he's possibly leading up to something specific of concern. I wish that he would outline just exactly what it is and maybe I can be of some assistance in answering, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I would question how well the Minister knows me, but to be very specific then I will ask the Minister whether he would be willing to use his influence in terms of Manitoba Forest Industries, which has up to this time, not recognized that the educational equivalency tests that employees have taken in order to upgrade their educational level, or to show that they have upgraded their educational level, and people who have passed these educational equivalency tests for example to a Grade 12 level are still not admitted by that particular industry into a program that requires a Grade 12 level.

MR. MacMASTER: That comes under apprenticeship training, but I'll certainly take it under advisement. I'm aware of the problem. At least I've been made aware, I can't say specifically when but not too long ago I was made aware of that particular problem.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure in this specific incident whether it's apprenticeship training it does come under, or whether it's an internal training program of the company for which

they have set their own educational standards, and I think specifically in terms of the lab work at that particular industry, so I'm not positive it's an apprenticeship problem but a specific policy of that particular company in terms of a non-apprenticeship program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some further answer from the Minister in terms of the program evaluations that he has mentioned as a function and, Mr. Chairman, in order to keep the Minister happy I will list any of those and all of those that I wish to find out what kind of an evaluation has been done, or whether any evaluation has been done or whether any is intended. So, Mr. Chairman, I wonder in terms of the employment services section whether an evaluation has been done of that section or whether one is intended. Mr. Chairman, in terms of the provincial job office, was any evaluation done of that particular operation before the cuts were made in that operation?

MR. MacMASTER: All programs, as I said before Mr. Chairman, are being reviewed. It's an ongoing process to see if they can be upgraded or amended as I said before.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, to be very specific again, I wonder in terms of the provincial job office whether there was an evaluation done of that operation, whether there was any study done of that operation, or whether it was sort of an instinctive feeling the Minister had that it should be reduced. Mr. Chairman, knowing this particular Minister as I do, to use his phrase, previous actions have been taken before evaluation was done, before a study was undertaken and, Mr. Chairman, I wonder in this specific case of the provincial job office what evaluation was done before that operation was reduced?

MR. MacMASTER: We're quite satisfied with the operation of that particular function as it now stands, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the question was whether any evaluation was done previous to it being reduced. That was the specific question I asked the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MacMASTER: Some of the functions within it have certainly been reviewed and some are ongoing, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us in a little bit more detail what was the nature of the evaluation and which functions within it were reviewed and which functions within it were not reviewed?

MR. MacMASTER: The provincial job office is No. 7 on the Estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his information which was obviously available to everyone. I'm not sure then, Mr. Chairman, how this Minister wishes to proceed because from his explanation that he gave us the item we're under is an item that does program review, program evaluation, to use his words, and Mr. Chairman, therefore I would like to know what program evaluation they have done and the Minister asked me to be more specific. So I'm very specific. What program evaluation was done of the provincial job office before reductions were made in that particular office?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, in reviewing it with departmental staff, we've found that some of the functions under there had come to a close themselves and others are being continued and we'll review them as we get to them in the Estimates.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, in order to understand this section that we're on now, 3.(a) Research, the Minister outlined certain functions that Research did and one was program evaluation. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if that program evaluation extends at all beyond the items we have before us and to meet the Minister's wish, I'll be very specific. For example, Mr. Chairman, the provincial job office administered a program called the Special Northern Employment Program. Would his research division have done any evaluation of the Special Northern Employment Program?

MR. MacMASTER: The Special Northern Employment Program is not in my portfolio, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me whether or not the provincial job office did in fact administer the Special Northern Employment Program?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't believe it did. I'm not just sure whether it did. I don't think it did, but that program isn't in my jurisdiction, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, I could just bring the Minister up-to-date that up until October 24, 1977, the provincial job office did administer the Special Northern Employment Program, but I take it from the Minister's answer that the section we're on now, Research, did not do any evaluation of the Special Northern Employment Program, as long as he was familiar with this Research section.

Mr. Chairman, then I would ask the Minister if the Research section did any program evaluation of the apprenticeship training program before the Minister made his statements of dissatisfaction with some aspects of that program, whether he had before him an evaluation of the program that caused him to make those remarks, or whether those remarks were from some intuitive feeling that the Minister had?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't remember using the word dissatisfaction, I remember as it relates to the apprenticeship program, I remember saying very clearly that I felt that a good review of it would be of assistance.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to know whether the Minister based that statement that a good review of it would be of assistance on any preliminary, initial evaluation of the program, or on what basis did the Minister make his statement. On what analysis, on what evaluation, on what information did he make that particular statement? Did he use his Research Section to assist him previous to making that statement?

MR. MacMASTER: I understand the Provincial Advisory Board, just for one particular group, has suggested that a good review take place and I have talked to people in industry and labour who feel that a review of the apprenticeship programs certainly could have some advantages.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that answer because it helps us to understand this particular section. For example, in this particular case I am assuming that the Minister will now call upon this section to be involved in that review, that he didn't use the section previous but he got information from other sources that there was a review required in order to make that statement.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know in terms of program evaluation, and I asked the Minister in terms of the private sector youth employment program, and he said there is always an ongoing evaluation which means to me, Mr. Chairman, that there has been some work done by this group in terms of that program. I suppose my very specific question is, what has been done in terms of an evaluation of the private sector youth employment program and why hasn't that evaluation been completed, Mr. Chairman, because there has been ample time, or was in fact an evaluation begun and then dropped?

MR. MacMASTER: The total analysing of that particular program is not completed but will be completed shortly.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I suppose I could ask the Minister whether he needs more staff under this particular section because that program was, of course, completed some time ago and what was needed was an evaluation in terms of the administrative effectiveness and in terms of the grants made, whether they were used for purposes outlined?

And, Mr. Chairman, the members on this side of the House have raised more questions or appeared to have done more evaluation in the limited time available to us, than has been done by his Research Section. So I wonder, Mr. Chairman, were there problems with doing that particular evaluation or does the Minister need more staff in order to get the evaluations done because, Mr. Chairman, I imagine they are getting ready to institute the program again? It seems to me probably not very wise to institute the same program they've had last year without some evaluation as the Minister has said earlier so that it could be improved and upgraded and made even better than it was in the past, Mr. Chairman. So, I would wonder why that evaluation hasn't been completed by now.

MR. MacMASTER: Preliminary evaluations have been done and it certainly appears to us that basically it's a good program.

Mr. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder then if the Minister could tell us whether the preliminary evaluation indicated that one-third to one-half of the grants made under that program were in fact grants for jobs that would have been berated even if there was not such a program, that in fact the province was paying for jobs to be created that would have been created without the grant assistance.

MR. MacMASTER: I can't confirm that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that (1) there was a preliminary evaluation done which, Mr. Chairman, is the first time he has indicated that there has been any evaluation completed of this program, but he did confirm tonight that there was a preliminary evaluation done and he also said that the preliminary evaluation led him to believe it was a good program. So I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if he could give us some information on that preliminary evaluation.

MR. MacMASTER: When it's finalized that's the time that I'll talk about it.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could confirm that the preliminary evaluation showed that from one - third to one-half of those receiving grants under this program would have created jobs — those companies would have created jobs — those particular jobs even if this program wasn't in existence. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that is what the preliminary evaluation showed.

MR. MacMASTER: The question is repetitious. I have answered it already.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the question was repetitious, the Minister is half right in what he just said. The question was repetitious. He's correct in that part of it. In terms of his having answered the question — he's not correct in that part of it because, Mr. Chairman, he didn't answer the question. So, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if he would like to answer the question whether he could confirm that in the private sector youth employment program, the preliminary evaluation indicated that one-third to one-half of the jobs that were supposedly created would have been created even if this program were not in existence. Could the Minister confirm that is what the preliminary evaluation indicated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1. —pass. The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister obviously doesn't wish to answer that question and, Mr. Chairman, I don't blame him for not answering that particular question because the preliminary evaluation did show those kind of figures and if I were the Minister trying to defend the program, I wouldn't want to answer that question either, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could indicate if he could give us a little bit more information as to exactly the support for the labour division that comes out of the Research Division. For example a couple of specifics, Mr. Chairman, does this section do research for the Minister in terms of minimum wage? Does this section do research for the Minister in terms of the so-called lead program?

MR. MacMASTER: They haven't in either case to date, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass; 2. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I note that this appropriation entitled the Manpower Division, provides training, counselling and relocation assistance to special needs individuals. Could the Minister indicate to the Committee the particular sub-appropriation wherein funds for this program are found and I'm concerned primarily about the relocation assistance for special needs individuals.

MR. MacMASTER: In 3. (d), Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: In 3. (b) or (d) —(Interjection)— (d)? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) —pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. When the Minister indicated in his opening remarks

on this particular item that the Research Department did research on the labour market and just two days ago, I believe it was in this House during the question period, the Minister indicated that he was dissatisfied — excuse me I should not say that — the Minister indicated that he didn't understand why there would be a 5,000 worker drop, 5,000 person drop, in the transportation segment of the Federal job statistics in one month and I would just ask the Minister if this is the Department that will be conducting the research necessary to validate or invalidate that particular statistic?

MR. MacMASTER: They'll certainly be part of it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: With that the case, Mr. Chairperson, perhaps the Minister can indicate by which method the validation or invalidation of that particular statistic will be accomplished. In other words can he indicate the procedure by which they are examining that 5,000 worker drop in the transportation sector?

MR. MacMASTER: Several ways, Mr. Chairman, we hope through communications with the Federal people who come up with those statistics to attempt to establish how they got the figure. You know, statistics are great things. We all use them occasionally and I'm sure we all in the House use the ones we like and the ones we don't like and we sometimes forget. So we'll be communicating with them as to how they came up with that particular statistic. In addition we are going to be surveying or researching, whichever you wish, the major industries that would in fact have contributed to that particular figure, if that figure is exactly correct.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well I've been in discussion myself with the Stats Can people in Ottawa and I understand that they arrive at that figure by a sampling of households which has an accuracy rate, which implies that it also has an inaccuracy rate, but that is the case with all the different sectors and there are fluctuations up and down. I would suggest to the Minister, and I don't have all the figures available to me, but I would suggest to him that the figures show that a year ago that particular sector of the economy in Manitoba employed about 45,000 people and that it now employs about 45,000, and that perhaps the 50,000 figure was the aberration. In that case it would have shown up as the Minister says, a statistic that would be more favourable to his particular argument than to arguments of others that the economy is failing in many respects.

But it does lead us to a more general question and that is can the Minister comment on how we check Statistics Canada figures, computations, because if they feel there is a necessity to check them in this one particular instance then I would assume that they feel there is a necessity to check them in all instances or in the majority of instances, does the Minister wait for an aberration that is unfavourable to his government to appear before instigating an investigation or is there an ongoing investigation of those statistics? Is the Minister implying by his investigation that he has a certain distrust for those statistics that are coming out of Canada Statistics?

MR. MacMASTER: Well over the years those particular types of statistics have been questioned to varying degrees by people for a variety of reasons. I would suggest to the member if that particular 45,000 jumped to 50,000 next month, then I think I'd be just as curious about it as I am this last month when it dropped from 50 the previous month. So it's not, you know, that there is something outstanding in a particular area. I think a person's responsibilities plus his curiosity is certainly going to lead him to attempt to establish, for all people's information, not just his own, just what has happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, certainly those are admirable goals but, in this particular instance, it was sitting at \$45,000 and, as I say, I don't have the month-by-month list. Can the Minister indicate — perhaps he has the information — can he indicate if it did jump by \$5,000 to put it to the \$50,000 mark within one month or was it a gradual increase and then a substantial decrease in one month?

MR. MacMASTER: I haven't got those figures with me, but I will certainly supply them to the member, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, some time ago the Minister indicated his determination to evaluate and understand the out-migration figures. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether this is the section that would do some of that research work for him and, if it is, then what has been done in that regard since the Minister made those statements.

MR. MacMASTER: We're in the midst of hiring a demographer right now, Mr. Chairman, which I think will provide greater information and possibly greater understanding by all people in Manitoba as to what's happening in that particular area.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I would assume from the Minister's answer that that study of those figures then will take place when the person has been hired and is in place.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to this section of Research in terms of the importation of foreign workers, for example, the Mexican farm workers, the Minister indicate if this section does an evaluation and does research to see if in fact that labour need could be met in Manitoba, and whether this section makes recommendations to the Minister as to the importation of foreign labour?

MR. MacMASTER: That particular arrangement is normally worked out between the farming community, I understand, the farm workers and the Department of Agriculture.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is indicating that the Department of Labour and Manpower has no input into the decision to import foreign workers?

MR. MacMASTER: I understand that they haven't directly, in the last few years, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, since the Minister and I have had discussions before in terms of the allocation of responsibilities, and the Minister's feeling is that there is a neat and orderly way in the division of responsibilities, I wonder if he could explain why he doesn't have a role in that particular decision, which affects a great deal, Mr. Chairman, this whole section that we're talking about here, which is to predict in terms of the job market, to improve people's access to employment or trades' training; develops and implements job training and job creation and job placement activities, and does this for specific segments of the adult population. I wonder if the Minister could explain why there is no involvement of the Manpower Division in this decision, which affects everything this division does.

MR. MacMASTER: To repeat what I said, the Department of Agriculture have been the ones that have dealt with this in the past, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says the reason that they do not deal with it is because it was not done in the past, and, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it's his intention now that this has been drawn to his attention, that in fact the Manpower Division should have an involvement, Mr. Chairman, because in the past the Department of Agriculture was involved with the Selkirk Training Plant and the Minister had that transferred to his responsibility; and now, because the Department of Agriculture is involved in terms of manpower in the Province of Manitoba as opposed to farm policy but in actual Manpower Program, whether or not to import foreign workers, whether there is a need to import foreign workers. I wonder if the Minister will now ask to be involved in that particular decision.

MR. MacMASTER: I will take that under consideration, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that in some areas he is not clear on Statistics Canada information and in some areas he is not satisfied, I don't think, with Statistics Canada information, if I can imply that from what he said, Mr. Chairman I wonder what this Research section has done in terms of adding to the statistics, Mr. Chairman, especially the unemployment statistics in the Province of Manitoba, which, at this time, excludes Indian people from those statistics. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if this Research section has done anything to overcome that, to estimate the unemployment rate, which has been estimated by other at 80 percent, etc., etc. But I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether there has been any systematic evaluation of the unemployment rate as opposed to the guesstimates that is the best that we can go on at this time, and also, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister has made any strong indication to the federal Minister

for those statistics, to demand of him, that for or realistic unemployment figures, realistic planning and that Indian people should be included in those statistics. I wonder what action the Minister has taken in that regard, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I have expressed my dissatisfaction with the statistics as they relate to, particularly, northern Manitoba and, again, I will be opening up that discussion when this thing called the federal election is open and I will be bringing it to the attention of whatever Minister or whatever party happens to be in place at that particular time.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could answer the first part of the question whether any research has been done separately. For example, Mr. Chairman, enough research for the Minister to use as ammunition with the federal government, to say, "Look, we have looked at a couple of reserves and the unemployment rate has been this." And since you're not including them in the figures of unemployment and, as the Minister has already indicated, after my colleague, the Member for Churchill, pointed it out, that the change in unemployment insurance regulations have been negatively affected in northern Manitoba because Indian people are not included in those statistics, whether in fact this Research section has given the Minister at least enough information to present the case to Ottawa.

MR. MacMASTER: Not specifically as the member has outlined, but I have reason to believe that the federal people are aware of the position I presented and there can be no question they are aware of the facts that their figures are not a true indication of what the situation is.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, since this matter has been raised for a number of years, this is a case we have all been aware of for a number of years, I just wonder if the Minister could bring us up-to-date in terms of the federal government's response. Have they indicated that in fact by a certain date they will begin to include Indian people in those calculations? Has there been anything firm out of the federal government to this date?

The Minister has indicated, Mr. Chairman, that there hasn't been that kind of indication forthcoming and I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could tell us, sort of, some sequence of his contact with the federal government and some idea of their response to his communications with them, or his direct personal discussions in meeting to press home this problem, which is quite serious, Mr. Chairman: One, just because the statistics are not accurate; but, secondly, the federal government then uses those statistics to make decisions in terms of employment programs. Mr. Chairman, those decisions are being made without the proper information and are made in such a way as to have a negative effect rather than a positive effect on certain parts of our province, in this case, Mr. Chairman, especially northern Manitoba.

So I wonder if the Minister could indicate what steps he has taken or what communication he has had with the federal government, and what their response has been to those specific initiatives on his part.

MR. MacMASTER: The federal government, I am convinced, are satisfied that in fact the two figures are not being expressed in their statistics. And, again, I say that I hope very shortly after the election and the dust has settled that I will be further approaching them to have the real indication.

The member is correct when he says that it has been this way for many years. I don't think that we should hide behind the fact or try and bury the fact that it's not a correct set of statistics. I don't know what efforts have been in the past, in the last year or two or 10 or 12 or 20, but I intend to do my utmost to establish a true set of figures, or hope to convince the federal government to truly look at what the employment situation is and the unemployment situation is.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, one part of the question was I wondered if the Minister could just give us some idea of the specific efforts that he made. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of one press release that he did issue after the changes in the unemployment insurance regulations and I believe, at the same time, the changes in the eligibility for job creation programs that the Minister; in the press release that he issued and the letter that he sent shortly after my colleague, the Member for Churchill, had issued a similar release. I wonder if there were any other specific steps that the Minister has taken. Could he outline for us the specific steps he has taken in this regard?

MR. MacMASTER: Conversations have taken place, Mr. Chairman. I don't have them itemized.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, on (1), still . . . the Member for The Pas, my colleague, touched upon the subject of Manpower need assessments being the responsibility of this department and I think it would probably be an appropriate place to discuss the importation of both off-shore labour and labour from other parts of Canada into northern Manitoba, in general to work in the mines in northern Manitoba. The Minister is well aware of the recent controversy revolving around the practice of the mining companies to go to off-shore countries or down east to bring in semi-skilled, unskilled and skilled workers, and the controversy revolves around the fact that, according to statistics given to us by the Manitoba Metis Federation, there is a very high unemployment rate among the indigenous residents of northern Manitoba living in the Metis and Reserve communities, roughly . . . They use a figure of 66 percent, which is a figure that can be argued both pro and con, and I don't think that we have any more accurate statistics than what they can provide us with.

And their argument is , because of their desire to work, because of their need to work and because of their proximity to the workplaces, and also when a mining company comes in and builds a community and builds an industry, it disrupts the local economy; it invariably disrupts trapping in the area, fishing in the area, and we see all those sort of side effects from the mining industry occurring in northern Manitoba.

Also, when the government comes in many times and does projects it disrupts the economy also, so what we have in that instance is an economy that can no longer support the people that have to live in the communities, and wishing not to leave their homes, wishing not to . leave their own community which is an admirable trait in these days, they want to become a part of that mining work force. They feel that they are blocked, that they are locked out of that opportunity to become a part of the mining work force, and I understand that there are many projects that — some longer term than others, some have been around longer than others — that are designed for the purpose of integrating Metis and Indian people, indigenous people into the industrial work force, and those projects are very necessary because there is a problem. You are coming from an industrial economy, a time clock economy, you're going into an, excuse me, an industrial economy or time clock economy; and coming from an economy or a socio-economic system with different criteria, with different expectations, and it is hard to make the transition many times; it is hard to do the simple things, or what we consider to be simple things such as balancing a cheque book, although I have to admit that simple as it may be, it throws me every once in awhile — and I've been dealing with cheque books for quite some time — but for a person who has never dealt with a cheque book, that becomes a momentous task.

For a person who has never had to get up at a specific time, the very casual act that we all go through of arising to the alarm clock becomes a very difficult transition for that person to make. For a person who has lived in a community where there are no set periods for lunch or set periods for supper, where food is basically taken when needed, then taking a specific lunch period at 12.00 to 12.30 or taking a specific break at a certain time, is a foreign practice — in other words, we have two different cultures existing in northern Manitoba. I guess Justice Berger put it best — he said, "We have a homeland and a frontier," and I don't want to get off on that argument, but I think it does point out that the north has within it two very distinct and separate cultures.

And so the problem has been in the past that Indian and Metis people, wanting to break into this industrial culture, have experienced great difficulties, and the minister is as well aware of them, if not more aware of them, than I am.

And so, in the past number of years, a number of projects and I refer to one in specific, the Tawow Project which emanated out of Lynn Lake first , but is now centered in Leaf Rapids, were projects that were brought forth for the purpose of helping these people integrate into the industrial community. But, the sad fact is that they have not been brought into that community fast enough — now, I'm not talking about fast enough on an individual basis, I'm talking about fast enough on a general basis — they have not had the numbers participating that they would have liked to have seen participate.

So the companies, therefore' are going off-shore and down east to bring people back to work and this is creating, especially in the last number of months where unemployment has become a major problem, is creating a friction within the north , a friction that we are starting to see manifest itself in different ways.

Incidentally, one of the primary motivations of the group that sat in the Canadian Employment Centre, Manpower Centre just a month ago or so, was their dissatisfaction with the employment opportunities that were available to them in the mining industry of northern Manitoba. That being the case, that situation existing, perhaps the minister can take opportunity to explain to us how his department is dealing, how his Research Department is dealing in particular with this problem, and what sort of negotiations are going on with the clients involved which would be the Indian

and Metis people and indigenous northerners, and with the employers, and how his department sees the criticisms of the Metis people and what is being done to rectify that.

MR. MacMASTER: I appreciate the statements made by the member, but I think we can better discuss it under (d) which is Employment Services where that will all be gone through.

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

MR. COWAN: Okay, then perhaps we'll discuss that under (d). I'd then ask the minister — he has indicated that his department does program evaluation — I would just ask him if the investigation of the four grants under the Private Sector Youth Employment Program which the minister indicated is undergoing now by his department is taking place under the section of this item that does Manpower Program Evaluations.

MR. MacMASTER: Partially, Mr. Chairman' and partially under the group that runs the program.

MR. COWAN: Yes, perhaps then the minister could indicate what form that investigation is taking, the status of it at the present time, and when : he expects to be able to report back to the House with regard to the advisability of those four companies, I believe — J.D. Construction, Metrico Enterprises, Waseco Underground Services, I believe I may stand corrected on that, and G.A. Junkin Company Limited?

MR. MacMASTER: The initial commentary on it was that they did in fact have, to a degree, separate identity but we're further looking into that particular section or that particular question by the member.

MR. COWAN: Then we can't assume at this juncture that they are indeed four separate companies. Is that what the minister is indicating?

MR. MacMASTER: It appeared initially to be so, but I'm not totally satisfied that that is in fact the case. I'm not saying it isn't, but we're looking at that further.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. While they're looking at that, are they also doing a more thorough investigation of those four grants to ensure that relatives weren't hired, to ensure that other provisions of the requirements for employers participating under the program weren't abused also?

MR. MacMASTER: I think that'll be all part of the review, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, my other question to the minister in this regard, Mr. Chairperson, was when we can expect a report on that particular review?

MR. MacMASTER: I would hope within the very near future, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, perhaps I can ask the minister to be more specific — would he expect it to be within the time frame of this session, and will he commit himself to tabling a document in regard to explaining the outcome of that review in the House?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll take that under advisement, and I got into difficulty once before of saying X number of days that a report would come down, and I'm not going to get myself in that particular difficulty anymore.

MR. COWAN: Well, that's understandable, Mr. Chairperson. We on this side would just hope that the report does come down and is tabled in the House within this session, so that we can have opportunity to review it and opportunity to add our input as we have done in the past on items of this nature' because I feel that it is incumbent upon the opposition to participate in the good governing of this province.

There are a number of other irregularities, maybe too harsh a word, but questionable grants that occur throughout the Private Sector Youth Employment Program and I would just ask the minister if they are undertaking any other investigations?

The one that comes to mind immediately, and I don't have the materials before me, is another

two companies and I may stand corrected on this, I believe one was Environmental Contracting and the other was Interlocking Contracting and I can find out the grant numbers for the minister if necessary, but they were two companies again at the same address, both getting 10 positions under this program, and the full \$9,600 I believe, the full complement of subsidy. I'm not saying that there's any irregularity there but I'm saying that it's questionable and would ask the minister if he would undertake to look at that one and report back to the House?

And also, if this department is doing any sort of that investigative research on its own initiative, are they going through those lists now looking for these sort of questionable subsidies?

MR. MacMASTER: I spelled it out, Mr. Chairman, that we are reviewing the particular program.

MR. COWAN: Well, one can review a program in many different ways, Mr. Chairperson, with different goals and objectives and motivations behind the review; they can review the program to see if it performed the function that they had intended it to perform. In other words, this program seems upon first glance and I don't want to be locked into this statement, but it seems to be on first glance weighted towards a larger employer if you take away the individual employees.

In other words, The Bay getting 26 positions gives The Bay an advantage over the corner store which could only, at maximum, get 10 positions because it only has the one outlet. And I don't think, or at least I would hope that that was not the intent of the government in preparing a program of this nature to allow a corporation, a multinational corporation the size of The Bay to take advantage to the extent of 26 positions, yet limit the corner store — and the corner store is also limited by its own financial make-up — in other words, it has to put in so much money towards the providing of wages to each of the grants and they can't provide that much money, so they are down to 1 or 2 or 3 positions, and I think you'll find as you go throughout the book that that happens invariably in a smaller business if they are limited to 3. Then you'll also find that in the larger businesses that have a number of outlets that they can exceed the 10 and while they are in keeping with the actual requirements and restrictions upon grants under the subsidy program, they don't seem to be in keeping with the intent, and that's just my own observation.

I'm not certain that the minister would agree with me, but I am certain that it seems wrong to me and it seems as if the program is going about providing the grants in the wrong manner if that is indeed the case.

The program also has come to my knowledge through the Press and through private conversation, that in the instance of Standard Knitting, the Grant Book shows 11 positions; there were not 11 positions created by work. As a matter of fact, Standard Knitting while it applied for 11 positions and they have two different outlets so in keeping with the actual requirements of the Act they are legitimate in keeping with the intent I would question, but there's no question that those were legitimate grants under the outline provided by the government for that program.

But the fact is, when questioned by the Press in its immediate report, they said, "We didn't even have anybody under that program, we had applied for the grants and then we found out that there were age restrictions, and we couldn't keep with the age restrictions' so in the end, we ended up not taking any money for the grants, in the end we ended up not creating any positions through this program." And there, in one instance, is 11 positions that show up as being created that aren't actually created. So I was discussing this with a friend of mine from Thompson who said, "Yes, but we know of two particular grants in Thompson where the same thing happened. Application was made for the grants, the grants were approved, but because of poor financial position or because of poor planning, or just because they decided not to use the money for that purpose, whatever the reason, those grants never came about." In other words, jobs were never implemented as part of the program, yet they show up as two more jobs. So there's 13 jobs right there and I happen to know of other instances where this has happened.

So is his department researching the private sector Youth Employment Program for the purpose of determining actually how many jobs were created, as compared to how many are shown up on the initial list?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, that's part of the review, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, it is my problem, Mr. Chairman, the semantics. Is that part of the evaluation? And I'm not certain whether we have asked this of the minister — will that evaluation be tabled in the House or made available to members of the opposition?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll take that under advisement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, the new program, and the minister can correct me — the new program is in place now, is that not correct? The new private sector Youth Employment Program. Has any of this research or any of the revelations that have come about during the past month, outside of the most obvious one of the Progressive Conservative Party, being granted subsidies under this program and then returning the money? That is a very obvious case where they have used that information to change the requirements of the new private sector Youth Employment. Have there been any other changes made that differentiate this private sector Youth Employment Program from the private sector Youth Employment Program of last year, and if so, can the minister indicate what they were?

MR. MacMASTER: That specific program is outlined under (f)(4), Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The minister indicates that there's research done on a variety of technical assistance, I think I probably copied that down incorrectly, but the inference was, I believe, is that the Research Department does research of a technical nature. Can the minister inform us as to what specific research was done in this capacity during the past year?

MR. MacMASTER: One that's taking place right now, Mr. Chairman, is the critical skills area in the aerospace industry.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Is that the only one that's taken place in the last year then?

MR. MacMASTER: I didn't have this department last year. I'll try and get something together for the member on some of the technical programs that they were involved in in the previous year.

MR. COWAN: The minister also indicated that this department did career counselling. Would that career counselling come about as specific programs or is it general career counselling for people entering the work force. Where does that show up in the activities of the program?

MR. MacMASTER: They prepare bulletins for school counsellors, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The first question is the number of people here, the 14 staff positions. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if any of the original 14 that were transferred to this minister, whether any of the original 14 were fired by the minister?

MR. MacMASTER: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the minister could give us an indication of the amount recoverable from Canada. Under what program is that recoverable?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we're still on Salaries (1)Salaries I think that is included in (2).

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, then I would like to make a few general comments on this particular section. My colleague, the Member for Churchill, has raised in some further detail, the lack of evaluation of the private sector Youth Employment Program, and he's raised some very specific questions in terms of whether or not the evaluation included those specific items. Mr. Chairman, I raised the question of a more general nature, that is the intended effect of the program was to create jobs that would not have otherwise been created under this program. Mr. Chairman, on this section then, we wanted to know in terms of what research had been done, what evaluation had been done, and the minister for the first time this evening indicated a preliminary evaluation that was carried out. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier this was the first indication we have had of that preliminary evaluation, because when I asked specifically during Question Period of the minister, in terms of the research or the evaluation of this program, the minister indicated that there was no evaluation completed, whereas my information was that there was an evaluation completed, so that would match, Mr. Chairman, in terms of what would be a preliminary evaluation or a preliminary overview of what took place in the program,

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that in that preliminary evaluation, in the overview of the effect of the program, whether or not the program met its intention, that the answer was very strongly, that for the most part the program did not meet the intention of the program. That is, there was an indication from two different sources, Mr. Chairman. One, was that one-third of the jobs listed under this program would have been created anyway. Mr. Chairman, what was done in the past was that this program, when it was implemented before, was implemented at a later date, that is, those industries that would normally hire students for the summer had already done their hiring. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, when the program was announced and made available in the past, it had a far greater likelihood of creating new employment, since the initial hiring had already been done by the majority of companies.

The other aspect, Mr. Chairman, was that there was an evaluation instituted as part of the program. Were these funds spent as intended? It was an integral part of the program, so that the taxpayers of Manitoba could know whether or not in fact, they were getting the value for the money. Was the money being used as it was intended, as the program was announced? So, Mr. Chairman, that was a built-in evaluation program. What we have seen, Mr. Chairman, is in fact that this particular item, this section, has not completed its overall evaluation, and it has not completed the specific detailed questions, looking at the specific detailed questions that my colleague for Churchill has mentioned. So now we have a situation, Mr. Chairman, where some preliminary evaluation was done. I'm only guessing, Mr. Chairman, that the results of that preliminary evaluation were not that pleasing to the government or to the minister, since the preliminary evaluation of one source indicating one-third of the jobs were in fact jobs that would have been created anyway, and another source indicating that a half of the jobs were jobs that would have been created anyway.

Mr. Chairman, something happened between the preliminary evaluation that was completed, I believe, by last November and now I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that in fact the preliminary evaluation was left in a box, was filed, was put in a drawer somewhere; that in fact the evaluation of this program was then not pursued until my colleague, the Member for Churchill, sought the information in terms of order for return, and then, Mr. Chairman, used that information to, in fact, do his own evaluation, and with the limited information that was available to him, was able to outline and discover a number of irregularities within the program — a number of glaring irregularities within the program.

So, Mr. Chairman, obviously there was no research, no follow-up evaluation done in any effective way, if my colleague was able to ascertain that from the limited specifics that were made available to us on this side of the House. So, Mr. Chairman, both in the specific detail and in the general evaluation of whether in fact new jobs were created, the department and this Research Section was remiss in getting that done. Now, Mr. Chairman, it probably was not the fault of this Research Section because they were probably not given the task or assigned the task from the minister. After the preliminary evaluation had been done, I can only assume that nothing was done, otherwise it would have been completed before this.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation where there's a program with a number of problems in terms of its intent, and we have already reached the stage where the program is now being implemented for this season, for the students that will be requiring employment this summer, or now that the universities are out, Mr. Chairman, and soon the high schools will be out, and yet the evaluation upon which they could improve the program, make the program administratively more effective, and ensure that the program met the goals that were set for the program, to create new jobs, Mr. Chairman, not to pay people to create jobs that would have been created anyway — that that information is not available to them, because the evaluation has not yet been completed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult for us on this side of the House, to understand how a government that purports to be so efficient and so effective on the other side of the House, such good managers of the Government of Manitoba, could get themselves into a situation where the glaring irregularities of the program have to be pointed out by the opposition, and not by their own research, not by their own evaluation of the program. And then, Mr. Chairman, they do not even know, they do not even know yet whether or not these were new jobs. The minister has been unable to answer my question whether the information I have, one-third to one-half were not new jobs; he still does not know that information.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's a glaring example. Mr. Chairman, this is not the only glaring example in the short period that this of administrative bungling, of government has been in office, mismanagement on the part of this government. Mr. Chairman, how can they implement a program for the second year, when they haven't even completed the evaluation of the first year yet? How can they make any improvements to that program?

Now, Mr. Chairman, it's incomprehensible to me, that they in fact would be two things are incomprehensible into such a mess that it is sible — how it could have gotten now in, and how they

could not then take that mess and at least sort it out enough so they could implement a reasonable program this year.

Mr. Chairman, I don't understand how they could have gotten themselves into that position, Mr. Chairman, in which they are implementing the same program with only one modification that the Minister has been able to confirm, and that is the modification that grants not go to a political party under this section.

But, Mr. Chairman, what about the multiple industries? What about the listing of the jobs that, in fact, were never carried out so that the members opposite could brag, "We created so many jobs and for less money than had been done previously", when in fact, Mr. Speaker, many of those jobs were not new jobs. Many of those jobs were not in fact created but only applied for, Mr. Chairman. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't understand how they can make those extravagant claims for a program that is now becoming more and more evident that it was clearly bungled, clearly mismanaged; and then the evaluation of that bungling and mismanagement was bungled and mismanaged so that we don't even have an evaluation before the next year's program comes into effect, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for The Pas is probably the most expert in this House on bungling and mismanagement from the history of the particular department that he ran before.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I would ask the Minister is this department or this item the item under which we would discuss the summer student employment survey.

MR. MacMASTER: Could the member repeat the survey that he is talking about, Mr. Chairman, I'm just not sure what reference it is to.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. It is my understanding that the Department, at that time Continuing Education and Manpower, under the specific requirements as provided under the Manpower Division, initiated a survey each year at the end of the summer period, at the beginning of the school year, where a sampling of summer students were sent a questionnaire. The questionnaire asked them a number of questions. I can't be more specific than to say it asked them did they work during the summer and, if so, where. I'm not certain whether it asked them the amount they were paid. I think it asked them for how long they had been employed during the summer. Then that information was compiled and used to go to the university papers. And this is where the question first came to me, from one of the universities. The Editor of the paper had said, "By this time of the year", which was January at that time, January and February, "we have usually received a news release from the department directing attention to the results of this survey." And it would show how many summer students were unemployed during the summer, the number that were unemployed. I'm not certain if it would show the duration for which they were unemployed, or the wages, average wages. I'm not certain of all the information that went in it, but I know the primary function of it was to determine how many students did not find summer work during the summer.

And seeing as how it was in the Division of Manpower, when the Division of Manpower was under the Department of Education, Continuing Education, I am asking a question to the Minister if it's been transferred over to this department and, if it has been transferred over to this department, does it come under this particular item? Because it would seem to me to be a survey done for the purpose of researching program assessments, Manpower need assessments and program assessments.

MR. MacMASTER: I'll take that as notice and attempt to get the answer where that specific item is, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'd just indicate to the Minister that we would appreciate it as soon as possible, because I think that that program or that survey will have some impact on his government and our and the public's assessments of the Private Sector Youth Employment Program. Because if summer student employment did not decrease substantially then one would question the effectiveness of the program.

My colleague from The Pas has indicated that a preliminary evaluation of this program has been

done and I did not catch the Minister confirming that. So I would just ask him, did the Minister confirm that such an evaluation has been completed? Would the Minister be prepared to table that?

MR. MacMASTER: It's not complete, Mr. Chairman, and I said what I would be doing with the survey and with the review.

MR. COWAN: It was my misunderstanding then. This preliminary evaluation is just the preliminary aspects of the total evaluation, not an evaluation onto itself.

The Member for The Pas, my colleague, has indicated that, according to his information, only a third to a half of the jobs that were created under this program would have been created anyway. I don't know as how those figures were determined, but I'm certain that his information is substantially correct, as it has always been substantially correct except for the odd occasion. I have, perhaps, greater confidence in the Member for The Pas than the members opposite, than the Minister, but I will assure him that it is well earned.

To get back to the subject at hand, the Private Sector Youth Employment Program, and the evaluation of such — because we will be discussing the program in detail under the appropriate item — but the evaluation of such is the topic of discussion here, and I will be brief because I think the Member for The Pas has said it very, very well and very succinctly and very accurately, but I think that it bears repeating. It is a program that seems to have arisen out of a mad rush to do something, to do anything. —(Interjection)— Hothouse program. The program was put in place without a particularly great deal of forethought, and that is obvious from what has happened as a part of that program. The program lent itself to abuse, and the evaluation will point that out; that this program has probably been one of the most abused programs that any government has put in place in this province. And it had to be, because the evaluation will show that there were no specific requirements that would necessitate a person keeping with the intent of this program.

In other words, the program was so loosely structured — and I know that is one of the assets of the program, according to the members opposite — it was loosely structured; no bureaucracy; no red tape. But when you have loosely structured programs such as this you invite chinks in the armour, and when you have chinks in the armour you have people driving trucks through them and you have them abusing the program. And that's exactly what happened in this particular instance. And I think that the evaluation will show, for the record, these things: the evaluation will show that there were not the number of jobs created that the government would like us to believe; the evaluation will show that this program had very little effect on student unemployment rates in the province; the evaluation will show that this program has been abused, not only in intent but in actuality. And we know that for a fact. —(Interjection)—

The Minister of Economic Development has suggested to the Minister responsible for evaluation that they evaluate programs from the previous years, for the record, Mr. Chairperson, and if that's the undertaking that they wish to take then I'm certain they will. But what we're discussing right now, in this particular instance, is their program and it is the program that they have to take responsibility for and they don't seem to want to take responsibility for it now. And the reasons for that are obvious.

But to be brief, the evaluation will also show that this type of program cannot work. This type of program only redistributes unemployment. It does not act as a spur to the economy, nor does it act as a spur to the employment opportunities for young people in this province. It can only redistribute that unemployment that already exists.

And I would direct the Minister's attention and the Minister's Department's attention to numerous evaluations of programs similar to this. The National Union of Students, in Vancouver, May 13-19, 1979, at their Seventh Annual Meeting, discussed the problem of unemployment among students and discussed the different programs that could be put in place and their findings are much the same as ours, that programs of this nature tend to redistribute unemployment, rather than do anything towards accomplishing long-term solutions.

There is also an evaluation — and I'm not certain that I have it with me right now, Mr. Chairman — an evaluation done by the Honourable Ray Marshall, Conference Chairman of the Trade Union Advisory Committee and the Business and Industry Advisory Committee consultations, which, again, examines programs of this nature and finds that programs of this nature can only redistribute existing unemployment, that they do very little to spur the economy, that they do very little to provide new employment opportunities.

So, as I had said previously, we will be discussing the details of the program in specifics later but the evaluation of the program will not be favourable, and I hope that the Minister uses that evaluation to improve upon — not this year's program because it's already too late — and I think

that's to their discredit, that they had waited so long to do an evaluation that it could not be used for the purpose of improving this year's program but that they will use it for the purpose of improving next year's program if they decide, in their wisdom, to continue along this line of so-called "job creation" for students during the summer months.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, under (2) I wonder if the Minister could tell us what program is recoverable under, and what part is recoverable?

MR. MacMASTER: Adult occupational training, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister briefly explain to us the reductions in the Other Expenditures?

MR. MacMASTER: There were some services contracted out last year which our staff will be doing ourselves this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; (a)—pass; (b) Manpower Planning and Development: (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Could the Minister outline for us, one, the number of staff involved here that were involved before and that are involved now? Could the Minister outline for us the nature, the function of this particular section? And in what way is this section different from the section that we just looked at?

MR. MacMASTER: Last year there were five; this year there are five identical positions. The primary responsibilities are the administration of agreements and negotiations of funding with the federal government, and the objectives, of course, are to comply fully with the intents and terms of those agreements and to maximize federal funding, and to work with federal and provincial departments and agencies to assess manpower needs. That's generally the outline. It's dealing very specifically with agreements.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if the Minister can make that distinction between these two sections more clear. Like the assessing needs, to me, is like labour market determination, which was listed above, and I'm having some difficulty making a clear distinction between these two particular sections.

MR. MacMASTER: The majority of their work is the administration of your Occupational Training Agreement, Mr. Chairman, and they get input from others in regard to that.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister elaborate a bit on the Occupational Training Agreement and what is the nature of the agreement and what it does?

MR. MacMASTER: It facilitates the development and negotiations of the Federal-Provincial Agreements, and of course I've said it administers the present one, and I don't know if there's anything more specific that the member wants, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, my question was specifically what exactly is the agreement that is administered?

MR. MacMASTER: The agreement is a contract by which Canada purchases occupational training services for adults on apprentices from an institution which, of course, is approved by Manitoba. The agreement also identifies the interests and efforts of the two parties relating to industry and industrial training.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the training positions that are purchased, from where are they purchased? Is this mostly from the Community College? Is this 100 percent from the Community Colleges?

MR. MacMASTER: By and large the majority is through community colleges, but I understand that there's some from universities.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Then could the Minister deal with the same type of question I asked him before in terms of this particular Section, and its administration of the agreement, how does this Section interrelate then with the colleges?

MR. MacMASTER: The colleges deliver the services that are contracted for, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So this Section negotiates agreements and it administers agreements. Then it's not going to be sort of, what do they administer, because Canada Manpower buys 20 spaces; the college delivers a program that trains 20 people. What does this Section then do? Can the Minister give us some reassurance that there's no duplication of function and can the Minister say why this particular function should be located in this department as opposed to back in the department that deals with colleges?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, the agreement itself — the requirements are identified, prioritized, purchased from the college, and there's always consideration of ongoing amendments to the agreement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, does that mean that this Section of the Manpower Division actually does the purchasing then on behalf of Canada Manpower?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, we do.

MR. McBRYDE: Could we deal with the other question I asked about the avoiding of duplication and why this Section is in the Manpower Division under the Minister of Labour instead of under the Minister responsible for colleges, because it seems like sort of an unnecessary middleman the way he's described it in terms of that they negotiate and then they purchase from colleges, and I assume that colleges have to be involved because they have to be in a position to make sure the program is ready, that they can set up such a program and that they have enough people available to deliver the programs that are going to be purchased, etc., etc.

MR. MacMASTER: It's not felt by us that there's any duplication in this particular area, Mr. Chairman. I don't know how the member means that there might be.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the way the Minister describes it is what leads me to say there might be. As he described it, this Section negotiates agreements, and I assume that in order to negotiate agreements they have to know exactly what the colleges are able to deliver, so then they have to go to the colleges and say, "What can you deliver?" They have to go to the Federal Government and negotiate. Then they have to go back to the colleges and say, "We've negotiated this it," and you have to make sure you deliver and it seems like there's a middleman in this transaction, it seems then like unnecessary duplication when you have a middleman. Why don't the colleges negotiate directly with Canada Manpower in terms of those positions, and then we can have increased efficiency?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, that's the expression that the member uses isn't all that bad, that it is a middleman pulling all the required needs and the facilities together and then ending up with an agreement that will hopefully be of satisfaction to all parties.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, another question might help to clarify this situation of this Section (b) here. Those five positions that are here, where did they come from? Where were they transferred from to this department?

MR. MacMASTER: All from Education, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Then Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to give the logic and the rationale for the transfer of this Section from Education, I assume from Colleges, as part of the Education Budget, to this department.

MR. MacMASTER: It's an overview in the requirement balances between college training and industry training and we feel this is where it rightfully belongs.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder then if the Minister could give me a little bit more detail in terms of the statistics of the space purchases. How many would be purchases outside of the colleges and where for example would that take place?

MR. MacMASTER: Two examples I have are diploma training in Agriculture at the University of Manitoba, and some bilingual training at St. Boniface College.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that sort of increases my curiosity as to why this section would be under the Minister of Labour since it deals with spaces in the community colleges, it deals with spaces at St. Boniface College, and spaces at the University, and, Mr. Chairman, you know this is new to the Minister and the Minister doesn't know this section that well yet. His colleague behind him probably knows it like the back of his hand in details of exactly how it functions and works and it sort of makes logical sense to me as the Minister said earlier the reason that one section is where it is, is because that's the way it was, and that seems to make more sense in terms of this section, that it should have been left where it was because that's where it was — to use the Minister's rationale.

MR. MacMASTER: I think it's doing a fine job just where it is, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I forgot one question on (1) and that was in terms of these five positions. Were any of these five positions transferred to this Minister? Were any of those five people fired and replaced with other people, and secondly, Mr. Chairman, moving on to Item (2), could the Minister indicate the recoverable from Canada, under what agreement is that recoverable?

MR. MacMASTER: Under the same agreement, Adult Occupational Training Agreement, there is \$73,000 recoverable, and the answer to his first question is no.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister be so kind as to give me the job titles of those five positions?

MR. MacMASTER: There is a Director and two Program Analysts, an Administrative Secretary and a Clerk Typist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; (b)—pass; (c) Apprenticeship and Industrial Training, (1) Salaries —pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if the Minister could bring us up to date since the Minister has said on previous occasions that he is not satisfied with the Apprenticeship Training Program as it exists in Manitoba, at the present time. Some of the questions that I do have to ask the Minister are dealing with the certificates that we have now. I wonder if the Minister could give us the trades that are designated as trades under the interprovincial agreement, and what trades are still under our provincial certificate, and I know that there is a set examination for those desiring those interprovincial certificates under an inter -provincial exam where they must receive a mark of 69 or in excess of that to receive the seal designating them as having an interprovincial certificate. And is there any difference in the length of the term of indenture that an apprentice serves in qualification for a provincial certificate? Are we talking about a four-year program and what are we talking for an interprovincial certificate? Is there a difference in the length of the term of the program?

Also, in the tables that are provided here by the department we have certificates issued to tradesmen other than apprentices for time served or by examination since the designation of the trade. I wonder if the Minister could explain what is meant by "since the designation of the trade" since we see it here on, and I'm referring to page 55 of the Annual Report. Well, we'll take the first one here for instance, boilermaker, certificates issued to apprentices November 1st, 1977 to October 31st, 1977; 15. Then the next column we see is headed by "Certificates issued to apprentices since the designation of the trade". What is meant by "since the designation of the trade", if the Minister could explain that. Then we have a line here "Certificates issued to tradesmen other than

apprentices, November 1st to October" again the same time. And then we have the last line 148, for certificates issued to tradesmen other than apprentices for time served or by examinations since designation of the trade. I would like the Minister to be able to explain just what is meant by those headings, what length of time a person would qualify; would he have to have worked at the trade for, say seven years other than being in an apprenticeship program before he would be eligible to write an examination to receive either a provincial or interprovincial certificate? Would he have to take any written tests as well as the practical tests in order to gain his certificate of journeymanship? If the Minister has answers to those few questions at this time then I'll sit down and I may have some more later.

MR. MacMASTER: There is some trades that require a fair amount of practical but the answer is, yes, it certainly is written and in some cases practical. The general rule is one year longer than what an apprenticeship is — if you've been in a trade one year longer than what an apprenticeship is and your appropriate timing that you're talking about is a time when it was considered that that particular trade was appropriate for apprenticeship, which might have been 1973, 1974, 1971, the appropriate time, it refers to the time when that particular trade was considered appropriate to become a trade. Now, that could be different times, some trades have been in being for a long long time and some are very recent, as you know. So now, any that are recent, if there was one established last year, then the appropriate time relates to last year.

MR. JENKINS: I think I understand what the minister is saying, but to get back to what I was asking him about certificates of interprovincial and tickets of provincial. Could the minister, I believe it's 27 designated trades or somewhere in that vicinity, give us an outline of which ones of these would be classed as qualifying for interprovincial certificates? And is it possible for someone to obtain his journeyman's certificate in a trade at a provincial level and still not qualify? I realize if he doesn't pass that certain examination, is there a difference of time limit for the period of indenture for — I'm talking about the apprenticeship program, I'm not talking about those other than apprentices — if I was to become indentured to an employer as of today, would I serve a four-year apprenticeship or the time limit of, for sake of argument, say 5,000 hours? Would there be a different life of indenture, say for an interprovincial certificate? Would I have to serve 5500 hours, or say 6,000 hours? Well, the minister shakes his head — then there is no difference.

MR. MacMASTER: Maybe I could explain that there's 17 that once qualified in Manitoba, are considered interprovincial. If the member would desire and just shake his head if he wants it, I can read them out the ones that are interprovincial.

MR. JENKINS: Well, if the minister has a list, he could send it over.

MR. MacMASTER: Why don't I get a copy of the Apprenticeship Guidance Information. I'll keep it now because you may have some more questions, but I'll get a copy to the member and it spells out exactly the exact ones that do in fact qualify for being interprovincial.

MR. JENKINS: Fine. Then I think I understand the minister. Now, if say for argument sake it is a 5,000 hour program that the person served whatever the . . . Is it on an hour basis?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hour is specifically applied to the specific trades and in some trades are earmarked as interprovincial, so there's no set pattern, there's no extra hours because it's interprovincial, it's because you qualify for a specific trade, then once qualified if that's one of the designated ones then it's good for interprovincial. I can't break it down and say that there is X more hours because it's in provincial, there might be X more hours because the trade requires more hours. But there are certain trades, once you qualify, then you're good for interprovincial.

MR. JENKINS: I understand the Minister. Some trades may call for 4,000 hours and that would qualify the person then by writing the examination of an interprovincial nature requiring 69 of a mark or over, he would then qualify for an interprovincial certificate. Then, of the certificates that were issued for last year, the figure is 633, of those issued, would it be possible for the Minister and his staff to dig out how many of those qualified for an interprovincial certificate? I realize there are only 17 of those, so we would have to break it down of the 17 — and I don't know the ones right now — but if we could find out to give us an idea. I know it does show the passing percentages here but it doesn't break it down.

If we go to page 57, again just taking boiler makers because it is the first one, there were 29

boiler maker apprentices examined and of that 22 passed. Would the Minister be able to tell us of the 22 that passed, how many qualified for an interprovincial certificate; how many qualified for a provincial certificate? I imagine the two certificates still exist.

MR. MacMASTER: That's one of the particular trades that is interprovincial and they all would have qualified once they've got the trade.

MR. JENKINS: Well, do I understand the Minister correctly then, that the passing mark in that trade would be 69 or over? Would that be correct? Would that be a correct assumption? The Minister nods his head that that would be a correct assumption. Well, just to pick another one at random, just to give you an idea, a construction electrician: would that be one of the certificates? How about a heavy duty mechanic; would that be an interprovincial certificate or would that be a provincial certificate? Well, I think that answers the questions that I had. With that I understand the Member for Kildonan has some questions that he might want to ask on this.

Oh, one thing before I do sit down. On page 51, the Director of the Apprenticeship Training also arranges for institutional training. Is this pre-apprenticeship training included and is it also part of the . . . I don't know what it is now. I know at one time it used to be two months out of every year that apprentices went in for their schooling and training — at that time was the Manitoba Technical Institute and later on the Manitoba Institute of Technology — and now I guess it's Red River Community College and the other community colleges.

But what duration would the pre-apprenticeship training and the initial apprenticeship training prior to the apprentice being indentured be at the present time? What would the initial program be and what would the yearly program, that he goes in yearly for, at the community colleges level be at the present time?

MR. MacMASTER: There is no referral of pre-employment. There is referral of apprentices. I don't know if that answers the question.

I've got the other answer, too. Now, I might be out one, because we've added it up pretty fast, but there were 609 of the 633 that were interprovincial certificates. Now, I wouldn't want to say that I misinformed you if it's 606 or 610. We added it up pretty fast, but a huge majority of those were interprovincial certificates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Now, the department also, or the branch here, the Division, also develops Training Program curricula. Is there input from the Trade Advisory Committees to the setting up of these curricula?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, there is. It's devised in consultation with that committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I wonder if the Minister would give us a breakdown. I notice that there is quite a difference from the previous year in respect to salaries, whether he would give us the staff man years and indicate where the increase has taken place.

MR. MacMASTER: I should have spelled this out to start with, Mr. Chairman. Last year there were 21, and there were five unfunded; this year there are 21 and they are all funded. Would you like me to repeat? Last year there were 21 and there were five unfunded, not funded, vacant; this year there are 21, and it's the intentions of myself, as Minister, to fill those 21 positions this year. And there are funds there for them, that's why the major difference.

MR. FOX: Yes, in respect to the training for apprenticeship that takes place out of the province, do the apprentices get allowances for living away from home or what is the case in those instances?

MR. MacMASTER: The same as the apprentices within province, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FOX: Can the Minister inform us how many Advisory Committees met, and how often?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't have the specifics, but the Director informs me that there were approximately 16 that met and it's a general rule that they meet once a year, unless there is some

specific problem that arises that they would be called.

MR. FOX: I wonder if the Director could also inform the Minister and us whether there has been any tendency to reduce some of the apprenticeship time — I understand some of them are still fairly lengthy, up to five years — whether there has been any discussion in that direction?

MR. MacMASTER: There has been discussions but the Advisory Committees, up to this date, have not agreed to a reduction in time.

MR. FOX: Can the Minister inform us whether there's been any abuse of the apprenticeship system from the reports of his inspectors that go around?

MR. MacMASTER: No specific trade with any major abuses. Now, I know that it's an ongoing surveillance of the apprenticeship programs to assure ourselves that they're being properly carried out. But I think, as specific as I can be, that there's no specific trade that we know of any major abuses of it.

MR. FOX: Just one more question — well actually, two. Has there been any change in the complement of the staff man years in the last 18 months, or were any of them dismissed?

MR. MacMASTER: There was a Board held yesterday to fill one position, and the others are coming very shortly. It's our full intention to till those positions.

MR. FOX: I asked whether there was any change — maybe I missed the answer — in the complement that there was over the 18 months — no change?

MR. MacMASTER: No.

MR. FOX: Thank you.

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

MR. BARROW: I'd like to ask just a few questions on the Apprenticeship Program, and I think the Minister is interested in this program and he knows the success or failure is going to be very important, because it pertains to our Native Program in Flin Flon. And I think he's familiar with the program that Allard started; do you remember that, where he would take natives into Thompson to work with Inco for 20 days, and 10 days home. It failed, it was a failure for different reasons; because they couldn't adjust; and the work ethics; and it was a complete failure, as we all know.

Now they start a program in Flin Flon, with natives, and the Minister realizes the problem of these natives as well as anyone in this House. But I'd like to know how many are being employed through this particular program, in a construction basis, so far?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't have those numbers, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARROW: Oh, you will get them, eh? You will give it later? You're taking it as notice?

A MEMBER: He didn't say that.

MR. BARROW: No, I'm asking him, that's a formal question.

MR. MacMASTER: No.

MR. BARROW: Well, how is this program financed? Who pays what, and how much?

MR. MacMASTER: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I just missed something there. Is the Member for Flin Flon specifically talking about the Apprenticeship Program, or the Relocation Program? We are dealing specifically with Apprenticeship, and I'm not sure whether I missed the point that he was making there.

MR. BARROW: Maybe this isn't the place to bring this up, but I don't know where else, Mr. Chairman. It's a program where natives are brought in with their families, housed, trained, have

a chance to adjust and become workers for HBM and S, that's the program.

MR. MacMASTER: Under (d), Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARROW: Under (d).

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you. Perhaps the Minister can indicate to us what the current status of the Mining as a Trade Apprenticeship Program is? I know that there was some difficulty in getting people to participate in the program, and I wonder if the Minister has directed his department's attention to that, and what sort of progress has been made in making this program more acceptable, more accessible and more appreciated by the miners as a whole?

MR. MacMASTER: I was aware that there were some problems. I had a short discussion with one of the Steel Workers' staff in relationship to it, and our Apprenticeship people had a tour through the industry and discussed some of the problems as it relates to that particular miners' program. I can't say that the success is booming, but I do know that either this past Monday or next Monday, there's five starting in Flin Flon. So, where there's a bit of candlelight, I guess there's possibilities of a larger light, so I do know that there must have been some success following that, because there's five starting in Flin Flon.

MR. COWAN: Yes, which would bring the total number of apprentices in Mining as a Trade sector to what number?

MR. MacMASTER: I understand there's 17, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would hope the Minister would direct his department's attention to this program. It's a new program and as a new program, as the Minister is well aware, will undergo growing pains from time to time. And there are problems involved, and yet it is a very credible, and it is a very important program for miners, and it's innovative. It's something that the unions, the workers and the government themselves worked on very diligently, and very extensively for a number of years and they got it into place in that first year under the grandfather clause, which enabled workers who had experience to qualify as trades people. There were a large number of people, I'm not certain how many, I'm sure the Minister knows but it's not important, the exact numbers. The fact is, there were a large number of people who suddenly became trades people, tradesmen, trades people, miners, they had a trade which is something they never had before. And there were extensive negotiations with the company — I forgot to mention that and I should have, because it's to their credit also that they were so intricately involved in developing this program.

And then we see a large in-rush of people coming into the program, not as large as we would have anticipated or expected or hoped for, but a large in-rush nonetheless. And then it seems to have fallen off year by year. I know some of the problems, having worked underground myself and worked with the miners — I know some of the problems and they're not insurmountable, they're not insurmountable at all. And maybe we just have to take a fresh look at this program, in detail and try and figure out where the problems are. Some of them are monetary problems; a miner who's making bonus and has to give up a fairly good face in the drift, or has to give up a fairly good position in the stope or a fairly good timbering job to go to a lesser paying job, because those are the qualifications of the Apprenticeship Program — that may be a problem. And we can look at that problem, and I think it's time perhaps, for industry and the unions and the workers and the government to sit down for the purpose of reviewing and re-evaluating in detail, this program.

I wonder if the Minister could give us some commitment to initiate that sort of process, not immediately, but during the upcoming year or the next number of months to start that ball rolling, to get people looking at what seems to be a very credible program, but one that might need some minor changes to make it more efficient, and more effective and more valuable to the miners as individuals and society as a whole.

MR. MacMASTER: No problem with that at all. We have full intentions of doing just exactly that — of reviewing it, the contents of it and the problems within it. Part of that review took place when our people made the tour just over a month ago and maybe this new influx of five at Flin Flon is a sign that it had some benefits.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you. I hope it is a sign, and I share the Minister's wish that this program does flourish and blossom in the near future. Under the Apprenticeship Division as a whole, there seems to be something going wrong; I'm not certain what it is, but we see in the last year, in '78, we see the lowest percentage increase in the number of apprentices, acting apprentices at the year-end, which is October 31st. We see a 7 percent increase over the previous year, and that's the lowest since 1968. So, in a full decade, we see the lowest increase in the number of acting apprentices at October 31st, year-end. And we see the number of registrations at year-end, showing a 6.5 percent decrease, which is the rgest year-end decrease over the previous year since 1971, when it was 9.9, which was a substantial decrease at that time also. In '74, there was a small decrease, but in other years, we see 40 percent increases, 10 percent increases, and we see the number of cancellations year ending October 31st in '78 increasing also.

We see the number of apprentices in Winnipeg and in the rest of the province — while they're staying the same, the percentage of the number of apprentices in Winnipeg as per the total in the rest of the province staying at approximately 50 percent, which is an average that it's occupied for the last 4 or 5 years — a decrease from previous years and I think that's a good sign. We see those increases themselves being very small increases. And we're talking, to put it in absolute terms, we're talking about the number of apprentices acting at year-end, October 31st in '77 being 2,746, and in '78 being only 2,765. So, just to clarify those percentage increases, we are not seeing a substantial increase either percentagewise or numerically, in absolute terms.

So, there seems to be problems in the Apprenticeship Division and yet we know that this is a time when we will need more skilled people, that the world is becoming an increasingly more complex industrial world, and that we need more skills. As individuals we need more skills; as workers we need more skills; and as industry —(Interjection)— the Member for Flin Flon, my colleague, tells me the and I'm just wondering if he's hinting, if he's trying to politicians tell me something on the sly. But at any rate, we do need to develop those skills as a society and as individuals, and the Apprenticeship and Tradesman Division is responsible by and large for much of that development, along with the other integrated departments or branches or divisions, whatever terminology we wish to use in this particular section of the Estimates.

So I would ask the Minister if he could indicate if he is aware of this downturn, and if so what action is being taken by the department to turn it around so that we start developing skilled workers for the near future's needs.

MR. CHEIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I don't know whether I can take all the credit or any of the credit or whatever, but it is a fact that from October to October, from 1977 to 1978 there was only an increase of 19. But it is a fact that, and I don't want to say it's coincidental with myself becoming the Minister, but we're talking about months — and we'll guess at 6 months — and in that 6 months there's been 112 new entries.

MR. COWAN: Well that is indeed good news and will tend to allay some of our fears. Now the question is, why was that 1978 such a bad year and why is 1979 such a good year? The Minister indicates that they really don't have a handle on the problem yet, and yet I think it's important that we find out why in one year we show such an inconsequential increase, and yet it appears — although this year isn't over — it appears that this year is going to show a much greater increase.

The Member for Kildonan has what I might think would be a good point, and I would just throw it out for the Minister to comment upon, because I'm sincerely interested in solving this problem. He indicates that the construction industry strike may have had some impact on the number of apprentices entering the work force, would that be true?

MR. MacMASTER: I suppose there's that possibility, and also there is always a period of time, and I haven't analyzed that, where there is a flow into the market of those that are graduating and sometimes there is a pick-up period through history where it has to gather back momentum. That's a historical thing that happens, but I don't think it's ever been analyzed specifically and broken down in what periods, because apprenticeships . . . there's so many overlapping features to them.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, is the Research Department doing any sort of research to define the needs for skilled workers over the next decade or five years, whichever period they would wish to choose; and is there any sort of affirmative action recruiting that is being done to include women

and other socially economically disadvantaged people such as the Metis people and the Indian people into this program?

MR. MacMASTER: There's numbers of all categories of people that are entering the Apprenticeship Program. I haven't specifically broken that down and don't think I really want to get into nationalities of it. It is an ongoing initiative that we have dealt with under the research group that we certainly are going to be talking to industries about requirements, and having a look at the requirements of the trades. Again, the Aerospace Industry is certainly one that is going to have substantial expansion within the province.

MR. COWAN: Yes, and I would ask the Minister, is the department not only looking at the substantial increase in the existing trades but are they looking at new fields, new areas, for developing trades people's qualifications and programs and if so can he indicate in general terms what those areas might be?

MR. MacMASTER: There was just a recent designation of a new one, the power electrician. The Hydro people had been dealing with our apprenticeship people for some time on and that was just recently designated, if I took a guess, I would say a month ago.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, my apologies to the Minister but I missed the title . . .

MR. MacMASTER: A power electrician.

MR. COWAN: A power electrician. And that will be a trades program under the standard provisions of previous programs a certain amount of apprenticeship at . . . Are there any other areas that the Minister is looking at presently for designating as trades?

MR. MacMASTER: Not specifically, Mr. Chairman, but we respond to major industries' concerns. This response really came from Hydro themselves, and that's generally how it comes about.

MR. COWAN: Yes, can the Minister indicate if most of the formal schooling that is taking place under the Apprenticeship Program is taking place at Red River and Keewatin Community College, is that the proper place?

MR. MacMASTER: Both, plus Assiniboine, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairperson. Can the Minister indicate if there are waiting lists for people to take advantage of these programs, or if the community colleges are able to assimilate the numbers who are coming to them in a satisfactory manner?

MR. MacMASTER: No waiting lists that we are aware of, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There was an apprenticeship program set up to overcome a problem that was existing in the north, where people might work for one company when it came into their community for a number of months, then with another one and it was difficult in terms of completing an apprenticeship.

And there was an attempt made to apprentice people too, at one time, to the Northern Manpower Corps to provide some of the continuity necessary to provide one employer, although they might have worked for a number of employers. I understand that program has been having some difficulty in terms of the people being able to use it to complete the program, and I wonder if there has been an evaluation done of that particular program and what are the results of that evaluation, and whether or not there are any changes in that particular program to attempt to make it more workable for people in the remote communities in northern Manitoba. ,

MR. MacMASTER: We're looking at our Employment Services people to come up with people that may in fact be desirous of getting into the Apprenticeship Program. It gets into the area of relocation but it's similar that we want our relocation people eventually trained to offer opportunities along the line of the Apprenticeship Programs in addition to trying to relocate just the, certainly not the simple, but the basic process of relocating people in so they can go into the mines. For example, we have had some discussions on the possibility of bringing people in and attempts to get them

into the Apprenticeship Program.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sort of clear what the Minister is getting at with his answer. Is there no longer a program that exists through the Employment Services or through the Manpower corps or whatever to assist people to complete the apprenticeship that may not be in Thompson; it may be in a remote area?

MR. MacMASTER: There is no reason why the particular program can't be continued. As I said, we're working in that direction through our relocation people trying to get others into apprenticeship programs.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm not attempting to criticize the Minister. I'm curious in terms of what happened with the Program. The meeting that the Minister and I were at in The Pas, t/here was some indication that there was a high drop-out rate from that Apprenticeship Program through the Northern Man Manpower Corps. . And I wonder if he's had the opportunity yet to have some evaluation of that, to have some understanding of what took place and what the problems were and how it might be improved.

MR. MacMASTER: No, I haven't in all thruthfulness totally evaluated that yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We've got to take a referee's time out for changing the tape; we'll just be a few seconds if you'll just bear with us. .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The tape is in place, the Minister has returned, we can carry on.
The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to check with the Minister. Since it is 20 after 12:00, whether you would consider adjourning after this particular item is completed so that we are able to deal fully and properly with the remaining items that are on here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I would think, Mr. Chairman, we can go maybe a little further this evening. The dialogue seems very good and I think we're making reasonable progress.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister hasn't done an evaluation of the program I was asking about. I think there are some figures that were given out at that meeting in The Pas in terms of the number of people that had completed the program or still in the program and had left the program. I wonder if he has those available.

MR. MacMASTER: I can get that information for the member, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Churchill. **MR. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Well, it seems in this department that we have the same problem that we've had in all the departments passed, and that is that we've suffered a full loss of one year; that in almost every instance in the Department of Labour, the statistics and every indicator shows that it has stood sill or dropped behind, if not in absolute terms at least in relative terms to activities of the previous year and that we have suffered and the people of Manitoba have suffered the loss of a full year as far as the Labour relations in the employment in the industrial community in the Province of Manitoba. And the Minister indicates that they are not going to take any sort of affirmative action in regard to bringing what are commonly termed socially disadvanaqed, socially economically disadvantaged persons into the apprenticeship labour force. And yet he has a department which we discussed under these Estimates just a couple of days ago that is put together for one of the primary purposes, that is to bring women, who have been among those who have been considered to be left behind when it comes to apprenticeship programs, to bring women into the labour force and to bring women into the apprenticeship arena. And yet he tells us that they are not going to implement any such programs and the inclination or the inference that one can draw from that is they don't approve of any such programs, that they are philosophically or pragmatically — I don't know which — opposed to the idea of affirmative action programs. —(Interjection)—

The Member for Flin Flon says they're against women. I don't think it's anything that black and white. I think that they may at times be anti-progress, that they may at times be anti-change, that would be in keeping with their Tory philosophy, but I don't think that they're against women, I don't

think that they're against native people, Metis or status or non-status Indian people; but I don't think they understand. I don't think they understand the problems and I don't think that they're willing to understand the problems and I don't think they're willing to try change, that they get locked into this sort of philosophical posture and they play it by some very strict rules. You know, they accuse us of being doctrinaire and they accuse us of being stuck to a particular ideology but the fact is, that they in their own way are doctrins; air and the fact is that they in their own way are stuck to a particular ideology. And because of that we see that people in any progressive industrial state are being drawn into the labour force because people are beginning to appreciate the problems that they've faced throughout the years, people are beginning to appreciate the problems that they face today. People are beginning to appreciate their value to society and people are also beginning to appreciate that if you don't lock people into the system socially and economically, if you don't bring them into the system and give them a part of that system, that from the outside of the system they are going to work against the system, that they are going to work against you. So if you don't give them opportunity; if you don't give them opportunity to become a viable, and to become an integral, and to become an important part of our society, then you are in fact forcing them to work against that society because they do not see that society as valuable to themselves.

And we all view our society that we exist in or we exist on the peripheral of or the realm of, we all view it from a very personal perspective. In other words, we don't particularly care what the historical ideology of the Conservative Party is — and I'm talking about individuals — we don't particularly care what the historical philosophy of the New Democratic Party is. That doesn't matter to us. What matters to us is our bread and butter. How do we exist? What do we do? How are we going to make this a better world to live in for not only ourselves but for everyone else?

And so, modern industrial states, recognizing the problem and recognizing the solution, have all begun to implement affirmative action programs, and yet we see the Minister here tonight in an 18th Century mentality saying, "No, we're not going to do that" and yet on the other hand we see a department that says, "That's what we have to do" — the Women's Bureau. And we see the Minister at contradiction with himself. Somewhere along the line, something has to give; something has to be lost and I'm just afraid that given the Minister's attitude, that it will be the progressive aspect of our society that are lost and that we will be driven back into that 18th Century.

So I would ask the Minister if he can explain in detail or give us details as to how many women are currently a part of the Apprenticeship Program and perhaps he can compare that historically over the past number of years. I'm not asking him for specific numbers but I'm asking him for increases or decreases so as if we can see in fact if women are being brought into the society in which they want very dearly to exist and in which we should want them to become a part of.

So can the Minister indicate what relative changes have taken place in regard to the number of women as a percentage of the apprenticeship labour force?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I don't know what the percentage changes are but I know that there is somewhere between 15 and 20 women either in apprenticeship or just about to pass through it and we understand that more all the time are getting interested in the Program and we are encouraging them.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, the Minister mentions that he's encouraging them, yet he mentions that he's opposed to affirmative action program. Perhaps the Minister can indicate in specific detail as to how they are in fact encouraging women to enter the apprenticeship labour force.

MR. MacMASTER: I don't know where the member is getting the idea that we're opposed to affirmative action. The same set of Estimates that he was talking about the other day outlines that the Civil Service Commission are, in fact, very interested in the very types of things that he's been talking about, which we think will open up fields such as this and many others.

MR. COWAN: Yes, but when we pressed the Minister for details, Mr. Chairperson, they were scant and they were vague at best. So I would ask the Minister now to take this opportunity to prove my inference is incorrect, which may entirely be within his possibilities, within his capabilities, and to specify in detail as to how they are encouraging women to enter the apprenticeship labour force. How are they encouraging them to become tradespeople? What sort of affirmative action hiring

policies, affirmative action . . . perhaps he can limit his remarks to his own department or to his own government, and indicate to us just what action is being taken in this regard, in detail, so that we can have the opportunity to apologize for mistaking his inference and he can have the opportunity to prove that he says he is in favour of affirmative action.

MR. MacMASTER: The apprenticeship people are meeting with various women's groups and making them more aware of the opportunity that they can avail themselves of.

MR. COWAN: Yes, I assume when the Minister indicates the apprenticeship people that he's speaking about his own apprenticeship and tradespeople, or Tradesman Division, Qualifications Division.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes.

MR. COWAN: Can the Minister then provide us with a list of meetings that have been held with women's groups over the past year for the purpose of discussing opportunities open to women, options available to women, and discussing better means by which women can enter the apprenticeship labour force — and by this I mean discussing it in a two-way flow, with the women giving suggestions and the department giving suggestions?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll attempt to get that information for the member, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, to what does the Minister attribute the fairly high number of cancellations of apprenticeships for the year ending October 31, 1978 over the year ending October 31, 1977? There seems to be a substantial increase. As a matter of fact, in 1974 there were 348 cancellations; in 1975 there were 298; in 1976 there were 268 — we see it decreasing then — and in 1977 we see it increasing again, 310; and then we see it as 375 in 1978, and that's a fairly damaging statistic as to his government and his department's commitment to the Apprenticeship Program, and I would just wish the Minister to indicate why that came about and what in detail has been done to rectify it?

MR. MacMASTER: I haven't got an explanation why the numbers fluctuate as they do. I suppose there's a wide variety of reasons, but we have never specifically sat down and analyzed the exact reasons for apprentices doing the things that they do, which is getting out of the programs.

MR. COWAN: Yes, well, Mr. Chairperson, when the Minister sees an anomaly, such as the 5,000 lost jobs in the transportation sector, that is damaging to his government's reputation, he is quick to question the validity of that anomaly; he is quick to question why it occurred, why it happened, what brought it about, what impact it's going to have, what effect it will have. And yet, when we see this sort of anomaly, he says, "Well, we don't know." And he doesn't indicate that they're doing anything to find out. He doesn't indicate that they are interested. He just says quite bluntly, "Well, we don't know" and he attributes it to the cyclical flow and to the personality quirks of individual apprentices.

I don't think that's a complete, nor a fair answer to the question that we pose, because the question is a very serious question. We see a 20 percent increase, roughly, in the number of cancellations, and that must mean something to the Minister. Perhaps if the Minister hasn't done any sort of specific research to it, can he indicate his own feelings as to what would necessitate a change of that nature?

MR. MacMASTER: I would think the total fluctuation over the period of years is something that could be reviewed, and see if there was a pattern because something happened every second year, every third year, or whatever.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Well, there is a cyclical nature, certainly, in almost all of these figures, because there are certain years that are more conducive to apprentices entering the program. And there are certain conditions in industrial and environmental and economically environmental climates that are nonconductive. So perhaps the Minister can indicate what it was about 1978 that was nonconductive to apprentices entering the Apprenticeship Program.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the Minister is not willing to answer some

of the questions that are raised. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple in more questions on the apprenticeship aspect that I mentioned earlier terms of apprenticing out to a section of government, to a section of the department. Mr. Chairman, that particular avenue of approach to northern employment and to upgrade the qualifications of northern people, I think was a fairly unique one, probably within Canada. Mr. Chairman, it's important that we take a look at that, because there are so many aspects of the development of the north that have been dropped by this government.

Mr. Chairman, for example, the next item, Item (d), is pretty well all that's left in terms of employment creation and economic development in northern Manitoba, the next item, which is a fairly large item.

Mr. Chairman, since this apprenticeship section is one part of the many approaches that were established in the past — and, Mr. Chairman, I'm sort of surprised that the Minister didn't seem to be very aware of that particular program and hasn't asked for some kind of evaluation to see why it hasn't been as effective as it might have been. Mr. Chairman, what the purpose was, was to take advantage of the fact that there are many people in the remote communities of northern Manitoba that do, in fact, have the experience, that do, in fact, have the ability to become licenced and certified within their particular trade. But because of the way the Apprenticeship Program is set about, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think there's that many other options in terms of having an effective program, that you have to apprentice to someone, and that they have to have certain qualifications, you have to work with them for a certain amount of time, then you have to write an exam to complete your qualification process. Mr. Chairman, there were many people that had up to 10 years experience in that particular field, but since they had been with 30 or 40 different employers during that time, Mr. Chairman, they were unable to get the qualifications necessary.

So the program appeared to be one worthwhile way to begin to get people the qualifications. In fact, Mr. Chairman, you could talk to northerners, and there are many occasions when, for example, someone from a remote community would go to work at Hydro and be hired as a carpenter's helper, and have more skills and more knowledge and more ability than the person that they are working under, and be getting less pay than the person who was less experienced than they were. So this was a way, Mr. Chairman, to make that experience count towards certification, towards licensing of people.

Mr. Chairman, that's why it's difficult to understand why the Minister wasn't more aware of that particular program, and not able to find out what was happening with the program, if in fact the figures given at The Pas meeting were correct — the meeting between the native people and the labour unions — that in fact the program was not working very well, that many people had dropped out of the program. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister can get the figures, at least, and maybe even some preliminary ideas as to what was going wrong. And maybe the Minister would undertake to evaluate and find out if, in fact, the problems were such that they could be overcome and the program could be made more meaningful, or whether, in fact, the problems were such that maybe a different approach is necessary. Because it was one of many approaches attempted in order to overcome a specific problem, and it seemed to be a worthwhile idea, and it seemed to be a unique or an experimental idea.

MR. MacMASTER: People still can, Mr. Chairman — I outlined this previously — people still can apply to write for their ticket. They establish the fact that they have been involved in a trade for X number of years and they're still capable of . . . that option is still there, there is no problem with that.

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

MR. JENKINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Several years ago, the Department of Labour decided that they would try and set up apprenticeship programs in government departments, where we would, as a public sector service try and, where it was possible in the apprenticeship trades set up, where the government or the employing agent which would be the department — whatever department it would be, it could be Government Services, it could be various departments, it could be Roads and such — and I wonder if the Minister at this time could give us a comparison from when the program was instituted a few years ago, whether we have really embarked on this program, or is it just something that was started and more or less nothing has happened. How many apprentices do we have now of the ones that are serving apprenticeships in the Province of Manitoba that are indentured to government departments?

This would be interesting because I think that if we're going to strive for a good apprenticeship program in this province, then I think it is incumbent upon the public sector, and in this case the

Government of Manitoba, to set a good example for the employing of apprentices, which is a good program.

We touched on this briefly the other day when we were dealing with the Women's Bureau, and I asked the Minister at that time and from the answers that I got at that time, we don't have any women actually apprenticed in the provincial job sector as such. And if we are sincere — and I don't doubt the Minister is sincere — we should be encouraging as many of the women who are willing to go into the Apprenticeship Program. It's a good program. I realize that on construction job sites it's difficult, and it has some drawbacks, but I still think it is possible for construction firms to be able to employ female apprentices.

And the Minister mentioned that there were 15 to 20 women already in the Apprenticeship Program here in Manitoba, or preparing to enter, or were in it now. The case that I pointed out to the Minister the other day, sure, they were in the Apprenticeship Program — the two girls that I talked about — but the fact was that they could not become indentured. This is the problem. If the Minister could tell us, of the 15 to 20 that are in or preparing to go in, is there any possibility for these people, when they complete their school training, while that portion I guess is the easiest part, but it is to get employers to actually sign papers of indenture with the apprentice and the necessary signing through the department, and through the Director.

Now, if we cannot persuade the private sector to employ them, I think that we're missing a bet here, especially if we're not ourselves an employing agency setting the example. That I think is one of the real problems that we have with the program. If we expect the people in the private sector to take apprentices then I think we as an employing agent should be willing to hire and sign the papers of indenture to employ women within our service. I think this is one thing that the Minister and his department and the director really have to work on because if we just start these people in the apprenticeship program and they don't get the training on the job, then they are not going to be able to put their hours in in order to be able to write their certificates of qualification.

And it is unfortunate that we have not been able to persuade the trades to accept these people, and the Minister has on more than one occasion said that he is not satisfied with the apprenticeship program as it is at the present time. I would like the Minister to outline in a little better detail than what he has at the present time just what is it about the present apprenticeship program that the Minister feels is not serving the needs of Manitobans and especially the needs of the people who are being involved in the program. Has the Trade Advisory Committee advised him that the apprentices that we are turning out to become journeymen, are they filling the needs of what industry is calling for? I know that we can not specifically develop apprentices for the sometimes varied needs of industry. What we are trying to do I guess in an apprenticeship program is to develop the job skills which are transferrable and which can be developed when the people actually go to work or when they work for the employer that they're working for.

Another thing that I would like the Minister and through him — one of the problems that many apprentices have while on the job, and I think really gets down to the administration of the job training, on the job training that apprentices receive. In many of the construction firms an apprentice gets working on one type of job and the employer, because the person develops a fairly good job skill, gets stuck on one type of job on construction. Take the construction trades for instance. If the person becomes very proficient as an apprentice at framing, well then — and I speak from experience, Mr. Chairman, because that was one of the problems we had years ago when I served my apprenticeship, you got stuck on one job and the employer would keep that person because he developed fairly good skills because of repetition. That was one of the problems that we had in the apprenticeship program in those days, and that's a good number of years ago. But nevertheless apprentices have told

me that this same situation still exists today. And the whole idea, when you want to turn out a journeyman you want to turn out a journeyman who is well rounded in all the facets of the trade, whatever the trade may be that he is involved in that's the type, if of criticisms that the Minister has of the program — and he must have some, because he has stated, as I said, on more than one occasion he is not satisfied with the apprenticeship program as it is operating at the present time.

And hopefully, if the program is not doing the job that it was set up to do, is this one of the problems that the Minister is having difficulty with with? I think we have the Trade Advisory Committees and they're meeting, where are the complaints coming from? Are they coming from the employer section of the Trade Advisory Committees? Are they coming from the employee section of the Trade Advisory Committees? Or is it a joint criticism coming from both? Or is it from the people that are not from the employee section or the employer section but from other parts of the Trade Advisory Committees, and I realize that there are Trade Advisory Committees that are different, depending on what trade we're involved in. But I think it is incumbent upon the Minister

to share his thoughts with us. Just what is his main criticism of the apprenticeship program as we have it here today in Manitoba? Where is it not fulfilling the needs that it was designed and set up to give young people the opportunity to become qualified, get their certificates of qualification and at the same time turn out as best we can as good a mechanic, or whatever you want to call them in their trade as it is possible under the apprenticeship training program as we have here in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: The Advisory Committees themselves feel that there's need for a review, and I have suggested quite strongly along the lines that the Member for Logan has mentioned, that the government should in fact set an example themselves, and up until recently we had two carpenters' apprenticeships within Government Services and 12 heavy duty mechanics. Now one of the carpenter apprentices which happened to be a girl has quit, but there are 13 apprentices now within Government Services and we're reviewing that entire department to see if there couldn't be more.

MR. JENKINS: It's unfortunate that the one lady apprentice that we had decided — has she decided to get out of the program altogether, or has she decided to go to, say, the private sector? Do we have no other openings except for carpenters? Are there no openings for people in the electrical field, the plumbing? You know when the Minister says we have — what is it, 13 people under the apprenticeship program here in the whole department, surely we should be looking at the Government Services. We have a provincial garage over here where we could be employing people as auto mechanics, an apprenticeship program there, that's available. I'm sure there is some machinist work that is available within Government Services. To say that we have only 13 people under the apprenticeship program is not a very admirable record and I hope that the Minister, when he's looking at this program, will certainly be attempting to persuade the employing agency — and I realize that there probably will be very few within his own department, but with his fellow Treasury bench Cabinet Ministers, that he has to make his pitch, and I think that he should be making a pitch to those who are employing. I'm sure that within the Manitoba Telephone System there must be, certainly, people that are required there also, which is maybe another way that we can employ apprentices. I know this is a Crown agency.

The Minister has already mentioned that we have an apprenticeship program now. I think that Manitoba Hydro has called for power electricians. But surely I think that we can do much better than what we have been doing with only having 12, 13 people in total in the apprenticeship program in Government Services. I certainly hope that the Minister in the coming year will be putting some pressure on his fellow Cabinet Ministers to see if we can improve the record, because I think it bodes not only well for the apprenticeship program but it bodes well for the government in the long run, because we're eventually getting qualified trades- — people to work, which I think is what we're all striving for.

Another thing I would like to ask the Minister while I'm still on my feet is, has there been discussions between the various Trade Advisory Committees, especially in the construction trade? This is something that happens in the United Kingdom and the western European countries, where the people working in the trades of carpentry and joinery, electricians, plastering, plumbing, the various construction trades, where part of the apprenticeship program — so that they get the idea of the integration and co-operation of the trades with each other, that a portion of the time that the people spend in their apprenticeship program — and I realize that the apprenticeship programs in western Europe, the United Kingdom, in the main are a fair amount longer time than what we spend — they spend part of that time learning how to co-operate with the other trades. Because when construction takes place, it involves not only the people in carpentry and joinery, it entails how the construction takes place, with the ancillary trades that take part in it, and perhaps this is something that, when the Minister and his director are meeting with the various Trade Advisory Committees, that when they're reviewing this program then, which I imagine they will be doing since the Minister has said that they're not satisfied with it, I think that there should be that bit of training for those — that an electrician knows where he fits into the scheme of building the building, where the pipefitter or the plumber knows where his part of the apprenticeship program and where is, in his daily work he fits into the general building program, whatever it would be.

I think that the Minister should be — maybe if they're not doing this already — should be initiating this type of thought into the discussions that the Trade Advisory Committees will be going through in the months ahead. If the Minister has already instituted that, well then he could let us know, and if it's not, then he can tell me my ideas are all out of whack and they don't make any sense, but I think that the Minister should at least give us some ideas of what he and his

department are thinking, because of the input that they're going to have to put into the programs, into the development of the curricula that will be set up for the various trades. And if the department and the director and his staff are working on this, I think this committee would be pleased to hear just what steps they are taking in this type of progress when the talks do set up.

MR. MacMASTER: That will be part of the review and I'd like to believe that Government Services will be employing a great number more than 13. Two years ago there was none and today there's 13. Lets hope that number certainly increases substantially over the course of the next year.

MR. JENKINS: Well, I certainly hope so and I hope when the Minister is here next year and we are going through his Estimates that he will be able to give us a much brighter picture on that. I would just like the Minister, before I sit down, and I don't have too many more questions, but I did want to elucidate from the Minister, what his thoughts were on the integration of the various trades, whether there is any thought being given to giving the people who are involved, especially in the construction trade — because they involve many facets and new ones coming in — that people, who are going to be serving the apprenticeships in those trades, are given the opportunity of seeing where their job skills fit into the total job picture. And if the Minister has any ideas on that, then as far as I'm concerned, I have no more questions.

MR. MacMASTER: That's being done to a degree now, but it certainly could be more of that.

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

MR. FOX: I wonder if the Minister could explain the Canada-Manpower agreement in respect to apprenticeship, and on what basis we're getting \$160,000 back?

MR. MacMASTER: That's an administrative cost that's refunded, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FOX: Well, administrative cost, what, for just carrying out the program of apprenticeship, in what relationship?

MR. MacMASTER: It mostly relates to the referral system to the schools, Mr. Chairman, and the administration of parts of the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; (c)—pass.

MR. FOX: I wonder if the Minister is prepared to have the Committee rise at this juncture.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, we're going so well, Mr. Chairman, maybe we could go a little bit longer and just see how well we do go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) Employment Services; (1) Canada-Manitoba NORTHLANDS Agreement, Subsection (a) Salaries— pass — the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I asked the questions I wanted to ask under the Apprenticeship Program, and it was concerning the plan in Flin Flon which I thought was appropriate under that. But does the Minister want me to repeat the questions, or to take the questions I asked and answer them as asked?

MR. MacMASTER: I believe, Mr. Chairman, one of the questions was, if we're fully geared up for it and we like to believe that we are now, if the member can ask or repeat two or three of those specifics, I just don't recall exactly what they were, but I'll certainly get him his answers if he wants to repeat them now.

MR. BARROW: Well, the program is the program, Mr. Chairman, that engages natives and as the Minister knows and we all know on both sides of the House, that employment is the problem or unemployment. We know the difficulties, and this is a new plan — where former plans have failed — and the first question is, is it having any success? To what degree has it been successful so far?

MR. MacMASTER: It's been projected as a 65 percent success, when there was the appropriate

number of staff in place and that hasn't always been the case over the last two to three years. It's as the member pointed out, if you don't have the appropriate off-job counselling assistance and the variety of services that the people require, then that program success may drop drastically. One of the other aspects of it is if the companies do not have a person on staff with a pretty direct pipeline to the appropriate authorities, then the program sometimes does not have such a success rate. We understand that the three companies now do in fact have appropriate people on staff, where during the working hours, they can relate problems to the proper level of supervision to correct those problems and we feel now, that we have the appropriate staff to handle off the job. And when you combine it, we're projecting — at least it's a figure that we're shooting for and we think that it will have a reasonable element of success — is approximately 65 percent success.

MR. BARROW: Well, I'm happy with that answer of 65 percent — it looks very promising. My next question, who finances this program, the Corporation, the federal government, the Manitoba government, or is it a combination of the three?

MR. MacMASTER: It's cost-shared under Northlands, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARROW: So then, with the 65 percent success rate, we're almost compelled to go into a bigger scale in other mining centres. Is this feasible?

MR. MacMASTER: We're giving consideration to the Snow Lake operation right now. Now, it hasn't got any farther than consideration but I think it's an area that we should be moving into now. I don't have the numbers, whether it could be 15 or 20 or 25 or 30, what we could accommodate in that area, but it's certainly an area that we're looking at now.

MR. BARROW: With your answer, how was it financed, under the Corporation Act no input in the financial aspect.

MR. MacMASTER: The extent of the corporations are probably varied. I know as I've said it's my understanding they have a specific person on staff who certainly keeps in touch with those that are working and assures that there is no problems. And I believe that they have during flexible periods of time, other staff which do somewhat more training than they might.

MR. BARROW: I think I was misunderstood. Through this agreement, both the federal government and the Manitoba government financed the project. What I want to know, is does the Corporation have any part on this financing? I understand the staff part, but on a cash basis, do they put any money into the project in conjunction with the two levels of government?

MR. MacMASTER: Not specifically on a cash input basis. The staff end of it is part of their contributions.

MR. BARROW: Where the Corporation is enjoying the success of this program, don't you think it's important they should have some cash input? You know, the situation in Flin Flon and Thompson and Sherritt-Gordon — they can't get people to work in those mining areas. They go into every stream to get people, and I don't know why. We talk about unemployment in Manitoba, and all over Canada and yet they can't get people to work in those mines. And here is a flow into it, to solve their problems and yet they aren't financially involved. And what really bothers me, Mr. Minister, they're taking credit for this, which is a small thing but I still think they should have some input in this program more than they have. Do you not agree?

MR. MacMASTER: It's certainly a point to be considered, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to explain this section but more specifically, Mr. Chairman, I would like him to justify the expenditure that we have before us. Why should the taxpayers put out this kind of money and what are they getting for this kind of money and why does the Minister want this program?

MR. MacMASTER: I think it's a program that's helping orientate people in northern Manitoba into the mining industry and to varying degrees of success I think it's a worthwhile program, Mr.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's a very general answer. I wonder if the Minister could explain exactly what Manitobans are getting for their "over a million dollars" that are going into this particular program? .

MR. MacMASTER: They're getting the satisfaction of getting able-bodied people from northern Manitoba into the workplace.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, why is it necessary to spend this amount of money to accomplish that particular task?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (b)—pass.

MR. McBRYDE: I assumed that the Minister was preparing himself to answer the question but maybe he's just reading his notes, Mr. Chairman. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's an awful brief answer, and it doesn't really answer the question in terms of the purpose and usefulness of the program. I don't know whether that's because the Minister doesn't understand the program that well, or because the Minister is tired because it's 10 after 1, but for some reason he doesn't want to give a full answer. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, that's his particular problem. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could give us the staff man years in this program and I wonder if he could go back to '77 for that 1977-78 and '79, in terms of the staff man years.

MR. MacMASTER: Last year, there was 34; this year, they're budgeting for 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas?

MR. McBRYDE: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, with the interruptions from the Member for Minnedosa I wasn't able to hear the answer, I wonder if the Minister could repeat that please.

MR. MacMASTER: Last year there was 34, this year there's 25.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could go back one more year, does he have the figures to go back one more year as to how many were in the program then?

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Robert Anderson (Springfield): (b)—pass — the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know from the Minister the nine positions that were cut; whether they were vacant positions or occupied positions; and the geographical location of those positions, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MacMASTER: All were vacant positions, Mr. Chairman. There were 3 in The Pas, 2 in Leaf, 2 in Thompson, and there were 2 term that I assume expired, I don't know. They weren't attached to any location, they were vacant positions.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, of those vacant positions, I wonder if the Minister could tell us if any of those positions were vacant because of a person being let go or fired?

MR. MacMASTER: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could give us an overall picture in terms of that question, that is since the Minister assumed responsibility for this section, whether he could tell us how many people were fired since he was the Minister responsible for this section?

MR. MacMASTER: I haven't got figures on anybody that I fired in this particular section. I'm talking about positions that were vacant, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister would clarify. Since he became the Minister in the Employment Service Section no persons were fired?

MR. MacMASTER: Not in the Manpower Division that I'm aware of, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. For the remaining positions, I would like the job title and the location?

MR. MacMASTER: There is an Assistant Director in Winnipeg; 2 community workers in the East Lake Winnipeg area; in The Pas there are 6; in Flin Flon there are 3; in Thompson region there are 4; Cross Lake there is 1; in Leaf Rapids there are 8; and in Churchill there is 1.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, thank you. I would ask the Minister for the breakdown on staffing in this particular section by name, please?

MR. MacMASTER: Shoomski, Henderson, Robinson, Wells, Flett, Campbell, Arthurson, Berthe, Spence, Stonechild, Lehonon, McKay, Bousefield, Cook, Shanley, McLeod, Ducharme, Bayer, Bear, Mace, Cook, Queskepow, Wokes, McDonald, Lawrie.

MR. COWAN: Could the Minister please put a job title with each name?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll get that for the member, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Well, that's fairly important information. Is the Minister indicating he'll report back directly to us, or is he indicating that we'll have to wait some substantial amount of time for that information?

MR. MacMASTER: I can give the member the number of categories and at a later date I can fit the names to them for the member if the number of categories is satisfactory. We have 12 community workers, 1 regional manager, administration officer, 2 home advisors, 2 relocation counsellors, 3 clerical workers — no, there's 2 more community workers — and 3 clerical workers, and 1 manager.

MR. COWAN: The Minister will have to repeat that, because we couldn't hear it because of the Member for Minnedosa, and the Minister of Economic Development was also chirping away, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Minister wish to repeat his answer?

MR. MacMASTER: No, that was clear enough I'm sure.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Well, it is difficult to hear some of the answers from the Minister as there is quite an inordinant amount of comments coming from the backbenches. The Member for Minnedosa has been known to be in a jolly mood earlier (than this in the evening, so I'm not surprised that he's adding his own little contribution to the debate at this time. —(Interjections)—

He's saying that I should get it on the record. I don't think that it's necessary to put it on the record. I think the public of Manitoba already have had sufficient evidence of the Member for Minnedosa's problem. —(Interjectinn)—

MR. JENKINS: I rise on a point of order. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is your function as Chairman of this committee to maintain order in this House so that the members can hear what is going on. And if any member wants to get up and make remarks, he gets up, and he is recognized by the Chair. We are having a continual babble from the other side. Now we're here trying to pass these Estimates, but if the members on the other side of the House want to sit here till 6:00 in the morning, you're damned right we can sit here till 6:00 in the morning. —(Interjections)—

But if we're going to get the continual bombardment from the members opposite, who should know better, and the Member for Minnedosa is one, because the Member for Minnedosa, when he came into this House, said he deplored the lack of decorum of the members of this House. And he was going to improve the decorum, and the other went things that on in this House, and he certainly is not an example to anybody in this House. Because if we all carried on in the same manner as the Member for Minnedosa . . .

MR. BLAKE: Eight years, and we'll all be down to your level, Bill.

MR. JENKINS: . . . nothing would be done. Well again, Mr. Chairman, we are getting the braying from that jackass over in the back row. And so I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, if that's the way that the honourable member wants to carry on, then that's the way this Chamber will operate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you . . .

MR. JENKINS: I am trying to co-operate with you, Mr. Chairman, but you're not getting co-operation from members on that side of the House. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order. I have upon occasion indicated to all members that I would prefer to hear from one member at a time, and I trust that that will be satisfactory for the remainder of the Session.

(b)—pass — the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the last answer of the Minister, and I would like to have that answer repeated, because it's not my fault I didn't hear that answer.

MR. MacMASTER: There are 12 community workers, three clerical workers, two home advisors, four relocation counsellors, two managers, an administration officer, and an assistant director. I think that covers it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would like a breakdown of the responsibilities of each of those particular categories — the Minister doesn't have to do it by individual — but the 12 community workers, the three clerical workers, the two home advisors, the four relocation counsellors, and the two managers in specific — can he give us a fairly detailed breakdown as to what their specific and general duties are, and their responsibilities?

MR. MacMASTER: Your home advisors assist families in getting adapted within the community on money management, child care and work with them in relationship to how they get established within the community, make home visits, and work with the youth, if possible. Your managers, of course, are just what managers are — they manage that particular area. Your assistant director in Winnipeg, of course, is responsible for the department from Winnipeg. Your community workers, of course, do some training and referral and placement and establish the special need support that the people need, and provide information that may be necessary to the relocated people. And your clerks, of course, do just normal clerk functions. I think that just about covers them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you. I don't know whether the Minister included, in his presentation under a different item, or whether I missed it. Could he indicate if he included the four relocation counsellors specific duties in that? He mentioned Unicity workers — understand there were 12. Perhaps they're part and parcel of me function?

MR. MacMASTER: The relocation counsellors, Mr. Chairman, stay right within the established community.

MR. COWAN: Are they the same thing as a community worker, then; are they included in that 12, or are they a separate item?

MR. MacMASTER: They're separate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: So I understand now that these workers stay in the community, but their function is different than the community worker, is that correct? Can the Minister please outline, in the same detail as he did on the others, what their particular functions, duties and general responsibilities are?

MR. MacMASTER: They're specifically counselling the relocated individuals and their families on areas of housing, community services, recreation, opportunities that the families should be made

aware of that they can avail themselves of within a community, and there's a good number of them, of course.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Well, from talking with a number of my constituents, I understand that there have been some changes made in location of different community workers. There's also been some downgrading and upgrading within the department, or at least it is intended, and that the department is intending to move some workers from one community to another, and could the Minister please detail out what those proposed changes are?

MR. MacMASTER: I understand that one has been approached in Churchill to consider going to Flin Flon, and two have been approached in Churchill to consider going to Leaf Rapids' and there are one or two, I think, that are being considered for reclassification. But that isn't finalized yet.

MR. COWAN: Yes, perhaps the Minister can indicate what is necessitating these particular and specific changes.

MR. MacMASTER: The specific needs are in the area that they're being transferred to, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Well, could he be more explicit about what those specific needs are?

MR. MacMASTER: The one in Flin Flon will be a relocation counsellor; the two going to Leaf Rapids would be an administration clerk, one of them, and the other would be a home advisor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; (c)—pass. The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: The Minister outlined the categories for classification of whether he positions; I wonder could justify for us the position of home advisor — why does he have these positions, why does he keep these positions?

MR. MacMASTER: I already explained the purpose of a home advisor, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass — the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister then didn't match up in terms of location of the home advisors, and, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister, does he feel home advisors serve a worthwhile function?

MR. MacMASTER: In this particular program, Mr. Chairman, I do.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in the 1977/78 Estimates there were 15 home advisors. I wonder if the Minister could explain what happened to the other 12 home advisors, in what manner were they let go, and what communities were they in and let go from?

MR. MacMASTER: I don't think there's any need to go back that far in the Estimates. We're talking about 1979/80, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure how far back the Minister is going. I wonder if the Minister could tell us what happened to the 12 home advisors that are no longer functioning in northern Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: I answered that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass; (d)—pass — the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: We're still on (a), Mr. Chairman. I would ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that since he has described that home advisors have a certain function to perform, since the Minister feels that home advisors are worthwhile, I would ask the Minister why there has been an elimination of 13 home advisors?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass — the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I move that committee rise.

MOTION presented and lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we attempt to finish (d) and I would concur then with the members that we rise at that particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Now Mr. Chairman, what I would like to get from the Minister, if possible, if it's not too much for him, is an answer to my question. I'm not sure why the Minister is unwilling to answer the question that I posed to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, could I ask at what particular clause we seem to be at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to my understanding we are now on (c). A point of order?

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We were on (a) and you quickly read (b) and (c) but we were not finished with (a) yet. Mr. Chairman, you are the Chairman, I assume, and not the Minister of Economic Development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to the marks that I've made here, and my understanding we are now on item (c).

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I know that you are a reasonable Chairman and fair to both sides of the House. Often the Chairman goes ahead faster than the response comes and then the Minister goes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. On this point of order I would view it that any items that were missed could be picked up again on the Minister's Salary.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it has been the common practice in this committee and every other committee that often the Chairman starts rattling off the numbers, and Mr. Chairman, response is given to the number. We are still on this side of the House on item No.(1)(a) Salaries, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The discussion to this point has been relatively wide-ranging and has not been particularly restricted to one item or another. As we went through the discussion, I determined from the discussion and by calling out the word "pass" that the first two items were passed, although under Item (1) under the Manitoba Northlands Agreement, it allows for a reasonably wide-ranging discussion, and I would think all reasonable discussion could be accommodated. The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that if you were to recall the item that has been under discussion is personnel, the disposition of personnel, and we did not get to Other Expenditures. So therefore even though you did call (b) and (c), we were still on (a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone on the point of order.

MR. FERGUSON: Do I take it then that it has been passed or hasn't been passed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have through the last while considered (a) and (b) passed. I have not attempted to restrict the discussion. If the members wish to go back to (a) I will conduct myself according to the wishes of the House. The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, as my colleague pointed out, we have only been discussing (a). We haven't discussed Other Expenditures. We haven't discussed the Northern Youth Employment Program. All the discussion has been on Salaries. My last question was on Salaries, Mr. Chairman, so I'm assuming that we're still on Salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it still the pleasure of the House to continue to discuss Item (d)(1)(a)? Is it agreed that it's been passed? (b) . . .

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, on Item No. (d)(1)(a) a question to the Minister that he didn't answer. Mr. Chairman, my question was in terms of the home advisors, I asked the Minister if he could explain to us, since he said that the positions were worthwhile, if he could explain to us his reasons, his rationale for eliminating 13 of those positions and why he thought that was a worthwhile move, and an important move for him to make as Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I specified, Mr. Chairman, that the appropriate numbers are in place today, the ones that I feel are required to carry out this program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Minister outlined to us the number of — he used the word "relocation counsellors", and Mr. Chairman, there were a couple of relocation counsellors and a couple of employment counsellors and a couple of field counsellors. I wonder if he could clarify for us what the difference is between those positions or whether field counsellor is a new title for what was before employment counsellor or field counsellor is now called a relocation counsellor or a community counsellor. I'm not clear, Mr. Chairman, on the classifications.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I didn't make reference to field counsellors and I outlined the jobs of the community workers and the relocation counsellors. I have already done that.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes Mr. Chairman. What we have before us under this particular item, what's left is one of the few items that is left in a northern employment program in a northern economic development program, and Mr. Chairman, it is a remnant of a quite extensive program to attempt to bring about economic development in northern Manitoba, to bring about employment creation in northern Manitoba, and Mr. Chairman, the program in its entirety is a cost-shared federal-provincial program, 60 percent of the funds coming from the federal government, 40 percent from the province of Manitoba. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Member for Gladstone wants the Chair.

MR. FERGUSON: Don't get too smart. Don't get too smart, McBryde.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be all right if I proceeded at this time. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying before the chirping started from the birdman and others across the way, Mr. Chairman, was that this program, Mr. Chairman — and I think maybe the Member for Gladstone and the Minister of Consumer Affairs will understand that within this particular section, within this particular page, this is the major item within this particular page, and it's not that we want to delay the proceedings, it's that we want to deal properly with the major item in this particular section. And the major item in this particular section is the Employment Services, which is a remnant of what was Employment Services and a remnant of what was an Economic Development program, an employment creation program in northern Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, the Minister is unwilling to give us an explanation for some of the cuts in the program, for the elimination of a number of the positions within the program, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, so we can only assume that it's part of his philosophy and his government's philosophy that employment creation and economic development within northern Manitoba is not an important matter, is not a significant matter, is not a matter that require the full attention of this department and of this government. Mr. Chair what we have left here under this particular item, under this particular section, Mr. Chairman, is a few people in the community who assist people to locate employment, a few people in the community who assist people to take advantage of other opportunities that may lead to employment in the future. What has been eliminated, Mr. Chairman, is a number of people who did assist in that process in the past, but most importantly, Mr. Chairman, what has been eliminated is the Economic Development thrust by elimination of those people, of those positions that could provide the kind of advice, could provide the kind of consultation in terms

of economic development that is necessary in the remote communities in northern Manitoba.

What happened to this section, Mr. Chairman, is that this Minister, after October '77, failed to give any direction, failed to set policy or set program, failed to make use of the staff that was in place, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, when I talked to the staff in this program when I ran into them in northern Manitoba, their response was, "They are not getting us to do anything. Then they'll have an excuse to eliminate our positions." Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what took place. Because there was no direction given, the thrust in terms of economic development and employment creation was done away with. Mr. Chairman, because that was the emphasis of this government, that is do nothing, do nothing, then the Minister, there wasn't much happening and therefore we can eliminate these particular positions, and Mr. Chairman, what has taken place, in fact, has been an elimination, almost total elimination under this section, Mr. Chairman, of the economic development thrust. Yes, Mr. Chairman, without interruption from the Member for Pembina, which continues, what we have is all that's left — and from the Member for Minnedosa, Mr. Chairman. All that's left, Mr. Chairman, within this section, is some assistance in terms of job location or employment finding and assisting people to change from a remote environment to an urban environment.

Mr. Chairman, that is important that some of that is left. That is important that that continue, Mr. Chairman. I thought the Minister, given the opportunity that I gave him earlier, might in fact use the opportunity to explain why the program is important, why it is necessary and how it is easy for him to justify to the taxpayers of Manitoba why they are getting their money's worth out of this program. But Mr. Chairman, the Minister was unable to do that or unwilling to do that. I don't know whether it's just because he was unwilling to do that or because he does not understand the program well enough so that he could explain it and justify it in terms of what's left of the program. Mr. Chairman, what is left is important to the people in northern Manitoba, but what is more important to the people in northern Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, is that part that has been eliminated, that has been done away with. And that, Mr. Chairman, was the economic development thrust that in fact used these positions we're looking at here; these salaries that are left here.

In the past this section was somewhat larger and those people were the people that assisted with the actual economic development at the community level. But, Mr. Chairman, one reason that there is no longer a need for those people who give assistance with economic development at the remote level, is that most of the programs that assisted them with that economic development have in fact been eliminated by this government, Mr. Chairman. So what we have seen is the elimination of the Special Northern Employment Program. We have seen the elimination, Mr. Chairman, of a long list of economic development and employment creation projects and assistance for those projects by this government.

So what has happened now, Mr. Chairman, we're in a situation where this Minister and this government has put all their eggs in one basket. We talked, Mr. Chairman, about a thrust of 14 or 16 methods, 16 different types of efforts in order to bring about the kind of development that was needed. And, Mr. Chairman, even with all those approaches to economic development and employment, we still had a long way to go. But, Mr. Chairman, this Minister and this government has eliminated about 10 of those, have reduced drastically 3 or 4 of those and so we are left, Mr. Chairman, with this section we have in front of us which is a remnant of an employment service or a placement service and a relocation service for the people in northern Manitoba. And, Mr. Chairman, we are seeing a situation exist — and I think the Minister is well aware of this, Mr. Chairman — that the welfare rate for unemployed employables in remote communities has increased under this government, that the social problems and the social dislocations and the added cost to the people of Manitoba have increased under this government and, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is unable to justify even what is left here, let alone get approval to implement, or does not have the willingness to implement a more comprehensive employment and economic development program, a more comprehensive economic development thrust in northern Manitoba.

And that's why we're in the situation we're in, Mr. Chairman, that's why we're in the situation where the welfare is going up, where the other social costs are going up. That is why we're in the situation, Mr. Chairman, where a community is willing to detain civil servants, where a group of people are willing to occupy a government office, Mr. Chairman. That is the kind of situation we are getting into because of the actions and the inactions of this Minister and this government. Mr. Chairman, some of the people that were involved in the economic development aspect of it were in fact only cut from the program within the last number of months or at the start of this particular fiscal year. Some of them were cut in February I believe and some in December.

So, Mr. Chairman, we're not going as far back into history as the Minister would seem to imply, when in fact a number of the cuts, a number of the reductions took place during the last fiscal year and the connection, Mr. Chairman, between the number of staff that are shown here and the actual number of people that were dropped, Mr. Chairman, is not at all clear. And therefore, Mr.

Chairman, I would have to ask the Minister are there other sections or in what other sections were those persons that would have been in the employment services or the economic development services, or basically what was the Northern Manpower Corps? In what other sections of his Estimates would we find those particular reductions?

If these reductions that the Minister says here were vacant positions and no one had to be fired then the people that were fired at the end of March, the people that were fired in February and the people that were fired in December, where do they show up, Mr. Chairman, within the Minister's Budget within the Minister's Estimates?

MR. MacMASTER: I outlined it, the member that in this particular area that these positions were vacant and I am not going to wander all over my Estimates or other Minister's Estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have to admit to the Honourable Minister that I made the assumption that those positions that were eliminated in the Northern Manpower Corps within the last fiscal year, would in fact appear under this section of his Estimates. Mr. Chairman, now he tells us that the reductions in this particular section were in fact reduction of vacancies. But we know, Mr. Chairman, of the firings that have taken place within the last fiscal year. As I said, I think February was a group, December was a group and possibly some at the end of the fiscal year in March. And, Mr. Chairman, they were involved in this service, in employment services or in consultation for economic development. They could fall, Mr. Chairman, within some of the categories the Minister has given us: managers or relocation counsellors, or community — I'm not sure of the title that was used there — community counsellors, or community personnel, in some way.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's unreasonable for me to request from him the numbers of those particular people that were let go from this section or a section that is very closely related to this section, Mr. Chairman, to get from the Minister that information as to the number of people that were fired, for what reasons they were fired or, Mr. Chairman, if in fact they appear later on in the Estimates here, then the Minister could point out what number they appear under so that questions could be asked at that time,

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Abe Kovnats): (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure why the Minister is unwilling to answer questions this evening. He's not willing to give us the information that we're asking for, and it makes it very difficult to pass this section of the Estimates when the Minister doesn't explain that section or doesn't answer our questions dealing with that section of the Estimates. Mr. Chairman, it forces us into a situation where, how can we pass an item when the Minister has not explained that item to us, has not let us know what has happened in that particular section. And if I was to take the advice of the Member for Portage la Prairie, Mr. Chairman, then I would not be doing my job as a member of the opposition, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if he would be so kind, so considerate, so generous, that he might in fact avail himself to answer the question that was asked. And, Mr. Chairman, the question was: in those positions that relate or are closely related to employment services that have been eliminated, positions that were occupied where people have been fired, Mr. Chairman, wonder if he could give us those number and I wonder if he could give us the reason for those firings.

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

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been advised that the Motion is out of order particularly because there has been a Motion on Committee rise on this item and there has to be something that comes in between an intermediate proceeding.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the problem is that how you can pass an item when you haven't got the information to allow that item to pass? And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he would be able to tell us the number of persons related to the employment services,

related to what was the Manpower Corps under the Canada- Manitoba Northlands Agreement, how many of those persons were fired?

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

MR. BOYCE: I don't want to be out of order, Mr. Chairman, at this hour. Mr. Chairman, I've been listening to the debate on and off all evening. I can understand at this hour of the day why people's nerves get a little frayed but nevertheless the Minister in the last . . . fifteen minutes that I've been listening to the debate, he refused to answer what I feel are legitimate questions. And of course, the opposition can't force the Minister to answer the questions. The record should show that it's 3 minutes after 2:00 in the morning, that the opposition is willing to address itself to this question tomorrow when perhaps we've all had an opportunity to have a little bit of rest.

But as a Member for the constituency of Winnipeg Centre and having to deal with many of the problems that are created by the inactivity of the government in dealing with some of the questions raised by my colleague from The Pas, Mr. Chairman, it will go on the record that the Minister is refusing to answer the questions, for whatever reason, because of his chagrin at this particular hour which is understandable after the pressure which is being exerted.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the effects of the government programs, you cut back on government programs in these areas especially in the north , is having an immediate impact on our society and I, for one, would welcome some of the answers that the Minister has been asked for in this regard. Because in visiting some of the areas in the north and talking to some of the chiefs, one particular reservation comes to mind where they had a population of 900 some few years ago and this is now down to less than half, and many of them have migrated to the city with little or no skills, so it is of an immediate concern to the people in the City of Winnipeg.

So when the government announces they're cutting back this program and that program, I see that there is a modest increase but neverthe less I have been unable to understand from the Minister just exactly what he intends to do to replace these people that have been fired or moved on of their own volition to other endeavours. So perhaps i the Minister could answer some of the questions, Mr. Chairman, I think that we can all be reasonable and perhaps we could dispense with this item.

MR. MacMASTER: I think the record will also bear out, Mr. Chairman, that the questions have been answered, that they're just going around in circles at this particular moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairperson. Well earlier we were talking about some transfer of staff from one area to another, and I would just ask the Minister to indicate if this transfer is being done on a voluntary basis; if not, what terms and conditions are being offered to the employees who are being transferred? Are they being told that they must transfer or lose their position, or are they being told that they can stay in the area and that the transfer is strictly voluntary?

MR. MacMASTER: They are being asked to transfer under the appropriate sections of The Civil Service Act They're given the appropriate time to make up their minds, and the proper procedures are being followed in this particular manner. They are required in other particular areas, as I outlined before, and we wish them to move to those areas.

MR. COWAN: I'm somewhat concerned, because the community of Churchill has suffered varying amounts and degrees of economic and sociological setbacks in the past two years, mostly as a result of that Minister's insensitivity; mostly as a result of his government's insensitivity, which is blatant this evening; mostly as a result of their inability to see the future clouded by their own bias, and clouded by their own sense of the past they cannot see the future. And what they are doing in essence is destroying a community; they are destroying a community as if they had systematically decided to destroy that community and went out to do it in a step-by-step manner. First they had cut back on the home manufacturing facility in the town of Churchill, and they made numerous other cutbacks in employment opportunities for those people, and now we see three people leaving the community of Churchill. That's three more in a long list of people who have been forced out of that community; not because they wanted to move; not because they had any dissatisfaction with life in that community; not because they had any dissatisfaction with their jobs, but because of this government's insensitive attitude towards its workers; insensitive attitudes towards northern Manitoba; and insensitive attitudes towards all the communities such as Churchill. And it's getting rather aggravating, this constant onslaught on the employment programs; this

onslaught on anything that was progressive and anything that was put in place to support northern Manitoba.

And they will pay for their actions and they know full well, because they are starting to see the debts come due now. They are starting to see the consequences of their actions. The Member for The Pas had outlined some of them; I've spent numerous opportunities outlining some of them in this House on different occasions. And that is not all — that is far from what will happen if they don't take look to the future, and if they don't start considering the global impact of their petty insignificant little intransigent moves to move people around to satisfy their own ego.

You know we've seen a fairly descriptive example of the macho-man mentality of the Minister tonight, the Minister who likes to pipe up about co-operation; the Minister who had co-operation thrown back in his face this week. And certainly he's a little bit aggravated, certainly he wants to keep us here, certainly he wants to play the power trip, because after many many times of talking about co-operation he finally had to go in and do something. I'm speaking in specific to the reference of Canadian Bronze; he took the wrong course of action there, Mr. Speaker, but he had to — in a way he took the right course of action, in a way he took the wrong course of action.

A MEMBER: Make up your mind.

MR. COWAN: Well, the Member for Minnedosa asks me to make up my mind; then perhaps I should explain how it works. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I apologize to the Member for Minnedosa. I apologize to the Member for Minnedosa, it was one of his other colleagues.

But here's what happens. See, the Minister gets himself locked in a posture, as he has this evening. Now the posture does no good . . . I'm speaking to the item, Mr. Chairperson, I'm speaking to the debate that has flowed back and forth and why we are still on this particular item after several hours of discussion I'm trying to explain why it is necessary for us to be here discussing Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement (d)(1)(a), when we should have been able to pass this item quite some time . . . or not pass this item, but adjourn quite —(Interjection)— some time ago.

You see, it's all about co-operation. We were very willing to be co-operative with the Minister this evening. We had gone through Conciliation Services — half of it — because we had done half previous; we'd gone through the Pension Commission; we'd gone through Research; we'd gone through Manpower Planning and Development; we'd gone through Apprenticeship and Industrial Training; and some of us, unlike the Minister, have been doing our duty in this House all day today. You will note, for the record, that the Minister was not here this afternoon, that he was up in Thompson. But some of us have been here all day, and it has been a long day for us, and so what we wanted to do —(Interjection)—

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

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I think it's been pointed out specifically by the Member for Inkster on record in this particular House, that people have duties that aren't always necessarily here in the House, and I think it can be pointed out very clearly that the duties I had involved the Department called Northern Affairs today in the city of Thompson. That's where I was, and I suspect that I put in just as big a day, any day, as the Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: In reply to the Minister's point of order, can the Minister indicate, speaking to the point of order, if he was speaking to a Rotary Club event in Thompson today?

MR. MacMASTER: I was not speaking to a Rotary Club luncheon at Thompson today.

MR. COWAN: To the point of order, Mr. Chairperson, —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you want the floor to make a remark, stand up and I'll acknowledge you. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, speaking on behalf of the Minister of Labour, I don't really think it's any of the Member for Churchill's business where he was. At least he wasn't out campaigning, which many of their people have been doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I would move that Resolution 79, (d)(1) Sub-paragraph (a), which reads \$417,800, be reduced to \$417,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion that Item (d)(1)(a) Salaries, listed at \$417,800 be reduced to \$417,000 even. Motion is debatable but cannot be voted on, therefore are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, therefore I would move that the Committee rise, which, fulfills the requirement as you had mentioned earlier that there has been an intervention of some other item since the last movement to rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a motion before the House Committee rise. All those in favour? —(Interjection)— The other motion cannot be voted on. We have a motion before the House Committee rise. All those in favour please say Aye. All those contrary, please say Nay. In my opinion, the Nays have it.

A MEMBER: Division, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is a motion on Committee rise. — . Yeas, 1; Nays, 14.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

MR CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion defeated. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if by leave I could withdraw me motion to reduce Item . (d)(1)(a) to \$417,000.00. I wonder if by leave I can withdraw that motion. (Agreed)

MR.. CHAIRMAN: The member has leave. The motion is withdrawn.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I move Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. today. (Friday)