

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, May 5, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

SUPPLY — PUBLIC WORKS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: We are on Page 70, Item 105.(d) Leased Accommodations. (d)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate this point — I don't know if the Minister fully responded or not — but just to reiterate this point, there has been a significant reduction in the staff through a process of attrition and firings, and I calculate that figure to be 1500. I also calculate that, on the basis of a rough rule-of-thumb, that's about 150 square feet per person. I realize there is variations — in some cases some people may only have 100 square feet of space and others 200, but I think 150 is about average.

Therefore, I am saying again to the Minister that there appears to be the equivalent reduction in square feet required by the government, a reduction of 225,000 square feet, and that is approximately the size of the Woodsworth Building and therefore, I assume that the Minister is going to give up leased accommodations to a figure approximating that order of over 200,000 square feet.

Now he tells me right now, in effect, that there has been no sub-leasing and I don't recall whether he said there is any leases that have not been renewed or whether there might be a couple of small ones. Again I say that essentially the Minister has too high a vacancy rate vis-a-vis the number of employees compared to last year. He still is spending or going to spend about the same amount of money as was spent last year — 5.8 million compared to 5.6 million. He is spending the same amount on leased accommodation for fewer people.

So I am saying to him, what assurance can he give to us that he is going about consolidating, going to reduce the number of leases and in some instances perhaps sub-leasing vacant space. Could he summarize again?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what else I can add to what I have already said. (a) I certainly don't accept, I don't object but I don't accept the Honourable Member for Elmwood's figures. Secondly, the nature in many instances of persons no longer in the employ of the Government of Manitoba were not space-holders, if you would like to put it in that term — not in all, but in a good number of instances. Space consolidation, space reductions will be felt more accurately this time next year with respect to this department's space requirements, because in many instances the actual reductions or something like that didn't occur until contracts ran out in March, June, April, February and these figures that I've given him for what the current situation with respect to space is as of March 31, 1978 essentially reflecting last year's full government operation.

I have a list I undertook to give the honourable members of the committee of some of the changes that have taken place since October. It's been prepared for me on a month by month basis today which are a series of relatively small space requirements. A reduction of 1,360 square feet in Portage la Prairie which, I assume, without even asking staff that it probably has to do more with consolidation of space there into the new Portage la Prairie provincial building. Additional 1,000 feet that was not re-leased at Roblin. Different small bits and pieces of space, 350—200 feet on St. Marys Avenue, 340 feet at Ethelbert totalling some 20,000 square feet. I was asked a specific question had I sold any asset, a government asset, I would like the record to show correctly that, yes we have sold the former provincial building in Portage la Prairie. And, I believe the Lands Titles building was in effect given to the community. It's not the Lands Titles building, it's the provincial building and the purchaser was the City of Portage la Prairie. Again the change affecting by the result of the consolidation of office requirements by the government into the new provincial building. I have the question of how much the building was sold for? —(Interjection)— I'm told \$99,000.00. In fact we did not change the Order-in-Council that was drawn up by the previous administration, but, Mr. Chairman, that is about all I can say in addition. The member can make the conclusions that he wishes with respect to the fact that the report on space doesn't reflect what he thinks it ought to reflect, and I can only reiterate once more that we're speaking in this instance, not of the space as it may indeed be used throughout the coming year, but reflected from these staff reductions. The only figures and statistics that I have are those reflecting last year's operation to March 31, 1978.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have additional questions and I want to explore the area of leasing versus building, but my colleague from Transcona wanted to make a few remarks so I'll pass to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will have to wait for your other colleague. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the committee just what the ratio is of owned office space versus leased office space. Is that available or handy to the Minister, percentagewise or something like that.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, The gross figures, and we have been talking in square footage — that would perhaps be the best way of giving you an overview of that situation — is that the Province of Manitoba owns 6 million square feet and we lease 1,060,000 square feet. So that is the ratio; earlier on in the discussion we indicated a total number of 7 million square feet that are used, either owned or leased by the government, and that is the breakdown. That has changed little over- . . . so it's a ratio of six to one —(Interjection)— That is 1978-79.

MR. USKIW: That's about 15 percent, roughly. Then my follow-up question to that, Mr. Chairman, in recognition of the fact that one has to lease some space for the luxury of — well, necessity of flexibility, and not to be locked into space where space isn't required, is there any particular policy adopted by the government with respect to the proportionate leasing versus owned space, or are there any changes contemplated or already taken in that regard?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can't indicate, and I'm not aware of, other than what perhaps my own personal political thoughts might be with respect to what kind of a policy there was in this regard say, during the past seven or eight years. The department and staff fails to inform me otherwise that there is indeed a policy and we haven't imposed a policy in this regard.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I raise the question from two points of view: one is the need to get the most value for every public dollar utilized in space; and the other is to use the public capacity, financial capacity, to plug in additional buildings whenever (a) there is a need, and when we fall below a certain level of owned space, proportionately speaking. But to tune in or sort of act as a counter-cyclical instrument vis-a-vis the unemployment thing, that it seems to me it would be sound management from an all-around point of view, to be always in a position, to be ready, in other words, to add additional building space and to plug those projects in at periods in the economy when unemployment is above a certain level. In other words, Public Works can play a very catalytic role in terms of the economic well-being of the people of Manitoba, generally speaking, at least from an employment and income point of view, and it's in that context that I raise those questions, whether there is any policy in that regard or whether we simply just move along without any preconceived plan or approach to that question of space and how it may be utilized as a catalyst?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the public sector will be involved as it has been in the past in building, and as has been noted by the Member for Elmwood, there will always be specific building requirements, buildings that require, because of the nature of work expected to be done, or the kinds of programs they expect to house. I suppose the most prominent example of that is the construction that's currently under way of the \$5 million to \$6 million Environmental Lab; there's no question that that kind of a specialized building requirement will be undertaken and continue to be undertaken as the need arises by the public sector and this is through the aegis of the Department of Public Works.

What the new government recognizes, and to that extent will state as policy — although it's not graven in stone, to use an expression that is sometimes used in the House — that (a) there is a somewhat depressing surplus of straight commercial office space in the city. I am pleased to report that that is diminishing and that the private sector in several important incidences is being encouraged to ensure that a continued and stable supply of prime office space within the downtown area of Winnipeg will in effect take place. I am making special specific references to the commencement of the Eaton Square complex, the finally long-awaited developments at the corner of Portage and Main, along with other private initiatives that are being taken in that area by major buildings of prime commercial office requirements. I do not foresee, nor do I see it as the role of the department during the period of time that it's my responsibility to necessarily provide for all provincial needs, government needs. I believe the ratio that's just been announced and made available to the Committee, that of the 7 million square feet that government needs, we own 6 million. That ratio, just looking at that chart, has changed little, even despite the coming onstream of several major buildings like the Woodsworth Building, over the last five or six years — I can be corrected if I'm wrong, but it's in that area, I believe, and it has remained fairly constant — and I think that that is an acceptable ratio and ought to be continued in that way.

MR. USKIW: I simply raised the point because of the need to recognize that if you want to use the Department of Public Works as a catalyst in the economy, then obviously there has to be some thought given long in advance as to the projected needs that the Public Works Department will have in the next decade or the next period of time, and to be able to have preliminary work, design work done in order to make it possible to engage in fairly large construction projects, if indeed the government wants to play a role in terms of providing employment in periods of high unemployment.

It's in that context that I raise the need for some advance planning; in other words, we should be planning in either five year cycles or three year programs or something like that, so that you can pull a project off the shelf and plug it in at a time that it is most beneficial to the economy of the province. It would be counter-productive, for example, to plug in a new project at a time when construction activity was very buoyant and in fact you had very high tenders coming in, so it's in that context that I raise those questions. There are times to move which are most beneficial to a number of interest areas, (a), the public, in terms of the tax dollars spent; (b) the unemployment question and how public investment could deal with that question through the Department of Public Works. All of those, however, require quite a bit of preplanning and some projecting as to the needs of government

into the future in order that preliminary work could be done, in order to make it possible to have as much flexibility as indeed is possible in the system. It's in that context that I raise the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to thank the Member for Elmwood who gave me the opportunity to raise my question now, because I didn't want to get back to the Education Estimates, but frankly the Minister has answered a number of the questions I was going to raise. He was less operatic this afternoon and much more intelligible from my perspective.

A MEMBER: He was in more of a hurry today.

MR. PARASIUK: In more of a hurry possibly. I think that the whole question of this ratio of public to lease space is one that does require judgment, and generally I would think that the permanent requirements will probably be housed in public space than those things which are transitional, or reflecting introductory programs or what have you, would probably be housed in a leased space and I can see the rationale for doing that. I think that there probably are technical studies within the department that indicate the long term needs for space can probably most cheaply be met by the public building and owning the building. I think that the Department of Public Works probably has such technical studies although I've never seen any and really I'm not calling for them now, but I do think that such technical studies exist.

I noticed in the Globe and Mail the other day that there is a bit of controversy in Ontario on this item, where the Department of Public Works there has done a study which indicates that longer term office needs of the government of Ontario could best be met by the government building and owning it's own space and only leasing on a transitional basis. And, since the Minister has already indicated that that generally is his position, I'd just like to ask him if he could possibly undertake to try and get that study and I wouldn't mind taking a look at the technical analysis that has been raised in that analysis. I could probably get it myself, but I think the Department of Public Works probably has better contacts with the Department of Public Works in Ontario. That's the only question I really have to place now.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make it clear and leave on the record that the Department Planning and Design staff is indeed at all times trying to anticipate future government requirements, and in that sense is doing preliminary design work. We get indicators from client departments as to their needs. The client anticipates when they see legislation being forwarded and talked about and being passed in the House, that it will have space implications for the department, and in that manner the department is constantly in its planning division, design division, doing preliminary estimates as to future space requirements by whatever department or program that it may require.

I suppose, and I don't mind saying so, that in a sense there will be I suppose, a different, an expressed different attitude and direction of the Department of Public Works as distinct from that which has been suggested by the Member for Lac du Bonnet just a few moments ago that, (a) we do not see ourselves in terms of being that catalyst in terms of providing the leadership in this respect, if you want to use that term, although I know it will get bounced back on me. We think that we can provide similar stimulus in those areas that are of equal concern in terms of job creation, in terms of keeping the construction industry as fully employed as we can, in a general way creating the kind of economic climate and policies, employment in this province that will induce and hopefully encourage the private sector to carry on with that building. I think what's happening currently, in this first summer of construction year that we're facing, is indicative of some success in that measure. I must say, that the government will also, as I might say I'm informed from time to time, use its space needs and requirements to spur on a development. It's been indicated to me that while there was not any finality to it, but the previous administration had talked about securing some 60,000, 70,000 square feet of space, for instance, in the Trizec Development with the idea that that would move that multi-million dollar project ahead.

Now, you know, in the final analysis we can argue as to the benefits of ownership or leasing. But in the context that it was raised in the committee it was a matter of job creation, it was a matter of keeping the construction industry open and I can't recall precisely when I said that, but in that sense, I don't think we have done as good a job in spurring on the kind of planned and desirable downtown development through the use of the mechanism of securing some long term space requirements in some of these major developments.

Other cities across Canada have done that in a more meaningful way and have secured for themselves the kind of favorable downtown development — well that'll always be questioned, I suppose, in the eyes of the beholder. But, I know that in the major downtown complex in Edmonton, for instance, the municipal governments in the City of Edmonton, leases some upwards to 30 percent of the space in their, I don't know what it's called, McDonald Square Complex in the centre of Edmonton, along with I believe, some utilities companies of the province of Alberta, have leased additional, you know, are major customers of space in that area. And, you know, the securing of these kind of desirable long term tenants made the development of that square possible.

I throw these out just as musings of the Minister at this point, but the point that I think I want to leave on record is that essentially the Department main responsibility will to anticipate future needs of government. To anticipate future needs of the various departments, and to be in a position,

planning and design-wise to be able to respond to them at any given time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just before the Member for Transcona carries on, I wanted you to take note of the fact that the lights were off. We were trying to accommodate the Member for Point Douglas as quickly as we could. He wasn't, unfortunately, here this afternoon. Yesterday he raised the fact that we had the lights on too often. Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd just like to raise something in connection with what the Minister said just now, and I really don't even raise it in an argumentative manner, because I think many of the points he raised have validity. I just ask him to be careful regarding government commitments to very large scale developments in Winnipeg, which doesn't experience that type of rapid growth, and the one that does concern me to a degree, is the proposed East Yard development which is a very intensive use of the east yard property, and conceivably could result in the detracting of the Portage-Main Street area as the downtown part of Winnipeg, and frankly, I see the East Yard development as being a bit too far away from the Portage area to really reinforce that part, and that type of development would actually act in direct competition to the Portage development. I think we are probably at a watershed period with respect to Portage Avenue; it could quite easily continue to deteriorate, because it is deteriorating slightly now, and I would hate it to become a type of North Main, because I think the problem with North Main was that it was allowed to deteriorate too much and it's very difficult developing that type of climate whereby people would want to get into the North Main area.

I'm just a bit wary of a very large development in the East Yard development, which in one way or another would be somewhat stimulated or reinforced by public sector investment with respect to public transportation right to that particular area with respect to public housing or other types of housing in that area, or also with respect to taking out lease commitments for office space which I know is being proposed for that development. That development looks very grandiose and in a sense may in some respects compare with some of the major downtown developments taking place in other cities in Canada, and we might feel a bit proud of that. But at the same time, I would be afraid of the negative impact that that type of development might have on the Portage Avenue area.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just on that matter, let me assure the Member for Transcona and other members of the Committee that (a), no commitment of substantial space has been made by this government and/or agencies of the government with respect to the securing of long-term leasehold space in any of the projects, major development projects now either at commencement stage or on the horizon. What the Honourable Member for Transcona says, and I have a tendency to agree with him, underlines a concern that I expressed, the kind of spreading out of the development area to the detriment of the main central part of the city where the public already has considerable public investment, and I refer specifically to the Convention Centre. I think to totally maximize a facility such as the Convention Centre, it requires a high-density, fully utilized — particularly in our country with either underground courses, skywalks, integrated with shopping centres, convention hotel facilities, this kind of concentrated — you know, it may not from a country boy be a desirable kind of matter but certainly in terms of the utilization of such a facility as the Convention Centre, and its success hinges on the fact that we don't disperse our efforts and in fact allow the centre area to denigrate in any substantial way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there's a couple of interesting questions here. The Minister expressed a concern for over-building in the private sector but nevertheless he also talked about a balance. I have really two questions for him, one is, is he indicating to the Committee, is the Minister indicating to the Committee that he's not going to develop a dogmatic approach to the question of leasing or building, but he is in fact going to come up with a mix, he's going to continue the mix; he's not going to do what I have been afraid he is going to do, namely to, from now on, lease all government requirements. Do I understand him to say that he will lease government requirements, but he will also build government requirements?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the facts speak for themselves. We will lease where we think it's appropriate to lease; we will build where we think it's appropriate to build.

MR. DOERN: Then I would ask him, in his concern for the developers who obviously misjudged the market and were unable to anticipate or correctly make projections, they overbuilt and find themselves stuck with quantities of government space. I don't know if the Minister has had any meetings with these people; I'm sure he has; I know that as Minister of Public Works one of the requirements I think you need is a number of buckets which should be placed in front of your desk, and when the developers come and the architects come and the engineers come they will cry buckets before the Minister because of the fact that unless they do, they may wind up with no money and no jobs and no salaries.

So I understand his concern; he expressed a concern that there has been overbuilding of private office space, and although he gives us figures of 6 million and 1 million I think he would also agree that some of these requirements couldn't be leased; we've never thought in this province — no Conservative Minister that I know of has ever said to a private developer, "Build me a hospital and I'll

lease it from you," or "Build me a Red River Community College," I mean, we've always built our own requirements in those departments.

I simply say to him, on the other side of his concern does he have any concern for the unemployed construction workers and the architects and the engineers. I would develop that to this extent: there's a 30-odd percent unemployment rate in construction and the architects and engineers are facing some pretty hard times.

Now, I have some information that I obtained earlier in the week which is also in today's Tribune in the column of Frances Russell. I have some additional information that she doesn't have in her column. But it mentions in there that Ministers — (Interjection) — My source is a number of members of the — (Interjection) — No, no, people in the architectural profession and engineering profession. I understand that delegations have come to the government and have been turned away. They have asked, in effect, of the Ministers — I cannot name all of them; I can name one of them but I will not name him at the moment. But I will ask this Minister whether or not he has had approaches on behalf of various architectural and engineering firms who have come and asked what indications there were of the government resuming its construction program and also lifting the freeze. Many of these people hold in their hands contracts for buildings that were planned by our government that were frozen or perhaps discussions — they may be interested in other opportunities that may come from the new administration, so I'm saying, did the Minister callously, as the Mayor of Winnipeg was recently reported, that when he went to the Minister of Urban Affairs he was told, about arena aid, to go to hell.

First of all, I ask the Minister whether he has been approached recently by architects and engineers for work, for new work or to unfreeze work that they had been assigned. Has he been approached, and what has been told them?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the central question there was, am I concerned? Of course I'm concerned, and I met not only with the architects but also with members of the construction and building trade unions early on and expressed a similar concern. I don't know how much actual work would, in fact, have been in progress for this coming year, because in many instances they were matters on the planning boards only and in the early design stages.

I can't help but note that while I didn't read the particular article that the member refers to, I can recall a few days earlier a similar press report indicating the slowness or some of the difficulties that the architectural firms, in particular, are experiencing. But the article that I read notes that this is general throughout the country and while he knows certainly the situation in Manitoba, that that is a general situation which I think is perhaps indicative of government overbuilding and overexpending itself in this particular, not just here in Manitoba but across the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not I keep a crying towel in my office for bruised architects or architectural firms, I can make a comment that there is, in my judgment, as great a danger to encourage firms of this nature to become so overly dependent on government contracts and government work that for reasons, and the kind of very serious reasons that we face, not just here in Manitoba but reasons that were confirmed at the First Ministers' Conference by the Prime Minister, by our Premier, read into the record, the comments made from that conference by all Premiers, First Ministers in this country, indicating that because of the general economic situation in Canada that there would have to be a slowdown and a reduction of the public sector's initiatives in many areas, including the area of Public Works projects, in the hope and in the reliance that there could be a better balance achieved in encouragement of the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the . . . And of course we will agree to disagree on this matter, but I believe that with some of the encouraging announcements that are happening in the private sector with respect to major multi-million dollar plans and projects actually now under way that the architectural firms in this province, along with the construction industry as a whole — labour and management — can hopefully look to more stable and fuller employment opportunities in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I am generalizing; I know that. I read into the record earlier on in my presentation of Public Works the specific works and project areas that have, in fact, been lifted from the freeze, if you like, that was imposed last November, and are proceeding with. Hansard will show those particular individual projects as being proceeded with.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister inform us whether he was the one, or one of a number of Ministers, who told the architectural representatives that there were too many architects and engineers in Manitoba, and that he would be happy, or he would not be unhappy if some of those firms wound-down or wound-up, or left the province? Did he tell that to the architects?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly wouldn't say something of that nature, and I would have to place extreme incredibility as to the possibility that any other Minister might have said that.

Now, having said that, I recognize and I don't see this as being any different than any other field of activity in a relatively free and open society, in a reasonably free and open market situation, whether it's architects or highway contractors that find themselves, because of lack of work in any given jurisdiction, move out to sister jurisdictions. When we were busy building in the Sixties major earthwork projects like the Red River Floodway, the Assiniboine Diversion, the Shellmouth Dam, major construction efforts in the area of dirt-moving and earth-moving, we had a preponderance of those kind of contractors available to us here in the province, many of them coming to this province from far away places such as Quebec, who had just finished some major work in their line in that

province. That kind of shifting and moving about of contractual construction firms and architectural firms is, I think, a natural component of our way of life in this country and I express no particular desire to see it pegged at any particular level. Because I don't believe, and I simply don't believe that the government, and certainly not during the tenure of our term of office, will really be attempting to say that, you know, this is a desirable level of activity and we will, whether space is required or not, build to that level in order to maintain the full employment of several architectural firms.

We will build when we think it's necessary to build, and when we can find the necessary dollars to build, and we will lease when we think it is appropriate to lease and when the space is required.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to sort of read the message to architects and engineers in Manitoba, and draftsmen, and contractors, and construction employees, and I read that the Minister is saying as follows: That there may be some construction. There may be some unfreezing but that at least in the next year or two the picture is bleak; that the government does not intend to undertake very much in the way of construction. Sixty-five percent, apparently, of architectural and engineering work relates to government, depends on government. MHRC is going to wind down. I don't know about hospital construction. It doesn't seem as if there is going to be much doing there, or schools. Certainly not much in public works. Hydro — we know some of the hydro projects have been frozen, and so on.

It strikes me that the message — (Interjection) — I will not talk about hydro; it's not my speciality. I simply say to the Minister that he appears to be giving a message, telegraphing to the people in the construction industry including architects and engineers, that the future in Manitoba is bleak and that they should take their business elsewhere or wind down. Now, is that the message that the Minister is giving us?

Well, I mean, you know the Member for Rock Lake, my honourable colleague of 12 years, he says he can't believe this. But then I have to ask him whether the opposite is true. I have to say that the impression is not that the government is going to maintain a high level of activity: build public housing, build new hospitals, build new schools, build new facilities required for public works or hydro. If that's his impression, it sure isn't the impression that his government is giving. I wish that they were continuing a high level of activity, but the opposite impression is what is coming through. And I am asking the Minister whether his message to these professions isn't really a very bleak one? Maybe a realistic one, a message of restraint, but for them they will take it right on the chin; they are the ones who will feel the impact the most.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could maybe comment at this time if the Honourable Minister does not mind me making comments on up-to-date on-the-street situations that are occurring, because the Minister, I know, is very busy in his department as a government member and Treasury Bench member, that he might not be in contact with as many engineers or architects that I am. And I want to make it very clear to the committee before I make my comments, that I am an engineer. I'm also a contractor. I also want to make it very clear that I've never done any business with the government and don't intend to while we're in government, or as a member of the Legislature. But, I want to tell you something, Mr. Chairman, that I have talked to architects, I've dealt with architects; I've talked with engineers, not with all of them in Manitoba, but I would say a good number of the major ones in the last six months. As a member of the Legislature, they have indicated to me their concern; they have said one very basic common thing, Mr. Chairman: yes, we became dependent on government business; yes, we are concerned that what's happening is going to affect us.

But, I would say in a court or anywhere because I'm that type of individual, and I hope that all members of the Legislature are, that the majority of the people that I've talked to, architects and engineers have said, what you're doing is right. We got lulled, I wouldn't say lulled, they said that we got involved in doing consulting work for the government of the day and in some cases some of them have had 90 percent of their business with the government. And all of a sudden they recognized what was happening, but being free enterprisers, which maybe the honourable member doesn't recognize, never having worked as a free enterpriser — (Interjection) — well, my apologies if he has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please direct your comments to the Chairman

MR. MINAKER: My apologies, Mr. Chairman. They have indicated to me that what we are doing is correct. And not only that, they have gone out and started as good free-enterprisers to go and look for business elsewhere. But I must advise the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that as free-enterprisers, they go where they're most efficient, and if they have a government that wants to wheel out the business and think that government has to do all the business, then as good free-enterprisers, they will go where they're most efficient. That's the name of the game in the free enterprise system. But they have also indicated when — the Honourable former Minister has indicated when times are tough — and the government of the day has decided that we have spent too much and we have to put the books back into shape. They recognize this, and they're versatile enough to go out and start to get after other business, which they have done.

I would say, I'm sure the pressures have been on the present Minister to try and correct the situation, but I also have to advise the Honourable Minister which he's I'm sure very aware of, that the

people who have not gone into business because the government of the day was throwing away free rides or easy business. The ones that have been there from the old days and from recent years that want to stay in Manitoba and keep working, have looked at the situation and gone out and tried to correct it, and are out working on it right now.

So I don't believe that the architectural profession, or the engineering profession or, in fact, the construction area, the ones that are here and want to stay, will die because the government has decided to cut back. And that's what the former Minister doesn't really understand about the free enterprise system. That people will dig in, in the same way that our farmers will dig in; in the same way as my colleagues that are farmers, when they have good times, they go out and spend their money, but when the times get tough, they dig in. They don't give up the soil because times are tough. The same way that the architects and the engineers who are working in our province that want to stay here, don't give up, they dig in. They dig in very tough and they try and maintain their staff level to the level they can. And I'll be honest with the Honourable Member for Elmwood, they can't maintain everybody. But the whole idea of saying that everything has to be dependent on government is not the correct approach in my opinion; maybe in his opinion, it obviously is.

I'm just saying to the honourable member that the profession has dug in, has recognized the situation that we're in, and I have to commend them. I believe that Manitoba is one of the forerunners of what the rest of Canada has to do if we want to survive as a country, not wholly dependent on other areas. That's what I believe is happening in Manitoba, and the professional and the contracting field has recognized this.

So, Mr. Minister, I would just like to advise you, which maybe you are already aware of, I'm sure you are, that the word on the street, putting it in layman language, is that the architects and the engineers and the contractors have recognized the situation that we're in in Manitoba. They recognize the situation that we are in as Canadians — tighten their belts, buckling down, and they're going out and trying to produce and create jobs and create business so they can survive. But they're prepared to do this, and they're not saying that we have been castrated to the point that we're wholly dependent on the government either Provincial or Federal to do the work, but we are still free enterprisers, we are still Manitobans, we're prepared to do it. I just wanted to make this comment at this time, Mr. Minister, because that is the word on the street as I read it, and I would think in the majority of the areas that the former Minister has spoken about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Well, I had a basic observation I wanted to preface my question by. In Public Accounts on Page 121, I noted with interest that adding up the salaries of the Architectural Engineering, there was approximately very close to \$1 million in salaries paid out last year, and yet the surprisingly, in fact, I say alarmingly, the Member for Elmwood seems to be holding a tag day for the professional people in this province who were. . . —(Interjection— Well, he seems to be encouraging more government building whether we need it or not.

The question I'm saying, can we foresee the in-house use of this staff, and is their type of evaluation that possibly federally is taking place, where when a particular government has a large staff and there's some evaluation as to in-house work vis-a-vis contracting out, because if there is a particular need in the community there, that possibly, if it was evaluated properly, it might be cheaper to contract out some of the particular work. The jobs couldn't be handled by the particular staff, because the same Member for Elmwood, you know, he's also seems to be encouraging more building and seems to be encouraging more spending. I noted with interest, when he was the Minister, that he had \$170,000 worth of purchases of art, and these are the kind of thing that one has to be alarmed at, at this stand that he's taking for injecting this enthusiasm to get more government work for the private sector. And I wonder if the Minister was aware that his salaries almost totalled a million dollars and can he foresee if there is a freeze, if there is a cutback in unnecessary government building, that possibly there might be some savings in this area?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there will be undoubtedly, and that's of course what the architects are bringing to the attention of the government, possibly some notable reduction in that particular area of expenditure that the Member for Wolseley draws our specific attention to. But the Department of Public Works again in its responsibilities shares with the private sector and does not build into its in-house staff any more professional help that we require in this area than we think is absolutely necessary. I suppose a person could comment on the anomaly that's being expressed here; on the one hand the former Minister of Public Works, and supported by his colleagues, is suggesting that the public sector in the area of building and owning buildings should be all-embracing and with little or no room left for the private sector to be in the business of leasing space or providing space for a government. They have expressed concern that nothing should happen to change that ratio of roughly six to one, or seven to one, to help out the private sector, but just a moment ago we have the plaintive plea here for private architects, private engineering and construction firms, who are experiencing some difficulty because of the general slowdown in their fields of activity. And on that particular area, that has been the story of the building construction throughout the history of Canada. When you have major construction works taking place in specific areas of the province, all things tend to flow there. We have major developments currently underway in the provinces such as Alberta; we can look forward to a massive and major involvement in the business of pipeline building.

But let me use this one particular example on the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and ask him

Friday, May 5, 1978

whether or not he wants me to unfreeze a major billion dollar construction enterprise in the Province of Manitoba that would undoubtedly provide jobs this summer for 5,000 skilled craftsmen and tradesmen, and I'm referring to a freeze that their government imposed, and quite sensibly so, and perhaps, let me correct it; not so much their government but the directors and the management of Hydro, that simply indicated that with the growth rate that we are experiencing, we cannot proceed with the billion dollar development of the Limestone Dam and hydro project on the Nelson.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the answer is so simple; are we prepared, for the sake of providing a billion dollars worth of construction industry in the Province of Manitoba, and employing 4,000 or 5,000 people on that project, to face a general 30 percent increase in hydro rates at the same time, which are imposed on every householder, on every farmer, on every user of that valuable resource, which further makes it difficult for the private sector to enter into the debate, enter into the business . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk. What is your point of order?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, my concern would be that the Minister is going to carry on the debate in Hydro, that he's going to bring about a response, and I would think that you should call the Minister to order before we do enter into the entire field of Hydro and bring about responses I'm sure you're concerned about avoiding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he's generally talking about construction in Manitoba and I think the members of the Committee have all talked about it, and they've really strayed away from leasing in the general . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, you're going to find yourself in a debate on hydro rates because the Minister has introduced, opened the door to that type of debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate the comments on the point of order from the Member for Selkirk, that I overheard the Member for Elmwood mention Hydro and hydro rates, and I think that the Minister is quite in order if this is going to be allowed. And I would just like to say on the point of order that we can go on and debate here for hours and hours, I just want to say, on the total context of what we're debating here today, that my colleagues, or my friends on the other side, don't seem to realize that governments don't create wealth, whether you talk about Hydro, whether you talk about the Public Works or what-have-you, when we're talking about jobs. But Mr. Chairman, I just wanted that for the record, that governments don't create wealth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Back to the Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I would of course abide by your ruling except the issue was raised not to debate hydro rates; the issue was raised, and the Honourable Member for Selkirk wasn't around the Committee table just a few moments ago when the Member for Lac du Bonnet as well as the Member for Transcona to some extent, and the Member for Elmwood, has been pressing on the Minister and on the government that the public sector should take the slack out of the construction industry currently being experienced, and that we should act as the catalyst in terms of spurring on the employment in an area where there is, admittedly, an unacceptable level of unemployment. I am merely demonstrating with the Hydro example what the cost is at the other end of the scale. I do not introduce the subject matter to debate the matter of Hydro here, but I can't think of a more stark example currently facing us right here in Manitoba, very germane to Manitoba, than the consequences of tomorrow, directing Hydro to commence full-blown the stalled, you know, development of the Limestone plant which is a billion dollar construction site . . .

A MEMBER: No one said that . . .

MR. ENNS: Well, no, but the consequences are so very ready and so apparent in that example, Mr. Chairman, if I can persist, that nobody is saying it and nobody is arguing it. But, Mr. Chairman, the other example of uncontrolled government expenditures, merely for the sake of providing, you know, employment whether the space is required or not has more subtle but similar implications to the general tax base in this province and to the general ability of those who have to compete within the private sector to be able to carry on business with the competitive neighbours and to be able to provide those job opportunities in the private sector that by far the majority, the majority of Manitobans working require. And I use this occasion only and I will desist from repeating it, to demonstrate that particular point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . respond to the Minister. . . point of order, if hydro buildings or hydro development came within his portfolio and we were discussing expansion of Hydro projects and

what the effects might be under his Ministry, I could see the invalidity of my point of order. But we are dealing with government buildings and if the Honourable Minister wants to debate as to overall economic or social detriment in building more government buildings within his portfolio, that's one issue, but he is entering into a field that properly belongs to the Minister of Finance, responsible for Hydro, and that is the hydro developments in the north.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on just a couple of more points in this section. No one has ever said, I have never said, that buildings should be built for the sake of building them. What we have said is when there is a requirement or there is a need that the government then has an option. The option is either to lease or build. Those are the basic options when you require space. Nobody has ever said, "Let's build building, and then see whether or not we have any use for them." There might be an incentive in a time of high unemployment to bring something on track earlier, but no one in their right mind would build a building that wasn't required. The decision that any government faces is whether they should go out and have someone build a building for them and lease it, or lease an empty building, or lease a building that's under construction, or build that requirement. Those are the kind of decisions that we're all confronted with.

Now the advantage of leasing that everyone knows, especially members of the Conservative Party, is that it's less visible; you see that's the hooker there. If you lease space around the city people don't know about it as much as if you put up a building. So there's I suppose a political advantage there, if you want a low profile. You can get the same amount of space, but no one can point and say that that is a government building. And that is what the Roblin administration did essentially. The Campbell government built the Norquay Building or started the plans, started the ball rolling, the Roblin government built it, and from the time the Roblin government finished the Norquay Building, to the time that we built the Woodsworth Building, in effect, there was really no office construction of note, but there was a hell of a lot of leasing going on. I think that is the point.

Now another point that I would like to make is that the Minister talked about whether or not we would build all our requirements. We have never done that. We have never tried to do that. In fact we had a policy established in Cabinet whereby I think, it was something to the effect that when you have a requirement in a town as an example, that you do not take all the government office space, consolidate it in one building, and build it, thereby winding down all the leases from businessmen in the towns. We came up with a policy I think, and I'm not exactly sure of whether we said that if you had 100 percent requirement for space, about onethird would be continued to be leased, or whether it was one-half. It is one of those two.

So, and then what happens is when you build a building you find, usually like in Selkirk we built a building, there was still space being leased and after a while there was additional space being leased in the town. I'm sure the same thing will happen in Portage or in other areas where — like in Brandon, we put up a building, all of a sudden the building was fully occupied and there was more space rentals going on. And that makes sense rather than putting an addition on right away, you continue to lease and then at another point in time you might say well, now we'll take up half of what we are leasing.

I want to just a talk to the Member for St. James, but he is not here so I'll hold my remarks for him.

I just have two more points here to the Minister. I would ask him this. In view of the difficulties of architects and engineers in the province today, one of the things that we did, I ask him whether he is doing this or is going to consider doing this, in view of a very very tough market for them, is he having in terms of projects, like the environmental lab etc., projects like that, is he, and can he cite any instances where he is asking architects and engineers to complete the design drawings even if the construction will not go forward at this time? Because by so doing, the architects and engineers will have employment, the plans will be ready and when the government decides to take those projects off the shelf, they will then be able to proceed with construction. Can he indicate whether or not there is any policy in that regard?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe generally that we try to keep the horse well in front of the cart, once a decision is made by government policy-wise, to proceed with a major addition whether it's a school or hospital or other public building, then the staff within the department proceeds in a normal course of seeing that works proceed along the lines suggested by the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I then ask just one another general question now and that is this, that given the fact that rents are escalating every year, there is an increase in rents, and that there is also a considerable amount of slack in the construction industry and the architectural engineering area, would this also not be a good time to build, namely that the Minister should be considering the fact that rents are rising and that contractors are hungry, that there is a considerable amount of competition around, that people are willing to cut prices, are willing to come up with good prices and so on, is this not a good time to build, and is the Minister also reassessing his policy of unfreezing or freezing construction at this time?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that in the course of the last year, indeed the last several years, rents in the commercial sector have in fact decreased as a result of the pressure on the owners

Friday, May 5, 1978

of buildings where essential vacant space has been experienced. And certainly in the last year, and certainly during the period of time that I had responsibility for the department, we are receiving very favourable offers of rental space. In many instances, you know, rents that would have to be described as really the bottom line where it is questionable whether the owner is receiving anywhere near a normal return' if I can use that phrase. I recognize that rents aren't fixed and that those rents will in fact probably increase the next time a lease is re-negotiated, but in many instances we have signed comparable to a few years ago. We have leased space at very attractive rates.

MR. DOERN: I would like to see if the Minister could provide us with any examples, or could perhaps on Monday provide us with some examples where he has had offers of reductions in rental space. Because I find that most unusual. Mr. Chairman, I think that concludes my comments there, at least for the moment, unless the Member for St. James . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley has indicated he'd like to speak and the Member for Selkirk, and I might just remind all members of committee that we are still on the same item that we opened on first thing this morning.

MR. WILSON: I realize this is on the expense side of the ledger and we're talking about leased accommodation but I wanted to ask the question for the record of an Industrial Park that we own and it would possibly be — (Interjection) — I know it would be — but it would be — the comment is if we are leasing space is there any way where we could lease tarpaulins or covers or something to cover all those planes that we've picked up, or is there an intention to sell them, because I can see where we're storing a lot of equipment in a government building that would be better, if I can use the expression, better to have them stored under canvas somewhere or sold. So my comment then is where are the — just so that I can put this question on the record — where are all those planes now? Are they stored in our government leased accommodation?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that we are in fact currently trying to find alternate means of storing those planes that the member brings to our attention. Whether or not we can take up his suggestion of mothballing them in the way that he suggests is one that perhaps could be considered. We've approached, I think, the Department of Highways for some of the, you know, equipment that might be utilized by them. I would think that the member may also wish to ask that question of the Minister responding for the MDC, I suppose, who is the receiver or owner of these craft as to what the future disposition of them is. We at the Department of Public Works don't know whether it's a long-term holding operation. Do we mothball them for the next generation of Manitobans to come in view at a suitable occasion or is it a temporary requirement of space from us?

MR. WILSON: It was just that if we're storing them in a government building it just seemed to me that in order to minimize our losses that we should be trying to lease out that space because it's another item under another time — I just wanted to put that on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I know that you, Mr. Chairman, are familiar with this leased area, and it was a question I raised last night and I wonder if the Minister has information. The leasing of the office space for the Department of Industry and Commerce in Selkirk that was vacated, brought back into Winnipeg — the services — and I'm just wondering if that lease was permitted to expire or whether there is still a term left in connection with that lease.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that particular lease expires on May 31st. It will then lapse — in Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: We're having to pay rent now on a vacant office?

MR. ENNS: For the remainder of the month.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, I want to make one brief comment. I'm really surprised at all the undue haste to vacate premises that are providing a decentralized service in a regional centre even at the expense for a period of time — two months I believe would be here — two to three months of rental, which I'm sure is not insignificant.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm betwixt and between now. I was chastised a moment ago by his colleague, the Member for Elmwood, telling me that what with some of these staff reductions why isn't the department indicating and showing less space than is being occupied, or what are we doing to ensure that taxpayers' dollars aren't being unwisely spent in this regard. I'm simply indicating in this specific example given by the Member for Selkirk that I think what would have to be determined is within all reasonable description, you know, the department is acting as you would expect it to act. Space that is no longer being required by the department is lapsing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: I would ask the Minister if he is going to reply to the charge made by his colleague, the Member for Wolseley, who I note is not in the room. The Member for Wolseley raised the point that a million dollars had been paid for in-house architectural salaries and by implication made the charge that there were architects now sitting around in the department doing nothing. Will the Minister reply to this charge?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to reply to the charge because that wasn't the manner in which the subject matter was raised. The Honourable Member for Wolseley was referring to the roughly a million dollars that was being paid to outside architects — as he gleaned them from the Public Accounts Records — and, indeed, if anything, I can only indicate that in conjunction with the statements made earlier who was pleading on behalf of the architects, these same architects, that it's my hope that we can bring on to line and to move on to production and design stage those particular projects that are under way and those that we can see that will be required and have gained necessary Cabinet approval to ensure that whether it is at the same level but that it will be at an improved level in the coming years for these architects. But I make known to the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the concern was being expressed for not in-house architects — for the outside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass — the Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister, further to the information which he provided on the Selkirk example, I wonder if the Minister could advise the committee as to what other locations have office space been vacated in rural Manitoba as a result of centralizing services which were formerly provided in regional centres and rural points in the City of Winnipeg. Is Selkirk the only such instance or is it only the only instance that I can refer to because, of course, I'm quite familiar with this. Has it happened in other points in rural Manitoba as well?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I earlier indicated and read some of the areas where some space has been vacated but I'm not prepared, nor am I in a position to suggest that those spaces that are being vacated are being vacated for the reason given by the Member for Selkirk. For instance, included in that space on the list I read a little while ago when he was not at the committee — and I recognize that he has responsibilities on other committees — but, for instance, on this list is some 20,000 square feet vacated in the City of Portage la Prairie. The old provincial building that was turned over to the City of Portage la Prairie as a result of consolidation of space within the new provincial building in Portage la Prairie . . .

MR. PAWLEY: I'm not questioning that.

MR. ENNS: Well, I know, but my difficulty is I have a list of 53,829 square feet of space that has been vacated since October, the date of interest, I'm sure, to honourable members opposite, but I cannot give you that information. I'd be prepared to undertake to see whether I can't define that more clearly with regard to the specific question asked. I'm merely pointing out that I earlier indicated I have, you know, a list indicating numerous areas where small space has been vacated on St. Mary Avenue, in the Lakeview complex, but I suspect that that happens to be the case of vacating a ministerial office that no longer is being required there.

I have, you know, other areas in Dauphin and Ste. Therese but I would have to check with the departments involved whether or not that space is simply a normal matter of relocation of space into more desirable areas within the community or whether or not it can be attributable to the reduction of either program or staff. The most noticeable example of that total that I gave you is the 20,000 square feet that is on this list which I'm sure is not being questioned by any members of the space vacated in the old provincial building at Portage — space which has just simply moved over to the new provincial building. I hope the member appreciates my difficulty at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(1)—pass;

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I did want to reply to the Member for St. James, then maybe we could go on. I understand he was being held in the hallway. Just a couple of points in regard to what he said. He talked about belt tightening and so on and how architects are — they'd rather be unemployed and proud than to rely on the government. There's some sort of shame attached — proud to be a free enterpriser and rather be unemployed than employed with the government. You know, I don't want to get into a philosophical debate . . .

A MEMBER: Go ahead. Ah, come on, go ahead.

MR. DOERN: No, I simply say, I simply make one point philosophically, and that is that it's easy to tighten your belt when you have a 42 inch waist — you can tighten it to 40, and then you're doing okay.

Friday, May 5, 1978

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. David Blake: Just because I've taken over the Chair for a few moments I don't have to have personal aspersions cast on my . . .

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, you're interpreting my objective comment as a snide remark. It is not in reference to your considerable girth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I just wanted to say in general that I think the honourable member will have to take — you know, I believe him because I think that he is one of the more straightforward and candid members. I believe him when he tells me that some of the architects and engineers are telling him that — well, it's killing them but they agree with what the government's doing. But I think he should take that with a grain of salt because he is now a member of the government. He is a member of the Administration, and an engineer or architect could walk up to him and say: You know, George, your government is wrecking this province and doing this and doing that — it's not a very, shall we say, a small "p" political statement to make. It would be much smarter to say, "You know, George, I'm really happy about what you and Harry and all the other people are doing at the Legislature."

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, . . . references by surname to members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, all I'm saying is I don't want my colleague for St. James, who made some remarks before you were in the Chair . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Try and stick to Item (d)(1)Salaries.

MR. DOERN: I'm sticking to the reply made by the Member for St. James prior to your . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's up to you. The item under consideration, I would remind the Member for Elmwood, is Item (d)(1) Leased Accommodations, Salaries.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me three more sentences, I will conclude my comments made to the Member for St. James prior to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are they prepared?

MR. DOERN: Yes, I wrote them out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, three more sentences.

MR. DOERN: Sentence No. 1 is that he should take with a grain of salt what is said to him by people in the profession because if they would have said that to him when we were in office, about, "I am taking all this work and making all this money and doing all these things, but I hate the government, you know that I am with you." If they had said that to him, and now they are saying that they love the government even though it is killing them, then that would be all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The second sentence?

MR. DOERN: But I think — second sentence — I think that the member should be very careful about having people come to him, patting him on the back and saying, "You are doing a great job. My firm is going broke; I had to sell my car; my wife is selling apples on the street but, George, I want you to know that deep down, we are with you."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Third setntence?

MR. DOERN: That's it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (d)(1) Salaries—pass — the Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, just to advise the Honourable Member for Elmwood that I assure him that the people who may have commented that what we were doing was correct when we weren't in government and were getting the government business, a good number of them are now supporting the Liberal candidates in the Federal election. But the people who have indicated to me that what we are doing is correct and we are tightening our belts and going out and looking for business, I don't have to comment on the philosophy that they support. All I can say is they surely outnumbered by many the ones who were saying, we're for you; when you people were in power; and were doing considerable business with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (d)(1) Salaries—pass; Item (d)(2) Other Expenditures \$5,880,900—pass —

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, could we just have one brief explanation there, and that is, Recoverable from Canada — what does that line refer to?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that that is the cost-sharing of Federal programs, principally health programs which sometimes have a space component within the sharing formula.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (d)(2)—pass; (d)—pass; Item (e) Employee Housing, (1) Salaries \$88,100—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain the number of SMYs there, last year and this?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there is no change in the SMY requirements in this vote, 5.16 was voted in 1977-78, 5.16 in 1978-79. I assume from the figures the modest increase of \$6,300, that there is in fact no vacancy here but provides only for the general salary increases, annual merit increments. Sixteen weeks of term have been added to allow for vacation and/or sick leave relief.

MR. DOERN: Does the Minister understand just the bald statement in the Task Force Report that employee housing should be eliminated as far as possible and adequate charges made for the remainder? Does he know the logics behind that, and if he does, what is the alternative in some cases in remote communities — tents, igloos, dugouts — what does he propose that staff do in remote areas?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it certainly wouldn't be my intention to in any way second-guess my colleague or other members of the Task Force but I am prone to remark that the situation, particularly in remote communities, and that is principally where the department or the government is involved in employee housing, is one that hasn't received the kind of attention perhaps that the members of the Task Force ought to have applied to if indeed they chose to comment on it. We have an ongoing kind of, you know, difficulty. We recognize that we are often called upon to provide employee housing, certainly as part of the overall means of attracting suitable staff into these areas, and I really don't see the department getting out from the continuation of that kind of program. There may be refinements to it from time to time as the nature and the style of the service that is being provided may change, as you would expect any program to change from time to time, but it is certainly an area of considerable responsibility for the department to find the means to properly maintain these units at reasonable cost and to generally accept the responsibility for these units.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just a brief point here. I assume, as the Minister has said previously, that the policy of the department is unchanged, namely tendering out and announcing the bids, a public rather than a kind of a private commission situation, and that there will not be an undue preference given to a firm that has already been raised in the Chamber, namely Metropolitan, that he is not holding any brief for them and they will pay their money and take their chances like everybody else.

MR. ENNS: That is the situation, and that is the situation that will continue, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Does the Minister intend to maintain the present level of in-house security services that we have now? We have a certain number of employees in this and other buildings who are on our payroll and Public Works payroll. Does he intend to maintain that but, let's say, perhaps lease new requirements or contract out new requirements?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, this is one particular item that I have made my thoughts known to the honourable members of this committee and to the department, that where we have a reasonably high level of service available to us from the private sector, and where there can be and is indeed an active number of firms competing for the business, I wouldn't want to indicate that the department is taking any fixed position that a specific level or balance will be maintained. We will look at it pragmatically. Where it makes common sense to invite the private sector to gain gainful employment for their employees in this area, that will be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1)—pass; (f)(2)—pass; Resolution 105: Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$23,242,400 for Public Works—pass.

Item 3. Supply and Services, 3.(a)(1) Salaries under Senior Administration. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: One small item that I would like to raise here and perhaps the Minister could give us a partial answer and maybe a commitment, has to do — and of course it is carried further down in detail but I would like to raise it here in the early part — just a short item — that is that the Minister, I think, treated the Official Opposition generously when it came to the provision of space. I was given the task of negotiating with the Minister and much to my surprise and delight, the Minister gave us even a more generous allotment than I had hoped for, so I thank him for that. That, I think, enables us to function in proper circumstances as opposed to people crammed into one room.

Now, I realize that some of the members opposite may say, well, in the old days we were all crammed into our room, but there have been improvements made in the working conditions of MLAs over the years. We made, I think, significant improvements; you have made an improvement there. There are just a couple of items which don't amount to much but which I feel are essential for us to perform our duties, that I would like to ask you about. I think we are on the same wavelength here because it is too easy to say and too easy to think that we are not going to do anything for them, namely the opposition, etc. etc., but I don't believe that is the approach of the Minister. I just wanted to ask him a couple of quick points here.

We were promised a modern telephones communications hookup because we have our offices in the basement and upstairs we have two secretaries. We were promised — and I can't think of the name — a Centrex System. People came in, they studied our situation. The problem now is that each member has a telephone. If the member isn't there, it rings, the secretaries are sitting upstairs and no one is in the office and people are trying to get us, etc. etc. Just on that point, and I have a couple of other ones, could the Minister indicate when we are going to get that Centrex hookup?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am just about tempted to use the traditional expression, "soon." I must express some concern that that is not already in place. It was agreed to some time ago. The necessary instructions are in the hands of the appropriate officials. I will ask that senior staff take note of the member's comments and in fact try to expedite the installation of that system which I appreciate makes it somewhat awkward for the members opposite.

MR. DOERN: The other points are these: Again, and I think I am asking for minimum requirements to enable us to perform our duties, what I am asking for — I would also ask the Minister whether he could provide us perhaps with an additional typewriter or two downstairs, maybe manual or electric, that could be accessed by MLAs. That is one item.

But one of greater importance the Minister, I believe, could get approval from his colleagues for us — but I can tell you that we are labouring under some difficulty in regard to secretarial assistance. We have two secretaries year-round, but during the session we have no additional help. Now, our Leader has a secretary, which I believe is appropriate, and we have two for 22 MLAs. Now, during the year that is more than adequate, we don't need any more, but during the session, in my judgment we need a minimum of one extra person and probably two for a three to four-month period. I would ask the Minister whether he could make a comment as to whether this could be provided immediately or if he cannot ensure that now, whether he would undertake to make that provision for us next year because it is causing a considerable difficulty in terms of all the little things that secretaries do and particularly the typing load and photocopying and message-taking and so on. We are just not able to function properly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Public Works.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, now the Honourable Member for Elmwood is stretching my generosity too far. Does he not realize that there is a restraint program on?

MR. DOERN: Did you let one of your secretaries go?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the comments earlier expressed by the honourable member are appreciated. I think that we arrived at a reasonable division of space available. The matter of telephones will be looked into. I am not prepared to comment at this time as to those additional, particularly with respect to secretarial staff, that the member requests. I would ask the department to certainly undertake to look at what kind of additional requirements can be made. You've mentioned the question of perhaps an additional typewriter or so, those requests will be noted, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Well, I would thank the Minister for that and I would simply say that I couldn't too strongly emphasize the need for additional secretarial assistance during the session, that that is a problem. I think the members opposite would appreciate that, but maybe they still have some problem, but the point is that when you have 22 people sharing two secretaries and the session is really hot and heavy, it's just too much, they cannot handle that work load.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass; (a)(2)—pass.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, if I could just get clarification on those two increases of salaries and other expenditures, why the increase, any change in SMYs.

MR. ENNS: There are no changes, Mr. Chairman, only provisions for general salary increase and

Friday, May 5, 1978

annual merit increment. There's an Item 2, Other Expenditures, provisions for rise, the cost of stationery, private mileage payments and copying charges.

MR. DOERN: How many SMYs?

MR. ENNS: Four SMYs in this appropriation, no change,

MR. DOERN: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1) and (2)—pass; (b) Central Provincial Garage (a) Salaries.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, this opens up another major topic and there's a couple of items that I would like to discuss here, but I would like to make one point in reference to electric cars, and I make this largely for the benefit of my friend from St. James, and that is that there is, you know, considerable glee and chuckling and laughter on the part of members of the government about problems with electric cars. I would just cite to you . . .

A MEMBER: . . . me laugh about it? Did you ever see me laugh about it?

MR. DOERN: Well, the Member for Wolseley is laughing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order. Let the Member for Elmwood carry on.

MR. DOERN: I would just cite as an example, one article, Winnipeg Tribune, January 1978. "U.S. recalled 12.6 million vehicles in 1977." Now you know, here is the automotive industry, highly developed, highly skilled, thousands of engineers and designers and God know how many years of experience and how many million vehicles of production in Detroit, and they have a never ending problem with defects. They have not ironed out the bugs of the contemporary automobile.

A MEMBER: They have a warranty system.

MR. DOERN: I mean I myself, you know, drive an 11-year old Buick, it is a 1967, and it's in pretty good shape, but there were several items in that car from the beginning, I bought it a year-and-a-half old, there were several items on that car, right from the beginning that were clearly defects, engineering defects . . .

A MEMBER: But it got you from A to B though?

MR. DOERN: Yes. So, all I'm saying in general is electric car problems, you'd better believe it. We had plenty of problems. They still haven't ironed them out. They still have a long way to go. But even the contemporary gas engine automobile that we all drive has all kinds of defects, and if you buy a brand new car you have problems and if you run it for a while and then you get little notes from the manufacturer maybe that this little part has resulted in three collisions and deaths and as a result it will have to be recalled etc. etc. etc. That's the point I'm making. — (Interjection) — If the member didn't get it I'll repeat it, but . . .

MR. WILSON: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, my privilege is the Member for Elmwood has stated that I laughed at his purchase of the electric cars. I certainly did not laugh. I was more than concerned of the fact that that particular type of research information could have been gathered without a \$100,000 plus expenditure by the government, and I think it is a very serious blunder on his part and we'll just have to live with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, another couple of short topics before the long one, which I think we won't get into in too much detail today. The member, like a number of his colleagues I think is superb, that's the only word I can use, at flying trial balloons or kites. He has an ability here, like the seat-belt balloon and in fact there it is, I think it's right out the window, it's in bright red flying down on Osborne Street there. So, I'm saying he is pretty adept at this, I have to hand it to him because when someone says something politically the opposition usually pounces on it and sometimes they find out that it was a mistake to do so.

But I believe that he has made some comments about charging civil servants for parking. This is an old historic honourable subject and I would just like to know, if the Minister could indicate what his intents are. Is he going to introduce legislation or change — it wouldn't be legislation, a change in administrative policy? Has he spoken to his colleagues around the Cabinet table? What are his personal views on this matter? Does he intend to make civil servants pay for their parking, which up until now has been free?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have not considered that question in any way. I would assume that that would be a question that would quite appropriately be dealt with by those Ministers responsible,

negotiating with the Manitoba Government Employees Association as part and parcel of a wage and salary agreement. I would rather suspect that it always entered into those discussions. I can only indicate to the honourable member that I'm not a member of that sub-committee of Cabinet and that I have expressed no personal views or departmental views that is as Minister of Public Works. I can indicate to the honourable member nor have I heard around the Cabinet table, not that I feel bound to report to the Honourable Member Elmwood what I hear around the Cabinet table, but I have not, you know, I don't say that facetiously, I have not heard of any changes in this respect.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought, and I don't have all my clippings here, but I thought that a number of months ago that the Minister was quoted as saying that there was about to be a policy of charging employees, but perhaps I'm mistaken.

MR. ENNS: I am searching my own mind while the honourable member is asking that question. It is of course entirely conceivable that the printed word in the media does not always coincide with the actual noble and precise and accurate words that were mentioned by this Honourable Minister from time to time but I hold that to be one of the occupational hazards that he and I both are engaged in. In any event, there has been no consideration by the department, aside I suppose from the kind of consideration that has come up from time to time in trying to resolve some of our parking problems in some of our areas. We get proposals for instance, I think I mentioned it the other day at the committee, when I was being asked by some other member, you know, what kind of proposals am I getting in terms of the people, the private sector coming to me offering to build buildings for lease or for other reasons, I think I indicated that there was a proposal much in this general way from somebody suggesting that he would like to build a parkade or parking facility within this facility and offering X-number of car spaces to provincial employees, whom then I assume, if it were to be entered into as a commercial venture, would either be paying for their parking spots or indeed if it was a negotiated part of the agreement, the government would continue paying for it. But I can only recall it in that context that it may have been raised.

But in any event I think what's the important thing to consider here, it would not be up to the Department of Public Works or this Minister to unilaterally move in this direction without it being part and parcel of the negotiations which I understand are currently under way with the MGEA.

MR. DOERN: So, the Minister is telling me at the moment there is no policy on the back burner to charge civil servants for parking?. On the negative side, does the Minister have any plans to discourage the use of private automobiles, or does the government have any plans to discourage the use of automobiles and perhaps related to that, discourage the use of private automobile, on the other hand encourage the use of public transit, and/or.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any particular changes in policy direction, at this particular time. There is a great deal of discussion taking place within the department, as is noted by the Task Force, as to the possible changes that may occur within the government fleet. The size of the government fleet has come under some review and some question. The necessity of it being that size or the availability or the possibility of re-examining some leasing arrangements for some aspects of parts of the fleet. I am just throwing out the number of areas that are currently under review. It may be timely at this point to indicate to you that at the month end of March 31st, 1978, the provincial government fleet stands at some 2,415 vehicles. Percentage of sub-compacts and compact sedans versus all sedans is 34 percent. Well, I don't know whether these other matters are germane to the argument, but we have some in rough figures . . .

MR. DOERN: Well, that was my next question, so perhaps you could give us the break down.

MR. ENNS: Well, we have in total some 1,327 sedans . . .

MR. DOERN: What is the percentage of that? Is there a percentage there?

MR. ENNS: We have in the area of total wagons, that's compact wagons, intermediate wagons and standard design wagons, along with four 9-passenger wagons, an additional 124 in the wagon fleet.

MR. MINAKER: Could If the Minister could tell us how many of those have been returned under warranty because they didn't work like the electric cars.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, do I have to put up with these snide comments from members of the committee while I'm trying to give serious information to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister of Public Works carry on please.

MR. ENNS: Total vans list 518. Then we have in the area of half-ton and three-quarter ton pick-ups an additional 401. We have a total of 57 special vehicles which includes such things as a bus jeep, a one-ton truck, a two-ton truck, three-ton truck, four-wheel drive units, for a further total of 57 comprising of the grand total of 2,415 units.

Friday, May 5, 1978

MR. DOERN: The last point that I would like to ask here, but I have many other comments to make on the fleet and we won't be able to complete anything there today, but what is the Minister's intention in regard to the number of compacts and sub-compacts. He indicated about one-third of the, I guess the sedans were compacts and sub-compacts, we tried to increase this, does he have any goals in that regard?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that while there has been, you know, some difficulty in these units there is no change of substance considered. The recognition that manufacturers, generally, of the North American automobile are moving towards the smaller compact units. What we would have referred to as a compact unit a few years ago now has become the standard unit in many instances just about.

We anticipate that if we carry on in much the same way with the fleet and the fleet replacement, that we would have much the same situation and the composition of the fleet would be much the same.

MR. DOERN: So you have no intention to increase the percentage of compacts?

MR. ENNS: We are finding that in the purchasing of our standard units, we are getting perhaps closer to the compacts in that instance, intermediate and sub-compacts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would direct the honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 34 pupils of Grade 9 standing from the Grant Park High School under the direction of Mr. Dooly. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights and also, — there's a little confusion — but also the Member for Crescentwood who happens to be in the other committee room chairing the other committee this afternoon.

I would ask the honourable members to please welcome these students.

I direct the honourable members to Page 28, Department of Education, Clause 6. University Grants Commission. Clause 6.—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the Honourable Minister had concluded his remarks during the 30 seconds or so that he spoke at the time that the committee broke for lunch, or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I believe when we did recess for lunch, I had been speaking to the point brought forward by the Member for Burrows in regard to the fee increase and I had pointed out that in our neighbouring province of Saskatchewan, they pay some \$625 in tuition fees and in Arts Course as opposed to \$540 in the Province of Manitoba with the increase. I believe that type of comparison, Mr. Chairman, points out the tremendous discrepancy that had existed in this province and had been allowed to exist over a considerable number of years. Of course, even with the increase which at 20 percent is considerable in a year, we still are some \$85.00 below that level that exists in Saskatchewan. If the Honourable Member for Burrows can then claim that our fee structure, as it now exists, is exorbitant, out of the way, not comparable to other provinces, I'd be very interested in how he would justify that particular point.

He brings up several other costs that occur in our society and I certainly agree with him that these increases do happen. I don't think that they are going to necessarily mean that anyone will have to miss going to university because of that particular fact. It may produce some hardship for some individuals; I certainly would be the first to admit that, however, there are many of us who I am sure have enrolled at university and endured some financial hardship — at least we felt it was hardship at that time — in order to get the type of training and the type of education that we felt would be of value to ourselves and to society in the future.

He mentions, of course, that it is people at the bottom of the economic scale who will be most affected by this. I would suggest to him that it is perhaps the people at the bottom of the scale, students in that particular category or who have parents in that category, who find it most easy to avail themselves of government bursaries and of government loans to help them along. Whereas those who are in the so-called "middle" of the economic scale are the ones who, in fact, if anyone suffers under this type of circumstance, feel the pinch, because they are just over the borderline of eligibility for these types of help. They have to scrimp and save and budget, and perhaps prioritize their life-styles in order that their children may attend university.

But I take exception, and I would question very seriously the point that the Member for Burrows maintains, that it is people at the bottom of the economic scale necessarily that are hurt by this type of increase. I maintain it's the people at the middle of the scale who, if anyone feels any great amount of hardship, will certainly suffer in this way.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd be most happy to take the Honourable Minister into my riding and spend all the time with him that would be necessary, take him into other ridings, take him into the riding of the Honourable Member for Churchill, and have him attempt to persuade and convince my constituents that the fee increase is going to hit harder the family of the middle income level, rather than the one at the bottom level.

I must confess and admit to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, I don't have that persuasive power to convince my constituents of that; they wouldn't believe me. If the Honourable Minister feels that he has that skill and ability, I would welcome him to come into Burrows constituency at any time, or to go into any constituency wherein there may be people living at the lower end of the social economic scale, and persuade them and get them to believe that the fee increase isn't going to hurt them at all but that it's going to hurt those more who estates may be liable to succession duties, who are in a category that they make gifts that may be subject to tax, and that sort of thing. That it's the people in that bracket who are being harder hit. My constituents, Mr. Chairman, I would tell the Honourable Minister now, would not believe him. And I'm also certain, Mr. Chairman, that he would have difficulty in getting his constituents to believe the statement that he had just made in the House. He would have extreme difficulty; in fact, he would find it impossible.

He just shook his head in the negative, that he wouldn't have any difficulty. I would like to meet that individual in his constituency who does believe him that the fee increase is not going to hurt the guy at the bottom end of the wage scale, but rather the one in the middle and in the upper brackets.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can arrange such a meeting for the Member for Burrows, if he would like to meet that type of an individual. And I maintain, again, that the opportunity for student aid and student assistance is there for those at the lower end of the scale and provision has been made in the student aid appropriation to deal with these increases, if there is increased need, and of course when we get to that particular part of the Estimate appropriation, I think he will notice that we have made that provision and I still maintain — and he is entitled to his opinion, of course — that in fact it is not the lower but perhaps the middle where the people are just above the level that qualifies for that type of particular aid that do suffer under this type of circumstance.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I agree that there is another Section in the Estimates where the impact of tuition fees on students and in turn as it relates to Student Aid could be debated more appropriately but I just simply would want to remind the Honourable Minister at this point in time that he would find it extremely difficult to square the comment that he has just made with the fact that quite recently, as it will affect Student Aid for the forthcoming academic year, he has increased the entry level into Student Aid. In other words, the loan first, the bursary second point has been raised from what it previously was by a few hundred dollars. How one squares that with the comments that he has made, I certainly do find it difficult to understand. However, Mr. Chairman, let me not violate the rules and, as I've indicated, there will be a more appropriate time to debate that point.

What I would wish to ask the Honourable Minister to comment on, and this is a matter which had been of concern to the Conservative Party and to the Legislature in general in previous years and I'm sure that it still is and it is to us on this side of the House and that is the Faculty of Education, the enrolment in the Faculty of Education as it relates to the supply and demand of teachers. The Honourable Minister may recall that over the years there was a feeling that there was an over-supply of graduates and, as I recall it in previous years, that there may have been a temporary over-supply of graduates at a snapshot point in time as of September 1st of a school year or whatever but over a period of months, three or four months, most — in fact practically all who were seeking teaching employment did manage to find their way into the classroom. Could the Honourable Minister comment on the present state of affairs?

There is a class of graduates who have completed their studies this year and who will be graduating, receiving their diplomas officially in two or three weeks' time and what the job prospects appear to be for them for the forthcoming school year. Perhaps he may also want to comment and express any views that he may have on any direction or advice or guidelines that he may wish to offer for dealing with the level of enrolment in the Faculty of Education for the forthcoming year, what he may consider to be a reasonable level or whatever.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, as the Member for Burrows well knows, and I'm sure he has lived with this particular problem in the last two or three years as school enrolment has been dropping, and it has dropped some 2,000 students in the public school system this year from last year and I understand there was a drop the year before. In fact, there has been, certainly, a downward trend and there is every indication that this will continue on for some seven or eight more years. And of course as this trend continues, then we are well aware that the number of teachers required will diminish as well. I understand that last year there were some 200 teachers who did not find employment. That's 200-and-some, Mr. Chairman, I don't have the exact figure with me at this time.

The disturbing aspect here, Mr. Chairman, is that I also understand that we had some 200-odd number teachers come into the province from other provinces and other countries to fill positions that apparently could not be filled with provincial people. That, of course, is explained in part by the fact that we have had some difficulty and will have some difficulty as the previous government has had, in persuading people that teaching in rural areas and teaching in the northern part of this province can be a most satisfying experience. For some reason, we have not been able to break down

a certain psychology that suggests that the only teaching opportunities that are worthwhile are within the area bounded by the perimeter, or perhaps in a city the size of Brandon.

Of course, the Member for Burrows knows full well, as I do, that the chance and the opportunity for a teacher to meet a new challenge and to live a very satisfying professional and private life in the rural or northern areas is equally as good as in the urban areas. And I know that he has, I'm sure, as I will do, and as I do on every opportunity that I get the chance, urge the young people entering the teaching profession to consider teaching in the rural areas and the northern areas of this province.

In fact, in the northern areas, Mr. Chairman, there is an opportunity not only for the same challenge as one finds in what we talk of as the typical rural area, but the challenge of becoming acquainted with another culture and of increasing one's understanding of that culture and at the same time of doing something, I think, from a humanity point of view, that is very worthwhile.

There was a trend at one time, Mr. Chairman, where university graduates felt that they had to go to some foreign country to teach in order to be helping out cultures, and so on, perhaps not as fortunate as we were. I would suggest that you don't have to go quite that far, that there are parts of the northern sector of our province where good teachers are always in demand, and where they will be welcome and where they can certainly realize a very satisfying career. And so I would say to the Member for Burrows that in some way, and I know the previous government was not completely successful in overcoming the problem, perhaps we won't be, but I believe that it's a common assessment that we share that if we are short of teachers in any spot, it is in some of the more remote rural areas and in the north and that certainly we do have to promote in some way the movement of graduates in the teaching profession into these particular areas for some of the reasons that I have just mentioned, of course.

I understand that the Faculty of Education has been monitoring the situation as far as teacher supply is concerned and I understand that they have, in the past and will continue to do so, will continue to impose some type of quota as to the number of teachers that are entering the faculty. I would hope that that monitoring process will not result in us having too great an over-supply of people in the teaching profession. Not, Mr. Chairman, that I would suggest that training as a teacher is not worthwhile in itself, it's certainly a training that more or less supplies a person with certain skills and abilities that probably can be used in other areas as well as the classroom but really for the full realization or fulfilment of the professional, I think they would like to get into the classroom area after receiving that training. So I would say to the Member for Burrows that pretty well the same type of policy will be followed in the next year at least as has been followed in that particular area.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So here's another example, Mr. Chairman, that this government is not venturing in any new direction in education as the Minister and his colleagues had stated on many previous occasions.

The Honourable Minister did make reference to the Faculty of Education considering imposing a quota. —(Interjection)— I would like to ask the Honourable Minister what role does he play in the determination of the quota that he says has been imposed?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Member for Burrows, it's my understanding that the university, in its discretion, has made some judgments as to the proper enrolments in the faculty in past years and has followed rather closely those guidelines that they have set out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While we're on the discussion of the Universities Grants Commission, I thought members opposite might enjoy some comparisons, Mr. Chairman, of tuition fees and costs of education that I personally paid and experienced in the course of attending the University of Manitoba. In 1964 when I enrolled in the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba, the tuition fee was some \$375.00. In that first year of education, my total expenditures that year were \$1,200 for the year of education, for the seven some-odd months I was in the University of Manitoua. The tuition fee represented that year some 31.2 percent of the total dollars that I expended to attend university for that one year.

In 1968, tuition fee in Agriculture had risen to \$400 per year; and in my final year of attendance at the university my yearly costs were \$1,800 per year. It had increased by 50 percent because in the last year I got the urge and I bought a set of wheels. So my costs were quite a bit higher because I was driving a car. But still, even at that, the \$400 in tuition fee represented some 22.2 percent of my yearly costs of education.

Now I've just checked with the Faculty of Agriculture and their tuition fees for 1978-1979 — a degree program at the Faculty of Agriculture, University of Manitoba — range from \$575 per year to \$630 per year, the variation depending on what particular course enrolment you have.

So if we strike out an average on that range of costs, it might cost you \$600 per year, on an average, to attend the University of Manitoba Faculty of Agriculture, to take the degree course.

Now, in brief discussions on the costs that a student incurs in a total year of education at the University of Manitoba, it seems like \$3,000 might be a reasonable cost for a year's education at the University of Manitoba. So in the Faculty of Agriculture we've got a situation in 1978-79 with a recent fee increase of roughly \$100 per year, we've got a situation where tuition fees will equal approximately 20 percent — and no more than 20 percent — of the student's out-of-pocket cost of education. That has decreased since 1964 and since 1968, so that the student today is in a better

position than I was in 1964 through 1968, to finance his portion of tuition fees as a portion of his education costs.

My costs of my education in 1968, when I graduated, totalled some \$5,900, in total, for the four years. Now, I considered that to be an investment in the future. It was something that I could carry around with me and use as a job recommendation. And when I graduated I received a job with a pay of \$575 per month, for a total of \$6,900 per year, upon graduation in 1968.

Now I just checked with the Department of Agriculture — seeing as how I was an agricultural graduate — and I find that a graduate from the Faculty of Agriculture, in 1978 as compared to 1968, if he lands a job as an Agrologist 2A, with the Provincial Government — and this is the wage rate that approximately 90 percent of the graduate students in Agriculture receive in 1978 — his pay will start out at some \$15,500.00. If he has a little bit of experience in summer-related jobs, his wage will be \$16,100.00.

Now, we're talking, a student in 1978 spending approximately \$12,000 in total, to obtain his degree in Agriculture and being able to step into a job which will pay him \$15,500 per year — I spoke in 1968 of graduating after spending some \$5,900 for four years of education and stepping into a job that would pay me \$6,900 — if anything it's more encouraging today to go to university in terms of upgrading your income compared to the costs of going to university than it was in 1968. So that I think the fee justification of \$100 is not a serious implication and not a serious barrier to anybody going to university.

When I went to university the tuition fees were, as I mentioned, approximately \$400 per year; and I openly admit that my family was not a wealthy family at that point in time. They had to scratch and scrounge to come up with the money to put me through the university. My father took on custom work on an unpleasant job of breaking scrub to pay my tuition fees for the first year that I was in there, in 1964. But the whole purpose of doing it, of going to university — and I had options open to me; I could have gone out of Grade 12 and taken a job; I could have taken the diploma course in Agriculture, two years; or I could have taken the degree course — and I chose the degree course at considerable expense because I considered it to be an investment in my future. It was an investment that I was willing to make and that I was willing to make sacrifices for, because when I graduated, Student Aid was not as liberal in terms of bursaries then for people who couldn't afford to fully fund their university. I graduated in 1968 after spending \$5,900 going to university, with a \$2,000 Canada Student Loan that I had to repay. I considered that no hardship at the time because I was pleased to have the opportunity to go to the University of Manitoba, get a degree in Agriculture and use that degree in Agriculture to better my future.

I think the same situation exists today. The opportunity to everyone is available, to go to university. The increment of \$80.00 or \$100.00 in tuition fees, if it hampers anyone from going to university from the dollar and cents standpoint, then I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they're not very serious about the benefits of going to university and they're not very serious about going there; because it represents a smaller portion of the total year's cost of the education today even at the increased rates of tuition fees; and I don't think it hampers anyone from going to university, particularly vis-a-vis changes in the Student Aid Program.

I have to think that anyone who is claiming foul and saying that we're now turning the universities into the "Haven of the Rich" at the expense and at the effect of closing the door on the poor people in Manitoba, I have to say that they're using the cheapest form of political sensationalism to get themselves a little bit of coverage in the newspapers, or whatever.

If anyone is serious about a university education and serious about upgrading his future by a university education, \$80.00 to \$100.00 per year increase in tuition fee should provide little, if any, hampering to him obtaining that education.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to this last contribution and the reminiscence of times past. So I am reminded of my times past which are a little more past than that of the honourable member.

And you, Mr. Chairman, I remember hearing your maiden speech when you were harking back to times past and really, I suppose, we can only reflect on how far we've gotten by looking back to where we were. So I'll tell the honourable member. I'll give him a little bit of my autobiography.

I went to university. I was the son of a lawyer, one expects the lawyers are doing very well, have always done very well, rich kids. — (Interjection) — Did somebody say rich kids? Somebody said rich kids, I didn't hear who. — (Interjection) — Oh, yes, well that's true, Mr. Chairman. I lived two blocks away from where I live now. I suppose we were amongst the better-off on our street.

My father was a lawyer. I went to school, to university. I worked that summer for two bits an hour. And you know, Mr. Chairman, I was a rich kid because I worked for a friend of the family and he was paying me the minimum wage. I discovered later that others who were working beside me, doing better work, were somehow not being paid the minimum wage, in spite of the laws at the time.

So being a rich kid, as the Minister of Education says, and having pull with my employer, I got two bits an hour, \$12.38 a week. After two months I had saved some money which really made me feel like a rich kid, when I discovered that my father was on the verge of losing our house and he asked me if I would pay the tuition for that year out of my earnings — which I did — \$125.00. I think that came about as a result of the McRae Scandal, because it was just about that time that it was discovered that university funds had been stolen by other rich parents, if not rich kids, and the university was in a bad

state, so they raised tuition fees.

The point I am making is that even for me, the rich kid, it was rather difficult for that payment to be made, but I don't talk about me. I am talking about people whom the member describes who are having difficulty putting themselves through. I remember how, well we all used to go by streetcar to university, there was no thought of anybody having a car, or any other means of getting there, so we went by streetcar. Streetcars were much cheaper then than they are now, Mr. Chairman, especially in the last month and I make the point about that, because — (Interjection) — Well, they were a nickel each, a nickel a ride. We got 8 tickets for a quarter and then they were two for 15 cents as I recall it, and if the honourable member wants to ask a question he should do it by standing up and asking a question.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that I observed so many of my fellow students who used to bring their sandwiches to the university for lunch and didn't have a common room because the university didn't have a place for them to eat, and I would see them eating their sandwiches in the locker room, this was in the winter, and admiring them because they had the strength and the fortitude and the desire, and they did, and they worked, they delivered groceries at night — they put themselves through — as compared with the majority of university students at that time who did not have to sacrifice, who came from homes where the payment was automatic, who were able to manage very nicely. The result was that the small minority, and a very small minority, of students who had to fight their way through the educational ladder, had to be the brightest and most aggressive, the toughest.

But, Mr. Chairman, it would be all right if all of them started the same way and they all had to be as aggressive and they all had to work as hard and they all had to be as bright, that's fair game, then I would say by all means let them work, let them work like my father did. My father was earning, I think, \$5.00 a month when he came to Canada and he was still sweeping the streets when he was going to Law School, but that is all right as long as everybody is in that position.

My complaint against this government and to some extent against our government, is that we were not able to equalize the opportunity of these students. That is the point that I want to make and that is the point I would make right through Education. The honourable member's speech was so good, I would have to ask him why it is that he does not endorse a tuition fee, a user fee, at the high school level. The argument is valid. He said he could have quit school at grade twelve, he could have quit at grade nine. — (Interjection) — Well, I say he could have quit at nine, he said he could have quit at twelve. I say he could have quit at nine, and I know other students have quit at nine, and not only because they couldn't cut it, but in many cases because they had to go to work. So look at it in the context.

Now, the honourable member peculiarly enough compares his graduation year of 1968 with what is being offered today to people graduating with the same qualifications. After eight years of NDP Government he suddenly discovers that life is a lot better for students who graduate from the university. The fact is that in times of rising costs and rising expectations, we deliberately — the Chairman of the Universities Grants Commission is here to tell his Minister — we deliberately wanted tuition fees kept at the lowest level possible, because we believed that there should not be a deterrent to higher education. We said that we believed that the equality of opportunity is important. I am not talking about equality of income at that level. I am talking about opportunity. You can't convince me that people coming from wealthy homes don't have a stride well ahead of those coming out of poorer homes, to take the benefit, the full advantage of higher education. We strove for that. I tell you frankly, Mr. Chairman, I have said it in this House in years gone by. . . . I don't know how many students we have at the university undergraduate level today, I am guessing — may I throw out a figure of 30,000. — (Interjection) — Well, let's cut back to 20,000. Let's assume that we have 20,000 students today. Mr. Chairman, I would reduce 20,000 to 18,000, to 15,000, if concurrently I could remove the disadvantages that they would have amongst the 15,000, so that they would all have the equal opportunity to show their ability to learn. If by doing that, if we could cut out — and we can't do it and our government wasn't able to do it, but I think the ideal would be to be able to cut out tuition fees and costs and even to pay students to go to school providing that they are able to show their ability and their desire to learn and to improve their ability to fulfill their lives in society. We are doing that to a large extent at the high school level, and I don't take credit that the New Democratic Party introduced fee-free public school costs. I haven't heard the Minister of Education proposing to charge for public school. I don't know why not, it would be more consistent with the policy of his government if they did, and the policy of the Honourable Member for Pembina. It would be much more consistent with his philosophy. There, Mr. Chairman, is the important difference in philosophy. Clearly that is a clear distinction. It is no longer what can be done, but really what we believe ought to be done.

And again I have to say I deplore the fact that there are members of the Conservative Party, many of them, who say, "We have to raise tuition fees because we have an economic mess." That is not true. They want to raise tuition fees because they believe that somebody should be called upon to contribute to his education, and the Member for Pembina made it clear, and I accept his point of view, if only he wouldn't hide behind this fiction of a mess and this fiction of financial incapacity. The Member for Pembina hasn't been here that long, but I can guarantee to him that he spoke about a mess. As a matter of fact it seems to me that in either the Budget Speech or the Throne Speech, he was the one who mentioned the figure of 225 million more often than even the Minister of Finance. I may be wrong — (Interjection) — Would the Honourable Member for Pembina agree that he did

mention at least once the figure of a \$225 million deficit?

MR. DOMINO: Different speech, different topic.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, different speech, different topic, and the Member for St. Matthews seems to be able to sit on many fences and to ride many go-carts in order to arrive at some argument. I would tell the honourable member that he will find more consistency here where we don't have to apologize for making a different speech on a different topic and showing a different philosophy.

I am saying, and I don't think it's wrong, that the concept of user fees is one which the Conservative Party endorses, the concept of higher tuition fees is consistent with Conservative philosophy, and I don't fault them for it. I disagree with them, I don't fault them. As I said I fault them for finding other reasons to blame.

The unfortunate thing, Mr. Chairman, is that we often help finance graduation of students who leave the province and the country and that's an unfortunate thing. I would not yet be prepared to make education exclusively available to those who guarantee to stay here because that becomes a form of coercion to force a person not to move but we have to deplore the fact that we train people, highly skilled people, professional people, and then they leave the province.

I must tell the Member for Pembina, I was at a dinner the other night where it was a farewell dinner for a person who had lived in Manitoba for some eight years who said, "You want to know why I'm leaving Manitoba? It's because of the Lyon government," he said, "I'm leaving Manitoba." He was a New Democrat but clearly that's what he said.

So now, Mr. Chairman, I do mention the fact that we are losing students and I deplore the fact that an unnamed Cabinet Minister is quoted as having said to architects, "You'd better get out of here; you've had it too good." The phrase "you've had it too good," is a phrase that the Minister of Labour has already accepted as being a correct one as it applies to society generally. She said that she agreed that Manitobans are spoiled. She made the cute distinction — at first she agreed with spoiled rotten and then she said, "But he didn't really say rotten." So I'll only go as far as she was prepared to go. She agreed that Manitobans are spoiled. Now we learn from today's Free Press that a Cabinet Minister is quoted as telling the architects, "Well, you've had it too good and maybe you should get out of the province." I deplore it. There was just a recent announcement that a cousin of mine is leaving the province to teach and do research elsewhere and he has complained to me in the past that there's not enough money available for research in his specialty.

A MEMBER: You'd better name him because he's a . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Dr. Rueben Cherniack who is a highly regarded respiratory physician whose research is renowned all over and he's leaving Manitoba and I think it's unfortunate. I will not blame the Lyon government for that because I believe that it's unfortunate that the education which we have provided to him, largely paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba, is being lost, the direct service is being lost to Manitoba but that's not the case in that people of that calibre, /B /o, working wherever they do work for the betterment of humanity and we in Manitoba will benefit from it.

But just to brush aside as the Member for Pembina does and describe what he paid in tuition fees is to be out of concert with the fact that there has been tremendous strides in this province towards a reduction of cost of education and the thing is, he says, "Where will you find it cheaper?" Well, as his colleague from St. Matthews said, "Where will he find it cheaper?" The thing is, they don't really look alike that much but they're the only ones in the backbench so if I confuse one for the other it should be . . . understandable that they're both chirping side by side.

Mr. Chairman, I just point out to the member — I don't even disagree with his statement of facts — I point out that we have a difference in policy and philosophic approach as to the availability of education and the extent to which it is beneficial for the people of Manitoba to assist others to obtain the highest possible educational standard to which they are capable of accepting and that, to me, is the only real criteria. Do you want to learn; do you have the ability to learn; then we should make it possible for you to learn and remove financial obstacles. That's really all that it's about, and I say that that's the difference. The Member for Pembina seems to feel that if you put in a financial obstacle, it will make them work harder. Well, it will make those who don't have it work harder but it will not affect those who maybe shouldn't be at the university at all. Maybe we have people who should not be at the university but are there because they are coasting along because they can do that with ease and equanimity and for them it's good. I wouldn't like to see a continuation of that sharp differential between those to whom educational costs come easy and those to whom it comes more difficult, especially as is recently imposed on them by the increase in tuition fees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right where we have 40 students from the Glenboro High School of Grade 9, 10 and 11 standing under the directorship of Mrs. R. Christie. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. I would ask the honourable members to welcome this group.

The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Chairman, I don't interject into the Estimates procedure very often. I've been listening and I think the Minister of Education has been doing an excellent job of explaining his Estimates, explaining the government's position. I think he's done a good job. But the Member for St.

Johns has made certain points and he mentioned myself by name, or at least my constituency, and I think that I should say something.

He mentioned other speeches at other times made in this House and I recall several of the speeches made by other members across, vicious attacks on the government's attitude towards the poor and those in our society of low income and those who don't have as much as maybe the average citizen. There have been many attacks made, suggestions, that this government, all of its initiatives have been toward removing privileges and funding and services from the poor and giving them to the middle and upper classes. The Member for St. Johns mentioned the upper and middle-income people were \$25,000 a year and over. I think that was his definition a couple of days ago. Well, I would suggest that this is . . . And the reason he came to his feet and other members, and the reason we're having this debate right here, right now, is because they want desperately to cover up an inconsistency in their argument. The tuition fee raise does not hurt the poor in this province, does not hurt the low-income people. I don't think it does. The Member for Inkster says, "It certainly does." I don't think it does. I would suggest to you that the tuition fee increase of about \$90 a year will not discourage any students from going to university and, more important yet, it will not in any way affect the level of family income of the average student. The family income of the average student already is high. It's certainly not a poverty level type of person that goes to university. There are very few people.

I taught High School at Gordon Bell for almost four years. Most of the students who go to Gordon Bell, except for those maybe who come from the Gates, their family incomes would be less than the average for the Province of Manitoba. It's a core area high school and the students are poor. Very few of our students went on to university but yet you talk about the kids from Grant Park or any other suburban type high school, a large majority of those children go on to university. So when you're asking students and families of students to pay a little more, you're not in general asking the poor to pay more because the poor don't get to university. —(Interjection)— Okay, bear with me. You're asking, in this case the government is asking those who can afford to pay a little more, we're asking them to pay.

Now, I would suggest if you were to do away with university fees, tuition fees altogether, you would still not alter that mix. You would still find basically upper and middle income children went there. —(Interjection)— So if we're going to discuss ways of getting — and I think it's an admirable pursuit — that we should find ways of getting the low income children, the disadvantaged children — first we have to get them through Junior High and through High School because most of them don't finish, and then get them on to university, let's take it completely out of this context of tuition fees, because tuition fees have nothing to do with it. If tuition fees were \$500.00 a year for a course, or nothing, it still wouldn't make any difference to most of my constituents, who don't send their children to university.

The reason they don't send their children to university is because the children don't have a desire to go; and the reason they don't have a desire is because of a very deep rooted economic and social condition.

Now, I've been looking at a report prepared by a Jack Lamb. It's called, "The Path Analysis of Barriers to Post-Secondary Education." It's a summary actually of a much larger report. I read it over in lunch hours. It was prepared in March of 1978. It's a project for the Post-Secondary Research Reference Committee of the Province of Manitoba and it goes on and on. However, it's a provincial government report. They talk about which sort of students go. They talk about the fact that it's middle and upper income students, students whose parents have already gone in the past, not students of the working poor, not the parents of the working poor. The working poor, their children don't go. And they talk in their conclusion, this gentlemen suggested ways in which we can encourage more of the poor children to go to school. He doesn't mention tuition fees. He doesn't talk about tuition fees. He talks about things like better or more effective guidance counselling, changing the sub-culture among students which encourages them to take advantage of the immediate benefits of getting a job rather than postponing the benefits and going on to university.

He talks about making sure the schools offer better knowledge and skills to the students when they're in school. He talks about changing the values so that they can place more emphasis on education and less emphasis on going out and working for the minimum wage, or just above it, as soon as they get out of school.

I think generally the point made across by two speakers now was that the tuition fee hike somehow hurt the poor. It doesn't. The tuition fee hike asks the wealthy to pay a little more. It's especially true when you consider that the Minister of Education and the government increased the amount of money available to students, on the basis of need, in terms of loans and bursaries.

If you've got a child coming from a poor home, there is more money available in terms of loans and bursaries this year than ever before. So let's take them out of the argument. Let's talk about who we're asking to pay more.

We're asking the middle and upper income children to pay more. That's who we're asking, and I don't think there's anything wrong with asking them to pay that. —(Interjection)—

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wish I had the power to take the Member for St. Matthews and the Member for Pembina, and lock them into a room and force them to talk about those two divergent philosophies that I think I heard from them. I think that they ought to get together.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Matthews made a better speech than I made, along the same

lines that I was trying to make. Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Matthews pointed out all the obstacles there are in the way of people from the lower income groups to be able to go to university. He pointed them out and he may recall that I said that I would like not only to remove the financial barrier of tuition fees, I would be prepared to pay students who showed ability and desire to go to school. I said to pay them, and that is part of the economic problem.

He spoke about the socioeconomic problems, and I wish he would realize that's what we're talking about all the time we're in this Legislature. That is the real reason why there are two parties in this Legislature, because we disagree on how you approach the problem of dealing with the socioeconomic problems of people who are in need, mostly.

But the honourable member is the one who is going to vote — I don't think he's yet spoken on it — but he's going to vote in favour of reducing income taxation which affects the highest level of the greatest; those whom he wants to contribute a little more to the universities because they're wealthy, he said. Let them pay a little more, \$90.00 more, meanwhile he is going to vote to remove — I think it's about \$500.00 from a \$25,000 a year person — in income tax. He is going to do that. I know he's going to do it. He doesn't dare not do it.

He is going to see to it that the wealthy have a reduction in taxation and then he says, "Well, it's mostly the wealthy who are going to university anyway, so let them pay a little more, \$90.00 more," so that means that per student going to university who will pay \$90.00 extra, per individual earning substantial income, they are being reduced — we debated that this morning — they're being reduced \$400.00 or \$500.00 and meanwhile we know that the \$10,000 a year person is going to be reduced \$13.00 a year. His kids will have to pay \$90.00 or \$100.00 more if they're in university, per child, but he is going to save \$13.00.

The point is that the Member for St. Matthews is right. It's most unlikely that a person earning \$10,000 a year will have a student in university. It's a little more unlikely if the tuition fee is just a little bit more because there are people to whom the tuition fee has been meaningful — and I think the Member for Pembina described that his father had to go out and do an unpleasant moonlighting job in order to find the additional fees necessary to pay his tuition fees — and that means that he made a substantial increase and a substantial sacrifice to help his son do it. And the Member for St. Matthews reading a book pompously tells us, tuition fees mean nothing. Well, if they mean nothing they ought to go to the university.

Mr. Chairman, I invite them both to go to the university, sit around the common room and talk to the students. —(Interjection)— He just left he was there this afternoon and talking to them? —(Interjection)— Oh, you mean as a student? That's correct, Mr. Chairman. The member was a student at the university much more recently than I was. I told him that when I went to the university, the tuition fees were raised to \$125 a year, not by \$125, but to \$125, actually by \$125, and that hurt, it hurt a lot of people. So let him not say that because he is so much younger than I and gone to university more recently that he knows the problems that are going on among students. I suggest he go today and find out what they think about this Minister's increase in their tuition fees and if this Minister wants to absolve himself from any blame, then let him say so because the blame lies on his shoulders and not on his government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I listened to what the Member for St. Matthews said and I recall participating in this debate previously with respect to the cost of higher education and how it should be paid for, and I will readily concede, Mr. Chairman, that there have been arguments within the parties on this question and that nobody has had a clear cut position with respect to it. And the Minister of Education points out that the Saskatchewan government increased tuition fees for attendance at university, and this is done by a government of the New Democratic Party. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I sometimes agree with what the Government of Saskatchewan does, I sometimes disagree, but I certainly wholeheartedly disagree with what has been done in Saskatchewan — I don't think it's right in Saskatchewan and I don't think it's right to the Province of Manitoba. And the Conservative Party in this Chamber has indicated that they don't agree with everything that is done in Ontario even though it's a Tory Government, or what's done in Alberta.

The point that is most often raised, Mr. Chairman, is that the tuition fee does not deter university attendance. I want the Conservatives to digest that thought. They say that a five or six hundred dollar tuition fee would not deter even the lowest income group people to be able to pay for higher education, and it would not prevent those people from acquiring the money and going to university. . . I This is the same party that says that a \$500 reduction in revenue on a business from \$20,000 to \$19,500 is of such consequence as would mean that that business would discontinue operation, would take its assets and leave the Province of Manitoba, because \$500 — not a fee — but a \$500 difference in revenue. That instead of making \$20,000 they are going to make \$19,500. Mark you, Mr. Chairman, that is what they have been saying ever since we came into this Legislative Assembly during the first session, and they say, Mr. Chairman, out of the same mouth, although it is two-faced it is coming out of the same mouth, that a lower income group family would not be deterred from having their child attend university because of a tuition fee of \$500.00.

Well, Mr. Chairman, honourable members will all relate personal experiences. The Member for Pembina says that his father made all kinds of sacrifices and did all kinds of difficult things in order to

make it feasible for his son to attend university. Is the honourable member suggesting that all the people in the Province of Manitoba have equal capacity to make sacrifices, because I suggest to him that it is not so, and that what he is depending upon for a lower income group family to go to university, is that the father will be an extraordinary person who will sacrifice his time and his hours to make it possible for that son. And, Mr. Chairman, I don't see anything wrong with that — don't misunderstand me. I don't think that that's a bad thing, but why should it be so, why should opportunities be so unequal, because none of the parents in the upper income groups, who come from the "Gates" and send their children to Gordon Bell — not all of the parents have to do that, they don't have to make that uncommon sacrifice. And if we are saying that education of lower income groups will be based on uncommon sacrifice, does that not indicate to the honourable member that we are discriminating against low income groups with regard to our post-secondary education, and, Mr. Chairman, I'm not referring to the increase, I'm referring to the notion that individual responsibility for post-secondary education on a 15 percent basis is a sensible program.

What is the result of the existing program? The Member for St. Matthews indicated the results. That by and large, the people who acquire post-secondary education at the academic level, and now we have a great discrimination at the industrial level, it's horrendous, it's more of a crime against society to raise the industrial schools from \$7 a month to \$21 a month, that is a greater crime than the increase in tuition fees. It is a horrendous thing to do, and this, Mr. Chairman, is the fat that is being cut by the Conservative Party — another definition of fat — permitting people to make themselves sociably useful in our society by going to an industrial post-secondary school, and charging them a user fee, that's to eliminate fat. So now we have now the list of fat that's being cut by this Conservative administration: sheets in hospitals, meals at nursing homes, toilet paper in toilets, lifeguards . . . this is the fat that's being eliminated by the Conservative Party.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that no matter what we have done, what we have demonstrated is that our present system subsidizes the very well-to-do, that by and large the people who get a post-secondary education are the well-to-do, that we are paying 85 percent of it — they are paying 15 percent of it. And what we have done, Mr. Chairman, is said that we will cause the general society, including the poor, to pay for the education of the rich. That is the present system. We have made the tuition fee high enough that it doesn't deter the rich, so they will get the subsidy, but it doesn't include the poor who will then have to go to work and pay taxes to pay for the rich kids to go to school. That's what we've been doing in the area of higher education.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable members, the Conservatives, really believe that we should not be subsidizing these rich people, I give them one of two propositions for the principles of Conservatism which they spout over there: let them pay the tuition fee, the cost of education — pay their user fee, they're rich kids, — the fee for attending university, if \$500 is 10 percent or 15 percent, then the fee is obviously in the nature of \$4,000.00. Right? Is my calculation correct? Let them pay the \$4,000.00. Do it your way and then have a needs test for those who need, who are poor, and who can go. That's not my way, that's your way, but that's in principle your way, and then we will not be asking the poorest taxpayer to subsidize rich kids. You will do it on the basis of your Medicare program, that the individual who can afford it will pay \$4,000 and the poor kids going out and working for a living when they leave high school, will not subsidize their former friends whom they went to school with to go to university.

Those who want to go to university, and who want to make the extra supreme effort, will go and apply for a needs test, and the government will ask them to close their eyes and cross their heart and spit and show that they have nothing in their pockets and that their parents have nothing and that they have received no gifts, and then they will get a needs test. That is the Conservative way.

Or, Mr. Chairman, do it in a different way, and I'm not even able to say, the New Democratic Party way, but in a different way which I have proposed in this House between 1966 and 1969, which I say without any difficulty because it was done publicly, it was part of regular discussions and public discussions with the New Democratic Party, do it this way. Say that the provision of a higher education, a post-secondary education, is to the benefit of society, that society will accept social responsibility for it in the same way as we accept social responsibility for secondary education. And, by the way, the honourable members want to look at the statistics, universal, elementary and secondary education have resulted in all income groups being better educated to the benefit of all of us, as distinct from the system when private people and education was a matter of private individual responsibility and they paid for it themselves.

The honourable member says, "Get them to go to Grade 10 and 11, and not drop out." Yes, Mr. Chairman, if there was a future in it for them, and if, in a lower income family they did not, as of cultural and economic inertia say that higher education is really not going to be part of us, therefore what's the use of going to the secondary school, if they really saw that there was a future for it and that higher education was not the province of the upper income groups, then I suggest to you that they would go to high school, that they would know that the higher education is going to be tested on the basis of capability. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is an ineptitude. That is a very difficult process. It involves some arbitrary decisions, it involves some error, it involves some disappointment, but it's done at the medical school, it is done at the law school, and however arbitrary, however it is prone to error, it is not prone to the savage error that is committed by the existing system which causes a whole group in our population to consider the fact that post-secondary education is not for them, it is an activity which belongs to the upper middle class groups in society because that's what it is. Those are the great majority of people who go to university.

Now, you will always find the exception and the exception will always be thrown at you. Well, this

poor family — his child went to university and became a doctor, that's true. You know, your best examples are from personal experience because you know them best. I was from a family of six, two of them went to university — my eldest sister, and she only went because she won scholarships every time, and myself — and the rest of us did not go and it had to do with the tuition fee, with the money that it was necessary to have to go to university and, Mr. Chairman, I tell you that that is not only my own personal family experience, that is the experience of most of the children that I grew up with, most of the children. They just did not have, and at that time it was \$180 to lay out. One of the things was fees and the other thing which was just as important is that they were expected at the age of 18 years to start bringing some money into the family or to share the burden. But the fee was part of it and the other feature of it came from what the Member for St. Matthews is talking about.

A MEMBER: What about student aid?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the concept of student aid and the concept of that I am so poor that I have to come to a government to help me, to get those nice Conservatives to put me through school, is the most degrading system of all. And you know, I've given you that system, if you're going to go to the student aid system, then ask those people who can afford it to pay for it, charge them \$4,000 and use the student aid to help those people who you think you want to get to declare to come in and say that they are not self-sustaining, that they are poor, that they need charity, and send them to school. That's the Conservative system.

My system, Mr. Chairman, the one that I propose, is that we make society generally responsible for post-secondary education. That we say that that is something that we gain from, and the Member for St. Johns has gone somewhat further, but I think that in many cases it is valuable, that if I could somehow be assured that the people that are given a post-secondary education will contribute what they have learned to society, then there should be a way of sustaining them while they are going to school.

But let's not move ten jumps at a time, let us say that first of all you're going to make it available to those who show the aptitude and the need, and, Mr. Chairman, I want to do this and I want to do it with restraint. I want to save the Minister money, save him money by eliminating tuition fees. Is that so difficult? It's not difficult at all, Mr. Chairman. How much are you spending for post-secondary education? What is the figure? Ninety million dollars? Spend eighty-five. There's your saving. But for those eight-five, say how many students that you can take, which faculties you can take them in and take the top students that you can get for those faculties and send them to university, but don't have a tuition fee — don't have a tuition fee. Say that the top people who have made themselves acceptable to the faculty, and, Mr. Chairman, the interesting thing is that the screams that you will get are the screams from the rich. Isn't that interesting? They will say, there were one hundred places; I am a hundred and one on the list — I want you to open the educational system so I can get in — stop spending eight-five, start spending ninety. Those are the people who will scream, because those are the people who are presently getting huge subsidies, 85 percent of the costs that are being spent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I heard somebody else say, "Don't you believe in the work ethic? Don't you believe that people should work for their education like you did?" I get that from the Member for Sturgeon Creek. Well, you know, I find the Conservative Party becoming more radical every day. Do you really believe in that? Do you want a work ethic as a standard of university education? The Member for Peina is saying yes. Fine, let us have a standard on the people who will be selected, or the people who are paying their tuition, that they have to show that they went out and worked, not for their father or mother, an independent source, and that the money they are giving to the school was made as a result of the exercise of the work ethic, that they got a job and that's where the money is coming to go to school. If that's what you believe, Mr. Chairman, let us require a sweat certificate when you are applying for a university education. In accordance with your principles, that the certificate that I am presenting is going to show that I independently earned \$650, which is going to pay for my education, that I am not coming here through the grace of having been born with a silver spoon in my mouth, that I've gone out and worked, because you believe in that.

But, Mr. Chairman, they don't believe in it. They don't believe in either saving money, which I have offered them a way of doing very simply; they don't believe that people with the best aptitude should go to university, because I have offered them the same proposal; they don't believe that people should work to acquire their post-secondary education; they don't believe that those who can afford it should pay for it, because all of those propositions are quite contrary to what the Minister is doing.

What they believe in is as follows: Let's keep our class society; let's keep university education the province of the upper middle class of our population. Let's have a tuition fee that's high enough to keep the educational system pure, and which will make it very difficult for the others to get in because if it's a deterrent to a business to get \$19,500 instead of \$20,000, and we believe that, we Conservatives believe that, we have said it a hundred times, ad infinitum, then we Conservatives must believe that \$500 will be a deterrent for the family of a young person in the lower income group who is not getting \$20,000 or \$19,500 instead of \$20,000, but who is earning a total of \$10,000 to look after a family, which many people are on, that that will be a deterrent, and we will have the best of both worlds. Our children will be subsidized by the State, and everybody will pay for it but not have it available to them.

That's the system that you are employing and it's not the system that you have to employ. And that is the system that is employed by every jurisdiction and if you want to include Saskatchewan, go ahead and include it, that deals with this situation. But it's not the situation all over. There are many jurisdictions in the world that recognize that post-secondary education is a social rather than an

individual responsibility, that the society generally gains from it, that society generally should pay for it, and that when the people go out of the post-secondary system and enter the productive fields, then generally they will be paying for their education as a result of the higher incomes that they will be making as a result of the preferred position that they will have by virtue of that post-secondary education.

So there you have it, Mr. Chairman. I've offered you a bold Conservative scheme, it has everything, it has restraint, it has user pay, it has the work ethic, and it has what you love best of all — the needs tests — because you just love to be charitable to those people who will come on their hands and knees and grovel and say to you, "We haven't made it and we need your help." And, Mr. Chairman, I know from experience and direct association, there is nothing more degrading than putting a person through those kinds of needs tests with the possible exception of the degradation that it causes amongst those who are being appealed to and love to think of the luxury of giving charity. There's nothing more degrading than receiving charity than the sanctimonious superiority that it creates amongst the people who are giving charity. And we say that it should be neither. We're not talking about charity, we're talking about creating a useful society, we're talking about making it possible for people to make a contribution to that society by post-secondary education. Now if you want to do it your way, do it with a user fee and a needs test. If you want to do it in the way that I am suggesting, do it by educating to the extent of your financial capacity and I'll let you set the figure, because don't call me a spender — I would spend less than you are spending, less, not more — you set the figure, and have education socially provided for on the basis that it will be made available to those whom it will do the most good and who will thereby do the most good with it for the future benefit of our social and economic well-being.

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

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I seek your guidance on a point of privilege. I asked the Minister a question yesterday. He undertook to bring the answer today. I thank the Minister for sending me a typewritten answer, however, the answer does not apply whatsoever to my question and I wonder if I would be able to perhaps — we don't have Hansard before us — but I wonder if I could give the Minister the question that I gave him yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose if his question could be placed again under Item 1. (a)?

MR. ADAM: My question was 1.(e), on the Keewatin. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I realize, but the honourable member has another chance to ask the question under 1.(a) Minister's Salary, if he would bide his time for that point.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether the Minister would be able to provide me with the answer in that short period of time, that's why. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We won't be till 1.(a) for a while, I don't imagine. Would the Honourable Minister carry on? The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: We can come back to that particular item if the Member for Ste. Rose feels that the information he requested has not been adequately provided. I think that the explanation that accompanies the information should clarify that particular situation. There is some matter of confidentiality involved in the material that he requests and I believe the explanation accompanying the material I supplied explains that, and does provide an opportunity for him to receive the information from another Minister. If that is not satisfactory then perhaps he will come back to this topic under 1.(a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the course of discussion, the Member for St. Johns brought up quite an interesting concept in that he would like to have post-secondary education free of charge and even pay the students to go to university. I think that's an interesting concept because I think there's quite a few children of wealthy families who would meet his criteria of standards to go to university who would very much enjoy having their university paid for and, as a matter of fact, receiving an income whilst going to university. I think that concept would be probably quite acceptable by a lot of people, especially people who can afford right now to go to university, the prospect of getting paid to go would be attractive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with some interest to the different comments that have been made by the members on both sides on this topic. I think it is rather interesting the divergent philosophies and schemes that have been proposed by members on particularly the other side. I would like to make a few comments in connection with what has been said because I don't

think too much of what we have heard today is new. These particular concepts have been with us for some time and have been considered in many different countries of the world and some have adopted one, and some have adopted others. In our particular democracy, in our particular country, the idea of an elitist system such as the Member for St. Johns suggests, where the state selects those who will go to university, some omnipotent board of government officials decides that this boy will become a doctor because of his marks and so on, and then the state will pay the full amount for that individual and this system will be what will provide the best educational system with the state deciding who will go and that will take care of all of the problems we have and the different economic levels. That of course is one option and certainly we do have a bloc of countries in the world that follow that system. But it is hardly consistent, Mr. Chairman, with the idea of freedom of opportunity that we hold with in our country.

I can't accept, and regardless of the impassioned arguments that I have heard from the Member for Inkster, I have known many people whom he would certainly classify as being economically destitute and so on, who have struggled and who have made that trip to university. I would suggest, and perhaps it is a wrong rule of thumb to use, that quite often those who sacrifice the most to get an education, appreciate it the most and as a result have become more productive in our society. There are perhaps many examples of that very rule of thumb sitting in this House on both sides of the House, I would suggest. Those who sacrifice very little, quite often, as a result, do not quite appreciate the opportunity and I think I would agree with some of the members opposite when they put forward that idea.

Let me also say, Mr. Chairman, the idea that university should be free has all sorts of implications with it, not only financial to the average individual but to universities themselves. Because as soon as the state begins to finance the total costs at university, then in fact the state says what will happen there and what courses will be taught, and they dictate exactly what happens in that particular institution. If we want to talk about academic freedom and autonomy, then, Mr. Chairman, we can forget about those concepts because they disappear under that particular system. They happen to be concepts, Mr. Chairman, that in our society we still feel are valued and it is something that we certainly will not attempt in any way to remove.

However, I would suggest that that is the path that you would go if you wish to subscribe to a state education. Of course, a majority of people, I am sure, in this province subscribe to the idea that although the citizens of the province are paying some 90 percent of educational costs at the university, the idea certainly endures and I'm sure among a majority of people, is approved, that if students have to pay some portion of that cost, that they will feel that then they are making some contribution to their education directly and as a result, feeling that they are a part of that and having made a contribution, will derive more from it.

The Member for Inkster has said that nothing is free. I think that is a concept that the fee schedule implies and carries with it because if you went to university without paying that fee, then you might have the idea, well, this is free and really I have no investment in it, what do I have to be concerned about? I have paid nothing to be here, so it's a free ride and as a result, I have no commitment. Well, I happen to disagree with that, Mr. Chairman.

I also found it was rather interesting that the Member for St. Johns, speaking of some isolated case, about someone leaving Manitoba and I don't know whether it was a student or a professor, this of course happens every once in a while, and by the same token, we have people from other provinces coming here, but I wondered if it was a student, which way he was going. If he goes to the west to Saskatchewan he'll pay \$625.00 in fees, and if he goes to the east to Ontario, he'll pay somewhere up to \$700.00 at most of their universities. So I was a little puzzled as to which way this particular person might be heading, Mr. Chairman, but nevertheless I think it's interesting that he was heading one of these directions and there can be good reason for that as well. We've always had people who have had reason to study at universities outside of the province, perhaps because of the particular faculty or the particular academic interest that they had and that's not something that I criticize, I think there is certainly some logic in some cases to that.

I was interested in the comment on research. I'm not sure just how much money is enough for research, perhaps there is never enough. I know that there was some \$14 million that went into the total research of the university last year. I have no reason to believe that that would be less this year, of course, that is not all government money by any stretch of the imagination. A great deal of this comes from private sources. But I know that in some areas and particularly in the health area, I think we could be doing more in research. I think governments perhaps have been lax in that area and should have been putting a great deal more money into research in health to try to overcome some of the diseases that certainly are taking their toll on our citizenry. And of course we can look at countries that are spending millions in rocketry and space travel and at the same time have not solved the problem of cancer or some of the other diseases that as I mentioned take such a toll on our humanity. At the same time I would suggest that we should be doing more in this area. All governments should be doing more and I don't think that I would get any argument from members opposite in that way.

I have also some concern when I hear members opposite saying that perhaps we should take only the top people and send them to university. Only those who show the they have the highest intelligence. This elitist approach again bothers me a bit because quite often I think we have found that some of the people who with the highest promise have gone on to university and perhaps after graduating have not made the greatest contribution to society. Whereas others, who might not meet

the criteria of this elitist approach would never have that opportunity to go, and I would suggest to members opposite and members of this House that there have been rather outstanding contributions made by people who, at the time that they graduated from high school, perhaps not having reached a certain level of maturity or perhaps for a number of other factors, did not show that outstanding promise at that particular time, but in fact in later years that developed and they made outstanding contributions to their society.

And that is one of the real dangers I would suggest to members opposite of that particular elitist approach. Let's skim off what we consider the academic cream of the crop, forget about the rest, and then we will solve all of the problems, and I suggest that is not a solution. —(Interjection)— The Member for Inkster is asking how they do it at the medical school today? They have entrance examinations I understand, and I understand and they possibly are picking the top. And I suppose if that is the way the member wishes to define that type of elitism he may, but I am suggesting that in the broad entrance requirements to university, that that particular approach not be used, because everyone has that opportunity to apply to medical school, and everyone has that opportunity to apply to get into law school, whereas the system that the Honourable Member for Inkster has been espousing would not even give them the opportunity to apply because they'd never be at university in the first place.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, lest there be any misunderstanding, on a matter of privilege, I am willing to give everybody the opportunity to apply.

MR. COSENS: I certainly apologize to the Member for Inkster because I had the impression, perhaps it was the Member for St. Johns then, that he would pick those who were judged most able and they would be the ones who would have the opportunity of attending university.

Let me also suggest, Mr. Chairman, if we can just return to the fees for a minute, that the amount of money that is derived from the fees this year will amount to some 2.1 percent of the total budget and that, along with the 3 percent, the universities, will total some 5.1 percent. Now, I would wonder, Mr. Chairman, if members opposite consider that that is an inadequate amount of funding for the universities to operate on in this coming year?

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I am afraid the Minister for Education has just lost some marks in my marking. Mr. Chairman, firstly, I don't know where he interpreted anything I said which had to do with some student leaving Manitoba to go to school elsewhere. I haven't the slightest idea of what I could have said that would have given him that idea. I did suggest that many people are leaving the province because of the lack of opportunity. I meant opportunity to earn a living. I really referred specifically to the architects who are being referred to in today's Free Press as having learned from Cabinet Ministers that they've had it too good and would be better off to leave, that's what I referred to. I also referred to a cousin of mine whom I did not want to use as a debating point out of respect for him, and whom I don't because I feel that his capacity is so great that it belongs in a field where there is greater opportunity for him to do his research work.

I don't know whether the Minister was defensive about research or not. I don't see how one could expect that the province of Manitoba, with one million people, should be able to provide research work to the extent — he talked about finding the cure for cancer, you know, it's a national and international problem that has to be dealt with. I wouldn't think that the people of Manitoba should finance the highest level of research. The important matter for research is to attract the best teachers and to keep the best students, that's the important use that research has at university but maybe he doesn't know it, so I guess I have to teach him something too. —(Interjection)— Oh, he says he knows it. Well, if he knows it he wouldn't have to be apologetic about the amount of research that is being done. He should know that it's an educational tool.

The reason that I spoke a little harshly now is that I think he deliberately attempted to distort what was being said from this side of the House, and I say deliberately, and I say he lost marks because this is the first time during the Estimates debate that I've heard him attempt to twist something in that way.

What we were saying, Mr. Chairman, is that there should be equal opportunity to acquire an education in the province of Manitoba at all levels and then we talked about capacity of a province to finance it, and I asked him how many students we had and he didn't know, and I didn't know, so —(Interjection)— Well, he didn't tell me. I said 30, and I was told not quite that much, so I said, "Well, all right, then maybe 20." If he does know, that's not important. The important thing is that I suggested that I would rather see a lesser number of people have equal opportunity to learn than the number that are today attending, if that is our financial capacity. Now, I would like every person in Manitoba to go to school. I would like every person in Manitoba to go to university, but I would expect him not to go if he's not able to measure up to the academic requirements to do so.

Now, the Honourable Minister talks about a leader society, and the only thing he didn't say was describe Russia as being what he might think we were saying as the ideal, because he kept talking about state selection of students. No word did I hear from this side anything to do with state making the decisions. And he talked about academic freedom, and he talked —(Interjection)— Oh you see, Mr. Chairman, that's the way he operates. He talked about academic freedom, but he says that they pay the money, therefore they make decisions. Who pays the money today? Well, to a large extent, it's those people who he insists should think that they are paying the cost. He says people should

have to pay something in order to appreciate that it is not for free, so who pays the cost? Let him ask the Member for St. Matthews. The Member for St. Matthews told him as well as me, if the Minister was listening, that it is the rich, the well off, who attend universities. And the Minister of Education says, "Let them know it costs money, so we charge them a fee." They know it costs money, that's why many of them supported the Minister of Education in this party. They knew they could expect a reduction in taxation from them, cause they knew they were paying for this, they didn't want to pay so much, so they are the ones who are very conscious of what they pay and they are the ones who crack the whip and play the tune for the Minister of Education, who now accuses us of wanting an elitist society.

Let the Honourable Minister know, I'll give him a little bit more of autobiography. My sister wanted to get into medical school the early 30s, and she discovered that she had to fit into two quotas, she had two big problems: firstly, she was a woman; secondly, she was a Jew. She had to qualify in two ways in what they called numerous clauses in those days. You couldn't go to medical school unless you had very high marks for accreditation if you were Jewish; you had to have extremely high marks to get in if you were a woman. Otherwise, it wasn't that difficult. That was pretty elitist, I think.

What is it today? Today it is based more on academic — well, I think it is based entirely on academic achievement. It is still selective, not everybody can go, it is pretty tough to get into medicine today. Maybe even tougher than it was, because now the competition is greater because it's a 3.9 average, I gather.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the 30s you had to be non-Jewish and a male, and then it was a lot easier if you had the money; if you had the money, there wasn't that much of a scramble to get in then, there wasn't such a big fight. I used to see the list of the applicants. There was a Professor Wardle, whom I think so highly of because he was one of the admission members who gave me all the confidential information to show me how they had three lists: women, Jews, everybody else; and told me how many they were told they could bring in on each of those three categories. So don't tell me about elitist selection. But in those days it was easier, because only the people who were well-off could really get in. That doesn't apply today.

Today, people of more moderate means are able to do it, and I will not hesitate to give credit to all of the governments in all of this country for what it was that it achieved in the last 8 years. The Attorney-General came in at the end of my remarks, and he heard me talking about a payment of \$125 in tuition. He asked across what I thought it was worth in today's dollars, and I said, "An awful lot more." I think he was going to say, "Well, then, why shouldn't the tuition be an awful lot more?" The point I was making then was the \$125 was a larger percentage of my ability to pay at that time than tuition would be today, but I say that with pride and so should he. Society has progressed way beyond the middle 30s to the extent of providing a greater opportunity of access to universities.

The main reason I stood was to point out to the Honourable Minister, that if he doesn't believe in the kind of "elitist society" that he mentioned, let him get busy in that medical school, let him go to that law school and find out that they have their own quota system. Does he know that? Yes, he knows that. I think it's 10 or 15 out of 100, approximately, let's say 10 to 15 percent of the students going to law school are people who do not have the academic qualifications in the same capacity as the general run. They are selected, they're given special opportunities, and the Member for Minnedosa likes that. He should be pleased to know that this introduction came about during the NDP regime.

Mr. Chairman, there is a reverse discrimination taking place in the law school, because it is recognized — the point he makes is recognized — I don't think that applies in medicine, I don't know. But the important point, and the reason I rose to my feet, is that he then suggested that if there were no tuition fee, by inference — I drew the inference that if there were no tuition fees then the government would be involved and there wouldn't be academic freedom; therefore, the state would be involved, and that is just so much errant nonsense, Mr. Chairman, so much errant nonsense. There was never a suggestion made from this side, that selection should be made by government. The decision as to who enters universities, I believe, should be left to universities.

He said something else, though. He suggested that it would be a terrible thing for government to intervene as to what courses should be taken. There I'm willing to debate a little. I think that the people, the taxpayers' representatives, do have a stake in knowing that we are producing too many of one kind of expert and too few of another, and I don't mind saying that when — I don't know whether it was our government or the previous government that introduced a special payment for students in dentistry who were prepared to go outside of Winnipeg. We introduced it — all right, there, you can may call us elitest, if you like, but I'm told that our government introduced a system of special bursaries to dental students who agreed to spend a certain number of years practising in rural Manitoba. That's selectivity — that's elitist, if that's what you want to call it, but I think that that's justified. I think that it is right for a government to recognize what is missing within its province in terms of capacity to deliver important services such as dental health services, and to have an incentive to do it. They used money, and we used money, only they give it to private enterprise by way of tax reductions ostensibly to stimulate their interest in working in Manitoba, and we gave it to dental students. Call that elitist, if you like, but don't for a moment suggest that we recommended: firstly, that numbers of students should be limited; secondly, that they should be selected by the government. That we did not do.

We said that if you have limited money, then you have to limit students. And if you limit students, it is better to limit them on the basis of their ability and desire to learn than on their ability or that of their parents to finance their going to school, and I think that's important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to continue debating this particular issue, because I see the Member for Inkster is no longer in his seat, and some of the concepts that have been put forward he had advanced. But I would like to come back to the point regarding the total funding to the universities, both by the government and the amount of funding that they have realized through the increase in tuition fees. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that with the 3 percent provided through the University Grants Commission and in turn to the Grants Commission by the government, and the 2.1 from the increase in tuition fees, that we're looking at a 5.1 amount of increase to the universities. I've been hearing from the opposition for some time, that that's not enough — 5.1 isn't enough, it's not receiving enough, — but at a meeting I attended at the University of Manitoba, along with the Member for Fort Rouge, who I'm sorry is not here at this time, and the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition said to the students and others assembled there, in criticism of the 3 percent that we had provided, "If we had been looking at this, we would have provided something in the area of 5 perhaps 6 percent." I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that through the tuition increase and the 3 percent that we have provided, that the universities have their 5 percent, and if the Leader of the Opposition was saying that 5 percent was adequate funding — and I'm sure of course he was not advocating a fee increase — that would not be consistent with the policy of those on the other side — then I can't see where they're criticizing the 5 percent of moneys that the universities will have to operate on next year. And I have some trouble, Mr. Chairman, understanding the criticism in that area, particularly in relation to what the Leader of the Opposition has said, "Five percent or perhaps 6, we would have considered," and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the universities, along with the tuition increase, have received 5 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

c84-07 MR. HANUSCHAK: I have two questions. Would the Honourable Minister be good enough to give us some breakdown of the \$89,108,000 to indicate how he arrives at the 3 percent increase, because as I had indicated to the Honourable Minister previously, that on the total amount shown here, the increase is only one and a fraction percent, and that's question No. 1.

Question No. 2. I would like to know from the Honourable Minister what portion of the university costs does he feel ought to be borne by the students directly, and what portion ought to be funded out of the public purse?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in order to answer the first question of the Member for Burrows, and of course these determinations are made by the University Grants Commission, they arrived at this increase of 3 percent in the following manner: they made reductions in a number of areas to bring down that amount of money that we see in front of us in the Estimates, to a point where they were able to provide some \$2,400,000 additional to the universities. Now, I think if the Member for Burrows does some simple subtraction in the figures that he has in front of him he will find some \$1 million something, so we are short another million something. So if we start adding up the figures of seven hundred thousand and some dollars in grants in lieu of taxes, and if we add in other economies that the University Grants Commission themselves practised, and if we take into consideration the fact that the Grants Commission itself pays things like computer and xerox rentals, and first claims, and then apportions the money out to the universities — that in fact the amount of money that they have given the universities this year amounts to some \$2,400,000 more than last year, and in fact is 3 percent.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Would the Minister be good enough, rather than talking in generalities, give us the figures that would apply on both sides of the Estimates sheet to indicate where the 3 percent increase is? In other words, Mr. Chairman, here we have two figures: one \$87.9 million; the other \$89.1 million, which shows one and a quarter percent increase, or whatever it works out to precisely.

Could he give us similar figures for the fiscal year ending 1978 and for the fiscal year ending 1979 that would show a three percent increase, rather than if the university were to exercise the following economies as recommended by the Grants Commission, etc., etc., that would add up to three percent? Give us the precise figures.

MR. COSENS: I'll have the breakdown for the Member for Burrows in a minute, Mr. Chairman. It involves as I've mentioned those factors previously and I can give him those particular factors with the dollar equivalents. It will take a minute to produce those for him and if we don't have them ready today, I can certainly have them ready for him on Monday. But as I say, the figure that it represents is some \$2,400,000 which is three percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, we will remind the Honourable Minister on Monday in the event that if the figures should not be forthcoming at that time and we'll deal with him then. In the meantime there was a second question that I asked the Honourable Minister, and to refresh his memory I had asked what does he consider to be an appropriate breakdown as between the fees charged — breakdown of funding university operations — as between fees charged directly to the students and

Friday, May 5, 1978

that paid out of public purse? In other words, what percentage of a cost of university operations does he feel a student should bear directly?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that's a rather difficult question to answer specifically to the Member for Burrows, but I would suggest if he looks at tuition fee costs across the country, that the figure seems to fall into the bracket between 10 percent and 15 percent.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, you know, listening to the user pay philosophy as expounded by this government over the past few weeks, I am at a loss to understand why this Minister would want to limit the user fee to 15 percent. Why not 16, why not 20, 50, 75, or 100 percent? What is the magic about 15 percent? Why not the 100 percent?

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that perhaps we are trying to fill in a bit of time at this point. However, perhaps the Member for Burrows is serious in his question and I'll treat it in that way. I think he well realizes as certainly I do, that society in general believes that the contribution of university education to our society is of value and it is prepared to pay part of that particular cost. And as a result, that is the reason that we find across this country that in all provinces, society is in fact prepared to pay a certain percentage and I have given the Honourable Member for Burrows some idea of the range within which society is prepared to go in that regard, and I would suggest to him that that does fall into the category from 85 to 90 percent they have been prepared to pay to this point.

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I can now give him the breakdown that he requested and we will go through 1977-78 and 1978-79. The operating grant — would you like me to proceed, Mr. Chairman? Very well, I will go ahead. The operating grant in 1977-78 was some \$80,126,800, Mr. Chairman. First claims amounted to \$2,339,500, the University Grants Commission Expenses \$395,200, the support programs \$1,024,400.00. I'll just pause for a bit of clarification. Computer rentals \$3,352,000, grants in lieu of taxes \$7,215,000 and that totalled some \$94,455,900.00. Now in 1978-79, Mr. Chairman, the operating grant some \$82,490,000, the first claims \$2,339,300, the University Grants Commission \$344,200, support programs \$822,500, and computer rentals — I believe Xerox and so on is in that category — \$3,111,000, and the grants in lieu of taxes of course are in the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the total there is some \$89,108,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 4:30, is it the intent of the House to go into Private Members' Hour?

MR. JORGENSEN: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that there is no disposition on the part of honourable members to go into Private Members' Hour, and I suggest that the Committee rise.

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

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that the House do now adjourn.

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