

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

Time: 8.00 p.m.

## SUPPLY — PUBLIC WORKS

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee come to order. We are on Page 72, Item 6.(b), Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets. 6.(b) Other Items. Prior to the break for Private Members' Hour the Member for The Pas was partially through his statement. Does he wish to continue?

**MR. McBRIDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Before we adjourned the Minister had explained that he was now familiar with the situation with the Courthouse and Jail at The Pas and that he and the Attorney-General and I assume that the Minister responsible for corrections have this high on the priority lists, and I certainly would like to thank the Minister for that effort to make sure the project was high on the list and the fact that he is now fully aware of the problems in the situation in regard to that facility at The Pas.

As I was explaining, Mr. Chairman, right now they are functioning at The Pas in temporary trailer-unit facilities which is not ideal in terms of a correctional facility. It requires extra personnel and extra staff to keep guard over the doors, etc., and even with the new trailer facility those problems with the Fire Commissioner's office because of staff available to unlock doors, etc. should a fire break out at that facility. There was a number of problems that showed some bungling on the part of the new government when, in fact, the Minister of Corrective and Rehabilitation Services wrote to The Pas Chamber of Commerce as opposed to the Town Council and others who were directly concerned.

For example, Mr. Chairman, on March 14, 1978, L. R. Sherman, Minister, wrote to Mr. Bob Campbell, president of The Pas Chamber of Commerce, saying that the proposed facilities at The Pas were given careful consideration and a decision has been made with my concurrence to defer construction for one year. Now, Mr. Chairman, that was announced by the Minister to the Chamber of Commerce and he was unaware that he had sent that letter until it was brought to his attention.

The other problem that has arisen that I think for that situation the Minister of Public Works, certainly I can't get after him too much because he probably wasn't aware of the letter sent out by the Minister of Corrective and Rehabilitation Services either. However, there was, I think, a point at which the Minister might have been more effective than he was since he now realizes the high priority of this, and that was at the stage when Cabinet was considering which items would remain cut, which items would remain frozen, and which items would proceed. At that time the Minister, had he been fully familiar with the situation, either the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Health and Social Development, could have indicated that the facility was easily broken into two parts; that is, the Jail facility and the court house facility, because whereas the jail facility could no longer function in the old building, the old building could still be used for a court room on a temporary basis, because if there were a fire or other kind of emergency people could leave, whereas with the jail facility the problems are much greater. So I think that is where there was a falling down on the part of the Ministers concerned with this project where they could have said, "Well, just a minute, as we are reducing these projects this isn't a \$4.5 million project, it's a \$1.8 or \$2 million project, which will meet the immediate needs and the immediate concerns." So I think there was a slip up there on the part of the Minister, and I don't know whether it was this Minister or the other Minister.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I could never get it clarified which Minister sort of took these projects before Cabinet. The earlier discussion that I caught the end of with the Member for Elmwood and the Minister, indicates that the Minister responsible for that function, that is the Attorney-General or the Minister of Corrections or whatever department it is, seems to be the one that carries the ball as opposed to the Minister of Public Works. Since when I asked that question the First Minister got very much on the offensive or became very offensive, maybe the Minister could clarify it for me now — who does take these matters, like a jail facility or like a court house facility, to Cabinet; is it taken by himself or is it taken by the Minister that has the responsibility for the operation that will take over that building once it is completed? So maybe that is one question that the Minister could address himself to.

It is my understanding, for example, that the jail part of the facilities that were designed were very spartan, and they were an essential part of the project. I am not that familiar nor did I see the plans for the Court House part, which the Minister says there might be some room for reduction or savings. But I think in comparison with other jail facilities on the square foot basis, the proposed correctional facility or jail at The Pas was quite low, compared with other jail facilities.

The other problem that arises that maybe the Minister could also deal with is the situation now where there is a temporary permit allowed for the trailer units at The Pas, on the understanding that the correctional facilities would have been finished this year, and that the new facilities would have been moved into and the old trailers would have been moved out to the Egg Lake Camp. What for example will the Minister do if the Town of The Pas says, "Well, we are just not renewing your permit for trailer facilities anymore. Since the Province of Manitoba didn't carry out its understanding, its deal with the Town of The Pas, then the Town of The Pas is going to become stubborn, and we are just not going to allow you to have those trailer units occupying the site at The Pas."

Mr. Speaker, in that regard I would like to read into the record a letter from the Mayor of the Town

**Tuesday, May 9, 1978**

of The Pas, dated March 23rd, 1978, to Honourable H. Enns, Minister of Public Works: "Dear Mr. Minister: As you are aware I have discussed with you personally and with your Deputy Minister, Mr. Brako, the status of a new correctional. . ."

**MR. ENNS:** A fine and honourable gentleman that Mr. Brako.

**MR. McBRYDE:** ". . . institute and court house for the Town of The Pas. Both projects were announced and tendered by the former government, however the new government delayed the awarding of contracts pending a review under its Restraint Program. As I have pointed out to you and to at least two members of the Cabinet who have inspected the present correctional facility, the existing operation is only temporary, and as a matter of fact is operating under a temporary permit issued by the Town, which expires December 31st, 1978. There has never been any doubt that a new correctional institute is an absolute necessity at The Pas, following the closure of a former facility in a building commonly referred to as the Court House on Fisher Avenue, because of the extremely high fire hazards. It was for that reason that temporary quarters were planned until a new facility was constructed, and it was hoped that the new facility would be completed by December 31st, 1978, or not too long thereafter, hence the temporary occupancy permit issued by the town for the temporary facilities.

"Only last week in a conversation with Mr. Brako by long distance, I was given to understand that no firm decision has been made pending some action on the part of the Attorney-General with respect to the new Court House to be constructed alongside the new correctional institute. The two facilities are to be joined by a common corridor tunnel. It was my suggestion to Mr. Brako that plans proceed without further delay on the correctional institute, as this project, I felt, had a higher priority due to the temporary and far from satisfactory conditions encountered in trying to operate a facility of this nature with trailers.

"I would be surprised if either the Honourable Frank Johnston or the Honourable Sidney Spivak, who have inspected the temporary facilities, would argue against my suggestion.

"This week The Pas Chamber of Commerce received the enclosed communication from the Honourable Bud Sherman, Minister of Corrections. I find it hard to reconcile Mr. Sherman's letter with my phone conversation with Mr. Brako, who said he was calling me on your behalf, especially when Mr. Sherman's letter is dated one day previous to your Deputy Minister's phone call. However, I had spoken to the Honourable Mr. Johnston on the subject while he was in The Pas on March 14th and he could not confirm a report attributed to the Member for Swan River that the institute had indeed been postponed. The writer had been called by a member of the Foundation Company at Swan River advising me of Mr. Gourlay's information and enquiring if I, as Mayor of the Town, had formerly been advised of the postponement. The Town had not, of course, nor has it of this date been formerly advised of the postponement.

"I have been instructed by the members of Council to convey their unanimous disapproval of the Correctional Minister's letter to the Chamber, which in effect is bypassing the municipal authority. We do not believe Mr. Sherman has been properly apprised of the situation as it relates to temporary quarters here in The Pas. It is for that reason I am writing to you requesting a meeting with yourself, the Honourable Mr. Sherman, and the Attorney-General, Honourable G. Mercier, just as soon as possible.

"We are prepared to come to Winnipeg if no further reason than to establish for how long the temporary permit will have to be extended. You can appreciate Mr. Minister that the granting of a temporary permit is a privilege and we would expect the government to act no differently than any other citizen who seeks privileges or temporary suspension of existing bylaws and codes of the municipality."

So maybe, Mr. Chairman, the Minister could explain his response to the Mayor of the Town of The Pas. Maybe he wants to explain the bungling that took place and sort of who contacted who, and who said what, but more important and maybe he could tell if he met with The Pas and whether in fact they have come to any understanding with regard to the permit situation?

The other question I would address to the Minister is the nature of the contract awarded. It is my understanding that much of the contract was with northern contractors who expected to employ northern labour, whether he sees any serious problems, especially for local businessmen like the cement supplier in The Pas when the facility was not proceeded with, if it caused them any extraordinary problems?

I know that the Minister believes that his government's policy of returning estate taxes or not collecting estate taxes, for example, will stimulate the economy and maybe this kind of measure isn't necessary. So maybe since he firmly believes that he could advise how much employment has been created in The Pas as a result of the estate tax elimination, and whether in fact any jobs had been created in that region because of that step by the government, or whether he feels that this kind of project would not only meet an urgent and necessary need, but it would also help with the unemployment situation in northern Manitoba?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Public Works.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I have indicated earlier that the line of initiating action I will attempt to make very clear to client departments, whether it involves a matter of corrections or health or education, that those departments charged with the immediate responsibility of carrying out those

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

programs initiate the action. I do not place that responsibility on the staff and the Department of Public Works to initiate that action.

Secondly, let me say, and I know that I invite further comment on this, I find it passingly strange that in this day and age, and to hear from the former social worker, now MLA, former Cabinet Minister from The Pas, talk about the spartan facilities being suggested to house 68 people. I find it passingly strange that the costs to house on the main, young people who have violated the law and who have subsequently, because of our laws, have to be detained for relatively short periods of time — because it is a correctional institute, it is not a penitentiary — for 6 months, 3 months, you know, within a limit of 2 years as I understand the system, and I'm not the Corrections Minister, that it costs more to provide housing accommodation or shelter for that person, than it does to build an acute bed in the General Health Sciences Centre. There's something wrong with that.

I find it passingly strange that in 1978, we are building overnight sleeping quarters into court houses into The Pas. I have canvassed the judges, and every judge assures me that he has no intention of ever overnighing in his court house. There are motel facilities available in The Pas, when in most cases the court holds their hearings and flies out the same day, so I don't know why I'm building into a facility elaborate overnight sleeping quarters for a judge who has told me that he will never sleep in that court house. And so, when the honourable social dreamer of the previous administration tells me that this is spartan living accommodations, or spartan facilities that we are deferring, I suggest to him that there is every reason why this government says I would sooner take a million dollars of that \$5 million and build a personal care home somewhere.

I would sooner take a half a million dollars of that \$5 million and invest in senior or public housing somewhere. I would do a lot of other things other than what I believe to be an over-again design and overbuilt facility of which we have so many examples in the north, that they are a stone around our neck like you wouldn't believe. Like you wouldn't believe, thanks to the kind of wishy-washy, dreaming planning that is taking place by the Federal government whether it involves the shopping center at The Pas, whether it involves the complex at Churchill, or now the proposed facilities at The Pas. And, I make no apologies for taking a second look at it.

And, by the way, this is no criticism directed at my staff who respond to the needs that client departments place on them in the design and the, you know, in the drawing up, the working drawings of these kinds of facilities. All I'm saying that in 1978 you don't build sleeping quarters into courthouses any more. And I question the price tag. I question the fact that it costs more to house a relatively healthy young Canadian for a relatively short period of time and why those costs should cost more per bed than it costs to build a sophisticated, totally modern, updated, acute health care bed in the Health Sciences Centre or in the Seven Oaks facilities that we are now building, but that is the case. And I'm saying that from the Department of Public Works, for those reasons I am prepared to review that kind of what I consider to be inordinate expenditures of money and say, no, we will take a second look at it. Having said that, I expect the facility to be built this year.

**MR. McBRYDE:** I very much thank the Minister for the last part of his statement. It's rather unfortunate that he is not capable of listening when somebody else is speaking because I said I had not seen the plans, nor discussed with members of his department the courtuse facilities; that I had discussed with them the jail facilities, of which they showed me comparisons with other jail facilities and reassured us that those costs were very low indeed for that type of facility that has to contain people and prevent people from breaking out. And I mentioned specifically that I was not sure of the courthouse facilities and whether there could be reductions in the courthouse facilities, but the Minister preferred to ignore that while then launching into the situation of the social worker from The Pas.

Mr. Chairman, I was not a social worker at The Pas, nor was I a rancher who leased out land — government land — illegally. . . I was neither of those two things.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister wants to direct his comments . . . —(Interjection)— I think the key thing is, Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the Minister has assured that construction will proceed. I wonder if he wants to address himself in a manner just to explain what happened in terms of the letters that went out and the bungling that took place or whether he would just as soon that we just let that matter pass, which is all right with me as long as the facilities are going to proceed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, as one of the bureaucratic spenders from the south — to use the Honourable Member for The Pas phrase — I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the members of the committee here today the amount of people who go through this institution or jail and the cost of the proposed correction centre. Thank you.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, if I had that information I would be more than happy to try and supply it to committee, but that would be the responsibility of the Minister of Corrections, who is responsible in terms of staffing the facility and would have the estimated costs in terms of population and the kind of questions that the member asks.

I can only indicate to the honourable member from the 3 of Public Works the physical construction costs, which are of the order of \$5.9 million.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** \$5.9 million?

**MR. ENNS:** \$5,985,519.00 to house 68 persons.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can indicate how many institutions of that nature we have in the province.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Emerson again please.

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate how many institutions of that nature and that kind of cost do we have in the province.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, every facility is another facility. We have facilities now at Dauphin. We have facilities at Brandon. Of course the major facility being Headingley. These come under the title of correctional institutions. We no longer call them jails, but that's what they are.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Just a minute, we have a list. The Member for Wellington is next. Elmwood, The Pas and Swan River, in that order.

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I must say I am intrigued that we are going off on what I think may prove to be a tangent. But given that you, Mr. Chairman, have allowed the Honourable Minister to stray afield, I feel compelled . . . We can't have a law for the rich and a law for the poor, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please. I was very fair with the Member for The Pas and let him compare estate taxes and reduction in taxation when he was speaking on the correctional institute. I think I was more than fair with the Member for The Pas. So therefore if the Minister, in replying, wanted to get a little off track, I think it's only fair to permit him to get a little off track. The Member for Wellington, if you wish to carry on.

**MR. CORRIN:** Thank you for that elaboration, Mr. Chairman. It was uncalled for but it was offered gratuitously and I take it for what it is worth.

Could the Honourable Minister please tell us something more about the northern correctional institute? He has advised the Member for Emerson, I believe, that it was \$5.9 million in terms of its capital cost. What does that break down to on a square foot basis and how might that, Mr. Chairman, through you, compare to the capital costs appropriations on a square footage basis for other buildings, particularly personal nursing care homes — since that has been raised — in other parts of the province or in northern regions? Well, there is a difference in economy, somebody says, in the south. I prefer we talk about apples and apples and deal with northern situations.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to answer the details of the question. I can answer as it relates to other facilities, but in this particular instance we are looking at about \$100 per square foot and I am told that that compares to about \$70 to \$80 per square foot for a facility like Seven Oaks. were inflated as a result of locale.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm told. I don't wish to evade the question. I can't answer these questions that definitively, those are questions more appropriately asked to the Minister responsible for Corrections. But, by way of comparison and this is a concern to this government, the fact of the matter is that per person served we are asking for, or that is the plans of the previous administration was to spend \$58,000 per person, per inmate as compared to \$33,000 that we spend per acute hospital care bed at the new facility of Seven Oaks, or the General Health Sciences Centre, and I'm saying that that concerns me. That tells me that in building, perhaps what has to be considered the most sophisticated, costliest, facility, to look after people in need people who are sick, people who need all kinds of additional services built into that bed facility — supply of oxygen, supply of respiratory equipment, additional electrical machinery to put on the various life saving machines that modern medicine now has. It is costing us \$33,000 to provide that bed for an acute ill heart attack patient in a hospital, and the plans of the previous administration were to spend \$58,000 to house 17 year olds who happen to be violating the law on a weekend, had a few drinks too many, and is being put in the hoosegow for 2 months. And, I'm saying that something is out of wack, I'm saying something's out of wack. And, I do not apologize to this committee for taking a second look at it.

**MR. CORRIN:** Would the Minister then not be willing to concede that given the fact that there probably is something in the order of a 20 percent to 30 percent differential in building costs, construction costs, as between southern and northern Manitoba — and, I think that his staff can support that statement if he wants to take recourse to their advice — given the fact that the intensive care unit he's talking about is essentially, in a capital sense, not much more expensive, given that differential. It probably will be much more expensive. . .

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, if I may interject before the member gets carried away. He is more learned than I am, but you know, 25 percent or even 30 percent of \$33,000 is in the neighbourhood of \$6,000.00. That brings that hospital bed up to \$40,000, as compared to \$58,000 that we're building. I still say it's still an inordinate differential.

**MR. CORRIN:** Could the Minister, given the fact that he's stated, although he has indicated by way of demure that he's not responsible for the Correctional Department, but he has indicated that this particular expense, the expense associated with provision of this correctional institute, seems to him to be inordinate. Inordinately high and presumably an inordinate demand on the public purse, and given that I agree with him that first of all these types of expenses probably are in certain circumstances unwarranted, because some of the offenders are, in effect, being given hotel space — and I'm not sure that that's a desirable end in itself in the corrections field; and given the fact that there are other alternatives that are available in the county where these people could be more productive; and, given the fact that these people perhaps in playing that sort of more productive role, could make proper recompense to the community that they have slighted, that they have previously offended.

I'm wondering whether the Honourable Minister would be willing to indicate whether he would be willing to advocate to the Cabinet alternative positions vis-a-vis corrections in northern Manitoba.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, that question again is more appropriately asked to the Minister Responsible for Corrections or indeed the Attorney-General who administers justice and the manner and way in which justice is meted out in this land. I plead with the committee that I cannot, as Minister of Public Works, respond to those questions without. . . It's fair game, I suppose for the members to ask me whatever they wish, but I've been in the game long enough to know that all these matters are put on record, and they will be read back to me or to some other Minister, and I'm not prepared to suggest what I may think the Attorney-General, my colleague ought to be doing in this area, or what I think the Minister of Corrections ought to be doing in this area. They have this responsibility and they will respond to the questions that the member raises, and I would invite the honourable member to direct those kinds of questions to the Estimates of the Attorney-General, or the Minister responsible directly for Corrections.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, with due respect to the Honourable Minister, I would argue that it is quite relevant that we ask him those sorts of questions because one of the primary considerations and concerns when determining what sort of correctional facilities would best serve our community is cost. You can never divorce the efficiency of a particular reform system from its costs. It's like any other service the government offers, it can't be offered in isolation anymore than we could if we wished, I suppose, build all sorts of very sophisticated elaborate health facilities that might, in fact, be of utility to some members of our population. But, because we deemed the construction of those types of facilities to be not cost-effective and cost-efficient, we choose as a matter of public policy not to. And, the same can be applied to bridges, highways, roads and so on and so forth.

So, I suggest that for the Honourable Minister to stand before us this evening, sit before us this evening and say that these matters are properly within the bailiwick and jurisdiction only of the Attorney-General and the Honourable Minister responsible for Corrections, is intellectually dishonest. Because, he knows darn well that when it comes down to the short strokes we darn well have to look at the costs. That's a practical reality. And, he has told me that. He has told all members of the Assembly that for some many many weeks now, we have laboured under the burden of that particular position, that everything must be reviewed in light of its financial fiscal impact. I would suggest that the same applies to Public Works and Corrections, and we can't simply say that the Minister responsible for Corrections can have what he wants. Surely this Minister would not suggest to this committee that he is willing to give into any sort of fantastical proposition raised by the Honourable Attorney-General or the Minister of Corrections. Obviously those propositions, any proposals made, are going to be made in the light of costs.

So, I ask the Minister whether he can't please tell us what the alternatives are. I believe there are alternatives, and I would suggest for a person who's been involved in Public Works for as long as this particular member has, he is fully aware of what the alternatives might be. And, I would ask him whether the dollars spent by Manitobans in the corrections field might not better be allocated to other programs. And, if he wants some suggestions I'll make a suggestion. I suggest that it's high time we had a work program in this province. And, I'm not talking about a chain gang, I'm talking about a work program. A program that might help the Honourable Minister with respect to maintenance of highways and parks, and it might also give young offenders such as the one the Minister has indicated are presently wasting in custody in very expensive over-built facilities, the opportunity to become productive and learn what it is to earn an honest days dollar. And, that in itself might be of lasting benefit to many young people in this province.

I don't care what the former policies were. I'm not divorced from the party, but I wasn't a member and I was not a Minister, and I certainly wasn't party to any decisions that were taken, and, I'm willing to discuss this matter in a rational forthright fashion with this committee, and I would ask the Honourable Minister is he willing to view alternatives? Is he willing to present something innovative to his Cabinet to the Minister responsible for the department of the Attorney General, the Minister responsible for Corrections, in order that we can ameliorate the present cost-ineffective situation that exists in this province with respect to Corrections ?

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that in many ways I concur with much of what the honourable member has said. I particularly concur, although it is at some divergence from what the former speaker in this committee just talked about, the spartan facilities and the need to proceed immediately with it. Now the Member for Wellington, a party colleague of the former Member for The Pas, talks about is it necessary to proceed with the overbuilt, expensive, deluxe-type accommodations? Now, quite frankly, the Honourable Member for Wellington is coming very close to sharing with me the concerns that I have about proceeding with the plans of the previous administration. I also do not dismiss out of hand his really more serious suggestions about rethinking and relooking at the manner and way in which we house and the way we treat offenders, persons, citizens who are temporarily at odds with the law. I will only say this to you, that when the Premier of this province decides to relieve me of the onerous duties of being Minister of Highways, Public Works, and Minister responsible for Autopac, and makes me the Minister of Corrections, then I will be in a position to respond more directly to taking up some of the challenges, some of the advice, and good advice, that the Honourable Member for Wellington has just given me.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Elmwood and then The Pas.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, just a couple of points here. I think the Minister has drawn up a phoney comparison. He is trying to make the case that there is more money being spent per inmate bed than per hospital bed, etc., etc. Well, you know, first of all, I think there are reasons for that and I recall a chart which I am sure that his staff behind him could pull out or could produce in a day or so showing the cost of new correctional facilities across Canada. If my memory serves me correctly, they were in the range of \$60.00 to \$80.00 to \$90.00 to \$100.00 a square foot. These were costs of new correctional facilities in other parts of the country.

There are reasons for this. You cannot say that you can build a correctional unit that, let's say, is to hold a prisoner, for the same amount of money that you would use for a person who is ill because, for example, in the case of Brandon, and I assume that the same applies at The Pas, you have prisoners separated into different categories. There is a male and female separation; there are age separations, etc.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, we're going to have to change that; it's against the Human Rights Act.

**MR. DOERN:** There are people, for instance, who can go out during the day. So I know in the case of Brandon, there are about five categories of prisoners. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, there is some noise coming down that is interrupting me.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is there?

**MR. DOERN:** There are about five separations at Brandon and I assume three, four or five at The Pas and you cannot compare the kind of facility — I mean, I don't know what you require in a hospital, whether the walls are six inches thick — but in a correctional institution where they are a foot thick and where the materials are different, clearly you don't have plasterboard in a prison if you are trying to contain somebody. So your costs are significantly more.

Similarly, if you are renovating in this building where the walls are several feet thick, it will cost you a great deal more to renovate than in an ordinary building. And also there are northern costs; there are costs of construction in relation to building north of 53.

So when you compare our costs to other correctional facilities in the country, to the fact that it is being built in the north, to the fact that it is not a school or a hospital but a holding correctional facility, it is obvious that it will cost more than other kinds of institutions. I have to say to the Minister that because he says so, doesn't make it so. I mean, he uses words very loosely and he uses these words with a repetitive effect. He keeps talking about overdesign and overbuilt, luxurious, and he is trying to create an impression . . .

**MR. ENNS:** That was the Member for Wellington who talked about overbuilt, hotel-like facilities; that was the Member for Wellington who put that on the record.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Wellington, on a point of order.

**MR. CORRIN:** On a point of order. Just simply to clarify the record, I wish to indicate that at no time did I say that I acknowledge that these particular facilities were overbuilt, but I said that given the fact that this Minister was of that opinion, given that he felt that they were overbuilt and too costly, that I felt that other things led from that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Elmwood, please carry on.

**MR. DOERN:** So all I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister is loosely using these words and I would ask him to examine the various projects that we have undertaken since our administration has been in. I would cite to him a couple of very current examples, the Woodsworth Building as being one of the best. The square-foot cost of the Woodsworth Building — and I would recommend to him that he examine that building very carefully — on a cost basis, it is inexpensively built. The same

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

applies to the Environmental Lab which he tells us he is going — (Interjection)— I said Woodsworth Building. Well, I don't know, it was about \$30-odd a square foot, around \$30.00 a square foot.

The Environmental Lab is another example where the consultants came to us, provided us with a certain general plan, and they were cut to the bone. There is no fat in that particular building.

Two more points I would like to make and then I would turn the floor over to my colleague again because I have more points and he wants to add a point or two. The Attorney-General is here and he must have known a lawyer whom I knew from the time he was a little boy and my colleague from Wellington may have known D'Arcy Bancroft . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Would the Member for Elmwood continue to address his remarks through the Chair, please.

**MR. DOERN:** Yes. Well, some of the colleagues around the table are familiar with one D'Arcy Bancroft, who in fact, I believe, was prominent in the Conservative Party . . .

**MR. ENNS:** A fine fellow, a fine upstanding citizen.

**MR. DOERN:** . . . who passed away several years ago. He was a pretty well-known lawyer and also a bit of a humourist and I think one of the funniest articles I ever read in my entire life was published in The Bar Journal five or ten years ago. It was, "D'Arcy Bancroft on The Pas Jail," and about how preposterous the situation was with the prisoners up above and the court down below and the stamping of feet by the prisoners to interrupt Court proceedings and the fire trap and the blocking of toilets, which they did deliberately, flushing them and raining down upon the Court proceedings, etc., etc., all the things that they did to disrupt Court proceedings, the fact that it was a fire trap and so on. This was all contained in one funny article, funny meaning absurd.

I would also point out to the Minister that ten years ago, the Attorney-General of Manitoba was the Honourable Sterling Lyon and he was saying back in February, 1968 and so on, that in due course — I quote from a letter he wrote to Mr. Moule, the Secretary-Treasurer of The Pas — he said: "In due course, more adequate Court facilities will be provided."

And then other correspondence going from Mr. Moule to the Honourable Stewart McLean who was the Attorney-General back in 1965, saying: "We are giving some serious thought toward providing Court facilities at The Pas . . . and we refer to a meeting with Sterling Lyon, etc."

All I am saying, Mr. Chairman is, how long do we have to wait for this building to proceed? It has been talked about for — my colleague could clarify — at least 13 years that I could document and maybe 15 or 20. — (Interjection)— Well, what happened in the last eight years? In the last eight years a decision was made to proceed. The architects were commissioned to design and the project was officially kicked off. Okay? Shortly after that an election took place and your government is now freezing the project. So I simply make those points, Mr. Chairman, and let my colleague continue.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the discussion has been very interesting. I have some concerns now. First of all, the previous situation that Mr. Bancroft was able to write up very humourously, was if you want to see the other side you read the Fire Commissioner's report, which was not very humourous at all.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Can I interrupt the Member for The Pas? Would some of the other members around the Committee table please keep their comments a little quieter so that the Minister can hear the Honourable Member for The Pas and his comments. The Member for The Pas would you continue please.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the Fire Commissioner's report at the time was far from humourous and it pointed out a very serious and very critical situation in which the government of the day took action. But I am a little bit afraid now, Mr. Chairman, that egged on by the Member for Emerson the Minister is going to get himself into a trap if he is not careful, a similar kind of a trap that his party got themselves into when they talked about fat here and fat there and then couldn't find the fat and had to cut programs. Because the Minister should be fairly cautious in his comments in terms of the jail facility, because I don't know of anyone who has tried to break out of an acute care facility, but I am sure that there are many people who have tried to break out of a jail or a correctional facility, and I think that that is probably one of reasons why the costs are a little bit more, because people would like to break out of them. I wouldn't want the Minister to leave himself in a position that he would have to come back to Member for Emerson and say, "Look, knock off on this cost because that is the lowest cost we can bring it in at, so knock off on the cost, don't bug me about that cost any more. Don't get me trapped into that situation where I would have to pretend that it can be cheaper."

The Minister when he refers to a facility that can — (Interjection)— Yes, he has already got the Member for Emerson all confused and maybe he better straighten him out. When he is talking about 5.6 or 5.8 he is talking about a court house as well as a jail facility and the Member for Emerson maybe you should let him know how much the jail facility is, separate from the court house facility, separate from the corridor connecting the two, because he is going to get awful confused, even more

confused, if the Minister isn't careful in his answers to him.

My colleague, the Member for Wellington, brought up the matter of the program itself, and I think one of the reasons why the jail facility didn't get off the ground as quickly as I wanted and as quickly as the Town of The Pas wanted — and that discussion goes back to 1957 when the government of the day opening the provincial building at The Pas did say the next project was going to be a court house at The Pas so that was 1957, and that was carried on through Liberal and Conservative administrations — but, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Wellington mentioned the program and there was some considerable time making sure that the facility fit within the program. I have to sort of smile when the Member for Wellington brings up the big discussion they have had recently in Ontario about corrections in terms of putting people to work, etc. Mr. Chairman, that has been going on for a long time. It went on under the previous Conservative Government, it went on under the NDP Government. The bush camps — the Egg Lake Camp and the camp in the Whiteshell Provincial Park — are exactly for that purpose and it is a good thing. I think the inmates should be put to work and they have been put to work, and it is nothing new, it is nothing dramatic, it has been going on now since the previous Conservative administration, one of the progressive steps that they brought forward in government, and one that we expanded and continued, to ensure that inmates had the opportunity to go to work.

So, Mr. Chairman, there are other costs associated with not having the facility at The Pas. There are extra staff that are required with this very poor trailer facility. There are extra costs of sending certain inmates off to Headingley, which is quite expensive, without the facility proceeding. So I would hope that the Minister will not get himself entrapped in response to some of the questions and will proceed this year with a very spartan and the lowest cost possible correctional facility at The Pas and I thank him very much for his announcement and I am sure that the people who have to work in the temporary facility will be very pleased and I know the Town of The Pas will be very pleased that he is able to go ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one further comment, and I am sorry I haven't been at these discussions because I found the educational ones very fascinating and I want to get back there and make a contribution before we get off the Grants Commission.

**MR. ENNS:** Cousin Keith will be forever grateful.

**MR. McBRYDE:** If the Minister might comment and I will read it in the Hansard in a couple of days time. If he might comment, if he hasn't already, and he could tell me if he has already, on the — there is a bit of a problem in Public Works, because Public Works, as the Minister defines, is a service department and they have clients and the clients are other departments. Another department needs a facility and it is agreed that they should have a facility and then the civil servants in the department say, "Okay, you people that are going to be using the facility, what do you need in a facility?" And, of course, they come back with what they would like in a facility, which is usually a little bit more expensive and a little bit more elaborate than what they need, it is what they would like. What they would like to see if they could have exactly the kind of facility they need, and so the Minister of Public Works has a real problem. Maybe he might consider that he should get the departments to build their own bloody buildings and then he wouldn't have to argue with them all the time that they want too much and that they are too elaborate and too fancy and too luxurious, and not spartan enough. Maybe the Minister of Public Works would like to look at that option as a way to have other departments live within their budget because now we are back to including capital in current, all together, anyway, and that would force the other departments to be really tough with their civil servants, to be really tough in their programming. I wonder if the Minister has addressed himself to that problem of the nature of the structure of Public Works being the service agency for all these other departments, clients, whether he has addressed himself to that and what his thinking is on that matter, and as I said I will read about it because I am not going to be able to stay much longer.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Swan River.

**MR. DOUG GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for the record's sake, I would like to mention that relative to what the letter that the Member for The Pas had read out, I have not been the Mayor of Swan River since November 1st, 1977. I have never talked to the Mayor of The Pas about the correctional institute, and I find it very interesting that the Member for Wellington and the Member for Elmwood mention the high cost of building the facility at The Pas. I was wondering if the Minister might look at the possibility of relocating this facility in the Swan Valley area, where I think it would be more strategically located and the building costs would be considerably lower than they are at The Pas.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. HENRY EINARSON:** Mr. Chairman, it has been interesting to listen to the comments from honourable members of the Opposition, also to listen to the comments of some considerable diversity and particularly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question to the Minister. When the

Member for Elmwood was pointing out the excellent examples of the full utilization of our public buildings, I may say etc., etc., could you Mr. Minister please tell me, this Committee, and the MLA in particular from Elmwood, exactly how high the Woodsworth Building is and further does it conform to the height standards of this particular part of the city?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Does the Minister of Public Works wish to answer that?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am advised by my staff that it is much too high, without actually having the measurements. . . But certainly from an aesthetic point of view and from blending into the surrounding courthouse facilities, and indeed the Legislative Building itself, I would have to say it's much too high.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Chairman, having received that answer from the Minister just gives me one indication, and we can debate here by the hour and listen to comments from honourable members opposite, particularly from the gentleman who was the Minister for some seven or eight years, and to think that that Minister would perform his duties in such a way that he was not aware of the regulations insofar as pertained to that part of the city, I would say it's amazing to me that he is still the Member for Elmwood. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Elmwood is the next speaker.

**MR. DOERN:** I won't devote more than a minute to the Member for Rock Lake, my beloved colleague of 12 years, other than to say this: That when a height standard was developed for the area, which I recommended to the city and to the province and which support was given for, the height of that building was taken to be the existing Woodsworth Building. And somebody in the City of Winnipeg didn't know that the building was 15 storeys high. They had an earlier set of plans in which the building was 13 storeys high. They gave the wrong information to their own people, who then decided that the height of the building was 13 storeys. They could not see by standing outside that the building was 15 storeys high. They didn't realize that it had gone up a couple more storeys. All they would have had to do was look.

As I gave the member the story one day about the Aristotelians . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The Member for Elmwood has the floor. Please give him that courtesy.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I am trying to explain to these rowdy members of the government the situation. —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Please carry on. The Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** It isn't easy, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It is obvious that this is a popular committee tonight. Please carry on, the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** So it's obvious that if the standard of height — the standard of height in the area is the Woodsworth Building, that the Woodsworth Building cannot be in violation of itself. So some clerk provided the wrong information to the city and came up with the brilliant deduction that the Woodsworth Building, which was to be the level at which the other buildings were to be contained to, was in violation of itself. Well, that makes no sense.

I went to my colleagues in the dying days of the Session and I said, "Look, I want to bring in a Bill. We trusted the City. They are fooling around. They don't know what they are doing. I want to bring in a provincial Bill." And they said to me, "You can bring in a Bill at this late date provided you can get the unanimous support of the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party."

So I thought, well, that's going to be a tough assignment. I have to go to the Conservatives, who have a new leader named Sterling Lyon and a House Leader named Don Craik, and I had to ask them whether they would support this legislation — and about three days to go of the Session. I also went to the Liberal Party and I explained the situation, and they all agreed. They all agreed — Mr. Craik, Mr. Lyon, and Mr. Johnston, I believe, or Patrick from the Liberals — they all agreed that this was the only way to go. We introduced the Bill. There was, in effect, no debate and the measure passed. Because it was a preposterous situation.

So I would say to the Honourable Member for Rock Lake if he isn't familiar with it, he should ask the Minister of Finance, whom he trusts, and the Minister of Finance will explain the situation.

Okay, let's get back to The Pas jail here. I want to make a few points here, and I want to refer to an article in the Tribune of March 29th, headed "Government reviews plans for jail in The Pas". And I want to question the Minister on a couple of points here.

It says in the middle of the article that his department and the Foundation Company of Canada, which won the contract from the former government, are discussing going ahead with just the jail,

costing about \$3 million.

And then it says that if work begins before the end of June, Mr. Enns suggested the contractor would enforce no penalties on the government for delaying the project, but no deadlines have been set. And then there is a quote, "He hopes we will proceed and is reluctant to press us." That's Mr. Enns speaking about the contractor.

So I say to the Minister, does he have a written commitment from the Foundation Company of Canada? Because my information is that he has never contacted the Foundation Company of Canada, that there has never been any clear statement coming from his department to the Foundation Company of Canada, and that he has no commitment whatsoever from the company that they will not press him for a penalty. And that they could, in effect, hit the government for damages of a sort, because of the fact that they have invested money. They have probably rounded up their troops and planned their work schedule, and spent money on the estimates, etc.

So I ask the Minister, does he have something in writing? Does he have an exchange of letters? Does he have a document to indicate that he had discussions with the Foundation Company and that they gave their solemn commitment that they would not press penalties?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I have no commitment from Foundation of Canada.

**MR. DOERN:** Well then I ask the Minister whether he is now going to undertake discussions with the contractor, who I believe was awarded the contract, initiate discussions to inform them that he is proceeding with the construction, or is he going to re-tender?

I guess another question is: How does he know they will hold their prices? Or is he throwing it wide open again? If he throws it wide open, he has to possibly pay a penalty. If he doesn't throw it wide open he may have to negotiate a higher price. What is he going to do?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, a great deal of what I do hinges again — as I repeat now for the eighth time — on the requirements that are pressed on the Department of Public Works by the client department — in this case the dual portfolios of the Attorney-General's Office, with respect to the need of the courthouse facilities, and the Minister of Corrections, with respect to the need of the facility itself.

There has been no direct negotiations at this point with the contractor, who had been awarded by letter the awarding of the contract by the previous administration. The speculation of the Honourable Member for Elmwood is basically correct. It depends to what extent modifications are imposed on the situation, on the facility, as to whether or not some of the options that the honourable member suggests are going to be exercised, whether we indeed re-tender or whether indeed we modify and stay with the existing contractor.

I would suspect a great deal of the contractor's attitude in question on this matter would hinge on that position of government as well, in terms of whether or not he will press for possible penalty clauses, which he may well be entitled to, or otherwise. I think the contractor in question is obviously desirous of, at some stage, doing the work and getting the contract, and has at least not pressed government — not pressed the Department of Public Works — in any official way that would lead us to believe anything to the contrary.

I believe that the contractor is aware and is concerned about the fact that in the interim a new government has come into place. And a new government, as one would expect, sorts out its priorities, and this particular project happens to be among them.

**MR. DOERN:** I think we can leave this topic and go to other buildings then.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Oh, is the Member for Elmwood finished, or . . . ?

**MR. DOERN:** I'm willing to let The Pas jail go but there are another four or five buildings.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right. The Member for Lac du Bonnet indicated earlier he would like to participate in the debate and I overlooked him. I apologize. The Member for Lac du Bonnet, and then the Attorney-General is next.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated to the committee that the facility that was being proposed and I gather a contract let on in The Pas is inordinately expensive per square foot. I wonder if he, to back that up, could indicate to us how that particular project compares with any other project, either in Manitoba or elsewhere, or any other building, in terms of cost per square foot, and whether there are things added to this facility that are not the norm of such a facility anywhere else in Canada.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, firstly I don't single out Manitoba and people involved in the correctional field as being unique to what is in fact taking place not just across this country but possibly, you know, throughout North America. I am just suggesting, though, that whatever is taking place and what has taken place in the last, you might say, several decades of correctional work — and here I am way out of my element — there has been a concern expressed by the general public and I can find no more dramatic way of underlining that fact than from the Honourable Member for Emerson's information. The figures that I quoted, the comparison figures of \$58,000 for an acute hospital care bed as compared to \$33,000 for an inmate bed in a correctional facility of this size, are the correct

figures. They do not include the courthouse additions or something like that. We are comparing apples and apples. I'm saying that there seems to be . . . —(Interjection)— Well, okay, and then we add 25 percent, and I made that clear and the record is clear. We add 25 percent on top of that, so that brings the cost up to \$40,000 for an inmate bed compared to \$58,000 for a facility like Seven Oaks or the Health Sciences Centre.

**MR. DOERN:** How much is a tent per square foot?

**MR. ENNS:** If you wanted to say that, then if you wanted to build I would suggest if you were building that same acute health care cost under northern rates, such as the facility that we have committed ourselves to building at Snow Lake, then you would have to add those northern costs to that, too. So, you know, the same comparison exists. I think the Honourable Member for Wellington in a moment of candor was prepared to exhibit some understanding of the basic and fundamental question I am raising here. There seems to be something wrong. I say to myself, what happens to the idea of in fact perhaps a work rehabilitative program in our correctional institute? What's wrong with the idea of relatively — what I would call — spartan outdoor camp facilities? What's wrong with something less than a full deluxe hotel-like facilities that we are building, whether it's in this province or in other provinces?

I am merely saying that the total cost of this facility was sufficient for us to say that we wish to take a second look at it.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, you know this is rather an interesting evening. The Minister, in his statement earlier, implied that there was something terribly wrong with the costs of this facility on a per square foot basis. But he didn't choose to compare the cost of a correctional facility with another correctional facility anywhere else in Manitoba or Canada, but chose to compare the cost of building a correctional facility with a hospital. And I don't know what one has to do with the other.

I want to know on what basis the Minister can sit here tonight and tell us that a correctional facility is too costly and somehow out of reach, and beyond the norm. And if he has figures to tell us that a similar facility was built in Quebec, or in Alberta, or in British Columbia, or in Saskatchewan, at much less per square foot, please let him tell us, then I know that he is comparing facilities of an equal kind. But to suggest that there's something wrong because he's comparing hospital costs with correctional facility costs, I don't know the connection, Mr. Chairman. The facility may be costly, maybe it can be trimmed. I don't know, I'm not making that argument, that it can't. But I want to know on what basis, by what comparison — and the Minister has the facility of the Department of Public Works, they can advise this committee through the Minister — just whether those costs are reasonable, given the type of structure that is required for correction purposes or whether we are over-building beyond the norm, beyond what other correctional facilities have provided in other provinces, or indeed in this province. Is there some example that we can compare it with to show that this is somehow too expensive for Manitoba? I would like an answer to this question.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm prompted to remind, particularly those new members of the committee — members like the Honourable Member for Rock Lake and Virden, and well others would recall — I can recall listening in 1969 to the Throne Speech when a brave young group of newly elected members of the Legislature who formed the government at that time, put into their Throne Speech of that day the fact that they saw as their mission during their period of government to break away from old traditions and not to hold to what happens to be the norm of past government performances here or elsewhere. And, I'm telling the members of the committee, that you name me another government that is not showing that same spirit in breaking away with the traditions, and not simply accepting the answers. Well, they do it Ontario, or they do it in British Columbia, or they do it somewhere else which is the Minister . . . We are breaking away with some of the traditions, the accepted norms and concepts that government growth is inevitable. It has to grow and grow and grow like topsy-turvy. We have demonstrated and are demonstrating the courage and the guts to reverse that trend with some costs, with some costs in political terms to us right now.

It's in that vein that I choose to answer the honourable members. It's not a question of comparing what the state of New York is paying for correctional institutions, or what Ontario or Toronto is. I am saying that here, in terms of the million people that we have in this province of Manitoba, in terms of much the same tax base that we had in this Province of Manitoba 10 years ago, to pay \$58,000 for an inmate bed that is housing somebody that has transgressed society, as compared to \$33,000 for a person that requires the most sophisticated, modern medical attention that he can, with all kinds of additional facilities built into that room — the Member for Lac du Bonnet wasn't here when I repeated this once before — with facilities to pipe in oxygen, with facilities to hook up the lifesaving machinery that modern medicine provides today, and I might also tell him and for other members who indicated that you don't have to build to break out of a jail, I will tell them that probably more inmates have broken out of hospitals, that have been brought into hospital, more inmates from Stony Mountain, for instance, have broken out of hospitals, that have been brought into a hospital bed for treatment. So, the facility for some concern in that area also exists.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it's an endless debate. I've indicated to the honourable members, and I'm rather pleased that I've managed to solicit from the member from the opposite side some empathy for my concern. Some concern that I've expressed in the sense that (a) in an area that I'm not responsible for with respect to the kind of rehabilitation program that ought to be directed to offenders, but also some recognition that perhaps a second look at the facility that we're planning is in order.

**Tuesday, May 9, 1978**

Now, Mr. Chairman, again I make it very clear that the facility and again I was helped by, I believe it was the Honourable Member for The Pas again, or some other member that suggested that the Department of Public Works is placed in a difficult position. It is not the prime responsibility of the Department of Public Works and its planners and project planners and designers and architects, that can be held responsible for the type of facilities that we are often asked to construct. We are subject to the demands of the client departments that as the member suggested, they want the best, they want the ultimate and we are placed under those strictures and try to accommodate to the extent possible. You know, this is part of the system and the way the system works. But, Mr. Chairman, I will desist from any further remarks, and really I can't add, you know, for the members benefit, they can carry on the debate' but I really can't add anything more enlightening to the debate.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside's last comments are that he can't enlighten the committee any further than he has. The fact is, that he tried to enlighten everyone, including the media here tonight to the fact that there is some over-building taking place, and some inordinate costs taking place with respect to The Pas facility. But when he's pinned down to show us an example of how and why and what the comparisons are, he doesn't produce one shred, one shred of evidence, Mr. Chairman, that somehow there is something unusual about that particular project. I would like to know if there is something unusual about it, Mr. Chairman. The member prefers to sidetrack the discussion to the question of whether we should be looking at different correctional procedures, rather than to building correctional buildings as such. And, I don't think that's an innovation of our time here today, Mr. Chairman, that's been with us for a couple of decades. It's nothing new. It's been ongoing and accelerating. But not withstanding that, in the wisdom of some people in the correctional field, they felt it was necessary to build a jail at The Pas. Now that may be right or wrong. I have no way of knowing that, but we have to assume that it was the correct decision based on whatever information it was made.

Having done that, then we proceed to the question of the cost of construction. What is the facility going to cost the people of Manitoba? The Minister comes here and tells us that in his opinion it's too costly, that there's something dramatically wrong with the project. It's being over-built. I want to know if it's being over-built compared to what? I don't want it compared with the General Hospital, I want to compare it with some other facility that performs the same kind of function, that is either built, in the process of being built, planned to be built. Tell us where where we are erring here if we are erring, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know what the basis of that statement is. We have the department here. I'm sure the department can tell us whether the per foot costs are excessive in this case or not in their mind, relative to the cost of construction of that kind of facility in that part of Canada. If the department can advise us that, yes, there is a cheaper way of doing it without altering the policy relative to corrections, then I'd like to know that, Mr. Chairman. It's not as if the Minister doesn't have the capacity. He has the whole battery of expertise behind him, and I want to know. I want to know exactly what the cost per square foot are, and where they are found to be cheaper for that kind of facility.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Attorney-General is the next person on the list, and then the Member for St. James.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER(Osborne):** Just very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I have to comment because of the comments of the Member for Elmwood who stated that the actions of the city in dealing with the height by-law were preposterous. I don't want to provoke him or make any statements that might involve the committee taking any more time on this, but I would only say that the by-law that was presented to the city was not proceeded with because it was discriminatory. It was discriminatory in that lower heights were allowed at distances similar to the Woodsworth Building, and the Woodsworth Building was, in effect, exempted from that height by-law and for that reason the City of Winnipeg did not proceed with it, because it was discriminatory and inequitable. I don't want to provoke any more argument, because we're not going to resolve anything here, but in fairness to the city and those people who made decisions at the city, I wanted to make their side known.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, it's on the same subject. The Honourable Member for Elmwood chose to blame a clerk in the City of Winnipeg, and I don't know whether I was the Chairman of Works and Operations at that time, or my colleague, the Attorney-General was the Chairman of Works and Operations, but if he chose to bring the name of a clerk into the committee where he cannot debate and defend himself, then I suggest to you that either blame myself or the AttorneyGeneral . . .

**MR. ENNS:** Lay off the clerks.

**MR. MINAKER:** . . .for what he claims was an error on the part of the city, but don't bring the clerk into it who cannot come forward and debate and protect himself.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**Tuesday, May 9, 1978**

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we have the spectacle here this evening, of statements being made by the government. The departmental people at his elbow, and the Minister refuses to give us the answers to the questions that have been put. I know that the department has the figures, Mr. Chairman. What is this Minister trying to keep from this committee? Is he now trying to salvage his own position because he cannot, Mr. Chairman, get away with the kind of statements that he has been making, and the Member for Elmwood is correct, that they are very loose statements not based on any evidence that we have been presented with, at least, and his opportunity to present the evidence is here. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it's incumbent on the Minister, having made those statements to tell us and to provide for us, if not tonight, then tomorrow, a documentation as to the costs of this facility compared to the costs of any other facility that either is in existence or is being planned relative to the kind of service or function that that facility is going to provide. We have a right to know, Mr. Chairman.

It is not right for the Minister of the Crown to make silly statements and then sit back and hope that no one pins him down as to whether they are authentic or they aren't. The whole purpose of the Estimates debate is to sort out programs, costs, cost benefits. All of this is part of the exercise, and the committee, Mr. Chairman, is entitled to that information. Surely the Minister can give us a commitment, that he will furnish to this committee information showing us where this particular facility is over-designed, over-built as compared to any other so that we have an idea, a bench mark as to what we are, in fact, building relative to what others have been building for the same function. Now if the Minister chooses not to build a building because of a different policy in corrections, I accept that. But then let not him leave on the record, Mr. Chairman, the phony argument that there's something unusual about this particular building as it relates to costs and function that it performs, or that it's intended to perform.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that, you know, what the Member for Lac du Bonnet says is correct, and I recall very clearly, requiring the staff to produce figures requested by the Premier and our Cabinet, to show comparative costs in other correctional facilities across the country. And, I believe that I recall figures of \$60.00, \$80.00, \$90.00 and \$100 a square foot and I believe that when one compares the correctional facilities that we built, that they were in line but not at the highest level of other facilities built in Canada. And, I would ask as well, if the Minister can't provide us with comparative costs, can he provide us any comparative costs for Brandon? The Brandon correctional facility, I believe, is proceeding. Can he give us any comparative costs between The Pas and Brandon as an example?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, again part of the difficulty is, I've said this earlier, I don't hold that to the responsibility of any member. I recognize that we have two committee systems going. But, I've repeated myself now several times on the subject matter and, yes, I have, it's a fundamental question, it's not a question of comparing costs. I am prepared to accept that the figures are not out of line with what other jurisdictions are doing in this area. But I am saying that the whole system is out of whack.

**MR. USKIW:** That's a different argument.

**MR. ENNS:** I have said that, and the Honourable Member for Wellington showed some empathy for that position.

Now, the specific question the Member for Elmwood asked, the costs in Brandon exceed these costs but that is partly because it is a different nature of a program. There's a residential aspect to it, a training aspect built into it, but I am advised and I know that those costs on a square-footage basis exceed them. That's (a), and secondly, it is very difficult to compare costs. One has to take into consideration where the facilities are being built and for what purposes. In some instances, there are specific training and educational programs built into the facility; in other cases, it is straight retention for short periods of time. Each facility really stands on its own grounds but I have made the general comment, and I am reflecting this government's attitude, that in general there is some lack of balance in terms of prioritizing public moneys when they are spent for these purposes. Mr. Chairman, that is all I can say.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Lac du Bonnet, again.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, had the Minister made that statement initially then we would have not had an hour of useless debate, but the Minister chose to suggest that there was something radically wrong with the structure that was being built and the costs attached to that building. We find now, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has backed off completely on that statement, that he accepts that those costs are within reason, but perhaps we should review the program and the priorities. That is a very good debatable point and I don't argue with that point, Mr. Chairman, but that is not the impression that the Minister tried to leave earlier this evening. The impression was that there was a building that was being overbuilt for the service it was going to give to the people of Manitoba and it was an exaggerated cost; it was unusual, for some unknown reason, relative to the cost of other buildings

elsewhere.

Now we find that is not true, Mr. Chairman. So I suggest to the Minister that if he would be a little more straightforward instead of trying to play on words . . .

**MR. ENNS:** That's not fair.

**MR. USKIW:** . . . instead of trying to play on words and his attempt, Mr. Chairman, to mislead not only this committee but to mislead the media so that he can get another shot at the former Minister of Public Works. You know, Mr. Chairman, I have had my opportunities to argue with the Minister of Public Works for eight years — (Interjection)— twelve years, but, Mr. Chairman, I have never stooped to the position that this Minister has and that is to attack the former Minister on something that is totally unfounded, and then to back away under pressure because he is unable to provide the committee with the evidence that is asked for.

That is all that I am objecting to, it's the charade that the Minister is trying to perpetrate on the whole committee.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I think that we don't have to add anything to what the Member for Lac du Bonnet said. I think the record will conclude on the debate on The Pas.

Could we now move on to the Brandon Correctional. Could the Minister indicate what is happening in the Brandon Correctional facility in terms of construction?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the work at Brandon is proceeding as initially scheduled. I would also advise that the actual construction work is well ahead of schedule.

**MR. DOERN:** Could the Minister indicate when the construction will be completed on the facility?

**MR. ENNS:** The suggestion by staff is that it will be completed sometime in the months of September or October.

**MR. DOERN:** Of this year?

**MR. ENNS:** Of this year.

**MR. DOERN:** Could I go on to another building and ask him what the status is of a proposed senior citizens complex and office building that was to have been built in Elmwood, 60 senior citizens' units plus an office component? The land was acquired; the design was worked on; the contractor was on the verge of commencing construction. Can the Minister indicate whether one or both sides of that project are going to go forward?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, the project for the office complex is shelved. The project involving the proposed elderly person's complex is presently under review by the Minister responsible for Housing. The land assembly has taken place and is completed and the option remains open to the Minister responsible for Housing to proceed with the elderly housing units.

**MR. DOERN:** Could the Minister bring us up-to-date on the Dauphin office building? I believe that is almost 100 percent. Could he indicate when that will be completed and opened?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the member's information is correct, that building is at the stage of near completion. It is contemplated that by mid-August the building will be ready for occupancy.

**MR. DOERN:** By August.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Dauphin.

**MR. DOERN:** I have some more questions, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right, the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** The Gimli Industrial Park — we talked about the fact that the CNR portion, which I believe is some \$3 million of construction agreed to in a special contract between the CNR and the province, that that facility is proceeding. But I also believe there were several million dollars worth of other construction, related facilities for the Gimli Industrial Park, for example, upgrading of Aspen Lodge; certain equipment, steam distribution system; roads, etc., etc., electrical, mechanical upgrading. Could the Minister indicate whether those other expenditures will be made and if so, on what?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I can just indicate to him that the major contract involving the CNR facilities are anticipated to be completed relatively soon, in June. The other projects indicated by the honourable member are in our ongoing program: reconstruction of the sewage treatment system;

**Tuesday, May 9, 1978**

some of the equipment replacement; Phase 2 of the proposed replacement and renovations. The Honourable Member for Elmwood is probably more familiar with these particular items than I am, but in short, the proposed work that was contemplated by the previous administration at Gimli Industrial Park is proceeding.

**MR. DOERN:** So then I take it that the Minister and his government are going to continue to make an investment in Gimli Industrial Park, several million dollars worth of infrastructure, and that they are going to keep the operation going to the best of their ability? They are not going to sell it; they are not going to wind it down; they are not going to gut it; they are going to carry it on as best they can?

**MR. ENNS:** Very much so.

**MR. DOERN:** A final point on a list that I have here: Red River Community College. Can the Minister tell us roughly how much money he is going to spend? The Member for Wolseley threw out a comment that he obviously didn't know very much about — he referred to a certain Ron Lazare as a friend of our administration. I might tell him that he was retained by his administration earlier, ten years ago, and because of his thrifty and economic engineering designs, we have had to spend millions of dollars to correct structural flaws in construction. So could the Minister tell us what is happening at Red River in terms of how many dollars will be spent in the next fiscal year and for what purpose?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, that remedial work is being proceeded with at the cost of some \$3.5 million.

**MR. DOERN:** In the next fiscal year? Okay. Well, then, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a brief comment to summarize this, and then to get to the Minister's Salary, which is the last item.

**MR. ENNS:** But I would remind him that I have no salary in this department so I would think it would be appropriate that that be kept in context when you are debating my non-existent salary.

**MR. DOERN:** We had an agreement about a general discussion. I just wanted to summarize this, Mr. Chairman, to put on the record — and I think this is of some interest to the Attorney-General and I tend to press him on this because the Minister of Public Works gave us the following information: The Attorney-General apparently was cool to proceeding at The Pas, but The Pas is proceeding in terms of the correctional facility in terms of the . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Public Works, on a point of order.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am not that tired that I am not aware of what honourable members are attempting to do. In response to the questioning by the Honourable Member for The Pas, I indicated to him many reasons why the deferment took place with respect to that facility. I won't repeat that hour-long debate as the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet already referred to it. But I indicated to him that it was a project, for differing reasons, that both in the Ministries directly responsible, that is, the Ministry responsible for Corrections and the Ministry responsible for the Court system, the Attorney-General, that I have had indications from both these Ministers that the project at The Pas is high on their list of priorities and that, I believed, and it was my hope that the project would be proceeded with. That is what the Minister of Public Works stated and that is all the Minister of Public Works stated and I state this for the record, not to allow members to play games with suggesting that I have firmly and unequivocally indicated to the members of this committee that that construction was in fact proceeding with this summer, that is not the case. The case is that I believe it will.

**MR. DOERN:** I see. Well, then, I must say that the impression given earlier, if I were to call the Member for The Pas back here, he told me in summary that it was proceeding with and that the Minister had indicated that. Now, the Minister is saying that is not so. He is now saying it is a hope rather than a plan.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to let the Hansard, the public record of what was said a half-hour ago, support what I am saying now.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, then, are you saying now that it is not proceeding, but that it may proceed?

**MR. ENNS:** That is precisely what I am saying.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, then, in order words you are not giving a commitment that it will proceed?

**MR. ENNS:** I am not in a position to give that commitment.

**MR. DOERN:** So I am saying that there appears to be still some doubt about The Pas Correctional and if I understood the Minister correctly, he said that the Attorney-General was not in fact pressing

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

for the renovation of the Law Courts, or he was not pressing for the construction of the Provincial Judges Building?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, again, if the honourable member recalls, we were talking about the extensive renovations planned for the existing Law Courts facilities. I indicated that we are in a limited program of renovations — simply the installing of the two elevators that were in fact there and had to be installed — and that the further phases of that renovation were part and parcel of the overall final disposition of the building of new courthouse facilities, building new Law Court facilities and that major renovation programs to be carried on in existing facilities obviously don't make sense until that matter is disposed of. The Attorney-General can speak on this matter on his own accord. I happen to know that it happens to be a subject matter that's very dear to the Attorney-General's heart and will be in due order of things making his case for that project to proceed with.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, our government in consultation with the Attorney-General's Department and the senior judges of this province — I can't name them all, Justice Freedman and others, I'm afraid I can't recall all the names — they pressed us for a commitment to have a long overdue renovation of the Law Courts.

It's been talked about for about 10 years at least, and they asked for various projects which could have cost \$7.5 million, up to \$7.5 million for a new building up to \$10 million. And finally after considerable discussion over a period of months, a decision was taken to commence a renovation long overdue of the Law Courts that would cost over a period of time, over a number of years, \$3.5 million. But, I got the distinct impression from the Minister of Public Works that the Attorney-General was not pressing him on this, and that he had simply undertaken to spend a small amount of money to fix the elevators, but that the rest of the project was put on ice. That there was no pressure coming from the A-G in that department, or on the new Provincial Courts Building, which is apparently needed very badly because of a great case-load backup, and because of other pressures on the courts. So, I just want that to be on the record that according to the Public Works Minister, he said that he is not being pressured to proceed, and gave us the impression that there would be no movement in terms of existing Law Court renovation or new court construction because the A-G is not pushing it. He is silent on that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Public Works.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, let me also place this on the record. That our government and the Attorney-General in consultation with judges and other officials having to work in the proposed new environment, have indicated to us that the site selected by the previous administration and the previous Minister of Public Works is lousy and not satisfactory, and want us to reconsider the whole positioning and the siting of that facility. And that is precisely the information that has been given to the Attorney-General, and while this information has to be grappled with by the Department of Public Works, there is obviously an opportune time for review of whatever we're doing in this regard. Whether it is the commitment of \$3 million worth of extensive renovation to the old facility not in concert with the planned or proposed new facility, and I'm awaiting that direction, and that direction will be forthcoming. And, the leadership in that area will be made, I repeat for the tenth time, by the appropriate Minister, the Minister directly responsible for those facilities that has to answer to providing the kind of facilities that meets the particular needs of that department. In this case, the Attorney-General.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just repeat again, the sites were selected, the sites were selected, I guess, in about a two level way. One, by the Minister of Corrections, and the Minister of Corrections in the new government is here, and also, of course, the Public Works Minister was involved. And, also a joint team of city technical staff, probably under the direction of the Attorney-General in his capacity of Chairman of Works and Operations Committee, but selected by city staff, and selected by a provincial team, they made recommendations in terms of the site.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Dauphin.

**MR. JIM GALBRAITH:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a few comments about the new provincial office building in Dauphin. And, it seems to me that this must have been a project that was put together in a very hurried way by the previous government as an election bait last summer.

One of the things that I find very amusing about this new building is that there is virtually no parking space at this new complex, and I would say that the new Minister of Public Works is going to run into problems once this building is opened as there is virtually no parking space available in that area of the town. And, I'd like to know if there was any study done in the Dauphin area before this building was proceeded with. I think that there are going to be some very bad side effects on the town's economy when you take all these government employees out of the town and put them all in one building. The revenue to the town is going to be greatly depreciated and I feel that there should

have been a study done.

Just going back further, there was a comment made further back in Public Works and it deals with the mixing between the private and public sector, the work load on the ground upkeep, shrubs, flowers, etc., and also cleaning facilities. The former minister made the comment that he tried to keep the balance but I have complaints from the Dauphin area that during the last 8 years that there was no contracting done along this line at all in the Dauphin area, and I'd just like to know whether the present government is going to make any change in that policy and start contracting some of the work out for grounds and cleaning facilities?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Public Works.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I believe in response to the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that I've indicated to the committee that the department is reviewing their practices in this matter and where it is considered advisable and feasible either by personnel being available, or small companies, or the kind of help being available, that that aspect of the member's concern will be duly considered and hopefully, you know, taken into account, recognizing that, you know, employment is employment and it may not always be necessarily within the arms of government. I want to repeat, however, that it's not the intention of the department to in any way approach this in a doctrinaire fashion, that we will always find ourselves in a position where the best advice that the department can give me is that for reasons services can best be done by in-house staff, if I can use that phrase, but I've also asked, and made it clear to the department that I want the other option exercised and examined.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Wellington

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, getting back and dealing with the proposed and formerly committed provincial judges courts and remand centre for the Winnipeg area. I'm quite concerned in that I've heard that this project is, and I believe the term that was used was under review, I'm very concerned, because I felt that there was an expressed need for the construction and early implementation of this particular facility, and I'm wondering whether the Honourable Minister could advise the committee as to what priority level this particular facility has attained and when we might expect construction to be scheduled?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, for the twelfth time I will repeat myself and say that I will respond to the requests made by the appropriate department, in this case the Attorney-General's. I happen to know that the matter is of considerable concern and lists high in the ranks of priorities of that Minister's consideration. But, I would ask the honourable member whether those questions would not be more appropriate directed to the Attorney-General, directly, either during the discussions of his Estimates or in the House, but the Attorney-General's Estimates are scheduled right after this committee — pardon me, I think it's Municipal Affairs — but we will then be going subsequently into the A-G's Estimates and the matter can be vented and he can get the appropriate Minister to answer those questions.

**MR. CORRIN:** Again, Mr. Chairman, I must remind the Minister that it's quite unlikely that the Honourable the Attorney-General is going to succumb to my blandishments. Certainly, I can direct queries to him when we're dealing with his Estimates, but in no way, not within the bounds of the formalities of this particular Legislative Assembly, in no way can I direct him as to where he should lead his priorities. So, Sir, I direct my queries to you and in a sense, I suppose, I'm forced to do so by way of importunation. I do so because I feel that you having a position in Cabinet, being a person vested with a certain status and authority as a public representative are in a better position to bring forward these types of matters to the members of the Cabinet and most particularly to the Attorney-General.

If, in your opinion they demand rectification or immediate attention, and I would suggest to you if you are in doubt as to whether there is a need for a proper remand centre in the inner-city area of this particular capital city, I would suggest that you visit, at your earliest convenience, the Public Safety Building and apprise yourself of the circumstances, the living conditions available in that particular situation. I must remind the Honourable Minister that this is not a correctional institute. This is not a place where people are sent for rehabilitation or punishment. This is not a place where people are sentenced by the courts to serve terms of incarceration. This is rather a place where people are remanded while their cases are pending before the courts. These are people who have not been adjudicated to be guilty of any crimes . . .

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Public Works on a point of order.

**MR. ENNS:** I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, that the matter that the honourable member is discussing falls most appropriately under the Attorney-General's Estimates, possibly not even that. It's a matter of corrections, and/or there's certainly a degree of responsibility within the city's jurisdiction in this matter, but certainly not under Public Works. I am flattered by his suggestions that I carry certain status or influence within the Cabinet. I'm sure every Minister does that, but I request, Mr. Chairman, that we are dealing with the matter before him. He can ask me as to, and he has asked me as other members of the committee have asked me, as to what is contained within these Estimates

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

with respect to the building and I've answered that question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Wellington. To the Member for Wellington would you try your very best to stick to the subject matter 6.(b).

**MR. CORRIN:** I believe that I am sticking to the subject matter.

**MR. CHAIAN:** All right, carry on please.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, I think that it's exceedingly important that something be made known with respect to this particular facility. Now, I've asked as to what priority level this particular facility, this particular proposal has been accorded by Cabinet. This Minister is presumably responsible for bringing forward these matters to Cabinet. It's a matter of Public Works. He indicates that it's properly within the purview of corrections, but I would dispute that. It's factually a facility that's being operated, administered by provincial employees. They may well be under the direction of the Minister of Corrections but realistically and factually this Minister is responsible for the circumstances. He, through his department, leases those facilities from the City of Winnipeg. There was a lease that was executed, as I'm sure he's aware, last year and therefore his department is in fact responsible for the facilities. And I would suggest to him that the facilities are abominable, they're abhorrent, they're repugnant and they demand rectification, early rectification. There were three suicides in those facilities last year. Those were men awaiting trial that elected. . . some may want to be facetious and say that they chose another way, but in no way can anybody make light of that sort of situation. Three suicides in a remand centre is uncalled for and absolutely unexplainable, in my opinion.

I would suggest that any member here who wishes to apprise himself, including the Minister, of the circumstances in that centre make an early visit to that particular building. Because I can tell you quite honestly, Mr. Chairman, and I speak through you directly to the Minister, that I would not ensconce my dog in those facilities. I have seen kennels that are better appointed.

For those of you who want a very graphic description of what is in that facility, I will give it to you. I do not consider an open room with a bare electric light bulb, and I'm talking about a provincial facility that we are discussing, Mr. Chairman. I am not talking about something alien to this discussion.

**MR. ENNS:** We are not discussing a provincial facility; it hasn't been built yet. Once it's built, it will be my responsibility to maintain it.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, this Minister is responsible with respect to a lease with the City of Winnipeg. He leases, through the auspices of the government, those facilities. He has full responsibility for the circumstances within those walls. Now, for him to abdicate that responsibility and suggest that the City of Winnipeg is responsible that is sheer hogwash. It is garbage. It is specious nonsense. He has respoity.

Now, I'm not suggesting . . . I don't want to suggest something that's inordinate. I don't want to make inordinate demands of this Minister. I appreciate the situation is complex. It has been under deliberation for years. I appreciate that the past government, in a sense, did drag its feet; I thought they did. That is, at this point, irrelevant. There were three suicides in that facility last year. The former government did take some action — albeit after great and deliberate prodding by representatives of the Manitoba Trial Lawyers Association, who were familiar with the circumstances of that particular remand facility. And I think it was acknowledged by all those who were knowledgeable that there was an immediate need for a redress of that situation.

Now, what I am asking is: What is the priority level that will be given to those people? Those people are innocent, awaiting trial. They are ensconced in circumstances, as I began to discuss earlier, where they can't even go to the bathroom in private, where there is a television camera right over their head, which shows . . . If any of you want to go down, you can watch people take baths, take showers, go to the bathroom because there are monitors right in the waiting rooms, in the guest rooms, where people of both sexes come in and wait for visits.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Wellington, would you please address your remarks to the Chairman, through the Chair, and not to those opposite you and therefore you might be able to shorten your remarks.

**MR. CORRIN:** I'm sure that we are all interestee in those circumstances, and I tell you that I have spent many hours visiting clients in that particular building, and I tell you that it turns my stomach. It turns my stomach because I can't possibly see how we can allow people . . . Even if they are guilty of their crimes — and of course many of them aren't, but even if they were — I couldn't see how we could, in all good conscience, allow people to remain in those abominable circumstances. They are primitive. That building was never meant to be a permanent remand centre. When it was built, it was a temporary measure. Those were the terms of reference — that it would be a temporary expedient; there would in a very few short years be a new facility built. Things went on that basis and that has proven to be untrue, and people have languished in those cells for periods of up to six and seven

months.

Now I ask you: Circumstances where you are not allowed access to fresh air because there is no place to exercise. You are in the middle of the building. You are not let out of the building. There are no windows. A bare electric light bulb. You shower and go to the public convenience — and it is a public convenience — in front of a television camera, where your bed consists of a bare mattress with wire sticking out of the mattress stuffing in the middle of a public cell that looks more like a kennel than a place for human beings and . . . —(Interjections)— I might ask if I might participate in discussion, Mr. Chairman, obviously certain people aren't interested and they are trying to out-shout me.

But I might ask whether the new Minister is willing to . . . Since he has indicated that because of the restraint program this particular facility has been frozen, I want to know when in fact he does indeed contemplate scheduling construction and what priority level he will accord this particular facility?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Public Works.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I have answered all the questions the honourable member asked. I can perhaps just make one observation, that if the honourable member feels — and I believe he feels very strongly about this matter — then he would have to agree with me that the leasing of that particular facility by the previous administration was, in fact, a disgrace.

**MR. CORRIN:** Excuse me, I missed the last few words.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that was leased, as I understand it, the City of Winnipeg refused to maintain that building any more. The City of Winnipeg's position — and I know that Chief Stewart was one of the strongest advocates — was that those facilities were untenable. He did not want his men involved in further conflict of interest because it not believe it proper — and he was right — that police officers should be asked to guard prisoners, when in fact they were, of course, going to stand witnesses against those people in subsequent trials. He felt that was a conflict of interest. He did not like the circumstances in which he was asked to provide the service. He felt that the whole thing was better in other hands. And he felt that since this was a matter properly for the provincial government to manage, he strongly advocated and was finally successful in moving representatives of City Council to make demands to have this building turned over to the proper and rightful authority, the provincial government.

Now, that finally happened. The provincial government recognized its responsibilities. It took over . . .

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, please. I have, within the jurisdiction, responsibility of my department, engineers, building managers, project managers; I do not have any correctional officers; I do not have any police force. I cannot answer for any of the matters that the honourable member is raising with me. When decisions are made that the Department of Public Works should proceed, and there are a complex series of decisions have to be made. They may involve the future use of the old provincial garage, which the former Minister is aware of — not the facility itself, necessarily, but perhaps the space, if we proceed with certain plans. And you know this government is six months old and the Honourable Member for Wellington is laying onto me a problem that has existed for the last eight years, and is laying it at the doorsteps of a Minister that cannot possibly answer for these questions. And it's not possible for my staff to answer for these questions, or to advise the Minister to answer these questions. And I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, that we deal with the questions that are before us.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)—pass — the Member for Wellington. But I must caution the Member for Wellington to stick to Public Works and not Corrections and Attorney-General's duties.

**MR. CORRIN:** I must ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, then, how priorities are indeed established. He raises a very interesting question. He says he is not, as the Minister for Public Works, responsible for prioritizing the construction or re-development or renovation of public works. Well, I ask him, then, if he is not responsible, who in the hell is?

**MR. ENNS:** The appropriate Minister is.

**MR. CORRIN:** The appropriate Minister, okay. Mr. Chairman, there are, I believe — correct me — some 14 or 15, or 16 Ministers in this government, how do they come to conclusions and make decisions as to priority?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, again I don't think it's particularly my responsibility to educate somebody who likely never will experience the responsibilities of Cabinet. However, for his edification, a Minister is appointed by a Premier. That Minister then assumes the immediate and direct responsibilities for that department and it is that Minister's responsibility to use whatever means at his disposal — charm, influence, lobby pressure, caucus support — to provide the necessary support to prioritize programs within that Minister's mind that are necessary to that department's function.

And I will ask the honourable member to read the Hansard, because it was so repetitive. I stated

**Tuesday, May 9, 1978**

that in my opening comments, and I am stating it now for the final time, that the Department of Public Works is not the initiator of these programs. It is simply too ridiculous to assume that possibility because I will tell you what happens when that happens, as it did happen under the previous administration. That's part of the problem. The Department of Public Works did, in fact, initiate programs all over this province. And that's how all of a sudden you end up with a backhouse in Memorial Park that the Premier wasn't aware of until it was built.

We don't initiate programs. We await for the appropriate department under the due and appropriate process of government to initiate those programs. We are a service department. We respond to those legitimate requests when and if they receive the necessary support from Cabinet.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, I must say that prior to this discussion I would tell the Honourable Minister that he is a Minister for whom I had a great deal of respect and I am, frankly, shocked to hear him laying on — that's the only term I can use, "laying on" — this committee, putting on this committee, by alluding to his seeming lack of authority. Suddenly this Minister who, frankly, I think has a great deal of authority in this particular government is putting forth, postulating, a thesis that he is in fact responsible for a service-oriented department and therefore he is more or less at the beck and call of other Ministers. He is somehow a subordinate, inferior Minister.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, allow me to interject here. The member is describing so totally and so completely my humble and meek character, and that is my role in this government — to respond to the needs and requirements of my fellow Ministers. And I do that with the keen desire to be a servant to not only the people of Manitoba, but immediately to my fellow Ministers.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman, I would say through you to the Honourable Minister, that if in fact that is his position then I would suggest that appropriately he should resign. Because there is absolutely no need for the public to pay the salary of a Minister of Public Works if the Minister of Public Works derogates his responsibility, delegates that responsibility to other Ministers, and refuses to take initiatives and action in situations where he is fully aware and cognizant of something that only can be described as an abhorrent neglect of human interests in this province. Now, if you're telling me that you . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Public Works.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, as a matter of fact I am doing this job gratis. There is no salary under consideration for the Minister of Public Works. I am doing it gratis.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Wellington, would you carry on, please. And please stick to the subject material.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Chairman' it's my contention that the Minister must give us some idea of what priority he would accord this particular project. It is improper for him to say that he will simply respond to the initiatives of other Ministers. I do not believe that that is the role of a Minister of the Crown. I believe that in circumstances such as this, where the Minister is fully aware, notwithstanding that he says it's the responsibility of the Attorney-General or the Minister responsible for Corrections, he is fully aware of the situation at that particular facility. Those honourable members in due course will presumably and probably already have discussed this with him. He is fully aware of the circumstances, and I would say to him, I would suggest that it is incumbent upon him having that foreknowledge, having that knowledge of those circumstances, to do whatever he can to redress the situation that exists. And it's improper for him to say that he will allow others to, in effect, run his department by telling him what to do.

Now, if he has not brought this matter to Cabinet, if he has not mentioned this to them that he regards the circumstances of the situation to be intolerable, then I suggest that he do so at his very, very earliest convenience. A situation where there have been three suicides in less than a year is intolerable. It cannot exist.

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

**MR. MINAKER:** I have sat here and listened to the Honourable Member for Wellington discuss how the Cabinet should operate, in his opinion, and how the Minister of Public Works should operate, in his opinion. I believe that we are dealing with the Capital Estimates of the Department of Public Works, and I wish the honourable member would stick to that particular subject.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Also I might mention to the Honourable Member for Wellington, you have mentioned three times the suicides. I would ask you if you would quit repeating yourself and hopefully draw your remarks to a conclusion fairly soon. The Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** I gasp once again, Mr. Chairman. Since this project has been frozen as a result of the restraint policy, can the Honourable Minister tell us what level of priority will be accorded, and when we might expect construction to be scheduled? That's the fourth time I have asked.

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I have answered that question for the last half hour. The disposition of a major public investment in the building of new law courts facilities involves, first of all, departments immediately other than my own — and I make no apologies for that. I might also say that we have, within our caucus, numerous members from the city — the Member for Wolseley, the Member for St. Matthews, the Attorney-General himself, the Member for St. James, the Member for River Heights, our Premier — who are quite aware of the concerns about the remand centre in the Safety Building, and bring their pressures to bear on the shaping of priorities.

But the fact of the matter remains that the somewhat hasty decision, not unlike the decision made by the Honourable Member for Elmwood in building backhouses in Memorial Park or \$3 million garages, as housing or redevelopment centres, is far from accepted by those people involved. I mentioned that our first response in coming into government is that our Attorney-General and our government received briefs and representatives who said, yes, they would like a new facility, they would like a new Law Courts building, but not where the former Minister of Public Works wanted to put them. So we are reorganizing our whole thinking on that and we are, as the Member for Elmwood talked about and indicated, we're talking about an \$8 million or \$9 million complex and, Mr. Chairman, this government is not going to rush in haste and pursue simply for the reason of putting bricks and mortar together until the priorities have been set aside, have been sorted out, and then can be carried out in an appropriate manner.

I have indicated to the committee that the Attorney-General, in this instance, has that responsibility. I know from discussions with him that it is of concern to him; it rates high in the order of priorities with him and will be dealt with in the normal and usual course that these matters are brought to the attention of Cabinet and dealt with.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot be asked to respond to the facilities, the running of the correctional institutions, the running of the Remand Centre. I am the Minister of Public Works; I don't operate the remand facilities in the City of Winnipeg.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** I'll ignore the more fiery comments of the Minister, just his playing to the galleries or attempting to amuse the First Minister. But can he inform us, Mr. Chairman, of how much money — the Minister appears to know nothing — has been spent on renovating the existing city jail, for the purposes of the Provincial Corrections Department? Can the Minister tell us how much that total project costs and how much money has already been spent?

**MR. ENNS:** Pardon me, which corrections . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Would the Member for Elmwood repeat the question.

**MR. DOERN:** I'll repeat the question. The city jail in the Public Safety Building has been taken over by the province and we have signed a lease for it and we committed to renovate it and we committed to make improvements so that there could be some minimal improvement in terms of exercise, etc. How much is that total amount, and how much has been spent, because you may be half-way through that project or farther than that? Can you tell us what the total cost is and how much has been spent because you are not commencing it, you are well into it?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, that kind of information could be acquired through an Order for Return, or I can undertake to provide the member with that information. It is not information that is readily available to us at this time. It would have to take some checking on the part of staff.

**MR. DOERN:** I think it should be clearly stated, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Wellington has been asking questions and the Minister has been answering as if nothing has happened, as if the project is on the drawing boards. The fact is that the project is perhaps half-way through or near completion for the use of the Provincial Corrections Department.

I would just like to mention to the Member for Dauphin, who made some comments about the Dauphin office building, if he wants more parking for the Dauphin office building, then he can put his case to the Minister of Public Works. We developed the parking for that building on the basis of a formula. If the member thinks it is inadequate, then he can ask his Minister to acquire more land and spend money on developing more parking spaces. The location of the Dauphin office building was hammered out in conjunction with the city council. I don't believe that the Provincial Department of Public Works made the decision on its own. It was made in consultation with members of your own council.

Also, leasing in the Town of Dauphin is still taking place. Not all the leases were combined into that particular building.

So, I would conclude on this point, Mr. Chairman, and then perhaps we can move on to the Minister's Salary, that it is very easy to take swipes at another government's construction or buildings . . .

**MR. ENNS:** No, it is not very easy at all, it has to be a particular government you take swipes at.

**MR. DOERN:** As a matter of fact, it is very easy. I could dredge up in a detailed way, two particular

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

buildings that were quite flawed that were built by your administration. I'll just mention them in passing: Red River Community College, which has millions of dollars of structural correctional work being done to it; and secondly, the Norquay Building, which was poorly designed, inadequate elevators, etc., etc. —(Interjection)— Yes, well, it is Doug Campbell's building but it was built by your administration.

**MR. LYON:** No, it wasn't.

**MR. DOERN:** Were you in office in 1959 and 1960?

**MR. LYON:** Yes.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, I believe . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Will the Member for Elmwood continue to address his remarks to the Chair.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take smart-ass comments from the First Minister or anybody else and I would ask you to tell him to mind his own business and watch his language.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)—pass?

**MR. DOERN:** I'm not taking insults from the First Minister or anybody else.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)—pass. Resolution 108: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$24,721,700—pass.

In accordance with the normal practice, we will refer to Resolution 104, 1.(a) Administration. The Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I have some comments I want to make here in conclusion. I want to reiterate a couple of points and I am glad the First Minister is here because one of these points pertains to some of his comments that were made during the election campaign. That concerns his ill-informed and tossed-off comment concerning the requirements at the Portage Home and the fact, according to him, that all it would have required was a few thousand dollars to bring the Manitoba Home up to fire code requirements, or up to a Fire Commissioner's report. Now, that is what the First Minister said some six to eight months ago. We obtained information from the present Minister of Public Works that the requirement to bring one building in the Manitoba Home up to the new fire code was \$750,000 for East Grove, and secondly that Dr. Lowther estimated, on the basis of architectural estimates, that \$4 million to \$6 million would have to be spent to bring the Manitoba Home up to the new fire code. The Minister of Public Works himself has indicated that it would require, using his figures, \$40 million to \$50 million to \$60 million to bring provincial buildings and institutions into compliance with the new fire code.

Mr. Chairman, this is a far cry from a comment or a quip tossed off by the First Minister, "A few thousand dollars would have saved lives, etc." His own Minister tells us now that to meet the fire code province-wide is going to cost \$50 million. That is not a few thousand dollars, that is thousands of thousands of dollars to do that.

He also tells us that he is going to make an effort, which I commend him for, he is going to make an effort this year to spend \$5 million to meet the fire code and he is going to start with certain institutions. But I say to him that even though this is commendable and a step in the right direction, that it is going to take him 10 years of activity and 10 years of effort to meet the Provincial Fire Code and all that time he will be in violation of the Provincial Fire Code, that for at least 10 years, he will be in violation of the very code that we were criticized for not being on a par with.

So I simply point that out to him, that he should commence his program and he should complete his program, but if an accident or an arson or a tragedy occurs, then he will stand condemned in the same way that he condemned our administration.

I think that he did not meet the argument of my colleague, the Member for St. Vital, concerning the community residences, if he is prepared to spend a large amount of money in that institution at the very time when the staff and the director are arguing that several hundred people should be put into communities. He is going to the extreme of spending an enormous amount of money into some buildings which will then perhaps, in a matter of months, no longer be used.

Now, a couple of other points I would like to make. The Minister said — and I put this on the record again, these are points that I strongly concur with — that he intends to provide about the same mix in terms of contracting out that we provided. He also indicated that the Environmental Lab was proceeding. Those are points that I strongly support.

He also indicated that there are some 233,000 square feet of vacant space, equivalent to a Woodsworth Building, that is now vacant and I say that he has a responsibility, like any other Minister, to try to consolidate his operation and to direct staff in such a way that as much as possible, that vacant space will not be paid for, that he will sub-lease, that he will wind up leases, and that he will consolidate because of the terrific expense.

I also hope that he will make his decision shortly, because I really believe that he is playing around with the matter of the Central Provincial Garage. I don't know how he started out on that project

**Tuesday, May 9, 1978**

originally, I can only guess. I believe that that is a left-over from the last provincial election, that it was a favorite target of the First Minister and was a target of some of the Conservative Party ads and so on, and that they are working in reverse. They are not looking at the existing situation in the Central Provincial Garage; they are not looking at the requirements; they are just taking a political position. They are willing to throw away \$3 million million and they are willing to spend \$3,500 a month to simply keep a facility closed. Now that to me, Mr. Chairman, is an irrational position. I don't believe that the Minister can sustain that particular position.

I would also say that I would be very interested to learn, as I am attempting to do, who those Ministers were who have been talking to members of the architectural profession. There was apparently a specific meeting called by the Architects Association to deal with their situation and there were reports given by members of the profession on discussions that they had. Now, I don't know if these were over the back fence; I don't know if these were telephone calls; I don't know if this was cocktail party chatter; I don't know if these were luncheons or informal meetings. But members of the profession reported to their association at a meeting on April 20, a special meeting of members of the Manitoba Association of Architects, that they had been given indications by this administration, by Ministers — plural — that as far as they were concerned, the freeze on construction would continue. One architect reported that as far as they were concerned, there were too many architects in Manitoba and too many firms and some of them should fold and the rest should leave.

Mr. Chairman, that is pretty harsh talk, when you tell somebody that there is not going to be work and then you follow it up with the fact that their profession should wither away and die, maybe to 50 percent, that is adding insult to injury, or salting the wounds. So I don't know who those Ministers were; I tried to determine that, I asked that question of the First Minister, the Minister of Finance, the Public Works Minister, and the Minister for MHRC . . .

**MR. ENNS:** You never asked me.

**MR. DOERN:** I asked you in Estimates. It is on the record, a few days ago that I did ask the Minister. I think he has forgotten. So I simply say that that, I think, is disappointing, that the Minister of Public Works and his colleagues have little sympathy and no work for the construction industry. The blue collar tradesmen, the contractors, the architects, engineers and draftsmen, etc., they have been told in effect that there is really nothing going to break and that projects that are frozen, essentially will continue to be so.

I think that is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, because I believe that the projects that we had on the books can be demonstrated as needed in terms of the buildings and the requirements of government, and also that the construction of them would have been beneficial to the Manitoba construction industry employees, architects and engineers and their firms.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 104—pass. Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,283,500—pass.

Gentlemen, that concludes the Estimates of the Department of Public Works. Committee rise.

## **SUPPLY — EDUCATION**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would direct the honourable members to Page 28, Department of Education, Clause 6, Universities Grants Commission, Resolution 46.

Clause 6—pass — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we stopped the Committee proceedings at 4:30, I was just about to enter into some comments about the way in which the issue of the universities has been thus far handled in the Committee proceedings, and had expressed the point of view, which I think I can provide some strong evidence for, that thus far we haven't done a very good job by way of the universities in terms of providing them with some assurances that are needed as well as some directions that are also required. And I wanted to pursue this matter, Mr. Chairman, with the Minister, because I felt that we should clear up very quickly some of the misrepresentations that have been made, particularly by some members of his own side of the House, which I think are a common enough bias, or a common enough distortion of what goes on. But I think as the Minister responsible for university affairs, he has a responsibility to respond to, and a responsibility to clarify, so as to ensure that some of the myths and points of view that are expressed can be dispelled pretty quickly, so the universities, and the problems and difficulties they face, can be dealt with in a realistic manner, not in a manner of some emotional and somewhat superficial observations. I was struck particularly by the outburst from the Member for St. Matthews — who has been engaged in a frequency of outbursts these days — concerning the position of universities and how it doesn't really matter anyway, because as we all know, I think something, that they are all overpaid and underworked, things to that extent.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for St. Matthews has not done his homework very well, because if he begins to look at some of the figures he would realize that he used salary figures in the

range of \$25,000, \$30,000, \$40,000. I would simply point to him that the salary range for an Assistant Professor in my own university runs from \$16,000 to \$20,000, which I don't think one would consider to be an excessive range. The fact of the matter is, when you compare it to the salary scales of equivalent professionals, with equivalent years of graduate training, they are substantially lower, certainly by comparison with doctors and lawyers and others. And in particular, I would point out to the member and perhaps to the Minister as well, that as of 1976-77, the position of the faculty in the universities of Manitoba are amongst the lowest in the country. In 1976-77, in the range of salaries for Assistant Professors, the range at the University of Winnipeg was somewhere around 23 out of 35; the University of Brandon was 27th. The lowest were places like Trent, Acadia, Mount Allison and St. Xavier, all in the Maritimes, which have substantially lower economies than our own. So that what we're simply saying is that by two forms of comparison, (1) in comparison to other rankings in other universities we are substantially low on the list, and certainly by comparison to other professions, the faculties of our universities are substantially lower on the list.

I think there was one other statistic which may even be more revealing, and that is if you look at the percentage change in faculty salaries in the Province of Manitoba over the year compared to other economic indicators. For example, the percentage increase in faculty salaries from 1970 to 1976, which is the latest year the Canadian Statistics has, was 15.7 percent, now I am going to underline it — 15.7 percent. That compares to the other kinds of indicators such as the gross provincial product went up 46 percent; personal incomes in the province went up 54 percent; disposable incomes went up 51 percent; the labour income per employed labourer went up 29 percent. So what I am suggesting and pointing out through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Member for St. Matthews, is that frankly, he was engaging in a lot of unnecessary and complete distortions of the facts. He doesn't do his homework and that's a basic problem, he's just not doing his homework, and he would be a much better member if he did. And I think, Mr. Chairman, it's a requirement of this Minister to make those kinds of facts known, so that we can dispel for one and all times, this kind of situation and I think it is this responsibility.

Now I'm not saying this simply because. . . I'm not saying that university professors are starving in the streets, not by any account, but I would say that it is necessary to put forward the fact that compared to colleagues in the rest of Canada, they are amongst the lowest paid, compared to almost any other professional group of equivalent education, they are the lowest paid. And that furthermore, that the kinds of comparisons in terms of economic growth in the province, they haven't been keeping pace. Now that doesn't mean to say that we should be increasing by 20 or 30 percent. But it does come down to one important point, and the reason I bring it up is this; that the universities in Manitoba must compete in the national market for good faculty members, and good faculty members are the backbone of good universities. And if we are going to engage in sort of cheap shooting, and simply try to make comparisons on this one-year level as the Minister and the Member for St. Matthews and others have done, then we are in danger of losing the quality and credibility of our universities; that we will simply not be able to attract and maintain the highest calibre of people and once that happens then the effectiveness and the ability of the universities to provide good education in the province will be ruined.

And that was one thing, Mr. Chairman, I found that was interesting. We didn't talk very much about the universities as learning institutions; we talked about them as the battlefield for class warfare whether it was the rich or the poor that were going; we talked about them as machinery for producing people for jobs; we didn't talk about them as places that provide the basic climate of learning and education in this province, which set the tone and character for the province. And what concerns me, is if we continue with this kind of attitude, that I heard expressed from here, then we are in danger of not only sort of providing a deterrent based upon salaries, but a deterrent based upon attitudes, that they're going to feel that this is not a government which is understanding or sympathetic to the problems of universities.

Now beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I would also point out this, that aside from the low scale of salaries, amongst the lowest in the country, that what the current cutbacks produce, perhaps in many cases the most damaging to the universities, is the cutback on the necessary instruments of a good university; libraries; research laboratories; proper services; the ability to publish; the ability to do research. Those are the things that also make a difference to a good university, it makes a difference between a good one and a mediocre one, and those are the areas, Mr. Chairman, which universities are being cut back, that we have amongst Canadian universities, probably the lowest percentage of research moneys allocated than any province other than a few in the Maritimes. I think Newfoundland is the only one that has a poorer record than we do for supplying research moneys to our universities. So, I mean, let's take for example, again if I can digress for a moment, when the Member for St. Matthews says, "Yes, and they're all off for five months holidays," I would suggest the Member for St. Matthews visit the university which is in his own riding and find out how many are on holidays these days, find out how many are in fact in their classrooms or in the libraries doing proper research which is what the whole thing is about, to provide for both better teaching for their students next fall as well as to provide some advancements in knowledge and information that can benefit this province and the total community.

I think, again, it is required that those statements be made because if the kind of position taken by the Member for St. Matthews is allowed to stand, that we are again guilty of doing serious discredit to our higher educational institutions in this province.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that if somehow or other the universities had deserved this, then I suppose there wouldn't be much of a case to make but we, in this last year, in this budget

year, received the lowest grant of any universities in Canada — 1.5 percent at the University of Winnipeg increase; 3.1 at the University of Manitoba and 3.8 percent at Brandon University. That compares to places like 10.2 in Saskatchewan; 8.25 in Alberta and 6.25 in Ontario. We have the lowest grant. Now, you would say those low grants would be justified if these were a bunch of sort of fat cat professors who were on the top ranks. Well I just point that they are on the lowest rank and what we're simply doing is going to further exaggerate that problem once again.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, that there has been a serious misstatement of fact and I would like the Minister to correct it and I think that he should correct it in order to maintain the position of his own responsibilities as Minister for higher Education. I think he should be the spokesman in the House for those institutions. They need a spokesman in that government obviously because they're not getting one right now and if the kind of attitude we hear coming from the back benches is indicative, then we are in serious trouble.

Now let me just take issue with one other aspect of the comments that I've heard in the last two or three days and I have read, which came to me as some surprise. There was, I think, a statement to the effect that raising tuition is all right because we're just dunning the middle-class anyway, that it's not really going to hurt the lower income people; it's just going to hit the middle-class, upper middle-class. I can see it right away, Mr. Chairman, that it is middle-class parents who have been by and large sending their kids to universities. You know something, Mr. Chairman? I see nothing wrong with that. In fact, I think there is a lot of middle-class people who are sort of saying they're getting tired of government always laying things on their backs and why is it, if they are taking some incentive and some initiative to make sure that their kids do go, that all of a sudden they're somehow being criminalized for it or being hung up as bad examples. We got again a Conservative member of the Legislature saying, "Yes, it's all right to do it because it's only the middle-class who is going to get hurt." Coming from , I presume, a government that got elected with a lot of middle-class votes.

I just did some rough calculations in this last day or so, Mr. Chairman. What would you say a middle-income income would be in a province, \$18,000 a fair guess, I guess. eh? Let's say \$18,000.00. I mean that's what assistant professors make and let's say that they're middle-class. That's a good salary for an assistant professor. Let's say that he's making \$18,000 or \$19,000, paying \$4,000 or \$5,000 in taxes, maybe \$3,600 or so in mortgages, has a couple of other expenses: food and clothing, and when you compare the cost. . . let's say that that professor doesn't live in Winnipeg, let's say that he's in Brandon and wants to send his child to the Faculty of Agriculture in Manitoba. It's going to cost him \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year to keep one child in university. If the student is staying at home, he can take that cost down to maybe \$2,000 or \$2,500.00. Now it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that's a pretty good chunk of dough for a guy who maybe has disposable income of only \$12,000.00. And yet we're saying, "Well, look it, we can carry this out because we can ride on the backs of the middle-class." Well, I take exception to that, Mr. Chairman. I think that while there is a serious issue about the need to bring more people into the universities and provide greater equality, it doesn't mean to say that all of sudden we start hitting those who, up to this point in time, have provided much of the backbone of this community and have provided the kind of wherewithal for their kids to go.

It's not just the tuition fees. That's the problem. I think the issue has got off base by simply concentrating and saying, I think it was the Member for Pembina who said, "Well, you know, compared to this it's only 2 percent or 3 percent increase." We should also add up into that the additional costs of housing for a student who lives off campus which has increased 15 percent to 20 percent over the last year. We should add up cost of books, transportation to and from classes, and the fact of the matter is that this summer he will be making far less money on a summer job if he has one at all. You start adding up those factors and you're talking about a 10 percent to 15 percent increase in costs for university students to go, or their families, and now we're saying we can hit them further on this thing.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we are making a fundamental mistake in terms of assuming that somehow there's a big pot out there that we're going to draw on and that the middle or upper middle-income class can bear it. It may be that they should find other ways of bearing it.

One of the issues that is really emerging and I think what the Minister should be looking at — and I would ask him to look at it — is the fact that in the American higher educational system that there is a form of middle-class parents' revolt going on right now and . . . I think — is it the First Minister who loves to point to the Carter statements on how to deal with government all the time? — they have just brought in a major program of tax credits for tuition for people who are sending their children to universities. It may be that we should be looking at some similar kinds of incentives because that little cut that the Minister of Finance said he took on the income tax has already been spent twice that by increasing tuition fees if you happen to have a kid or two going to university, so it's gone already, I mean zap! That was a very short-lived tax cut break I'll tell you. It lasted all of about what? Thirteen days or something, whatever it is. — (Interjection) — Well, take it down some more, well that's one way of doing it. But the point is, I think the Member for Roblin should recognize, that if we're going to be dealing in this question of user fees, we have to be selective, you have to make choices.

Now it does come back to the question as to whether you are interested in supporting the continuation and in fact expansion of the university education for more people in this province. Again, no one has indicated to me — and I think other members on this side have asked the question and I would also be interested in knowing — what the Minister has in the way of a plan or proposal for universities. I think it's fair to say that they've been waiting a long time for some direction. I think it is wrong, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to simply back off and say, "It's the job of the Universities Grants Commission," because members of his own department don't think it's the Universities

Grants Commission who have that primary responsibility.

There was an interesting conference held at the University of Manitoba last spring on the whole question of the relationship of government to universities and some very senior members of his department were suggesting that the Universities Grants Commission no longer is able to fulfill the proper watchdog or planning role that is required and what really is required is for much stronger directions and purposes from the government itself. I would quote Mr. Blauer, Assistant Deputy Minister, speaking at that conference. He discussed the role of Granting Commissions in his speech — and I don't have the full text but I'll read the text that was reprinted in University Affairs, which is not an exaggerated document coming from the university students but is a fairly reputable journal dealing in university matters — where he said, "That they serve as a buffer between universities and governments; allocate money among universities and to some extent, act as a watchdog. They're woefully inadequate in undertaking this final function," said Mr. Blauer — "woefully inadequate".

"The university is simply far too complex and technically sophisticated to have its spending monitored in an intelligent way by a small commission." And he went on to suggest a number of recommendations. Well, I don't know if Mr. Blauer was right or not, but he does make some very strong recommendations concerning the role that government should play in relation to the Granting Commission and does conclude pretty clearly, that the Granting Commissions aren't suffice or sufficient for the job at hand which is to give some purpose to universities; to give some policy directions.

Now you signal policy directions to your expenditures, there's no question about that. The amount of money you allocate very clearly demonstrates the priorities that one places on them, and we've seen the universities in this budget do not have any priority, certainly not in comparison to other expenditures the government is taking. Because when they do talk about restraint, they're talking about far more restraint here than in other places.

But it does indicate that there should be at least some indication — and I guess if there was any other further major complaint on the part of a lot of people in universities is that these kind of things happen year after year in an ad hoc way as if we're going into a wrestling tag-team match — as opposed to developing some ongoing sort of consultative process to determine what the role of the universities will be in this province.

And they know they've got problems. God, I know. The universities were force-fed during the Sixties by government. You know, part of the problem with universities is that during the 1960s governments at both levels, provincial and federal, sort of used them as milch cows, you know they fattened them up because it was suggested at that point in time that universities were going to solve all our problems. So they were given all kinds of money; they were bloated; and all of a sudden they were told to go out and multiply and save the world; and now the switch gets turned off and they say, "Hey, suffer." But no one in between time has bothered to deal with how to make those transitions. No one has bothered to deal with some of the other kinds of issues that they've had to concern themselves with.

And I had hoped desperately that this Minister, in his first administration, would undertake that challenge and not sort of simply either hide behind the Universities Grants Commission and say, "It's their job," because it's very clear that that's not their job, they are simply acting and fulfilling their role properly, but they're not set up to do a policy job on universities.

So that would be another thing that disturbs people in the universities, Mr. Chairman. It also relates back, I think, to an issue that has covered some debate here, and that is the governance of the universities themselves. How do you go about managing in this day and age? And are the institutions that we used, the Grants Commission, the Board of Regents, this style of thing, really the proper means to make sure that the kind of planning and co-ordination that's necessary between universities takes place.

And again I would quote from a paper or a statement that was delivered at that conference by Dr. Lorimer. It suggested that in terms of tough times in the province, that there had to be some very major changes in the way the universities were managed and co-ordinated.

He suggested that there had to be a lot more joint undertakings of courses and enrolments. He also suggested that government, business and industry should expand their research institutes. I can certainly endorse that principle, Mr. Chairman, and thereby make opportunities for graduates. He pointed out that one of the problems is that the unemployment problem faced by graduates from universities is a direct cause of government itself in terms of their cutback of support for scientific activities, research activities and other related educational knowledge activities.

So you can't go to the universities and say, "It's your responsibility" because it's government, federal and provincial, who in fact have been the sponsors and authors of many of the unemployment problems now faced by university graduates because they have, again, in the '60s bloated it up and all of a sudden sort of pulled the plug and sucked all the air out, and said, "Sorry, we've got other priorities now; we're going to go build roads or we're going to do something else." But you didn't provide for the transition or the planning and the mechanisms that have been around in the universities weren't capable of responding to that in a quick form of way.

So, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has got a responsibility for governing these universities and managing them and perhaps finding better ways of doing that as well. Again, all I heard from him is, "Sorry, it's not my responsibility." So here we come down to it that among the lowest salaries in the country — It's not my responsibility. Problem of the question of financing universities — not his

responsibility. The question of how to govern and manage it — not my responsibility. The question of how to get better planning — not his responsibility.

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, we can buy those arguments and while I would concede that perhaps six months is not long enough to develop full-scale plans and programs, it would have been very helpful if the Minister had allowed us to enjoy some of his thinking and how he intends to deal with these problems because I would like to go on the assumption that he does have some intentions and plans in these areas. If he doesn't, then woe-betide us in this Province of Manitoba because then the universities will simply be allowed to founder as they in many cases do for lack of direction and lack of purpose and lack of resources. It really is going to take some very purposeful direction by this Minister in this government to get things moving again.

Mr. Chairman, I have several other questions I would like to ask but perhaps that's enough comment for the moment seeing as I'm probably running out of my time anyway. The Minister might be prepared to respond to this. If not, I'll go on to some others.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, I have one question which I wish to ask the Honourable Minister. I know I did ask him a similar question in relation to the overall Estimates of the department, but in view of the fact that the Universities Grants Commission operates under legislation of its own, I would like to know definitely whether at the time that the Honourable Minister assumed responsibility for this portfolio, whether he had found Estimates for the Universities Grants Commission, approved by me and recommended to Cabinet for approval?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I'll deal with the Member for Burrow's question first and then come back to the remarks of the Member for Fort Rouge.

The answer to the Member for Burrows is no. If such were available, I did not see them.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to spend a bit of time replying and reflecting on what the Member for Fort Rouge has said because I think, really, as he points out, this is the first time in the Universities portion of the Estimates, that education has been discussed to any extent. There has been a great deal of political one-upmanship and a great deal of this type of detail which really isn't that close to education. I would suggest that the Member for Fort Rouge has probably come the closest of anyone to saying, well, let's take a look at what this is all about and let's take a look at universities and what they are all about. When he says that universities are concerned, I can agree with him. I have been talking to them about their concern and he knows full well that not only universities are concerned in this province, but practically every other sector of our whole populace, whether it may be industry, business, agriculture, you name it, or our citizens at large. And many of those other sectors, Mr. Chairman, are rather concerned about universities too because they realize, as the Member for Fort Rouge does, the value of the university in our community and of course I don't think we are going to run into too many people who don't realize that value.

But nevertheless, if universities are concerned, Mr. Chairman, and if governments are concerned and, you know, really the state that the Member for Fort Rouge brings before us as far as universities are concerned, is something that must have been building up over a number of years. He is fair enough to say that in six months I haven't had quite the opportunity to solve all those problems and I think that's rather fair of him, but I do accept his challenge in the months and the years ahead to try to do something about it and to sit down with the university people and discuss and look at solutions and look at other jurisdictions and see what they have been doing there to meet these problems because, in fact, Mr. Chairman, in other parts of North America, they have contended with some of the problems that we are experiencing right now and have attempted to solve them and perhaps have solved them, maybe not the most pleasant solution. The president of a Canadian university was telling me that while he was at a certain American university, for three years they didn't receive any increase at all. That was one of their solutions.

Now, the Member for Fort Rouge, I am sure, as a faculty member and I know how faculty members think, I was a faculty member in a little different level of education, we don't like the idea that funding is going to be cut back because certainly that hits our pocketbooks.

But there are solutions. I am not suggesting that that is the solution but I suggest that we should be looking at other jurisdictions who have already met some of these problems and have solved them, and look at the solutions. I can assure him that we will be doing that, and I can assure him also that, personally, and I am sure that as far as our government is concerned, that we realize the value of the university. There are a number of people sitting on this side who are rather proud of being graduates of either one of the three universities of this province. We realize its value not only in the sense of a training institution but also in the intrinsic sense that education in itself is of value to society. Of course that may sound very trite, Mr. Chairman, to some people, but I would suggest to the Member for Fort Rouge that if there is one area — and I suggest this very personally and privately, it's my own personal opinion and I have suggested it, in all modesty to the university people — that perhaps one of the poorest jobs they have done over the last number of years is a PR job. They have gone along and done their particular duties and they have more or less ignored letting the rest of society know the job that they are doing, feeling that it is self-evident, that "They will just see that we put out doctors, and we have graduated dentists and we have graduated scientists and great teachers and all

of the other people who come out in the different professions and out of the different faculties."

I suggest to the Member for Fort Rouge that that hasn't been enough, that the PR job that we have done at the university level hasn't been adequate and we haven't convinced society generally that the universities are a very very important part of our society. We haven't done a good enough job of convincing them and I suggest it is one of the things we are going to have to do in the future. You can run into people in our society, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly don't agree with it and in fact I deplore it, who say that we don't even need them, we could do without them. I think that's a deplorable statement but I would suggest to the Member for Fort Rouge, the Member for Brandon East, who are both university people, that we haven't done a good enough job to let the world know just what we're doing at our universities. And it's a challenge that we're going to have to meet in the future.

The Member for Fort Rouge has mentioned the faculty point of view and of course you can't blame him — we're all victims of our own particular perspective. He's a faculty person so he's going to dwell to a certain extent on the faculty aspect of university education, a very important one, perhaps the most important. But that aspect has to be looked at too. And in my discussions with faculty people, and I have had a number in the few short months that I have been in office, they are quite prepared to talk about all the other problems at the university and all the other solutions, and that administration apparently also is one that they are very much concerned with. But when you say to faculty people, "Well, what about your own area? What can be done there?" Well, then, Mr. Chairman — and I certainly, as an educator, sympathize with the position — they're not very interested in looking at their own particular area. And they never say, "Well, with dropping enrolments, you know, we may have to face the possibility that there are going to be cuts in teaching staff." They don't suggest that to me. Instead, they look for a rationalization, a suggestion of how they can get more people to university, which isn't a bad idea, but in view of the projections that we've had for the years ahead, it doesn't look as if we're going to get more there, Mr. Chairman. They don't talk to me about number of lecture hours, in other words, the lecture load, the teaching load, which after all I think, along with research, is the most important function at the university. They don't want to talk about that. But yet when I talk to a truck driver and he says to me, "I have a relative, he's a professor, and he only teaches eight hours a week," I have an awful job convincing that truck driver that that fellow at the university is earning his pay.

I say, "Oh, but he does research too," and he says, "Huh, don't give me that." And so I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that's part of the PR job, and I suggest that when you talk from the faculty point of view, that the faculty, along with the administration and all other aspects of the university have to look at their operation. And I think all aspects of the university have to be prepared to do a very careful re-examination, and perhaps break away from what have been rather traditional patterns, because I'm sure the Member for Fort Rouge will agree with me, that although there are many modern things at a university, there are a great number of very old and traditional patterns that are enshrined and will never change, I suppose. But perhaps as society changes, they will have to change, too. I would suggest they have to be looked at.

I'm not picking on the faculty, Mr. Chairman, I just suggest to the Member for Fort Rouge that that was the perspective that he emphasized, and I suggest to him that yes, it's an important one. Perhaps the most important one in any teaching institution. But let it look at itself, too, and it has to be aware that in that examination, that there may be solutions that come forth — and some of them have come forth in other jurisdictions, that in fact, the faculty may not like. It may be hard to live with. There's a reality there, and Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that people like the Member for Brandon East and the Member for Fort Rouge and others in this House will agree that if education was to have one great characteristic, it is they are idealists. And that's perhaps a good thing because of their calling. But when we get into an age where we have to become very realistic about a number of the things that allow us to be idealistic, then it becomes rather difficult, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that as educationalists, being realistic is sometimes the most difficult thing that we can face.

The Member for Fort Rouge mentions the fact that the universities have been short on research money. Well, I'm not going to debate that point with him. I don't know when universities ever receive enough research money. I don't know what the top figure should be. I know that last year on the information I have received, it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$14 million in research funding from all the different avenues that channel research moneys into the universities of this province. Now, I don't know whether the Member for Fort Rouge is suggesting that it should be \$28 million, \$58 million, I suppose it has to bear some resemblance to the size of the university and the population that it serves, but again, I would like to see some comparison made between the funding in research that our universities has received with other jurisdictions of similar sizes.

Of course, the Member for Fort Rouge has mentioned the higher fees, the amount of money that has been given to the university, we've been over that once, I don't think he was here at the time. I don't agree with the figure that he suggests for Ontario, I believe the correct figure is 5.8 percent, and I believe he suggested something higher. I would suggest to him that 5.8 percent in Ontario, as compared with the 5.1 percent that our universities had to work on, that's counting the raise in tuition fees, the 5.8 percent in Ontario is perhaps not that much different to what our universities are working with this year because the fees in Ontario are some hundred and some dollars higher and that amounts to quite a bit of money, Mr. Chairman.

Of course, I mentioned to the Member for Fort Rouge, the 5.1 percent here, the 2.1 percent of it achieved through the fees, and we have had considerable discussion on tuition fees, and for a change, we have had a different tack because other members opposite have been maintaining that a fee increase is going to hurt the poor, and we now have the Member for Fort Rouge saying, no, that's

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

not true, he agrees that the area that's going to be hurt the most are the middle class. And I agree with him. And that it is what I maintained at the beginning. I said it's the people just above the level who make just a bit more than what would qualify their children for student aid, are the ones who get hit under this particular type of increase. But I also would suggest to the Member for Fort Rouge, that they are the people who are most prepared to make a contribution to their children's education in this way, and I get less griping — in fact very little complaining from that particular group at all.

I am still looking forward to the day that that barefoot boy without shoes on, that the Member for Burrows referred to, heads down to my office — it will probably be in August when many young people don't have any shoes on, but that is something we will have to look forward to in the future, I suppose.

Of course, the Member for Fort Rouge, as have some others, have suggested that this isn't a humane move at all, this increase in tuition fees, that it's way out of proportion, it's ridiculous, it's going to hurt so many people, and yet I put the question to him, as I did to other members, how does he explain the poor people of Saskatchewan paying \$625 tuition, still considerably more than what we will be paying in Manitoba with the increase. And what about the poor people in Ontario, who are paying close to \$700.00. I would also suggest to him and to other members present, that the past experience of those provinces where there have been fee increases, is that there has not been a significant drop in enrolment, and that has been the record, Mr. Chairman.

I thought it was interesting that the Member for Fort Rouge mentions a parents' revolt. I believe he was referring to some American jurisdictions. He could well have said a taxpayers' revolt. I would suggest to him, yes, taxpayers are asking questions. And they're asking questions of government, and they aren't saying to government, well, you should be handing more and more money to the educational institutions. You should be seeing that they are getting enough to maintain their quality and to cater to the quantity that they have, but the taxpayers here are not revolting, Mr. Chairman. But I would say to the Member for Fort Rouge, they're asking a lot of hard questions, and perhaps some of them could be answered by that PR, that public relations that I mentioned to the Member for Fort Rouge earlier. Perhaps they should find out exactly what they're getting for their dollar from the universities. Because I suggest again, we haven't done a good enough job of letting them know what that is.

The Member for Fort Rouge, of course, is also anxious that I immediately solve all the problems in university education, and I know that he says that somewhat tongue in cheek. He doesn't expect that someone in a few short months will come up with immediate solutions. But I suggest to him that I have already had discussions with the university people, and I know that they are planning, and I have been invited to attend and take part in several workshops and discussions that the universities are holding in concert with people from the world of business and other parts of our society, looking at the very problems that disturb the Member for Fort Rouge. Now I don't know how many of this type of workshop and so on has been held in the past, Mr. Chairman, but I know that the universities are concerned enough that they are ready to start talking and looking for solutions. The realism of the situation is here. I believe they realize it, and they are prepared to try to do something about it, prepared to do something about it so that they can maintain quality at the same time.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that with the expertise, knowledge and ability of the people that we have in our university community, if anyone can come up with answers, they have that capability.

The Member for Fort Rouge refers to the opinion of a civil servant who works in the Department of Education, an opinion that I believe he delivered last spring. I suggest to the Member for Fort Rouge that he's entitled to that opinion. I would also suggest that as far as our government's policy towards universities and perhaps any aspect of education is concerned, our policies will be uttered by the Minister of Education. But at the same time I respect someone else's right to their opinion, whether I agree with it or not.

I should mention to the member also that in the most recent meeting that we've had with the presidents of the three universities, that they feel that with some belt-tightening and with some careful assessment of their situation, that they can maintain the quality of education at the universities in this province in the coming year. They are not sure how long they could do that at the present level, because there comes a point, I suppose, where you can't tighten your belt anymore without it becoming exceedingly uncomfortable. But we have had that assurance. And they have also mentioned the fact that they are going to be doing some very careful planning and looking very closely at their management and their administration.

What assurances the Member for Fort Rouge requires beyond those I have just given him, I don't know. If he wants me to announce royal commissions or government inquiries and so on, I'm not in a position to announce that sort of thing at this time. The situation is serious, and it's serious in our view because we value those particular educational institutions in our province, and will continue to value them. I should say, Mr. Chairman, that I've appreciated the remarks once again of the Member for Fort Rouge. I think he has brought us back to discussing education, and I thank him for it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister as well for his response to those. I think they certainly deserve though some counter. I know he'd be disappointed if it didn't. I think there are a couple of interesting points that he brings forward and I'm glad to see that he does. Some I think we can get rid of right away.

The Minister suggests that one of the solutions to our problems would be better PR universities. Of

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

course he would recognize that that's not the normal characteristics for those in the university community. —(Interjection)— Well, now by example, the Member for Brandon East and myself and perhaps even the Leader of Opposition you know how diffident, retiring and shy we are in expressing our points of view, and how —(Interjection)— that's right, so that we are obviously trained to be more sort of in the cloistered confines of the classroom than perhaps the more ebullient and aggressiveness of other occupations. But, it's tough sometimes for universities to be PR institutions, because oftentimes they're in the business, or in the activity of being unpleasant as well. If you're in a university, one of their requirements is a degree of free inquiry, in some cases to be a gadfly, to say things that society doesn't like to hear, to make comments and criticisms about the way the world is, that's the nature of what we do. And of course, it gets people mad at times. I think I've been in that circumstance myself, Mr. Chairman, where, when I was a full-time faculty member, that comments that are being made and the kind of research that's being done may not fit the conventional wisdoms, may not deal with the standard mores of a society, and yet that's one reason why you have universities, to challenge those mores and conventionalisms and provide some alternative to them. So sometimes the PR has got to be bad PR simply by the nature of the learning process, and the nature of inquiry.

So I don't think the Minister can assume that we are going to get in the business of sort of being hucksters for the operation. I think that universities — well he's right — perhaps might do a better job of describing what they are doing. Someone said, maybe if they really described what they were doing, people would be even less reluctant to support them because there are a lot of things going on there that people might not like. I know that I've heard in this House in the past, people picking out certain areas of research, I know that research has been stopped by governments in the past because it didn't fit government policy. It happened in the last three or four years. So I would say that while it may be an interesting suggestion, I don't know how practical it is from that point of view.

I think it's much more important, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister responsible for education to do the selling job. That's what his responsibility as a politician is, to provide for justifications and for arguments for the extension and improvement of universities, that that is why we get elected to this House, we're supposed to act as the links between policies and public opinion, and to shape public opinion and support it.

Let me also deal with . . . the Minister made some suggestion that I was simply reflecting a faculty point of view. That personally would be wrong because I'm in a stage where I'm now in that glorious position known as administration, not faculty, and I spend a good deal of my time fighting about salary increases for those who are under my jurisdiction, and I spend, I suppose, more time doing that than I do sort of fighting for my own.

The reason I mentioned faculties was first, because of the silliness of the Member for St. Matthews, to get away from some of the nonsense that he came forward with yesterday afternoon, and secondly to talk the fact that salaries themselves, are simply an indicator of something much more critical, and the indicator is that you must maintain some degree of quality in universities and because we were so low down on the scale. The Minister didn't answer that particular problem, that the salary levels in the universities in Manitoba are amongst the lowest in the country. The longer they maintain that, the more difficult it's going to be to attract the kinds of teachers and researchers and staff to maintain the quality of our universities.

I know people like to think it's a seller's market, but it's not that way. I agree with him in part — I spend a lot of time, if the Minister knew it, at my own university fighting some of the traditions of the university. I head an institute which is a maverick in the university system, because we believe in inter-disciplinary research and don't sort of go along with many of the traditional notions of it. There is a lot of entrenchment in the universities. I don't think entrenchment is on the side of people saying that they're not prepared to work harder or do more, I think they are also looking for the kind of incentive to be able to do that. Maybe teaching hours should change, but I think they also have to be recognized, the kind of service they provide. I would hope the Minister again, as the spokesman for the universities, when he speaks to that truck driver, would remind him, I suppose, if he made the same comment about a brain surgeon who only does nine hours of surgery a week, that he might be glad that he's doing that, simply because he wouldn't want to be doing it any more. I think if one looks at the kind of preparation time and so on that goes into classrooms, and the amount of time one spends with students, which is a major part of it, that you very quickly can get to 40, 50, 60 hours of time. People who don't bother to visit the universities or don't bother to know anything about them, don't understand that, but that is also very much part of the activity. If you start loading up additional teaching time, you start pulling back from the kind of supports the university can give.

I'd like to concentrate, Mr. Chairman, on one important point that the Minister made, because I don't think — at least from his comments I don't think he understands in some cases the value that research does, and let's talk in common sense, practical terms for a moment. But for a city like Winnipeg and a province like Manitoba, perhaps one of the most important economic stimulants and one of the most important economic growth factors, is in the area of human skills and knowledge, the creation of knowledge. I could point to him in this continent, any number of cities which don't have a natural resource base. They don't sit in pools of gas, they aren't sitting next to an iron ore load, or they're not sort of near a fishing port, that maintain their quality and excellence as communities, simply by the skills of the people involved. Cities like Boston and San Francisco are two examples, and why? Because they have created in those communities, high class, first class research

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

institutions in the universities that create a whole secondary area of industries based upon that research.

One of the problems that this province suffers from is that it has never had a proper research policy. That's what I am asking the Minister for, not even necessarily for the funds.

I would like to comment for him on the recent development in British Columbia. I know that the government of British Columbia has provided a mull for the Conservatives in the past, and it's interesting that in just this month, they've established a provincial-wide research policy under Dr. Pat McGeer, and I think it's important to indicate some of the things, the reasons why. Let me respond to that. The first thing you do is to develop a proper research committee on the Cabinet level to co-ordinate the different research between universities, business and technology, in order to create new work and new jobs. One of the reasons is, Pat McGeer says, and I quote, "to strike a better balance between high technology industry, universities and government, as part of its future economic strategy." He then went on to promote in British Columbia . . . they're now developing an innovation and industrial research park on the campus of the university to provide a place where business, researchers can meet together, and through both public and private financing, begin to develop new products, new technologies, new work for its highly skilled populations. Mr. Chairman, we have nothing like that in this province whatsoever, nothing like that is going on.

We're not talking about . . . the \$14 million by the way, the universities get — and I don't know the exact figures, I've got them somewhere — I expect that 75, 80, perhaps a higher percentage than that comes from out of the province.

One of the other things that the Minister should be looking at is the fact that the universities are also importers of additional capital and research talent, and that the kind of leverage that can be provided by the provincial government is to bring some more of that in, and yet if you look at the newspaper accounts in the last year or two, we've been losing more than we've been getting. The number of research opportunities, let's say in the medical field, that have been turned down, or have had to leave simply for lack of support, is a very clear example of the paucity and bankruptcy in our research policies. As our research is not just something esoteric that's happening in someone's attic or downtown garret, it is becoming, as McGeer, the Minister of Education in British Columbia, suggests, an integral part of their economic develop strategy, an integral part of their educational strategy, and the two merge together.

So let's talk seriously about research in universities and let's talk about it as something that is of major benefit and boon to the entire province, and to the problem of maintaining and enabling our university graduates to stay here to work and utilize their talents. That's the kind of thing that I'm concerned about, that we're simply not providing those kinds of incentives in this province, because we don't have a research policy, nor do we have the mechanisms to bring one about, and that is absolutely essential. I think that if I am asking the Minister to make some quick, immediate decisions, that would be one of them right at the start, because it's something that could be done right away and it wouldn't take an awful lot of effort to do it.

I'd finally say to the Minister, that there is one other area where I think he could take some very immediate action, without getting into royal commissions, or big inquiries, and that is in the funding of universities. There are two things about the funding that bother me, Mr. Chairman, one is that the way we fund universities right now tends to encourage bad management. The kind of grant system that we use is not designed to produce productivity in the university system, in any public service institution, and the grant system itself is sort of one of the causes of the management problem that we face, the way that the money is transferred and the way the money is given, per its students. Because one of the reasons that universities go out and hussle to get those student numbers up in those classrooms every year, is that the funding itself relates to that. This may sound like special pleading, and perhaps it is, but one of the curiosities, Mr. Chairman, is that the university that received the lowest grant this year was the one university which over the last few years has had surpluses. That's not what you would call incentive granting, is it? And I think there are some reasons ' to look into that.

The other part of the funding problem, Mr. Chairman, is this, and it's something that this government should pick up. I offer the advice because of their own philosophy. I think that we have made a fundamental error in the funding of universities in the last ten years, and that is to increasingly assume that they should be paid for out of the public purse, that we have left private funding off the hook, both from business and foundations and other sources. One of the real weaknesses of the Canadian university establishment is its lack of endowment funding. And one of the reasons for this lack of endowment or private funding is because there isn't much in the way of tax incentive to provide that kind of funding, nor is there much encouragement done by government. We assume, again in that period of the '60s, when government sort of grasped universities to their bosom and said, go out and do our work for us, they tended almost to make them captives. They kind of captured them, and in the way, like anybody who creates a dependency, it loses their incentive to go out and get additional funding.

Mr. Chairman, I'm in one part of the university that gets most of its funding, not from this government, or from governments, but from outside funding. I spend a lot of my time with research foundations and so on to get money from them. I know how difficult it is and how small and miniscule the foundations are in this country compared to other countries because there isn't the kind of framework in which we allow foundation funding to grow.

I would suggest that one of the real incentives that this Minister could provide would begin to look how you can bring about a better balance between private and public funding. And I do that not because I think I want to help the Minister particularly, I do it as a university person. I think that's one

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

way of preserving the autonomy of the universities. If they can lessen their dependency upon government funding and provide for a better alternative through other sources, then they don't have to be coming cap-in-hand every year as supplicants to, sort of, the ministerial Crown; that they will provide alternatives. But I think in this case they need the help of government to provide that alternative funding.

So I would say that there is a drastic need for revisions in how we go about funding our universities in this country — not just this province but in this country — and the provincial governments and the federal government could help in this area.

I must express my disappointment, Mr. Chairman — perhaps this Minister would correct it — at the reluctance, in fact, the total rejection by Provincial Ministers of Education last spring — at the suggestion by the Federal Government — that they set up a permanent forum on the financing of post-secondary education to work out those problems. And again, for the sake of defending their provincial rights — which is the reason I believe it was — they eliminated the opportunity to sit down with the Federal Government and work out, perhaps, a new funding or a tax base to provide alternative ways of funding universities. Again, it was, I think, not a very smart move.

And it may be that this Minister when he goes to the next Council of Ministers of Education can reopen that issue and maybe not stand on the kind of rigidities of provincial autonomy but be more interested in how we go about redrafting and redesigning the tax system and the financial systems for universities, in company with the Federal Government, to see if we can find ways of providing an incentive for more private funding to come into universities, for research and for teaching and other activities.

So I would say there are some areas where he could take some very quick and direct action in these areas; and then I think through that kind of incentive, Mr. Chairman, would be able to provide a demonstration to those in the university community that the government is serious about its commitments because I've got news for him now — they don't think so.

I know he's met with the presidents of the universities but there's a lot of other constituencies who don't think that this government cares very much. I think that in order to win back some trust and confidence, and the universities are going to have to live with you and you're going to have to live with them, I think you've got some bridge building to do. I think that bridge building can best be done by demonstrating that there is an active interest. You don't have to do it the way it was done before, but at least show that you prepared to reach out and start securing some alternative ways of doing things.

Now, just before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, there would be two other comments, quick ones, I would make and the Minister may want to pursue them. They relate not to this general issue of the overall state of universities but to special issues that I think that are important for the Minister to look at.

One, is the question of foreign students in Manitoba universities, that I have been bothered, frankly, by again the way the issues are merged and have been handled universities in terms of setting quotas for foreign students. I guess it goes back to the fact that I, for one, was a beneficiary of a graduate education in a foreign university, having done my undergraduate work here, I enjoyed sort of going to another university in another country; and would feel somehow that the university community is an international one. It's one that shouldn't necessarily be restricted to national boundaries. But I still recognize the problem, that there are large numbers of foreign students and that the money that the Manitoba taxpayer has to put out for universities goes beyond the tuitions.

So it may be, Mr. Chairman, that we have to work out some very strong differential scales on funding. But I would think that the Minister, in consultation with the Grants Commission and the university presidents, should get together and declare some very specific guidelines in this province on the question of foreign students, to clear the air or at least get into the debate and discussion about it; because I think that there is initiatives being taken now and there's a lot of again, I think, distortion and sometimes unsubstantiated arguments about the question of foreign students that should be looked at. And it would be a responsibility, I think, of the Minister responsible for Universities, to clarify that or at least set in motion — and maybe this is a topic for a commission of some kind, or a study group of the universities to begin looking at the issue of foreign students.

And in that case, I would also suggest to him that the other issue he should be looking at is the question of the accessibility of a university education for minority groups in this community. We have had enough discussion about poor people, but there is also other minority groups.

We do not do a very fair job by way of native people in this province. I think the number of native students in the universities could be almost counted on two or three hands. They simply are not going and there's a lot of reasons for that. I think that the universities are as much to blame as anyone else is for not providing the kind of outreach that could be used to develop it.

But one of the reasons for it, Mr. Chairman — and this is what disturbs me a little bit — is that many of the cutbacks that are taking place in university funding means that universities must cut back on special programs, special programs that might be designed to provide entryways or accessibilities for minority groups. I think that that is something that the Minister better be very cognizant of, that his belt-tightening and budget cutting and restraining may mean that we're also beginning to severely restrict accessibilities or the ability of universities to reach out further.

I was also struck in that same topic about the fact that there is still, I think, basic discrimination against women in the university systems, both in the faculty and the administration side — if you look at salary differentials — and also the number of students going into the professional faculties, and others.

Again, I think that we would do very well, Mr. Chairman, if we were to again, through the Minister

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

and through the initiative of him, insist that the universities undertake this whole question of the accessibility of universities of different minor groups, women, native people, and others, to determine what methods and means could be found to improve that and also to make sure that there is a fairer degree of equity in salary scales and personnel programs and regulations that apply to people coming into the universities.

Well that, Mr. Chairman, is a lot of sort of quick-card throws at the Minister at the tag end, but I still think that there's a lot of things that he could be doing right away to kind of get the thing off dead centre, which I think is where it stands right now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister. The Honourable Member for . Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Honourable Minister in rising to reply to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, could also make note of some of the questions that I intend to put to him as we're approaching the end of the debate on the Universities Grants Commission.

The Honourable Minister mentioned that he is waiting to meet that "barefoot boy" in his office. I would like to suggest to him that this year he will meet countless numbers of barefoot boys and girls in his office, and so will his department, and so will the Student Aid office. What concerns me most is the point that I made to him last Friday, is that in responding to their pleas and their concerns, he will likely tell them the same thing as he and his colleague, the Member for St. Matthews, had indicated in the House on Friday and again yesterday, that the fee increase is going to hurt the rich more than the poor. He will make that same comment with respect to all expenditures that students will have to incur. And using the pair of shoes as an example —(Interjection)—

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order. The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, please. I believe the Member for Burrows has made this self-same speech before. Now I can see that he's trying to make a point, and I can appreciate that repetition does drive these things home, but is it necessary to go over the same ground two or three times?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Well, no, I'm not going over the same ground at all. I'm simply trying to impress upon the Honourable Minister that my concern is that that will be his response to costs of education in general, whatever they may be, be it a pair of shoes or whatever, that's going to hurt the rich more than the poor because the rich person is going to buy a more expensive pair of shoes than the poor person.

He made reference to the Province of Saskatchewan, that the people of Saskatchewan pay \$85.00 or \$90.00 more by way of tuition fees at the Faculty of Arts, or whatever faculty it was that he used as an example, and how do they pay the higher fee? Well, of course, he overlooks one thing that perhaps the people of Saskatchewan are able to pay that difference in the fees from the income which they earn from the savings that they were able to accrue as a result of the benefits of a socialist government for well over 25 years of the last 33 or 34, of which we only enjoyed eight in this province.

The Honourable Minister was asked by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge to indicate the new directions that he proposes to offer to the universities in this province, and you will remember, Mr. Chairman, in introducing his Estimates, in his opening paragraph, he made specific reference to this government giving new direction to education in the province, and there again, he did not exclude universities, because you will recall, and I have no intention or desire to repeat myself, I raised the same question with respect to community colleges, and the Honourable Minister's reply was that as far as community colleges were concerned, everything was fine. Business as usual type of thing.

Well, I want to ask him about the universities. In attempting to reply, he said, well, the universities aren't doing the PR job that they ought to be doing. And again, taking a very similar approach to responding to questions from the opposition as he has over the past few days, over the past two days with respect to universities — yesterday and Friday — but previously it was, well, this is the Grants Commission's responsibility, now it's the universities responsibility. They're not doing the type of PR job that they should be doing. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not all that convinced that universities ought to be out selling education in the same manner as manufacturers of toothpaste and deodorant and shaving cream and hair spray are in selling their products.

Nevertheless, he did indicate that he is — in fact, Mr. Chairman, I must become political once again, because I really fail to make the distinction because I think this is what this is all about, to make the political distinction between the philosophy with respect to a whole host of government programs, in this instance, education, the philosophy on this side of the House and the philosophy on that side of the House, plus the two members who happen to occupy seats — no, three, because Mr. Speaker also has a desk on this side, on the side that we're on. But nevertheless, the majority are over there.

In fact, I'm sure, I know that the Minister has been a very busy man for the last couple of weeks. Just handling the Estimates certainly kept him busy, but I'm sure that tonight if he were to check his diary, he would find that he is scheduled to participate in a conference on Monday, May 15th

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

sponsored by the University of Manitoba. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether I should even make reference to this publication, it's the University of Manitoba bulletin, because I know that the Honourable Member for St. Matthews takes exception to some publications emanating from that campus. He takes exception to reference to the Manitoban — (Interjection) — oh, just the Manitoban, very well, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that I have the blessings of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to make reference to this particular publication.

Mr. Chairman, I note that the first session, chaired by Dr. Clay Gilson, Vicesident and two participants on the panel, Dr. Joan Foley, Principal of Scarborough College and the Honourable Minister, are going to discuss Higher Education, Quality and Development in Times of Financial Constraint. Now, Mr. Chairman, surely the Honourable Minister can no longer say that this is a matter of responsibility to the universities, let them sort out their own affairs, let them do a better PR job, and other matters are a responsibility of the Grants Commission and so forth, and thus wash his hands clean. The Honourable Minister did commit himself to dealing with this topic, and I have no intention, Mr. Chairman, of wanting to steal the Honourable Minister's thunder or to force him into a position where he'll have to go through the act that he may have prepared for himself for a week yesterday, but nevertheless, as a member of this House, as a member of this committee, if he is going to discuss higher education, its quality and development in times of financial constraint outside the House, then surely he would want to discuss the same topic within the House, in Committee of Supply.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, from this topic, that the Honourable Minister is going to talk about new directions, because it would appear, I would think that he's not just going to say, well, look fellows, we're in a period of financial constraint and there's really nothing that we could do, we had to cut the budget right to the bone, cut the estimates right to the bone, it's just a matter of bare survival, doing what you did in the past, well, whatever you can get by with doing, there's really no opportunity for much more because he's going to be talking about quality and development. In other words, it would seem that the Honourable Minister wants to tell the public about his plans, his hopes, ways and means in which he sees some change come about in the education program, in line with what he thinks that the post-secondary education program on our university campuses ought to be doing, ought to be achieving, the needs that it ought to be meeting, the needs of the public that it ought to be serving. So I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that if, as indicated here, the Honourable Minister is going to debate this topic outside the House, that he would want to take some time of this committee and indicate to us and share with us some of his views that he has on the quality and development of higher education in times of financial constraint. 53-04 I would also want to draw to your

attention, Mr. Chairman, and to members of the committee, that as part of this conference, the other theme, what the Minister will be speaking on, this will be next Monday evening, on Tuesday morning, Public Stake in University Education. I note one of the participants will be Mr. Harold Thompson, the President of Monarch Life Assurance Company and no doubt well known to the Honourable Minister, having served on one of the review teams of his task force. In the afternoon, Should University Education be Job-Oriented? — and I notice that Richardson Securities is represented on that panel. So I'm sure that the Honourable Minister would want to share with us some of his views.

That brings me, Mr. Chairman, to another point. I would like the Honourable Minister to indicate his views on this. The Honourable Minister — let me put it this way — I'm sure that the Honourable Minister is aware of the fact that Great-West Life has a very significant presence in the board rooms and the senate chambers of two of our three universities, namely the Universities of Manitoba and Winnipeg. At the University of Winnipeg, the Chancellor of the University is a board member of Great-West Life, Mr. Rod Hunter. At the University of Manitoba, the Chancellor, Mrs. Auld, the wife of a board member of Great-West Life. Now, as far as those two individuals personally are concerned, Mr. Chairman, I know both of them. I know them very well and I think they're very competent and very capable people.

But my question to the Minister is, has he any thoughts on, I was going to say concerns but I won't even say that, has he any thoughts about the matter of this type of presence of Great-West Life, of the other board members sitting around and knowing that here is Great-West Life, just across the street from this building, and knowing the close association between Great-West Life and this government, and here is one individual who could be said to be representing Great-West Life present there and what effect that may have upon the decision-making process in the senate and in the senate chamber and in the board room.

I know that under the University of Manitoba Act, the role of the chancellor is, well, I was going to say it's merely an honorary one, it's a bit more than that, but nevertheless, the fact does remain that the chancellor is a member, a voting member, can take full part in the proceedings of the senate and of the board of governors. So I would like the Honourable Minister to comment on that. By the way, Mr. Chairman, I'm not suggesting that this be the route that the universities pursue, but nevertheless, that might be something worth exploring. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge suggested to the Minister that some encouragement ought to be given to endowment funding from private sources, well, perhaps these two chancellors may be individuals that could be tapped for that very type of support from the private sector for our two universities.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to university research and the cost of university research, I'd like to remind the Honourable Minister that a little better than a year ago, a year ago last September, the Council of Ministers of Education in Canada did appoint a committee representative of universities, Federal Government, the council to inquire into the matter of a — I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, if I've forgotten the exact terms of reference of this committee — but I think I would be reasonably accurate if I were to say that its terms of reference, that it was to address itself to the matter of costs of

university research, and the effect of the costs of university research, some of the additional costs that accrue to universities and so forth, flowing from university research. And I suppose a host of other matters. Perhaps the Honourable Minister may want to indicate to us what progress this committee is making. I believe that that committee is chaired by the President of the University of Winnipeg. I may be wrong. I think it is, although there might have been a change over the past 18 months.

Speaking of the future of post-secondary education, I would like the Honourable Minister to indicate to us whether he is considering bringing a bill to the House, University of Winnipeg Act. I believe the Honourable Minister is aware of the fact that the Board of Regents of the University of Winnipeg has a committee struck to draft a bill and they have been working at this for the last two or three years or so. I would like to know whether the drafting of it has been completed by the University and if it has, whether the Minister is planning to bring it to the House. Perhaps he may even want to indicate some of the highlights of it or there might be some significant differences within it as contrasted with the University of Manitoba Act that he might want to bring to our attention.

I would also like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether any further development is occurring in the area of Co-operative Post-Graduate programs among the three universities. A start had been made in some courses where courses in Master's programs are being offered on a co-operative basis jointly between the two universities, and I would like to know whether further progress is made into other areas beyond that which has already been established, and which by the way was recommended by the Oliver Commission on post-secondary education established by the previous government.

This government, Mr. Chairman, and I'm going to ask some of the questions that were asked of me when I was Minister, when the honourable member's party sat on this side of the House proclaiming to be a very very cost-conscious party. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what views the Honourable Minister has on having the universities operate 12 months a year, as opposed to the manner in which they do now. In all faculties. I know that the Honourable Minister might say to me, well, the faculties of Arts and Science, there's a seven and a half month program, the regular winter session, and there's the intersessional program during the months of May and June, extending, I believe into July, and then of course the six weeks summer school course. But is he giving any thought to setting up the entire university on a 12 month basis.

Perhaps the Honourable Minister could also tell us whether it is his intention to have the — and I believe that I did see something in the press not too long ago indicating a postponement of the date for public dialogue with the Universities Grants Commission and I would like confirmation from the Minister whether that meeting or those meetings will in fact take place.

Also, I would like to hear the Honourable Minister's views as he perceives the matter on the benefits of that type of dialogue.

Perhaps the Minister could also indicate to us what the present status is insofar as national accreditation of some of the schools and faculties at our university; because given the budgetary constraints that the Estimates reflect, are there any faculties, any schools at any of our universities that may run the risk of losing national accreditation? If I may just explain for a moment or two, I would suspect that this, of course, would affect the professional schools to a greater extent — perhaps exclusively.

Perhaps the Honourable Minister would wish to comment on . . . At the present time we have an arrangement with the University of Saskatchewan for students studying Veterinary Science and Waterloo Optometry. Is the Honourable Minister considering any other such co-operative arrangements with other universities in other disciplines, or in the alternative is he contemplating expanding our University of Manitoba — well, no, I shouldn't say University of Manitoba; it needn't necessarily be so, it could be any of the three universities — or is he considering expanding any of our universities with a view to establishing schools or faculties in other areas of study?

The Honourable Minister did indicate that in a sense the university enrolment is still growing, in that the part-time enrolment is increasing. The full-time enrolment has levelled off but the part-time enrolment is increasing, which, translated into full-time student equivalence can be considered as an increase in enrolment.

I would like to hear his views on what he considers to be an optimum size for a university. Is our University of Manitoba running the risk of becoming too large, or not?

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge did mention the matter of foreign students. I'm sure that the Honourable Minister is well aware that a government of his own political party, that in Alberta, did institute a fee differential for foreign students and I think the people of Manitoba would like to know whether the Honourable Minister, being of the same political persuasion, is of a similar mind.

And of course, the matter of access to the professions — and I realize that this topic I think can be discussed to some degree under the Grants Commission, under this appropriation, and perhaps once again under Special Programs — but in the light of this government's track record up to the present time, I must indicate, Mr. Chairman, that I am concerned about the future of many of the programs that we have instituted which were designed to provide greater access to the professions for our native people, for the disadvantaged, for women into professions that traditionally over the years were regarded as the exclusive domain of the male society, and so forth. I would like to know what the Honourable Minister's plans are in that particular area; to make the university and the programs that it offers more accessible to those to whom, for far too long, accessibility has been denied.

Also, Mr. Chairman, two more points. One, the matter of labour education. I'm sure that the Honourable Minister is well aware that labour education is a matter that has received the endorsement

and support of the Federal Government, and the Federal Government has demonstrated that by its commitment to a \$2 million a year grant to the Canadian Labour Congress over the next two years, as well as grants to agencies and groups other than the Labour Congress, to develop a labour education and establish a Labour Education Program.

And I am sure that the Honourable Minister is aware of the fact that the mechanism, the framework, for a Labour Education Program at our universities has been established here; and I would like the Honourable Minister to comment about the future that he sees for the getting on track of the Labour Education Program for which the framework had been designed by our government.

And lastly, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Honourable Minister may want to share with the committee some of the issues and concerns that he is presently discussing and dealing with at the Western Post-Secondary Co-ordinating Committee, which is a committee of Ministers responsible for Post-secondary Education in western Canada. I would think, that upon assuming office, and after having attended — probably he may have attended one meeting of that committee by this time — and even if he hasn't, that he likely has become aware of problems and issues that he would want to raise at the Western Post-Secondary Co-ordinating Committee and obtain the views and opinions of his colleagues in the other western provinces; and perhaps in some cases to co-operatively, jointly with the other provinces, find ways and means of resolving those problems in an attempt to provide the best quality Post-Secondary Education Program for the people of Manitoba.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, let me first of all thank the Member for Fort Rouge for his second contribution here this evening. I appreciate many of the topics that he has raised and I can assure him that these are topics that I also have an interest in, and I believe are crucial and are important to the university scene; and they are topics that are going to be given consideration in the months ahead.

To the Member for Burrows, I have some problem when I listen to him being concerned about all of these things because I always have that great tendency to want to say to him, "well, I understand you were Minister in charge of that at one time. Why didn't you solve those problems?" And of course, I know that's not a fair question because, obviously, I can take a look and see how successful he was in solving those problems; but he would like to know what I have done in — well, let's say five or six months — and I would suggest to him that he knows that by the time Estimates are completed that's about three months. So, I'm always amazed at how much trust he puts in me and what great faith — and I thank him for that — that he feels that I can somehow perform these miracles in six months that he wasn't able to do in several years. But by the same token I thank him for that particular type of faith and I will attempt to deal with some of the points that he has brought forward here this evening.

When I spoke of P.R. at the universities, I wasn't speaking of cheap huckstering or selling; but I was suggesting, Mr. Chairman, perhaps justification, perhaps letting people know what was happening, a matter perhaps of just straight information. And when I speak of P.R. I don't carry it to the state that the Member for Burrows carries it at all.

He remarks on the boards, chancellors and regents at the universities. He seems to have some particular concern there. He mentions a couple of individuals who I understand are not even government appointees on the boards — or at least the board of the University of Manitoba. All I can say to the Member for Burrows at this time is that as far as government appointees are concerned, that we will attempt to find the most capable and respected citizens that we can find to serve on those particular boards. And the numbers available are fairly considerable; and the list of names that I have looked at that have been suggested from many different sources contain the names of many people who I would consider would fit those requirements of capability, general respect in the community and people who have shown certain dedication and interest to education, generally.

The Member for Burrows questions me about the University of Winnipeg Act. I can tell him at this time that I have received no proposal in regard to that particular Act. I am sorry that I cannot report to him at what particular state of development that is in at this time.

He also mentions the Masters Programs, some that have been developed, I understand, jointly between the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg. If there are more of these programs under consideration at this time I have not received a progress report to this point.

He asks for my views on the 12-month year. I suggest to him that that is something that I would like to study in much greater detail. I have personal thoughts but I don't intend to utter them at this time. I would like to bring back a report on that after I've had more time to look at the particular research on that matter.

He's quite right that our universities do operate, to some extent, a 12-month period. However, he's suggesting that they should be going all months of the year. And, of course, he knows full well, Mr. Chairman, all of the implications that that contains from a staffing point of view, and so on.

But, however, he also wondered when the Universities Grants Commission would be having their "open" meeting, I think, as he referred to it. I can tell him, May 18th at the International Inn at 2:00 p.m. I, of course, think that's a good idea, I'm sure an opportunity that I would hope many people would avail themselves of, although I understand that last year there were more people on the stage than there were in the audience. But we would hope this year that perhaps there would be more interest evinced.

In the area of national accreditation — and I'm sure the Member for Burrows is thinking here of the problem that he, no doubt, ran into, or at least was encountered in the Dental Faculty — and I can assure him that that particular problem has been overcome and that the information that I have received is that there are no problems in national accreditation at this time.

He also is wondering where we're at with other interprovincial arrangements regarding the

offering of particular courses, such as the Veterinary Course in Saskatchewan, and so on. There's no particular expansion planned there in the months ahead. I don't rule out the possibility that in the next year or two there may be a course or two that will come into this particular category, but there are no particular plans at this time. And of course, any plans in that area would be based on a voiced need by different parts of our community.

The matter of foreign students is one that I'm sure the Member for Burrows is well aware, as I am, and the Member for Fort Rouge also mentioned his concern in this area. There seems to be a heightening concern in society with this topic and it's one certainly that we are going to have to study in the months ahead. I would hope that when I stand here next year at my Estimates, that I can come forth with some rather clear policy statement.

However, it is an area that both members have highlighted to me and I agree with them, one of growing public interest for a variety of reasons I might suggest.

Things like access to the professions are, of course, always under study and always under consideration. It's my understanding that in the area of Labour Education that there are courses being offered through the Extension Departments at the universities' that are directly related to the type of subject matter that would be of interest to people involved in different areas of labour. I understand these have been offered for some time and reasonably well attended. I have not reason to believe that they will not continue to be offered.

As far as the Western Post-Secondary Co-Ordinating Committee is concerned, I can advise the Member for Burrows that it will be meeting in June of this year. That will be the first opportunity that I will have had to attend such a meeting. I have a few thoughts that I imagine I will crystallize before that time and will be bringing forth at that particular meeting. At this point, I wouldn't care to enlarge on it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I would suspect that the Honourable Minister may have just overlooked one of my first questions which dealt with the Council of Ministers of Education Committee on post-secondary research. I want to remind him of that. With respect to labour education, could the Honourable Minister comment upon the future of the Labour Education Centre as established, incorporated as a corporate entity last summer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in regard to the two questions from the Member for Burrows, first of all the post-secondary research committee of the Ministers of Education that he refers to, I have not seen any report, nor have I seen it on the agenda at the two meetings that I have attended. Whether that particular topic has somehow been shelved or sidelined, I am not able to tell the member at this time. I would think it's important enough that that should not have happened to it, but I have not recently seen any indication that it was still under consideration. It may well be.

The Labour Education Centre has fallen into the same category as the addition to the Faculty of Music building at Brandon, the library at the University of Manitoba, and the building at the University of Winnipeg. It's fallen under the particular freeze and any plans to proceed with that this year have been deferred.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Clause 6—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** I don't want to prolong debate on this point, but is the Honourable Minister suggesting that he is regarding the costs of the Labour Education Centre program as a Capital expenditure? Because according to my recollection, there was very little, if any Capital expenditure involved in there. It was basically program.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I can say to the Member for Burrows, the dollars for that type of program this year are not available.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, on that specific item, I wonder if the Minister of Continuing Education could tell us whether the Minister of Labour has expressed her concern that the Labour Education Centre is not proceeding, that she would be very concerned that that is not happening, whether she's expressed that concern to him.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, I think in a year of restraint, in answer to the member, that all Ministers at times have concerns that certain projects are not able to go forward because of lack of funding. But that concern also has to be tempered with a reality of the amount of money that is available. As a result of that, priorities are set and certain projects — I've just named a number of them — have had to be sidelined or deferred, and have not been carried forward this year.

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Clause 6—pass - the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister of Labour indicated from her seat, no, that she hadn't expressed a concern on that subject. I wonder, the Minister, being the Minister responsible, has to have some idea of the priorities and where cutbacks should take place. Where does he see the Labour Education Centre in terms of priorities for education in the province of Manitoba?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, that's a rather difficult question. Where do I see it in relation to what?

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, in relation to the programs that he has responsibility for as the Minister of Education and Continuing Education. Is it a low priority, is it something that shouldn't have been initiated in the first place, is it a high priority just waiting there as soon as there are funds available? Where does it sit in relation to the education needs in the province of Manitoba?

**MR. COSENS:** Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I don't see it in the same relation as I would the public school system, or certain aspects of our post-secondary system, in the training there, because I feel that some of the courses in the area of labour education are available now through the university extension courses. Certainly the facility is there to offer these, and also the labour courses have some availability through adult education. As far as where does it stand on the particular list, I would hesitate to say, Mr. Chairman, in relation to a number of other projects, but in those general areas, it certainly wouldn't stand ahead of schools or the universities, or in fact the community colleges. I would put it into the general area of adult education. Not that I am saying that education for people involved in labour is not important, not at all. I think it certainly has to be to the benefit of our society, that people who are involved in, whether it may be labour unions or whatever in the labour unions, should have that opportunity to improve their educational standing. But I really feel, Mr. Chairman, that in many ways, they have that opportunity the same as any other adult in our society. I know that in remote areas and so on, that opportunity doesn't always exist, but in cities, I would suggest that many of those courses that can fill that need are being offered.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Clause 6—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, it's nice to hear at least one Minister opposite who has at least a little bit of concern for labour and labour education. Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to make some general comments on this section and I would like to also talk a little more on the Inter-Universities North Program.

In a more general way, Mr. Chairman, the Minister was concerned at a meeting upcoming whether there would be good attendance or whether the people on stage would exceed the people in the audience. That's one area, Mr. Chairman, where this government has succeeded remarkably well. They've managed to get the citizens of Manitoba very much more involved in the governing process than they have been involved for a long time. We've never had such a good turnout on the front steps of the Legislature since the days of Autopac when Great-West Life organized their demonstration, so the Minister has been successful, and his government has been successful in bringing about a kind of participation in certain matters relating to government policy.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the Minister, when he was talking about appointments to the university boards which Lieutenant Governor-in-Council does have authority to appoint certain people, remind him of his comments yesterday I believe, or last evening about the representation from northern Manitoba, just to make sure he doesn't forget that aspect of it. He talked about respected citizens in our community almost as if there was a certain group that might be represented on the board. I know that there are a number of citizens that were appointed by the previous government that were respected in their own particular communities but might not have been known throughout the province of Manitoba, or were not employees or management people of Great-West Life or others. I know there are a number of native people appointed to the boards, and I hope that he would re-appoint some of those people or appoint other people from the native community to sit on those boards, because they have been very much affected by the universities' programs and the special mature student programs, etc.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned the library and the possible construction of a library at the University of Manitoba. I'm not sure how strong the need is or how high a level of priority that project should have, but I know from a very recent experience of going back and taking a class and writing papers this fall and spring, that the University of Manitoba library is not up to snuff. It's not what a university library should be and I think it suffered under our administration and under previous administrations. It looks like they got a good stock of books in the '30s or before that, and up to now they haven't been able to keep up with new publications. There are certain areas, especially in the area of graduate studies, where you just can't get the resource material. It's just not available there and I assume that's because of the budget restrictions.

The other aspect that's been touched upon is the foreign students at the university. Mr. Chairman, I don't know, I see that as an important part of the educational system. I mean, there's the formal part,

you go to class and the professor lectures and gives you some information; there's the other part where you talk to your fellow students and you learn from them and you discuss what's going on, etc., and certainly the presence of foreign students is very helpful to Manitoba students, to Canadian students at a university when they have the opportunity to hear different points of view, people from different countries, people from different ethnic backgrounds, what their opinion is, what's happening in their country, what is the nature of development in their area' etc., etc., etc. So I hope the Minister of Education doesn't get red-necked on this issue, that he sees the value of having foreign students at the universities, and that he doesn't take any steps that would eliminate that possibility or reduce the number of foreign students at the universities in our province.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get really specifically into the Inter-Universities North Program a little bit further, and I want to address the Minister directly. I want to mention to him that the Inter-Universities North Program — and I hope he's aware of this history — that initially it was not funded through the Universities Grants Commission. It was funded in a more direct manner by the Provincial Government, that's how it got started out. At first it was funded, it was initiated by the Mystery Lake School Division in Thompson. They put up some of the funds initially, and then the funds came from other government sources. I think basically the instruction of the University Grants Commission was, the funds for Inter-Universities North are now going to be placed in the Grants Commission, but those funds are really for Inter-Universities North. I think that there was some understanding that that program would continue, that program would carry on.

But since, Mr. Chairman, the program was in fact funded separately, specially, then I think it falls back on the Minister of Continuing Education. He's a big strong gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I don't think he needs to hide behind the Chairman of the Grants Commission any longer on this issue. I think he can let us know where he stands on this issue and not say, well, it's just the Grants Commission, I can't say what the position is — I think that the Minister is going to have to stand up and tell us. Does he think this program is a low priority, the Inter-Universities North program is a low priority? Does he think it can operate at 120,000, that it's going to provide anywhere near the extent of courses that it offered before?

There could be two possibilities. Either the Minister does not believe that this program is worthwhile, which I assume that those that are directly under his responsibility now, that he has assumed that some of them are not worthwhile, or such a low priority that he could cut them out when directed to do so by the First Minister, but in this case, it's either that he doesn't think the Inter-Universities North is a worthwhile program, because if it was and if he believes it is, then he can fund it directly. There's nothing that says he can't fund it directly. It was funded directly before, it can be funded directly again. He doesn't even need to play with the Grants Commission any more. He can provide the funds for that program if he believes it worthwhile. So either he doesn't believe it's worthwhile, or he has no power, no strength in Cabinet, no ability to get his colleagues to accept what he thinks is worthwhile.

I think he should stand up and tell us what it is. Does he think the Inter-Universities North Program should proceed, that it's important, that it's worthwhile to the people of northern Manitoba, or does he believe that and he just can't get his colleagues to agree, they don't think it's important for northern Manitoba. Which is it? I don't think he can just say, well it's up to the Grants Commission. It's up to that Minister, and he should tell us where he stands on the Inter-Universities North Program; he should tell the people of northern Manitoba where he stands on the Inter-Universities North Program.

Mr. Chairman, the Inter-Universities North Program developed, was initiated by people in northern Manitoba to meet a need in northern Manitoba, and I know that when we went around with the Northern Task Force away back in 1969-70, there was one group in northern Manitoba that was, I think, especially affected by living in northern Manitoba, and that was the people who had moved up to the north basically from the southern part of our province, the women who were acting basically only as housewives in northern Manitoba, and they didn't have a job outside the home, but that was their basic work, as housewives, raising the children, etc. etc.

Mr. Chairman, some of the doctors in northern Manitoba and some of the social workers in northern Manitoba said that there is a disproportionate level of problems with the housewives in northern Manitoba, especially in the more remote areas, especially in the one-industry communities where, for example, in Gillam, the husband worked for Hydro, he probably worked overtime, long hours, and that community is fairly structured. You have the management people and you have the technical people or the trades people, and you have the labouring people in that community and the community maintains that structure. So the wife of the labouring person doesn't necessarily have anything very much to do with the wife of the manager, etc., etc. It's kind of a closed society and that puts a lot of pressure on people. One group that it puts extreme pressure on is the women, the women who are not employed outside the home, but working within the home and I think that the Inter-Universities North Program served a very important function for this group of people.

You know it's happening in North American society, in our society today, that more and more women are saying they need a little bit more in terms of a role than being a housewife. They need some outside interests, at least outside the home and many of them want to get back into professional or into careers and be able to work outside the home. I think that the same thing is happening to the women who have moved up into northern Manitoba and are in the industrial communities in northern Manitoba.

So some of them would take the Inter-Universities North Program just as an outside interest; the matter of learning something new, looking at something in a different way, getting a chance to get away from the house for awhile and explore a new area; and that was a very helpful and a very

Tuesday, May 9, 1978

worthwhile and a very useful outlet for people who start to feel trapped because they're in a one industry community that's fairly isolated. That was a very important aspect, I think, of their lives.

The other was the women that would like to begin to start into a career — maybe perhaps they got married before they had a chance to get into university and pursue a career or develop the training for a career — and these people now saw some hope that they could, in fact, live in northern Manitoba and begin to develop their abilities and begin to develop a career through the Inter-Universities North Program. That helped people, one, it helped people to survive, just to cope in northern Manitoba; and secondly, it helped people to stay in northern Manitoba and not have to move into the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in my own family, my wife was able to take some university courses by correspondence; but then it was necessary to attend the university for a certain period of time because you couldn't get all the courses by correspondence. I think that avenue has now been taken away from many of the people in northern Manitoba; and I think that this special problem, special situation is being aggravated and it was a very important need that the program filled, and I think the Minister could probably understand that and maybe he could increase his willingness to pursue and try and get the program back to a level — the plateau level — the level that it seemed to be providing the service that was necessary.

The other group of people is the people in the industrial communities who did go up north, basically, to earn a good income because there was employment up north; move their families into the northern communities. There is some mixed feeling there, Mr. Chairman, I know that there were some surveys done in a couple of mining communities and the management themselves didn't want further training because they figure, well, if you train these people that are mine workers now they might get more training than they can use in this particular community and they're going to move out and we want to keep a stable labour force here.

There were others, though, that wanted more training so that the people who were already living in the north could move up and fill the position so they didn't have to bring people outside when they weren't sure how long those people would stay, how long those people would remain in a remote community.

The other aspect was that for the first time a lot of young people — very capable people, very intelligent people who probably hadn't had the chance to go to university — got involved in the labour movement; got involved with their unions. One of the courses that the Minister mentioned in my earlier question, was a labour economics course that was offered by Inter-Universities North. Many of the working people in northern Manitoba found it a very practical and very useful course. It helped them to be better union members and to participate better. To, in fact, move into executive positions with their unions; be involved in negotiations with unions. And now this option of those who want to stay there being able to increase their understanding, their learning, their knowledge to do better in the community, that is taken away; and the option is taken away, Mr. Chairman, for those who do want to, in fact, change their career — those who have come up north and said, "Okay, I've been a miner now for three years, I want to try something different." I know a number of them that I knew in northern Manitoba have in fact come into university and started taking university courses because they wanted a career change. They wanted an occupational change. I'm sure that many of them — when they do develop a profession — will return to northern Manitoba and implement their profession in northern Manitoba.

The other group that's very seriously hurt — and we've explored this with the Minister a number of times — of course, is the professional people, the teachers, that exist in northern Manitoba. The Minister is aware that he's going to have increased difficulty recruiting teachers. The Minister is aware that the professional people, many professional people, will consider specifically moving out of northern Manitoba if they don't have the training opportunities available to them in northern Manitoba.

I think the Minister should be aware and is well aware of that situation. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that he would stand up and tell us where he stands on the Inter-Universities North Program. I don't think he can hide from the issue or run away from the issue. I think that he has to take a stand and say that, "I am going to fight for this program, this is a worthwhile program," and not let the Chairman of the Grants Commission take all the flack, but let us know what he thinks of this program; whether he's going to support it and whether he's going to fight to have this program maintained and reinstated because he has the choice. He can fund the program directly. He doesn't need the Grants Commission to fund this program he can fund it directly. He can move it out of this section of the Estimates Book and then the House Leader would be happy because we wouldn't be on this item so long. He could move it into another section of the Estimates Book — Special Programs or Adult Education Programs or whatever he wants to call it — and he can fund it directly. So, does he not want to fund it directly? I think he should answer that question.

The other main item that we've tried to get at as northerners and what norther MLAs have been fighting for all along, is some basic equality for people in northern Manitoba and people in southern Manitoba. This educational step — this was one step to bring that equality about — to give the people I've been talking about that chance to have a university credit course in northern Manitoba and not have to move into southern Manitoba to get that kind of course. So that's what we're talking about, is the basic equality.

I think the group that organized itself on the Inter-Universities North Program are to be congratulated for preparing a very excellent brief. I'm sure the Minister and the Chairman of the Grants Commission, maybe even the Premier has had a chance to read this particular document over

which traces the history of Inter-Universities North and gives a feeling of the people in northern Manitoba to the program and I think the Minister is aware that it contains resolutions from the town councils, from the city councils, from the Local Government District councils, from the school boards, from all those groups in northern Manitoba that are very concerned about the elimination of this particular program.

The other groups that are concerned and the only remote community, the only native community that the program has gotten into, is Island Lake. But here again is a chance for people to begin their university education within their own community; to expand their horizon; to expand their knowledge and their learning through this kind of a vehicle, through this kind of program.

I would just like to — in terms of the feeling of the people of northern Manitoba — just quote two paragraphs from the brief that I believe the Minister has had a chance to take a look at: "Additionally the Inter-Universities North helps to bring reality out of the concept of equal education opportunity for all. The north has often been considered a forgotten province, no upgrading courses, business people expanding their academic background or general public seeking cultural fulfillment.

"The IUN Program is an attractive, and in most cases, only outlet. Even groups with special interests, commerce, administration, nursing, graduate studies, etc., recognize IUN as a viable alternative.

"Any consideration to discontinue or even curtail the valuable and critically needed Inter-Universities North Program, is unthinkable. Support is rallied from communities," — and they have the schedule here — "and from individuals in the short time since the announced cutback of the program. Hopefully all parties concerned will consider the success of the program to date, the limited outlay and the broad community acceptance and the critical need in northern Manitoba."

Mr. Speaker, I think what we are talking about is the critical need in northern Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see that the First Minister of our province is in the House. I don't know if he's listening or not, but I think that's a basic concept that he is not familiar with, that he has very little understanding of, that there needs to be some special emphasis to bring about an equality between northern Manitoba and southern Manitoba; and that this was one vehicle to bring that about; and that by reducing the budget of the Minister, the First Minister has in fact made the north unequal. He is, in fact, discriminating against northern Manitoba, and this First Minister is following a tradition of the Conservative Government — of Conservative Governments and Conservatives — to ignore northern Manitoba; and I wish the First Minister would just listen for a second — but I don't think there's much possibility of that — because he's not one that's capable of listening to anybody but himself.

But if he would just listen maybe he could understand the need of housewives in northern Manitoba, the need of working people in northern Manitoba, the need of the professional people in northern Manitoba, the need of all groups of people in northern Manitoba, for this program and other programs that have been reduced, cut back, eliminated by the Conservative Government of the province of Manitoba.

I can see that the Minister of Education isn't going to get much support in this from the First Minister so he's going to have to fight this battle alone. I think he should tell us if he's going to fight the battle. If he thinks this is a worthwhile program, or whether he thinks it is not a worthwhile program, whether he thinks it's a high priority or not a high priority, and let the people of the north know where he stands and not hide any longer behind the Grants Commission.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for The Pas — and we have had quite a thorough coverage of this topic of IUN — I can say that I enjoyed meeting with the delegation from the north who presented, I think, a very good brief on this particular topic, and a brief that was very representative.

I can tell the Member for The Pas the same thing as I told that particular delegation: That this government has a commitment to see that courses are offered in the north. Now whether that commitment Mr. Chairman, the extent, the scope, will meet with the particular standards of the Member for The Pas or not, I don't know. But I assured that group, as I will assure the Member for The Pas, that we do have a commitment in that area and we will be observing very closely the delivery of courses in the north in the coming months. We will be monitoring that and reviewing it and keeping in touch with it.

Now beyond that type of assurance I feel that I cannot proceed at this time, Mr. Chairman, and I would hope that the Member for The Pas would accept that type of statement as some assurance, in good faith, of the particular feeling that I have towards those courses and, in fact, the particular feeling that I have heard from other members of the Cabinet in that regard.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before we proceed, I would just like to bring to the attention of the Honourable Member for The Pas, that I have considered and I have allowed a great deal of latitude. We have gone through the questioning on the Inter-Universities North. It's the same questions and the same answers. If you're going to proceed on a different vein I would recognize the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I just had one comment or some advice for the Minister, which I haven't given him yet. Maybe you will allow me to give that, although my comments this evening, Mr. Chairman, with respect, were on some new items that I had not raised before. I hope that you were listening well enough last evening and this evening to realize that there were some new items that I'd raised.

The advice I wanted to give to the Minister is that, when I as a Cabinet Minister was having some trouble with the program and there were groups coming in, etc., what I used to do if I thought I was going to have some trouble with my colleagues, was trying to get the Premier into the meeting. Now, of course, I was much more fortunate than the Minister, because my Premier was very sympathetic to northern Manitoba and what was happening there. But I knew if I could get him into the meeting, that I would have a chance with these other guys of getting that particular program and that particular policy approved. So maybe the Minister would just take that advice from an ex-Minister, that if he could draw in the Premier or a couple of his powerful colleagues to some of these meetings, they might gain the same understanding that he himself has gained and might give him support in these programs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Earlier this evening, Mr. Chairman, the Minister, in response to the Member for Fort Rouge, was saying he was glad to hear somebody talk about education relative to the Universities Grants Commission appropriation. In so saying, I think that he has missed the point and he reinforces this opinion of mine, in that in his remarks he said that in his opinion perhaps the faculty was the most important component of the university. I hope that when we get to his salary he can once again clarify this and reassure Manitobans that the most important people at university are the students who go there because what seems to be implicit in his remarks are that the buildings and the faculty, the institution itself, are what we are talking about.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, in talking about this appropriation, the only reason that the public is involved at all in the financing of education at any level is that there is a public benefit. It used to be that the argument was made that the moneys allocated to education at the university level came back to the public coffers through future taxation. The question comes to mind as a result of the present trend, which has been exacerbated by the present administration forcing professional people to leave the province, that this is no longer the case, that many of the people we are training are forced into a position to leave the province, and a lot of them do so by choice.

Now, the Minister has used the expression many times that fees cover 10 percent of the cost of operating the university. I have the question of what does this 10 percent represent? Is it an across-the-board average? I think the people of the province are entitled to know what it costs us to educate people. Now, I know that the Minister has been using the expression that the Grants Commission is responsible; he is unfamiliar with what criteria they use in establishing what amounts of money they will give to any particular university. But, Mr. Chairman, I for one don't accept this argument because everything that occurs in the Province of Manitoba relative to any government function, whether it is done directly or indirectly through some body which is established, is a responsibility of the government. The Acts that we were presented — there is Bill 25 which just happens to be on my desk is a case in point. The first sentence says: "Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba enacts as follows . . ." "Anybody who creates is responsible for the creation.

So the public is asking the question, and the question I can best describe by giving a case. Last fall 25 doctors were leaving a particular hospital in Toronto for fields more green than they had there and they were being interviewed by one of the television stations. The interviewer asked a man, "Why are you going to this further field." He said, "Well, why should I work here for \$67,000 when I can get \$180,000 somewhere else." And the interviewer asked him, "What about the hundreds of thousands of dollars that the taxpayers of the particular province paid to train you?" He said, "That is the way it is."

So people ask me — the middle-class people who don't send their children to university, who paid the taxes — "What does it cost to train a doctor? What does it cost to train a lawyer? What does it cost to train an engineer?" So when you use a figure of 10 percent, 10 percent of what, for whom? Are we in the business of training people to export, is this what we have come down to?

I would like the Minister to — I know that he doesn't have the figures this year — but I would like him to undertake, in the name of the people of the province, an analysis of the cost of education of the different components and perhaps during his Estimates next year he can report to us on the findings.

To us the argument that the College of Physicians and Surgeons, another creature of this Legislature which governs the admissions and who will become a doctor and who won't — because for every one who is allowed to go in there are 10 people who aren't allowed to go in, equally as competent and equally as capable. For every person who applies for admission to Law School, the same is true. So this inclusion and exclusion, and the cost to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba, is becoming more and more of a question in people's minds. We had in this Legislature a committee which was established a number of years ago, and up to their report — I think it was in 1974 that the Committee on Professional Associations reported to the Legislature — and their recommendation at that time was that there was not a need for change but perhaps there is at this time because of the changing in employment opportunities for these people within the province.

Mr. Chairman, I don't, as I say, expect the Minister to have these figures at his fingertips but I couldn't but think, when the Minister was saying that the members from the north who had been talking about their problems, weren't talking about education at all. I have had occasion to go to the University of Manitoba; I have three degrees from that university and know many of the problems that are involved. It was always strange to me why, if you took one course in one building from one professor it was accepted, and you go across, the same books, different buildings, and it is not

**Tuesday, May 9, 1978**

accepted — inter-professional jealousies. These are human problems and they will always be with us.

But for the Minister to suggest that making educational opportunities available to those people who have not got access to education through the regular institutions, Mr. Chairman, just comes as a great shock to me. They can sit there hours and hours and listen to the pathos. I don't know how extensively the Minister of Education has travelled in this province but nevertheless I had the opportunity to travel extensively and the people who are in these particular communities, as described by the Member for The Pas, are as much entitled to the services which are provided by this government as anybody who lives in Fort Garry right next to the university, or across the street from the University of Brandon, or next door to the University of Winnipeg. This is what these people were talking about.

By the by, Mr. Chairman, just on the general question of services being available to people, by people who are competent to deliver these services, there isn't one ophthalmologist outside of the City of Winnipeg, not one. In asking the College of Physicians and Surgeons what their position was on midwifery, because not everyone has access to obstetricians or pediatricians, they had no official position when I asked them this question.

The case has been made that about Mr. Gordon Beard, whom everyone in this House respected, being forced into a position where he left that group because of their attitude towards the north. While it may be uncomfortable and inconvenient for the Minister to sit long hours, to listen to the people from the north who are being cut back drastically in all of their services and in this particular area specifically, and not know that these people are talking about education in its truest sense, comes to me as a shock for anybody who wants to be the Minister of Education in this province.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Clause 6—pass. Resolution 46: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$89,108,000 for Education; Universities Grants Commission \$89,108,000—pass.

Resolution 47, Clause 7, Manpower Planning and Development, (a)(1) Salaries. The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it may be a good time to have 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. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE):** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Wednesday.**