



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

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



Vol. XXVI No. 42B 8:00 p.m. Monday, May 15, 1978

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, May 15, 1978

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — URBAN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Gentlemen, we have a quorum. We are on Page 78 of the Estimates Book, Urban Affairs, 1. General Administration. 1.(a) Minister's Compensation. We will pass that for the moment and go to 1.(b) Administrative Salaries, and any opening statement the Minister may care to make. The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it might expedite matters if I ran over the changes in expenditures from last year to this year. Under item 1.(b) there is a reduction in expenditures which is accounted for by the fact that the contract position of a special assistant to the Minister is no longer included. In (c) there have been many restraint programs, which accounts for the reduction there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: I didn't hear the explanation on (b).

MR. MERCIER: On (b), that reduction is accounted for by the fact that the contract position of a special assistant to the Minister is no longer included.

Under 2.(b) there is an increase in that amount, which is accounted for by the filling in of two previously frozen and vacant position by two people who were previously on the Planning Secretariate.

MR. MILLER: 2.(b) did you say?

MR. MERCIER: 2.(a).

MR. MERCIER: 2.(b), there has been a reduction as a result of a decrease in funds, which are necessary for professional fees for contract and consulting work.

In 2.(c) there is a reduction. There were a number of funds that were necessarily included in there to complete the Bellan Report, which has been finalized. There is a reduction in the extent of the requirement of the province's share of the cost of the Greater Winnipeg Development Plan Review.

In 2.(d) the reduction is the decrease in the amount of moneys required for the operating grant to the Convention Centre.

In 3.(a) the staff complement is still the same, but that results in the amount of the moneys included for the salaries.

In 3.(b) there is a general restraint in the expenditures of the Emergency Measures Organization.

Mr. Chairman, that is a brief explanation of the changes in expenditures from last year to this year.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for these explanations. We will go over some of them again. What I'm curious about, really, is whether the Minister can tell us whether or not there will be a Department of Urban Affairs? I was just partially joking when I made that comment earlier, but since the Task Force recommendation came out and questioned having a Ministry of Urban Affairs, I am wondering what this Minister's views are; whether he feels that there is any value and any need for a Ministry to co-ordinate the services with plan departments that interface with Winnipeg and meet with Winnipeg regularly on an ongoing basis to resolve mutual problems; whether he feels that's necessary or whether he feels that the entire Urban Affairs portfolio or Ministry can simply be subsumed as another part of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the recommendations included in the Task Force Report have not yet been considered by Cabinet.

I think it's important that in a province like Manitoba where the major portion of the population of the province is contained in one city, and it is such a large urban centre relative to the size of other urban centres in the Province of Manitoba, that there is certainly a definite need and a

requirement for the co-ordination of the policies of the government of the Province of Manitoba as they relate to the City of Winnipeg.

Whether it's necessary that that function be carried out in a separate department or in a reorganized department, is yet something to be considered and reviewed by Cabinet. But there's no question that the special consideration of the needs of the City of Winnipeg be recognized by virtue of its size and amount of its population and because of that it has special requirements related as compared to other urban centres in Manitoba.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Minister has made that comment, that he recognizes the value and the necessity review of coming to grips with the fact that in Manitoba we have got a unique situation — I think no other province is in that situation — where one city is so much larger than any other built-up area, built-up community in Manitoba. Brandon is the next one and that's, you know, considerably smaller, although it is a city.

So I'm pleased that he recognizes that whether it's called Department of Urban Affairs or whether it's subsumed by Municipal Affairs, but if I understand him correctly, he's acknowledging that there is a need for some mechanism and some structure to interface with the city at all times because of the unique situation that exists in Manitoba and the fact that Winnipeg contains over half the population and certainly generates something like 75 percent as well. On the other hand it has most of its problems, a great deal of its problems.

So with regard to that, Mr. Chairman, I'm taking it, as I say, in accordance with the Estimates before us, the Minister explained that Administrative Salaries were down because of that one position that was on contract.

The staff is with you so they'll refresh my memory and yours; I believe that the Minister's staff — secretarial staff — in my office last year was paid through Urban Affairs as was my own indemnity. So when you say that the only change is the contract position, I'm wondering whether there isn't other clerical staff that was also part of the Administrative Salaries.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the secretarial staff function has been transferred to the Finance Department. None of the secretaries in my office are paid for by the Department. I might also in anticipation of a question from. . .

MR. MILLER: That is the 39,300, is that it?

MR. MERCIER: Yes. The Member for Seven Oaks indicates that there was a 1978-79 capital carry-over authority of \$70,000. . .

MR. MILLER: How much?

MR. MERCIER: \$70,000, of which \$67,560.91 has been paid to the City of Winnipeg to cover the province's share of the portable indoor running track.

MR. MILLER: I see, all right. So that capital came from the General Purposes Capital I assume?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. MILLER: And you have no further unexpended capital or anything allotted to Urban Affairs?

MR. MERCIER: Not according to the statement filed by the Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: All right, that explains the difference between the 39,300. Where did the money for the extra \$240,000 or something to the Assiniboine Park and Zoo, where did that come from?

MR. MERCIER: Most of the monies came from unexpended funds in 2(b) and 28(c), and I think I advised the member in the House that there would be supplementary estimates required of approximately \$70,000 in order to cover the province's total financial commitment for Assiniboine Park and Zoo in this fiscal period.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the 70,000 will be in supplementary supply. How much was paid out of the (b) and (c) categories? When we get to that you can get me the information.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we'll come back to that figure.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are still on Administration and I think the only place I can ask these questions is in the administration end of it, because I don't think there is any line for it as such.

I am thinking of the studies that were undertaken, together with the City of Winnipeg, studies like the south-west corridor, like the discussions with regard to the Winnipeg Housing Corporation, the Federal Task Force on the supply and the price of residential lands in Canada, but Manitoba participated in that, the various studies that Urban Affairs Department has been involved in through its administration. Are they going on? Is it the intention of this Minister to continue that kind of interaction with the City, and that kind of support and working together with the City?

MR. MERCIER: Well, with respect to the Task Force on Land, my understanding is that report is in a position where it's almost ready to be released by the Federal Government.

The matter of the \$1 million for the Non-Profit Housing Corporation of the City is a matter that is being considered by the Minister responsible for MHRC and is presently in the discussion stage, I believe, with the City of Winnipeg officials.

The matter of the southwest rapid transit corridor is one on which the Mayor and I spoke to Mr. Lang, the Federal Minister of Transportation, in December, because we were concerned about the lack of funds available under the new Urban Transportation Program announced by the Federal Government because it, in our view, just covered the moneys taken from the rail relocation fund and the grade crossing fund. They amount to about \$2 million per year, over a period of five years, and don't provide the necessary federal support for a rapid transit corridor that we, and the previous provincial government, had anticipated, I think, in considering an innovative rapid transit project for the City of Winnipeg.

We had asked that consideration be given to providing additional funds for that project, by the Federal Government. We have had no response and the City has not — at least in a recent period — raised that project again.

MR. MILLER: I see. So the study is complete. Phase two has been completed. The report has been made but the City has not yet determined what it wanted, or has it made a decision on what it would like to see?

MR. MERCIER: It hasn't communicated to me any decision.

MR. MILLER: Okay. The question, although the money is paid through the Department of Highways, the determination of the amounts, etc., was always with Urban Affairs. I'm talking about the formula with regard to support of, let's say, a transit system in Winnipeg and other . . . Flin Flon and Brandon, as well, but we will stick to Winnipeg itself. Last year, as I recall, we went to 50 percent of deficit. This year that formula wasn't followed and I'm wondering what formula, if any, now exists? Or is it simply an amount that the Provincial Government will determine from year to year and make a grant, not necessarily based on a formula or a set relationship with either revenue or deficit?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the province is following exactly the same formula that the Provincial Government followed last year in paying the grant equal to 50 percent of the 1978 audited operating deficit.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong but if I remember correctly the grant that was made to Winnipeg in 1977 was 50 percent of the deficit. Is the Minister now saying that in fact the grant for 1978 is equivalent to 50 percent of the deficit to the City of Winnipeg, the Transit System?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Then why would there have been a drop from one year to the . . . because was there not a drop in 1978 as compared to 1977, or let's put it this way. The newspapers reported that the City of Winnipeg was informed that they would not receive as much as they had anticipated in transit support, and that was a justification for the raising of the transit fares.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the province indicated to the city that we would pay a grant equal to 50 percent of the deficit subject to a maximum amount of \$8,400,000, in addition to \$652,500 towards the net costs of operating the urban transportation demonstration projects and advised the city that they could, if they wished, transfer funds from any one of those projects with the exception of Handi-Transit Program to their regular operating deficit, and which they did do, Mr.

Chairman.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, well then I am right. I mean to simply say as the Minister suggested that there has been no change, there has been a change. You may call it 50 percent of the transit deficit, but not over and above a specific amount, which may be less than the actual deficit they anticipated, and you simply indicated to them that they could use funds from other services, like Dash, I suppose, or the Dial-A-Bus. . .

MR. MERCIER: Suburban feeders.

MR. MILLER: Suburban feeders and use that because of the shortfall in funds. So when you say the formula hasn't changed, it is partially true, but the fact is that the city was faced therefore with a heads-I-win, tails-you-lose situation, it was 50 percent of the deficit but in fact it had a ceiling, and if the deficit was going to exceed that ceiling they would have to find funds elsewhere and the funds had to be found — and even then I suppose not all the funds were found because they still had to raise the fares by what was it? 40 percent.

So what the Minister is now telling us and what the City of Winnipeg has indicated aren't quite the same. The city was forced to raise its fares because the province reduced its support, it reduced by putting a limit or a ceiling on the amount that the city would get unless the city was prepared to cut out other services.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would point out that, I guess it was in 1977 and 1976 the city did have, well for a number of years, continuing negotiations with the Province of Manitoba and there were changes from year to year with respect to the formula. The previous government did indicate when they approved their share of the city's transit operation in 1977 that the formula would be reviewed prior to 1978 and that they would be reviewing the implications of that policy that was in effect for 1977, and that in fact, Mr. Chairman, we did increase the amount of money available for the transit operating grant and made a major change in policy as compared to the previous year in that the funds which were allocated for special urban transportation projects in previous years were committed only towards those projects. They couldn't be used for other projects, and we did allow those funds to be used in the discretion of the city for their total operating deficit if they so wished.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, this brings up an interesting point. What the Minister is saying is that a sum of money was made available to the city, but without strings attached. Are you suggesting that the province has so little interest in the City of Winnipeg that they would simply make a lump sum available and if they used it on Transit, they could use it for Transit or if they wanted to use it for something, they use it for something else? Doesn't the province have a responsibility and an interest in seeing that transportation in the City of Winnipeg develops along certain lines?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my own mind that in a usual year and a year in which the kind of financial restraints that we have had are not necessary, that there has to be continually increased support for a transit system because I think the advantages of the operation of transit in a modern urban and large city are so evident and have been discussed so much, particularly by myself in the last six years. . .

MR. MILLER: That's why I am asking you the question.

MR. MERCIER: . . . that the continued support for it is, in my view, necessary.

Three of the programs which the city changed, the demonstration projects, Dial-A-Bus had been operating for a three year period and it was time that a decision be made by the city as to whether that kind of a project is going to be considered indefinitely, or is going to end because the city was in a position where they either had to continue it and expand it, or else delete it, and there is no question that although it was a project that had a great deal of merit, it was a costly project and was not one in which, I believe, the city could rationally or reasonably expect to be in a financial position to expand it throughout the . total city.

The suburban feeder services, while they had merit, the costs of the service was substantially in excess of the normal operating cost per hour in the city. So it was time that the city made some decisions on the operation of those three particular projects and be given the latitude to make that decision, because this is an area in which, I think, the province, to its credit in the past, put in

what the Member for Seven Oaks might like to describe as seed money to start projects off because they did and they do add a great deal of knowledge in the operation of the total Transit System and experience that is important.

The Handi-Transit operation, of course, was also begun as an experimental project in the city and I don't think it can ever be terminated. It certainly has proven to be, although a costly service, one that is absolutely essential to physically handicapped people in the city and has been a tremendous boon to them and, by giving them some mobility, has served a real need in the community. I don't think anyone at the provincial level or the city level would ever consider the termination of that project. It may be that it requires some special consideration to be set up separate and apart from the regular transit Budget.

Mr. Chairman, those were special projects on which some decision had to be made by the City as to whether or not they were going to continue in the same form or be expanded or be ended, and the City was given the discretion to make those decisions and they did indeed make them.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister keeps saying that it was left to the discretion of Winnipeg. Is the Minister saying that if in fact the province had been agreeable to continuing the 50 percent cost-sharing, as they had in the past and weren't given the Hobson's choice, that the City would have come forward on its own and suggested the elimination of the, let's say, the feeder service or the imposition of the — what is it? — the charge for the DASH bus or a different time schedule on the frequency of buses on the DASH route? Does he really mean that — that they would have done that, in any case? Or were they put in the position of having to come up with these discretionary alternatives because the funds being made available by the province were less than they anticipated when they prepared their Budgets?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I can say seriously that the City one year ago, when I was Chairman of the Works and Operations Committee responsible for the transit operation, our Committee and Council were extremely concerned about the 50 percent cost of the transit budget which the City was paying, and they were so concerned that they appointed a committee, a small sub-committee, with myself on it and a number of other councillors on the Works and Operations Committee, to look at the efficiency of a number of bus routes where the revenue per hour was much less than the average. We did do that, and we in fact established policies over a year ago eliminating some routes where they were obviously not attracting enough customers or passengers to justify the continuation of the route.

In fact, the criteria we used was very lenient, I think. It was that any route that had less than 20 percent by way of revenue, compared to the cost per hour, was then to be considered. The average revenue to expenditures in the transit system was about 40 percent, so we were establishing a pretty lenient criteria. And on that basis, at that time, the feeder bus routes were considered and were only continued on for a short period. In fact, the service was decreased and they were operated only during the peak periods in an attempt to serve the transit rider in the times when it's most important that the transit system attract passengers in order to obviate the need for the expansion of the highway system, etc., to accommodate highway traffic during the peak period.

The Dial-A-Bus was considered at that time and was recommended to be discontinued over a year ago. I, in fact, opposed that at the particular time because it had been a very successful program for a couple of years, in that the ridership had continually grown. What the City decided to do was to attempt to operate the route for a further six months with an increased fare and with some reduced hours of service, in order to see if they could lower the cost. And obviously, Mr. Chairman, they weren't able to be successful. And so I am saying that the discontinuation of those projects was considered well over a year ago by the City, when they were concerned about the costs of operation.

MR. MILLER: What the Minister is saying is that even the 50 percent cost of the City was a . . .

MR. MERCIER: Was a concern at that time.

MR. MILLER: . . . concern and that they were planning to discontinue, or to discontinue some services. And in the case of DASH, they decided to drop the frequency and impose the ridership fee, even if the grant formula had not been in any way tampered with or if the same 50 percent cost-sharing would have been made available to them.

MR. MERCIER: At that same time the DASH was another aspect of the transit operation that was

considered and the service was reduced in half. I believe there was service every two or three minutes and it was reduced to five or eight, or something like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood is next, then Transcona.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of issues I want to discuss with the Minister.

One is I would like to know a couple of questions of policy and thrust of his department. There has been some discussion in the Legislature about the City's proposed capital works acceleration. I think the Minister indicated he had had no formal request, as of this date, but I know that he is aware of the EPC resolution that was passed last week and I assume that that will go to Council and will be passed; that's my assumption.

Obviously, the people on EPC, including the Chief Commissioner, have some concern for the fact that there is unemployment in the construction industry. There are tradesmen, electricians, plumbers, etc., out of work. There are architects and engineers having a hard time. And, on the good side, there are good prices available, that people who are tendering buildings and calling for tenders are finding that prices are coming in low. The City, I understand, has made an estimation that they could save 15 percent of construction costs of certain capital items by tendering now, and they have projects that they want to bring forward, projects that, for instance, were normally going to be developed in the next fiscal year, they're talking about tendering them this fall and they're talking about designing now, but they will only do this, and they will only consider doing this, be able to carry it out, if the province is willing to cost share because I suppose all of these projects are cost shared with the senior governments.

So this is what I wanted to ask the Minister. The city has gone further, in fact, and they are encouraging private developers. They're even talking about going out and drumming up business with the CBC, trying to get them to untrack their project faster at the old St. Paul site, of possibly trying to encourage Great West and the CNR to develop the east yards.

So I simply state to the Minister, hypothetical or not, at this point in time, he will shortly be approached by representatives of the city and asked for money, and I ask him what his attitude is and how he intends to respond to that request?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the question certainly is hypothetical and I believe the First Minister indicated last week that if and when such a request came it would have to be considered at that time, but let me make some comments about it because this year in the provinces budget for regional street construction, we are estimating and providing for \$15 million on a cash flow basis. —(Interjection)— The bridge from last year, yes, and about \$14 million worth of new construction this year, but it is the largest amount, I believe, that the province has ever provided for on a cash flow basis in one year to the city.

I'm not sure exactly which projects the City of Winnipeg is talking about.

MR. DOERN: MacGregor overpass.

MR. MERCIER: Sherbrook-MacGregor Overpass. I indicated to the city in December of last year, and to the Minister of Transportation, federally, Mr. Lang, that the province of Manitoba was prepared to carry on with the same commitment as the previous government and pay 50 percent of the costs of that particular project, and we asked at that time, in December of last year, that the project be expedited before the Canadian Transport Commission. My understanding now is that the Transport Commission has been in the city recently and have done some reports and some investigations during the past few weeks, and that it may very well be if things can be worked out with the CPR, and there are no great objections, that the matter can be brought forward to the Canadian Transport Commission relatively quickly, and the project can be approved. Now even when it is approved there will be a great deal of lead time and design work, the detail design work that is necessary to be done in order to prepare the project for tendering as the Member for Elmwood will well know. But, the province stands ready and prepared to share in the capital costs of that construction and even if it's approved relatively quickly I would believe that our government would approve it now on the basis that there would be no necessity to expend any moneys this year, and that we could provide for the actual cash-flow in the coming fiscal year.

The Solid Wastes Disposal study, again we approached the federal government last December

with the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and urged on the federal government as did the previous government, some federal financial support for the large capital costs associated with that particular project. We have had no positive response from the federal government, but we expect that it may be part of a new financial formula available to provincial governments and municipalities. And, it may be that within a restricted amount of money there may be some discretion to allow moneys to be used for that kind of a project, but we have to await some discussions that are going on with departmental officials now and with a final announcement from the Federal Government.

The question of the CBC has not been raised to me by the City. It is one which would have to await some discussions with them. Certainly we would support any requests that they might make to help to persuade CBC to start construction as early as possible.

Great West Life and the East Yards. The department has received a request from the City for an amendment to the development plan which would accomodate a development there, and we are prepared, when the City wishes to begin discussions, to sit down with them and attempt to work out, from our point of view, whatever we can to assist them.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, again the government, the Provincial government, is not to the best of my knowledge, accelerating any capital works. I am not aware of any capital works projects that you are accelerating. We are aware of the fact that you're not even holding projects that our government, say, had approved in terms of housing and public works. You're not holding the line there, you're cutting back. And, I'm talking about the question not of eliminating or freezing proposals by the former government, I'm talking about bringing them forward as opposed to freezing them. Or, I'm talking about accelerating other projects that you may have in your mind as essential capital projects. So I'm saying that as far as I'm concerned the record the of the present Provincial government in that department is not a very good one, and I'm saying that when the City or a municipality comes to you and says we intend to accelerate the following projects, and they give you a list, are you prepared to cost-share on that list. Or, are you just going to, in effect, say no?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out firstly, that perhaps the Member for Elmwood didn't hear it the first time around. There is more money being provided on a cash-flow basis for the construction of the regional streets in the City of Winnipeg this year, than has ever been included in the Budget in the amount of \$15 million. \$7 million is for current regional street construction and the balance covers the completion of the construction of the Fort Garry/St. Vital Bridge Project.

The question which the member placed at the end, I would refer him to the total amount that's shown in Urban Affairs which is \$1 million. Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to answer some questions on a general policy-wide basis as they may affect the city, and I'm prepared to, if and when we receive this kind of request and we haven't yet received it and so it's pretty hypothetical at this point, if and when we receive the request, meet with the City of Winnipeg, review their submission and discuss it with my colleagues in Cabinet, from whose budgets funds for the kinds of projects that the member refers to will come.

I might say I'm not satisfied that this is the proper format for an Urban Affairs Budget. As the members will appreciate, the grants to the City of Winnipeg for highways, construction, health, Assiniboine Park and Zoo, the Neighbourhood Improvement Program, the regional street maintenance, bus purchases, etc., the libraries are all contained in other departments. I tend to think that they should be included in the Urban Affairs Budget, that the Urban Affairs Minister should be responsible for the preparation of the budget covering all of those grants, so that he's in a better position to respond more quickly to the city's requests and their needs. This year, unfortunately, the budget was prepared and on the way, by the time we sat down and were in a position to review it was too late to make any changes in the preparation of the Budget. But my personal preference would be to see it all contained in the Department of Urban Affairs in order to retain better control and ability to respond to the needs of the city.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know now the Minister's giving us too little. This is the department that liaisons with the City of Winnipeg — that communicates with all the line departments — that tells the line departments what to do.

MR. MERCIER: The former Minister was a Minister of Finance, which helps.

MR. DOERN: Yes. He's also a smooth talker, which helps, as well, and I'm just saying this is the line of communication, the funnel, the channel — anything that you like, and although you may

not have the dollars, you have the responsibility, and you also have a considerable amount of influence. I'm saying to you — you want to say this is a hypothetical question — well, you know, I guess we could get into a debate on that. I'm saying that EPC has approved this and EPC has indicated that they are going to meet with you, and you are going to be asked for a response, so if it's hypothetical, it's by one week that it's hypothetical, because it's around the corner.

MR. MERCIER: Well, the only thing I would say, and the Member for Wellington will appreciate it as a member of the Executive Policy Committee for four years, that didn't automatically mean that the recommendations of that committee were accepted by Council. Mr. Chairman, it is a hypothetical question, and as he will well appreciate, these decisions are not made by one Minister alone, they are made by Cabinet, and so it would be presumptuous of me to indicate which way the government was going to respond without the government and the Cabinet having had an opportunity to consider any requests.

MR. DOERN: Well, then Mr. Chairman, I'm not optimistic because I asked the First Minister this question in the House, and he gave an answer — a sort of modern version of an old answer that used to be given during the Campbell days, and the Campbell days' answer sort of was — we'll see how the crop is. If the crops are good, if agriculture's up, then there will be money to do these things, and that was to me the kind of answer that Premier Lyon gave. He suggested that if they looked in the cupboard and found multi millions of dollars, then they would maybe do things, but it didn't sound as if the City was going to get a positive response, it was sort of some day, if there's money, we'll respond.

I wanted to ask the Minister as well, he's familiar with a resolution of Council that he, I'm sure, supported, that called upon the Provincial Government to undertake a program of public works in housing to help develop some of the downtown core or the old urban core of the City of Winnipeg. The request came from the City, came to us passed by the City, and we responded; technical groups were set to work and plans were developed to develop housing in the old Midland Railway area and a series of public works projects for which the locations were recommended by this technical group, and so on. Now it doesn't sound as if much housing is going to go forward, and we know that half or more than half of the public works' projects have been frozen, so I'm saying to the Minister, is he going to do anything to honour that agreement, because at the moment it is not being honoured? Or being honoured in the breach, if that's the expression.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister responsible for MHRC is in the process of reviewing housing policies in consultation with Cabinet, and I would expect that he will be in a position to make some announcements soon.

MR. DOERN: And in regard to the public works portion, is the Minister of Urban Affairs urging his colleague to tender these projects or is he fighting in Cabinet to implement this agreement?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have not yet received any decision from the City, and when it is received it will be considered seriously.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the Minister's remarks refer to, these are projects that the province was undertaking. The Province agreed to undertake a certain amount of public housing, infill housing, townhousing, etc., so many units; the province agreed to build four or five buildings — a lab, a court building, an autopac building, a garage — and we know that the garage is ready, we know that the lab, according to the Minister, will be completed. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I can stop the Member for Elmwood, and point out to him and remind him that, during Public Works, the discussion of their Estimates, the Minister at that time said that the autopac building would not proceed, they would not proceed with it. You are asking this Minister a lot of questions that you asked the Minister of Public Works, at which time he answered most of them for you. I would just suggest that your crusade to help the building industry — I don't think you are going to get anywhere by going from one Minister to another and asking the same questions, particularly when you've gone through the Minister of Public Works already.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that you call yourself to order. You are now speaking as the Member for Crescentwood, not as the Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No I wasn't. I was reminding you that you asked the Minister of Public Works, when we did his Estimates last week, the same questions.

MR. DOERN: Well, I think I have the right to ask the same questions to the Minister, and I am

asking the questions to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has the right not to answer if he wishes.

MR. DOERN: I'm asking him whether, in view of the fact the City asked the province to do something about the urban core of Winnipeg, and the province responded and the province indicated that they would undertake certain housing programs which now appear to be in danger — grave danger — and they indicated that we would build four or five buildings, and several of those buildings are now frozen or killed — what is the Minister doing about trying to persuade his colleagues or to give assurances to the City that that program will be completed? What is he doing other than shaking his head or saying that it is not in my hands? It is in his hands.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the City has not, since we've been in government, asked for any reassurances or any information as to the status of these particular projects. I have indicated that the Minister responsible for MHRC is reviewing the housing program, I believe the Minister responsible for Autopac has indicated the fate of that particular building. The Minister responsible for Mines, Resources and Environmental Management is reviewing the environmental lab building and I will deal with the new Provincial Judges' Building in my Attorney-General's Estimates.

MR. DOERN: But the Minister is not going to indicate whether or not he is leading his colleagues, or pressuring his colleagues to honour that agreement? He's just waiting to hear what they are going to recommend, and then he'll report after they make the decision.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think that it is only fair that new Ministers, who have only been in government for a six-month period, be given an opportunity to review projects of that magnitude in order to determine what they wish to recommend be done on behalf of the new government. I would ask the member to give the new Ministers a reasonable amount of time to make those decisions and I'm sure that by this time next year those decisions will have been made and the questions which the Member for Elmwood has indicated will be answered.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just point out to the Honourable Minister that the new chairmen of council, who only got elected about a month after we did, they are making these decisions. The members of City Council, a new Council, new chairmen in some cases, they are making decisions to accelerate capital projects, and I point that out . . .

MR. MERCIER: Those decisions are not made until they're done by council and until they're communicated and I'm sure that was the basis on which the previous government acted, that they would only respond, and rightly so, to decisions of council, not to decisions of individual committees with the exception that they might where an individual committee had the responsibility or authority for looking after a particular matter, but the Provincial Government can only respond to the decisions of the City Council as a whole, and there has been no decision on that matter yet.

MR. DOERN: Well, okay, I would just say in conclusion in that area that I think the Minister is being far too modest; namely, that it is his responsibility to show some leadership here, and he's not just the fact collector and the man who waits to hear what his colleagues are going to do and then reports. I think that the role of the Minister of Urban Affairs is to lead his colleagues and to lead his team vis-a-vis the City of Winnipeg.

MR. MERCIER: That's exactly right but you can't do it until you get a decision from the city. I don't recall any former Urban Affairs Minister appearing as a delegation at the City Council meetings to attempt to lead them to make a decision. They're fully capable of making their own decisions and when they're made and communicated to me they'll be considered seriously by our government.

MR. DOERN: And there's nothing precluding you from indicating to them that they would have a favourable hearing or a favourable response. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of smaller specifics. I was interested in one comment that sort of flew across the table a few minutes ago and that was the status of a portable track for track and field. Could the Minister just repeat what he said there for the Winnipeg Arena? Has that been completed and is it in place and how much did we contribute?

MR. MERCIER: We contributed one-half of the final cost and our share, 50 percent share, was \$67,560.91 — I wanted to be specific.

MR. DOERN: And it's now complete?

MR. MERCIER: It's now complete and is in the hands of the city, and in fact has been used, it is my understanding, in Brandon and, I believe, may have been used at another location in the country for track meets in rural areas.

MR. DOERN: And was that track made in Winnipeg or in Manitoba?

MR. MERCIER: My recollection goes back to last spring, I think, when I was at the city and we entered into the agreement to purchase and I believe it was an out-of-province purchase — Vancouver, the Member for Seven Oaks reminds me — and it was at a pretty favourable price.

MR. DOERN: And is that track — I assume that will be turned over to the Knights of Columbus or is it a case that it's the city's property and it is loaned to the Knights of Columbus. How does that arrangement work?

MR. MERCIER: The city is responsible for administering the operation of the track. That was one of the terms of the previous government's agreement to participate in one-half of the cost.

MR. DOERN: Well, that's all the questions I have at this time.\$

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona and then Fort Rouge, then Wellington.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, the first question asked by my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, was, "Will the department continue to exist?" The Minister responded by saying that maybe this was a question for Cabinet to decide, but frankly through the subsequent hour I've had some concern come to my mind in that the Minister really hasn't stated to us — and he's a new Minister and it's a new government — what will the thrust of the Minister be with respect to the whole area of Urban Affairs? What will the thrust of the government be with respect to the whole area of Urban Affairs? Perhaps he could take this opportunity to expand on what is the Conservative Government's perception of the problems of urban Manitoba, or the urban areas of Manitoba, and what does it see as its role as a government with respect to these problems?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: I wonder if the member could be perhaps a little more specific about . . .

MR. PARASIUK: Okay. Sure. You know, for example, does the Minister see the department solely as a conduit between the City of Winnipeg and various departments of the Government of Manitoba? Does it see itself solely as a conduit between the City of Winnipeg and the Federal Government? The Federal Government does have a Department of Urban Affairs. It has a Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. It has other programs and departments which may in fact relate to urban areas of Manitoba, but constitutionally it has difficulty liaising directly with the city. Other provinces have said, no, the Federal Government can't liaise directly with the city because the province has some perception of what the city should be too, and in the case of Manitoba where 60 percent of the population is in one particular urban area, I would think it's important for the government to clarify what its role with respect to the department will be. Will it be sort of a passive conduit or will it be something more than that?

MR. MERCIER: That certainly was helpful, Mr. Chairman, in nailing down the question. If I may just comment on a few things — one of the certainly important roles that the Provincial Government will play and can play is in the tri-level review of the greater Winnipeg development plan if it is considered seriously by the province and if the province is prepared to develop some basic policies and lay on the table its position for the development of the city. I'm not so sure that that was ever done by the previous government. It's not an easy thing to do. I can appreciate that. But that certainly is one area where the city can play a major role in the development of the province. You know, virtually every department of the Provincial Government has some effect on the City of Winnipeg, from Finance to Agriculture — Highways, Health . . .

MR. MILLER: You name it.

MR. MERCIER: The former Minister of Urban Affairs is giving me some assistance, Mr. Chairman, acknowledging that that is indeed the case. So, it's important that some priorities be established

by the Provincial Government in that review of the greater Winnipeg development plan. I say that the support for an urban transit and transportation program is an important area because the road network in the city is the main basis, foundation of the planning process that follows afterwards. The development of the regional street program and regional services will naturally lead to development in the areas that they are constructed no matter what sort of plan you have.

The problems of the core area and the native people in the core area is unquestionably a problem that's existed for a long time in the City of Winnipeg, exists now, and will exist for some time to come. Whether or not governments can solve the problem is another question, but I would hope that while I am Minister that we can in some way work with the various agencies that are involved in the core area of the city, either working for the city or independently funded or through the Health Department, in attempting to co-ordinate their activities and hope to perhaps establish some priorities and attempt to accomplish something for the better in the core area, because the statistics and the studies that have been done show an increasing Indian population, native population in the core area and the housing problems that are going to develop must be met. So it's a very complicated question that the Member for Transcona puts, Mr. Chairman. The role of the Minister of Urban Affairs must be to attempt to co-ordinate from the city's perspective, the city's concerns in all of these areas from finance, transportation, core area, housing, land-use, as they relate to provincial policies and it probably is very difficult for past Urban Affairs Ministers to point to any one or more specific things that they were able to accomplish while they were Ministers because of the complex and intricate matters that are dealt with. The Minister of Urban Affairs doesn't really have much specific authority or much money to work with but the true test is the co-ordination of the provincial policies in recognition of the city's major problems that I have outlined.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I thank the Minister for that response. You see, I think that the Department of Urban Affairs is a very important department and I think that it does have to be more aggressive than even it was in the past with respect to developing policies, with respect to urban development. The past government took the approach of in a sense creating the unified City of Winnipeg and then possibly holding back a bit waiting for the City of Winnipeg to develop some policy thrusts of its own with respect to urban development, and I don't think it's a completely one-way, one-sided effort. I don't think the City of Winnipeg can develop all the policies that will affect the citizens of Winnipeg by itself in isolation. I think the province has to look at particular problems and come up with some positions of its own and the Minister has indicated that he foresees the Department of Urban Affairs developing policies. I think that's a good idea. However, he says that a few minutes after saying that the department itself is under some kind of cloud because the Task Force has recommended that it be merged with the Department of Municipal Affairs and he hasn't stated what his particular position with respect to that recommendation is. I would think that I would value his comments on that recommendation. He has had some experience in the municipal politics; he's had some experience now at the provincial level and I think he's had somewhat more experience in these two levels of government than the members of the Task Force had.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the member might permit me . . . because if the member got the impression that I said the department was under a cloud . . .

MR. PARASIUK: No, I said it's under a cloud.

MR. MERCIER: Perhaps he said it. What I did say, and perhaps I could state again for the record is that I feel that the urban problems which are unique to government in the Province of Manitoba because of the size of the city in comparison to the total population of the province and because of the size of the city by itself as a large urban centre, are important and warrant the special attention of someone to coordinate provincial policies as they affect the city, whether that occurs in a separate department of Urban Affairs or whether that occurs in a specialized department of local government or whatever you call it. Whatever the name is I think it's still extremely important, so I don't think the function of the Urban Affairs Department will ever disappear, that it's an important function and must be continued to be carried out. I say again the Cabinet has not had an opportunity to review this recommendation of the Task Force and no decision has been made on whether or not it would be carried out.

MR. PARASIUK: When, in fact, the Cabinet does look at this recommendation I would hope that the Minister will make a very strong case for the continued existence of the separate department of Urban Affairs, in that I think any Minister's time is limited, and I think that this Minister probably has found that out over the last six months, the extent to which there are demands on the Minister's time. And one of the things I can foresee happening if a local government department is created,

is that the municipal politicians — and there are many municipalities in Manitoba do want to have audiences with the Municipal Affairs Minister. They would like to see the Minister, not the Deputy, or the ADM; although it might be possible to have the ADM or the Deputy deal with these people, usually they do want to have some audience with the Minister.

And the same thing holds true with local government if you're talking about local government districts or community councils in northern Manitoba, and these people as well require a lot of time with the Minister. And what I'm afraid of is that just from logistical reasons if this is all combined into one department the Minister will find that he has very little time because of the formalities, in a sense, of the office to really look at the very deep, complicated problems of Urban Affairs nowadays. I think special attention is needed for urban problems, and that it's important for the province to keep a separate department.

I think it's important for the Minister and the department itself to be prepared to take the lead in focusing the various departments in the Manitoba government on to the particular circumstances of Winnipeg, or sections of Winnipeg, or the particular circumstances of, say, employment or unemployment in Winnipeg. The circumstances of unemployment in the inner core are much different than the circumstances of unemployment in remote and isolated communities in northern Manitoba. The circumstances of unemployment in the inner core are somewhat different, certainly, than the circumstances of unemployment, or, more particularly, under-employment in rural Manitoba. I would think that if people are developing an employment program per se, it has to have these regional nuances if it's going to be effective, and the regional nuances, especially with respect to urban Manitoba, will be provided by the department, by the staff and by the Minister — by the staff who have sufficient resources to look at those problems, to analyze them and to provide leadership through analysis and through policy and program suggestions to the departments. Now if they're understaffed, they will have a hard time doing that.

If the Minister finds that his time is limited because of other commitments he will have a hard time sitting down with the other Ministers and getting them to focus the attention on those particular circumstances that make it difficult to have a line department just deal with the problems of Winnipeg. So I hope that he would make a very strong case to his Cabinet colleagues when this is presented. I still haven't been able to ascertain from the Minister, having had some experience now in the department, whether he would prefer to have a separate department in existence. I think that's not an unfair question to ask, and I see that the Task Force recommendation is a recommendation of a ministerial colleague of his, so I don't think it's unfair to ask the other Minister and the Minister directly responsible for the department, what does he think of that recommendation? What is his own personal preference? The Minister responsible for the Task Force has indicated his particular preference; I think it's not unfair to ask the Minister responsible for the department to state his particular preference at this time. Is he prepared to give us his position with respect to the continuance of a separate Department of Urban Affairs?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated what I think is a very important function of the Department of Urban Affairs. I don't think it is proper for me to discuss my own personal preferences as to the recommendations any further prior to consideration by Cabinet.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, I guess there are variations then in the way in which Ministers treat recommendations of that Task Force. Other Ministers have rejected certain recommendations quite quickly. The recommendations in Education dealing with curbing the independence of the school boards I think have been dealt with quickly and fairly succinctly by the Minister of Education. I think this one is a fairly succinct recommendation with respect to the Department of Urban Affairs but the Minister hasn't dealt with it the way I would like to see him deal with it so that the people of Manitoba can have a clear idea of what the future of this department might be.

I'd like to ask the Minister whether, in fact, he and other Ministers are meeting monthly with the official delegation of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I can't say whether we have been meeting monthly. We have been meeting regularly and at certain times we have met weekly, particularly when we were considering the Capital in current budgets. I think the member might recognize that as in the past five years or six years when the session has been on there's not been as much opportunity to meet with the city as much as you would like and there's not been as much demand from the city because, once they've completed their budget requirements, there simply hasn't been as much need. But I certainly have indicated to the city that I am prepared to meet with them at any time that they wish. I would point out that we have initiated a new form of meetings with the city with respect to the City of

Winnipeg Act in that my department and officials of the City of Winnipeg have been meeting for approximately a month and a half reviewing the city's request for amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act in order to provide what I think is some helpful information from both sides.

I think in the past amendments would be proposed by the city and perhaps not adequately explained to the Provincial Government. As a result, they may have formed mistaken impression of the amendments that were proposed or the results that would accrue from those amendments, and this year we introduced a form of dialogue or communication with the City of Winnipeg on the amendments that they have been proposing for a number of years and we will, in this session, be introducing a bill to make certain amendments to the Act as a result, I think, of some good discussion with the City of Winnipeg.

MR. PARASIUKE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to come to a couple of specific points to illustrate what I was talking about before when I was asking the Minister whether the province would assume a bit more leadership with respect to development policies. One of these does concern the east yard development. In reviewing the Department of Public Works Estimates I was asking the Minister whether in fact he was in favour of development that would reinforce the Portage-Garry Street area of downtown Winnipeg which I think is undergoing a bit of decline, and probably could do with in-fill development there. This is the area, say, between the Hudson's Bay Company and Main Street. There's been some in-fill, but right now there isn't as much in-fill as I think there should be and some of the merchants on Portage Avenue have been complaining about the fact that some of the areas are undergoing a bit of decline — some of the types of decline that, say, occurred on parts of Main Street about 25, 30 years ago.

Now, we have only so much office space that really can be absorbed yearly by the city, and we have the east yard proposal which is a very ambitious proposal which would have at least one million square feet of office space in the east yards. But from the early studies that I had seen put forward by Great-West Life and the CN people, they foresaw a number of office towers in the east yards. They foresaw in a sense possibly the shifting of commercial activity to the east yards' area because it's a fairly large area and it would be very densely developed. This development was really predicated, I think in part, on the southwest part of the transportation corridor, terminating there and providing a good steady flow of people to it.

Now, the question facing the province would be what attitude should it take with respect to the east yards' development. Should it just support it if the city wants it to go ahead or should it look at some of the other implications? Should it look at what the implications of an east yard development would be, say, on the existing Portage Avenue area? Should it look at what the implications might be for the developments right at the corner of Portage and Main right now? Should it be analyzing what the effects of that development might be, or should it just be sitting back waiting for the city to make a decision on the east yards and then respond at that stage — or should it not be looking at that problem now, anticipating it, doing some work on it right now?

I can think of a couple of others. I'll just give you . . .

MR. MERCIER: On that one, Mr. Chairman, I can say that we will be meeting with the city shortly with respect to the proposal that the city has sent for to amend the development plan to accommodate that development in the east yards. We will be reviewing it with them at that time.

MR. PARASIUKE: You still haven't indicated whether you'd be doing work on it and whether the government would be prepared to do whatever it could to make sure that the office and commercial development along Portage Avenue is continued. I think that years back there was a downtown Winnipeg development plan that recommended that that be the focus of business and commercial development. Now someone is coming along and saying: Well, we'd like to do some development away from the downtown area because it's about ¾ of a mile away. We'd like to do some downtown development away from that area because our costs — and I think the private costs of the developer would be somewhat lower. I think that the public costs of that type of development would be very high over a 20-year period.

This brings me to the second point that I want to raise with respect to what is this province's attitude to Winnipeg development. I think the basic question facing the greater Winnipeg development plan review is whether in fact government — and that's all three levels of government — all three levels are involved in the study — whether in fact government is going to try and reduce suburban sprawl and induce in-fill development, because we have large areas in the City of Winnipeg that

aren't sufficiently developed and I think one of the major reasons for this situation is that the private costs of suburban development are pretty low — you can buy land fairly cheaply. You can go in and you can do it and you can get out, and the residences are left there, but the public costs of suburban development are pretty high. You have the costs of transportation. You have the costs of bus transportation and, you know, if you look at the Dial-a-bus experience, that cost is quite high. If you look at the costs of trying to provide police protection, fire protection, garbage collection for suburban sprawl, it's pretty expensive.

So the private costs of suburban development are low but the public costs are very high.

Now, if you look at some of the areas in the City of Winnipeg that, in a sense, are vacant lots — and there are some pretty large vacant lots — in those areas you find that the public costs have already been spent by and large, the police are patrolling that area, there is fire protection. In fact, some of our downtown fire stations probably are under-utilized. There's sewer and water there. We've got the garbage collection there. We've got the streets there. We've got the bus service there. So those social costs have in fact been paid so we could fill in those vacant lots — and many of them are parking lots — but if we could fill them in with development the marginal social costs would be pretty low. But the private costs of that development might be pretty high. I think that the experience of any level of government in trying to acquire downtown property that is under-utilized is very high. You try and buy the property and you find that people want incredibly high prices. You find that their assessment is very low. They're probably paying very low taxes. They can afford to keep it. So any private developer looks at that piece of land downtown which probably is prime development land and says wow, that cost is too high to me so I'm going to go out to Fort Garry, or Transcona, or East Kildonan, or North Kildonan, or places like that and I'll buy land at \$8,000 or \$10,000 an acre and I'll proceed with development because it's cheaper to me to do that.

But I think the costs to society and to all three levels of government are much higher when that is continued. And I think the costs to the taxpayer are ultimately much higher if that is allowed to continue. So I think that's a basic fundamental problem facing all three levels of government with the greater Winnipeg development plan review. It's a tricky problem but I think it's important for all 8 levels of government to look at that question and to come up with some decisions with respect to it rather than just sitting back and saying we will let the status quo continue.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, first I would say I think the city in the past few years themselves have recognized that particular problem and recognized in their 5-year capital development plan the fact that they can't afford to expand in all directions at once. The 5-year capital program that the city has developed is based on continuous development in those areas where the services can be expanded at least cost. I think some of the programs we've talked about in this government in terms of developing programs for the rehabilitation of housing in the inner core area — not right in the core but in the sort of surrounding — mainly in the former City of Winnipeg area, in terms of improving housing programs to develop, improve those areas and encourage home ownership in those areas, will tend to improve all of those areas.

We have, in conjunction with the city, recommended to the Federal Government that moneys be made available for their storm relief program as compared to merely making it available for the extension of sewer and water systems which naturally bring with it the additional extra cost of developing further and further away from the downtown areas and that has been received generally favourably. I think all three levels of government now recognize limited funds are available, that development has to be controlled to a certain extent to avoid excessive costs to all levels of government as a result of uncontrolled urban sprawl, and I'm hopeful that in the review of the development plan we would see all three levels of government recognize that point and review the plan in that connection and in that context.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of curiosities about the Minister and his department. When he says that he's meeting with the official delegation, does he mind telling us who that is composed of?

MR. MERCIER: It's composed of the mayor, the deputy mayor, the chairman of the Executive Policy Committee, the chairmen of each standing committee — they come if they have any matters that are under consideration with respect to the committee of which they're chairman — and, in addition,

the chief commissioner of the city, or any commissioner of a committee that has something on the agenda.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister mind telling us, on this committee that's meeting to discuss the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act, who is on that committee from the city side and who do they represent and who are they taking instructions from in terms of changes or amendments to the act?

MR. MERCIER: Well, the council have made the initial request for the amendments. Some of these go back a number of years. I believe the mayor has sometimes attended, the deputy mayor and chairman of the Executive Policy Committee, city solicitors, and any department that might be affected by a proposed amendment who wish to, or who are required to explain a matter or offer some background to any particular event.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, the reason I'm asking is that it's quite apparent that the executive policy-making structure of the City of Winnipeg is in a total and complete stalemate and breakdown or cross-purposes and that the peculiar and sometimes ridiculous position that the mayor finds himself in relation to the Executive Policy Committee, in relation to the ICEC caucus, in relation to the commissioners, is something that has resulted in that kind of multi-headed monster from City Hall and obviously there's no consensus or agreement as to either the direction of the city or the kind of way in which they say it should be operating. I think that the amendments passed last year are an obvious cause of that, aside from the personalities that may be involved, so therefore I'm wondering when it comes down to making changes to the City of Winnipeg Act that the Minister's proposing, who in fact is he listening to? Is he listening to the mayor? Is he listening to the chairman of the EPC? Is he listening to the ICEC caucus? Is he listening the to the board of commissioners? All of whom have expressed very different points of view as to who should be operating and running the City of Winnipeg?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As chairman, I sure wish I could answer that question. I will refer now to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Member for Fort Rouge is not attempting to downgrade the efforts of the present chairman of the Executive Policy Committee and the Liberal candidate in St. Boniface.

MR. AXWORTHY: I suppose if I had to take my druthers I'd probably choose his preferences over others but I'm simply pointing out that there seems to be a number of differing points of view being expressed as to how the city should be operating and functioning and who, in fact, should be exercising authority. Now, if in fact we are about to consider amendments to the act, I hope to God those amendments would include some clarification of those lines of authority and executive powers to eliminate the confusion that was created last year, but if so, and if the Minister is solely acting upon the recommendations of the city, I want to know who is in fact giving those recommendations? Which of the fiefdoms is he in closest consultation with?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm in close consultation with all members of City Council who wish to express any viewpoint to me, but what we are dealing with is the recommendations that are passed by City Council. We're not dealing with personal recommendations of any individual. In the main the recommendations for amendments deal with housekeeping, amendments that would improve the administration of the City of Winnipeg Act. When it gets down to the situation referred to by the Member for Fort Rouge the, what you might call the political — where the political decisions have to be made as to the structure and the decision-making process and the responsibility of certain of the positions — that is a decision on which our government will have to make a political decision on and we'll announce that when we introduce the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask, does the Minister suggest then — and I wasn't clear — he said that the amendments he's considering are housekeeping amendments. Does that mean that he does not intend to bring in legislation that would attempt to clarify the present state of confusion at City Hall in terms of the position of the mayor and his relationship to the Board of Commissioners and to the different committees of council, or can we, as I would fervently hope, expect some clarification and much stronger, or strengthening of the position of the mayor in relation to council and to the executive branch of government so that we can get some decision-making in a very clear, forthright way?

MR. MERCIER: You can expect some clarification.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the Minister's intent in that respect. In terms of these amendments, if I can ask some further questions on it.

MR. MERCIER: The member can, if he's asking me, Mr. Chairman, but I'm really not going to — I wanted to talk about the process because that was raised, I think, in a question but I'm not going to go any further than I have in discussing the amendments because I think it would be improper and there would be objections from members of the House if I did.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, my questioning was intended entirely to deal with the process had I been allowed to complete the second part of my thought. I am wondering if the only source of recommendation for these amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act is the city officials and politicians themselves. Has the Minister made any effort or will he make any effort to consult, for example, with the resident advisory groups in the City of Winnipeg who also have some serious concerns about its present operation? Does he intend to consult with any of the civic employee unions who have also expressed some real concerns? —(Interjection)— civic employee unions. In other words, is there any wider consultation going on than what he described in terms of determining the particular fallacies or weaknesses in the present City of Winnipeg operation, or is he simply relying on that one source of opinion?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I've had no representations made to me by resident advisory groups or civic employee groups. I've had some by employees on a personal basis but there will be every opportunity for any interested group to appear before Law Amendments Committee if they wished at any time to direct any proposals to me or to any member of the government.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I recognize the Minister's charitable approach but I think he is wise enough in the ways of government that people usually don't come forward until they're invited and I haven't noticed any major invitation of that kind being publically expressed in this way, particularly to the resident advisory groups who I think have been sufficiently cowed over the last while that they would probably not be encouraged or sustained in any of their approaches unless they've had some specific reference, as they did at the time of the Taraska Commission in which they did appear, and made some fairly useful contributions.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, is the Member for Fort Rouge suggesting, I think it's within a year after the Taraska Commission held fairly extensive hearings on the City of Winnipeg, that we should have another commission or body appointed to hear public submissions after less than a year of operation since the Taraska Commission?

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I'd suggest that if the Minister looks at the record, Hansards in particular, of the last session of the Legislature, he'd realize just how little consideration was given to many of the findings, both of the Taraska Commission and of the legislative committee that appeared, that the bill, The City of Winnipeg Amendment, was pushed through in a matter of about two hours of discussion at Law Amendments Committee, and therefore many of the considerations at that time were simply not considered. So that a lot of the recommendations and proposals were simply ignored at that time, for reasons which still defy me.

Therefore, it means that if you have to go back over ground that you've already travelled in order to get a better City of Winnipeg administration it may be worthwhile doing.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, if that is indeed the case, and I haven't had an opportunity to read Hansard covering that period of time when the Taraska Commission recommendations and the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act were considered at the last session, I'm certainly prepared to do so. I'm not prepared to suggest in any way that the amendments that we will be proposing will be the result of a thorough review of the whole Act, that was something I contemplated should be done before the next election of the City of Winnipeg. The council itself has for some six months, since they've been newly elected, been reviewing their own structure and their own authority, and that has been conducted by a lot of people who have already been on the council for six years, so that was one aspect that I was waiting for from them and I would think that prior to the next election, prior to the third session of our government, that a thorough review of that Act will be considered and I would certainly want to, at that time, review Hansard and the recommendations of the Taraska Commission.

If it's deemed necessary to hold another public hearing, that is a possibility but I wouldn't want

to commit myself at this time.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I take from the Minister's remarks then that that is a commitment to undertake, sometime within the next two or three years, a major review of the City of Winnipeg Act. Is that a fair conclusion?

MR. MERCIER: That's my own personal commitment.

MR. AXWORTHY: That's your own personal commitment. I think that's a useful one to take. I hope you stay in your position long enough to fulfill it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not through yet. I was distracted by the euphonic sounds of the cattlemen's association behind us here. —(Interjection)— That's right. I hope you get some fresh material by that time, Harry.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few other questions I'd like to ask. While we're talking about untouched reports that have yet to see the light of day or which are still in their virginal state, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what he intends to do about the Bellan Commission report on land prices that the previous government commissioned and which made many recommendations concerning the question of high land costs around the City of Winnipeg in its estimate. Does the Minister intend to take any action whatsoever, either on the Bellan Commission itself, or on the issue with which it dealt, which is the fact that land costs in the City of Winnipeg have gone up about 50 percent in the last five years?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think I indicated earlier that the Bellan Commission report was part of the Federal report on land prices. I'm not sure of the exact name. But that is to be, according to my understanding, released fairly shortly, and I would have thought that the Member for Fort Rouge might have been aware of that.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may interrupt, I think the Minister is wrong, because I am fully aware what the other commission is doing. The Bellan Commission was not part of that commission, it was a separate commission established. . .

MR. MERCIER: Part of the information — I was previously advised by the former Minister of Urban Affairs — would be submitted to the Federal body and perhaps would be used in the development of their report.

MR. AXWORTHY: I would suggest that while portions of the Bellan Commission could have been, or might have been of some use to the Federal commission on land, that there were many recommendations in that report that dealt specifically with provincial responsibilities, or certainly raised questions about provincial responsibilities, and I'm wondering if the Minister would care to indicate whether he intends to take any action on those which are directly within the provincial jurisdiction.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it's called the Greenspan Report.

MR. AXWORTHY: That's right. David Greenspan is a Liberal lawyer in Toronto, Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: It's supposed to be published very shortly, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what's in the report, I've never seen the Federal report, but I think it obviously deals with the same general subject matter as the Bellan Commission report did, and I would like an opportunity to review that report, to review the Bellan Commission report, and both reports will have to be taken into consideration in the development of any housing policy by our government, but we have not yet reached that point and I can't indicate in what direction or what action we will be taking on the Bellan Commission report itself.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I would think that the reply from the Minister, that he's waiting upon the Federal response is an interesting one considering some of the past statements made by the Minister. But I would ask him whether there has been any . . .

MR. MERCIER: Well, it was a study, as I understand it, commissioned by the Federal-Provincial

governments, and it was one instance perhaps where the Federal Government listened to the concern.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, is it the intention of the Minister to deal with this issue of land prices with some dispatch once he receives the Federal report, or is he using this as a pretext to simply offset any action, particularly considering when you take into account that as the Minister of Urban Affairs, he has been party to decisions by the City of Winnipeg to release or eliminate certain land banking proposals that have previously been undertaken?

Now, can we assume that those actions which were taken in advance of any report on land prices, were done with the recognition of the findings of the Bellan Commission, or of any other Commission, or were they simply done for expedient reasons?

MR. MERCIER: Are you referring to the Fort Garry land banking area? That was a decision that was made by our government after due consideration of the comments of the Minister responsible for MHRC, and you may wish to ask Mr. Johnston some questions on the amount of land that is available for housing in that particular area. There's a substantial amount of MHRC land owned immediately south of the Fort Garry land banking area. We have indicated to the City that in our opinion, and we were asked in response to a recommendation of the council, where they asked our government to make our views known to them on the land assembly programs in Fort Garry and St. Vital, I indicated to the City that in our opinion, we should continue with the St. Vital land assembly program because it would appear that it can be developed fairly quickly for housing purposes in that area; that in the Fort Garry area, there's a substantial amount of land to the south of the land banking area which will be used for residential purposes; and that in our view, the Fort Garry land assembly program was not required for housing purposes in that area, that the cost to the province and the City has been substantially more than was estimated at the beginning. And that the City, if they are of the view that the land was not required for public purposes, might wish to abandon that particular expropriation.

Over one year ago, the City did attempt to abandon that land expropriation. —(Interjection)— No, the City attempted to abandon the Fort Garry land expropriation, and the previous Provincial Government did not agree. The City stayed in.

MR. AXWORTHY: I wonder if the Minister's remark indicates, or rather he could clarify, whether the government has, therefore, adopted a policy which either supports the use of land banking or land assembly as a technique to deal with land prices, or to control land prices or to guide urban development, or does it not? Considering the decisions that have already been made in that regard prior to the release of any commission report, can he indicate at least what the interim policy of the new government is in relation to the use of public land assemblies of some kind?

MR. MERCIER: In my personal view, Mr. Chairman, I think any municipality or any City has to have some sort of a land assembly program because land is always required for public services and public use. You may not have the exact piece of land that you want, but if you have land in various areas it can always be traded, or accommodation can be made with other owners in the area for the development of public facilities, and you can have an advantageous effect on the development of land within the City. In this particular case, in this particular area, and I suppose one aspect of the recommendation of the Bellan Report was to limit the acquisition of land by government to a certain percentage, in this particular case there appears — I really am speaking on behalf of the Minister responsible for MHRC to whom you should direct more particular questions — I believe in his view there is sufficient land owned in the vicinity by MHRC to provide adequately for housing needs, and that was the basis of his recommendation.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the Minister a further question in this area. He says that he expresses personal preference for the need for some form of public land assembly, without defining what form that would take. It seems to me in a fairly moderate form. When you consider that there is nothing in this year's budget for any form of public land assembly, as I can determine it, in the MHRC budget, there's been absolutely no capital assigned for that task, has the Minister made any effort, working with his colleagues or with the City of Winnipeg department, to re-allocate that loss capital for the acquisition of land to the servicing of the land, the development of proper sewage, storm sewer, servicing utility areas, so that the land that is presently owned could be opened up, made available, and therefore be used to bring the prices down? Has there been any effort made to undertake that particular initiative, that seemed to be suggested in part in the Bellan Commission Report?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, that in fact is what can take place very quickly in the St. Vital area

if the City agrees to continue the expropriation in that area. My understanding is that that land will be developed in conjunction with a private owner in the City or a private owner in that area, and that it could be as close as one and a half to two years away from actual construction. What is required, though, is a decision by the City to proceed immediately and to agree with our suggestion that that expropriation simply be continued and finalized.

For some reason, the agreements for the Joint Land Assembly Programs in Fort Garry and St. Vital were entered into by the Minister of Urban Affairs. I think all of the other housing programs are the responsibility of MHRC, and of course MHRC are very closely involved in these too, but any further specific questions would have to be directed to the Minister responsible for MHRC. I believe there is some activity, but he is in a better position than I to give you the detail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, we may want to come back to that, or maybe we may pursue the Minister of Housing more closely in this area, but it follows upon that statement questions I had concerning the position of the government in relation to the transportation system. The Minister indicates that he expects a possibility of a major new development in the St. Vital area, to open that whole area up for land development for residential purposes, and yet there is absolutely no plans, as I can see it, at the present moment being supported by this government or others for the extension of any major transportation corridors from the St. Vital area into the downtown area, where most of the traffic will flow. They will have to be using the existing arteries with the exception of the new bridge that is being built, which will simply add . . .

Now, the question is, other than it's fairly passive approach the Minister has described so far, where it's simply a matter of being a reception vehicle for suggestions by the City, does the Minister intend, if there is some formulation of a strategy that you are going to use the St. Vital land system as a way of trying to combat prices, the people are obviously going to have to move to and fro from that area, to begin to actively promote the development of a major new transportation corridor to the southern part of the City to alleviate the intense pressure that will develop once that line comes on stream?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the City of Winnipeg has within its 5-year capital budget the development of Dakota south to the perimeter and the upgrading of St. Marys and St. Anns.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know the City has it in its Budget, I'm asking, does the province have it in its Budget to support that particular extension?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the City has submitted a 5-Year development plan. The province has not yet responded or given any official sanction to that program, but I do concur with the comments expressed by the Member for Fort Rouge, because that is a difficulty of municipal government' or city government, to properly plan its own development without any commitments from the Provincial Government, not knowing whether they are prepared to participate in the 50 percent cost of the regional facilities over any extended period of time. Commitments have just basically been for a 1-year period up until now. I appreciate it's a difficult thing for a Provincial Government to do that, but that is what is required for a municipal government to properly plan its activities. I haven't yet advanced that position to my colleagues, but it's one that I would very seriously advance.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the Minister if in his new mandate and stewardship of this office, whether he would undertake to change the financing system in relation to urban development projects, so that they would run in some parallel fashion to the City 5-Year Capital Works arrangement, so that some longer term planning, in particular in the area of transportation and servicing might be undertaken, the commitments would be telegraphed several years ahead so that you could begin to do some proper planning. I would obviously urge that on the Minister because, without that it's impossible for anybody to do any serious anticipation of needs or to do any long-range planning of facilities, particularly, if we go through the kind of negotiations that have been in the past where there is so much sort of tortious changes of those programs along the way. And in keeping with that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister more explicitly about the transit corridor itself, that in response to earlier questions he indicated that there would be no support for the Fort Garry downtown transit corridor along the CNR this year. Knowing his reputation in the past of being an outspoken advocate of such a proposal, and having been the bane of previous provincial governments in extolling its virtues, I wonder if the Minister would at least be prepared to commit that that corridor development itself is essential to that southern part

of the City, and that the government would be committing itself to a development of that corridor once it's able to get its own dollars straightened away?

I would particularly urge considering that the Minister of Public Works is attending these committee meetings, or was, and is known for his generosity and charitable . . . whether that extra \$40 million he's wrapping into rural highways it might be part shared with the City of Winnipeg so could deal with its transportation problems?½

MR. MERCIER: The Minister for Highways indicates that's five million.

One of the very real disappointments that I had as a City of Winnipeg Councillor occurred just last year in the middle of the year, when the Federal Government announced their Urban Transportation Assistance Program, which they had announced in the Federal election in 1974, in which most municipal representatives felt that the Federal Government had made a real sincere promise to assist in the development of urban transportation systems. However, the actual announcement, which indicated that for the Province of Manitoba over a 5-year period there would be approximately \$10 million available, and that all grade crossing projects would have to come out of this fund, was a real disappointment for people who advocated the development of a corridor like the southwest rapid transit corridor which the City . . . they felt at that time could easily be extended into the northeast section of the City to serve East Kildonan and Transcona and St. Boniface. We were extremely disappointed, because we thought that here was a project that would, because of the Energy Conservation Program that had been talked about at the Federal Government level, support for urban transit, we thought that for a project like this, which had all the benefits of conserving energy, of promoting the use of transit, developing a rapid transit program along a railway line, the use of perhaps the abandonment of the Letellier line, the use of the CNR main line, that this was going to be a project to which the Federal Government would make - either on a special basis or as part of their general program — a substantial contribution to Capital Costs that were estimated anywhere from \$25 million to \$30 million.

But unfortunately the program that was announced by the Federal Government did not meet the expectations of people in the municipal level, probably right across the country. The capital costs are a formidable step to overcome in the development of that program. I think it's an important program, because the study that was done certainly pointed out, I believe, by 1981, the traffic congestion along Pembina Highway right into the downtown area, will be extremely severe, and I think those people who live in East Kildonan, St. Boniface and Transcona have a severe traffic problem right now. People in St. James have a severe traffic problem. I ultimately saw the extension of that corridor certainly into the northwest section of the City also.

The Mayor and I made a representation to Mr. Lang in December. We were advised, fairly strongly, that there would be no more additional moneys under the Urban Transportation Assistance Program. We are facing in the City, a No. 1 priority being the construction of the Sherbrook-McGregor overpass, which, if it used the urban moneys from the Urban Transportation Assistance Program, probably would use virtually all of the moneys available, leaving nothing else even for grade separation. I suppose governments are in a real dilemma now, because the future obviously requires the development of transit programs, yet the funds are limited. The longer you put off the construction of those kind of facilities, the greater the cost is going to be, and yet you still have the limitation on funds.

The City has not approached the Provincial Government since the discussion in December. I had heard on a news program that perhaps they had simply delayed any further consideration of the southwest traffic transit corridor. I think it's an example of a project that is going to have to develop in the City, whether if it's not now, or in the next five years, in the next ten or fifteen years, probably throughout the City of Winnipeg.

I can't really offer anything more than that, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that the City would raise the matter again, and that we can together in the development of their capital plans, hopefully with an extended commitment of the province over a number of years, insure . . . at least advocate to the City, and they're well aware of it, the need for developing an urban transportation system which doesn't mean just street construction, but means the continued development of the transit facilities.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I would share the Minister's disappointment, but as a member of a government which is priding itself upon restraint, I thought he'd be more interested in applauding Federal efforts to restrain itself as opposed to spend more money. I suppose there are many other people who are equally disappointed about many cut backs in many other areas that we are

But I'm not here to quibble on that point.

I would raise the question with the Minister that, taking into account the equation that he has described which is that there is a growing demand for new public transit services and shrinking dollars to pay for them, that whether there are should not be the attempt to look at somewhat more innovative ways of financing or of undertaking large scale transit programs that would escape from many of the binds of the traditional systems of City, provincial, municipal, federal, interjurisdictional attempts, which I think always add about four years to any negotiation.

Particularly, looking at first the model that was established in British Columbia. The province itself undertook the responsibility for many of the large scale urban transit systems. They simply set up their own authority so they could use their bonding power as a means of financing such systems, which is one way of providing for longer term financing of it.

When you consider the kind of capital commitments we're making in areas such as Hydro to provide for supply of energy, it might be as equally important to raise capital to reduce the demand for energy purposes on the other side of the scale, and to perhaps even look at the combination of that with other transit authorities that become self liquidating in their financing through the use of toll systems and other means so that the transit systems become more self supporting than they are and begin to reflect truer costs of these things. Because it strikes me that one of the problems in coming to any decision or agreement on many of the transportation, particularly the large scale transportation problems in the City of Winnipeg, is that simply there is a mechanical problem of making a decision, that there is simply so many actors, or so many cooks stirring the broth that everyone's got a different recipe and no one knows for sure exactly who's standing over the stove at any one time, that that's one of the real problems and we've lost opportunities in the past, and certainly have lost the opportunity of providing for alternative ways of longer term financing which any large scale transit project would be.

I would perhaps suggest to the Minister that in the case of the southwest corridor which is a particular and almost unique development for this province, for the city, that perhaps a separate corporate vehicle that would have membership on it by the three levels of government, at least the two levels of government, which would have a separate entity to it for that one particular corridor be established and also look at how other . . . if it's cross connection roads and so on, may be used to acquire revenue for such a project, particularly because it's going to be tied in the CNR East Yards Development and the Railway system strikes me there may be some ways of finding alternative ways of at least getting a cash flow to pay off any debts that are acquired, and what seemed to me that's the only way we're going to get that project moving, because our time lag has now I think, gone beyond the point of return, that unless something is done very quickly, the congestion factor in the south side of the city, where the major development is taking place, in the St. Vital-Fort Garry side, will not only result in major disruption along the Pembina corridor, but will also have enormously deleterious effects upon the intervening places in between. I am thinking of an area like Fort Rouge, which will be swamped by, sort of people trying to pick their way through all the residential streets just simply to get downtown and back. There will simply be no saving other than that very serious situation we're facing

I would suggest to the Minister, that it perhaps requires more than just — while he may not be in a position with his present government's own restraint policies to put actual capital on the table at the present moment, what could be done in the meantime I think is the development of an organizational means of perhaps undertaking that special southwest corridor project and incorporating different, or somewhat out of the ordinary financial features to it, rather than simply relying upon the normal tri-level attempts to get their heads together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was very interested in hearing the Minister of Urban Affairs respond to questions earlier I believe put to him in a general vein by the Member for Transcona. There was indication that the new Minister intended to respond more affirmatively to initiatives endorsed and initiated by Winnipeg Council. Some anomalies have already arisen, I suppose namely and primarily so far, the question of the Fort Garry Land Banking Assembly. I was wondering in view of the fact that the Minister indicated that this was initiated apparently by the Minister of Housing, and apparently because that Minister was of the opinion that there was an adequate supply of land available in that immediate vicinity for MHRC public housing use, I am wondering whether or not this Minister, being I think intimately familiar frankly with that situation, could tell us whether or not he and his department are in accord with that analysis.

MR. MERCIER: I am in accord with that analysis.

MR. CORRIN: I am wondering in view of the fact that you are in accord with that analysis, through you, Mr. Chairman, whether you feel that there are other relevant matters that motivated your department to be supportive of the Minister of Housing's initiative. I would address you specifically to escalating costs of land assembly made reference to by you in a report carried in the Winnipeg Free Press on April 21st of this year. You indicated that escalating costs of assembly in Fort Garry was a justification for abandonment. I was wondering, in view of that statement, whether you could give us particulars of how those costs have escalated since 1975.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think we should not be particular about this matter. It is a matter that is before the courts, the expropriation case . . . the project may be carried on if the city wishes, and particularly the Member for Wellington would not want to discuss the particulars of any cases before the courts. In a general way, the estimated cost in Fort Garry was roughly \$5.2 million, and . . .

MR. CORRIN: Excuse me, what was that figure?

MR. MERCIER: Roughly \$5.2 million. The advances as of the middle of April, amount to \$3.5 million. In the general view again I would ask perhaps if there is to be further detail, that the questions be addressed to the Minister Responsible for MHRC, because it is one of his considerations that the eventual costs will be substantially more than those originally estimated.

MR. CORRIN: I'll be very interested in discussing that matter, Mr. Chairman, with the Minister Responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal, because as both myself and the Honourable Minister are aware, 90 percent of the costs of this particular project are being borne not by the provincial government, not by the civic government, but rather by the federal jurisdiction, and in fact, the province is only picking up one half of the remaining 10 percent, namely 5 percent, and sharing jointly the annual interest payments. I should also like to point out in view of the fact that there has been a statement that there have been escalating costs of assembly, that as the Minister is well aware because he has formally occupied the position of Chairman of the Works and Operations Committee at the City Hall, the capital costs associated with the assembly in Fort Garry were all fixed in 1975 when those expropriations were confirmed. The cost of expropriation will therefore be assessed by the courts, or the value of the expropriated properties will therefore be assessed by the courts at 1975 levels and those are the benchmark land values that are now to be established.

As a matter of fact I would ask, in view of the fact that both the Minister and I are aware that there was an intergovernmental task force that was scheduled to report at the end of April, I believe, with respect to these expropriations . . . I believe that one of the reasons that the establishment of those benchmark land values were delayed was because the province and the city were awaiting response from the intergovernmental task force. I am wondering whether the Minister can advise us whether that force has reported now and . . . is willing to make public its position and recommendations.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the one point I should make clear is that the CMHC funding is not a grant, but is a loan, a 90 percent loan, that the 10 percent capital commitment over and above that is shared equally between the city and the province, and that up to the end of February of this year, the total interest on the CMHC advances was \$575,000, and that the city's share of interest and the province's share of accrued interest were each \$60,000, so there is a total of almost \$700,000 in interest accrued to the end of February of this year.

MR. CORRIN: I am wondering — not to digress too far, I will respond to that, because I think it's important that we discuss that — but I am wondering whether we can have some indication as to the status of that intergovernmental task force report.

MR. MERCIER: Obviously a number of committees involved in this matter, Mr. Chairman, which may account for the cost. That committee, my understanding is, reported to the Steering Committee; I don't recollect seeing that particular report.

MR. CORRIN: Will the Honourable Minister give us some commitment that he will chase down that

report in order that the City of Winnipeg can proceed to send its lawyers to court in order to establish those benchmark values if in fact they choose at their option, because they have been given an option in this case at the behest at the Honourable Minister's government, to withdraw and drop the land assely project.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that in this case, that the City of Winnipeg would make a very early decision so that if it's decided to go ahead, and I have already suggested that to them, that if they decide to go ahead, the expropriation proceedings be completed as quickly as possible, and that means going to court as early as possible to establish the benchmark case for values in the area.

MR. CORRIN: I see. The Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, made reference to the fact that there had been considerable delays with respect to this particular land assembly project and I think it would be remiss of me not to remind this honourable gentleman that the primary cause of delay in this case was his own political group, the ICEC and as a member of the Executive Policy Committee, that same Executive Policy Committee that brought in 1976 a recommendation to Council, that this particular land assembly project be opted out of, I am sure remembers, as a member of the Joint Delegation, as I presume will the Member for Seven Oaks remember long and arduous, laborious discussions pertaining to the question of the city's desire and wish to opt out of that program. I would bring to his attention therefore, that if there were accumulated interest charges, he will have to at this particular juncture bear at least a portion, some sort of proportionate share of the responsibility for those expanding interest **osts. And I was aware that the 90 percent figure I cited, being the federal government's share was a loan and not a grant, but I point out that those moneys are not repayable until such time as the property has in fact been brought on stream for sale, I believe the repayment is predicated on the land having been subdivided and having been brought on the market in one shape or another.**

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would just point out for the record that my response to the city indicated that if the city was in agreement with our observations and they wanted to agree to abandon the assembly program in Fort Garry, that it would be conditional on retaining certain lands for a fire hall which is being constructed and rights of way for a major road system, and that the owners' waive all rights to any consequential damages, return all moneys advanced together with interest on those moneys since they've held them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks. The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, dealing with matters of City initiatives and responses to those initiatives by the Provincial Government, in view of the fact that that this government has, as a matter of policy priority, taken the position that they will respond in that manner to those sorts of affirmative influences, I would have to question the Honourable Minister, as I have during the Question Period some many weeks ago now, whether or not a decision has been taken respecting growth taxes. This was a matter that was made public by the Mayor and other members of the City's Executive Policy Committee some time ago. It's an old matter, it's a matter that goes back, probably almost two years now.

I was very disappointed, as the Honourable Minister will recollect, I was very disappointed the decision in that respect couldn't have been taken prior to the City's having to finalize its current budget plans and set its mill rate. I, for one, felt that an affirmative decision in that respect could certainly have ameliorated the necessity of an 11 percent increase in City of Winnipeg property taxes.

I'm wondering whether or not any decision now has been taken with respect to a share of growth taxes in the liquor sale and pari-mutuel betting realm.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I first of all point out that the increase in taxes was 6 ½ percent increase over the 1976 taxes. Pardon me? I missed a year. A 6 ½ percent increase over 1976.

MR. MILLER: What happened to 1977?

MR. MERCIER: 1977. . .

MR. CORRIN: There was an election.

MR. MERCIER: By an act of God, additional funds were made available and taxes were reduced that year.

MR. MILLER: What was the increase over 1977?

MR. CORRIN: Increases were deferred, with respect, Mr. Chairman. I say that with prejudice.

MR. MERCIER: The Minister of Finance will, Mr. Chairman, be responding to the question posed by the Member for Wellington with respect to special taxes.

MR. CORRIN: I sometimes think that the Minister of Highways should have been a quarterback, he's so adroit and adept at passing things. He passes the buck. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure he'd like to go page by page with these particular Estimates.

MR. CORRIN: I'm sure he's interested in everything we on this side have to say.

MR. ENNS: I hang on every word.

MR. CORRIN: I know. I wish you could, if words were rope.

MR. ENNS: That's not nice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington, if not, I'll move on to the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, dealing with the question then of these grants. The Honourable Minister has indicated that this will be a matter that will be dealt with by the Minister of Finance. I'm wondering whether or not the Minister of Finance is privy to the discussions of the joint delegation. Is he a member?

MR. MERCIER: He's a member of the Urban Affairs Committee, yes.

MR. CORRIN: How many opportunities has the Minister of Finance had to meet with the Mayor and members of Executive Policy Committee?

MR. MERCIER: Twice, and once particularly on this subject.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I would note that I can read lips. I received the answer before the Honourable Minister.

I am wondering whether or not, in dealing with City initiatives and requests, whether or not the Honourable Minister would now be in a position to comment on the recommendations made by the Task Force? These recommendations . . .

MR. MERCIER: No.

MR. CORRIN: No? I'm wondering because the Mayor was quite incensed. As a matter of fact, so incensed that he suggested, I'm not sure whether he was referring to honourable members of the government or members of the Task Force, who he indicated he had never met with, he couldn't locate any of them, but he indicated that they could "go to hell," and that's a direct quotation. He indicated that any proposal that would freeze grants to the City of Winnipeg at this year's level for some two years in succession would be intolerable because of the many special, unique and expensive services that the City of Winnipeg was called upon to implement and supply. I think it would be most edifying whether the Honourable Minister agrees with those recommendations.

MR. MERCIER: I agree with the Mayor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see the Minister's getting coaching from both sides tonight.

MR. CORRIN: Who is it? I'm curious, who is it that the Honourable Minister would send to hell then? I'm not sure that that would be a greater form of purgatory than being sent to Cabinet, but

is it the members of his Cabinet, or is it the members of the Task Force?

MR. MERCIER: I agree with the comment of the Mayor that it would be unrealistic in a normal year to freeze City of Winnipeg grants. The City of Winnipeg's costs are just the same as the Provincial Government costs. They are increasing each year. I would say that certainly that comment has to be modified in the light of revenue which accrues to the Provincial Government. The City, certainly, and municipalities cannot expect to receive increases in grants that are greater than the increased revenue to the province, so that certainly has to be a benchmark for increased financing of municipalities.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I presume that although the members of the Task Force did not see fit to consult with the Honourable Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, that presumably they would have seen fit to consult with the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs, and having heard his remarks respecting his particular disposition in this regard, I am quite frankly astonished. I am very surprised that his wise counsel wasn't followed in the recommendations made by the Force.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Urban Affairs on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I don't recollect ever meeting with the gentlemen who made the recommendations in the Task Force Report and frankly, if you asked me their names right now, I couldn't tell you who they are.

MR. CORRIN: That's most interesting, Mr. Chairman. Quite frankly, I'm shocked that the members of the Task Force would neither see the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, members of the City's Executive Policy Committee, members of the City's Board of Commissioners, the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs in this province, and yet purport to table before the Assembly, a report making recommendations with respect to the conduct of urban affairs in this province. I would wonder in view of that whether the Honourable Minister will be giving any credence whatsoever to this report.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think I've indicated my own position on a number of the recommendations already.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. CORRIN: Excuse me, I have one other question, Mr. Chairman. Since we're dealing on the question of response to civic initiatives, I should also ask a question with respect to conflict of interest. I note that the City some time ago, I believe it was the month of November 1977, asked, and this was a matter of public record, asked the Honourable Minister and members and colleagues of his Cabinet whether or not they would be willing to give leadership and guidance in the question of conflict of interest. As the honourable member is aware a report in this respect was made, tabled before City Council, recommendations came forth calling for certain conflict of interest legislation and it was felt in the wisdom of the urban representatives that this matter would be best dealt with on a provincial level, and I am wondering in the five months that have intervened whether or not the minister has responded to the initiatives which he has called for from the urban representatives.

MR. MERCIER: You are referring to the City of Winnipeg, not the Urban Association?

MR. CORRIN: Well I can only speak in this case for the City of Winnipeg representatives because I don't know whether any other recommendations have come forward from the others.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me that you shouldn't have special conflict of interest legislation for only one area of publicly elected representatives. If you are going to have it then it should be applicable not only to the City of Winnipeg but municipal representatives throughout the province, to school board representatives, to provincial representatives. In the past I believe the previous government did at one point in time a few years ago introduce a bill that would have dealt to some extent with conflict of interest but I think that died a natural death.

I have been interested in seeing what other provinces have done and I will be attempting to get some sort of reaction from the two major urban associations, the Association of Urban Municipalities and Union of Manitoba Municipalities, because I think it is a problem that has to be dealt with provincially, if it is going to be dealt with, and not just for a specialized area.

MR. CORRIN: I heartily endorse that position, Mr. Chairman, I note that that was the position taken

by the representatives of the City of Winnipeg, and I would also like to indicate that I again endorse the concept of recognizing the — call it what you will — the equality, but certainly the authority and mandate of other urban representatives throughout our province, and in this respect I have been waiting in order that I could ask questions pertaining to the method employed to meet with urban representatives from those areas, particularly. . . I suppose the only other two urban areas that are recognized are Brandon and Thompson. I am wondering whether or not there is any formal official mechanism to liaise with those two centres.

MR. MERCIER: There is, Mr. Chairman,

MR. MERCIER: There is, Mr. Chairman, through the Association of Urban Municipalities. I should indicate though, if the Member for Wellington doesn't recall, that I do approach this whole subject with some personal bias and prejudice, because he may recall my voting against every suggestion that there should be special conflict of interest legislation, because I don't believe it is a subject matter that can really be legislated, that it's a matter of personal morality and ethics and I don't particularly think that conflict of interest legislation is going to be a magic cure for the kinds of problems that have developed.

MR. CORRIN: I didn't recall that Mr. Chairman, and I thank the Honourable Minister for reminding me. But it's true, in this case I suppose, I don't know whether consistency is a virtue but he has been consistent. His position through the years that I've been associated with him has been against formalizing conflict of interest through a legislative mechanism.

Through you, Mr. Chairman, you indicated that your government liaises with the urban centres of Thompson and Brandon through the association.

MR. MERCIER: That's more through Municipal Affairs.

MR. CORRIN: I'm wondering why there is a differentiation as between the three centres. I don't know the past practice, I wasn't associated with it, but it would appear to me that there should be equal treatment meted out and that all the three urban centre groups should be given equal treatment. That is to say, if they're to be met with on a delegation basis they should be met with in the same manner and given the same opportunity to present their positions.

I say this, especially because the joint delegation meetings with the City of Winnipeg take place in camera and I'm wondering whether or not that opportunity would be afforded the representatives of Thompson and Brandon at those association meetings. I'm wondering whether the Minister could give us some declaration of his position in that respect.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the relationship with the Association of Urban Municipalities has been generally through me as Municipal Affairs Minister and generally if we wish to obtain the view of that association we would submit that to the executive of their association and they would discuss that at the various regional meetings and their annual meetings that they hold throughout the year.

MR. CORRIN: I would wonder, Mr. Chairman, why there has to be such a tortious, tenuous process vis-a-vis communication. The Minister several hours ago indicated to us that the new benchmark as it were, the new hallmark of this new governmental regime was to foster, inculcate a new spirit of communication, of dialogue — I believe that was the word he used — and I'm wondering why that rule, that new spirit, that new esprit should not be equally applicable to all three urban centres. Surely the problems that present vis-a-vis transportation in Winnipeg can't be that radically different from the problems that present and the solutions that may pertain in the other urban centres.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to just deal with three urban centres in the province to develop conflict of interest legislation. There are 210 municipalities, including cities, towns and villages outside of the City of Winnipeg, and they have two main associations, and participatory democracy takes time and these people have to be given an adequate opportunity to review these matters in their councils and on their executives and their regional meetings and their annual meetings in order to provide their comments to us.

MR. CORRIN: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I didn't make myself sufficiently clear. When I was talking about the delegation process, liaisoning process, I wasn't referring just to the problem of conflict of interest which is, of course, germane to our discussions this evening, but also to problems that pertain to all the urban centres, and I was wondering why some other communicative medium other

than through the auspices of the . . .

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman, if the member's referring to direct consultation with councils of the urban centres he's referred to, I can say that I met with City of Thompson council at least four times. I met with representatives of the City of Brandon, the City of Portage, and many many councils of towns or villages or municipalities outside of the City of Winnipeg whenever they've asked for it.

MR. CORRIN: I would wonder in view of the fact that so much of the Minister's time is being taken up obviously in meetings with various representatives of urban centres whether the Minister still endorses — and I believe he did at City Council — whether the Minister still endorses the concept of a tri-level liaison committee that would bring representatives of all these groups together, including the municipal groups, in order that public discussions could be held respecting matters pertinent to the urban and municipal domain. Surely the Minister will remember the motion I brought before City of Winnipeg Council last year which was unanimously passed asking that the Provincial Government take steps to implement a similar liaison committee as was established in the Province of Ontario enabling both federal, provincial, municipal and urban representatives to meet and discuss matters publicly that were of interest to all levels, all those levels of government.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it's something that hasn't been asked for since I've been in office.

MR. CORRIN: No, but you asked for it. As a member of the Executive Policy Committee you were one of those who endorsed the concept. I may have brought the motion but it was endorsed by Executive Policy Committee and passed by Council. As a matter of fact it was sent on to the joint delegation of which you were a member at that time just before the election to discuss with the Provincial Government.

MR. MERCIER: I don't recall what the reaction of the previous Provincial Government was. Perhaps the Member for Seven Oaks could . . .

MR. MILLER: I'm sorry. I haven't been following this.

MR. MERCIER: Open city-provincial meetings form . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, do you mean that the meeting between the Urban Affairs Committee and the City Council Executive Policy Committee be open to the public? Is that the question?

MR. MERCIER: Tri-level.

MR. MILLER: Well, the tri-level was a national matter. It was discussed nationally. The Ministers of Municipal and Urban Affairs in various jurisdictions voiced their views and there wasn't a feeling that they should continue, and the thing is just hanging in mid-air right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the remarks by my colleague, brother from St. Johns, it seems to me that it's imperative in light of the remarks, for instance, made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that there be such consultation. The honourable member is quite right when he said that over the past years many important initiatives, many important projects have been infinitely stalled because of the inability of the various component governments to effectively communicate with each other, and I would suggest that such a mechanism, although it would bring everything out, it would put everything on the public's plate as it were, would be a most effective tool in forcing people, in compelling public representatives of all levels to make decisions. So I would suggest that the City of Winnipeg Council quite rightly acted in endorsing and passing that particular motion and I would note for the edification of the Minister that I've had a very affirmative response from the mayor of Brandon. I wrote to him and asked him what his feelings were in that respect and he indicated that he'd welcome the opportunity to publicly meet with representatives from the federal, provincial and municipal realms in order that he could discuss his city's problems with other people involved in similar circumstances.

MR. MERCIER: I'm glad, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Wellington reminded me of that previous recommendation. It hasn't come up in the six months that I've occupied this position but

we can certainly consider it for the future.

MR. CORRIN: I will defer my questions in this respect then till tomorrow because I believe the Member for Seven Oaks has some questions he wishes to present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are questions, but before that I want to make reference to the Provincial and City Joint Land Assembly Program that was mentioned earlier. I didn't want to interrupt the Member for Fort Rouge. But you will recall, Mr. Minister, that the City of Winnipeg approached the province very strenuously and when they heard that the province was entering land banking through MHRC they felt that they should be assembling land as well, and it was under their urging that I reluctantly — and I said that then and I say it now — reluctantly agreed to go into partnership with the City of Winnipeg because I felt that I didn't have the confidence, frankly, in the City of Winnipeg that they would carry through, and my fears have been found to be true.

But it was due to their insistence that they get into the land assembly business. The projects for undertaking — there were three initially — one was dropped very shortly after it was designated by the city because some speculation of land was supposed to have taken place as I recall. The decision was then on the St. Vital and the Fort Garry parcels of land. The city then started to have second thoughts and I believe there was some discussion about them abandoning both Fort Garry and St. Vital. I'm not sure it was ever passed by Council. As a matter of fact if my memory serves me correctly, I don't think Council sustained EPC on that position.

But what worries me now is the attitude that because there is land being held by MHRC at the southern end of the Fort Garry holdings, or the Fort Garry areas being expropriated, that perhaps the province and the city could just get rid of it or back away from it if the present land owners agreed, without penalty.

It bothers me because the reason that land is assembled is to try to avoid the windfall profits which then accrue to either land owners or speculators who buy up the land as the pressure increases for residential building lots.

You mentioned that there's land in the southern end of the holdings which MHRC has — and I know they're fairly extensive — but it's inevitable that as that land is filled, as the land north is filled, then the squeeze develops and the land which now is being expropriated becomes excessively expensive.

The city and the province will have put in millions of dollars in services, sewer, water, roadways, they have to because since it's not a contiguous development with the existing areas that are developed, it means leapfrogging and the result is a very costly public expense and the beneficiaries are, as I say, the speculators or the land holders who cash in on the demand when the time comes.

So I hope that you rethink your concurrence of your colleagues views that the Fort Garry expropriation could be backed away from without too much loss. I think the loss would be great in future years and the decision by the city to enter into land assembly and the province joining with it, was a good one then and it is still a good one because the only way you're going to control land prices in the final analysis is to get in early enough, through public land management and ownership, to make sure that the enhanced values of the land accrue to the public rather than to individual speculators.

Mr. Chairman, you mentioned on the matter of growth taxes, did I hear you say that you wouldn't discuss that, that you'd rather it was discussed with the Minister of Finance?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, I indicated that the Minister of Finance would be responding to that concern that the member raised.

MR. MILLER: Well, okay, then I won't press you on it. The only other matter then is, sometime in March a newspaper reported that you were indicating to the city a decrease in the unconditional grant — per capita grant — because of the anticipated drop in revenue.

MR. MERCIER: I believe it was that, yes, from the points of income tax.

MR. MILLER: That's right, and corporate tax. What I'm curious about is this, when you made that statement to Winnipeg, or reported to them, were you aware then that although income tax was

down, the anticipated income tax was down, personal income tax, in fact the corporate tax indications were considerably higher and I couldn't quite see how you got those figures — the City of Winnipeg — because as I say personal income tax is down but corporate income tax is up, considerably over last year, about \$10 million, and I was just wondering why such a large drop of \$1.3 million to the City of Winnipeg.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I was acting on the basis of information received from the Minister of Finance. I think that the member might realize and municipalities have certainly indicated to me and are aware of this that the municipalities have to know early in the calendar year what their revenue is going to be in order to establish their mill rate and do their planning. We have to work towards getting them those figures just as early as possible.

I haven't had any indication from the Minister of Finance that the situation improved since he gave us the information which we used to advise the City of Winnipeg and municipalities throughout the province. If there is, in fact, revenue which has come in since he gave out those figures, then I expect that would have to be taken into consideration in establishing next year's per capita grant.

The Member for Seven Oaks also asked me earlier, where did the moneys come from to make up the \$215,000 which we took out of unspent moneys from the 1977-78 department. Now, \$6,500 came out of (1)(a); \$8,000 out of (1)(b); these are out of last year's; \$76,000 out of (1)(c); and \$124,500 out of (1)(d) for a total of \$215,000.00.

MR. MILLER: (1)(a), (1)(b), (1)(c) and (1)(d) ?

MR. MERCIER: Right.

MR. MILLER: You mean 2.

MR. MERCIER: Oh, that was last year's. Yes, this year it would be (1)(a), (2)(a), (2)(b) and (2)(c).

MR. MILLER: Okay. So, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is saying is that the payments for the park and zoo which is paid to the City of Winnipeg, that all the moneys in the 1977-1978 Estimates for Tourism and Recreation were paid out to the City of Winnipeg. That covered their operation for the previous year. But that because the amounts that are required to operate Assiniboine Park and Zoo was greater than the Minister of Tourism had indicated, the province simply took moneys from the Urban Affairs Department — 1977-78 moneys — not allocated for Assiniboine Park and Zoo at all, and by so doing spent over \$200,000 in 1977-78 Urban Affairs Estimates and paid the moneys which otherwise would have to flow from Tourism and Recreation. So you're using 1977-78 moneys to pay for 1978-79 programs.

MR. MERCIER: Well, we're using moneys from the fiscal year 1977-78 to cover the city's calendar year, January 1978 to the end of March 1978.

MR. MILLER: That may be so and I knew that was going to be your answer. The fact is that the Department of Tourism had sufficient moneys in their budget to cover the requirements for the fiscal year, 1977-78, but because either you or your colleague, the Minister of Tourism, decided — I think it was he — decided to put a cap or a limit on the Assiniboine Park and Zoo expenditures without realizing that, in fact, the total responsibility, fiscally, financially, was the province's and then he had to back down on it, that faced with that rather than go to a special supplementary estimate for the full \$288,000, you chose to spend moneys which otherwise would have lapsed and thus raised the deficit for the 1977-78 year by well over \$200,000.00.

MR. MERCIER: \$215,000.00.

MR. MILLER: \$215,000.00.

MR. MERCIER: Exactly.

MR. MILLER: So that's actually what you did. You took the money from Urban Affairs, increased the deficit by \$215,000 in order to avoid showing it in 1978, either by using a special warrant — which is the other technique that's commonly used — or simply coming in with a supplementary supply for this year, for the full amount of \$288,000.00.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, my concern was that we do what we had to do to provide adequate

funds for the Assiniboine Park review. Our review — conducted by members of the Department of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and the city staff, after the city had complained about the amount of money we had allocated — indicated that in fact — and I appreciated this from years ago — the zoo was operated very well, very efficiently and the administrators are to be complimented on it, and we were able to reduce it by \$140,000, so that, in fact, rather than using your description, I would say that we perhaps saved the taxpayers \$140,000, but that additional money was needed.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that the Minister is missing my point. He's choosing not to understand what I'm saying — and that's his prerogative and his privilege. The fact is, the money was taken from Urban Affairs accounts, which had nothing to do with the Assiniboine Park and Zoo and nothing to do with the Estimates of the Minister of Tourism, the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, it was taken because they found that they had underestimated the amount that Assiniboine Park and Zoo would need and instead of doing what they should have done — which is bring in supplementary estimates, not for \$70,000 supplementary supply, not for \$70,000, but for \$288,000 or \$285,000, whatever the figure is, which should have been shown in the 1978-79 Estimates — instead, they chose to expend unexpended funds from Urban Affairs, which was earmarked initially for other projects, and in so doing decreased the deficit for 1977-78 by over \$200,000 so that they can then claim that they're spending less in 1978-79. But, in fact, Assiniboine Park and Zoo this year will be getting about \$2,800,000 and not the original amount that was mentioned by the Minister of Tourism, which is about \$288,000 less. In fact your explanation that it's still within the fiscal year of the province and the calendar year of the city, that may be so, but you did take moneys from another department entirely instead of going by special warrant, if you were still within the fiscal year or supplementary supply if you were into the next fiscal year. You chose to try to juggle your figures to indicate a lower expenditure this year overall, and increase the deficit for 1977-78 by \$200,000 and something.

MR. MERCIER: We chose, Mr. Chairman, to follow that procedure and save the taxpayers of Manitoba \$140,000.00.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, that \$140,000 could have been saved anyway, irrespective. I'm not questioning the fact that you cut down \$140,000, you could have stuck to your guns and cut down \$288,000, but you couldn't live with that. So you had to back away from it. But in backing away from it, what I object to is the way the books have been handled and the payout has been made. Instead of it being charged on the Department of Tourism and Recreation, you chose to make a charge on Urban Affairs and in that way show a higher expenditure for 1977-78 in order to show a lesser expenditure through supplementary supply in 1978-79.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to give the Member for Seven Oaks a \$215,000 credit against the deficit, which ultimately results from 1977-78 operation, but it was only done with a view to assisting the Assiniboine Park and Zoo in maintaining its standards as much as possible.

MR. MILLER: The same could have been achieved by a supplementary supply which you're going to bring in anyway for \$70,000, but you could have done it by a supplementary supply of \$283,000.00.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 1(b)—pass; 1(c)—pass. 2. 2.(a). Moved, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden that the Committee rise.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass — the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Excuse me, I'm just taking a moment out of my time to look at the Estimates Book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington on 2.(a)Salaries of Urban Co-ordination Branch.

MR. CORRIN: Yes. With respect to the efforts of these people to co-ordinate Urban Affairs policy, Mr. Chairman, I would ask if particulars of financial assistance by the province to the City of Winnipeg could be disclosed to the Committee, perhaps just dealing with each separately. I'll pose individual questions. The answers may well not be available tonight but I presume that they could be made

available by tomorrow morning or afternoon.

First of all, dealing with the category grants in lieu of taxes, I was wondering what figure was provided in this year's budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: We don't make grants in lieu of taxes. It's done through Municipal Affairs.

MR. CORRIN: Did you want to say something else?

MR. MERCIER: No.

MR. CORRIN: So that's properly within Municipal Affairs jurisdiction, is it?

MR. MERCIER: Yes. It was some \$14,700,000.00.

MR. CORRIN: I was wondering whether or not that practice would be continued. Could you comment on whether or not that practice is efficient and efficacious?

MR. MERCIER: Well, it's just a simple accounting procedure. The department gets the tax bills then they pay them in Municipal Affairs.

MR. CORRIN: How about welfare grants, transfers for welfare costs?

MR. MERCIER: That amount paid on a formula, I think that's by way of legislation, was increased from \$3,009,000 to \$3,258,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a) — the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: And the transfers to the inner city health department?

MR. MERCIER: Increased from \$1,582,700 to \$1,662,000.00.

MR. CORRIN: You must be using the same formula. Weed Control costs?

MR. MERCIER: \$10,850, decreased to \$8,250.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass — the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I'm wondering what the rationale for the decrease was, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MERCIER: It apparently depends on the amount of part-time help they use. That was a request.

A MEMBER: It's a request?

MR. MERCIER: That was a request.

MR. CORRIN: Are you telling us then that that was initiated. . .

MR. MERCIER: From the city.

MR. CORRIN: The request for the diminution was initiated by City Hall as opposed to the Provincial Government?

MR. MERCIER: That's right. You see, that was the city's estimate.

MR. CORRIN: So any jobs that were lost were not lost as a result of the provincial government's restraint policy?

MR. MERCIER: No.

MR. CORRIN: Regional Library Grants, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MERCIER: It was increased from \$979,562 to \$996,100.96. Again it met the city's estimate.

MR. CORRIN: Pardon me, I didn't hear the last . . .

MR. MERCIER: It met the city's estimates.

MR. CORRIN: It met the city's estimate. The Convention Centre.

MR. MERCIER: If it would speed things up I can read them into the record.

MR. CORRIN: If we're using the same list, I agree, it would be helpful.

MR. MERCIER: I have dealt with the Assiniboine Park and Zoo. I have dealt with the Convention Centre. The Ambulance Service Grant increased from \$588,740 to \$616,960; Dutch Elm Disease increased from \$202,258 to \$239,000; Hospital Debt charges remain the same and are still under consideration by the Minister of Health and Social Development; Neighborhood Improvement Program increased from \$1,227,500 to \$1,571,250; Winnipeg Development Plan increased from \$26,639 to \$110,000; Regional Street Maintenance increased from \$3,429,000 to \$3,488,600; the Transit operating Grant went from \$8,383,049 to \$8,488,000; Demonstration Projects, I dealt with; there are no bus purchases; Land Acquisition Right of Way increased from \$700,000 to \$1,500,000; Regional Street Capital Program increased, I dealt with that; and that outlines the grants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass — the Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I was wondering whether we could have an explanation. . . There was approximately \$1.3 million lost to the City of Winnipeg as a result of declining growth tax transfers. Those are personal and corporate income taxes.

I was wondering whether that decline was because of a decline in income or decreases in the tax rates. The Provincial Government took certain initiatives at the last session to decrease tax rates, and I was wondering whether or not the decline was as a result of those rates being decreased?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that it was not the result of tax decreases and it was a combination of decline in revenue and adjustments in population figures. Any greater detail than that, I think, will have to be directed at the Finance Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)—pass; 2.(b)—pass; 2.(c)—pass — the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: The Winnipeg Development Plan Review is in its second year, I believe. Is it still on schedule? Is it still going ahead as has been planned, or is it bogged down somewhere?

MR. MERCIER: I think it fell behind schedule the day it started.

MR. MILLER: Yes, we will allow for that — that's a long time ago.

MR. MERCIER: But it's still underway. My understanding is that the first phase of reports of the plan are to be made public within a month or so, depending upon the speed with which the Council deals with them.

MR. MILLER: The drop from 236 to 110 — would that be because of the completion of the Bellan Commission and the federal land study, and so on?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. MILLER: That's all it is, pretty well.

MR. MERCIER: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)—pass; 2.(d)—pass — the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: 2.(d), is that the Convention Centre only?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. MILLER: That's the only grant . . .

MR. MERCIER: Yes, the grant in 1977-78 was \$363,000 and they estimate \$325,000.00.

Monday, May 15, 1978

MR. MILLER: They anticipate that the deficit is decreasing annually.

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. MILLER: One question on that one: The City — I wouldn't say the City Council but some members of the City Council — wanted to have that sign that was erected in front of the Convention Centre treated as an operating cost; did they ever convince you to do that?

MR. MERCIER: No.

MR. MILLER: You are just as tough to get along with as I was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d)—pass Resolution 114.

: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$686,400—pass.

3. Emergency Measures Organization, 3.(a)—pass — the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: I wonder if the Minister could run through the EMO. I notice the salaries are up, because that reflects pretty well the status quo on staff but other expenditures are down. I wonder if he could tell us what changes there are, and what they are doing differently this year than last year or any other year.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand with respect to salaries there is an employee retiring this year and part of that is related to severance pay. I understand your question is directly more related to the (b) part of the deduction . . .

MR. MILLER: Well, both, because initially I believe when you ran through it, you indicated that there was the same staff complement as last year.

MR. MERCIER: The same staff complement.

MR. MILLER: So now you mention somebody retiring and . . .

MR. MERCIER: Yes, the increase in salary positions relates to severance pay for one individual in the department.

MR. MILLER: But he will be replaced, so that the staff complement remains the same.

MR. MERCIER: The staff complement remains the same.

MR. MILLER: It remains the same.

MR. MERCIER: Where there is one vacant position.

MR. MILLER: All right, then it's (b).

MR. MERCIER: And the moneys include the filling of that position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass; 3.(b)—pass — the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MERCIER: On 3.(b), I think the member . . .

MR. MILLER: Yes, I asked a question on that.

MR. MERCIER: . . . was concerned about the reduction in expenditures. There is a great deal of restraint that is going to have to be exercised in that department. There is reduction in transportation, \$10,000 in Training Programs, in hotel expenses, etc., on Training Programs. Well, it's a combination of a number of reductions in miscellaneous expenditures.

I perhaps could say at this particular time that we have agreed in Cabinet to proceed with a study that had been proposed to the previous government before the Emergency Services Delivery System, to be conducted by Professor Kueneman at the University, Department of Sociology, with the financial assistance of Emergency Planning Canada, at no cost to the Government of Manitoba, to review the existing mechanisms for delivering emergency services and to analyze the feasibility of reorganizing the system and all of the other aspects of government that in some way deal with

emergency services.

I believe the Member for Seven Oaks might be familiar with the proposal that was put to him, as the previous Minister of the department.

MR. MILLER: Yes, I recall it. I know I wasn't very sympathetic to it, but I recall the . . .

MR. MERCIER: The price is right.

MR. MILLER: Yes, well sometimes you get what you pay for. However, the next question: There is a reduction from what the Minister says in transportation in the Training Program and so on, is the Minister saying that the Training Program whereby, as I recall, EMO goes out to meet with municipalities and explains to them their responsibilities, helps them set up a structure so that they can respond to emergencies, that that is being curtailed. Because if it is, then frankly, I feel that EMO is perhaps the most important function is getting municipalities to realize that they are the line of first defence and they have got to have a structure; they have got to have a system worked out well in advance of an emergency rather than wait until the emergency hits them.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the reduction in expenditure basically relates to providing out-of-pocket expenses for persons that have attended the Training Programs, but the preparation of emergency plans and the development of Training Programs will still be continued this year.

MR. MILLER: Oh, so the difference is simply that . . .

MR. MERCIER: They are going to have to pay their own way.

MR. MILLER: . . . the grants that were paid or the moneys paid out to municipal people who were attending the program have now been cut back.

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Now, does the Minister feel that the municipalities will send personnel and staff if in fact they are not going to be compensated?

MR. MERCIER: We found in Municipal Affairs that councilor seminars held in Gimli this year were extremely well attended, and we cut back on the amount of support for them because as departments go through some effort and expense to put them on and they are for their benefit, although, of course, the province does derive advantages from these people taking these courses.

We will have to monitor it closely, obviously, and I can only at this stage hope that there will be no delay, or there will be no reduction in the number of people who attend them. We will have to monitor it closely, I suppose, and if there is, if people aren't attending because they are not receiving those expenses, then we will have to re-think this area of the budget, because it's important, as the member appreciates, to provide these programs and for people to take them and follow through with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)—pass.

Resolution 115: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$265,700—pass.

Item 1.(a) Minister's Compensation—pass.

Resolution 113: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$73,600—pass.

Lady and gentlemen, that concludes the Committee of Urban Affairs. Thank you for sitting late.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will draw the honourable members' attention to Page 28, Department of Education, Clause 7. We are on Item (b)(3) Assistance. (b)(3)—pass — the Honourable Meer for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. At 4:30, or just a few seconds prior to that, Mr. Chairman, I was in the process of asking the Honourable Minister if he would be good enough to explain how, given the fact that this year \$1.3 million more has to be set aside to take care of the deferred bursary portion. Last year there was a million dollars in the \$4.3 million; this year there has to be something in the order of \$2.3 million, which would reduce, in my opinion, would reduce the net number of dollars

that would be available to students by way of Student Aid and yet the Honourable Minister states that the Student Aid Program won't suffer any, that the students will still be receiving just as many dollars into their pockets by way of aid as they had in the past. So, would the Minister please explain that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe I've been over those figures previous to this for the Member for Burrows. If he could be more specific in what particular figures he requires . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, the point is, Mr. Chairman, that when we introduced the deferred bursary scheme as I recall it, the purpose was to make maximum use of student loan money and hence what is referred to as the deferred bursary. That is to say that if a student requires \$2,000 of Student Aid then he utilizes all of the loan money and then we make up the balance by way of the balance of the bursary. Then in the end when it comes to repayment, well in order not to put the student out of pocket to any greater extent than he otherwise would be, the province picks up the bursary portion of the repayment of the loan.

So, really my point is, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister had indicated that whereas last year there was \$1 million in the 4.3 to take care of that portion of our obligation under the deferred bursary arrangement, this year there's \$2.3 million for that purpose, which would seem to me pure dollars in the students' pockets. I don't know if I could be any more precise than that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think I can clarify it now for the Member for Burrows. This year there'll be a total of some \$5 ¼ million in deferred and regular bursary money. I understand last year there was some \$6 million, so there is that difference between the approximate \$6 million and the \$5 ¼ million this year.

However, with the bursary mix with the other factors that I've mentioned earlier that are affecting the number of applications, we're quite confident that this will meet the needs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that the Honourable Minister had indicated the figure that I'm about to ask for. During the fiscal year just ended, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe that we had budgeted for approximately 5,500 recipients of student aid. If I understood the Minister correctly the number that were granted was somewhat less than that. In other words, I believe that was what I understood the Minister to say. So how many recipients is the Minister budgeting for, how many recipients of student aid, is the Minister budgeting for in the 1978-79 fiscal year?

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the figures that the Member for Burrows mentions are somewhat less than the amount that he has stated. In 1977-78 it was 8,900. . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. When I used the figure 5,500 I was referring to the post-secondary and excluding special opportunity.

MR. COSENS: I will take a minute, Mr. Chairman, to work that out. Perhaps one of the members has another question we can deal with while we are working it out.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, could the Honourable Minister comment on the Federal-Provincial Bilingual Support Program, the appropriation within this Item for that program; for the Summer Language Program. And if he would also comment upon the Bilingual Secretaries Program, whether the enrollment is increasing or decreasing or remaining at the same level; and the Honourable Minister's opinion on the effectiveness or the success of the Bilingual Secretaries Program.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the figures that the Member for Burrows has been asking about as to the number of applications — was it awards or applications?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Awards.

MR. COSENS: Awards, very well. At the secondary level — I might as well give him all of these figures — 2,574, and at the post-secondary level, this is not counting the special opportunity bursaries in this total, 6,078. And if you take the grand total of all the bursaries, secondary, post-secondary and the special opportunities, the awards total some 9,343. And he was asking for the type of projection that we would anticipate this year — certainly no larger number of awards based on the number of applications that you had last year and on the factors that we feel that will bear

on this this year as well.

The bilingual matters that he refers to are now transferred to the section under the BEF that we dealt with under 4.(g), I believe, although I could be corrected. 4(g) is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The bilingual program would be something in the order of what about, \$400,000, by way of student assistance plus or minus 50? It wouldn't be more than a half a million anyway. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the government is budgeting for approximately the same number of recipients of Student Aid for this year, then perhaps in total number of dollars of whatever kind end up in the students' pockets, it may be approximately the same. But, in terms of bursary dollars, it will be less than last year in total.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that's correct.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. Now, under the Special Opportunities Bursaries program, I believe the Honourable Minister had indicated the medical and dental in its last or second last year or so. Now, what about the education Special Opportunities Bursaries, are those being continued? — in the same specialty areas as in the past, or have there been many changes?

MR. COSENS: There will be no changes in the Special Opportunity Bursaries, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: (3)/ / (c)—pass; (b)—pass; — (1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is one branch which I believe has undergone some re-organization, and even if it hadn't, I think that the Committee would want to hear the Minister briefly outline the nature of the programs that the Youth Services Branch will be responsible for. I'm sorry, I believe the Minister of Public Works felt an irresistible urge to assist the Minister of Education in defending his Estimates.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to go over the activities of the Youth Services Branch, and in particular I would outline the youth employment aspect, first of all. There are several aspects to the Youth Activities Branch, youth employment being the largest single component. They are dealing in employment offices, and in counselling, but the youth employment I believe is certainly the largest function that they deal with and I might suggest, deal with quite efficiently and quite adequately. I can go through the employment programs for the Member for Burrows; I believe he wanted some breakdown there of the Youth Services directorate jobs, those that come directly under their supervision. First of all there would be the STEP in government where there are some 735 jobs costing some \$1,600,000; the Regional Disparity with some 200 jobs, that's some \$214,000; the Hire-a-Student centres that will employ some 50 students at some \$95,000; the Summer Education Component with some 68 students employed at \$200,000; the Work-Stay Program which will involve some 148 youth and cost \$276,000 and there are operating expenses in there of some \$96,000 for those programs. So we have a sub-total there, Mr. Chairman, of about 1,200 jobs and a cost of \$2,481,000.00.

There is another aspect that also comes under the responsibility of the Youth Services Branch and that is the departmental budgeted positions and there are some 800 positions there at \$1,300,000 giving us a total number of government jobs, Mr. Chairman, in the two programs I've just outlined — those that are directly sponsored by the Youth Services and those that come under government departments — of some 2,000 jobs approximately at a cost of some \$3,781,000.00.

The Youth Services Branch also, of course, administers the other job creation programs dealing with youth and of course the one most prominent I suppose this year is the Private Sector Youth Employment Program which will supply some 2,400 jobs at a cost of \$2 million. I can report, Mr. Chairman, that as of May 19th on the basis of the applications that have been received that some 2,300 of those jobs will be filled. Now if you add the number of jobs that I have accounted for up to this point, it is 4,400.

Also, youth employment that we should note at this time, the Minister of Northern Affairs has announced a Northern Youth Corps that will provide some 800 jobs and is jointly funded by the Provincial Government and the Federal Government to the tune of some \$800,000.00.

On the basis of the figures, Mr. Chairman, that I have given you to date, our projected totals would be some 6,100 jobs at a total cost of \$7,281,000.00. And I might mention, Mr. Chairman, that the private sector Youth Employment Program, as announced by the Minister of Finance, will

also receive increased funding, if we find that the number of applications would warrant this. So this total could go much beyond what I have mentioned at this point. It's interesting to note that last year some \$9,731,000 was spent to create some 6,331 jobs, so that gives us somewhat of a comparison, Mr. Chairman, at this time. Now, I haven't gone into the specific details on each one of these particular employment components, but I thought that type of breakdown would give the Member for Burrows some idea of the total program.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in the operation of the STEP program, which we had initiated in 1971, and of which we had been very proud and which, I think, had served a very useful function, there were two basic guidelines which we attempted to follow. One was to maintain some balance in the male-female employment, and the other, a balance of employment opportunities as between Winnipeg and rural Manitoba. Could the Honourable Minister indicate whether those two guidelines are being followed insofar as the STEP and government programs are concerned, and — well, STEP and government and others directly funded by government — and how the private sector is responding in terms of meeting these two principles, that is, the male-female balance and balance of employment opportunities as between Winnipeg and outside of Winnipeg?

The third point which we were mindful of was student need, financial need. In other words, if the job applicant was also a Student Aid applicant, then it's quite likely that he had received preference over one who may not have been in as great financial need. Could the Honourable Minister also indicate whether any attention is being paid to the matter of financial need of the job applicants?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the two criteria that the Member for Burrows mentions, I can assure him, do still apply, and as well, other criteria, such as economic need, whether the student will be returning to school, and also whether the particular student happens to be handicapped, are other criteria that are taken into consideration in these programs.

The member also asks for the breakdown on the urban-rural; as far as the private sector is concerned, out of the figures that I have received lately, it shows that some 810 jobs are in Winnipeg in that program in the private sector, and some 873 are in the rural areas.

MR. HANUSCHAK: When the Minister announced the Private Sector Program a few weeks ago, he did indicate that a business firm or a farmer would not be able to hire a relative, son, daughter. This is probably the category that most employees will fall into in some cases, maybe wife, husband. But it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, and this may be particularly true in smaller communities where the businessmen within a neighbourhood know each other better than they may in an urban community such as Winnipeg, although I could see that happening here too, it would seem that according to the criteria set out by the Minister that there will be nothing to prevent a farmer or the owner of one business enterprise hiring a son or daughter of a friend of his who may also be in business and that businessman, in exchange, hiring the other's son or daughter. That would not be, according to my interpretation of the Minister's explanation, would not be in violation of the rules set out by him.

MR. COSENS: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that there is no program that has been devised that a devious mind cannot find some way around and perhaps the Member for Burrows has mentioned one way that some people might circumvent the guidelines in this particular program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (4)—pass; (5)—pass; (c)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could just give us an explanation of the cut in (4) and (5). One is just about halved and the other is just about one-sixth of what the program was last year. What is the criteria for the cutback in the program to what they were last year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, actually (4) and (5) are part of the fall and winter job creation program and there was some \$400,000 allocated by the Finance Department to the Youth STAY Program at that time as of last fall. That \$400,000 is what you see there broken down into \$388,000 and \$12,000.00. The figures on the right side are the unspent portion of that particular program which we intend to spend this year and I should also add that as well, in the Section (c)(3) above, some \$276,000 of that amount will also be used in the STAY Program. I admit it's confusing, Mr.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)—pass; (d)(1) Special Projects—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could give us a breakdown of this item as to the various projects and the amounts set opposite their names, both for last year and this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, by the breakdown, I would imagine the Member for St. Johns is concerned with the enrolment of people last year in a particular course as opposed to this year. The money is here . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I assume there was more than one project. If I'm wrong then by all means give us numbers of people but if there's more than one project, I want each project.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I don't have that breakdown immediately before me and as soon as I get it I can give the member . . . Oh, here we are. For 1977-78, and this is covering programs under (d) and under (e) Mr. Chairman, I'll try to keep that separate for the member.

First of all under (d) the Special Mature Student Program at the University of Manitoba in 1977-78 was some \$138,300 and in 1978-79, some \$119,700; the Special Mature Student Program at Brandon University in 1977-78, \$271,700 and in 1978-79, \$236,000; the Special Mature Student Program at Brandon General Hospital in 1977-78, \$94,800 and in 1978-79, \$81,300; the Winnipeg Centre Project in 1977-78, \$513,600 and in 1978-79, \$447,300; the Native Family Life Counselling in 1977-78, the figure I have here is zero and in 1978-79, \$156,000; the Impact Program in 1977-78, \$569,800 and in 1978-79, \$495,900; the Worker Training and Education in 1977-78 was some \$156,900 and in 1978-79, zero; the Special Mature Student Program at Red River Community College in 1977-78 was zero and in 1978-79, will be \$98,700; Support Services in 1977-78, \$112,700 and in 1978-79, \$77,200.00.

Under (e), Mr. Chairman, we're also dealing with these programs depending on whether they're north or south programs. That's 1671 Special Projects. The Special Mature Student Program at the University of Manitoba in 1977-78, \$375,400 and in 1978-79, \$327,500.00. Still under 1671, the Special Mature Student Program at Brandon University in 1977-78, \$219,300 and in 1978-79, \$191,300; the Special Mature Student Program at Brandon General Hospital \$142,300 in 1977-78 and in 1978-79, \$124,000; the BUNTEP Program in 1977-78 some \$2,005,200 and in 1978-79 some \$1,749,500 and support services in 1977-78 under this particular Special Project heading, \$116,300 and 1978-79, \$88,500; a total in this last heading, Mr. Chairman, of some \$2,858,500 in 1977-78 and in 1978-79 a total of some \$2,480,900.00.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the information given to us. Before I deal in much of them, I would like an explanation of the three items where there is a zero compared to another figure. Native Family Life was zero last year and is \$156,000 this year; is that a new program? Special Mature at Red River was zero last year, \$98.7 million this year; was that a new program?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I understand that it was funded after the beginning of the year, so it didn't appear as a sum on the left-hand side.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, could we get the actuals then, for these two?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that in terms of the printed Estimates, nothing. I am informed that in terms of the printed Estimates, it is nothing.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I understood that was the case, but the Honourable Minister said that subsequent to the Estimates being printed, these programs were instituted. Obviously they cost money; I asked what was the actual?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that it cost some \$87,000 for that program, the Family Life Counselling. —(Interjection)— The Native Family Life Counselling.

MR. CHERNIACK: And the Special Mature? At Red River?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the Member for St. Johns being perplexed.

Monday, May 15, 1978

the Special Mature — funds out of Outreach Development were used to fund it. There was some \$100,000 provided for Outreach Development in 1977-78.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, can I find out where Outreach Development was shown last year?

MR. COSENS: Outreach Development, Mr. Chairman, I understand was included in the total Special Project allocation to cover new programs that were being started up.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, Mr. Chairman, can I assume that that \$100,000 came out of programs that the Honourable Minister already read to us with the figures shown on this 1978 column, or does that column not add up to the \$1,957,800 shown in the printed Estimates?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, you'd have to include the \$100,000 in there for it to add up to that amount.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well now, I wasn't perplexed; I just didn't check the Minister's arithmetic, but now that he tells me that the \$100,000 is added in, I can understand it. Mr. Chairman, could we also get clarification on the Worker Education at \$156,900 and zero now; is that a program that is being dropped?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that program has been completed and terminated as of March 1st.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask the Honourable Minister whether completed means that he does not feel that he is prepared to continue it, or that indeed it was a special project for a limited time and that all that was intended was accomplished by that program?

MR. COSENS: Yes, the latter, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could the Honourable Minister clarify what was that program, and how it is that it was completed, and success shown to the extent that there is no continuation?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that that program had set out to compose and produce a history of a labour education, and it is my understanding, from what I have been able to see, that that particular project was completed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, that implies that labour has been educated, because if the Minister has continued some programs and is dropping this one, then I'm not sure that I understand why it is that he feels that the program was completed. A program in any year can be considered completed, but that doesn't mean that it can't be renewed for the following year, as no doubt is the case in other of these special projects. Could we get clarification? What was the nature of the program? What was the success, and why is it not being renewed this year?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly can clarify. The program, to my understanding, set out to do a special job; it completed the job, and the program terminated.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could the Honourable Minister tell us what was the job it was set out to do, and how it was established that it had been completed?

MR. COSENS: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the project or job that it set out to do, as I mentioned, was to write a history of labour; it was a curriculum project, and that project was completed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the honourable member correct me if I'm wrong. Under this appropriation, were there not also included funds to provide for release time for workers in basic skills training, and so forth, on the job? Where the instruction was given on the job at the work site, as it were, or very near the work site, anyway; designed particularly for new Canadians establishing themselves, or attempting to establish themselves in the world of work in Canada?

MR. COSENS: I understand that there was some teaching of English, but other agencies are also equipped to handle that particular function.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister then give us a breakdown of the appropriation for the development of a history of labour program, and the funds that were appropriated for the teaching of English to new Canadians?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it will take a minute to break down that particular information for the Member for Burrows; perhaps he would like to pursue some other point while we are getting that information.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, until that information is available, I would like the Minister to describe to us the method by which he was able to accomplish considerable savings from last year to this year, and he did refer and volunteered to give information regarding numbers of students last year and this year. Possibly he can confirm the manner in which he was able to find savings in the program; I'm assuming on that basis that there is no reduction in programs. If there is I wish he would clarify that.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in line with the restraint program it was necessary to reduce in some areas, but certainly not to the point where I feel the programs have been drastically affected. They are ongoing and with the support necessary to carry the people in them through; we also have new intakes in many of these programs as well.

I can go through the programs for the member: in the BUNTEP Program, there will be some 105 students this year. That includes some 20 new students; in 1977-78, there were some 135, so there is some reduction in enrollment there. In the IMPACTE Program, there will be about 12 new students; the enrollment level for 1978-79 will be around 36; last year it was 42. The Winnipeg Centre Project will have some 15 new students; for 1978-79, the student enrollment levels will be 56; last year it was 50.

MR. CHERNIACK: I suppose there are others, but it seems that the Minister is indicating a pattern. Well, Winnipeg Centre is an increase actually, over last year, an increase in the number of students. The Minister said, last year there were 50, and this year there will be 56. Could the Minister clarify how he has an increased enrollment and reduced allocation?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, we have an increased enrollment in that one particular area, but as the Member for St. Johns noticed, a decreased enrollment in several of the other areas.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I was going to leave Winnipeg Centre until the end of my inquiry, but I don't mind dealing with it now. The Minister said, in Winnipeg Centre there were 50 students last year; there will be 56 this year. There is no decrease as an increase, and yet the allocation in dollars is reduced. Now that has nothing to do with whether there is a decrease in other projects, we're talking about Winnipeg Centre, I thought.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can understand the Member for St. Johns' puzzlement with this; it is rather involved. I understand that at certain stages, some of these students are at full scale financial support and then at other times, on a sliding scale, so it varies from year to year as to the amount of money that's required for the supports to these programs.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have to assure the Minister, the only puzzlement I have is that I'm not getting answers that I can understand because I don't have the figures before me. Now, the Minister implies that last year there was a larger funding than is proposed for this year, per student I assume, or average per student. Is that what he means?

MR. COSENS: Yes, that's exactly what I mean, Mr. Chairman, that the average has gone down because of the sliding scale, which I understand depends on the circumstances of the student in a particular year, and this can vary from year to year; this is the only program where we have an increase in enrollment. In others, we have a decrease, so if you're looking at the total costing, I suppose this is one of the reasons why the total appropriation is down and yet, this particular course could be up. It is one of the few where we have an increase.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, we're still talking about Winnipeg Centre, and there is a reduction in dollars. Now, does the Minister suggest that the needs in this coming year are expected to be less on the average per student than they were last year, or is there a change in formula whereby

they are entitled to less?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I will try to be as straightforward and clear in my answer as possible to the Member for St. Johns. I understand that the per student cost will be reduced this year from \$10,270 to \$9,500 per student and this accounts for that particular reduction because, and I am not quite aware of all the criteria that are taken into play here, but because the supports required this year I am told will be less than last year for these particular students.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, Mr. Chairman, I infer from that statement, that it is expected that their needs will be less than they were last year and there is no change in formula. That being the case, I am surprised that in a time of general recession, that the Minister is confidently able to predict that this coming year, which has a number of months yet to go, will be one where the students will be entitled to less because apparently their needs will be less than they were last year. That's the inference I draw and the Minister is nodding his head so I leave that for the record; next year maybe we'll come around and see what the actual was. But the Minister is now saying that this is the only project where there is an increase in students; all the others are reduced. Would the Minister please indicate how it is that in this year, it is possible to bring about a reduction over last year unless there is a change in measurement or assessment of the qualifications of students. The Minister has told us that because of restraint, there is a reduction. Does that mean that if there were no restraint and the budget was the same as last year, there would have been more students and therefore there are students who could have been trained this year who are being denied that training because of the reduction in moneys that the Minister has available for that program?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the students that are coming into the program through the selection committee that operates in that particular area, will require less support than those that were in at the previous year.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I understood that that was the answer for Winnipeg Centre. I now broaden the question to involve those programs where there is a reduction in students, and a reduction in dollars. I asked the Minister whether that means a reduction in programs, and he then said, because of restraints there is less money but that in the main, the programs will continue. I want to establish clearly if that is the case. I infer that is the case from what was said, that there is an imposed reduction of money which carries with it a compulsory reduction in students and that there will be less students served than would have been served if the same amount of money would have been made available.

MR. COSENS: Well, if the Member for St. Johns is saying, Mr. Chairman, that the same amount of money as last year — I imagine that is what he is implying — then yes, it would have serviced more students than we will be able to service this year with the number of dollars that we have in this particular area.

MR. CHERNIACK: So Mr. Chairman, this clearly is a reduction in program. —(Interjection)— Yes, the Minister says, "Right." Well, let's get it clear that we heard from the Conservative Government time and again, "We will be able to effect savings out of cuts in fats and therefore, we will be able to give the same program, continue the same program, without any reduction in service because we know that there is so much savings to be found in fat and extravagance." Would the Minister now confirm that the questioning that he and I, the questions and answers we just went through, would indicate that the reductions which he made actually have a direct result on reductions in students, and that he was not able to find reductions in extravagances which would make it possible to serve the same number of people with less money?.

MR. COSENS: I wouldn't agree, Mr. Chairman, completely with the statement of the Member for St. Johns, but he is quite right when he says that budget restrictions have caused us to restrict slightly the number of students coming into these programs, and if he looks on that as some sort of terrible aberration, well, then I suppose that's his opinion. I would say to him, what is the right number of students in these programs? What is the correct number? What number should be in them?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Honourable Minister's invitation to participate in this kind of a debate, but I don't intend to accept his invitation. The fact is that I remind him that he was in an election campaign, as far as I know it was his first, but there may have been prior ones, and in that election campaign there was a great deal of talk by his leader and others

in leadership in his party and in the campaign, saying that there is so much waste and extravagance within the government, that we will be able to reduce the waste and extravagance, and thus with reduced costs and with giving up all sorts of income, which they gave up very hurriedly, very quickly, we will be able to continue to offer the same program. And I'm telling the Minister that it seems to me that the information he gave us this evening is a direct contradiction to the promises made by the government, and I go on to say that I am now just going through the early parts of this Session, where I'm finding statements by Ministers that would indicate that there would be no reduction in program.

Now, he said, what is the optimum number of students? No doubt, the optimum number of students that could be served by this kind of program is greater than the New Democratic government was able to carry forth in the years during which this program was instituted. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Manitobans, many Manitobans, are in need of greater help, greater assistance, greater educational opportunities, greater skilled training, than the governments have been able to provide in the past. But the fact is, I'm making the point to the Minister that they are now doing less than was done last year on these programs, and I believe that these programs, which are the Minister's programs, the department's programs — you know when we're talking about universities and how many students would be served and tuition fees, he kept saying, "Well, you don't want me to interfere with the autonomy of the universities. Do you think that I should go in and tell them what to do?" And I backed away from that. Oh, perish the thought that the Minister would dare to tell them what to do, although as I recall it later, he agreed that he would use some form of, I don't remember the word we were bantering about, I think it was influence, try to influence their decisions.

But he finally agreed that he did meet with the Universities Grants Commission and he did meet with the presidents of the universities and he did try to suggest to them what he thought should be the guidelines of universities, and I think he should have, and I'm glad that he finally agreed that he did do that, although at first he said, in indignation, that that was not the kind of thing that we should be permitting a government to do, to interfere in the autonomy of the university.

Now we're talking about programs of the Government of Manitoba, Department of Education, and in running through the list I find that there is not one of these programs mentioned by the Minister that has been cut out, except one which matured and completed itself, and that was the History of the Labour Movement. But other than that, there's not one program cut out, so I have to assume that the Minister, having studied this — he had five months in which to study it — has decided that these programs are worth continuing. But then, what does he tell us. He tells us, nevertheless, we are reducing the extent of the program, we are reducing the number of students being served, except in the Winnipeg Centre program, by reducing the money, and he agrees that had he had the same money as was provided last year, he would have more students. I think there's no question that the students are there, waiting to be placed, but obviously there will have to be some form of vetting their applications, or some form of — I want to be careful, Mr. Chairman, to indicate, the word that comes to mind is discrimination, and that's not a bad word and I don't use it in that sense of unfair choosing — but there will have to be a method by which — (Interjection) — selectivity, that's a nice word for discrimination, although discrimination is not a bad word except when used in the pejorative sense.

All right then, I'm saying that there will be a form of selectivity which will reduce the number of students that can take advantage of the program this year. And that clearly to me is an indication that with all the talk, all the publicity, all the Conservative predictions of all the wasteful moneys that they would be able to save, that they have not found that they could do that. They have reduced taxation, they have reduced their income in various areas, and have come up with a reduced program. That's the point I want to make strongly.

Now, the Minister said, "Well, that's the way the Member for St. Johns puts it, I might not put it that way." I invite him to put it his way. I'd like to hear his explanation of what they are doing and the extent to which they are or are not cutting program. I'm saying they're cutting program, and I think the Minister agrees they're cutting program. So let's be as blunt as we started out to be and agree that you're cutting program.

And I think the Minister's only excuse for cutting program is that whatever committee of Cabinet, of which he is a member, was responsible for setting the budget, cut his budget. That's all I can assume, because Mr. Chairman, the odd thing — I haven't applied the arithmetic to figure out whether it was a clear-cut percentage reduction all the way down the line, but there was a clear-cut reduction all the way down the line, except I think of one that I don't understand but I just mention it to

make clear that I recognize that there is no reduction in native family life counselling, but setting that aside, there is a reduction all the way down the line in dollars, and there's a reduction all the way down the line except for the Winnipeg Centre in students, and they go hand in hand, and they go by the fact that the Minister, whether he could help it or not, and I would assume he could help it — I say that this is something that he was party to, to this reduction in budget, he accepted it — and therefore I say that he has cut the program, he has reduced the availability of these special services to the special people who were availing themselves of it, without in any way, apparently, saying that the programs were wrong, because he hasn't cut the programs. The programs are there.

Now, that's the picture I have. If I'm wrong, I want the Minister to clarify it, because I will repeat what I've said and I will repeat it, not in his presence, I want to make sure that I am repeating what he confirms is right, and that is, program was reduced by the number of students reduced, because money was reduced, money was reduced because of some decision of Cabinet, of which he is a member, to reduce the money, and that the program itself, that is the type of education being provided, has not been reduced nor cut out. So I am saying that with the same program, which he has inherited from previous years and adopted, he has just taken less money and is therefore reducing the availability to a number of students. If I am not putting it his way, I wish he would put it his way.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, as usual the Member for St. Johns is partially right at least, and maybe in his terms he is completely right. He, of course, works on the premise that if the government in the campaign last fall said that they wouldn't be cutting programs, that means that no programs that the previous government had would be cut regardless. I think that is a false premise. I think programs would have to be qualified.

I would repeat that certainly these particular programs have suffered from budget restrictions and rather than having five months to make the decision as to the quality of these programs, I would suggest that I probably had three months. Budgets were solidified, crystallized, sometime towards the end of January, and I, Mr. Chairman, counter to what the Member for St. Johns has said, have experienced some criticism of these programs, as well as some praise, and I have had that type of feedback from people in the north, native people as well, and so until I have had an opportunity to further evaluate these programs, they are certainly carrying on at this particular level and will be supported. We may well find that in fact they are excellent programs and are doing the job, and I would hope that is what we find.

But I have to tell the Member for St. Johns that everyone does not share his opinion of these particular programs at this time, that they are very very outstanding, and that they are doing the job, and that they are certainly filling a need etc. There are some who question them quite seriously, and I would hope and I plan, Mr. Chairman, in the months ahead to have the opportunity of evaluating these programs very seriously, of talking to native people, and talking to people who have been in the programs, people who have worked with the programs at some length, and a year from now, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Member for St. Johns will be interested to see the degree of support that is attached to these programs. I would hope, as no doubt he hopes, that I will find that the programs are of such quality that we will continue funding them at an appropriate level.

I am interested also in evaluating what is the right number of people in these programs, because you see the Member for St. Johns operates on the premise that whatever number were there last year is the right number. He operates on the idea that the larger the number the better, and I have some problem always agreeing with that, quantity isn't necessarily quality. I would suggest to him that 20 less or 20 more people in a particular program may not be in fact an indication of the particular commitment of a government one way or another to a program.

So I would give him that particular explanation. It may not be one that rests well with him, but that is the situation as I have seen it, and that is the particular situation as regards these courses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am not quite certain what it is that the Minister intends to evaluate. Does he plan to evaluate or to assess or reassess the need, the desirability for a program or a variety of programs to provide the disadvantaged with access to the professions, and in this case we are dealing primarily with the practice of teaching? Is that what he is in the process of assessing and reassessing, or is he merely reassessing the manner in which the disadvantaged can be offered programs that would enable them to become teachers, or enable them to become whatever else

these programs train them to become?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, of course I have no problem with the question as to whether disadvantaged people should not have the opportunity for a type of training similar to this. I will be looking very closely at how this training is delivered and the reaction of the people who are involved as to the effectiveness of that training, the reaction of the people in the communities where these trained people return — many factors in connection, in fact all of the factors in connection with these courses, because I think that these people as Manitobans deserve as good a course as any other Manitoban, and I don't want to find out that this is a second-rate course for instance, because we are not dealing with second-rate people. We are dealing with Manitobans who deserve every bit as good a teacher-training course as any other Manitoban.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those last comments, important comments.

I want to tell the Honourable Minister that I don't see how he can share my opinion or not share my opinion on the program because I haven't expressed an opinion. I don't know enough about the programs. I know the nature of the programs and their intent. I don't know how well run they are. It is his responsibility to know that and if he admittedly does not know that, then that is fine. I think that he has to take time to learn more about what it is and next year we will know better what his opinion is.

Mr. Chairman, I am rather amazed that he talks about the numbers and what is a desirable number and the statement that quantity is not necessarily quality, that is a glib expression which does not apply one bit to these programs, as far as I can see. If he wants to talk about the quality of the Opposition, or the quality of the government MLAs, then he can say quantity does not necessarily mean quality. But when you talk about students that we are talking here, he just said that they are entitled to as good an education as any. I would have gone further, I would have said that the disadvantaged are entitled to more than the average Manitoban, because they have so far to catch up. So, you know, it doesn't make sense to say quantity is not necessarily quality. What is important, true, is not to turn out people who are not educated. It is possible to waste money by offering a superficial kind of a service which does not generate people who have profited from the education offered to them. If he means that, then I can understand that, but then he is not changing the program this year. All he is doing is reducing the numbers. All he is saying is that the program is the same. If he is changing it he better tell us that, but I understand from the way he described them, he is not changing the program, he is just offering it to less students, and he says that the fact that in the election campaign they said they would not cut programs, doesn't mean that they wouldn't cut any programs. I am wondering whether he is suggesting that this is where they are cutting and not elsewhere. Because if this is where they are cutting, then I really want to debate it with him.

Mr. Chairman, I had occasion to say when we were debating universities, that I believe that there are a number of students at the university who are not taking proper advantage of their opportunity. There are people there, in my mind, who are not entitled to take advantage of the opportunity offered to them, but get there for other reasons. And I argued then and I argue even more strenuously in this case that there are people who have not had opportunities, who are much more entitled.

But in this case, when admittedly there was a program offered — and I do not know the quality of these programs, I know their intent — that probably there are people waiting to get in and may never get in because of inadequate provision of the services. So if this is where the Conservative Government found it advisable to cut programs, then I would have to say that that's a very sorry statement. Well, now the Minister shakes his head. He implies that program was not cut in his department or in government, that there are programs that are going full steam ahead. If that is the case and if there are selective cuts, then I say it's a very sorry state that cuts have been imposed, and I say arbitrarily, because we are not informed that there is any savings effected by a rearrangement of the delivery of these programs. There is no change that we are aware of where they are able to say we could service the same number of people, or more people, at a lesser cost because we've brought in a more efficient method or because the salaries being paid to the teachers were excessive, who were able to increase their load.

He's not saying that they could reduce the number of pieces of paper that they have to work with, or the pens and pencils, or any savings of that kind, as compared with the work of his colleague

sitting on his right, the Minister of Health, who has imposed that kind of reduction over services where he says he has no control. So he is just arbitrarily — I'm speaking of the health organizations — where he has imposed an arbitrary reduction, says to a hospital, "You have to work with less; how you do it is your baby," so they cut other services.

But the Minister of Education in this field, is talking about his own program, and all I've heard him say in explanation of the reduction in dollars, is reduction in students. That means to me that he has not found any fat; that he has not indicated that he can provide the same quality of service to same number of students, for less money. That's what I say is a very sorry state, because it indicates a set of priorities which is not acceptable to me, but obviously is acceptable to the Minister and his government. Pretty petty.

Mr. Chairman, I want to hear more about Winnipeg Centre because the Minister and I and a large number of other people have been sent copies of a letter addressed to Mr. Peter Ferris, a director of special projects, by the student body of the Winnipeg Centre Project. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us what the situation is regarding the Winnipeg Centre Project; where it is heading; what changes are indicated by the Minister; what plans are on track involved in changing the program in some way, as suggested by the student body.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, just before I answer the Member for St. Johns on the Winnipeg Centre Project on the question regarding the labor education area and the allocation there, it was some \$156,000 last year, and the salaries of the group were some \$80,000; programming and supplies \$36,000; about \$20,000 of that \$36,000 went to teaching English; and there was — pardon me — a \$40,000 surplus unspent. To the Winnipeg Centre Project, I think the reference that the member for St. Johns makes, is to the switching of this particular program from Brandon University to the University of Manitoba, and this particular switch has practically been accomplished. I believe the letter he refers to as due to some apprehension on the part of some of the students involved who felt that this represented a change in direction, a change in administration and a change in the whole process — I understand that the director and others have met with the students since then and in fact they had met with them some three weeks before to discuss this transfer, and that their apprehensions in this regard have been dispelled. Because in fact there is no essential change except it would seem logical, and certainly the universities concerned were in agreement that a project centred in Winnipeg as it was should be administered by one of our local universities who has a teacher training function, and so it was switched from Brandon University to Winnipeg.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, is there any change in program?

MR. COSENS: No, Mr. Chairman, I believe I mentioned that; there is no change in program or process except it will possibly open up wider opportunities or greater scope to students completing the training in the Winnipeg Centre Program. The opportunities to go on to further training through the University of Manitoba will be there and I understand that in fact some people do follow that particular road.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is there any change in the curriculum?

MR. COSENS: No change whatsoever, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is there any change in staff?

MR. COSENS: Basically, Mr. Chairman, there is no change to my knowledge. The same basic staff will be utilized. I suppose there would be a tendency for some people that would have to perhaps switch allegiance with particular universities, although the people who worked with these students, as I understand it, did not live in Brandon, they lived in Winnipeg here. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the impatient Minister of Public Works is supposed to be in London; he might make a better contribution to Manitoba if he were indeed there.

MR. ENNS: That's not fair.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, it's not fair for you to interrupt me the way you do in such a rude manner.

Mr. Chairman, then the Minister is assuring me, and states that the students have already been assured, that the only change is the administrative umbrella, that there is no change in curriculum; no change in courses; no change in staff; no change in the operations of the project, other than

the umbrella. And, could the Minister explain why it was so desirable to do that? He indicated that it made sense, but is that the only reason — is it just that it made sense or is there a savings in dollars? Or is there a better administration that the University of Manitoba can offer than the University of Brandon — just what's the sense of disrupting it in order to make any change at all, unless there's a point to it?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I really think the Member for St. Johns overplays the disruption. I understand that this has been a move that has been under discussion for some time; it isn't something that we thought of, it had been contemplated before and geographically it would seem that a project centred in Winnipeg would be better served by a Winnipeg university than by one at Brandon, just as a project in Brandon would be probably better served by a Brandon university because of the geographical location. I imagine — I haven't seen the particular figures — that there would be some saving in dollars just because of the proximity of the University of Manitoba to the project which is carried on in Aberdeen School.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, is there any difference in philosophical approach to universities that makes this project more acceptable or more enthusiastically taken on by either of the two universities?

MR. COSENS: I don't think that is really a factor one way or the other, Mr. Chairman, in the particular determination. The University of Brandon felt that the project would be better centred in a Winnipeg university. The University of Manitoba was quite willing to take the project on, work with it, so that a philosophical aspect was not paramount at all in this particular move.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, Mr. Chairman, it would appear that this letter was prompted only by a lack of consultation. It would appear that from what the Minister says, everything is acceptable, there is no change of any kind in this project from last year. The only thing is, that as of May 8th, which is only a week ago, Mr. Chairman, the person who wrote this letter, the recording secretary of the student body, voices all the concerns that I have tried to voice, and more, and knew nothing about what was planned. So although the Minister said there was a meeting three weeks ago, it would appear that a week ago, today being the 15th I believe, yes, exactly a week ago, this letter was addressed to Mr. Ferris with copies to so many of us.

I don't want to dwell on each point that they make, Mr. Chairman, but they raised a number of concerns which would not be raised if they were satisfied that there was no plan change that affected them, the students. I'm surprised at the difference of discrepancy between three weeks and one week, but the Minister is now saying that all of the concerns that they raised are not founded at all because there is absolutely no change that would affect any of the students in all these matters that they raised. If the Minister confirms that, I have nothing further to raise on this point.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that change is something that causes apprehension among all of us and I can understand that the students, on hearing that this change was taking place — perhaps they had not been adequately briefed; communication is something that sometimes is lacking even in the area of education. If they had not been adequately briefed, I can understand some of those concerns. I have trouble understanding why a matter such as transfer of credits would not have been made quite clear to the students. I have some trouble understanding why the particular curriculum that would be followed had not been clearly outlined, so that there would not be any need for apprehension, but obviously the writer of the letter was suffering from those apprehensions. I'm not questioning the genuine nature of that person's letter, and I hope that they were present when the meeting took place, as I say some three weeks or so ago. I understand there was another meeting last week which would follow after that letter had been sent, and I would hope that that one removed any of those apprehensions and clarified the issue.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I have heard nothing but praise for Mr. Peter Ferris, and the way he conducts his program, and that is why I felt that I wanted to be reassured. I should say that some of these students are my constituents, I suppose that's why I was one of the recipients of this letter. And I would just like the Minister's assurance — I don't expect that he went to the meeting nor do I expect him to go down tomorrow morning to a meeting with the students, but I would expect that he received confirmation from Mr. Ferris that all of these concerns have been satisfied, and I am satisfied to leave it on the record that way. If I hear to the contrary in the future, then on behalf of my constituents, I suppose I'll be back on my feet addressing the Minister again.

MR. COSENS: I just want to add to what the Member for St. Johns has said, that the situation

is much as he describes it. I have of course checked with the Director of the Special Projects and he has told me that he has had this meeting, the second meeting with the students and hopefully these apprehensions will be removed.

But I can understand, in spite of that, Mr. Chairman, that whenever there is a major change, I think people do become somewhat upset, and particularly students, whether they are public school students, or even post-secondary sometimes, might develop particular loyalties to a certain institution, and the fact that it's being switched may have some bearing. I'm not aware of that, I don't think that was one of the apprehensions that were voiced, but just change itself, for some people, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, can be a little bit upsetting, and I would hope that that has been overcome.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, just as the Minister was speaking, it occurred to me that the best way that I can deal with this on behalf of my constituents, is to send a copy of tonight's Hansard to the people who sent this letter, and then they will be able to respond their own way, or more likely, be satisfied with the Minister's assurances that their concerns can be allayed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm afraid I'm not going to be quite as kind as the Honourable Member for St. Johns. I have to admit to some frustration and some disappointment that in the Special Programs this year that the Minister has seen fit not to institute a program, and this is the Labour Education Centre that was proposed in a Ministerial Statement by the former Minister of Continuing Education last year on June 10th. If I might just quote from the Hansard of that date, the then Honourable Ben Hanuschak, the Minister of Continuing Education, said, "Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to announce today that approval has been given to the establishment of a Labour Education Centre for the province of Manitoba. This decision follows two years of discussions between the officials of the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower and the Department of Labour, and officials of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, and more recently, with representatives of the Universities of Manitoba, Winnipeg, and Brandon. I am particularly pleased that the Centre embodies a close and co-operative relationship between the two departments that I have mentioned, that is, mine and the Department of Labour, the universities, and the Manitoba Federation of Labour, and that it will, in fact, have a Board of Directors consisting of representatives from each of these bodies. The Centre will serve as a focus for labour education in the province, and in addition will have the following functions:

"Organizing and co-ordinating credit courses and programs offered by the universities and colleges, setting up non-credit courses, training in seminars and conferences on an extension basis, providing a focus for research and study in such areas as labour history, labour relations and labour laws, and the creation of a labour library in conjunction with the existing resources at the universities and colleges that will provide research material for both the Federation of Labour and other union groups in the province, and other students and scholars having an interest in this particular field.

"The centre itself will probably have an off-campus downtown location, and it will consist of a central catalogue of research material and will be an organizing and co-ordinating centre for activities. We are not creating a new institution, but we are establishing a centre that will give real support to the educational aspirations of organized and unorganized workers, and at the same time providing the means by which the universities and colleges can provide their experience and resources to labour education and also provide a greater range of opportunities to regular university students. In fact, I look forward to the day when a student at any of the province's universities will be able to major in labour studies, just as students can graduate in administrative studies.

"While the details of the funding have not been finalized, the budget for the centre for this fiscal year will be in the order of \$250,000 to \$300,000.00. I might add, I will not be surprised if the Manitoba Education Centre provided the focus for labour education and labour studies for the prairie region as a whole.

"This is a particularly appropriate day to make such an announcement, for yesterday and today, the Manitoba Association of Continual Education is holding a conference that is attempting to define the needs in the area of continuing education for adults in this province, and I believe very strongly that the Labour Education Centre, by encouraging the sharing of resources and the co-operation of institutions, will be viewed as a major step forward, not only for one large group in the province, but a model for the delivery of continuing education opportunities on a wider scale. Thus, as Minister

of Continuing Education in Manpower, I am proud to announce this further accomplishment in our efforts to provide educational opportunities for all Manitobans."

And in reply, the labour critic of that day, who was the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, the present Minister of Health, said in reply, "Mr. Speaker, we welcome the Minister's announcement about the establishment of the new Labour Education Centre, and will certainly watch with great interest the courses and the development of the curricula at this centre in the future as it unfolds. We hope that the centre and its curricula will take a broad and universal approach to labour and labour's role in society, and in the economy, and that there will be strong emphasis for the need for tripartite co-operation, particularly bipartisan co-operation between labour and management, but tripartite in that it should involve some government participation, too, in order that harmonious industrial relations can be developed and maintained by the province of Manitoba. To that end, we believe that the centre can potentially fulfill a valuable service.

"Our position at this time would be one of interest and welcome, an ongoing interest in the courses developed and the way that they are applied, and the results in terms of labour and industrial harmony in this province."

Then, I would like to read into the record, a copy of a letter that the present Minister of Education, the Member for Gimli, sent in reply to correspondence that was addressed to the First Minister, addressed to Mr. Nels Thibault, President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour.

"Dear Mr. Thibault: As requested by the Premier, I am replying to your letter of March 3rd, addressed to the Premier, which lists the items that the Manitoba Federation of Labour presented to the Cabinet in December. The Labour Education Centre is in my area of responsibility. I note that you are proposing that meetings be arranged to discuss the various items. I shall leave it to you to call my office to arrange a meeting if you think that would be useful."

This is the kicker, Mr. Chairman, this is the kicker. "I should tell you, however, that the restraints program under which we are operating is so tight that there is no money in my Estimates for the support of the proposed centre, and I see no likelihood that it will be forthcoming. It will not therefore, be possible for me to provide any assistance in the establishment of a Labour Education Centre."

And that, Mr. Chairman, goes back to just what the Minister was saying to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the program, I believe he said, whatever was in the program last year is the right number. Well, it was zero last year on the Labour Education Centre, so I guess the Honourable Minister of Education figures the right number for this year is zero again. That's the only conclusion that I can come to. The fact that this program had been two years in preparation, it was a co-operative effort between the Honourable Minister's department and the Minister of Labour, but I guess what we are seeing here is the fact that labour in this province doesn't seem to be held in a very high regard by the present government. —(Interjection)— If the Honourable Member for Lakeside wishes to take part in this debate, he knows he has the opportunity to get up off his backside and stand on his two feet.

MR. ENNS: I'm on my two feet.

MR. JENKINS: And you can get on your two feet after I'm through with my time on this floor, and not before. —(Interjection)— If the Minister of Highways wants to act like a jackass in this place, he can go ahead and be one. He's acting natural, as the Honourable Member for Flin Flon says, he's in his natural role. This is a serious problem. The Minister, in his reply, he said, "sure, come and talk to me," holds out no hope, and I suppose next year there will be no hope again. That, I guess is the esteem that the Minister has looked at this program. I guess he figures it's not worth the paper it was printed on. That's the only conclusion I can come to.

The Minister has said, whatever was in the program, whatever amount of students were there last year, that's the right number. Well, we had zero last year, so we've got zero this year. I guess we can take from that that next year it will be zero again, and zero, zero, zero, until 1981 when we turf you out, and put you back over on this side where you belong. That's the only conclusion I can come to.

I don't see any great advocate for organized labour or even unorganized labour in the present Minister of Labour, given the performance that she has given so far in this House, especially in dealing with those on the minimum wage. And if there is anybody that really needs protection and help from a centre such as this proposed centre, I would say it would be the unorganized, far more so than perhaps organized labour, but there are the people who are on the minimum wage, or the near-minimum wage, working in some of the sweat shops in this province and in this city. These

are the people that need to be able to have the facilities in which to improve their education, improve their knowledge of labour laws and working conditions, how to negotiate, these are the people that really need the help, but no, lo and behold, cut, restraint, and that's how the department has been able to keep their cost down.

As my honourable friend, the Member for St. Johns, has been able to elicit from the Minister, we have been able to keep the programs down because we've got less money, we have less students. I certainly must say that I feel deep disappointment that the Minister has seen fit not even to make a feeble attempt to get this program even barely rolling. It has come to a dead standstill, and that, I guess, is where it's going to remain for the next 3 ½ years. I just want to put that on the record, Mr. Chairman, pointing out to the Minister and to this present government, my deep disappointment that they have not seen fit to proceed with this program, which I think was a well worthwhile program, and one that would have assisted not only the organized labour force in this province, but more so, those in the field of unorganized labour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Logan regarding the Labour Education Centre, I could very well answer, as I did in the letter, that this was a new program, and I think he well realizes as we go through our Estimates this year, that in the financial environment in which we were operating, there was no room for new programs. Not only did the Labour Education Centre suffer a deferment, but many other particular projects did, whether it be the music addition at Brandon College which was no doubt needed, Mr. Chairman, or the addition to Assiniboine Community College at Brandon, which from close observation, I would admit is needed, but they are going to have to get along for another year without it, and many other programs, whether they be at the University of Winnipeg or University of Manitoba.

But I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the previous Minister said that he was putting what was it, \$250,000 or \$300,000 in the program, where was it? Or did he say he would like to put it in? I don't know, I'm not clear, because there is no place that I can find in last year's Estimates where that \$250,000 or \$300,000 existed. I really wonder, Mr. Chairman, why in eight years, the Member for Logan, who I know is a great advocate for people of the labour movement — at least he is for certain unions, I don't know whether he's a Canadian union man or an international union man, because I understand there's a problem there, but regardless, that's immaterial, I suppose — I just wonder why he was never able to get his Ministers to move forward on this in the days when there was lots of money. I say to him I found myself in a position this year, where with the Budget restrictions I operated under, to go into a new program of this size — and it wasn't \$300,000, Mr. Chairman, it was some \$500,000, I understood, to move this program on its way. Certainly, within the Budget parameters within which I had to operate this year, this type of program fell in the same category as many others. It was deferred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . —pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, the Minister has raised a very interesting side-light. He said he doesn't know whether I represent what branch of trade unions. I'm a trade unionist, I happen to belong to an International Union, but that doesn't make it mandatory that my thinking is that Canadian unions, as such, are bad; or that because we have an International union, that they're bad. I believe in the trade union movement as a whole, regardless of where they have their headquarters and I can assure the Honourable Minister that I have never looked upon one union because it would have its headquarters in Canada as being better than a trade union that might have its international headquarters in the United States. If I really had my druthers, and whatnot, I guess national pride would say yes — I would say that I think all trade unions should be centered in Canada, with their headquarters, — but if the Minister knows anything about the history of the formation of the trade unions in this country, sure, they were formed on both sides of the border. In some cases, the unions in Canada gave birth to international unions that later, because of the amount of numbers of people who belonged to that union because we are looking at a population spread of approximately what — 10 or 12 to 1 in the United States, and so many more people belonged into that same union, and so they set up their headquarters in the United States. But to say that I am here advocating for one part of the trade union movement here in Canada, be it Canadian national unions or be it international unions, I'm not here on that behalf.

I'm also speaking now on behalf of those who are all unorganized. These people belong to no

unions. We have made the facilities for people to become organized, to become certified, to become unions, much easier than it was under the present government when they were in office prior to 1969, but we still haven't seen that great influx of people to become organized. That is mainly because of the lack of education of many of the workers, who have a definite fear that if they try to organize, the boss is going to turf them out. And it still happens, even under the present labour legislation that we introduced, which I think is some of the best labour legislation on this North American Continent. And it's only by the establishment of a centre, where people get to know their rights.

You know, we write legislation in this building, and it reminds me of Part II Orders in the Army: ignorance of published Part II Orders is no excuse — I throw Section 40 at you of the Army Act — and it's the same thing what we do here when we pass laws. Because the average citizen on the street really doesn't know what those laws are until he runs into them, or gets into a violation of that law sometimes very innocently, but law takes the same outlook, that ignorance of the law is no excuse. Judges, from time immemorial, have set that edict down, and if we need a labour education centre, it certainly is for those people who are, for the most part, unorganized in this province. We wouldn't need a Minimum Wage Board. We wouldn't need welfare, because these people would organize themselves, discipline themselves, and be able to get a fair share of the pie.

If you are telling me that \$2.90 an hour for those who are unorganized is a fair share of the pie today, then you and I are stalking at two different tangents altogether.

I want to assure the Minister quite vehemently, that I am not here on behalf of an international organization, a national organization or anyone else, I am here on behalf of the constituents of my constituency, whether they're trade unionists or whatever they are. They are the people that put me here. The fact that many of those people happen to belong to trade unions is just a coincidence, but there are many people in my constituency who are not organized, who are unorganized. I can say the same thing for the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, because we share common boundaries, part of the central core area of Winnipeg.

These are the people, the new immigrants. You know new immigrants come into this country and know nothing of the labour laws or anything of this country, nothing whatsoever, and they have the fear of authority that if they violate something they are going to get turfed out. And let's not kid ourselves, certain employers play upon this. If you start to agitate to organize yourself, you might find yourself on a slow boat out of here.

If the Minister can assure me that he's going to look very seriously next year, I will look forward to this with some anticipation. But I'm not holding my breath because I'd get awful blue in the face I think, knowing the priorities of the present government, and it certainly is not centred on that segment of society. I want to make it quite clear, I think that the former Minister of Education and Continuing Education will be able to tell you what happened to the \$250,000 or \$300,000.00. All I was quoting was the Ministerial Statement that he made at that day, and the reply that the labour critic of that day made on this side of the House.

We had many priorities when we were government, many many priorities. If we had made all our priorities those of labour in this province, we would have had this program perhaps in operation many years ago, but we also operated other programs for those other than those in the field of labour. And so to say that we have spent eight years — we spent six of those years doing certain things, and we had spent two years in preparation of a program to put forward to the working people of the Province of Manitoba, and especially since it would have been centred here in the Winnipeg area — I think that the trade unions have shown with the labour courses at the University of Manitoba and other places, that there is a need for this type of education.

And there is also a need for employers and trade unions themselves, to put up some money too. When we look at some of the programs of education, and you look in some of the European Countries, where it is possible for a worker to go on a year or year and half of absence and be able to have his means of livelihood kept up while he's able to improve himself and become a better citizen, and become a better member of society and be able to contribute more to society, and also in many cases improve himself financially, which in turn government all benefits from because of the increased earnings, he pays increased taxes. And so we receive the money back many times over for what we invest.

But I say that this government, or any government, should be looking at these types of programs, to set it up and get these people so that they can improve themselves and be able to get their rightful share of what the pie is divided up into.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Minister correctly, he is in agreement with

his colleague, the Minister of Health, as he spoke in the House last year, when he endorsed the concept, the principle of a Labour Education Centre, but that the only thing that is holding him back this year is financial constraints, but insofar as the principle or the need for a centre of this kind for a program of this kind is concerned, that with that he is in agreement. Am I correct in that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think I've gone on record in this House earlier in the debate. I believe a question came up on this under another particular part of the Estimates and I went on record at that time by saying that I firmly believed that courses and particularly quality courses such as the type that are offered at the University of Manitoba for people involved in the labour movement, and people involved in the management movement too, and I think each one should take a few courses in the other person's area so that there's a little more understanding between the two. I've gone on record, Mr. Chairman, in saying that I'm certainly in favour of that.

When the Member for Burrows says, "Well then the Minister is in favour of the Centre," well, that is another matter, Mr. Chairman. I would have to look carefully at all of the qualifications of what that implies, but as I understood this was a new program, and this year, as I have stated, we are not considering new programs — whether it be, as I've mentioned before, an addition to a music centre in Brandon University, or whatever it may be. I would say personally, Mr. Chairman, that I am more concerned with courses, and where they are delivered, than a particular building or centre, where they have to be delivered in a City. I don't know that that matters as much, having a centre to deliver the courses, I think the important thing is that courses be available for people.

I would hope that we don't have to go in our society to the point where people in business have to have their own particular college so that there they can offer business courses. I would hope that the community colleges, the universities, perhaps the high schools would make this type of course available. The need for a centre is another question altogether, but certainly this year, in relation to other new programs, there was certainly no question that this particular project fell into that area, the new program area, and was deferred.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am surprised that the Honourable Minister, during the seven months minus nine days or so that he's had to study and review this program, that it did not become apparent to him that, in proposing the Labour Education Centre, that the term centre wasn't used so much in the sense of bricks and mortar, but rather program, and I think that the Honourable Minister would have noticed that it was suggested making maximum use of all available resources in terms of programs that are offered, as opposed to a distinct centre geographically identifiable located in some separate location. Now, it's true that it may require an address, because it's apparent to us that it would necessitate some minimal staff to co-ordinate the program and to disseminate information to the labour movement and so forth, but only to that extent, but not in the sense of another huge brick and mortar structure to house this particular program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: As we look through the Estimates, it seems as though there's a pattern develops. The cutbacks affect mainly those areas which are the least able to take the cuts, that the Minister has decided would not be in a high priority, and this is one thing that does concern myself, and I believe some of the other members representing northern ridings, because the programs that are being cut are mainly the ones that affect — the IMPACTE, BUNTEP, Mature Student Program, he's cut back the other programs affecting the north, and thps in my opinion is sad. The Minister uses as his argument, well, you know, my budget is cut, we have to change with restraints. You know, we can accept that argument until we look at the fact that the argument gets pretty weak when we consider the fact that we have cut back in millions of dollars of revenues from the highest income groups in our province, and this is where we have to start to question the Minister on his priorities, because these problems are very crucial to remote areas and northern people in remote areas in an attempt to get them into the mainstream of things.

The intent of all these programs was to try and get these people into the stream of things that they were never able to participate in. We haven't come to the New Careers Program, it comes up on the next item. But if you will look at the communities that this program did serve, by and large it was all in the remote areas of our province, and it's unfortunate that . . .

I don't know if I missed the Minister's comments on the Registered Nurses Education Training Employment program. I'm just wondering if this program has been cut back. I might have missed that on his comments, I'm not sure whether there was a cutback on this. What is the enrolment this year? It was 20 last year, I believe.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the enrolment level last year was 20 in the Brandon General Hospital special mature student nursing program, and the enrolment this year will be 20.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member may well recall comments made by his colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce when he spoke of a billion dollars of investment capital had left the province. —(Interjection)— Yes, it's more than a billion dollars. The Honourable Minister just tells me that it's more than a billion dollars which had left the province during the years of New Democratic Party administration. —(Interjection)— I'm sure that the Minister would like to think that with the change in government that this flow of investment, or the direction of flow of investment capital, would reverse itself, and it will come flowing back into the province of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, a billion dollars of investment capital surely can create many, many jobs. If one uses a rule of thumb figure which is used by some, \$200,000 creating one job, a billion dollars will create about 5,000 jobs.

Even at the rate of about 1,000 jobs a year, if this reversal of investment flow is in fact taking place, as I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce would like to see happen, if that is taking place, what is the Honourable Minister doing to gear up his program. I would think that this would likely have to fall under Special Projects, a variety of training programs to train and prepare and equip our disadvantaged, our people in the north, native, Metis, to find employment in these new employment opportunities, openings that will come on track with the reversal of the flow of investment capital. So, to what extent is the Honourable Minister in contact with the Minister of Industry and Commerce to find out whether in fact this reversal in the flow of investment capital is taking place, and if it is, is he gearing himself up to meet the manpower needs, the employment needs, that no doubt that reversal of investment capital flow will generate within our province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can only assure the Member for Burrows that I am talking to my colleague almost daily, and topics of this nature do come up, and discussions are held in this regard.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Has the Minister of Industry and Commerce given any indication to the Minister of Health that during the last seven months minus nine days, during the last seven months, well, there should be some evidence of a reversal of flow of investment capital. How many millions of dollars have come back into the province, because that's going to create job requirements, and the Minister of Education will have to gear himself up to meet the needs of the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for Burrows asked if he'd indicated to the Minister of Health if there had been any change, but I believe he's confused there. I think he was referring to himself. . .

MR. SHERMAN: He hasn't spoken to me for days.

MR. COSENS: I would suggest that if he is concerned with this type of information, that he should check with the Minister of Industry and Commerce as to the actual figures. I understand that there is some improvement. As to the exact figures, I certainly don't have those available. They fall a bit outside my department.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: That type of information may fall outside the area of responsibility of the Minister of Education, but nevertheless, as I had indicated to the Minister, by making the economic climate so much more lucrative and attractive to the investor with the election of a Conservative government, then surely that must be attracting investment capital and creating a job to do for the Minister of Education. —(Interjection)— If the Minister of Industry and Commerce doesn't know, the Minister of Health, somewhere on the scene in Manitoba, has seen this investment capital come pouring in. So if it's pouring in, the Minister of Education better hurry up and get his department geared up to train people to put to work on all the jobs that all this capital is going to create.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I want to speak on (2) New Careers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, this is one that really concerns a number of the members on this side of the House. I'll read the preamble, because I think it outlines exactly the intent and the success of this program. "New Careers is generally known and recognized as a successful on-the-job training program through which individuals develop knowledge and skills to assume jobs within the primary job market. The objectives of the program are to help disadvantaged people to enter the job market in areas of high need in human service; to improve services to paraprofessionals helping the professionals in their duties; create socially useful and meaningful jobs at the entry level and training for advancement and between agencies; and to reorient employment practices within government by demonstrating to the employer that waiving traditional recruiting patterns and qualifications is not equivalent to lowering standards."

I note, Mr. Chairman, that 75 percent of the students, the trainees in this program, were of native ancestry, so I would like to ask the Minister if he can justify and give us some information on what is the intention of this government in this very crucial and important area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, probably the Member for Ste. Rose understands the nature of the program, the Department of Education of course is the training component for this particular program. The objective or goal of the program was to train people who would then enter the Civil Service or in fact become employed by agencies of the government. What we had happen here was that with the cutback in staff when the new government came into power last fall, there were not budgeted positions for some of the people in this particular program, and as a result, without that type of commitment from other government departments, we found it necessary to freeze the intake. There was no particular use, Mr. Chairman, in taking in more people into the program when in fact we did not have the commitment from government departments to take all of the people who were currently in the program.

What we have done, Mr. Chairman, is make every effort to find employment for those people who have been graduating and to ensure that those in the program will be able to find employment. We are also looking at other alternatives for the program, one of them being training in industry for people through a New Careers program where we try to involve the private sector to a much larger extent. This had been purely a government agency type of program, with the main emphasis on bringing people into the Civil Service. So we are looking at other directions, and I suppose the freeze itself represents a breathing space for us to evaluate the other alternatives for this program.

I'm not standing here, Mr. Chairman, and condemning the program, although there are, again, like all programs, certain criticisms that have been levelled, but by the same token, it depends who you are talking to. There are others who have high praise for the graduates of this particular program. The problem, as Minister of Education, I was faced with, that the graduates have to move into particular government positions. Those positions were not budgeted for and the moneys were not forthcoming from those particular government departments that would employ these people. So as you can well imagine, the people in my department have had to do a certain amount of scrambling in looking for jobs for these graduates in many instances — in some instances we were able to employ them in particular departments. I think we've done a reasonable job in that particular area, and I would mention once again to the Member for Ste. Rose, that we are looking at alternatives for this particular program. Because we have frozen in-take does not mean that we are scrapping the program; it merely means that we are trying to get a little bit of time to evaluate other alternatives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, what we have is the Minister admitting that this is another program which is being cut, even worse than that, emasculated. I haven't spent too much time on the Estimates of the department so far, but this particular program was one of the best programs that the former government established. The government, in choosing to impose their particular philosophy in cutting back this program, is nothing but pound foolish and penny wise, because the people who were involved in the delivery of this particular program were one of the best and most dedicated group of civil servants that I've ever had the opportunity with whom to work. On top of that, the clientele that they served, many of these people over the eight years that I was in government I got to know personally. And when you take into consideration it costs about \$18,000 a year, Mr. Chairman, to

keep a man in an institution — this is my concern at the moment — they did serve and deal with other people.

But nevertheless, a person has to have some reason for buying into society, and it wasn't the formal educational process, the books and the pencils and the scribblers that we're talking about in this regard, it's the people who were involved in delivering this program, and being able to nurture these people along until such a time as they bought into society. A goodly number of people who have been involved in this program are no longer employed in government services, they're employed in the private sector. Because what they acquired through this involvement was not only the training for some specific skill, but a basic skill of how to work.

One of the problems that we are faced with in this particular province and across the land is, a number of years ago the Federal Government chose to close down, — just close the doors walk away from it, with very little preparation — all the Indian resident schools in the province. These institutions are empty. For example, at Birtle there's an Indian school that is empty; at Brandon there is one that's empty; they just walked away from them. They said that these people were going to go into the main educational stream and they were going to fit in these little boxes, and they are going to survive.

I taught at St. John's, the biggest High School in the Province of Manitoba; over 2,000 students, 2,000 kids in the school, and we dealt with the problems of these people trying to fit into these little boxes. They got sent to these schools, with no identification, nothing that they could identify with, no one that they could identify with, but they were dumped in the system. And we wonder why we have problems today; it's because of this attitude. This budget just completely emasculated, after this government and the people that ran through the province saying, "Oh no, oh no, we're nice guys; we're going to be efficient, we're going to save money by being efficient." The Minister has told us that the reason that this program was cut back is they haven't budgeted for the positions into which these people may eventually move. They haven't this year and I would suggest that they won't next year. —(Interjection)— Yes, we did last year. Don't tell me what I did last year and what P didn't do last year.

For example, the institution out of Brandon that you people are scrapping, to deal with people who have problems more with alcohol than being in conflict with the law from a criminal propensity, don't tell me what I did and didn't do. You people cut that program out also. —(Interjection)— Now the Member for Thompson is, you know, they come along and they tell us all these great horror stories of all the Estimates that we approved and didn't approve, and now they tell me what I did put in there and I didn't put in there.

But back to the point at issue, that the cutting of this particular program is going to cost us money in the final analysis. But I say that the present government will not change their attitude. The Minister said that you're going to rely on the private sector. Well, there's one shining example in the private sector that I know of, in fact, in this regard I learned an awful lot from this particular individual, as a former Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Lorne Dyck, who is manager of Boeing Aircraft, who had a New Career program himself in the industry, and it was from him that I learned much about helping people get involved in the mainstream of life I learned from this particular individual.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, it's just like people putting out bids for a contract. If I put out a bid for a contract and I say I want a machine that's got a little handle here that you turn this way and this ball up here bounces up and down; if I write the specifications for any particular piece of goods that I want to purchase, I know exactly who's going to buy it, or who I'm going to buy from. If you keep writing job descriptions some of these people who have not been able to follow through the regular training programs in life are never going to fit into them. I am advised that one of the positions that was cut out was a job that we had rearranged, and I think that the young lady was going to resign anyway, so I don't fault the Minister of Health in this regard, because I understand that she's expecting, but nevertheless the job was arranged so that her with her limitations, could do this particular job. The job had to be done, so they took each component away from somebody else and gave it to her.

But what I am getting at, Mr. Chairman, is that if the present government thinks the way to dissolve the problems of people who for whatever reason, the present Minister of Education has been around schools long enough to know why people choose to drop out of school for a while; some of them have valid reasons. Some people are successes in life — it may seem strange — without a lot of formal education. In fact, a young man that I know quit school in Grade 9 and every time we bump into each other, he says, "I made a quarter of a million last year Bud, how did you make out?" He's a contractor, he does very well, and he didn't see the need of a formal education. But for some reason or other many people don't fit into the system and one of the

best ways of fitting these people into the system was the nurturing process that took place in the New Careers Program, it's the only place within government and it was more a co-ordinating effort with the people that were involved, because the private sector I'm sorry to say, can't do it by themselves they need assistance in this regard and the moneys allocated. Mr. Chairman, you talk about farces, this is a farce, because it is totally emasculated; this particular program.

But on the whole area of special projects and helping people buy into this society, I think it's incumbent upon the Minister to advise us just exactly how they're going to be of assistance. He said in one of his earlier comments that he's not so much interested in the buildings involved in education as he is in the programs. But perhaps I view education in a fundamental sense, that really all education is is the process through which one generation passes on to the next the information that they have acquired, and helps those people develop the skills that they will need, not that we need, but the skills that they will need to survive in an ever changing world. This is what education should be about and we see people who haven't got a snowball's chance in hell of competing at their potential, many of them, through no fault of their own.

A case in point — and how this person slips through the system and was never discovered I don't know. But a man 23 years old out in Headingley with dyslexia, never diagnosed by anybody; no interest in it whatsoever until somebody says, you know, what can we do with this particular individual; how can we help him get into society, because he rebelled against society every time, he got a little bit annoyed, frustrated, he took it out on society. The rest of us went through assistance such as programs like the New Careers. The history of this particular individual has changed, I'm sorry, not his history, but his behaviour patterns have changed. How long this will be sustained I don't know, but nevertheless the fact that there has been a change has been worth the effort, because I repeat, for every one of these individuals that we have to lock up, for example, it costs us \$18,000 a year.

But it's easier to get this money than it is to prevent it in the first place, and I don't know what the Minister's attitude towards the old adage of an ounce of prevention is worth a ton of cure, or however it goes, but nevertheless I think it is incumbent upon the Mpnister to explain to the House and the people in the Province of Manitoba how they're going to help people become involved in the way that the New Careers Program had involved people.

The Mpnister mentions that you will get people condemning the program; that you will get people praising it. Is this not so with anything? And for the Minister to — I forget when this thing was presented to us, when were these tabled? About the 23rd. . . I don't know how or what evidence he came to the conclusion that the New Careers Program was one of the ones that the government could emasculate with no repercussions, and I don't fault the Minister personally. I know what it's like to get into Cabinet and fight for a dollar, but nevertheless in this particular program I think it's not you, yourself, but the government is being pound foolish and penny wise.

The Teachers' Society, for example, in commenting on the task farce report, said did you know that they couldn't possibly have evaluated the program. You; you're government evaluated the program, not somebody from outside, I don't think that you have had the time to look in depth at this particular effort. The surprising thing is we always see the failures in any program. I could tell you stories but I can't identify individuals, because anonymity of these individuals in my mind is sacrosanct. But over the years through this type of program, and this is one of the best of these types of programs, there are literally hundreds and hundreds of people who are now pillars of our society if you will; people with families; people who have accepted their responsibilities; people who were helped to buy into society by people showing them how, not sitting them down in some classroom and lecturing them from a pulpit, but getting down there and working with them and leading them and encouraging them. And when they fall down they are picked up and put back on the path. I'm familiar with some of the failures in the program also, but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to explain to me and to the people of Manitoba, how he and his government intend to resolve the problems to which I have referred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many trainees that are employed of those who were trainees last year; how many do not have jobs; how many will be trained this year, if any; and what alternatives have these people who are now fully trained and without a job; how have they been advised what their alternatives are?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Ste. Rose, there are currently 15 people who

have graduated from the program who are unemployed; that's 15 people, and that's of 65 people who graduated since October 1st of 1977, and we are currently working on alternative places of employment for these people and have had some success with some others. Some have found employment, as the Member for Winnipeg Centre points out, in the private sector, and as to the number who will be trained this year, some 116 trainees; 116. There will be other people who during the year will be graduating, for a total I believe, is 148, but there will be 116 through the year who will be graduates at different points during the year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that if he hopes to save money in this fashion by putting a halt to the program as it were, that is insofar as intake of new students is concerned pending review and assessment of the program and consideration of alternatives, that it is a sense of false economy. That in the end the Honourable Minister will not save one red cent; not one cent, because surely the Minister is aware that this program is another one of those designed to assist the disadvantaged. So, if the Minister is not going to be spending money on a program designed to assist these individuals to become productive citizens of our community, if not he then a colleague of his is going to be spending money in some other fashion on those same individuals, either by way of welfare cheques, or those who may have the misfortune of becoming a ward of the Department of Corrections, in there or wherever it may be, an equivalent amount, perhaps even a greater amount is going to be spent. In fact, I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that over the years a greater amount will be spent because upon the completion of the New Careers Training Program, the individual can become a self-supporting productive citizen of this community as opposed to being a charge on the public purse for the rest of his life and going the other route. So there won't be a saving of one cent.

Now this rationale, Mr. Chairman, of putting a halt to the intake of new students pending review, assessment and consideration of alternatives — it rather intrigues me that this happens to be a program upon which, you know, wherein the Minister behaved in this fashion. Of all the programs that he administers, I am certain that he may have certain questions in his mind, some doubts about many programs, not only this one. And it strikes me as strange, why didn't he do the same thing in some others. Or maybe he did and if he did I hope he would tell us. I would like to know which programs in the community colleges he has put a halt to insofar as taking in new students pending review, assessment, consideration of alternatives. Because maybe there are some programs there that aren't really delivering what it was hoped they would deliver. So why does not the Minister put a stop there? If this is really an economic thing to do, tell the universities that next year we don't take in first year students. We're going to review the whole program and consider alternatives. Well, over there the Minister would save about \$15 million to \$20 million if he were to do that. Not take in students into the public school system pending review, assessment and doing whatever else the Minister wants to do.

But here the Minister, for some reason, has selected this program and said, okay, hold the phone, no new students next year while he does what he has indicated in committee tonight that he intends to do in this program and this program only.

Then, of course, he throws in the other argument, restraint. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the reason why the Minister has seized upon this program and to impose a cut of this kind is because the consumers, the beneficiaries of this program are least able to defend themselves and to speak for themselves.

As my colleague, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, was speaking, I was just flipping through the Estimates book and it is rather interesting that in the Estimates of a colleague of his, the Minister of Agriculture, the appropriation for 4-H Clubs was increased quite significantly. The appropriation for Home Economists was increased quite significantly. And you know why, Mr. Chairman? Because if those appropriations wouldn't be increased, there would be all kinds of people along Nos. 2 and 3 highways screaming their heads off and they would be at the Minister's office. That it will be at the offices of all the Ministers complaining. But the Honourable Minister knows that it is quite unlikely that somebody from Shamattawa, somebody from Oxford House or Nelson House will come in to complain if this program does not continue next year by the discontinuation of an intake of students. That the Minister knows and he is prepared to take that political chance.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can't quite agree with the Member for Burrows. As I mentioned before, the Department of Education is the training component for this program and if, in fact, the different agencies and departments of government who require the trainees did not indicate that particular interest and that particular budget allocation, then it necessitated the type of action

that I have had to take to look at alternative uses for the program. Because if the intake is not there from different departments and different agencies then we have to look at some reasonable we can utilize the program and that is what we are doing.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary that the Minister do this tonight, but sometime before the session ends I would like the Honourable Minister to give me a list of all the occupations for which new careerists are being trained and I am going to keep that on my desk and as the Civil Service bulletins come out advertising for applicants for those positions, I am going to draw every one to the attention of the Minister and say to him, "Mr. Minister, here was a job that you could have filled by training a new careerist but you didn't because you are discontinuing the program and the Civil Service has to go elsewhere." So this explanation that the departments did not indicate a need for new careerists, I find difficult to accept because the positions, the types of occupations for which new careerists are trained, I am sure that there will be need for them tomorrow and next week and next month and next year. People die, resign, quit, are promoted, transferred and the need —(Interjection)— Yes, somebody said fired and of course this government would know that, Mr. Chairman, because even before it became the government the individual who is now Premier and at that time he wasn't even Leader of the Official Opposition because at that point in time I don't even think there was an official opposition — he could have been an MLA, I am not even sure about that — he took it upon himself to fire three civil servants, so they are experts on that.

But the point is, Mr. Chairman, that the jobs for which new careerists are trained, there was a need for them last year, I am sure there is a need for them this year and I am sure that a need will arise in the future. In the Department of Tourism and Recreation there will be a need for people in the parks, a need for people to work in the recreation area; and in the Health Department and the Corrections Department there will be a need for the types of trainees that the program trains. So I find it difficult to accept the explanation that the departments said that they could not see a need for new careerist trainees and that is why I have indicated to the Minister that if he gives me a list of the types of occupations, the job descriptions for which new careerists are being trained, I am going to watch that list carefully and I am going to watch the Civil Service bulletins as they are issued and everytime I find two that match, a Civil Service bulletin and a job description of a trainee that could have been trained by the New Careers Program, I am going to draw it to the Minister's attention, to this Minister, the Minister of Education, as well as to the Minister of the department that will be hiring that particular individual, and point out to him that there again he had passed up an opportunity to provide meaningful employment or a training program leading to eventual employment of a person who is presently unemployed.

MR. COSENS: I am pleased the Member for Burrows is going to do that, he can start right away because we have got 15 of these people we are trying to place right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, I don't want to get myself in hot water with my colleague, the Member for Burrows, but I can understand the Minister's predicament in not having slots in which these people could be scheduled. I guess what I am trying to do is get to the Minister to convey my impression of the program and the efficacy of continuing such a program. But the slash in this particular program, in my mind, is but a manifestation of the fundamental philosophy of the government in their — not their restraint program which everyone is seeing through as nothing but a farce, but a story to excuse the imposition of Conservative philosophy. The steps are to transfer from 100-cent dollars to the provincial coffers to 100-cent dollars on the federal coffers, put people on unemployment, number one. That's preferable than having them on the payroll of the province. Then the next step that is preferable is 50-cent dollars on welfare so that these people really don't appear on the rolls of the province. Because there is implied in the expenditure of these moneys 100-cent provincial dollars albeit I see that even under the 747 — I don't know how much of these two lines, 409,500 is recoverable from Canada. Perhaps the Minister could tell us relative to which programs the \$409,500 is recoverable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Winnipeg Centre, I appreciate the fact that he is somewhat sympathetic to the situation I found myself in with this particular program. I think I have pretty well stated my position in that I do not condemn the principle of the program at all. I reiterate, and I think it is for the fourth time, that I am currently, along with the people who are working in this area, looking at alternative ways that we can make this program work. If the

demand is not there in the Civil Service then we will look in other areas because the name of the game is to work with disadvantaged people to find employment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that these trainees get their upgrading in the different departments, several departments of government and other agencies. Organizations that provided training opportunities for new careerists included the Frontier School Division, Knowles School for Boys, the Salvation Army, Main Street Project, Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, Native Communications, Native Clan, Native Alcohol Council and Ste. Rose All-Care — might as well get a plug in for Ste. Rose there — Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba and the Manitoba Metis Federation and Klinik Incorporated. And, of course, there were approximately 50 communities involved.

Just the fact that these people have been trained through government departments should help them to find jobs in the private sector, there's no doubt about that. But I wanted to ask the Minister, in relation to my last questions — on the 65 people graduated, 15 still unemployed; that means there is 50 employed, I presume; 116 new trainees or older trainees from last year carried over; 148 throughout the year — I want to know how much did we spend last year, Mr. Chairman, and you can answer the other question at the same time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe there are two questions there and I should clarify the 148 are the total number of people who will be in the program in the 1978-79 year; some of them will be graduating in a month, two months, three months down the line; 116 will probably be carried right through the program. In other words, that is the round number for the year but, as of this point, there are some 148 in the program.

Now how much was spent last year in the program, I believe was the other question the member asked. Last year the gross expenditure was \$1,420,000 and \$1,644,900 — I am giving you the two figures for the south and the north component. The south component was \$1,420,000 and the north component for 1977-78 was \$1,644,900.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: The Minister said that he wasn't going to condemn the program, I remind him that condemnation by feigned praise is condemnation in itself. I had asked the Minister where the \$409,500 recoverable from Canada — to which program was it applicable.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, there are two types of funding here; for those from the northern sector of the program and that is the one under (e) . . . Pardon me, the (d) part is the south portion, I believe — I'll just check that out — pardon me, of the \$409,500, \$350,000 is the portion in New Careers in Section (d).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I wonder if the Minister could advise if the trainees that are going to be in the program this year are new trainees, or some that have not completed their courses last year, and how many drop outs, if any? And if we spent over \$3 million last year, I believe, \$3.6 million for 185 students, how do we propose to train 148 students this year with the appropriations on the right side of the Estimate book?

MR. COSENS: I'd have to check the 185 figure, Mr. Chairman. And the first question of the Member for Ste. Rose in regard to the number of students, I believe, the question was that he asked, that are being carried over or are new students. They are all people who have been in the program previous to the start of this fiscal year. I believe that was the first question that he was concerned with.

The other one was the number of dropouts out of the program — minimal. I don't have the exact figure, and I don't think our people have that figure available at this time. The number of drop outs is very small, from this particular program.

His other question as to will this amount of money be adequate to carry this — he mentions 148 students. I suggest to him that the figure is actually for the complete year, 116. That 148 probably in a months' time, may be 120. I am not sure of the exact graduation dates for every student in

the course. Mind you, that particular type of information is available but I don't have it at this time, but I can assure him that the moneys provided for these students is adequate to certainly see the 116 through the course.

I believe the figure, rather than 185 as the Meer for Ste. Rose mentioned, is some 215 that were trained last year. Some of those, of course, have graduated since then, and some of those 215 are people still in training and represent part of the 148 I mentioned earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: What the Minister has advised us, Mr. Chairman, is that of roughly the \$700,000 that they intended to expend on New Careers programs this year, about half of that is recoverable from Canada, so we are still talking about 50-cent dollars, so really it's just a matter of transference of funds from Health and Social Development to this particular expenditure, because most of the people who are involved in this are on some type of assistance from somebody. So really it's a transfer of funds from Health and Social Development for Welfare payments, to a program which has been effective over the years in getting people into the labour force on a permanent basis.

But, Mr. Chairman, the question I have is, what effect is block funding going to have on this particular type of program, VRTP, because I imagine that's where these funds come from, through the Health and Social Development transfer of payments, so what effect is block funding going to have on this particular component?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Winnipeg Centre refers to \$747,000.00. I would suggest to him that he has not also looked at New Careers under (e), where there is \$1,188,000 provided, so that is the total picture there between the north component and the south component, and the funding there is not as he mentions but through Canada Manpower in the south, and through DREE in the north. So the effect, I would suggest to him, is not something that is really that serious, it's open to negotiation and has a bearing on the number of people who are being trained in the particular courses, and bears directly on the numbers in the northern component and in the southern component as to the funding that's received.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, we'll have to check with the Minister of Finance, because I'm not too sure either, because the money doesn't flow to the particular departments, but nevertheless is not some of the funds that are allocated for New Careers in such programs, allocated to VRTP?

MR. COSENS: Well, I believe, the Northlands Agreement or the DREE agreement is managed through the Department of Northern Affairs, and the Canada Manpower agreement, of course, through the Manpower Division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)—pass; (e)(1) Special Projects—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (e)—pass; (f)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to give us an outline of what is happening with this program, because some of his colleagues have mentioned that we like to have programs where there are a lot of resources that are volunteered at no cost to the government, and I believe that this program is one of these programs, that the Community Education Program is one that a lot of the resource was done at the local level on a voluntary basis. Could the Minister give us some information of why this program was cut?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Member for Ste. Rose is referring to the Community Education Project, and no doubt the project that dealt particularly with part of his area of the province — the Parklands Project? Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. ADAM: Yes, primarily the constituencies of Swan River and Roblin.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, this is again a program, from what I have been able to learn, that was functioning quite well. The people of the area had developed a considerable interest in adult education.. A great number of courses are being offered in many different communities. I believe the cost of the program was some \$128,000, and in no way am I, again, condemning that type of program.

The unfortunate thing is, Mr. Chairman, that if this type of program is good for one area of the province, why isn't it good for the whole province? Can we justify operating programs of this nature in one particular section, whether it's in the Member for Ste. Rose's area, or the Member for Roblin's.

and ignoring all of the other areas of the province, whether it be the Interlake or eastern Manitoba or southeastern Manitoba or the southwest corner.

I would very much like to see a program where we could offer this type of adult education to all portions of the province. However, Mr. Chairman, I realize, and I'm sure the Member for Ste. Rose realizes that the cost of such a program, if it's modelled after the Parklands model, the cost would be prohibitive. I understand that the basis there was something like \$4 or \$5 per capita. If we spread that over the province, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at something around \$4 million or \$5 million, and at this time this government couldn't see fit to pursue that particular course. Obviously, the previous government couldn't either, because it had not extended this particular program beyond the Parklands region.

I would also hope, Mr. Chairman, that any programs of this nature would have the built in characteristic of helping people to eventually run programs themselves. In other words, I'm sure there is the ability and the initiative existing throughout rural Manitoba, to operate adult courses, and in fact, Mr. Chairman, in many parts of the province that particular function is being handled by a variety of groups within the communities. It is a different type of group, and different types of communities. Nonetheless, this is going on without any government intervention at all, not to the extent, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to see, and certainly not to the extent, I'm sure, that the Member for Ste. Rose would like to see, either. But it is being carried on.

I would suggest that the job of government in this area is not to go into a community or communities in this province and tell them what is right for them in community education, but to provide some support to the initiative that exists within the community, and some encouragement, so that the local people can, in fact, carry on these programs themselves.

One of the things that's disturbed me in this particular area of adult education in rural Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that quite often government was renting town halls at the same time the schools remained in darkness, and I suggest that's a misuse of what are basically public facilities, Mr. Chairman. The schools have cost the taxpayers of this province a great deal of money, and particularly so in many of our rural communities where we have some very fine schools. I would suggest that to make optimum use of these buildings, they should be used more than the typical or traditional school day. But it is my understanding, that in this particular community education program, that very often the schools were ignored and perhaps for a good reason. I don't know what that reason may have been, but I know there are a variety of reasons, and that halls were rented instead to offer courses that could have very well been offered in the evenings in the schools that existed in the communities.

What I would hope to do in this area, Mr. Chairman, is to offer some incentive — grants to school boards throughout the province — that would enable them to keep schools open in the evenings so that people desirous of adult education courses, and many of these courses, Mr. Chairman, are not so much vocational or academic in content, as avocational, and I don't knock that. I think there is something to be gained from pottery making, hooking of rugs, and this type of endeavour. Certainly it doesn't fall into the academic or necessarily the vocational area, but I think it is a worthwhile activity, and it's not one that I would deplore at all.

I would suggest that if we can provide grants to school divisions throughout the province, that in rural Manitoba we will see more of our school buildings being used for that purpose.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I would say that I am not critical of what happened in Parklands. I've talked to people from that area, in fact, I had a delegation of people from that area come to my office, and I talked to them about what they had been doing, and I know they were very enthusiastic. I have confidence that with that type of enthusiasm and initiative that has been developed in the area, that these people will carry on with their courses. I know that rural people aren't looking for a hand out, that they're quite prepared to pay for courses that they take. They take a look at their enrolment, and then they charge a fee according to what is required to hire the instructor.

So really, Mr. Chairman, what I feel is the alternative that we have to look at in the community education field, is a program that will help people help themselves, not a program that is done by the government to the point where it helps people become more helpless so that they can't do anything for themselves and rely on those government employees to do every little aspect of the organization and the administration. We have very capable people in our rural communities who can do this sort of thing if given the encouragement, and in fact the school divisions are given some incentive to keep their school buildings open. I know the Member for Ste. Rose will tell me that many rural school divisions don't have night janitors, that their janitors leave the school before

supertime, and one of the problems why schools are not used is because there is no one there to open the door and put on the lights. That may sound rather a simple problem, but I realize that is a big problem. So I am quite prepared to offer grants to school divisions that are prepared to keep their schools open in the evening for adult courses, and the moneys for this particular type of grant, Mr. Chairman, are supplied in 3.(a) Financial Support to Public Schools.

I don't think I need to pursue this particular topic any further. Once again I certainly am in no way critical of the people of the Parklands Region who I know have a very good program going. I am quite confident that they have that ability and that initiative to keep the program going now after they have developed that type of organization and the type of expertise that is needed to make the contacts for instructors and for particular types of surveys to find out how many courses are needed and the type of advertising that needs to be done to promote these courses. They have developed that type of procedure and I think and I hope that the success of the Parklands Project will be shown in the fact that it was a project sponsored by government that made people, enabled them to become helpful to themselves.

I suppose the proof of that will be in what happens in the coming year or two, but in my conversations with these people they feel that they can go back and make some headway and carry on. They are not sure that they can do it to the same extent that they were able to do with government help. There were some government courses that came into the area and were offered, and really, Mr. Chairman, and again I am not critical of that particular program, but I just wonder how much demand there was for a course on Rape Control in a little town north of Swan River, because that was one of the courses that was offered. I could go into two or three others and from my experience in rural Manitoba some of the problems that I saw addressed in some of these courses caused me to question somewhat the type of government input that may have existed there. Whether the government was responding to a need felt by the people in the community, or in fact responding to something they felt was good for the people, is a concern to me. I think government has a tendency sometimes to decide what is good for the people and then try to foist it on it. I would rather see them respond to a need that is voiced by the people of a particular area.\$

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I listened to the Honourable Member respond to my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, with great interest. A number of points that he made don't really square with each other.

Firstly, here again we have another example of a reduction in the level of service. The Honourable Minister is not saying that he found waste, fat, extravagance, in this program, he gave other reasons for reducing the level of support, but not that, resulting in a reduction in the level of service. Then he tries to make this appear as a reduction in the Estimates, that the government is saving the people money, but in the same breath he also said that the people from Parklands area indicate to him that they will find other ways of funding the Parklands Project. So although it may be true that the cost of the program, the entire cost of the program will not appear in the Minister's Estimates, but insofar as the cost to the individual out in Ste. Rose, Winnipegosis and Swan River, Roblin, Gilbert Plains, wherever, it is still going to be the same. It is still going to be there. The tab will still have to be picked up by him.

The Honourable Minister said he took a look at this program. Here it is offered in one region, well why not all of Manitoba? Why didn't the previous government offer it to the entire of Manitoba? Well, the more I listen to the Minister the more convinced I have become that perhaps the Minister in the seven months that he has been in office, for whatever reason, did not fully acquaint himself with what this program is all about.

Well, firstly in response to his question: "Why did the previous government not institute it in all of Manitoba?" I would like to assure the Honourable Minister that the previous government would have gradually phased in the program to reach every citizen in the Province of Manitoba, and this government could have done the same thing. If the cost of \$5.00 per capita which in our province would amount to \$5 million sounds all that much I am sure that it wouldn't to this government. We know some of the legislation that this government passed, particularly some of the tax cuts to the rich. So \$5 million could have been found, if not in one year, over a period of two or three years. or whatever, and it could have been gradually phased in.

Now, I would really wonder, Mr. Chairman, what response the Minister would offer to a Manitoban who may remind the Minister of the comment made by the Minister of Health a couple of weeks ago in speaking to the Red Cross, putting out a call for greater involvement of volunteers. Well,

he was referring specifically to Health Services, but I am sure that if the Minister of Health endorses the principle and advocates volunteerism in the delivery of Health Services that the Minister of Education also would want to encourage greater and more effective use of volunteerism in some of his programs, and the program, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would have taken a close look at it, was a perfect example of that, of the use of volunteers, because over and above whatever minimal honorarium may have been paid to some of the instructional staff, thousands of hours of volunteer work went into it in the organization and the setting up of the program, and the conduct of it. So there is a perfect example of effective use of volunteers in endeavours that have certain social benefit to them, to the community.

The Honourable Minister then gives a couple of other reasons and for the life of me I just can't believe that the Honourable Minister is serious about this, that because in some communities schools were not used, but rather halls, and then in the same breath he went on to add that he is aware of the problem of using schools in some communities, keeping them open, and so forth.

Then he mentioned the fact that he would like the people to run their own programs. Well, Mr. Chairman, you can't have it both ways, either you are going to let the community run their program and make their own decisions and make their own mistakes, if they must make mistakes, and none of us are infallible, neither in the Parklands area nor in the Minister's office, and thus they learn by their mistakes. Or is the Minister saying, and I think he was getting himself into a bit of a bind, because out of one corner of his mouth he says he wants the people to run their own programs, out of the other corner of his mouth he is criticizing them, what they are doing, because they were running their own program out there. They had their own Board, they identified the needs of a community for the type of education program that they wanted, and then in turn they did all the necessary organizational and preparatory work to deliver those programs to the people. There was no dictation from this office as to the type of programs that were to be offered. If there was a program offered on Rape Control in some community then obviously there was a need expressed for it and it was in response to that need. Some people perceived a need for that program in that community, and hence that program, and for the same reason a variety of other programs of different types were offered in various communities. Those were decisions made by those people, those were the programs that they wanted.

So the very thing that the Minister says that he would like to see happen is this program set up in such a way that the people will be able to run their own program, to identify their educational needs, and devise a system to meet those needs. That in fact was happening in the Parklands Project, that is what it was all about. I do regret that for some reason or another the Minister missed that point.

Now he reminded us tonight that he proposes, when we dealt with an earlier appropriation in his Estimates, that he is making allowance for increased grants to schools, to enable schools to remain open for whatever community activities may be desirable and necessary to be held in the evenings. Well, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that that will not keep a community education project such as the Parklands Project, which was a demonstration or a pilot project, it will not motivate the institution of other programs of that kind, because all the Minister is saying to the school divisions is, "I am going to give you additional funds to keep your schools open in the evenings." But who is going to set up the program? Who is going to take the initiative to get the program going and where is the funding going to come for it, even seed money, even some minimal assistance to get the program going? Just simply telling a school division that you can have "X" dollars to keep a classroom open tonight isn't going to get an education program going in that classroom tonight.

So I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that in response to the increase in grants to schools to enable them to be open in the evenings, that that will do nothing towards the development of a community education program anywhere in the Province of Manitoba. —(Interjection)— But as my colleague, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre says, it will look good. Yes, it will have a certain cosmetic attractiveness to it that on the surface it would appear that the government is doing something, but you wouldn't have to scratch all that deeply to find out that really by offering that grant the government is doing nothing to assist the people of Manitoba to develop a community education program for themselves.

Now, if the honourable member has some reservations, and here again it is interesting that, you know, that he is reducing this program to the extent to which he has, and I just pointed out to him that the grants to schools per se will not motivate any school division to take the initiative to develop a community education program. So if the Minister has some reservations about this particular program and its style of delivery perhaps the Minister could indicate some alternatives

that he has to offer to the communities in the Province of Manitoba, some other ways and means that in his opinion may be cheaper, more effective, to deliver this type of program.

But in summing up, Mr. Chairman, I just can't resist repeating once again my amazement at the Minister's comment, and he repeated this about two or three times, he wants to see communities run programs for themselves; he wants to help people to help themselves. Mr. Chairman, if you were to look at the structure of the Parklands Community Education Project, the manner in which it was set up, the Board that they had, and the entire modus operandi of it, that is exactly what it was all about. What the Minister says he would like to see happen, that is what the Parklands Project was designed to do. Then in the same breath he says he is scraping it. That action of his is completely inconsistent with some of the comments that he has made about it.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of points in reply to the Member for Burrows.

First of all, I would like to go on record as stating that I have a great deal more faith in the school boards and the school divisions of this province than the Member for Burrows obviously. I think they will meet this challenge and in fact, Mr. Chairman, in many parts of rural Manitoba, and perhaps the Member for Burrows isn't too familiar with the rural part of this province, this very thing is happening and I would be very pleased this fall to take him out to a number of communities where adult education programs are operating in those communities, rather good adult education programs, without government interference, but I am sure that they would appreciate some grants that would help in the financing of those particular programs, and also, Mr. Chairman, if in fact, as the Member for Burrows states, this type of structure has been set up in Parklands, and I hope it has, then the proof of how effective it has been will be obvious in a year's time. Because I would hope that the people have developed that particular expertise and so on that will enable them to carry on. They'll have learned the type of organization that's required, the contacts that you have to make in order to find instructors, all of the different facets that go into an adult education program, and I have considerable faith in the people of rural Manitoba, that when they have a challenge, they can meet it.

I would suggest to him that regardless of what was happening in Parklands, that was one portion of the province. What was happening in the rest of Manitoba? It would appear to me that the Member for Burrows is not aware of what was happening in the other parts of rural Manitoba.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to accept the Minister's invitation this fall, and I would be most pleased to see an adult education program develop such as he claims will develop in the school divisions of Duck Mountain, Boundary, and Lakeshore.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicates that this type of a program should be applicable to the entire province or not at all. I think that surely the Minister is not telling us that an experiment of this type, a program that is new, innovative, that he is going to apply it to the entire province without any knowledge as to how it's going to work and how it's going to function. And I suggest to him that this was the ideal way to put this program underway. It's the kind of program that this government is talking about all the time, that they want as many volunteers to look after the program as possible, and here is a classic example of that. There were, on the participating committees, I have all their names here, there were 12 on the committee that participated in Ste. Rose, there were 17 volunteers that participated in Roblin, and there were 39 volunteers that participated in the Swan River area. There was a Parkland Regional Co-ordinating Committee, and there were 15 in addition to the number that I have just listed. In addition to that, there were 15 members on the co-ordinating group, the regional co-ordinators, in Dauphin.

So here, Mr. Chairman, is a program that was very effective, the communities involved were Laurier, Ste. Rose, Eddystone, Ebb and Flow, Cayer, Rorketon, Ste. Amelie, and Ethelbert. It was put in with Ste. Rose although it's between Dauphin and Swan River, but there was only one course there. It was a farm electrical course at Ethelbert. In Roblin, there was Roblin, San Clara, Boggy Creek, Bield, Petlura, Shortdale, Inglis, Makaroff, Cromarty, Dropmore, and Swan River Valley District, Cowan, Renwer, Lenswood, Minitonas, Swan River, Kenville, Durban, Big Woody, Benito, Bowsman, Birch River, Mafeking, Burrows, Alpine and Bellsite.

There were a number of departments that participated and assisted in this program, and for the Minister to say that he objects to a community north of Swan River, that had a course on prevention of rape, or rape crisis, or whatever it was, that must have been important to that group

there. I don't have it listed on my list here, I have three sheets, three pages here of different programs, there were 6,000 participants in 34 communities. This year alone I believe there was a 1,149 enrolment in 102 activities.

So I don't know what the Minister wants. He wants a program that doesn't cost much, here's one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, before we pass (3) I wonder if the Minister would indicate his reasons for discontinuing the Focus program, No. 1, and No. 2, if he would indicate to the people of Manitoba, and in particular, to those resident in those communities that were served by the Focus program, what alternative program he has in mind for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this program, when it was conceived, supposedly was to follow its title, it was called Focus, which apparently stands for an open campus within the university system, and it was designed to provide university credit for what was supposed to be university courses. I further understand that that particular objective was never achieved, and perhaps for a variety of reasons, although there may have been some credit given for the odd course at a community college.

I know that a number of courses were offered, the cost last year was some \$414,000, I also understand that since the inception of this program, that some 1 million, 800 and some thousand dollars have been spent on it and I would say to the Member for Burrows, does he really feel that the people benefited to that extent, from that particular program. How many people did receive, according to the original objective of this program, how many people did receive university credits for courses offered through that program, or did it change in its direction somewhere along the line.

I'm also aware, Mr. Chairman, that some three years ago a study pointed out that the cost was some \$600 to \$800 per student, and that was three years ago, Mr. Chairman. So I imagine now the cost has risen much higher, this for courses that were not eligible for university credit, in fact, were they eligible for any kind of credit? The value of the courses — of course the Member for Burrows will tell me that they were exceedingly valuable, because he is a proponent of this particular program. I would suggest to him, if he is, that he is possibly in the minority, because I received a great deal of criticism regarding this program from people in different parts of Manitoba, and in fact, I understand that enrolment figures had dropped in many of these courses, if you could find out, in fact, how many people were enrolled in the courses. These were offered one or two nights a week. The name that one person from the north attached to these courses was that they were expensive coffee clatches and that little was accomplished. I know that some of the people within the program themselves felt that the program had outlived its usefulness and that its direction had somehow been lost.

So, Mr. Chairman, to sum up, why was Focus terminated? I would say it was because it had never achieved its purpose of providing formal adult education with university credit. It had lost interest in the localities where it was operating, and enthusiasm, even among some of the people working in the program. I believe all of the people in the program, Mr. Chairman, were contract employees, which I find strange for a program that had been established for so many years, why these people had not become permanent civil servants, a permanent part of the government because the program had been operating over a considerable number of years.

I would suggest that it was terminated, Mr. Chairman, because it was very expensive, and in the light of our assessment of it, at a time of restraints, where we had to make a choice between this type of program or the type of training that we are providing at the community colleges, then if I have to make that type of choice as a Minister, I am afraid that I would have to see the dollars going to the community colleges.

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

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, on this particular program, there is some validity to what the Minister suggests. I suppose it's one of the difficulties in getting off-campus courses accepted by universities is a problem which will always be with us. But one of the things that concerns me is the access to services of people in the province. In the city of Winnipeg, there isn't much problem in some of the things that were offered in the Focus program. The Minister mentions about some community north of Swan River or something, they had identified a need for a course on rape. I don't know

just exactly what the incident of rape in that particular community was, but nevertheless, I imagine it was because of some concern in that particular community. But in the city of Winnipeg, which does contain half of our population, Mr. Chairman, the courses that people can take, there are just a myriad of courses. You can go to the YMHA, YMCA, YWCA, and all the rest of them. They offer these kind of courses. In fact, within Winnipeg No. 1, they have for years had courses on almost anything that you can imagine available through the school system. The janitors don't quit at supertime. Arrangements have been made to operate the facilities in the evening.

But Mr. Chairman, how do you measure the effectiveness, or how do you evaluate a program, and against which criteria are you going to hold these programs? Where is the template that you can use to evaluate the programs? One of the things that concerns me is this continual search for the philosopher's stone that we can use to say this is a good program, or this is a bad program. In the final analysis, it's a matter of judgment. There's precious little that we can measure in absolute terms and we keep trying to impose these absolute systems, which in themselves are shaky at best on systems that they were never designed or intended to be used to evaluate. One of the subtle benefits of these programs, from my brief experience with them, was that they got people out in the community, outside of the bingos and the beer parlours and all the rest of them. They got people thinking about things other than self-amusement to a degree, and I really don't know how you can measure that.

But nevertheless, there is some validity in the Minister's statement, and I just was listening to his remarks, and I think that this is the most definitive statement that the Minister has made relative to any program. He doesn't think it was any good, that's what it comes down to. And for the Minister to make such a definite statement . . . I have found, in his Estimates, it's just like dealing with wool, he says, "I don't want to condemn a program, but . . ." and he goes on to condemn it, so it is refreshing to hear that the cutback in this particular program reflects the Minister's personal judgment in this regard. That's his responsibility to the House and to the people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It's interesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister was able to do an evaluation and assessment of the Focus program in much more rapid time than his colleague, the Minister of Tourism, was able to, than what he requiree to provide us with the Jarmoc report. The reasons which the Honourable Minister gives for discontinuing the program, again, are difficult to accept because, let's assume, Mr. Chairman, that all his criticisms were valid, but the fact of the matter is that the program was within his control and he could have corrected every one of them. He seems to have some obsession about the need for courses to carry university credit in order to be of any value. Well, when he met with the university presidents, when he discussed the funding of universities, when he discussed the level of tuition fees, he could have discussed credit for the Focus courses at the same time, or he could have arranged for another meeting.

He expressed some concern about the fact that most of the Focus staff were contract employees. If he finds contract employment offensive, then he could have put them on permanent staff; he could have created permanent positions for them, so that too was within his control.

One thing he didn't tell us though, Mr. Chairman, when he spoke about costs. He didn't tell us how many students over the years participated in this program; that he didn't tell us, so we don't know that. He talks about the community colleges, that he'd rather put his — you know, if he can have his druthers he'd rather put his money in the community colleges — but I'm not aware of any community college program reaching most of the remote communities in northern Manitoba that the Focus Program reached. And the Honourable Minister will recall that I did ask him — and that question he did not answer as yet — having terminated the Focus Program, what alternative suggestions has he to offer; alternative ways and means of providing an adult education program of a type or if he feels that that is not the type of program and he has become the expert, he seems to know what people want. Ten minutes ago, he said that he wants to rely on the advice of the people, but now he knows what they want and what's good for them. Well, if he is that kind of an expert, what suggestions has he to offer us as to alternative ways and means of providing them the type of education program that the Focus Program offered them, or the type of program that he thinks they should have?!

MR. VHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say to the Member for Burrows, that certainly I have an interest in adult education, and certainly I am going to be looking very closely at the type of

Monday, May 15, 1978:

programs that we can offer in the years ahead. But on the appraisal, on the assessment that I looked at with Focus, I could not see that this was a place where our dollars were being well spent, or that results were being achieved, and if I have a choice between the dollars that will go into a program of this nature, for the apparent results, as opposed to the kind of results we get from the extension service provided by Keewatin Community College, then I am afraid those dollars will go to Keewatin Community College.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass; (f) — The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Before we leave this \$25,000 figure, P would like to ask the Minister . . . There was a letter from the Parklands Continuing Education, requesting that the \$25,000 item here be spread over the fiscal year rather than June 15th. Has that been accepted?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass; (f)—pass. Resolution 47: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$14,610,300 for Education, Manpower Planning and Development, \$14,610,300—pass.

Resolution 48: Clause 8. Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets. 8.(a)Community Colleges—pass — The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I have two or three brief questions and I believe that I must ask them in relation to (a), (b) and (c) together, because some further data which the government provided us on capital grants gave us only one figure for this appropriation, and that is the capital carried forward was shown in this department as \$1,573,300, so if the Minister would give us a breakdown of that, of what that consists of, of the \$1.5 million capital carried forward — that's question number one; a breakdown of the \$1.5 million. Would he also indicate if there are any other allocations that are being carried over and if there are, will they be used in the forthcoming fiscal year and if they will, what amounts and for what purposes, or will they not be used; and again, what amounts?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the sum that the Member for Burrows refers to as carryover is some \$1,564,800.00. That is the figure that I have from the finance people on a sheet of Reconciliation here as to the money that is being carried through. I can give him a breakdown of that particular amount if he would care to take down those figures.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I am reading from a document titled "Summary Estimates of Expenditure, Department of Finance, May 2nd, 1978" and the second last column on the right-hand side, 8-79 carryover authority on the line marked "Education", the figure on my sheet reads \$1,573,000.00.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a discrepancy of some \$9,000 between the figures that the Member for Burrows has and that I have. I can give him the breakdown for what I have if he wishes. In the Student Aid Deferred Bursaries, and as he knows this builds up from year to year and it now reads some \$6,100,000 and this carries over from year to year and passes through, and I think he is aware of that. In the Community Colleges Equipment Purchases, and I mentioned this earlier when we were in the Community Colleges, but there is some \$48,800 that has not been utilized as yet but of course is earmarked as equipment comes in. Community Colleges Emergencies Student Loans, some \$6,300; in the University of Winnipeg Fieldhouse project, a carry through of some \$17,600; in the Universities Centennial Projects, a carry through of some \$114,200; in the Keewatin Community College Recreation Agreement, a carry through of \$56,600; and under Miscellaneous Capital, some \$984,300.00. Now, Mr. Chairman, the figures that I have in front of me would indicate that that totals some \$7,327,800.00.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Which of those figures will total up to some figure closely approximating the \$1,570,000.00?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I was giving the Member for Burrows the total, and then if you subtract the commitments for the Student Aid Deferred Bursaries from that, the \$6,100,000, you are left with a total of \$1,564,800, which is the carryover that I believe he is concerned with here.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the Minister answer the other question I put to him, if he could? Will

this carryover be used in this fiscal year?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, without checking rather carefully into every item here, I would say in the majority of items, yes; there may be one or two exceptions. Of course, the equipment purchases that the community colleges — no doubt that will be completely utilized in a few months as that equipment comes through. A couple of other items I can't be sure without checking; the University Centennial Projects, these in all probability will be used up in architects' fees and so on, on the projects that are now under way at the universities; the Keewatin Community College Recreation Agreement, I would expect that the large portion of that remainder will be utilized; the Universities Miscellaneous Capital, I think it is reasonable to assume that that will likely all be utilized in the next number of months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)—pass; 8.—pass. Resolution 48: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,655,000 for Education, Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets, \$4,655,000—pass.

Resolution 41: 1.(a)Minister's Compensation \$15,600—pass — The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I have just a couple of questions that I'd like to ask the Minister. One has to do with whether there are any bursaries available from the Department for students in high school; not in university, but in high school; are there bursaries available, explain that? And the second question — I asked the other day, in regard to the employees that were laid off or losing their employment with the cafeteria at Keewatin — the question I asked him was whether any of the employees would lose their pension rights, not the amounts that - they were getting or the classification of pension' but if any were losing their pension rights because of this changeover of the cafeteria at Keewatin?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for Ste. Rose's first question, I alluded to the high school bursaries, if he wishes to call them that — the secondary bursaries in student aid — and certainly these are available to students who for any number of reasons might not be able to carry on with their high school training because of their family situation or a number of other factors; yes, there are bursaries available to those students in Manitoba.

And the second question, Mr. Chairman, regarding Keewatin Community College, the pension rights of the individuals involved there, it's my understanding that there were some people who were eligible for some early pension rights. The exact number I don't have at my fingertips at this time. If the Member for Ste. Rose would like that information as to the number who were eligible for pension rights, I would certainly take the question as notice and get that information for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Well, if the Minister does get that question, if he could put it on the record, and give me the information in the question period, because I asked that in the question period, so that it would be on the record. What is the criteria for the bursaries; where do they apply, to what department and to what branch of the department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the students applying for the high school bursaries apply to the Student Aid office in much the same way as you would apply for the post-secondary bursaries. An application form is sent out and it is filled in and, of course, the criteria is based on need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have waited for about two or three weeks to ask the question, I missed it when we went by 3.(a), I was in the other Committee when 3.(a) was dealt with, and this is Grants to Schools, and frankly it relates to an issue that arose during the campaign and it still exists within my constituency with people asking me questions. It is a fairly controversial subject, it is the subject of public aid to parochial schools.

During the campaign my opponent and some other people within the constituency gave the impression that the Conservative Party if elected as the government would review the whole question of public aid to parochial schools. Since the election, of course, a number of people have been asking me questions about when is it happening. So, I would like a clear concise statement from the Minister as to what the position of the Conservative Government is with respect to the question of public aid to parochial schools.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for Transcona, he is quite correct that we have had that particular area under study, and I would hope that in a few weeks, perhaps not too many weeks, that I can make a policy statement and clear up any concerns that they have in that particular area.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, since we have just gone through the Estimates, will that have any implications for the Estimates process that we have just finished up, or is the Minister saying that will not have any implications for the Estimates process, because, you know, we are just finishing them up and it would seem rather strange that the Minister couldn't have provided the position regarding public aid to parochial schools, if it did have any implications for the Estimates procedures.

MR. COSENS: If there are implications, Mr. Chairman, that remains to be seen. The Member for Transcona may think it is strange, but I think with any serious topic it deserves considerable study and that is what it has been receiving, and as I say I would hope to be able to make some announcement as to that particular area. To quote my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, "soon."

MR. PARASIUK: Obviously people will then be asking me further questions and you aren't in a position to clarify with any answers. Just so I can confirm this in my own mind, you are saying that in the next two or three weeks you will be making a statement on behalf of the Government of Manitoba regarding the question of public aid to parochial schools, and since it will be a statement I presume then that that will mean that there will be some changes to the present policy regarding the agreements for shared services that presently the Department has entered into with some school divisions. Is that correct?

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Transcona can presume what he likes. He, I am afraid, will just have to wait until I am able to make that particular announcement.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. Then, given the reluctance of the Minister to be specific with his answers, I will be specific with my questions.

Will the present agreements under the Shared Services Act, will the present agreements be honoured?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, any agreement that has been signed between the parties concerned and signed by a Minister of the government will be honoured.

MR. PARASIUK: Given the fact that the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 expressed some concern about the legality of some of the agreements, has the Minister looked into the legality of the agreements that are presently in existence?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think I have told the Member for Transcona that we have the topic under study, under rather extensive review, and that he can well imagine that all aspects of the topic will have been encompassed in that particular review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I had one more question to the Minister on the bursaries. Could he advise what the amounts are that are available, the maximum amounts? Or is it so much a month or what?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I, off the top of my head, hesitate to state the amount. I believe it is some \$250 or up to \$250, but again that is a guesstimate and if the Member for Ste. Rose would like the exact amount I can certainly get that for him. But I believe that the figure is some \$250.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, will the Minister be bringing in legislation dealing with the matter of aid, public aid to private schools, or does the Minister feel that he can do whatever he has in his mind that he wishes to do without having to bring in legislation to amend the Public Schools Act?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, as I have said to the Member for Transcona, I think the same answer applies to the Member for Burrows. I would hope to be in a position to make our policy clear in this matter in a few weeks.

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

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Minister when we were discussing Resolution 44, namely, the Curriculum Services — (c) Subsection 4 — Computer Services, and the Honourable Minister undertook at that time and he said he would give me the answer during the discussion of his Salary. If he could give me a breakdown of any other place where Computer Services are being contracted out and whom they were being contracted out to. That is sometime ago I realize and I don't know if the Minister has that information available at the present time, but he did give that undertaking. If he will check Hansard he will find that he did give that undertaking. If he hasn't it here this evening I would be willing to wait and have that information, if the Honourable Minister can give me an answer to that.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would take that particular question as notice. I know the Member for Logan mentioned it earlier, and I alluded to it when we were in the area of the Department of Education and its functions. I believe I also mentioned the computer component in connection with the Community Colleges, but I can get him the specific information that he requires, and I will undertake to provide that to him in the next day or two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the House should still be in session at the time that the Minister may make his announcement re private schools, will the announcement be made in a form that would enable the House to debate the issue? Now perhaps the Honourable Minister of Labour isn't aware, but this is a matter of tremendous concern on both sides of the House, on this side as well as the other. So will we have an opportunity to debate the issue?

MR. COSENS: Well, I can't really give the Member for Burrows a definitive answer, Mr. Chairman. Once again I think he is going to have to wait. There are very few items that come into this House even in the form of an announcement that aren't debated, I have observed in the last few months, so I would expect that he would get his opportunity, if I made some statement, to come back with some remarks if he felt that was necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; Resolution 41: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,976,800 for Education, Departmental Administrative Support Services \$2,976,800—pass.

That completes the consideration for the Department of Education.

Call in the Speaker. Committee rise.

The Chairman reported upon the Committees deliberations to Mr. Speaker, and requested

The Chairman reported upon the Committees deliverations 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 Springfield, that report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, that the House do now adjour.

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