

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, May 28, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — GOVERNMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. I'd like to refer members of the committee to Resolution No. 59, Item 3.(b)(2)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, we were discussing this innovative and unusual purchase of tires for the Minister of Fitness' car before you arrived. I just wanted to ask a couple of more questions on that particular point.

Again, it struck me as a violation of the tendering process, and although it may have been well-intentioned, it was certainly out of order in my judgment, and I think the Minister generally agrees that it wasn't a desirable method of operation. I wanted to ask him, though, if he can indicate the procedure that was adopted in that a new car was ordered, and then a substitution was made of the tires on that car. And I wondered whether Mr. Banman approached the Minister to make that change, or whether he dealt with the central provincial garage. And if it was that route, whether the people at the garage then checked with the Minister to ascertain whether the purchase would be in order, or would be agreeable to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think prior to supper-hour adjournment, I tried to deal with the matter in a reasonable way. I can understand the opposition members' concern here. They honestly believe that, having discovered the fact that a colleague of mine insisted on a pair of special whitewall tires, that somehow or other they would be able to demonstrate a departure from the restraint program.

The truth of the matter is that he got those tires for considerable dollars less than the provincial garage was prepared to provide them for. I have also indicated to the honourable members of the committee that it's not a particular purchasing policy that I would choose to endorse. I've indicated that to the Minister, who is now present, and who I would welcome to add any clarification to the great tire debate in the Government Services, in that department. But I don't think I can make any further statements about it. The tires were purchased through the Central Purchasing Bureau, through the central garage, from the supplier that we are currently on tender with, Uniroyal, except that the Minister asked for a less costly tire, a less expensive tire. It happened to be a tire of his choosing. I can't say much more other than that.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my question to the Minister was, how did this procedure evolve? Did the Minister of Fitness ask you for permission to make this substitution?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have had trouble with the Minister of Sports and Fitness. It is a question of, I suppose, religious and ethnic background — we don't speak to each other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, maybe somebody in the department could advise the Minister as to the method of purchase again, because we're talking I think here about a principle, and it wasn't myself who raised the matter. I think the Minister of Fitness took great relish in announcing that he had saved money by this purchase.

Now, you know, on first hand that sounded terrific, the problem being that could anybody who had a deal or who had a connection or who had access to some material that would be purchased by the government, can they operate in a similar fashion? Can they contact the Minister, or can they phone the department and sell them a special? I assume in most cases that the government buys on the basis of a process. There are well established rules for purchasing; anybody in the

same business might be able to compete. Maybe the Minister got a deal, maybe he didn't; maybe he bought an inferior product for the right price. Maybe somebody else could have given him an even better deal on it; maybe the government bought too expensive tires in the first place; maybe they didn't. But I'm just saying that it is an anomaly, and you know we had some concern as to the way the whole thing was handled. It is not so much that it's a small amount of money as the fact that I find it peculiar that some Minister can say I want this particular thing and it's just purchased as such, particularly if he says, "I know where you can get a deal on this," because that strikes me as being a very dangerous precedent, if Minister's are going to be phoning up and saying I know where we can buy a truck load of this or a carload of that. I don't think people who are in business would be too happy with that as a regular procedure. They want to know what the ground rules are so that they can participate, and I intend to raise a matter more serious in the tendering processes for security when we get to the Minister's Salary, where the ground rules seem to be very vague and very flexible.

So I'm simply saying to the Minister again, maybe the Minister of Fitness would care to answer as to what method of operation, what procedure he followed in making this substitution? Did he, for example, phone the Minister and say, "Can I do this?" Did he phone the garage and say, "I want this." If he phoned the garage, did the garage people then phone the Minister of Government Services and say, "Is this okay?" Because somebody approved this, and I want to know who approved it.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to continue this debate much longer. I know of a former Minister of Public Works who used to spend a considerable amount of time wandering through the art shops of this city and deciding in an arbitrary way which particular painting or which object of art struck his fancy.

I have a cup of some unknown description that I have yet to be able to find a suitable invoice for that was purchased by ministerial direction. You know, I'm not doing this or suggesting this to throw red herrings; I'm saying that in this particular instance the Minister involved in effect, if you want to put the bottom line to it, saved the tax-paying public some moneys by opting for a particular choice of tires that he wanted. It was within the purchasing policy of the department. The bulk purchasing contract is with Uniroyal; he purchased a less expensive set of Uniroyal tires. I invite the Minister of Sport and Fitness to add any personal comments that he may on the subject matter and I don't say this by way of attempting to come out from under this heavy attack on my ministry right now but I was not the Minister at the time that the questionable purchase was made, and so the direct answer to my honourable friend for Elmwood: "No, the Minister did not inquire of me as to whether or not he could purchase these tires. I wasn't the Minister of Government Services at the time."

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(2) — the Honourable Minister of Fitness.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a classic case of some civil servant's nose being out of joint, when you've got a problem when you're going to save the taxpayers some money because the previous administration, or maybe the previous administration before that was putting on a much higher grade of tires on the car than was, I feel, necessary at this particular instance. And here is an example of where the taxpayer is paying less money, but the government is being ridiculed by the opposition for taking that particular approach. As the Minister has mentioned, the department has the contract with the Uniroyal people, it was bought through that particular purchasing system, and those are the tires on the car right now at. I must say, a saving to the people.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how the previous administration worked it, I understand, my particular car, when the Member for Brandon East wanted to instal a mirror and a light so that his wife could powder her nose on the sun visor on the right hand side. I don't know if he phoned up the Member for Elmwood and asked him if he could do that; I don't know, or did he just phone the Provincial Garage and say: "Hey, I think that's a good thing. We should have it; put it in" or if he said: "Hey, you know, I think we should have air conditioning," and it costs about \$300 or \$400 to put it in. I don't know. Did he phone up the Member for Elmwood and ask him if he could put in the air conditioning? Maybe they did that but it's such a small item that, you know, Mr. Chairman, we're spending a lot of time on one particular item which saved the province some money and bought tires from people that already were supplying us with the contractual commitments. And somebody somewhere along the line has said that minister's cars should have Michelin Tires or Bridgestones. And that is the word and that's it. Well, Mr. Chairman, those are more expensive tires and these tires are less money. And if I can save the taxpayers \$150 or \$200 on a set of tires, Mr. Chairman, I think it's my duty to do so.

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

MR. DOERN: Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, it's all very interesting but the Minister still doesn't answer the question and neither does the Minister of Fitness. If the Minister of Fitness is going to go around and inspect the car fleet and he's going to look at all the batteries and make recommendations on cheaper batteries, and if he's going to go and look at all the parts on all the cars, then perhaps he should apply for the position of Minister of Government Services. When you start tinkering and you want to start making substitutions, then I think you open up a whole can of worms. And my understanding was that the Minister chose these original tires on aesthetic preference, that he wanted a wider whitewall, and that this was his aesthetic preference, and that that was the main reason for his preference, etc.

So, I'm simply saying, if there are procedures that are established, I think there are good grounds for them, and when individual ministers start making substitutions and then trumpeting about how they saved the taxpayers money, I don't think that point has been proved. What has been demonstrated, which we all knew before, is that you can buy tires at 25 bucks a shot, I suppose, and you can buy them for over \$100.00. And the fact that you buy a cheaper tire doesn't mean you're saving money. It may mean that what you're doing is buying a cheaper tire, and it won't last as long, and it won't give as good service.

We all know that car parts — there are expensive parts, there are cheap parts. There are different types of vehicles. You can buy a car for \$15,000, and you can buy one for \$5,000 new. So, you know, I'm simply saying that I'm not impressed with the fact that the Minister made this substitution. And if he wants to do that, then he can, you know, he can make that kind of a recommendation to the Minister on cars. He can go around and tell the Minister of Government Services what type of batteries to buy and why, and he can make recommendations on tires, and any other parts of vehicles, if he wants. He can do that.

But, once he does that, Mr. Chairman, then you have to give people the right to bid on those particular products. You can't make isolated purchases. You must then give people in the industry an opportunity to tender on those specs. So if the Minister of Fitness wants to set the standards in the Department of Government Services, he's free to do so, but he shouldn't be doing it on a one-shot basis, or on an occasional basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that nobody is trumpeting this. There was no news release that the Minister of Fitness had saved the government a bunch of money. The matter was raised in the Legislature by the Member for St. Vital. And I just replied to questions that he asked me, that's all. That's all that happened. There isn't all kinds of trumpeting and press releases that have come out on this. This is an issue that has been raised by the opposition, not by the government. And to try and sort of say that we're not allowing tendering in this particular instance, I think the Minister has pointed out very clearly that Uniroyal are the people that we are buying tires from at the present time. Those are the people that were the low tenderers, the low bidders, when the government accepted the different tires that they purchase.

And as the member knows, there are 13 inch tires, there are 14 inch tires, there are 15 inch tires, and there's even big truck tires. So, you don't go out every time and say, "Now we're buying two 13 inch tires, and we let tenders out for those things." And the member should know that.

But, Mr. Chairman, let me just say, you know, a classic example — I think the government can save money. I will make recommendations, and I will do everything within my power to save the taxpayers some money. And you know, Mr. Chairman, a classic example of that, and I was here when those electric cars were out in the front there, and they went around there. And the manufacturers were out here, and the Minister was out there, the then First Minister was driving the cars.

And I went over to the guy — and I've been in the car business a long time, I grew up with cars, Mr. Chairman, so I know something about them. I know something about tires, I know something about oil, and I know something about gas. And I went out to this fellow, and I said, "How are you going to heat this car in the winter?" "Well", he says, "we've got an electric heater in there." "Well", I said, "How does the electric heater work?" "Well, it runs off the batteries." "Well, I say, "doesn't the motor run off the batteries?" "Yes." I say, "What kind of efficiency are you going to get on those things?" "Oh, tremendous," he said, "tremendous." "Well," I said, "how about the wheels?" I said, "Everything is much stiffer in the wintertime, you're going to lose a lot of efficiency." "Oh, no," he said, "we've got got this new kind of grease that will really turn — the

wheels turn really (Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, you . . . — know, having been in the business and having the practical experience, there is no magic grease. The wheels turn harder in the wintertime than they do in the summer. It's a fact of life and you can use whatever graphite, grease or slippery grease you want to use. That's a fact of life.

Mr. Speaker, I walked away there and if I had been a part of the government, I would have screamed long and hard before we paid \$8,000 for cars, which I knew, Mr. Speaker, having been involved in the industry, would be an absolute waste of taxpayers' money. Because until we come out with some kind of energizing pack or something, the old lead batteries with the sulphur, just won't work. So, Mr. Speaker, were I in any department of government, whether it be Public Works, whether it be any other things, that I know from the fact, we can save the taxpayers' money, I will endeavour to do that and I don't care if it means that some of the civil servants will get their nose out of joint, because that's what has happened here, and he went running to the Member for St. Vital. I was member of the opposition long enough to know how he got his information. So that's what happened here but I can tell the member, I'm not backing away from that and wherever we can save the taxpayer some money, I will endeavour to save it, even if this is the type of tack the opposition wants to bring forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(2) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, we're asking questions, we're getting speeches, but we're not getting answers to the questions that we're asking and if you want to debate electric cars, we'll get Bob Wilson in here and we'll have a debate on electric cars. But that isn't the question that we're dealing with. We're simply saying that there is an unhealthy precedent in a Minister giving direction about substitutions. —(Interjection)— Yes, saving the taxpayers' money, trumpeting the saving of taxpayers' money —(Interjection)— I have the floor. And the point is, you can adopt new procedures if you like, but you will also have to then decide whether every Tom, Dick and Harry can go running up to the Minister or the government, saying, "Here, I've got a deal, would you like to hear my deal? I've got so many chickens or so many batteries or so many fence posts at a special." And you can save money that way as well.

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

MR. ENNS: I don't mind the honourable member casting aspersions, certain motives to Tom and Dick, but leave Harry out of it, eh?

MR. CHAIAN: The Honourable Minister does not have a point of order. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has never had a point of order. He's been in the Legislature 13 years. He has never yet had a point of order.

I wanted to ask him if he can give us a breakdown again of Other Expenditures going from 4.6 to 5.8 million. How much of that money is being spent on new cars and how many new cars are being purchased?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: This appropriation provides funds for replacement program for 1979-80, of some \$1.5 million. It also provides for an allowance for price increase for gasoline, repair parts and costs of labour to the tune of \$232,000. That's part of it. I think we are talking about some 187 cars, I believe. Some 189 vehicles, for a total expenditure of \$1,195,640.00.

I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that the rest are the operating costs involved with the general fee, but in terms of capital acquisition, it covers some 189 vehicles, replacement vehicles, for a cost of \$1.195 million.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister indicate at what mileage cars are now being traded? Is it 80,000 or higher?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that's part of the area of concern right now. I'm anticipating that the Deputy Minister is going to address himself to on a priority basis. We have an aging fleet. For instance, just by way of some figures, we have some 24 sedans that are over 100,000; we have 21 trucks in the same category; we have some 50 trucks and vans that are between 90,000 and 100,000 miles, some 72 sedans; we have some 82 trucks and vans between 80,000

and 90,000 miles; some 115 sedans in the 70,000 to 80,000 range; 120 trucks and vans, 185 sedans in the 60,000 to 70,000 mile range; 117 trucks and vans and 228 sedans in the 50,000 to 60,000 range; 103 trucks and vans and 226 sedans.

Mr. Chairman, the figures speak for themselves, we have an aging fleet.

MR. DOERN: That's my point, Mr. Chairman, the Minister sums it up by saying, "we have an aging fleet," and that is because the mileages are being allowed to pile up and the day of reckoning is being postponed. So I'm simply saying that it's all very good in the short run but.. sooner or later you're going to have to start spending a great deal of money on fixing those cars or they're going to be write-offs, will have no value in trade-ins and so on and so on.

What I'm asking the Minister is if he could indicate the policy, or is there no policy, because I recall, I believe, that we used to trade at 60,000, and then, supposedly to save money, I think that figure was raised to about 80,000. Now, I'm not sure whether I'm recalling the figures correctly, but I know that we were getting into those regions. Can the minister just indicate what a guideline is for trades, or is there no guideline at the moment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable minister.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the last policy as set by the previous administration was at a level of some 80,000 miles, and that was an extension from what had been. I think generally he traded between 50,000 and 60,000 miles. You know, I can't help but agree with the honourable member to some extent, that the wise economic decision to be made — there should be a relationship between when cars can be traded in for maximum value from the fleet and replaced — that policy has obviously suffered somewhat in this process of where the whole question of the government fleet policy is being debated.

MR. DOERN: Well, I'll ask a third time, Mr. Chairman, can the minister indicate what his policy is in terms of trades? Does he have a figure of 80,000 or 85,000 or 90,000 or 95,000 or 100,000?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, I'm not prepared to prejudge a policy decision that has to be made in this regard. I think it will be a prudent course to follow, that if it's judged — and I hope that judgment will be made relatively soon, certainly in terms of time to facilitate departments in their preliminary discussions for, would you believe but up-and-coming Estimates for the coming year — that a firm and clear policy decision is made with respect to the size of the fleet, and then that we would expect our administrators to advise us the most prudent course to follow, which I would suspect would be a combination of the model years and miles, that they both have a relationship to when you're talking trade-ins. I would think that coming back to a figure closer to the 60,000 miles, for instance, would probably be a more realistic figure to deal with in terms of maximizing the return on used government cars.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, one general question here on purchasing is: Does the government have any policy or intention in regard to encouraging Manitoba firms through the use of purchasing? In other words, are we giving a Manitoba preference? Does the minister intend to use the Purchasing Bureau in a manner in which Manitoba industry can be encouraged, or is there no policy in that regard?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, aside from those particular areas, where we show preference to specific groups and organizations, particularly those that supply some services by handicapped organizations, unskilled workers of Manitoba, you know, groups where we show preferences in a very definite way, the government of the day is not showing preferential treatment to the Manitoba manufacturers. I should add, Mr. Chairman, that this is a question that is causing us a considerable amount of concern at this time. We can't avoid the fact that, in my judgment increasing number of sister jurisdictions and provinces are indeed writing in very specific preferential treatment to their manufacturers. It's a matter that Cabinet and government will have to deal with, but aside from those areas that I mentioned, where we are purchasing certain services from very special groups — groups that are supplying some goods or services by different agencies, particularly handicapped people that are providing some goods or services — in those instances we are continuing the same policy of the previous administration, and indeed the policy that has been in effect for several decades

in this province, but we are not extending that preferential to general purchasing in the province.

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

MR. DOERN: So that if there was a bid by a Manitoba manufacturer for, say, \$1 million on a product, and there is a bid by an out-of-province firm that was three cents lower, you would award it to the lowest bidder?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, without specific direction from Cabinet or without a specific policy stated, I, personally as the minister responsible, exercise an option that, in my interpretation of the Manitoba Purchasing Act, makes it possible for me to exercise, that is, when I deem tenders to be equal, I will show preference to a Manitoba manufacturer in all cases. I go one step further, and it's a self-imposed regulation, that that deeming of tenders to be equal have to fall within the 1 percent range.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, are the Other Expenditures under this item money that is spent on purchased items, or is this only the Other Expenditures that usually go along with Salaries?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised here in my notes that provide this information that these increases provide for data processing costs relative to the Purchasing Bureau Information System, for which adequate provision was not made in the 1978/79 Budget. It's a total of some \$28,300.00.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the minister when office equipment and furniture, etc. is purchased, does it come out of Resolution 61, Acquisition of Physical Assets?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by staff that the bulk of that would come under Resolution 58, 2.(c)(4), and as well some out of Acquisition of Physical Assets.

MR. WALDING: Then, would the minister consider that office machines would be a capital matter rather than a current item?

MR. ENNS: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that those kind of expenditures come under the appropriation that we just passed (c) Office Equipment Branch, of which there is some \$230,000 for Salaries and \$507,900 Other Expenditures, which is being increased to \$619,000 this year.

MR. WALDING: So is the Minister now telling me that the purchase of office machines would come out of Current, under this item?

MR. ENNS: Yes. All out of Current, all current.

MR. WALDING: But the Minister told us when we were at 2.(c)(4) Furniture and Furnishings that the large drop in there was accounted for by Expenditures, Capital Expenditures, which were under Resolution 61.

MR. ENNS: 2.(c)(4)? Mr. Chairman, my staff advise me that under 2.(c)(4) that provides for alterations and renovations to offices whereas the actual acquisition of furnishings or something like that is probably found under Resolution 61. Any replacement of existing furniture, updating or something like that, comes out of the current supply under 3.(c)(2) and the acquisition of additional or opening up a new office, opening up a new building and supplying it with new furnishings, that that comes under Resolution 61: Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets.

MR. WALDING: So if for example the government were to buy a new typewriter for a new building, that would come out of Resolution 61, I understand it.

MR. ENNS: If it was a new acquisition.

MR. WALDING: And it would be considered a Capital item, I assume from what the Minister tells me.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the question of Capital and Current, you know, is something of the past in this regard, and I don't particularly know what the member is attempting to divine here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(2) — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Further to that last point, most businesses and corporations would consider that anything that was to be consumed or used within the department in that particular year, such as paper, pencils, paperclips and things would be considered a current item but things that were to be used over ten years — and I believe that's the figure the Annual Report mentions as a reasonable time for office machinery — would be considered a capital matter. If that is the case, I wonder if this Minister would share the surprise that was evinced by his colleague, the Minister of Finance, in finding Gestetner machines listed by the previous government under Capital.

MR. ENNS: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that we have no more Capital.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, then can the Minister explain, if he says there are no more Capital purchases, can he explain Item 61? Is that going to be for items that are going to be consumed and used in that one year alone, or they will be items for long-term duration?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it's not a question of their duration; the question is that this is one-year money. I may not have it next year. It all lapses at the end of the year.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister explain any of the authority that is granted to a government in terms of each legislative session, in terms of the 200-and-I-think-\$5 million that is being requested under the words Capital by his very administration that is broken down this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(2)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, you know, we're playing with words here and it's like when the Minister says he has a point of order he really means he wants to make a speech. Is he telling us here that under 61 when we talk about the Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets that that isn't Capital? Is he telling us that's something else?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I would ask perhaps if we could proceed in an orderly way with the consideration of the Estimates. When we arrive at 61, I perhaps may have the answer for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the Purchasing Bureau, the Minister indicated that equipment that was new equipment would be purchased under Item 61. Would equipment that is being replaced be part of the Other Expenditures in 3.(c)(2) and 2.(c)(4), in terms of furniture and equipment?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's my understanding that that is the procedure that is being followed.

MR. URUSKI: Is there a clear delineation in the Departmental Expenditures with respect to furnishings vis-a-vis equipment purchases, in terms of the Equipment Branch? Are all the funds utilized specifically for — and maybe the Minister can elaborate — what types of equipment are those funds used for and how are they broken out as furnishings, furniture and not as equipment?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that office equipment — that is typewriter machines and other calculators or what have you that go to make up a modern office operation — that they are distinct and separate from the furnishings that go into that same office, and they would be

covered under appropriation 3.(c)(2), that \$619,000 that is allocated there as distinct from Resolution 2.(c)(4), where you see Furniture and Furnishings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(2)—pass; (d)—pass; (e)(1)—pass; (e)(2)—pass; (e)—pass; (f)(1)—pass; (f)(2)—pass; (f)—pass; (g)(1)—pass; (g)(2)—pass; (g)(3)—pass; (g)—pass; (h)—pass; Resolution — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister why this Item (3)(h), Recoverable from other Appropriations, is down from last year. **MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that the decrease is due to a decrease in the size of fleet staff, less recovery from other departments as a result of that, for a total of some \$551,600.00. That accounts for the decrease. Less mileage on the fleet. And there were, as we determined earlier when we were discussing the fleet, there was in effect an actual reduction of some hundred-plus vehicles of the fleet, and by the way, cheaper tires.

MR. WALDING: Is the Minister wishing to open that discussion again?

MR. ENNS: But I would invite that discussion to be opened up on my salary.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister if there is any change in the rate of recovery from other appropriations, other departments?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can have the details of that at a later date, but I'm told that there has been a slight increase in the charge for office rentals, or office equipment, but there's been — any change in mileage? Yes, also an increase from 12 to 15 cents — a difference from 12, which was the charge to departments, has been increased to 15 cents. That accounts for some of the changes in the department.

MR. CHAIAN: (h)—pass; Resolution 59: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,897,700 for Government Services. —pass;
Resolution 60, Item 4.(a)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, this is the Gimli Industrial Park, and I wonder if the Minister could give us a general picture of what is happening there. It wasn't too many years ago that the Armed Services pulled out, and that some very considerable efforts were made by our government to keep that base going. There were quite a few companies brought in. There are a whole variety of different operations in the Park. Several hundred people were working there. The CNR has invested a considerable amount of money in developing a training centre for engineers from across Canada, and I was just wondering if the Minister could indicate what has been happening in the past 18 months in terms of businesses pulling out, or businesses going in — if he can give us some current information.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that quite a bit is going on at Gimli Industrial Park. You know, I don't have to repeat the history to the honourable members, who are only too well aware that, following the closure in 1971 of that base, and leaving aside the one particular controversial industry that was established at that site by the previous administration, I would be happy to read into the record the listing and the number of employees that are currently operating out of that Industrial Park if that is the wish of the Committee. I can give you it in approximate terms that we have some 300 people, personnel, with an annual payroll of some \$4 million, operating out of Gimli Industrial Park. If the honourable members wish to be more specific, I would be in my usual style only too happy to accommodate them.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister whether he could indicate any new businesses in the past 18 months, and any closures in the past 18 months.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to indicate any significant new developments there, although there are some hopefully on the horizon. The question is perhaps more appropriately directed to the Minister of Economic Development, but there is that ongoing activity that I indicated involving some 300 people with, some 30 odd individual enterprises operating out of Gimli Industrial

Park,

MR. DOERN: How does that compare to a year or a year and a half ago?

MR. ENNS: I'm advised by staff, Mr. Chairman, substantially the same.

MR. DOERN: So there's been no improvement, and no deterioration.

MR. ENNS: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)—pass; 4.(b)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: There's been a significant reduction there from 758,000 to 70,000. Can the Minister explain this? Is this a deferral of maintenance, or why is there this reduction?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, This decrease is as a result of some non-recurring costs relative to the termination of Barnes Security Services for some \$37,000, certain buildings, 3, 4, 7, 10, 22 and 31 will be vacated, and thus saving on some operating costs for a further \$29,000, termination of contract for operation of golf course for \$8,000, the Aspen Park Housing Units Insulation Program in vacant units not requiring utilities expenditures. We were apparently paying for utilities in vacant units which we didn't think we had to, for a further decrease of \$21,000; miscellaneous decreases, cease of use of walk-off mats, the removal of a switchboard, which wasn't being utilized, for a further \$6,000.00.

MR. DOERN: What are walk-off mats? Those mats that walk away on their own legs, or?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: I'm advised they're the ones that are at the door as you walk in. People aren't walking into vacant buildings; we don't need the walk mats any more. Anyway that totals to a grand total of \$139,000.00. We have some allowance for increases relative to utilities and building materials for \$51,000, the net reduction being \$88,000, which accounts to the penny the appropriation under question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 60. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,623,700 for Government Services — pass.

Item 5 — there is no money expropriation needed here or voted on. I'm at the guidance of the Committee if you want some questions on the area. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well I think there's a place for some questions here, Mr. Chairman. On 5.(a)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Would the members prefer that we go through it item by item? 5.(a)(1)—pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister explain under Land Acquisition whether the land for the provincial court building near the City Hall has now all been acquired?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that there is still some outstanding paper work to be done on several properties.

MR. DOERN: Is the government proceeding to expropriate and acquire all the properties on the site?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions. I'm not sure whether it comes under (a) or (b). Perhaps I could ask the Minister ' whether the Land Acquisition Branch has had any dealings with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation over the year?

MR. ENNS: I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, by senior staff that there does exist a friendly relationship between the two.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister whether either the Land Acquisition Branch or the Land Value Appraisal Commission was consulted by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation regarding the value of some farm land that it has sold over the last while?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman. The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation has its own staff people with respect to appraisals that they do on land acquired by that corporation or within their control.

MR. WALDING: I would like to ask the Minister then whether either the Branch or the Commission has done any work either in acquiring or selling land or appraising land for the MACC?

MR. ENNS: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I was momentarily diverted.

MR. WALDING: I wanted to know from the Minister whether either the Branch or the Commission has done any work for or with the MACC in either acquiring, appraising or disposing of land?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, my advice from staff is no, that the Land Acquisition Branch under consideration here is not involved in the appraisals and or approvals of prices set by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, my question also included the Land Value Appraisal Commission, is that also included in the Minister's answer.

MR. ENNS: I'm so advised, Mr. Chairman, that it is included, yes.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, do these two bodies work only for and with departments of government or also with other agencies such as Crown corporations or municipalities?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's been my hope for some 14 years now or close to that, 12 years ago I can recall bringing in or attempting to bring in an amendment to the Land Acquisition Act to have Land Acquisition be the purchasing agency for all lands required for government purposes inclusive of Crown agencies, and in the same way to have the Land Value Appraisal Commission, which in effect puts a certificate of approval of the acquisition and the price that the public, the Crown is offering for that land, that that should indeed cover acquisition of Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Telephones — although Manitoba Telephones doesn't acquire that much land, they generally just require easements, right of way. But I happen to believe that the public doesn't differentiate between whether highways or water control requires land for public use and that as such it would be prudent policy to have a single government agency acquire land for government and public purposes, whether it be for direct line use — by that I mean departments like Highways or Education or Water Control for drainage purposes.

I tend to believe that that same principle ought to apply whether Housing Authority is requiring land for development of housing; whether Manitoba Hydro requires land for the purpose of right of way or construction of power lines, but that is not the case today. There is for consideration again at my initiation a request to make it all inclusive. Whether or not that will see the light of day during the course of this session is open to question at this point but it's a direction that I myself see as desirable in moving towards and I would include in that instance the Land Operations, the Land Acquisition, and the land dispersal of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation in the same light.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. ENNS: I just want to underline that is not the situation today nor has it been that in, not only the last 8 years but in the last decades, agencies, Crown agencies such as Manitoba Hydro purchase their land and appraise it entirely within Manitoba Hydro. Other agencies are doing it as well as is the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister, with respect to Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, do they do their own land acquisition and appraisals in-house

or are either of these two bodies involved?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation does use the expertise and the facilities of the Land Acquisition Branch under discussion here and also the Land Value Appraisal Commission. It simply points out what I just said a little while ago, is that there appears to be an inconsistency re in terms of different government agencies' approach to land buying, land appraising, or land dispersal, and I believe that's not in the best public interest. I would like to see that brought under one umbrella.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister reporting for MHRC gave a particular example in his speech to the House about some land that was, I believe he said expropriated for a certain large sum of money by his department, perhaps prior to his taking over, that was not used and I believe he said was either worth a sum, perhaps a quarter or a fifth of the original amount or it was sold for that very low amount. I wonder if the Minister would care to give us the other side of the story as the Acquisition Branch or the Appraisal Commission's involvement in that particular transaction. I suspect there was more to the matter than those particular facts that the Minister made before the House. Are either of these two bodies prepared to give an explanation to the Committee through the Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it would be difficult for me to comment on that question without knowing the specifics of the question. If the member has a particular transaction that he is referring to — I can't recall being in the House or being present when the Minister responsible for Housing spoke on the subject matter, but certainly if the member brings to my attention a specific transaction, then I would ask staff to provide me with the details.

I should correct an earlier statement. Mr. Osler advises me that MHRC uses the Land Acquisition Branch in the purchase of property. They do not use the Land Value Appraisal Commission as to the certifying of the — pardon me, I'm getting it straight now. In the acquisition of land, MHRC has traditionally used the services of the Land Acquisition Division and also the certification from the Land Value Appraisal Commission, but in the dispersal of land, they operate on their own, which again is not, you know, consistent with general policy. Any land dispersed by government as such, the departments, that is when Highways has surplus lands to their needs after completion of a highway, or other government departments, and they find it desirable to dispose of a particular portion of land, then it is also disposed through the offices of the Land Acquisition Branch. —(Interjection)— MHRC does not do it. They do it on their own. In other words, to come to the nub of the question that the Honourable Member for St. Vital is asking, the Land Acquisition Branch, the branch that we're now discussing, has no involvement in the sale of land by that corporation. —(Interjection)— We have involvement by the purchasing of the land, but we do not have involvement by the sale of the land.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister indicate whether, in the Land Value Appraisal Commission, do they have contact with other agencies of the Crown besides the regular departments and MHRC in terms of viewing their purchases, or at least consulting with them? Do other agencies come before them to have them examine the purchases that they are making? Not the Land Acquisition Branch but the Land Value Appraisal Commission, which I presume would be under this . . .

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, not at the time. You're speaking about other agencies, for instance, like Hydro . . .

MR. URUSKI: I'm speaking about the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Telephone. Do they touch base with the appraisers and/or with the Land Value Appraisal Commission to have them view the likes of any of their major purchases that they may be making on land within the province?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, to answer the Member for St. George, they do not. I quite frankly and openly solicit his support for an amendment to the Land Acquisition Act, that in my judgment, they ought to, simply to provide a more consistent approach when government, and I use the overall phrase, whether it's Hydro or Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation or MTS, when they require land for public use, that it would be I think in the interests of better understanding by the general public when they these lands are so required, if they had one agency that did in fact touch base

for all.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate whether at any time in the last number of years was there a procedure which involved consultation between the Land Value Appraisal Commission and other agencies in the purchase and examination of land that was being purchased? Now maybe there was certification of purchases. I'd like to know whether purchases made, say by — it seems to me that I recall that MPIC did submit their purchases of land, and that's going back a number of years when I was Minister, did submit their purchases of land to the Land Value Appraisal Commission for examination. Now the Minister tells me this is no longer the practice. Was it the practice of other agencies? Because I do recall MPIC doing that, submitting their purchases to LVAC in other communities where claim centres were being set up so that the Land Value Appraisal Commission could at least look at it in light of other purchases that are going on, whether — I can't recall whether there was an actual certification, but at least there was an examination and a comment if the prices were out of line or not.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, what the member says, it's quite possible that agencies such as MPIC might well have availed themselves of the knowledge and the expertise of the Land Value Appraisal Commission, but they weren't bound to by statute and it has not been a general practice. The Land Value Appraisal Commission was only set up about 1966-67 and I think was part of an evolution which I think is still going on with respect to government purchasing land. I reiterate again, I believe that the whole business of government's manner and method of acquiring land ought to be done in a fairly consistent manner and that as we're building up the expertise in a particular group such as the Land Value Appraisal Commission, it would seem to me just good common sense that agencies of government should utilize that function. I'm given to understand, and the former Minister responsible for MPIC, I won't argue with him if he indicates to me that that corporation from time to time made use of the Land Value Appraisal Commission to kind of satisfy themselves that they were on the right track, I have no doubt that that took place, but I point out that they are not bound to do so by statute, and neither are any of the other agencies of government.

MR. URUSKI: Just to ask, in the same way as I asked before, the Minister didn't answer my question with respect to whether other departments in the past availed themselves, although they were not bound, as the Minister indicates by law to do so, to make contact with LVAC on purchases, like MACC, for example, or Hydro. Was there a practice in those, if not now, in the last say, five years?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Jack deZeeuw, Director of the Land Acquisition Branch, is not with us this evening, and he might be able to cast a more specific light on the subject matter, but Mr. Osler informs me that to the best of his knowledge that has not been the case.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister looks at possible changes to the Land Acquisition Branch, or the procedures with respect to the purchase of land, I don't think there is any doubt that if he wishes to look at not standardizing the policy with respect to purchases, because I think there has to be separate approaches taken by governments in terms of their land requirements, I, for one, would not argue for a straightforward expropriation after certain procedures are undertaken in terms of lands that are required, say, for highways or for drainage purposes, that there not be a very long drawn-out procedure in terms of the public need for a definite parcel of land. But when it comes, of course, to the purchase of land for housing or for parks in those other areas, I believe there has to be a flexibility in terms of the approach that governments should take, so that when he looks at possible changes and the like, he should look at areas where there be policy developed that is in some areas both fairly straightforward, but also in other areas, quite flexible, and looks at more than just the straight public need in terms of the two types of projects that I've already mentioned.

So he can certainly, if he wishes to move in that direction, I, for one, provided some of the comments that I have made would be incorporated, and I think they probably are as a basis of policy now. Only he's talking about standardizing the procedure — he should give it a try and see whether his colleagues will accept it.

MR. ENNS: Just a final comment on that to the Honourable Member for St. George, I invite the honourable member's comments and helpful suggestions, when as is my hope, a bill dealing with the matter will be presented to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. BERT G. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, under this section, I've been waiting for a long time to put on the record some of the things that have been bothering me about this. I'm very pleased to see he talked about the acquisition of real property and all departments and agencies whose programs involve the need, and I underline the word "need" for land and buildings. It would seem to me that when you have over a \$200 million deficit that it's time, that if you have more owners you have more wealth, I think the coffers of the taxpayers of this province need a break and I think that we should be on with the job of selling some of this so-called need for land — because how much land and buildings do the state need?

I can give several personal experiences which really bother me. I was tired in Public Accounts and as a member of opposition sitting watching, time after time, members of the private sector become millionaires at the expense of people that may or may not still be with this department. About people who went out and bought moose pastures and sloughs and land access and land-locked land, talk about 10 Osborne Street over there as an example, the former member bought for 85,000 that wasn't worth 30, and these are the type of things that bother me.

It seems that here we have a fellow such as myself who can look forward — and I won't use the words, an Empire Loyalist or pioneer stock, but I look to the fact that my relatives got put to the cleaners by governments under their so-called need for land. I think that governments should be a consumer advocate for many of the people who have for 50 to 60 years owned land in their families and decisions are made in the marketplace and behind closed doors that seriously affected the people of this province and I can't see how the Al Zivots and the Tommy Sidebottoms can be millionaires because they package land together. What is wrong with our staff people that if we need land, they can't go out and package the land themselves? What are they doing as civil servants? Are they earning their money or are they just sitting back, saying to somebody like Sidebottom and Zivot, "you go out and get us 400 acres and we'll pay you so much," and they go out and option the hell out of it and within a couple of hours, they're millionaires. And that has to rest, that fault and that inflationary aspect of land has to rest with the former government. That really bothered me.

Another thing that bothers me, personally, as I say, in my own particular land that I have and I have a series of them, in St. Vital they told me they were going to expropriate me if I didn't give them the land and I ended up giving them the land for \$11,000; it's still sitting there, right on St. Anne's Road. And I think this is one of the tragedies that the so-called need for land that government gobbles up. I mean, I think that at some point in time, if the government doesn't need it, why do they engage in exaggerations, and I'll even go as far as to say, engage in so-called needs of land which do not exist?

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

MR. DOERN: The Member for Wolseley keeps directing his comments to me. I am not defending my Estimates; I wish he would address his remarks to the Chair and attack the present Minister rather than myself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood does not have a point of order. It is not the direction of the Chair to say where a person has to look. The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to offend the Member for Elmwood. He happened to be involved in the 10 Osborne Street one, but I was just merely using that as one slight example.

My comments to this Minister are that it seems to me that we have people on staff, who we are paying good money to, and if we have to package land together the days of people . . . You know, I have friends that say, "Tell me where there is a Socialist province and I will become a millionaire." It's unbelievable; when people know that Socialists are going to buy everything, they immediately go out and package land together and sell it to the government. I think that this government should stop buying land unless it is needed. We should begin selling today. This very hour we should announce to the public, the more owners, the more wealth, and reduce that deficit that we inherited from the former government. And I would think that if we sold land, rather than by tender we sold it at auction with a reserve bid, we would watch the action proceed; we would watch the prices go up, and I would suggest that that is the method we should use. And I would like to see the onus, rather than buyer beware on the government's part, where the government gets stuck with the moose pastures and the sloughs, that maybe some of those foreign buyers and some of those other people should end up buying some of this stuff and we, in turn, could reduce the public debt.

Again, I wanted to put on the record that I honestly feel that government's that come along — and I use an example of Gimli; I know a family there that had 40 acres expropriated. It was lakefront property; they had been there for 30 years. They were an old Ukrainian couple, that this was their farm. The government paid them \$34,000 for it. They had to buy a house in Gimli for \$26,000 and their lawyer grabbed \$4,000.00. They ended up with a net of \$4,000.00. They had one acre, not 40, and the government went in there with a bulldozer and knocked down the 50-year-old beautiful trees and the landscaping that they had spent years building. These are the type of properties that are not needed that should be offered back to the same people, with all costs included, at a slight margin for inflation, and offer them the land back i.e. or sell it.

What was this great idea to expropriate all the lands along Lake Winnipeg? To me, if we're going to sell them at \$10,000 a lot, great, but if we're expropriating for flood protection or the fact that the Lake Winnipeg Regulation may not work, or whatever, I don't think that that's proper. I think that these lands should be left in the private sector, and I've been wanting, for a long time, to put this on the record.

I think it's terrible. I went to Assiniboine Credit Union — and I buy and sell quite a bit of stuff — and they wanted me to pay some character \$175 to ride by a piece of property in his car and give a windshield appraisal. And much to my disgust — and this is one of the things of why the Crown agency should be under the Minister's thumb — is this man is employed by Manitoba Hydro, and I think that it's terrible for the Appraisal Institute to allow government employees and employees of the Crown agencies to compete with them, and I think they should begin today to complain to the new Conservative government that they do not approve of moonlighting, especially at the tune of \$175 to give us some kind of a windshield appraisal.

As I say, I just wanted to say that I don't think there is any more . . . There is always going to be some need for certain lands for, certainly, highways and stuff like that, but I think the day is fast approaching . . . I went by, on my way in here, down Henderson Highway and I passed a building in Elmwood, a purchasing building, in the old Snowdon Building. Now, what in the world is the Purchasing Department of the Manitoba Provincial Government doing in the Elmwood Constituency, when it should be down here, where it should be a communication. And I asked the Minister the other day why we renewed the lease. I know we had to renew it, but I hope that he finds . . . —(Interjection)— No, I don't want it in Steinbach, either. That would just be switching it from Elmwood to Steinbach. I would rather see it in the core area of the city.

So really, as I say, we don't have a bowling alley in Wolseley and we don't have a government building in Wolseley, that I know of. I believe we do have a welfare office. I'm not sure if it's on this side of Portage or the north side.

But, just to wrap up, I wanted to put on the record that we should begin to sell land today. I look at some of the aggressive American states that are getting down to so-called getting out of debt, and they are selling off large tracts of land. I look at Florida, the leaps and bounds at what they have done with swamp land and so-called desert. I was told we didn't have any bad land in Manitoba, that, compared to Europe, our farmland, even the A, B, C, even the D land or the Number 4 land, is as good as it is in many countries of Europe and, for that reason, I would like to see us . . .

And, again, one of my pet peeves is right across from the Convention Centre there is a big chunk of land that is the last piece of the puzzle of development for the downtown core, and it is owned and is one of the most under-used government parking lots that I have seen. I know the former member wanted to build a \$7 million parking lot there, but if we're not going to build a parking lot there I think we should sell that land because if we sell that land and the new developer supplies parking that means on the west side of the Convention Centre we will be able to get the hotel development that we need to make that entire package, the downtown selling package, available to help the Convention Centre get out of the red. And those are the kind of things that I am talking about. Sell what we don't need because today's market prices, there is a good bullish market and I would like to see us sell more land and reduce the public debt that we inherited from the likes of the Member for Elmwood.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to give the Minister the opportunity to reply to his colleague, and if he doesn't I do have the specifics of that matter that I mentioned to him just a few minutes ago where his colleague, the Minister reporting for MHRC, said of Friday, February 23rd, Page 206 of Hansard, "They expropriated the old Burrows Court, Mr. Speaker. Mind you, it was condemned and it was expropriated and the expropriation figure is \$85,000.00. We are still in negotiation, mind you. We may have to pay more. It looks like when the negotiations are over, we might have to. We had estimates for fixing it up that probably range from \$250,000 to

We found that after we did that, we would end up with a building with suites in it that we could have bought brand new buildings for for less money. So we thought we'd put it on the market, Mr. Speaker, to see if we could move it. We got offered \$15,000 for it."

Now, perhaps the Minister would like to explain to the Committee a few more details about this particular transaction.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that that's part of the problem that I suppose I am hoping to correct, that while Land Acquisition was involved in the purchase of the department (sic) it has nothing to do with the sale of the property and, you know, you might well raise the question as to the judgment that was exercised in terms of recommending that kind of a price for the purchase when obviously, the experience of MHRC when it came to sale of the property, there was such a wide disparity between the purchase and market value for that property. But, to the specific question, I am not attempting to dodge the issue. The Land Acquisition Branch is not involved in the disposal of the property.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the clear impression left by the Minister is that this particular property is worth \$15,000, i.e., the amount that was offered to MHRC for it. That being the case, you will have to wonder why it went to expropriation and why the expropriation was settled at \$85,000 for it. I understand the usual reason for expropriation, which is a rather time-consuming exercise, is that the owner doesn't accept the offer that is made for it and that it then goes to expropriation and a fair value is established for it.

Now, can the Minister tell us whether there was an offer made on this particular property, was it refused and did it go to expropriation? And is the Minister satisfied that the figure of \$85,000 was a fair market value for this particular property?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not, again, fully apprised of the facts but I do point out to the honourable member that, if indeed it went to expropriation, then a third agency, namely the courts, established the price, and they might have included in establishing a fair price a number of matters that were germane to the owner of the property at that time but not necessarily reflected when the use of that property wasn't used for what it had been. I am not really in a position, Mr. Chairman, to answer to the specifics that the member raises, other than to indicate to him that the branch that we're dealing with was not involved in the dispersing of that property or the sale of that property.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, at the moment I am still considering the acquisition of that property. Does the Minister know whether there was an offer made and refused?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, staff cannot advise me of the details of that particular offer. I will undertake to find out the specifics of it, the manner and way in which acquisition of that property was undertaken.

MR. WALDING: I ask the Minister if he is of the opinion, after the matter went to court, that that particular property or that \$85,000 was a reasonable or fair value to put on that property? Would he also consider that it has not depreciated in value since it was purchased and that it is probably now worth, fairly, \$85,000 or even more, since it has probably appreciated since that time, and that the \$15,000 that someone offered the department was a ridiculously low figure?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to find the answers to those questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass; (a)(2)—pass; (a)—pass; (3)—pass; (b)(1)—pass; (b)(2)—pass; (b)(3)—pass. Resolution 61, Item 6—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to spend some time in this section because there are quite a few government buildings that are either in a state of construction, a state of suspension or in a state of renovation. And I wanted to review, with the Minister, what I call Capital but he calls something else, and I have a list here of I guess about a dozen such buildings. I wonder, again, if we could review the Brandon Correctional, for starters, and if the Minister could indicate how much money has been spent in Brandon and how much more money will be spent for the completion of that facility.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the total project cost will approach the \$6,915,666, as indicated at the introduction of my Estimates, that we look at September occupancy, and this

is essentially coming in line with the projected cost as originally indicated.

MR. DOERN: Just again, how much has been spent, and how much is now committed to conclude?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the general contract cost was some \$5,486,000.00 That has been spent. We are now in a total project cost, which includes furnishings, total completion of the inside structure brings that cost up to \$6,900,000.00. That's what is being spent right now. The building, in effect, is complete, Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the additional \$1.3 million of inside furnishings are being put in place.

MR. DOERN: That's a total of 7 . . .

MR. ENNS: No, a total of 6.9.

MR. DOERN: \$6.9 million, right. Again, the Law Courts renovations, how much has been spent, and how much is committed for this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Member for Elmwood like to repeat his question?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, essentially the work that has been done in the Law Courts has been in the installation of the elevator service, roughly to the extent of some \$160,000 to \$180,000.00. That is, as the honourable member knows, the preliminary phase to the renovation in the Law Courts Building. The expected expenditure for the coming year — staff will advise me of in just a few moments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Elmwood wish to repeat his question?

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand we have committed about \$180,000, completed renovations to the Law Courts of the order of \$180,000.00. I was asking for the commitment for this fiscal year, as to what the government intends to commit, because there have been lengthy discussions and negotiations between the Manitoba judges, Chief Justice Freedman and others with the government over a period of years, to renovate that building because it is simply not suitable — it's 60 years old, there's a lot of deficiencies in the building — shortage of court rooms, etc., etc., lack of security and we considered a renovation which was cut or slashed. So, so far we've only, I gather, completed the original commitment of a first phase of elevating, etc., and I was just wondering what other commitments there are on the books for this fiscal year and/or in the future?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the whole question of the provision of space and facilities, improved space, additional court rooms is subject matter that's under very active review. There are a number of alternatives being studied at the moment which include the use of, as the member is aware of, for the provision of additional provincial court room space, which would alleviate some of the congestion within the Law Courts Building. It is also being considered to perhaps make use of the old Land Titles Building by means of a connecting tunnel. These are capital projects that will be undertaken hopefully in the very near future, but we have not got a specific commitment or allocation provided for in the Budget or in the Estimates before you because of the numerous different plans and projects that are being considered.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I understand the minister correctly, then he's saying that there really are no commitments, that they're still reviewing, etc., etc. Have there been any meetings? Has the minister, in his, I don't know 12 out of the last 18 month term in government services or 14 out of 18 months, whatever it was — has he been involved, has he sat in on meetings with the Provincial Judges? Because I know that I certainly did, and I would assume that he probably did, or should have, assuming there were such meetings. Has he been involved, or was Mr. Spivak involved in meetings in the past year?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have been involved with a meeting with the judges, both the Provincial Judges as well as the senior judges in concert with the Attorney-General. We're only too well aware of the situation that prevails. The Member for Elmwood is equally well aware that the government is in the process of attempting to, or not attempting but is making a firm offer for additional building space within the general area, that hopefully in a relatively short period of

time, and when I say short I'm speaking in the order of six or seven months, will enable considerable expansion of provincial court room space on a temporary basis. That hopefully will open up more options to us with respect to the requirements of the senior judges circuit, but there are a number of alternatives being explored by the department at this time.

MR. DOERN: So then the minister is saying that, in terms of the Law Courts themselves, and as I say there are discussions that went on in our administration for a couple of years, there are continuing discussions going on with the senior judges as to their requirements, that there are no financial commitments to the Law Court renovations per se.

MR. ENNS: That's right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: And I was just wondering again, when we consider the Provincial Judges Building or Provincial Courts Building which is part of the package. I'm aware of the fact that the government is considering buying the IBM building which is part of that package. In fact maybe the Minister could comment on that. Has that building been purchased or leased?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, steps are under way to purchase the building. The normal procedures of land acquisition, involvement, certification by the Land Value Appraisal Commission has taken place, my understanding is that an offer to purchase is currently being drawn up — an offer to purchase not to lease.

MR. DOERN: Can the Minister indicate the negotiated purchase price or the suggested purchase price and the amount of money indicated for renovations of that facility?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, we are hopeful in purchasing that building for some \$975,000.00. We anticipate with, understandably at this point, relatively preliminary figures re the renovations involved that would provide, and this is still subject to some further negotiation with the Attorney-General's Department as to the actual number of courtroom facilities required, in the order of 6 to 7 renovations . . .

Mr. Chairman, it would be too early and probably not appropriate to talk about renovation prices, in the sense that we are going to tender very likely for some of those costs but the renovations, as the member will appreciate, will be extensive in the sense that the building which is primarily an office structure now will be converted to house a number of courtroom facilities. My understanding is, to provide the necessary, you know, use of that building suitable for that purpose, would require such major capital improvements such as additional elevator facilities that would provide judges with appropriate exit and egress from the building into their courtrooms.

Just by way of general information the property at 373 Broadway, known as the IBM building, consists of some 8,512.5 square feet of space; some 28,000, or land area, pardon me — the actual close building area is some 28,000 square feet, 28,657 square feet; what they refer to as net rentable area some 22,940 or 23,000 square feet.

But we anticipate that the renovations will be of the order of $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million dollars or more.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite clear again. The government is considering purchasing the building for just under \$1 million and about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million to renovate, and again what is the intention? Is this going to be a temporary use of courtrooms or a permanent use of courtrooms? If it's temporary will it then be reconverted or is this now going to be part of the permanent picture of Manitoba courtrooms, etc. etc.?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Attorney-General will probably be a more appropriate party to ask those questions although I don't mind, you know, as part of the executive council to indicate the general intentions of government in this respect. We do not regard the acquisition of this building to resolving the question of providing adequate and desirable permanent courtroom space to replace the Provincial Judges' Building. We see this as a desirable way, however, to in a relatively short term meet the need in the Attorney-General's Department and to process and to speed up the backlog that currently exists within the judicial system.

We also look further down the line. We recognize that this kind of a building with the renovations now being recommended would adequately serve the Family Court systems in Manitoba and bring them into a more centralized position in contact with the support of administrative offices in the Woodsworth Building and the government agencies involved with Family Court. The Honourable Member for Elmwood is aware that at the moment Family Court services are scattered throughout

the city. Some of them in the Fort Osborne complex buildings, housed in buildings which are deteriorating at a pace where continued maintenance and operating costs are becoming prohibitive and we look forward to the renovations that we're planning for the property at 373 Broadway will in effect be put to good and more permanent use as the future site of the Family Court Services within the central area of the judicial complex and that within a reasonable time that we will proceed with the long planned construction of a Provincial Judges' Building.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have some problems with this in that I, you know, realize that there is perhaps some sort of short term requirement but there's really two extremes here. On one hand there is a long outstanding requirement to renovate the existing Law Courts, which isn't being done and isn't being planned, and on the other hand there is a need to proceed with the construction of new courts, and to that end property has been expropriated and acquired and in terms of sites it could be the construction at the site for which the land was acquired or the government chooses, since it's their decision they could revert back to the site adjacent to the Law Courts. So those two requirements continue and at the same time there seems to be no movement on those two fronts, no movement to renovate the buildings that we own and no movement on the construction of buildings that we need. The government then decides to pick up a new property and spend \$1-¾ million for a short term solution.

So, I'm simply saying that it would appear that, you know, this is only a temporary solution and there could be some wastage of money here. There could be some money that is thrown away, in that it is necessary to move on these other two fronts. Instead of moving on those fronts, the Minister and the Attorney-General, in response to criticism, is picking up a building and renovating it. I think it would have been better and more advisable if the government had decided somewhere about 6 to 12 months ago to continue to renovate the existing Law Courts and to plan the construction of a new building. Instead nothing was done and now there is sort of a panic response to acquire a building and to pour money into it for a short-term solution. That still leaves the other two requirements.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, you know renovating of the existing Law Courts Building does nothing to handle or to meet the problem that surely is the most important one, that is to provide additional courtroom space and to start making some inroads in the backlog of cases that the Attorney-General's Department faces.

Secondly, once you relieve the congestion and remove the Provincial Judges out of the present Law Courts Building, that gives us a great deal more elbow room in terms of making that facility more acceptable to the senior courts and indeed proceeding with the plans. Many of them are on the drawing boards and complete, to provide within the old Law Courts Building the kinds of facilities that the Senior Benches require.

But I think the point that the Honourable Member for Elmwood is missing is that to embark on the renovations of the old Law Courts Building by themselves, does nothing to relieve the pressing problem that members of the Opposition have made the Attorney-General only too well aware of, that is, namely, the need for more courtrooms and to improve the backlog situation of cases.

I really find it somewhat hard to understand why the honourable member cannot accept the fact that if we can have 10 or 11 courtrooms in place and functioning within six or seven months that that isn't a very wise investment, both in terms of dollars spent and in terms of meeting public policy and, particularly, it would not be all that wise an investment if, after having done that and used those facilities for three or four years while a new courthouse was being constructed, we then turned the property back over to private office use or tried to sell the building. But we have, as I have indicated, a very specific requirement for that building, which we think will fit very nicely into the total judicial complex by moving the Family Court facilities into these facilities that we are now hopefully, going to have available for the Provincial Judges within, I say, a relatively short time.

Now, when I say a relatively short time, the Member for Elmwood is well aware that to commence, whether it was five months ago or four months ago or six months ago, on a major construction of a new courthouse would still not have provided within that time frame of the next two years, any easing of the load that the Attorney-General's Department faces.

I have to refute the suggestion that there is any wastage of public money. In fact, I think — and I don't have the figures before me and I don't choose to use them in that case — but we have been assured by the senior judges of the Appeal Court and the Supreme Court, that if they had the Law Courts Building to themselves, more or less, plus perhaps the expansion of some of the court offices into the old Land Titles Building connected by means of a tunnel, that that complex

would serve the senior benches adequately, providing of course that the necessary renovations were made.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I have to ask the Minister, and to him and through him to the staff whether, in the renovations to the existing Law Courts it was not planned to add new Law Courts, new courtrooms, either by dividing old ones or making old ones which were in disuse useable again? I wonder if the Minister could comment on whether there was going to be some additional new courtrooms added within the Law Courts structure.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the requirement for expanded courtroom facilities is shared by both branches of the law that is the Senior Courts, as well as the Provincial Courts, and the member is quite right that within the plans for renovations of the Law Courts Building, additional courtroom space has been planned for. But the request is there for that space from the senior judges, which cannot be met until we house the Provincial Judges elsewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, my other point is that, if the government buys the IBM Building, which I believe will occur, and renovates it and then reverts to office space, that will, of course, have a considerable price tag attached to it. So it's going to cost $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million to convert it; it may very well cost another $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million to reconvert it to office space.

MR. ENNS: Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: On the other side of the Law Courts again, is the Land Titles, and that building has been vacant I think, for over a year. Is that going to be used for court purposes and if not for what purpose will that building be used?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, as indicated, that that is part and parcel of the overall review that is taking place. There has been consultation with the Senior Courts that that building could well be utilized for some of their requirements, particularly if suitable renovations are made and an interconnecting tunnel to the existing Law Courts Building is provided for.

MR. DOERN: Does the Minister have any rough figures on what it would cost to convert that or renovate it, or how much it would cost to build a tunnel, which is a pretty expensive undertaking?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we're talking again in preliminary figures, but in the order of \$600,000.00.

MR. DOERN: How many square feet are in that building?

MR. ENNS: I can't furnish that information at the moment. Perhaps some of my staff may be able to find that for me in a few moments.

MR. DOERN: But it's a fine building, the Honourable Member for Elmwood will agree. It fits in

MR. DOERN: Well, it's a beautiful aesthetic building, not too functional but it should be used.

MR. ENNS: It should be used.

MR. DOERN: I would agree.

MR. ENNS: Right.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some questions on community colleges, Assiniboine and Red River, in particular. Under Assiniboine, a couple of years ago we were planning an addition to that community college. Could the Minister indicate whether there has been construction or whether construction is planned?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, that project was cancelled.

MR. DOERN: What was cancelled? What was the requested addition for? Was that for new programs, expansion of programs?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that question as to the use of the requested space. That's going to have to be directed to the Honourable the Minister of Colleges and Universities, or the Minister of Education, but I can only indicate to the honourable member that that project is not being proceeded with.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give us some figures on the cost to date of the Red River Community College repairs?

MR. ENNS: The costs of Red River?

MR. DOERN: I'm talking now about the structural repairs that were necessary due to faulty design. They were getting into the four and five and six million dollar range. Can the Minister indicate how much money has been spent to date and how much money it is believed will be spent to make those repairs?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, some \$2,086,200 is projected to be spent by the end of 1978-79, which will leave a further \$1,438,000 expected to be spent in the year 1979-80.

MR. DOERN: That's \$2 million this year and \$1 million next year.

MR. ENNS: \$1.4 million next year.

MR. DOERN: And how much has been spent up to now?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the exact figures that were spent before that, but Mr. Osler advises me that the total approaches the \$6 million mark. So we have the two and one, we are at 3.5, there has been close to \$3 million spent previous to this.

MR. DOERN: I'm just saying, Mr. . . .

MR. ENNS: The total remedial bill would be in the order of, very close to the order of \$6 million, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: I'm just saying, Mr. Chairman, that this is, I think one of the more unfortunate government undertakings, namely that there was a retention of a firm of architects who then retained a structural engineer who made a design for this college in the late 1960s, mid to late 1960s, and because of that faulty work, the province has been stuck with a \$6 million remedial bill which has to be a very unfortunate and costly state of affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just to answer a question that the Honourable Member for Elmwood asked me a little while ago, the square footage involved in the old Land Titles Building is some 18,000 square feet.

MR. DOERN: Does that include the basement?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister about a building at the Portage School known as South Grove. I recall there was considerable renovation being done on this building following a tragic fire out there. Can the Minister tell me what the state of that renovation is, whether it's completed?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, for the member's edification, it's not South Grove, it's East Grove and I'm advised that we have some \$700,000 to \$750,000 for renovations to this building, which includes early warning smoke detectors, sprinkler systems, these have been in readiness for some time. Contract has been awarded to Elwood McQuarrie for the East Grove portion; some \$701,300 actually expended or committed on smoke detectors and sprinkler systems in 1978-79, and this completes expansion for East Grove. Further to, just in general, the firm of Green, Blankstein, Russell, have been retained to design and upgrade the entire complex, essentially sprinklers. Some additional \$100,000 has actually been expended for the design with some \$341,300 expended or committed on upgrading in 1978-79. Design expenditures are 25 percent complete, while the upgrading is estimated at approximately 5.5 percent complete. The total upgrading costs are estimated at \$6,187,300.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister uses the word "complex" and a figure of some \$6 million, is he then speaking of the whole of Portage School?

MR. ENNS: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, my question was a little more specific about East Grove itself, the building, one dormitory and a number of ancillary rooms there, can the Minister confirm the figures that he gave me as somewhere between \$700,000 and \$750,000.00?

MR. ENNS: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Has that amount all been expended, and has all of the work been finished at that building?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that amount has been expended and occupancy ought to take place on or about June 30, which is imminent.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister inform me the capacity, the sleeping capacity of the main dormitory there?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, I apologize, I can't answer that detail.

MR. WALDING: The reason I ask, Mr. Chairman, and I questioned this amount last year, and I seem to recall that the Minister gave us a figure of a quarter of a million dollars a year ago. Perhaps that was the amount that had been spent as of that date on East Grove, and I recall when we visited that building a year or so ago that what we saw there was a room perhaps a little wider than this one and perhaps half as long that had, at the time of the fire, accommodated some 10 or 12 students at the school. It was the ongoing policy of the previous government to move out as many of those residents as possible from the school, and I don't recall off hand how many residents there were there, perhaps some 800 or 900, and it was the policy to open community residences to move as many as possible out of there, and that East Grove was being used as sleeping accommodation for some of the residents there more or less on a temporary basis.

When speaking to the staff out there, they informed us that it might well not be necessary to provide this accommodation for some of the students there because of the policy and that, because the building was old and very substantially built, it should not be demolished but could probably be renovated for storeroom space; and that, as such, it would not need the elaborate sprinkler systems and fire exits and the various other requirements of the Fire Commissioner's report. So I would then have to question with the Minister the justification for some ¾ of a million dollars to provide, you know, accommodation for perhaps a dozen boys in that room.

I believe last year, when we were considering an amount of \$250,000, I suggested to the Minister that he could probably buy five brand new three bedroom houses for that same amount of money, accommodate more students, but now the amount is up to three times that. I have to ask the Minister, was this policy ever reviewed? Did the Minister seek the advice of the staff out there? Was there any consideration given to finding other accommodation at a much more reasonable cost, and using this quite substantial building for storage or other purposes?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, just to refresh the honourable member's memory, a year ago when

asked the same question, I indicated that the costs for renovations of East Grove would be \$700,000 to \$750,000.00. I'm now reporting that that, in effect, is what we've spent, \$700,000 to \$750,000.00. I'm also advised that at the time of the fire the facility housed some 54 inmates, residents. But on the general question as to the advisability of whether or not, you know, whether I can justify the expenditure for that particular facility, I would have to in all seriousness defer that to my colleague, the Minister responsible. I do not set the policy as Minister of Government Services for the Department of Health and Social Development, nor am I equipped, nor are my staff people equipped to pass judgment as to whether or not the use of that facility is appropriate or not. Experts within the field of mental health care have that responsibility. I concur with the honourable member's suggestion that there has been, and continues to be, a move towards deinstitutionalizing these people, but we have to respond as a Department of Government Services to those requests that the client department, in this case Health and Social Development makes of us. They have asked us to provide these facilities. We have to adhere to fire code commission's regulations if they're going to be used for specific purposes, if they're going to be housing residents of this nature, and again it's not a question of not wishing to engage in debate with the honourable member, but I submit respectfully that you're engaging the wrong minister for debate. I may well choose to agree with the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that \$700,000 spent in this particular way might well have been spent in another way. But we respond to the requests of the client department.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, if the minister told me a year ago that the cost was \$700,000 to \$750,000, I'll take his word for it, my memory must be at fault then. The figure of \$250,000 stuck in my mind.

MR. ENNS: That's what we had been spending on consulting fees and things like that at that time.

MR. WALDING: Yes. The minister mentioned a number of 54 residents in the building. Now, can he confirm that those residents were actually in dormitory circumstances, in that they were sleeping there, or was it just that that number of people were using the building for workshops or recreation or some other purpose? I recall distinctly from being there that the area where the sleeping accommodation was, was an area perhaps from behind the minister to the end wall, and there was certainly not more than a dozen beds there.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'll just explain that a little further. I'm advised that there were some actual 14 students housed in that particular building that burned. The remainder of the 54 were housed in the same building in the complex. If the member on inspection of the facilities, you will recall that the building is separated into two structures, 14 were in the building that you are now referring to and the remainder were in the other portion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just on that last point, just one question. How many square feet are in East Grove?

MR. ENNS: 16,483, I believe, but I'll just have the staff check that. We'll have to get the accurate number, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: The \$750,000 there and the \$6 million for Portage, is that fire improvements only or is that fire and other renovations in both instances?

MR. ENNS: Yes. Fire and other renovations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Can the minister break out only the fire code requirements out of the \$6 million? Approximately what percentage is for meeting the fire code and what is for renovations?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the 6 million is all upgrading for fire.

MR. DOERN: All upgrading for fire.

MR. ENNS: Yes, to meet fire code recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass; Resolution 61 — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: One further question on those lines, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister tell us when that upgrading and renovation is expected to be completed?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the one, the East Grove Building, as I indicated, is ready for occupancy June 30th of this year, but the ongoing program will proceed for the next three or four years.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, will all of that three or four years work be connected with the upgrading for fire protection measures, as required by the fire code?

MR. ENNS: I am advised that that's the case, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.—pass; Resolution 61 — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of more buildings I wanted to ask questions on; the Environmental Lab. obviously needed and under way. How much money has been spent? How much more will be spent, and when will that building be opened?

MR. ENNS: Construction status: preliminary work is well under way; expected construction completion, March of 1980. Total project cost, some \$9,780,045.00.

MR. DOERN: I'm just wondering if the estimates on that building several years ago were judged to be \$7.2 million, they are now \$2,500,000 higher; is that the result of the delays? The government put a freeze on that building and has tendered much later than was originally planned. I'm just wondering whether the additional increments can be attributed to a delay in the construction.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, firstly, the general contract cost which the honourable member refers to was originally scheduled at \$7,697,473.00. The general contract costs today, under construction, is \$7,746,000, so there's a slight escalation of costs from \$697,000 to \$746,000. The additional cost to completion is the completion of the interior of the building with some of the elaborate equipment that the lab will require, plus furnishings, etc.

In other words, again to use terms that my former Minister of Public Works is well familiar with, the project costs, total project costs comes out at \$9 million, the general contract cost is 7.7.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, two other buildings, does the Minister have information on the Flin Flon building? This is a building that we were pressured on by the city of Flin Flon and by the RCMP and there was a plan to construct an office building to consolidate government space in Flin Flon, and also to aid the municipality in the provision of space for the RCMP. Was that project cancelled?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that project has been deferred.

MR. DOERN: Deferred. The other question, Mr. Chairman, is the MPIC requirements. I don't know if the Minister has information there in terms of additional rentals in the past 18 months where they've expanded in the Royal Bank building, if he has any . . .

MR. ENNS: I was not Minister of Government Services at that time. I'm aware that they have taken up some additional, nor would we necessarily be aware, we don't pay the rent. But I'm aware that some additional space, I believe two floors of the Bank of Montreal building were leased by MPIC but I cannot give the honourable member any details about it.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could for one minute switch to a lighter topic and then go to a heavier topic.

MR. ENNS: My salary.

MR. DOERN: One of the unusual assignments of the Minister of Public Works is to have portraits painted, not of himself, thank God, but of the Premier of the day and the Speaker of the day. There is one outstanding requirement, and that is the Member for Kildonan, who was a Speaker of the House, now a member of the opposition, the present Speaker, and the present Premier,

and I was just wondering whether the Minister has taken any steps to having these men done in their prime? One can never be certain of the longevity of any member politically or in life itself, and I think it's desirable to have a painting made of somebody when they are still in power, and I'm very concerned, after the results of the federal election in Manitoba, that the writing may be on the wall, and I would much prefer a smiling picture of the Premier as opposed to one when he's not in office anymore. —(Interjection)— My colleague for St. Vital wants to know whether I'm referring to a miniature.

Mr. Chairman, I simply ask the Minister whether he has, having been bounced around in the helicopters and in and out of Government Services and high profile that he is, whether he's had any time to consider the retention of an artist for the purpose of commissioning an artist to paint these pictures.

MR. ENNS: The Honourable Member for Elmwood would appreciate that I would, of course, want to choose an artist with a suitable Conservative bent in his philosophy to portray my Premier and I've been in touch with Al Capp, the cartoonist to see whether or not he would consider that commission, but I'm advised that he's too busy on a circuit tour and lectures, public lectures in universities throughout the United States and hasn't got time to take that consideration on.

But I have, seriously, been aware of that responsibility that befalls the Minister of Government Services, and the very capable Irene Levinson from my department has forwarded me information and data with respect to particular artists that have been helpful to the department in the past in this respect, and I will take the concern and the consideration that the Honourable Member for Elmwood has, that my Premier should be suitably portrayed with a painting in due course. I'll see that that gets done in the next 14 to 18 years.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I don't share the Minister's optimism, but I think it would be desirable if he found a painter to paint his Premier, because if we found a Premier to paint his Premier, it might be a very different result.

MR. ENNS: I understand your former Premier had second thoughts about the artist you found.

MR. DOERN: He never expressed them to me, Mr. Chairman. But we'll compare. We'll compare the aesthetics. I understand that most of the . . .

MR. ENNS: You don't mind if I put Sterling on a chair, though, eh?

MR. DOERN: Or on a stool. But most Premiers, and my impression is, were not overly enthused about their paintings, and you might recall that the Bracken family had theirs redone, many years later, that John Bracken, apparently when he stood at the unveiling, turned to whoever was beside him, possibly D. L. Campbell, and said, "Do I look like that?" And it was years later that his family had it redone and so on and so on.

I'd like to turn to a more . . . well, Winston Churchill, we know what happened to his painting. I think his widow, first of all, stored it and then had it destroyed. It was painted by Graham Sutherland, who's probably considered the most significant contemporary artist in Great Britain, and the most talented, but he was not too happy with his portrait. At any rate, I trust to the Minister, who has a considerable interest in art —(Interjection)— Russian art being his specialty, and we'll see how he fares in the aesthetic sweepstakes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a serious problem that has arisen in the past few months concerning the operation of Metropolitan Security, which was purchased by the former Premier Duff Roblin . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, are we dealing with Acquisition at this point?

MR. DOERN: Right. Perhaps we could pass this and go to the Minister's Salary and then I'll deal with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (6)—pass. Resolution 61, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$15 million for Government Services — pass.

I'd like to refer members to Resolution 57, Item 1.(a) Minister's Salary—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there were some articles that appeared in the press in January, perhaps

some before and perhaps some later, but certainly in January there were some rumblings in the Tribune and Free Press in particular, some questions raised in the House about government contracts for the provision of security services, both in the prison system and in the general system. I want to just ask as an initial comment, before I read from some correspondence that I have, I just want to ask the Minister why it is that Corrections handle some of the security contracts and Government Services the rest, whether it wouldn't be logical to have them all handled by Government Services. I don't see why we have split contracts or split responsibilities here.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can't take issue with the Honourable Member for Elmwood on that particular matter, other than to point out that that has been the practice throughout the years that he was responsible for Public Works, and/or, as it's now called, Government Services. I tend to agree with the honourable member, just as I indicated on another subject matter such as land acquisition by government, that if you build up a degree of expertise and responsibility for a particular aspect of government services, then to me it would make common sense that that service should be responsible for these kinds of services throughout government services. But I indicate to you that to the best of my knowledge, Agriculture, Corrections and Health all have, in the past, and continue to, in the present, provide for their own security requirements.

Let's agree to agree, Mr. Chairman, with the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I'm led to believe that that is not any change in policy, but that's a matter of practice that was in place, in effect when he was Minister, and has carried on to this day.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to deal, and I've sent the Minister some documents there about some complaints dealing with Metropolitan Security, and I want to also read briefly from an article in the Tribune on January 20, 1979, headed "Government Contract System Unfair: Security Firms." Just to read the first couple of paragraphs here and then to refer to the correspondence that I'm tabling.

This article read as follows: "Security guard firms in the city are furious that the provincial government has given an edge to one firm in bidding on a contract for the guarding of prison inmates in hospitals. 'This is so wrong,' said Richard Henry, General Manager of Active Security Systems, 'this is a pretty sick situation.' Another security firm spokesman called the government action 'rotten' and he wouldn't let his name be used for fear of losing future government contracts." That is in reference to the use of security services in the correctional system, and further into the article, it says that "other security firms say the government's action makes a mockery of the tendering process. Whatever they bid, Metropolitan will be allowed to match and thus hang on to the contract." That's for this peculiar innovation of allowing the successful firm, the incumbent firm to match any bids and therefore not to bid themselves but to be informed of bids and to be given the opportunity to meet it.

I want to refer to the correspondence I gave to the Minister through the Chair about security services at Keewatin Community College. In the first letter which came from Mr. Johnston, the Administrative Officer for security in this building, who is responsible in the province, he indicates in a letter that the tender of Sentinel Security for Keewatin Community College did not receive favourable consideration, and then he thanks the company for submitting. But the company complains in a series of letters about changing type of qualifications; about new procedures; about lapses in old procedures, all with the result of apparently favouring Metropolitan. As I say, this was a complaint of other firms in regard to Headingley, and it is a complaint here in regard to Keewatin Community College.

And Sentinel writes Mr. Johnston a few weeks later on April 24th and really questions the method of operation and asks, for instance, for information: Number one, of the names of all companies tendering and the prices, escalator provisions and the terms. Second, for the record, were all tenders received on time or were some discarded for being too late? Third, did the newspaper publication of the tender constitute the only communication to the guard contract industry or was it supplied through direct telephone communication, drawing the tender to the attention of one or more companies? And would you be kind enough to let me know what other guard companies have been employed in the years 1972 to 1977 at this site, and the manner in which their services were obtained?

So, those questions, Mr. Chairman, which I think are important certainly for this company and for any company interested in tendering for government security contracts, the complaint being that they couldn't get this information. They weren't told what the other companies were bidding. Now, my understanding — and I referred to this I guess when we first opened the debate on Government Services — is that the normal type of procedure for opening tenders normally held out at 1700 Portage Avenue is sort of a pleasant show, headed by the Ring Master Sam Sims. And I have been told by architects this is really kind of an interesting thing to see, where they

hand him the envelope and he reads it out and somebody writes it up on the board, and it's all open tendering. I always think when you're opening envelopes and so on, I always think of the Great Carnac on Johnny Carson.

MR. ENNS: Tell me about it. I never saw that.

MR. DOERN: Maybe they will invite you. The idea being though, that all the bids are submitted on a certain date. Anybody can go down there and they can watch the opening to show and demonstrate clearly to everyone that it's open and above board, that nobody is slipping in something late, that nobody is having special preferences and everybody can go down there. The numbers are written there. You can see what everybody bid. You can see —(Interjection)— You can see who the successful bidder is, right — the St. James system, as we call it.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is a normal method of operation. Now, here we have a company questioning this, and I understand that they were suspicious and are suspicious. First of all, they can't get information on what other firms were bidding. They attempted to find out on what day the tenders would be opened, and couldn't obtain that information — they seem to have been opened in private — they were suspicious that there were late entries in the bidding system, and they are also suspicious that firms were sort of ensured that they were bidding on these contracts as opposed to acquiring their information the way other firms would acquire it, namely through the public media.

So, there shouldn't be any doubts about the system. Otherwise, if there is any tampering . . . And I know that Government Services is pretty jealous of meeting these requirements, that there are strict rules and if somebody doesn't adhere to the letter of the law that they are thrown out and they don't get a chance to resubmit. And I guess one of the procedures always is, after tenders are opened and after they are sort of announced as to who the successful bidder is, there is a period to ensure that that bid in fact is in order. And that then, takes more time to make doubly certain that that bid is in order.

I then refer to the next letter which appears to have been an afterthought mailed on the same day, asking more questions again about how the government is handling security services, asking again for the names for all contract security presently being provided, the names of the company providing them and the rates, about the time of the contract, asking for the closing date of the last five tenders and a list of those qualified to tender, and so on and so on.

And then the final paragraph saying that, "While I appreciate that it may not be possible to have all the details within seven days of this letter, I would nevertheless like to have it on the record as to whether or not this information could be made available in this manner."

Well, that wasn't answered in that time and finally on May 10th, another letter attaching still another copy asking for the information, saying, "Would you please advise me if you are in a position to supply the information ? " And then the key paragraph, "It is important to me that I understand how the province issues tenders for contract security services, in order that we may bid for this work should we desire to do so."

Because the problem is this, Mr. Chairman, that the rules seem to have been changed or seem to have been bent and the firm made this request in a series of letters. Mr. Johnston was phoned a couple of days later, according to a notation on this letter. He said that the information was forthcoming, but he never did reply. And so I am just asking the Minister why this information hasn't been provided, whether there have been some new rules or revisions to the standard form of letting security contracts?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to refute as I have earlier refuted, any suggestion of any impropriety with respect to the tendering for security services. I have, since the other day that the subject matter had come up, double-checked with staff. My staff advises me that that is the case. Members of the Committee are aware of an isolated incident where in fact a tender for specific reasons was not called for and a particular firm was called upon to offer their services. I refute it, and it bothers me that that kind of a motive is being attached to a particular firm because of the persons or one of the principal's former political involvement. It's not unlike me asking my Deputy Minister of Highways — just the other day as matter of fact, this week — how come we're buying all our tractors from George Schreyer, a brother of the former Premier, a candidate that I defeated in the 1973 election, and he tells me that he wins the tenders and he has got good tractors. Or how come I keep giving Tony Schreyer \$1 million and \$2 million highway contracts? It's not because he is the former Premier's brother; it just happens because he is a good contractor and wins contracts.

I can't state it any more emphatically, other than to say that the tendering system is straightforward, that there is none of this business of allowing an existing contract holder not to

retender when a tender does come open for a contract. There are extensions under certain circumstances allowed, but in all cases when a contract is open for retendering, the retendering process is followed to the letter of the law.

Now, some of the particular information that the honourable member brings to my attention via the letter that he has tabled, for instance, the name of all companies tendering, the prices and escalative provisions and like that, I'm not so sure. I'd have to check whether that is the particular business of the firm or an onus on the part of the government to supply that. A person in an open tendering system knows when he wins the tender and knows when he hasn't won a tender. I don't know whether we in Highways supply all our contractors with the details of the five, six, seven, or eight bids that we might have received on a particular contract. The winning contractor is awarded the contract on the basis of low tender. If there are circumstances that prevail that would make us deviate from accepting low tender, then of course there's a considerable onus placed on the department to explain to those tendering, why low tender was not accepted. Those occasions happen from time to time when, from our experience, we have reason to believe that a tender for other reasons other than price is not acceptable, but I have to rely on the advice that staff has just given me again on this subject matter, that there's nothing out of place or irregular with respect to the tendering practices for the Security Services as hired by the Department of Government Services. I will undertake, Mr. Chairman, to talk to my colleagues in Agriculture, in Health, in Corrections, as to whether or not they would not be better advised to utilize the services of my department in the purchase of this service. I accept the constructive advice given by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that these services should, in fact, all be tendered through the Department of Government Services.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just a few more questions here. I assume that it is public information that when five or six firms bid on a contract, that that is public information, that those bids should be open publicly and that that information should be available to anyone who requests it. Because in the case of the construction of new buildings, those tenders are open in public, the figures are put down, and there's nothing secret about the results. I assume the same should apply; does it apply, has it applied to security contracts?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, but there's a difference. I quite agree with the honourable member that when a contract, whether it's for road building, or a building, or for security services, that is public information, but the particular onus that the writer of this particular letter indicates says that I, as the department, take on the responsibility of furnishing details of every tender that's received. I assume that his representative was present at the time that public opening of the tenders took place, and that he could follow the illustrious Mr. Simms as he dictates to the chap on the blackboard the prices that were being recorded. But you know, I don't necessarily feel that it's my responsibility within seven days to take it upon myself, or to impose on the staff from the department to advise every person tendering for any kind of government services the wherewithall and the details of why and how come he didn't receive the tender. It is public information. Tenders are opened in public, and I think there is some onus on the parties involved to be present to secure that information for themselves.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I'm simply saying to the Minister that you know, I guess it's the old question about justice must be done and also must appear to be done, that that is equally —(Interjection)— must be seen to be done, as my colleague suggests, knowing the quotation far better. I'm simply saying that there have been complaints by people in the industry about the manner in which security contracts have been handled, and I think the Minister must appreciate that any firm challenging the existing system, or decrying any injustices, would do so with some fear because to complain may mean, they may feel that if they complain they're dead, or they're going to be blacklisted. I mean this would be a normal concern. I mean a normal reaction would be, "Keep your mouth shut or swallow hard. Don't complain."

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, you know, but surely the honourable member loses sight of the virtue of a tendering system, that precisely that kind of vindictiveness on the part of a Minister or on the part of a staff person is not possible if the department in the government adheres to the open tendering system. That's the virtue of a tendering system, that it doesn't really matter what my feelings are towards a particular firm, or whether or not as a result of comments or statements made by a particular firm in the past, that doesn't enter into it when envelopes are opened with respect to a service being called for.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable two former Ministers of the previous administration are shaking their heads and saying that that's not so, then let me tell them that that is so under this

administration.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the reason for the tendering system and the whole bidding process is to prevent personal preferences and to prevent vindictiveness. But the question that I'm raising with the Minister is this, can he ensure the Committee that there is — Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fitness is outshouting me here. He's fit to be tied, as my colleague says.

As long as you follow the system, there'll be no problems, but I am telling the Minister that in the case of Sentinel, I understand that when they went to submit tenders for a particular job, they were told that, say the deadline was a Friday, and they went there and the tenders weren't opened that day. They were then informed within the next week or two as to who the successful bidder was. The impression was clearly created that the tenders were not opened in public but were opened at the convenience of some member of the department, so — and I'm only reporting what I was told — namely, that the normal procedure wasn't followed. If the normal procedures are followed, there's protection for everybody, there's no complaints from anybody. It's a case of, you win or you lose and you know the rules of the game, but if the rules are changed or if they're bent, then you're going to get suspicion and you're going to get complaints. I simply give to the Minister the letters from Sentinel where they tried to get information and they had complaints, the comments from active Security where they said that they're being confronted with a sick situation, and some other unidentified firm saying that the government action was rotten because there was an unfair system established that seemed to favour Metropolitan.

So if the Minister's going to protect the tendering system, which is his only option, he has to ensure that it's done open and above board and then he'll have no complaints. But there have been complaints, and there have been suspicions, and I think the Minister would be well advised to check into them and to ensure us and guarantee that there won't be any bending of the rules by extensions, by private openings, by anything that would deviate from normal procedure.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to give that assurance to the Committee, and indeed to so advise the people in charge of this particular aspect of the department's responsibilities to doubly insure that the tendering system is religiously adhered to and that I, or any other Minister of Government Services, a year from now can make that statement in the same way that I'm making it now.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I may have what is a concluding statement now and simply say to the Minister in general that he's well aware of the unemployment rate in the construction industry, that there are over 10,000 unemployed construction workers; that there are a considerable number of architects, engineers, draftsmen, who are unable to find work; that the construction industry in Manitoba is in an unhealthy condition and that he should attempt, I think as the Minister, to examine what he has on his plate, the plans that he has, the requirements that government has at this particular time, and to see whether it's possible to accelerate any of the projects that the government intends to proceed with. I'm not talking again about any master plans or anything like that, I'm talking about government requirements that are identified and that the government intends to proceed with in the next year or two. And if it is possible for the Minister to bring any of those projects forward at this time and to persuade his colleagues in Cabinet to do so, I think he would be warmly welcomed because, you know, we're into the 1979 season. If projects aren't brought forward shortly you'll be into the 1980 construction season. There is high unemployment in the country. There is high unemployment in the province, and there is particularly high unemployment in the Manitoba construction industry. We're losing people to other provinces; we're having bankruptcies; we're having all sorts of problems and I think that the Minister as part of his responsibility should consider the welfare of the people in the industry and should simply do whatever is in his power to attack some of the unemployment rates. I look at a list here of a staggering number of carpenters out of work, bricklayers, electricians, on and on and on, and I would urge him to address himself to that problem and see whether he can accelerate certain projects and in so doing help tackle the unemployment problem in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass. Resolution No. 57. Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,254,400 for Government Services—pass. That concludes the Estimates

of Government Services. Committee Rise.

SUPPLY — LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 61 of the Main Estimates, Labour and Manpower. Resolution No. 78 (sic). The item under discussion is (f) Employment and Youth Services, Item (2) Other Expenditures—pass; (3) Youth and Student Employment—pass; (4) Private Sector — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, I'd ask the Minister first if he could indicate if this would be the proper section under which to discuss the Summer Student Employment Survey that's normally taken by the Manpower Division each year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I'll just take that question as notice for a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, and we'll come back to it if this isn't the section.

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

MR. COWAN: Well, in that case, Mr. Chairperson, perhaps the Minister can indicate roughly what responsibilities flow from this department, what projects, what is being done under the general direction of this particular item?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm just trying to refresh my memory. Maybe the Member for Churchill — he had asked this question before about that survey and I can't recall where we had referred it to. I think it was one that he had mentioned he thought was done by the university and the government of the overall employment situation in the province? I just forget how the conversation went, and I remember saying we would discuss it somewhere in the programming, and if he could maybe refresh my memory on that. I don't want to leave it hanging if we can . . .

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I believe, and I'm looking for the items in Hansard right now, but I believe I had brought this up on Thursday, May 17th, and that the Minister at that time was not certain under which item we would discuss it, and undertook the question as notice and was going to report back as to the specific item under which he would prefer to discuss this particular program. So in that case we have not discussed it since, but I would assume that it would be under this particular item or an item of similar nature.

MR. MacMASTER: Getting down into Youth and Student Employment and what it entails, it involves the Student Temporary Employment Program within government. This is a program which funds the salaries of students employed for the summer within the Manitoba Civil Service and it's the Hire A Student Job Centre Program that I spoke about in the House, where we have 40 centres throughout the province who assist young people, are manned and assist young people in finding employment.

And there's another program in there, the Volunteers in Public Service Program. This Program hires co-ordinators of volunteers who are placed in selected provincial government departments or agencies. These co-ordinators are responsible for the design and development of volunteer components, which includes training staff in effective use of volunteers, and recruiting and screening and orienting and placing and supervising volunteers recruited for programs.

The fourth one is the Summer Education Program, which involves your Cranberry Portage Program where children are brought in from communities all over northern Manitoba for a two-week period in the summer, where they not only relax and enjoy themselves, but the people, the staff involved in this Program talk to the community leaders and talk to their teachers and their parents and find out if they need a bit of upgrading in particular subjects, and they combine it with a summer vacation.

This also involves the Work Stay Program, which provides employment opportunities for youths between 16 and 24 who are having difficulty in obtaining and retaining a job. This is part of that cycle that portions of society have decided is unemployable, and possibly never will be. And this is in an effort, this particular Program's in an effort to break into that hard core cycle of young people who find themselves on a bit of a merry-go-round where they can't get a job because they haven't got a job history, and they just go back and sort of withdraw within themselves, and then go out and try and find another job and they find that they can't get a job because they haven't

got a work history and it's just a vicious circle that they find themselves in. So this particular Program helps them break out of that.

So, that's the five segments. That's your STEP in Government, your Hire a Student Job Centre Program, Volunteers in the Public Service Program, the Summer Education Program, and your Work Stay Program are the five separate ones, Mr. Chairman, that are in (f)(3), Youth and Student Employment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, there seems to be a drop in the allocation for this particular item. I'm wondering if the Minister can indicate what programs have been dropped or what programs have been curtailed or restrained or cut back. And also, if he can indicate which of these are new programs, or are they all continuations of programs of the previous administration?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: There was a Program titled Regional Disparity Program, which upon review we found that the Young Canada Work Program and our other youth programs, do exactly the same thing. So that particular program was cut, and the Volunteers in the Public Service — that is a new Program, Mr. Chairman. There was a pilot project started a year ago called the STAY Program in 1977, and that program lapsed, Mr. Chairman. So that's the differences in the programming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister mentions a Work Stay Program and a Stay Program. Are those indeed two different programs or are they a similar program?

MR. MacMASTER: The Stay Program was a pilot project and it was not continued. The Work Stay Program is very similar to what it was before.

MR. COWAN: Yes, well we would have to assume out of the list that the Public Service Volunteer Co-ordination Program would be new money and therefore expanded funds and that the Regional Disparity Program of course would account for some of the loss of funds under this item. Can the Minister indicate if the STEP Program, the Hire A Student Job Centre Program, the Work Stay Program, and the Summer Education Program are operating at the same levels as previously or if there have been drops or increases in their respective budgets?

MR. MacMASTER: The STEP in government program is increased; the Hire A Student Centre Program was increased slightly; the Regional Disparity one I said was dropped; the Volunteer Public Service Program is a new one; the Summer Education Program and the Work Stay Program are similar amounts, and the Stay Program has been dropped, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, perhaps the Minister can just indicate how many people were served by the Regional Disparity Program and what specific areas it was operating in in the province and what years it was in effect?

MR. MacMASTER: It was in the budget for 1978-79. I haven't got any figures going back any further than that. There was 30 SMYs equivalence, and I don't have a number at hand of the number of students that that would have involved — 250 students that that involved that particular year.

MR. COWAN: Yes, and the final part of the question, Mr. Chairperson, was: which areas was it operating in throughout the province?

MR. MacMASTER: No particular area, Mr. Chairman. It appeared to be one that came in after others had all sort of filled out their applications and everything else was in place. We felt that with the other programs coming on line properly administrated and with the proper initiative put into them, that they could fulfill that obligation rather than having one that clicked in later on in

the season. That seemed to be the differences in them, this one came in farther on down into the season.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass; (4)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, before we pass (4), the Private Sector Youth Employment Program, there are a few comments that I wish to make.

No. 1. We have heard from government many figures bandied about in terms of the number of jobs that were created — 3,000, 4,000, 5,000 jobs — and I'm surprised, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister didn't use a higher figure. Why doesn't the Minister say that these \$3 million could create 50,000 jobs, because it depends on how you slice the pie. Surely the Minister knows that if he's going to talk about a figure in excess of 3,000 in terms of the number of jobs, then he's going to be referring to shorter periods of employment. In other words, he is going to be referring to 9, 10-week periods of employment, or whatever, and the shorter the average period of employment, then in terms of the actual bodies that could find employment under this scheme will, of course, increase. So, I would like the Minister, when he talks about the number of jobs that this creates that he would not just use the figure that it's going to create 4,000 jobs, or 5,000 jobs, but that he would be more precise and specific and, as I've said, if it's going to be a figure in excess of 3,000 indicate that it is going to be 5,000 jobs of average length of 10 weeks, or whatever it works out to. I didn't do the mathematics on that, but the application of simple back to the basics arithmetic would indicate to me that that would be the result.

Another point that concerns me, Mr. Chairman, is one would think, and in fact that if one goes back through the press releases made by this government in announcing this program, one would conclude that the government's intent in the implementation of this program was really twofold: One, to assist unemployed youth; two, to assist Manitoba small businessmen, — we are on No. (4), Mr. Chairman, are we not, because I see the staff looking at me? Yes, quizzically. No. 4, yes. I would think that the intent of this program would be two-fold, as I've said, one, to assist the unemployed youth in finding employment; and two, to assist the small businessman in the Province of Manitoba in providing jobs for the unemployed youth of our province. In other words, that there might be some small businessman who might say to himself, "My business is just a sort of a hand-tomouth operation, I can see some potential, some opportunity for expansion, but if I were only to have another body in my shop to do certain things, then it would free me; it would give me the time to do certain other things which would allow me to expand my operation and hopefully make a greater contribution toward relieving the unemployment situation in our labour market. Well, if that were the case, if that were the case, then perhaps one may be tempted to look upon this Program more favourably.

But, Mr. Chairman, amongst the recipients — and I will use the term again, which the Minister of Economic Development finds very offensive, because he make some distinction between that term and other expressions, but to me welfare means assistance — so therefore I will use the term "welfare" again, because I note that some of the welfare recipients do not fall into the category that I've just described. They are not the poor, struggling, hard-working businessmen, really slugging it out to get their business operation going, get it on a sound financial position, and make the contribution to society that they want to make.

But I note, Mr. Chairman, that many of the recipients, if they really did have a social conscience, which I find it very difficult to envisage in my mind how a multinational corporation could have a social conscience, because by its very nature it can't. Mr. Chairman, when you buy a share in the Moore Corporation, when you buy a share in an oil company, you buy a share with the hope, No. 1, that it'll appreciate in value; and No. 2, that it'll pay you a dividend and you're not all that concerned about the oil company discharging its social obligations in Asia or wherever their oil interests may be.

But even if it did, surely, Mr. Chairman, some of the corporations of the size that they are, don't have to depend on the \$960 per employee, to enable them to make their contribution toward relieving the unemployment situation. So, as I'm saying, if they had a social conscience at all, they're in a position to do this on their own. But they didn't.

So, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that some of these corporations are making a mockery, they're making a mockery out of this welfare program that the government has provided. When you look down the list of the applicants — and now I know, the Minister will say, "Ah, but these are a few, these are a few. But look at all the jobs that we created." Some were temporary, that's true, but some eventually led to full-time employment. And then look at the hundreds of all these small businessmen that we assisted. And now' here's a letter from one businessman who said thank you very much for giving me the \$960 last summer, because it was just what I needed, it enabled me to pull a few other things together, which enabled me to refinance my operation, now I'm off

to the races. And if it weren't for the \$960 at that crucial time, I wouldn't have been able to do today what I am doing."

Mr. Chairman, despite that, on the other side, or in the same list, you know we find recipients — and these are some of the more glaring examples — Catelli Limited. Catelli Limited, and, Mr. Chairman, who owns Catelli's? Labatt's own Catelli's. Labatt's own Catelli's. They were one of the recipients.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you mean to tell me that Labatt's could not see their way, if they felt that there was a social responsibility resting upon them to assist with the unemployment situation, you mean to tell me that Labatt's could not find \$960, that additional \$960, to hire a young person for the 9 to 16 week period of time, or whatever?

MacLeod's-Gambles, another, Moore Business Forms, and I spoke about this on the Budget Debate, Mr. Chairman, you will recall. You know, Moore Business Forms, a large, multinational — well, its parent company, the Moore Corporation is a large, multinational, which is the sole owner of Moore Business Forms, which operates in every major country of the world, in every continent of the world. And it is a recipient of assistance of this kind. Bird Building Supplies, through its directorate, through its board, it too is tied in with various large national and multinational organizations, including Massey Ferguson. Bulman Brothers Limited, which is an interesting one, and I must emphasize that point again, because it really sort of makes one see why grants were made to these firms and that this was obviously a handpicked group of corporations. The Bulman Group owns Bulman Brothers Limited. Its president sits on the board of The Traders Group. Its president is the vice-president of the Canadian Manufacturers Association. And perhaps now he is president of the Canadian Manufacturers Association — and the Minister of Economic Development is assisting me — I think he said next week. And an organization of that kind is a recipient of this grant. And so the list goes: ADCO Structures Limited, owned by ADCO. One of the wealthiest corporations in Canada; I think it ranks No. 15 or No. 20 amongst the top 100 corporations in Canada. And so do the others; so does the Moore Corporation. It's up near the top too.

The ADCO Corporation based in Alberta, the wealthiest province in Canada and it receives a grant. Isn't that something like carrying coals to Newcastle, Mr. Chairman. Going to the wealthiest corporation in the wealthiest province and saying to them here is \$960 or whatever the amount was, if they hired more than two or three. Would you please assist us in relieving the unemployment situation? You know, to you Mr. Southern, the president who is earning \$200,000-\$300,000 a year, here is \$960. Please help us with the unemployment situation?

Western Grocers, another recipient, Western Grocers owned by Kelly Douglas and company, which in turn is owned by Loblaw's, and — (Interjection) — that's right, and in turn by Weston, a corporation which made last year a profit, a net profit after taxes and everything of \$10 million, and it receives a grant. And it receives a grant from this modest amount that the Minister has of \$3 million. And it receives a grant, a corporation whose profits far exceed the total amount that the Minister has at his disposal over here.

So what I am saying to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is I would like him to reconsider the criteria and the terms and conditions under which grants are paid, and if this program has merit, to make the grants available only to Manitoba corporations, to corporations of a certain size and below a certain size, based in the province rather than multi-national. Because you know, for the Minister to say that the taxpayers of Manitoba — that the economy is such that his constituents and mine have to assist Mr. Weston of his conglomerate of corporations, have to assist Mr. Southern of the ATCO Corporation, have to assist Moore Business Forms — and the Chairman of the Board is one David Barr, who sits on the Board of Reed Dominion Packaging, Canada Life, and the Bank of Nova Scotia, and Dominion Insurance, and Inco, and a host of other corporations — that the taxpayers in my riding and the Minister's riding have to assist these people in creating jobs. You know, my constituents and his and yours, they just can't understand that. They just can't understand why the Minister has to go into the pockets of your constituents and mine to assist Mr. Barr in providing a fraction of a job to assist a conglomerate of corporations, which probably could buy out the whole Province of Manitoba with the small change in their pockets. And here we are giving them money to create employment — giving money to these organizations that this government always talks about.

Oh yes, it's these rugged individualists out in the private sector — they're the ones who are building our economy. They're the ones who are creating jobs. But Mr. Chairman, over the past month or so — and I'm sure that the Minister reads that publication. It's one put out by an organization which — I'm not sure whether it came into being recently, but it's in recent years that they sort of developed a bit more muscle and acquired a bit more momentum to the things that they're doing — it's not The Canadian Federation of Independent Businessmen. I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, whether I have the title correctly or not, but it is the Federation of the so-called

small businessmen, and doesn't include the Westons and the Lord Thompsons, and the E.P. Taylors and the like. It's the guys who are slugging it out in their business operations with their own two hands and their families working with them, brothers and sisters, cousins and aunts and so forth. It's a federation of those.

And you know what the Federation of Independent Businessmen is saying? They're saying that in recent years it is their kind that have created far more jobs in Canada than these large corporations, some of whom have been receiving grants from this government. So that's why our constituents just cannot see the rationale for and the justification to give funds, moneys earned, hard earned tax dollars earned by the people of Manitoba, to Mr. Labatt and to Mr. Barr of the Moore Corporation; and to Bird, and to Mr. Bulman, the president — or as the Minister of Economic Development indicated to me, next week he will become the President of the Canadian Manufacturers Association — and Mr. Southern of ATCO, and so forth, Mr. Chairman.

But Community Centres are denied assistance. The Community Centres built by the taxpayers of our province, those are denied assistance. So the only conclusion that I could come to, Mr. Chairman, is that the payment of these grants, as I'd indicated before and I must make reference to it again, is this government's way of meeting the admission requirements to the millionaire clubs on Bay Street and Wall Street of Toronto and New York respectively. But the admission requirement was, in broad daylight, with the knowledge of all, to go out and rob the poor and give to the rich, and so they did this, and the requirements were to rob the poor and to pay to a number of different categories of the rich, give a grant to the friends in the news media, give a grant to the mining industry, give a grant to the brewers. But for the brewers, well, it became a little bit risky; you can't really go and put \$960 in John Labatt's hand, so you go to Catelli's — John Labatt, he's probably forgotten where Catelli's office is because he has so many corporations — and Catelli's, it's a nice respectable firm, makes macaroni; it makes other things, health products, and it makes it a bit more respectable; that here's Catelli's, they have an operation in Winnipeg, and there's Catelli's employing a young fellow who formerly was unemployed. But really the ultimate recipient, you know as well as I do, Mr. Chairman, is John Labatt.

And give a grant to a multi-national, so you go to Moores Business Forms, which doesn't operate out of a very elaborate office in Winnipeg and perhaps no one even knows that it's part of a huge multi-national conglomerate operating in every country, most of the countries in North America, Europe, and many countries in Asia and Africa. So give a grant to a multi-national.

And then give a grant to one of the wealthiest corporations in Canada in the wealthiest province. So you go to Alberta and you give Mr. Southern a grant, an organization which did manage to skyrocket in the financial community over the past few years. So you go to the wealthiest province with a heritage fund that it doesn't even know what to do with, and you find the wealthiest corporation there and you give it a grant. The Member for Roblin made some reference to hard work, and I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman — I have no doubt that Mr. Southern is a hard-working man. I don't question that at all. But, Mr. Chairman, so are the people of Manitoba hard working, and there's a hell of a lot of them in Manitoba working a damn sight harder than Mr. Southern on the minimum wage, and a hell of a lot of them wouldn't even get an increase in the minimum wage come July the first. Why? Because John Labatt, through Mr. Belanger, who sits on the Board of his company, who also sits on the Board of Great-West Life, which makes it very handy, just across the street from this government — because Mr. Belanger said, "No, John Labatt told me that it would not be in the best interests of the brewing and the distilling industry and the hotel industry. to increase the . minimum wage."

So you know, it all becomes very clear. It all becomes very clear why the grants to these corporations were made — to win their favour, to demonstrate to them that they really are a millionaire's party and not a working man's party. Because the nature of the grants indicates it, Mr. Chairman. And it's strange, but maybe that's the nature of the ostrich that the Minister of Economic Development is so concerned about, that they've got their heads hidden in the sand and they aren't even aware of the fact that those whom they claim to support, that the small businessman is being critical of many of their programs, and in the last issue that the Federation of Independent Businessmen put out, they were critical of the fact that they, the small businessmen, over the past five or ten years have created more jobs than the multi-national corporations, and yet governments seem to be more kindly and favorably disposed toward the multi-national than they are toward them.

So Mr. Chairman, I have made a request of the Minister that I would suggest to him that he reconsider the guidelines for this grant and if there is merit for its continuation make it into such a program that would really and truly assist Manitobans and not allow the benefits of this program to extend to God knows where — to Toronto, New York, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Switzerland and other countries in which many of these corporations have business interests.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I'll make somewhat the same case as my colleague the Member for Burrows, but perhaps from a little different perspective. One of the criticisms of this program that is coming back to me is from some of my friends and acquaintances over the number of years that I've been a member of this community who are involved in business, and with one in particular who called me, after it was drawn to the public's attention that four grants had been given to one concern, J. D. Construction, G. A. Junkin and Waseco and Metrico. It came to his attention and as a result of it I showed him the list of the grants. And earlier when we were debating this subject I said I thought it was a good program. And notwithstanding my colleague's criticism, if I was on the board of directors of all those companies that he has mentioned, I would make sure that we had the capacity within the corporation to take legal advantage of any program that was proffered by the government. So while he takes his particular viewpoint, I think that the companies operated legitimately. If they apply for the program and they get it, that's more power to them. —(Interjection)— Well so did McCain Food, they clipped us for \$2.4 million on the assumption that they were going to export potato chips but they had no intention of exporting potato chips apparently.

But, Mr. Chairman, the criticisms are that these people that I know in business, who in the past year or so have been living on borrowed money and depreciation, are actually in competition with these companies. This particular thrust for 40 employees, 40 employees are in direct competition with the person I was helping with books, to try and survive the crunch or the lack of construction in the province of Manitoba. This person is not a New Democrat, but I think he is becoming one, and I think that we're getting another one — my friend from Inkster keeps telling me all we have to do is make a few converts. But seriously, Mr. Chairman, this is a criticism that's coming from the business community. How come the man down the street can get a grant? And I'm talking about the small employers who have four, five, six employees. They can get help down the street in competition with him and he doesn't get dime one, and there isn't enough business in Manitoba right at the time to go around and they're giving grants like this to all of these companies that were referred to, and I'm not criticizing the companies for doing it. It's all above board, it's printed, they applied, they got it. But nevertheless they're in the construction business, and I don't know what the government's intention is as far as the total construction area is concerned but I know hauling mud last summer was something else. You had people competing with each other and cutting their throats and here they are, they're subsidizing one bunch or four reportedly, to be directly in competition with a number of people who have been in business in this community for a number of years. I personally, Mr. Chairman, don't think this is fair and neither do many of the conservative people in the province of Manitoba, as demonstrated in the recent election, if you want to take it away out there, because these are the kind of things that are getting home to these people, that there's a select bunch that seem to have inroads into the government, that can get these grants, and the small people that they purport to represent get zilch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Oh yes thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well my colleague seems to have very aptly discussed the broader generalities of the program and I think there are some major defects in the program that do bias it towards large business or enable large business to take more advantage of the program than a small business would, and we have gone over that in some detail previously during the discussion of these Estimates, and I'm certain that we'll have to go over it in some detail during next year's discussion of the Estimates because I don't see any pre-disposition on the part of the government to change the program so as to enable small businesses equal access to the program.

Earlier in the discussion of this particular item the Minister mentioned that a preliminary evaluation was being completed, or had been completed, and a final analysis was being completed of this program. I would ask the Minister then to indicate now to the Committee exactly what the status of that evaluation is? Have they reached any conclusions yet or are they still in the process of compiling their complete data?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've listened with interest to the members across the way. I think we should talk about some of the things that took place in relationship to this program. An interesting feature of it was that it's worked out to be \$518 per job is what it cost the Manitoba government, and if you relate that to the massive amount of inner-departmental program type jobs that took place a few years ago, they were running just a hair short of \$2,000 per job. So the theory of the program is very acceptable.

We were talking about numbers of people — there was \$3 million allocated to supply 5,000 jobs. All that was not spent. There was 4,918 job applications, there were 4,202 that were filled. The \$3 million would have adequately covered the 4,918. The actual cost was \$2,176,475.34. The average wage for the jobs last summer was \$3.37. 82 percent, and I bear repeating on this, 82 percent of those that applied and got help through this program had less than 10 permanent year-round employees, including the ones that were subsidized. I repeat that, that 82 percent of the successful applicants had less than 10 employees, including those that were subsidized. 96 percent of those that received assistance through this program had less than 50 permanent year-round employees, including those that were subsidized. So when we say that and we find a company or two that is somewhat bigger than 10 permanent including subsidized, which might mean that there are 7 permanent, and when we say that 96 percent of all those who were successful had less than 50, including those that were subsidized, so they had 40-some odd employees. I have no idea where the members opposite get the idea that it didn't help small businessmen, unless they have another interpretation of the word small, which I'm not aware of. I've mentioned that the average wage paid to the people was \$3.37. We have determined that there was a great deal of difficulty in relation to attempting to establish whether this is a new position, and I asked my staff in conjunction with others: Is it always this difficult to determine whether in fact it is a new position? And I find a quote from a survey evaluation of a program called, Jobs in a Small Business Program, and the members opposite will be familiar with it — they implemented it in the summer of 1977.

I suspect the words that were used in that determination are as good words that I can use this evening. And it says, "There is no way to determine accurately how many of the jobs would have been created without assistance, or if the starting date of the jobs were moved up to take advantage of the funding. There is no way to completely eliminate hiring of new employees to meet seasonal demands, and there is a limit to resources that can be devoted to determining whether the employees are additional. The more stringent the regulations to ensure additionality, the more criticism the program will draw from the private sector." Now, that's a direct quote, which I think we could quote today if we chose, in the difficulty in establishing whether in fact every job that was created was a new job. There's so many variables to it. We have found that it ranges, and I haven't dug into all the research to see what other programs similar to this were, but in the range of 25 to 30 percent, there is that question mark. And we wonder whether in fact the jobs were created sooner, whether they intended to hire people in the fall, whether they took advantage of this. We do know that there was a large number, and I don't have that number with me, of people who worked after the program stopped, and that in itself is very advantageous as far as we are concerned in government.

It also gives the young people a real look at what they're going to be facing when they graduate, if that's where they're going, back to school. It also, Mr. Chairman, and I think it's very important, gives a lot of young people who are having difficulty establishing - themselves in a job — it gives them an the opportunity to get into a job. And by allowing the large variety of applicants that we did, it gives the young people the opportunity to attempt to establish themselves, or at least look at the type of business that they may be interested in.

I think, Mr. CHAIRMAN, IT'S A HECK OF A GOOD PROGRAM. I intend to continue it, and I would have hoped that I could have had the support of the members opposite. Obviously, I can't; they object quite strenuously to the program. We're reviewing the applications in a more in-depth manner this particular year. If there's any question, they're referred on up to the director of the division or the Deputy Minister. We're sending out questionnaires and a survey sheet with the applications. We hope to have the deadline mid-December so that early January we'll be able to better review and report, if there's improvements on a particular program, to familiarize ourselves and others who may be interested in the success of the program. We're going to be doing more spot checks, if you will, this year, and we've reduced the number of students that can be employed, from ten down to three, because the average last year per employee, ranged between two and three. It provided last year 4,202 positive jobs. There was in the neighbourhood of 5,000 applications. We hope very sincerely, Mr. Chairman, that it has that type of success for the sake of the young people in Manitoba this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, the first thing we have to say from this side, and we have to correct the minister is, we do not object strenuously to this program. We object strenuously to the mismanagement of the Member for Roblin's government of this program. We object strenuously to the bungling of the program. We object strenuously to the fact that they weren't prepared to evaluate the program until pushed and prodded from the opposition. We object

to the fact that this program does not allow for the young people of our province to go into the public sector, to work in the hospitals, to work in the parks, to work in the nursing homes, and to be a part of the employment picture in that respect. We object strenuously to the minister standing up here and defending the program, and bringing in selective statistics which would tend to prove his point, while leaving out those statistics that would not prove his point.

The minister says that they have some difficulty in determining what is a new position under this program. What position has been created? Well, it would seem to me that if I wanted to determine what programs were new under this particular program, that I would ask the participants in the program, and I would ask them a question somewhat like: "How many of these subsidized jobs would have been created by your business or farm if this subsidy had not been available?" Now, that is a fairly point-blank question. That is a fairly specific question, and if you rely upon the honesty and the integrity of those who are accepting the grants under this program, then you can assume that they are going to give you a fairly clear indication of how many of the jobs would have been created with the subsidy, and how many would have been created without the subsidy. And if one is going to err in this particular program, one would have to err on the side that's saying, well, perhaps some of those employers, for the sake of wanting to make the program look good, which is an honest motivation, might have when given a choice between saying that it was possible to have this program without the subsidy, or it was not, might have erred on the side of saying that they would not have had that job without the program. That's where the error element would lie, in a question of that nature. And yet when that question is asked in this program, and it was asked in this program, we find that a full 31.9 percent of the 64 percent of the 2,392 participating employers under this program, a full 31.9 percent say that would have created those jobs if the subsidy had not been available. Close to a third of them say that the subsidy had no impact on the jobs that were created after all. And again, if we are going to build an error element into it, we would have to build it in on the negative side.

The minister said, he was quite specific in saying that right down to the detail, that the average wage paid in this program was \$3.37, and indeed he is correct. And he would get that information from an employer survey that was sent out, called the Manitoba Private Sector Youth Employment Program — 1978 Employer Survey, which was sent out to the various employers who participated in this program, and as I say a full 64 percent, or 1,533 responded. And that information, if he would do some quick, or actually it wouldn't be quick, it would be fairly detailed and complicated statistical work — would find out that the average hourly wage, including the provincial subsidy paid to your subsidized employees according to that, would come out to be \$3.37.

Now, that takes some figuring to get. But the minister provides us with that particular answer. Yet, when he says he's not certain of the number who worked after the program — and I'm going to paraphrase him — I think he said it was a great amount or a substantial amount, am I correct? Whatever, he indicated that it was a great amount or a substantial amount. We find out that there was, indeed, a question on the survey, and the question said: How many of these employees continued working with your business or farm for at least one week after the government subsidy ended? So, just for one week, not full-time, but just one week after the subsidy ended, and we find that only 431 of those employees continued working, or roughly in the area of 10 to 15 percent of the employees covered by this particular response to the survey.

So we don't see that a large number of permanent full-time jobs were created. In fact, we see exactly the opposite; we see that there were very few permanent or full-time jobs created under this particular program.

And the program, Mr. Chairperson, to my knowledge, was developed to benefit students wishing to go out into the job market during the summer, so that they would have the opportunity to make some money; so that they would have the opportunity to make some savings to carry them through their school year.

Mr. Chairman, we find that, according to the survey again, that less than half of the employees out of this group that covered 64 percent of the employers, less than half of their employees were either community college or university students. Less than half; the percentage was 23.6 percent were actually college or university students, while the largest group was students in Grade 11 and under. Now, students in Grade 11 and under, who don't have to face those tuition fees coming up the next year, who don't have to face the costs of living away from home or living in a dormitory or an apartment, who don't have to face the costs that are usually associated with going to university.

So the program, to my way of thinking — and perhaps we have a difference of opinion on this and that would be honest — but to my way of thinking is not serving the very people that it was intended to serve, that is the students who need that money to continue their schooling.

And we find that there are problems now, and we don't have to conjecture, we don't have to guess, we find that the corresponding problems did, in fact, happen at the university level. We find

that many students had trouble making their tuition, and we still don't know how many students were unemployed yet because the Minister won't give me the information on the Summer Student Employment Survey. Now, I don't know why he won't give it to me; perhaps he doesn't have it. But that survey, Mr. Chairperson, is usually completed in January or February of the year, and we're far beyond that now, and that survey is usually used by a responsible government for the purpose of determining how effective their programs are working during the summer. How many students are forced onto unemployment rolls because a program wasn't there to benefit them, or how many students did not find adequate jobs to make adequate wages so that they could continue their schooling? And that's an important mechanism of this whole global picture of student employment. Without that we can't really evaluate the program. Without that we can't conclusively determine what kind of impact, what kind of effect this program is having on those who need it the most.

And I can tell you, Mr. Chairperson, that according to their survey also that a full 18 percent of the employees, under the 64 percent group that responded, were no longer in school at all. They weren't students — a full 18 percent. And 34.3 percent were not returning to school after participating in the program, they had no intention of going back to school. So it was a short-term make-work project for them, which is not entirely bad, Mr. Chairperson, because they are as entitled to work as anyone else, but it is certainly not the intent that this government would have us believe was their own intent in this program.

And we find also from the survey, Mr. Chairperson, that the program favoured male workers over female workers. And this is something that I should hope the Women's Bureau would take a look at in the coming year, because according to their own statistics 65 percent of the subsidized employees were male, with the remainder, the 35 percent, of course, being female. And so we find female workers, women workers, who are disadvantaged to begin with, who have problems entering the job market and staying in the job market because of disadvantages built into our whole socio-economic system, we find those people not being able to participate in this program fully. Because there is no guidance; there is no control.

If I understand the program correctly, there was clerical help, maybe two or three, maybe four or five, I'm not certain, who would respond to a telephone call asking for a grant application and, in most instances, a grant application would go out. So someone would call up and say, "Hello, I'm J.A. Junkin at 572 McTavish and I want ten employees." And then someone would call up next to them, right after them, as they obviously did, and say, "Oh, by the way, I'm Waseco Underground and I'd like ten", same address. And the next one calls up and says, "Yes, I am J.D. Construction and I'd like ten," and the next one calls up and says, "I'm Metrico Enterprise and I'd like ten." And it's given to them, carte blanche, given to them.

When you have that sort of lackadaisical control over a program you are indeed inviting the abuse that has been heaped upon this program, and that is what we stringently object to, Mr. Chairperson. We object to an ad hoc sort of program that does not take into consideration the needs of the work force; as a whole does not take into consideration the needs of the people that it is intended to serve; a shotgun approach to employment — hit where it may, hit where it may. Because they do not want to spend the time and the effort that is necessary for effective monitoring, and that's what we're talking about, monitoring of this program, we end up with a program that is abused by their own party. The Progressive Conservative Association of Manitoba applied for three grants.

And do you know, Mr. Chairperson, that according to my information — which may be incorrect but so far it has been fairly accurate, right down to \$3.37 per hour — but according to my information the Progressive Conservative Party itself on its own employer survey form said that, well, we possibly would have created one of those positions whether we had a subsidy or not. That's what they said. They said that they possibly would have created one of those positions, had they not had that subsidy.

So not only do they dip their arm up to the elbow in the pork barrel but they also what I could only say would be violate the intent and the spirit of their own government. A slap in the face to their own leader, a slap in the face to their own leader when they do that. And I think he felt hurt when we mentioned in here. I know he felt shocked, and I know afterwards he felt mad, but I think also he felt hurt because what they did was they took advantage of his good nature, which at the best of times would be difficult to do. But if anybody could do it a Tory could. If anybody could do it the Progressive Conservative Association of Manitoba could.

So the real tragedy is not so much the past abuse, which is fairly well documented at this point of the program, but the real tragedy is the fact that the government has done so very little to correct the defects that are obvious in the program and to protect our tax dollars, and to protect our tax dollars. Because let us not lose sight of that one fact, this \$3 million did not come out of the Minister nor the First Leader's pocket, it came out of the provincial coffers, it came out of the pockets

of the taxpayers of this province and it went to the Progressive Conservative Party, although it was paid back.

Now, I'm not so certain it wouldn't have been paid back unless my honourable colleagues and myself had brought it to the attention of the First Minister. I'm not so certain that any action would have been taken. They would have, to be plain and simple about it and blunt, would have gotten away with it and been laughing all the way to the bank. But the fact is that we did bring it to their attention. The fact is, to their credit — Okay, to their credit — it was paid back, with interest, I hope. I'm not certain, but I would hope that it would be paid back with interest.

But that does not excuse the fact that they did dip into the pork barrel, swish around a bit and come up with a couple of grand out of the taxpayers' pocket. It does not excuse that at all. Nor does the fact that these four companies that we talked about were able to go in and pull out 40 grants for themselves. And the Minister can correct me, my information might be wrong, although they applied for 40 jobs, I understand that they only took 33 jobs — and we're talking about G. A. Junkin, J. D. Construction, Metrico Enterprise and Waseco Underground, that they only took 33 jobs out of the total that they had applied for. But that they could do that. And that they were companies that had nine permanent employees, three, I don't have my facts with me, but I can tell you that in many instances, as a company, they had less than 10 employees themselves. And all of a sudden they get 10 grants.

So we asked the Minister to investigate these particular companies to see, not only if they did violate the actual letter of the program, but if they did violate the spirit and the intent. And just recently, during the Question Period we asked the Minister if that evaluation had been completed, and the Minister indicated to us that an initial evaluation had been completed, or a preliminary evaluation had been completed, and he saw that there was no abuse of the program.

My question to the Minister at this point would be to ask the Minister if he is prepared now to table that evaluation so that we, who have brought this to his attention in the first place, will have the opportunity of looking over the evaluation that the Minister has done in this specific regard, and making our comments on it. Because it seems as if the public of Manitoba need us to watch out for their best interests, when a government puts together a program of this nature and allows it to be abused in the way that it did.

So I would ask the Minister then if he is willing to table the results of his preliminary or his final analysis of the four grants that were given to J. D. Construction, G. A. Junkin, Metrico Enterprises and Waseco Underground.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Those four companies in particular that have been mentioned, Mr. Chairman, were found to be separate incorporated companies, which entitled them to apply under the previous administrative purposes; it entitled them to apply for assistance. This program, the member points out that it's not helping those who need help. The program is a Private Sector Youth Employment Program. There were opportunities for other applications to come in; I hope there are more that come in this year, and I hope that there is enough to employ many more students, but we're also concerned about the total youth problem in the province. And if the 10 or 15 percent of those that carried on employment, be it a week or two weeks or a year or two years, or whether they're still there, that's possibly 400 young people out of that vicious circle that a lot of them find themselves in. And I think that, in itself, is very credible.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, one person out of that vicious circle is very credible. One person. But the fact is that this is an inefficient and ineffective way to go about taking people out of that vicious circle, to throw them into a Dickie Dee ice cream job, and say that we have taken you out of that vicious circle, does a disservice to the Minister and a disservice to those individuals. Surely they must have more awareness of the situation than that. They must have more compassion for those unemployed workers than they seem to have shown with this program. To say that we have spent \$2. some odd million, close to \$3 million — and I'd like to come back to that in a minute — of the taxpayers' money, and created 413 jobs that lasted just one week, and I'm certain many of those jobs were filling in the tail-end of a summer season; I'm certain that that was the case, and I don't think that the Minister can indicate otherwise — but to say that that is some sort of credible performance by his government betrays a certain lack of ambition on his government's part, because it's not doing the job.

The Minister, in a press release dated April 6, 1979, when he was talking about the new Private Sector Youth Employment Program, which began on April 30th and will run until November 2nd, which they expect will provide about 5,000 jobs in the coming months, said that, "It follows from the successful experience of last year when the program resulted in approval of about 2,500

from private employers, who provided some 5,000 jobs, or 15,690 staff man months of work, at a subsidy cost to the province of \$3.1 million." Those figures do not jibe with the figures that he gave us this evening. They do jibe in the amount of applications, but they do not jibe in the number of jobs. I'm not certain whether they correspond to what the Minister told us were the number of staff man months of work, and they do not correspond with the subsidy cost that the Minister mentioned just previously, which was under \$3 million, and this subsidy cost which is \$3 million. Can the Minister indicate why the discrepancy in those figures, one of which was a public news service that went out to the media and to the members of this House and to various other persons in the province, and the other information which he provided to us this evening.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite prepared to put together another press release which says that it cost us, on that particular program, with our finalized figures, \$2,176,000 and a few dollars to create 4,202 jobs in the Private Sector Youth Employment Program at a cost of \$518 per job by going out there, versus the NDP style where they wanted to employ them all within government and pay \$2,000 per job to do so. I'm quite prepared to put that release out and we'll let the people of Manitoba find out whether our program is satisfactory to them or not.

MR. COWAN: If anybody in this House should not be going to the people to ask them for a renewed mandate, or approval of their policies, it should be the Minister of Labour, who is also the Minister of Northern Affairs. If anyone should shy away from having to go to the public, it should be the interim Member for Thompson, as the Member for The Pas mentioned just the other day.

The Minister indicated earlier that 82 percent of the applications were for employers that employed less than 10 permanent year-round employees. I would ask the Minister how many jobs fell into that same category. How many jobs were created in businesses, as a percentage of the total, please, that were created in businesses that employed less than 10 permanent year-round employees?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll calculate that figure out, Mr. Chairman. The member makes reference to myself being an interim member. I think we're all interim for the period that we're here and I can suggest to him that he and his colleagues are quite welcome to come and do their best, such as they did last time, and they'll find a great deal more difficulty in the Thompson constituency in the next provincial election than they found in the last election.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Well, time will tell. Time will tell the harsh story for the Member for Thompson. But I have to disagree with him. I don't believe it comes under this particular item, future provincial elections in the constituency of Thompson, but since the Minister has brought it up, I would just like to indicate that there are people who are eyeing that seat, far more who are eyeing it today than a week ago because they are encouraged, just as the Minister must have been discouraged by the results of the last federal election.

Can the Minister indicate what was the average length of employment in weeks for the 4,202 employees who participated in this program?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm advised that it was 13 ½ weeks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, in my comments a few moments ago I had expressed my concern about making grants under this program to multinationals, and I asked the Minister if he would give consideration to redrafting the criteria that applicants, that is, employer applicants, would have to meet in order to benefit and assist those who really are in greatest need of this type of assistance, and if assistance were granted to them the spinoff benefits would in turn benefit the people of Manitoba and not somebody in New York, or Geneva, or Zurich, or wherever else the Head Office may be located. And I had mentioned my concern about the grants to the multi nationals, and some of the members on the opposite side sort of laughed it off, but you know, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of grants to multinationals is of great concern to the small businessmen in the constituency of Roblin. They are very much concerned.

And I'll tell you why they are concerned. Their concern is stemming from the fact that they have the presence of a multinational just across the Saskatchewan border from them in the City of Yorkton; Lord Thompson's presence is there in the newspaper, the Yorkton Enterprise. And they saw what the multinational did over there.

The Bay, which is a large corporation, it did its advertising not in the Yorkton Enterprise, but in another locally owned newspaper. It got the contract to do Hudson's Bay Company's advertising.

The Bay has a department store in Yorkton. Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that you know as well as I do, and all of us know, that there's no question that now that the Hudson's Bay Company has been taken over by Lord Thompson, where the advertising will go. It will go back to his own newspaper.

Now, the reason why I make this point, Mr. Chairman, is because it's quite obvious that Lord Thompson, he seems to have a love for small business operations as well as the big ones. Now what the philosophy of The Bay will be from here on in, who knows? Who knows to what extent The Bay may now expand in the small communities, and to what extent it may affect the clothing store, the hardware merchant, the food store, in fact the entire range of merchants that one may find in any community. So for that reason, Mr. Chairman, when the small hardware store operator from Gilbert Plains, from Roblin, from wherever, or from southern Manitoba or the Interlake, when he goes to the Minister and gets a grant, and on the way out of the Minister's office he meets the president of Gambles or of its related company, McLeods Gambles, and he knows that that company, McLeods, is in the hardware store business, and he says to himself, now, what's this Minister's program all about? Whom is it designed to assist? Because he comes home and he picks up the paper and he finds that McLeods Gambles is in the process of a takeover by a larger corporation, and he knows what those corporations do to the small businessman, , yes, may even be the 30, 40, 50-employee businessman, and he is much, much smaller than the 20,000, 30,000, 50,000-employee corporations spread all over the world, operating via, you know, sophisticated, computerized network and so forth.

You know, when that small hardware store dealer, when he sees that Burroughs Business Machines also received a grant, he says to himself, now Gambles is in the process of takeover, The Bay was taken over by Thompson's, and they're becoming larger, and who knows, rather than creating jobs in my town and setting up their own shop, what they'll do is go to Burroughs Business Machines and buy a computer and then go across the street to the Moore Corporation and buy the forms, all the paper for it, and they'll set up a computerized selling, merchandizing, stock control, stock ordering operation, which isn't going to create jobs but in fact will put people out of jobs.

So Mr. Chairman, what I'm suggesting to the Minister, and I know that our economic system being what it is, that he in his capacity as a Minister in a Provincial Government really doesn't have the clout, doesn't have the muscle, to tussle with some of these corporations. He can't. But Mr. Chairman, at least, to whatever extent he can as a provincial Minister, whatever programs are designed, design them to assist those who need the assistance. All right, the young person needs a job, but at least see to it that the job is made available within a place of employment that is truly Manitoban and not a place — to add insult to injury, to further rub more salt into the wound — a place of employment in which we see many of them are on their way to put the small businessman in Manitoba out of business, and which in the end will create even greater unemployment, Mr. Chairman.

So I ask the Minister again whether he would reconsider the criteria for this program, to limit it. And, you know, the controls — I know, the Minister might say, "Well, gee, I don't know who the parents are of these various corporations." — well, some of that information isn't all that secret. You know, the few that I've picked up here, it only took me a matter of minutes across the hall in the library, the information is there, and I'm sure the Minister with his research staff can, you know, do checks of that kind even more rapidly than I can just by punching a few keys on a machine and he'll get a read-out that'll give him all this information which I don't have access to.

So I would ask the Minister to design this program in such a way that, not only will it open the door to meaningful jobs, to permanent jobs for the benefit of the person seeking employment, and satisfying jobs, but on the other side of the ledger that it really would make a contribution toward enhancing Manitoba's economy and not the economy based somewhere beyond the boundaries of our province, beyond the boundaries of our country, and goodness knows where in the world.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member obviously wasn't listening when we said that we had \$3 million to spend on youth employment, and there was only \$2.1 something that was spent, so there is a great opportunity for more people to apply, and at this particular time I am not prepared to change the criteria of those that apply. Last year we fell short, if you wish to use that statement, but there wasn't as many applied and consequently not as many applications were fulfilled. I hope that this year there is many more. I would like to see the 5,000, and I would be prepared to accept whatever criticism there is coming from the members opposite that 100, 200, 300 or 400 of them were employed by large corporations. Because if, in fact, we do employ 5,000

this year instead of 4,200 there will be 800 more young people finding employment in Manitoba, and I think that's the important thing that we seem to be forgetting as we're going through this exercise.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Is the Minister, the Minister having said that he is prepared to change the criteria and he had indicated the manner in which he intends to, is he also prepared to change the criteria to limit this program to Manitoba small business, rather than having it set up in such a way that makes it possible for the large multinationals to apply? Now, the Minister may have made that point; I'm sorry, I missed it, if he did.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, the point is, Mr. Chairman, that there was only \$4,200 that did, in fact, find jobs and there were funds for substantially more than that. There were funds for substantially more than that this year.

I am not going to, at this particular time, try and re-define the criteria which might prohibit some of those young people from getting jobs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. The Minister suggests that we're opposed to the program and I personally don't know, unless I was asleep in caucus or something when this was discussed, I am not opposed to the program. I am opposed to some of the things that have occurred under the program, because I would be willing almost to accept anything to get some of the youngsters to work. Because, as you said earlier, what we are talking about is getting young people working. But when we're talking about small companies, I'm sure the Dixie Dee employees very few people in the wintertime.

But, Mr. Chairman, earlier when I was talking about a case, let me make a hypothetical case. I don't want to be hypothetical but I want to make a hypothetical case. If the Member for St. James and I were in business and we costed-out a bid on a project at \$100,000 and we had Companies A, B, C, D related with ourselves, that we were going to sub this out at \$25,000 to B, C and D and each one of those would be entitled to hire 10 people because of the effort that we are involved in is labour-intensive, so the 13.2 weeks that we're going to employ somebody we're going to recover \$9,620.00. So we sum this up, this \$100,000 costed-out bid that we have, and we say, okay, to insure this bid we're going to drop it \$10,000.00. We're going to drop it \$10,000 and sub it out through B, C and D, and we're going to pick up the difference and we're going to make the additional profit and we're going to get the contract in competition with the person down the street. This is what we're talking about.

And I'm sorry to hear that the Minister said that he wasn't going to change the criteria, because from my relationship with the Minister I felt sure — he inherited this can of worms a few months ago — I thought for sure that some of the things that we're talking about would not reoccur. But, nevertheless, maybe they're going to be, as a government, better than we were at defeating themselves and they will continue to proceed in a particular manner, even when it's drawn to their attention that this is not in the interest of the public.

I, for one, Mr. Chairman, would support actually going out and soliciting dairy farmers to take these people. I would actually support you going around to the farmers and saying, take some of these people, and any other small businessman in Manitoba, to help get some of these people. Because it is a critical situation. It's going to be a long, hot summer. They are squealing tires in front of my house already.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister says that we're rejecting the program carte blanche that's not true. We're bringing to the attention of the Minister certain — what was the . . . First Minister's . . . ? — aberrations in this program, hoping that he would take these into consideration. And when he says that it costs him \$500 in the private sector and \$2,000 in the public sector, I don't know what he is using as a basis of comparison. He says it's 13.2 weeks in the private sector; how long was it in the public sector? And how much of the cost . . . ? You're just writing off \$512; you're assuming that there is no benefit out of the \$2,000, that you haven't acquired any benefit from the \$2,000.00. So just to say that you can compare \$2,000 with \$500 is kind of fallacious.

I said I was going to be brief, and I will. No. 1, I, as a member on this side, support the program as far as its principle is concerned, in trying to do something to alleviate unemployment among the young.

No. 2, we would expand it to include the public sector, the public sector in the sense of school boards, parks boards. I'm not talking about, you know, direct provincial if that causes some problems for the Minister and for the government. Hospital boards — there is lots of meaningful needed

work that the money isn't available under your general program, and when you say you budgeted for more dollars than you spent last year and you hope that the same thing won't occur. If you have budgeted for \$2 million, for gosh sakes if you're going to have \$500,000 left in that pot don't let your blindness, as far as the public sector is concerned, inhibit you from doing useful and necessary work in the community.

Because, Mr. Chairman, speaking as one member of the House, I am getting rubbed sore with this continual attack on the public sector. Everything, everything, everything, everything: The health system, the educational system, and everything else that is done in the public service is no damn good. And here is another manifestation of it, that if there is some useful contributory work to be done in the public sector in the communities then it should be done and blindness and political . . . I'm sorry; I was thinking of a stronger word than that.

But, Mr. Chairman, we, on this side of the House, support the principle of doing something to put youngsters to work. We have indicated all the way along to the Minister of Agriculture, who wants to destroy the Wheat Board. —(Interjection)— Well, read your speech. But, Mr. Chairman, we encourage the Minister to try and prevent such aberrations as have occurred, and I agree with him that you can't kill a program by sending out a gestapo to inspect people's books to the extent that you turn them off, because you won't get any co-operation whatsoever, you have to exercise some discretion. But nevertheless I think the people in the Province of Manitoba are entitled to just a little bit more from this Minister and this government, that if it is a program to employ young people it should not necessarily be limited to the private sector. The government has taken this as a position of the government. For gosh sakes open your eyes and if you have budgeted for some money that is left over, as the Minister said, in his budget for last year for this job, that they could have employed more if they had them from the private sector, take a look around and see what can be done in the community. Forget this razzmatazz about the private sector and the public sector. What does the community need and what do the youngsters need?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, further to the comments of my colleague, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, in view of the fact that the Minister now has had one year's experience with this program and has become aware that it has a 30 percent non-acceptability, a 30 percent failure rate, because only about 70 percent of the funds were spent and 30 percent obviously the Minister couldn't give away even if he stood at the corner of Portage and Main and had the cash in his hands, the private sector just didn't accept it.

So, to give us some indication, out of this appropriation, what funds there might be available for the public sector, because I doubt very much whether something has happened to the program that would make it more appealing to the private sector, if this year's record of performance will be comaarable to that of last year, so the Minister will be left over with funds and I would like him to give consideration to setting up a comparable program in areas of employment such as my colleague, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, had referred to.

And I suggest to the Minister again that one of the reasons why this program did not have the appeal last year that the Minister had hoped it woul one of the reasons why he ended up over-budgeting for this program, is because the small businessman noticed that this program really wasn't designed to assist Manitobans. It was designed to assist some, but it was also designed to win favour with the large multinationals.

When the small manufacturer of pre-fabricated homes or buildings, or whatever, in Manitoba — and there is a number of them — and I repeat again, put them alongside of ADCO Structures Limited, they're small; or alongside the ADCO Corporation, they are very small. And you know when they apply for a grant — and those were successful in receiving one — and then they see that here is this great big corporation also receiving a grant, who are no friends of theirs, of the small operators in Manitoba, they say to themselves, well, what gives here with this government? On whose side is this government on? Is he on the side of ours, of the small businessman that they were so vocal about during the last election campaign, or are they on the side of Mr. Southern and the ADCO Corporation, and planning and scheming and running government affairs in such a way as to allow us to open the door for a further takeover by ADCO of the small operators in Manitoba?

So that is the reason why, Mr. Chairman, the program did have a 30 percent failure rate. And, having had a 30 percent failure rate, my prediction is that that failure rate will be repeated or increased this year and the Minister will be left over with funds. And I would want him to give consideration for the creation, No. 1, for finding ways and means of making the existing program more attractive and acceptable to both those seeking employment and, (2) business concerns that could really benefit for from it. No. 2, failing that, finding other opportunities for employment and

assisting those agencies in providing employment, such as many of the ones that my colleague, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre mentioned.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments with regard to the statements of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre who had said that I had sort of companioned myself with the honourable member with regard to small business and the support of the Private Sector Youth Employment Program.

I would like to tell the Honourable Chairman that I support the program. I also hire youth, when they are available for hiring in the summertime, but I want to assure the honourable member that I do not use the program and that I have nothing against big business or little business using the program, because I think it's good for the people of Manitoba and the youth of Manitoba and I'm not concerned about that competition. I felt that when I wanted to hire somebody to work in our company, that if he was qualified and could earn me a dollar and he could earn a dollar, I would hire him, and I needed him. And that's the way I operate and that's the way my partner operates.

So I can assure him that I support the program and I am not concerned if McDonald's or Dickie Dee — and it's not Dixie Dee; it's Dickie Dee — hires somebody to work for them, because we are employing people that end up paying taxes if they earn enough dollars and they work for the community and they work for the province.

So, as a small businessman, I am not concerned about that competition. Where I am concerned is if the government decides that they want to install carpets, or they want to start to build things with taxpayers money, then I am concerned because they don't pay a tax if they make a profit. They don't have to make a profit. That's when I become concerned.

So I am not concerned with this program that employs youths, rather than keep them unemployed during the summertime. So that's where we disagree, Mr. Chairman, when the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre ties me with his concern about with the youth program that we have going for us, and I think it's a good one.

Mr. Chairman, I kind of watch the other side about their concern about the small business, because I look around and I really only see one small businessman over there. That's the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, who has the Lakeshore Gravel. He's the only honourable member over there that has a small business. If I'm wrong then stand up and tell me that I'm wrong, and I will sit down and stand up again. I'm just saying that there's a lot of small businessmen over here and I'm a small businessman, and I don't mind that competition. This is what the people on the other side don't recognize. We recognize the competition. We'll fight it. But we can't fight big government competition because they've got everything on their side, and that's what we're fighting, because as a small businessman I stand up and pay taxes, because I've told you people before and I'll tell you again, that as a small businessman if you survive, you have three basic things you believe in.

First, you pay your employees, second, you pay the taxes and third, you pay your suppliers, and fourth, if there's any profit left, you pay yourself. And a good businessman follows those criteria. And that's what the other side doesn't recognize — that the small businessman in the community in the Province of Manitoba recognizes that. And they're not concerned if McDonald's or Wendy's or Dickie Dee applies for this type of program. We're not concerned. But I, as a member of the Government of Manitoba, or a member of the Legislature, will not apply because I know the rules. So I want to make that very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I have not ever partaken of this program and I won't, as long as I'm a member of this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable Minister of Labour should be commended for his program, because we're saying to the people of Manitoba and the small industries of Manitoba, not only the big industries, small industries, they can apply for it if they want to, and they will — and that's garbage when they talk about Dickie Dee, and they talk about McDonald's. And what really makes me mad, Mr. Chairman, is when the Honourable Member for Churchill stands up and calls these students scabs, because they're prepared to stand up and work for their education, where he would not stand up and defend his country. And he comes to this country and calls them scabs, whether he knows it or not, and that's when I get mad — that's when I get mad. Because that's wrong. When the students of Manitoba want to work for their living, want to earn their education, stand up for their country, and somebody comes in and starts calling them scabs — something's wrong, Mr. Chairman. That's when I get mad.

And when the other people talk about small businessmen, let's hear from the Member for Churchill when he stood up and worked for a living, stood up and worked, Mr. Chairman, 24 hours a day or 18 hours a day, because he was employing people. Because I have. I can stand up here and

swear on a Bible that I've worked more than 24 hours a day, to employ people — not only the people, but to employ people that had families and pay them before I earned a living. And that's what makes me mad, Mr. Chairman.

And then, when I hear the other side talk about this program — it's a good program — a helluva good program. And whether the big companies take advantage of it; they pay taxes, Mr. Chairman; they pay taxes here in this country. They don't flee like people that worked for Saunders, that earned good salaries, good salaries in this country, didn't pay taxes, ripped it off, took a good portion of that \$40 million that the people of Manitoba are paying for, and walked out of this country without paying any taxes. And those people on the other side have to remember that, because that happened in this province. But we're not doing that. We're not putting our money up, and saying okay Saunders, you spend it, you make that aircraft because we want to own it. We're not saying that.

What we're saying, Mr. Chairman, is okay you people in Manitoba, who own a business, big or small — if you want to do something a little extra, employ people, take that risk, we'll support you. And the surprising part is, Mr. Chairman, some of those people who've done that, big or small, big corporations or small corporations, have kept those people working after the program was over. And the people on the opposite side can't accept that. Well, Mr. Chairman, I support that, and it's a helluva good program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I don't know how many times the Member for St. James has been called on to defend his country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I was, and I have two sons who refused to go and fight in Vietnam. They're American citizens and still are. On occasions, Mr. Chairman, you have allowed this to occur in this Chamber, and I think it has absolutely nothing to do with the subject under debate, and I think that is a despicable attack by the Member for St. James, and I'm glad that he made that speech tonight because it shows just exactly where he stands — that he as a purported businessman, is not concerned about McDonald's, but yet his colleagues in Alberta are, his colleagues in Ontario are, because they have passed Acts to protect franchise operators. Mr. Chairman, I haven't said much this Session because I had high hopes when that man who occupies the Premier's chair had made his first speech that he was going to raise the level of debate, but he has not. We are completely out of order, in my estimation, but you have allowed it, Mr. Chairman, so I will reply. A defense and an attack . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. If I could just speak to the honourable members. I was at a quandary — the remarks appeared to be offensive. I've been checking with the rules and the Clerk to find out under which rule I could have ruled it out of order, if in fact it was out of order. I have got part of the ruling, but I wanted to give a correct ruling before I was going to rule it in order or out of order. The only thing I have here at this point: "No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty or of any other member of the Royal Family or His Excellency, the Governor-General or of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, or the person administering the Government of Manitoba, or use offensive words against the House or against any member thereof." I was asking the Clerk to give me some clarification on what words are offensive. To me it might sound offensive, which it might have, I'm not prepared to state at this time until I have further ruling from the Clerk. So it wasn't just a matter of passing it off. I was working with the Clerk at the time. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't casting reflections on the Chair, because I don't want to include you as being someone who's not concerned with the deliberations of this House, because in my judgment you're one of the best Chairmen that we have ever had, and I think it comes from your days of refereeing in the football league that you were called on on many occasions to separate people at closer quarters than we are in this particular Chamber.

But in my 10 years here, Mr. Chairman, I have seen the Conservative Party use every tactic in the book, even to the destruction of the parliamentary system and decorum in this House, to try and make their point. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, on occasion we have had the responsibility of disciplining a member for unparliamentary behaviour, but nevertheless we won't use that because the Conservative government wouldn't . . . the majority wouldn't support it, unless their attitude has changed since they got a majority.

But, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Member for St. James says that he doesn't give a darn about unfair competition, and that was the point I was trying to make with the minister, and I think the minister got the point. I think the minister got the point. That is my opinion; that is so; that is my opinion. And where the Member for St. James thinks that only they represent those people who think that if people save their money, they're entitled to a return on their investment, if they invest it. If people work harder, they're entitled to a return for working harder. If they contribute more to society than someone else, they're entitled to a better return. They're not all on that side of the House.

MR. MINAKER: The Member for Inkster doesn't believe that.

MR. BOYCE: Oh yes he does.

MR. MINAKER: No, he doesn't.

MR. BOYCE: Well, you argue with the Member for Inkster, I think that he will straighten you out on that particular point. Because I don't think the Member for Inkster reduces his fees as an attorney any less than the traffic will bear, just like anyone else.

MR. MINAKER: You're talking about . . .

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, he even drags in Saunders Aircraft. I remember the cash registers ringing. He doesn't say anything about Saunders Aircraft — the \$25 million or so that it cost us, this is true — it saved the Community of Gimli. Let the Minister of Education stand up here and attack what the government did in Gimli, and then compare that with the thing up in The Pas, that you sucked us into in secret. But, Mr. Chairman, we're away out of order. I'm sorry, I'm adding to your difficulty.

What was under debate is an item in the Estimates, dealing with the employment of youth in the private sector.

MR. DOWNEY: Try and stick to it.

MR. BOYCE: The Minister of Agriculture from his seat says, "Try and stick to it." Tell the Member for St. James to stick to it, and we will stick to it. But don't think that every time that you throw some hogwash across here, mister, that we're going to roll over and play dead, because we're not, and if you want to get down in the gutter and fight, we'll get down in the gutter and fight. I would much rather not.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: You're down in the gutter all the time anyway.

MR. BOYCE: I will repeat, Mr. Chairman. The employment program in the private sector that the government is . . . You know, the former Minister of Highways, Mr. Borowski, told the story about how you found out how much lard there was on a pig. You stuck it through the fat until it squealed. Well, they're squealing over there, Mr. Chairman, because we're into them. That's what's the matter with them, and they're using every fallacious argument in the book, every noise in the book, because they know they're dead wrong.

As I had said earlier, that I had confidence that the minister having acquired this particular program, after the points that were raised relative to some of the aberrations which had occurred, that they wouldn't occur in the future. But it shouldn't be just blindly, blindly locked into the private sector. If you can't generate enough jobs as admitted by the minister, I don't know if the Member for St. James was in the House or not — they said that they had more money than they had applications. So if you can employ people, isn't that what the program is supposed to be for? You employ people in any useful endeavour.

But the Member for St. James reinforced what I said earlier, just before him. They're so blind as far as public sector is concerned because their whole basic philosophy is locked into that dogma which governments are them.

I had said in another debate, Mr. Chairman, that in the Senate of this country, it's emblazoned as a quotation of Cicero, that the nobles have to protect the state against the fickleness of the people and they think that they are the nobles — that they're blind to the public sector. The public sector is not going to solve anything and when we start debating the Minister's educational bills, we'll demonstrate that in no uncertain terms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well I have to . . . now so I take no umbrage to the remarks from the Member for St. James, just as I have not taken umbrage to such remarks the numerous times in the past when he as resorted to those tactics when he has failed for an argument, when he fails to find an argument. I would prefer rather not to waste the time of the House, and I would only ask the Member for St. James not to waste the time of the House. If he wants to talk with me personally then I invite him to do so, but please don't waste the time of this august body and the people of Manitoba in gutter-sniping such as that, because that's what it is. So with that said, that is all. The only umbrage I take to what went on this evening is that it has wasted a bit of our time that could have been used more productively towards making this a better program and improving upon the many defects that were in the original program. So I think with that said I will go back to the original topic at hand and just once again extend an invitation to the Member for St. James to discuss this in a more rational manner at any time that he wishes.

The Minister mentioned previously that they had done an initial analysis of the four companies under question in regard to their private sector Youth Employment Grants numbering 40 applications, but I believe 33 actual jobs. Can the Minister confirm that in the year 1978, which is the year that these companies received those grants, that they actually employed fewer people than in the previous year? Can he confirm that data?

MR. MacMASTER: No, I can't, Mr. Chairman, I haven't got that information.

MR. COWAN: Well perhaps we can indicate to the Minister then that in Metrico in 1977 employed 51 persons in the summer, and in 1978 employed 43, so that they employed 8 less using grants from the province to do so. And that G. A. Junkin employed 43 in the summer of 1977, and 20 in the summer of 1978, using government moneys to employ approximately 23 persons less than they did the year before. I can inform him that Waseco employed 88 in the summer of 1977, and 52 in the summer of 1978, using government money to employ 36 less employees. I can inform him that J. D. Construction employed 180 in the summer of 1977, and 150 in the summer of 1978 using government moneys to employ 30 less employees. I can also as a sidelight inform him that the Progressive Conservative Party in the summer of 1977 employed 3 during the summer and that in the summer of 1978 they also employed 3 which we subsidized for them through government moneys of which, in all credit, they have paid back and that their actual total employment went down from 8 to 7 over those same years.

So, given that information, and I know the Minister now has to react very quickly to it, but I would like a reaction from him, can he indicate if he believes that the purpose of his program, to create more jobs, that the purpose of his program was to put more jobs into the economy, was being fulfilled by companies that employed less in 1978 using government money than they did in 1977 using their own money?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, not being part of any company or knowing the amounts of their business, be it last year, this year, or next year, I don't think that I can compare what the Member for Churchill — the point he is trying to make. If a company had lots of business last year and two years ago had 100 and last year they had 80 and this year they've got 120, the program this year is still available to companies. We have said that we have put a few safeguards, if I could use the expression, in the way of the program. We've reduced the numbers of students that can be employed from 10 down to 3. I personally think it's probably a little more controllable at that particular scale but I can't be responsible, I don't think, for a company that in 1976 had 200, in 1977 had 100, or in 1978 had 50 or 100 or whatever the case may be, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Well, certainly we're not asking the Minister, Mr. Chairperson, to be responsible for the company's actions, we're asking him to be responsible for the government's actions. Does he think that the purpose of the program is served when a company hires substantially fewer employees while collecting government grants than in the year previous? Does he think that is serving the spirit and the intent of this private sector Youth Employment Program?

MR. MacMASTER: I would think, Mr. Chairman, it would all depend on the volume of business that the particular company has in a particular year.

MR. COWAN: Well, Mr. Chairperson, that is not exactly the direct answer that I'd expected, although one would have to assume these being construction industries, that because of the policies of the

Minister's government last year was probably not as good a year for them as it was in the previous year and they might well have needed the help. But I don't believe that it serves the spirit nor the intent of the program.

I'd ask the Minister if he can indicate why his department, or himself if he made the final decision, decided that these four companies were not in essence one company, given the evidence that a Manitoba Labour Board hearing said that for the purposes of that application before them — all four companies were the same company and went through several criteria to explain why they made that decision which were fairly pertinent criteria — that they shared the same office space, that they shared the same trucks, that they shared the same management in certain instances, and given the fact that the company itself in a promotional article just two years ago, or three years ago, called itself J. D. Construction and Associated Companies, not J. D. and Metrico and G. A. Junkin and Waseco, but J. D. Construction and Associated Companies. So given that information I would ask the Minister to justify his decision that they are indeed four separate companies at this time?

MR. MacMASTER: I have mentioned to the member and to this House, Mr. Chairman, that they were all separate companies according to the Companies Act, and in law that's what they were when they put in their applications.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Perhaps the Minister can indicate if he has a legal opinion to confirm that suspicion of his.

MR. MacMASTER: The registration of the companies is what we have checked, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Did the Minister undertake on his own initiative to investigate further as to the application of these grants or did they stop at checking with the companies' registration?

MR. MacMASTER: We determined what I've already said, Mr. Chairman. They were separate companies, under the Companies Act.

MR. COWAN: Yes, then the Minister is saying that from the basis of that one check that they have determined that these grants were in essence in keeping with the spirit and the intent and the letter of the Private Sector Youth Employment Program. Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd be interested in view of the answer by the honourable member that in some way, shape or form, these are four separate companies and not just one company, if the Minister can — did I hear the Minister to clearly indicate that he did not have any legal opinion or basis for arriving at his conclusion beside the fact that in the registry book at the Companies Office there was registration of four separate entities? Now, Mr. Chairman, I find this rather incredible if the Minister is in fact suggesting that without the benefit of legal opinion, then what the Minister is indicating to the House is that these four companies each split into a second company so that we had eight companies rather than four, since we now have four companies rather than one, then in fact each company would be eligible for benefits under this program. Is that what the Minister is advising this House without the benefit of any legal opinion?

MR. MacMASTER: I haven't had legal opinion on it yet, Mr. Chairman, that's correct.

MR. PAWLEY: Is the Minister then indicating, I would be very happy to give him the benefit of the doubt if this is the case, that he has not arrived at a conclusion as he has not obtained the benefit of a legal opinion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister just said that they have not had a legal opinion yet, and those were his exact words, at least the "yet" was his exact word. Is he implying that they're in the process of having a legal opinion drawn up on this matter?

MR. MacMASTER: Our determinations were what they were to date, Mr. Chairman. I haven't said that that is the final position of myself in relationship to this topic. I've said that a couple of times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. James. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I find the Minister's answers rather fuzzy. Is the Minister indicating that he is seeking a legal opinion or not at this point? Can we have a very clear indication whether the Minister is in the process of obtaining a legal opinion, is awaiting the receipt of a legal opinion?

MR. MacMASTER: I haven't sought legal opinion yet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, will the Honourable Minister seek legal opinion?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm considering just that very thing, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would advise the House if he has knowledge of any labour liens relating to the companies in question with regard to payment of the students that were employed by these companies?

MR. MacMASTER: No I'm not, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that a further comment is needed. The Minister indicated clearly that he was determining whether or not the provisions of the Summer Employment Act in fact were being infringed upon and that he would bring the results of this investigation back to the House. Now, Mr. Chairman, in hearing that announcement by the Minister I certainly welcomed it and I believe that all members on this side of the House did welcome that announcement. But, Mr. Chairman, what was clearly involved was a determination as to whether or not in law the four companies involved were in fact one; whether it was a fiction their operation as four companies, and that is why, Mr. Chairman, earlier as well as tonight the question was raised to the Minister, just to show the lack of logic of assuming just because there are four companies registered in the Companies Office, therefore they're entitled to four grants — to ask the Minister if in fact the four companies had been split into eight companies or the eight companies split into sixteen or the sixteen companies split into thirty-two, that automatically they would be eligible for additional grants under his program. So, Mr. Chairman, I have to indicate that I cannot help and I say this regretfully, but be stunned by the sloppiness on the part of a government that's declared itself over and over again to be a business-minded government. Mr. Chairman, I believe what we are witnessing and have been witnessing this last little while is really about the height of understanding, insofar as a government that's claimed and boasted and prided itself upon business acumen, if at this point when an announcement was made, we thought, in good faith, Mr. Chairman, that an investigation would be undertaken in order to ensure, in order to ensure whether or not the provisions of the Summer Employment Act had been breached, whether in fact the four companies were involved were indeed, four or one. I would have assumed that No. 1 step would have been to obtain legal opinion from some person reputable in corporate law, and I'm sure that the government across the way have many friends in corporate law. But tonight we find that we don't have that answer, there is even uncertainty, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not legal opinion is to be obtained, and I think, Mr. Chairman, there is a shadow hanging over the heads of government members across, until such time, Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . until such time, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable members across the way take some step in order to ensure that the programs that they initiate are operated in an efficient and capable manner.

We are in support of programs for students. The only regret, Mr. Chairman, is that the program which honourable members across the way have attempted to operate, has been operated on such

an inefficient and less than effective manner, with a great deal, as the Member for Churchill was indicating, a great deal of overlapping and ineffectiveness insofar as actual job creation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Chairman, this has been going on all night. I've never heard such a silly argument from the other side as I've heard in my life. Do they want to employ summer students or don't they? —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, let me go back to their 1977 program, which I have personally asked the Minister of Labour to go to the old provincial job office records and dig out their 1977 program in the spring. And we'll dig out the complaints I got in 1977 where you hired under contract a bunch of inspectors just before an election year to wander around under the program. Then we'll talk to the employees who talked to me, who said, "I intended to hire a person, I advertised for them in the paper, I hired them, and that inspector came around and said, why don't you get on the program, so you could add to it." And you've got the gall to sit over there and talk about inability to run a program when you ran a program in 1977 that was an absolute disgrace to this province for young people.

You complain that . . . not in hospitals, we put them into private industry for the sake of getting jobs. And now you're reversing your statements. Your Minister of Industry and Commerce at the time used to stand up and say, "Our program was directed to have young people go into private industry and have jobs, continuing jobs, that was the idea of what we wanted to do, that was what we were trying to accomplish," and now you yahoos over there tonight are absolutely disagreeing with him.

Mr. Chairman, I have personally asked, and the Minister of Labour has said he will get me the Order for Return the same as we supplied to you on your program and if you want to stand around all night next year and the year after and debate on one mistake, or this mistake or the other mistake, go ahead. Be a bunch of little children about it. But, I will tell you this, there is no question that the people you put on contract employment during the 1977 employment program you had were nothing but political hacks walking around in an election year.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's not unexpected, it's about what you would expect from the Minister of Economic Development. So I'm not going to engage in the type of shouting and hollering and name-calling as we have just heard from the Minister of Economic Development. What we think of I don't believe really matters the Minister of Economic Development tonight, even though he's described very vividly to the House what he feels honourable members on this side of the Chamber are. That's up to him. If he wishes to carry on that way over the next two years, the people of Manitoba will indicate to him what they think of him in the next provincial election, Mr. Chairman. I have no doubt about that, none whatsoever.

But Mr. Chairman, the members across the way deliberately, and with design, because their Minister is in trouble, and the former Minister of Education is in difficulty, because they have fouled up this program, because they have handled it in an ineffective and inefficient manner, are continuing to attempt to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in some way, shape or form, we are opposed to the program involving youth employment. Honourable members know across the way that we are not opposed to the basic principle of job creation for students, but what we are opposed to, we will continue to oppose, is the inefficient manner by which they handled this program, and Mr. Chairman, we shall not retreat from any efforts to expose the sloppiness, when that sloppiness comes to our attention, we shall not hesitate when pork barrelling comes to our attention. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt, no doubt whatsoever that if the Honourable Member for Churchill had not exposed the actions of the Minister of Education insofar as funnelling \$2,300 into the coffers of the Progressive Conservative Association of Manitoba, that that money would have been repaid. It was only repaid due to the diligent efforts in exposing the channelling of those funds into the coffers of the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba.

We know that, the people of Manitoba know that' honourable members across the way, Mr. Chairman, fail to understand because they do not want to understand that very, very simple fact, Mr. Chairman, \$2,300 funnelled, it's been paid back, but paid back only thanks to the diligent efforts of the Honourable Member for Churchill and other members who exposed the pork barrelling that took place across the way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass; (5)—pass; (5)(a) New Careers—pass; (b)— pass; — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: On the New Careers program, Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions. It's related to a letter which I believe the Minister may be aware of, I know he was sent a copy of

this letter which was mailed to the New Careers Program. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the letter into the record because I believe it to be self-explanatory, and that is, Mr. Chairman, a letter from the — pardon me? —(Interjection)— Yes. It's a letter from Native Communications Incorporated, Thompson, Manitoba, to the New Careers Program.

"Dear Sir or Madam: During these past three months we negotiated with the New Careers Program to obtain four positions, a Manager-Trainee for the radio station at Cross Lake, CFNC, a Manager-Trainee for CJNC, radio station at Norway House, and two positions in our Thompson office. We had consultation meetings with representatives from New Careers and outlined the positions, their job outline, their terms of reference, and all matters relating to a good work training program. All seemed to be in order and these positions were approved in principle last month, and only had to be signed by the Minister for final approval.

"The New Careers people and ourselves were so certain at this time of the approval that steps were taken to advertise the positions and dates set for the interviews of the candidates. At the end of the month, my production manager received a call from the New Careers Office advising that these positions had been cancelled at the Ministerial level. No reason was given why they were cancelled, certainly it was established that funds were available and that all the criteria for the positions were met.

"The purpose of this letter is to ask that we be given the courtesy of being advised why these positions were so abruptly cancelled at the Ministerial level. Four years ago, we were given three positions, and I'm sure you can see from your records that we handled these trainees well, and these three trainees have established themselves very well in their area of training."

And this letter is signed by Ernest J. Scott, General Manager, Native Communications Incorporated, and it's dated May 24, 1979.

Mr. Chairman, I read that into the record because I would like to hear the Minister's response to that letter and the concern that has been expressed by the General Manager of Native Communications Incorporated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I understand that those applications, along with many other applications, are being reviewed, Mr. Chairman. There are a host of new openings that are taking place in the next few months and I don't think these have been thrown in the garbage bucket, I think they're among the many others that will be reviewed in the next, about 45 days. We expect a great entry into the New Careers Program, a great number of entries into the New Careers Program in the next few weeks.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, given the fact that these negotiations have been going on for the past three months for the four positions, a Manager-Trainee for the radio station at Cross Lake, a Manager-Trainee for the radio station at Norway House, and two positions in the Thompson office, and it appears that the production manager of Native Communications Incorporated received a call from the New Careers Office advising them that these positions had been cancelled at the Ministerial level. Now can the Minister indicate why that information was given to Native Communications Incorporated, if he is now saying that these positions are still under review. Can he indicate to us definitely one way or the other, have these positions been cancelled? Or is he as Minister, now reconsidering this cancellation and possibly giving consideration to them being approved?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, obviously I can't be responsible for phone calls that people make within my staff. I suppose I should be. Whoever said that this particular group was absolutely cancelled is not correct. I have said here tonight that there are many applications coming in, and they'll be reviewed in their entirety and ones will be assigned.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate what will be happening, if anything, with the number of New Careers positions, this involved people that were actually employed at different levels within the government training for positions which hopefully would have resulted from increases in staff levels at the departmental level in the government. Can the Minister indicate if any of these that have been cancelled in the past are being reviewed this year? I'm thinking specifically, Mr. Chairman, of the environmental aides positions which were introduced through the Department of Mines.

These were people that had been trained at the community level to do health and environmental work at the community level, they were working within the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. After the PC government took over the administration of this program, Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that all, almost all, if not all of those positions had been

the people that were involved in those positions were not given any opportunity to become redeployed or employed in any other capacity in the public service, even though they were given a commitment at the outset of the program that they would be training for a career which would be available at the end of their training.

Mr. Chairman, the recent results of the federal election in northern Manitoba should give this Minister and this government an indication of what people think of that kind of callous disregard for the lives of people working in northern Manitoba. That's just one thing that the PC Government did which I believe really grated on the feelings of people in northern Manitoba. There isn't one of those people that were cancelled from those positions and given the back of the government hand that was very happy with the way in which they were treated, and I'm sure they made their feelings well known throughout their communities, and they got the sympathy of those communities in terms of the way in which the community responded to them sympathetically for the way in which they were treated by the government.

Now Mr. Chairman, there are a number of areas like that where the government acted very callously, with a callous disregard for the lives of people living in the north. So Mr. Chairman, I would ask him if he is considering any changes with respect to those people in order that they may be able to resume employment in the fields for which they were trained, and could he, in further elaboration of the points he's making, give us a list of the kinds of positions that are under consideration by his department, those which he claims are under review and will be approved within the next 45 days?

I might remind the Minister that a considerable amount of the new fiscal year has already elapsed, and surely some of his staff should have been working to ensure that over the past two months, that some of these positions in the New Careers Program for the fiscal year 1979 and '80 would be filled, and surely they should have been able to give a group like Native Communications Incorporated some indication whether or not these positions for which they were negotiating for three months would be accepted or not accepted. It's not acceptable, Mr. Chairman, to have a group like Native Communications and the people who are considering working in these positions, in fact, as it states in the letter, dates had already been set for the interview of candidates — it's not acceptable, Mr. Chairman, that the government treat people in this callous manner, disregarding the lives of people and making it very difficult for them to function in terms of being able to co-operate with this government.

I know that when we questioned the Minister of Mines, and I note that he's now consulting with his colleague, the Minister of Mines, when we pushed the Minister of Mines on this in the fall of 1977 after the election, it was very obvious that he had a very slight regard for the lives of these people that he was disrupting by dismissing them from their positions and not making any provision for them to be redeployed within the public service of Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: If I understand, Mr. Chairman, that if the Member for Rupertsland wishes to read the memo that he himself drafted during September of 1977, that the inference in the memo is that some of these people should be kept on at least till after the election, and that's probably the people that he's referring to that eventually did not end up staying. Now, if he wishes to read that memo, I'll see if I can produce that for him.

One of the positions that I've taken very adamantly is that no group, no agency that's involved with the New Careers Program is to look at my department for funding if they are not prepared to find a spot for that person at the end of the term. I've made that very clear, very insistent, and that shall be the case. There's no question that that's my particular position, and it's supported by the Cabinet. They now understand that that's the way I feel about the program and there just will be no money. We will not approve anything unless departments or agencies establish that in fact there will be a job, be it an SMY or whatever, at the end of the particular term.

The member asked for some areas in which we were looking for new careers, or areas that are being considered: In the chemical and abuse counselling area; in the residential child-care workers area; and community recreation workers area; and juvenile and adult corrections area; and Native Communications Incorporated is on the list and it's established and it's there; the Dakota Ojibway Tribal Council in Brandon, and that is the extent of it at this particular time, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that the Minister knows himself what he's talking about when he says there was a memo drafted saying certain people would be kept on until after the election. That would be very fine if he does, but it was not the intention of the New Democratic Government to dismiss these people from their positions; it was the intention to provide positions

in the departments for them. And I was not the Minister of that Department of Mines at that time. I was not responsible for the environmental aides directly. But in my own department that I was responsible for, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Resources, there were positions to accommodate the New Careerists who were training within that department as trainee Conservation Officers under the New Careers Program. I ensure this Minister that that was the case, and I know full well that these Ministers could have done that with these people that were in their departments when they came into government, regardless of what draft memos they may have found, wherever they may have found them. Mr. Chairman, there are enough staff man years within the Department of Mines that the Minister of Mines could have accommodated those people and fulfilled their expectations of having useful, productive employment after their training program. —(Interjection)— You're damn right there are staff man years in there that could have been used for that purpose.

And Mr. Chairman, these people in the north who have been given the back of this government's hand will not forget it, and they showed them in this past Federal Election what they think of the way in which they operate.

And this is another example right before us, Mr. Chairman, when the Native Communications Incorporated Branch has to write a letter like this asking the government what is going on. Here we are negotiating for four positions for three months, and we have a call saying it's been cancelled at the Ministerial level. I would think this Minister should be concerned about that and should be tracking it down and finding out what's going on, because in the final analysis he is responsible for his department and everything that comes out of it, and if he thinks his government is not being judged by the way in which his department is operating, just look at the results from the last Federal Election.

We told him here in the House that the people in northern Manitoba were frustrated working with his department. Well, he's finding out that they're frustrated, and they're not getting any less frustrated by the disregard of this Minister and his colleague, the Minister of Mines, when we bring up matters like this to their attention.

All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that we express great disappointment in the way in which this government is operating, the way in which they're approaching programs that deal with people, with people's lives, with livelihoods, and in all of these areas, whether it's the one that was just under discussion, the Private Sector Youth Employment Program, or the New Careers Program, the overriding factor is that they're absolutely inadequate to meet the needs of the people in these areas where the need is being expressed. The need is being identified and the government is disregarding that need.

When you look at a program of \$3 million for Private Sector Youth Employment Program, and a program of \$1 million for New Careers, Mr. Chairman, these programs are simply inadequate. They're not adequately dealing with the unemployment needs of the youth and the disadvantaged people in this province, and particularly the disadvantaged people in northern Manitoba.

When you consider that on the Indian Reserves alone in Manitoba, there's an unemployed work force of over 10,000 people — over 10,000 people right now that are unemployed, that are not even statistically noted in the figures which his department uses and Statistics Canada puts together, they're simply not even noted, not even accounted for, Mr. Chairman. Just to deal with that problem alone would take much more than the moneys that we're discussing here.

And Mr. Chairman, this government thinks that they're saving money by cutting off and chopping funds in this area of the program. They're thinking that they're saving the taxpayers of Manitoba money, but we'll find out, Mr. Chairman, and we are finding out that they're not saving money; they're costing the taxpayers of Manitoba more money by not taking action in the areas where problems can be prevented, where you can deal with people before they get into serious trouble, before they get into trouble with the law, before they get into alcoholism, before they get into situations of frustration and despair and they end up with whole families on welfare. Mr. Chairman, these problems have to be dealt with before they happen. They have to be dealt with at the preventive side, and we simply do not see this government doing anything near what would be adequate in dealing with this problem. Even within the programs that they are administering, such as The New Careers Program, even with the miniscule programs that they are continuing, we find that they are inefficient in their administration of them.

I think the biggest problem as far as the people are concerned who have to deal with the administrators of these programs, is the paternalistic way in which the programs are being administered, where there's no longer a dialogue between the administrators of these programs and the client group. It's the boss talking to the employee. We're the big bosses now and we're going to do it the way we want to do it, and we're not going to listen to your concerns.

And Mr. Chairman, right here in the letter from Ernest Scott, he's asking why they haven't been given the courtesy of being advised why these three positions, or four positions rather, were so abruptly cancelled. They have the feeling certainly, that these positions have been cancelled. The

Minister may say now, two weeks after the fact, that these positions have not been cancelled, but Mr. Chairman, obviously no one has communicated this fact in any adequate way to the people who are being frustrated by their attempts to deal with his department. And this is just one example, Mr. Chairman. The councils in my constituency, the community councils in the Member for The Pas' constituency, in Churchill, in others, are having great difficulty dealing with the paternalistic attitude of the civil servants that are travelling around northern Manitoba with an attitude that's been given to them by the Progressive Conservative Government. It's a paternalistic attitude that is epitomized in the figure of the Honourable Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the First Minister of this Province. He sets the example. He sets the example for his Cabinet, his Caucus, and they in turn set the example for the public servants of Manitoba in a way in which they deal with people. It's a paternalistic, colonial system of dealing with people, particularly those in the disadvantaged areas of Manitoba, and Mr. Chairman, I can express nothing but disappointment for the people who live in those areas because they're not getting a fair deal from this government. They're not even getting a good deal on the programs that are being operated by this government, and the programs that are being operated by this government are simply inadequate to deal with the problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, in talking about the Estimates, the only time we have to raise certain points is under the Estimates because if there's no bill presented to the Legislature, then we're limited in our debate to make our case whenever we can. And really, what I have to say is more to help the Minister than to argue against him in this regard, that he is only one member of a Cabinet and, having had the opportunity to serve for a short time in the Cabinet, I know what he is up against. There are only so many dollars, and if you are asked to pare then you have to pare where you can get away with it. But my question on this particular issue is: What is the Conservative government doing to solve the problem to which New Careers and other programs addressed themselves?

Earlier in the debate the Minister mentioned the Selkirk Plant, and I was pleased to see that the Minister was continuing on it because that particular thrust was set up because of the availability of DREE money and other things. I don't want to go into that, but nevertheless it was set up to solve some problems. Now, when we're talking about the north and we're talking about such things as fishing and trapping, and when you're talking to the City of Winnipeg residents — and I know of which I speak because people have asked me what are they talking about New Careers in the north; what does this mean? When you talk about fishing it automatically comes to mind a nice boat under a shady tree with a straw hat and a six-pack and a bob on the water bobbing up and down. They don't know what they're talking about in fishing is bobbing around in a boat come all kinds of weather, and under ice and everything else, and that these people, you know when they're younger they are able to participate in this, but after they get 45-50 what are they going to do? The same thing in trapping. What are they going to do?

So the problem is: How do you help people who have been self-sufficient for a period of their life, and who have to, for some reason or other, change their career? There is no federal program that answers this problem completely. There are some participation programs. But, nevertheless, it's of the City of Winnipeg Winnipeg Centre Constituency that this problem is solved. Because if they don't solve it then an awful lot of these people end up in my constituency on welfare, because they really have no other choice. As they grow older, they just can't fish and trap. It always sounds so nice. You know, keep on fishing and keep on trapping, or keep on truckin' or something but, nevertheless, through no fault of their own, Mr. Chairman, many people are locked into a system they can't get out of and this is what New Careers was all about.

Now, MacKenzie King was a very shrewd politician, Mr. Chairman, and he had one philosophy: Never do anything unless the people see that there is a problem and insist upon a solution. If the New Democratic Party made a crass error, I would suggest it is in this field, that they saw the problem and they saw how to solve the problem, and they moved too far ahead of the public. Because most people don't know what you're talking about when you talk about New Careers. They didn't know what we were talking about in Health and Social Development when the Minister used as a rationale for cutting a program out completely it was only 28 percent successful.

So that the cutback that the Minister . . . And it is a cutback. I think there is a \$20,000 increase . . . \$20,000 in \$1 million appropriation. I haven't got my book in front of me, but it's a modest increase, nothing which keeps up with inflation, \$79 vis-a-vis \$78.00.

So, Mr. Chairman, in this regard we would encourage the Minister to use what persuasive abilities he has with his colleagues, that this is an important issue. I will have to agree with him that it isn't one that's loaded with political dynamite at the moment but just as sure as God make green

apples it's going to be.

Now, we saw one manifestation of the unrest with the people in the north, where they sat in an office downtown here. And this is what I am talking about at the moment. If not this program, then what? The government has announced all through their Estimates that they're cutting out this program, they're cutting back on this program. They are reducing this program. And all of these programs were designed, rightly or wrongly, well or badly, to solve the problem. The problem is not going to go away, Mr. Chairman.

So, can the Minister advise us if he has any other programs? I have listened attentively to what he has said about his relocation program at Flin Flon. More power to him and I hope it works, and I hope it can be expanded. It is a modest number of families that are involved. I hope it works. I hope it will be a point around which more people can crystallize to enter the labour force and enter the mainstream of life, as it is now and as it is going to be.

But in many of these other programs, Mr. Chairman, the programs which were put under . . . And regardless of what you call them, New Careers or BUNTEP, INTEP or all the different initials we pin on programs to try and reach out and get people who heretofore have not been integrated into the employment scene, and therefore the social scene, how is the Minister going to solve this problem? Because all we have heard in all of the Estimates, including this department, is that they are cutting back on the programs but yet we haven't heard of any new programs to solve the problem.

So can the Minister advise us if he intends to use some of the funds available to him to develop different thrusts? If he intends to pull back on this particular program and start up something else, maybe it will work. Who knows, until we try it? I, for one, don't think all the answers are on that side of the House or this side of the House. But with New Careers, the concept of New Careers is just as it says: Those people who, for some reason or other, were able to work or weren't, were able to develop new skills, and therefore attitudes, and become self-sufficient. So what other programs has the government in mind in this area, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I don't want to get in the position, Mr. Chairman, of wandering all over the place, but there has been reference made to expansion and hopeful greater utilization of some of the programs that are in place. The New Careers is very similar to what it was last year. We hope that it has a successful year, with the possibilities of expanding on it and maybe working out new varieties and new approaches to that particular program, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BOYCE: Yes, I'm sorry; I had difficulty hearing the Minister. Is the Minister saying that it's just less of the same? Is that what the Minister has just said?

MR. MacMASTER: Hansard won't record that that's what I said, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (b)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, before we leave that 5.(a), the Minister did indicate briefly that he had a rough idea of what kinds of positions are being considered for the New Careers Program. I wonder if he could supply the Opposition with a list of the kinds of positions that are being considered for funding under New Careers. I ask that question because we would be interested to know if the positions referred to in the letter I read into the record are being considered and/or what other positions are being considered by his department. Surely he must have some tentative list of where they intend to spend the amount which is in the Estimates, of \$1,043,000 in this fiscal year.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member asked a question and then the member was talking when I gave the exact list. Hansard will, again, record that. But, so we don't have a dispute about it, I will go through them again. I went through them once when the member was talking to I don't know who.

Chemical Abuse Counsellors; Residential Child Care Workers; Community Recreation Workers; Juvenile, Adult Corrections; Native Communications Incorporated, Thompson; the Dakota Tribal Council in Brandon, and we're presently looking at air maintenance mechanics and airport manager people, and we're looking at the aerospace industry as a different sort of approach, maybe, to try get the New Careers Program working in that particular industry.

So that's some of the ones that are before us now, an exact duplicate of what I read before.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, what I was looking for was somewhat more detail than that. I realize the Minister read out a generalized list of the areas in which they were looking for New Career trainees. However, what we would like to see is a list detailing the number of people in each of those areas that he is considering. How many in total will be funded under this program and how many in each of those areas.

MR. MacMASTER: We expect to have 90 in place by the end of June, Mr. Chairman, and an additional 20 to 25 within a month or two after that. It's being phased in and each one of the ones that I have mentioned are asking for anywhere from 8 to 12, some of them one and two, but they are all being reviewed as an overall package at the particular moment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate how many are in the program now, in their first, second or third year, or whatever, of their training program and could he give us a list of the number of people in each year of their training, and what status they have?

MR. MacMASTER: There are 49 in place at the moment and we expect that to go to 90 by the end of June, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)—pass; (5)—pass; (6) New Careers — South—pass; (7) Provincial Job Office—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, on New Careers — South, can the Minister just give us a brief description of what this item is standing for?

MR. MacMASTER: There will be nine regular staff, Mr. Chairman, and we hope to have 52 contract New Career positions in place.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate which areas, and the numbers attached to those areas, that are being considered here for New Career positions?

MR. MacMASTER: The member would be familiar with the Northern Affairs jurisdiction, and these people are those that are not in Northern Affairs jurisdiction — the southern part of the province, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, that's precisely the reason why I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, which areas are being considered here. What general areas are being considered for New Career positions? Could the Minister give us a list of the possible areas of training, what types of positions people would receive training for, and whether or not these would be permanent positions, eventually, for the applicant-trainees to assume a career at the end of their training period.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I made it clear before but it's worth repeating that I will not permit funds to be utilized from the particular responsibilities that I have, which is this particular section, by any parties without the guarantee that the job is there at the end of the training period. I feel very strongly about that and that's the way it will be and I think people in every agency that is looking at the New Careers program is very familiar with my feelings on that particular subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (6)—pass; (7)—pass — the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you. I think it's an appropriate time to ask about those Sunrise Homes, Mr. Chairman. I was out of order formerly. Is that right? Or shall I wait until Salary?

I would like some information on the Sunrise Homes Manufacturing Limited in Cranberry Portage. I have a problem there and I'd like to get some answers if I could, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It doesn't fall under this category I'm sure but . . .

MR. MacMASTER: No it doesn't, Mr. Chairman, but I'd be quite willing to take the information from the Member for Flin Flon and get him whatever answers are necessary as relates to that particular operation.

MR. BARROW: It seems the program has come to a standstill, Mr. Chairaan. They've applied for a Special ARDA grant of some \$100,000.00. They've had some success with the program, they took 17 houses just across the border into Saskatchewan, and it looks like it will be a success. What's holding this loan up is confirmation from the Metis Federation to support the grant. They won't give any support unless they have it written in the contract that they will . . .

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, if the member could give me that information, I'm not sure, I have a general idea what he's talking about, but it certainly has nothing to do with the particular Estimates we're on, but I give him my assurance, as you are my witness, that whatever the particular problem is, if he wants to talk to me personally about it, or if it wants to preferably put it in the form of a scribbled-out document or a typed-out document, I'll get him whatever information it is. He's relating to Special ARDA, it's job creation in the Flin Flon area I understand. I think I have an idea basically what he's talking about, but if he could document that for me, I'll be glad to get him the answers and speed up whatever the holdup is in relationship to the program or whatever it may be, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIAN: Okay. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: That's suitable, Mr. Chairman. It would only take two minutes to explain the situation right now and I'll give him the document. Or whatever you want, whatever you desire.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, it would be easy for you to explain, but if you want an answer, it might take a little bit longer. If you want it on the record, I would allow you under either the Minister's Salary, but I think by that time you would probably have an answer, but you're welcome to go ahead.

MR. BARROW: I'll document the thing, as the Minister suggests. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could indicate what has been happening here from the past year to the one that's being proposed before us.

MR. MacMASTER: This particular section is specifically at this moment in a maintenance of outstanding and ongoing and committed grants and loans to municipalities. We have heard, and I know it's been mentioned in this House, and I think all municipalities and communities are anxiously awaiting until we get, I can't remember the name of the federal program that was to replace so many of the ongoing programs that were in aid to municipalities. I don't know all the details but the Minister responsible for Municipal Affairs certainly has it and has mentioned in the House that there is a program that was hanging there ready to be implemented, some of the provincial governments were looking at it, that would be in aid to municipia municipalities. Whatever the title of it is, and I don't think anybody's hung up on titles, we're anxiously awaiting to see with the new government what type of program comes in to replace the two or three that were in operation in the last two or three years. They have been folding up and falling by the wayside and we have been promised a new federal program as it relates to municipalities and we're anxiously looking forward to it.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Minister indicate what was spent last year, what categories the \$116,500 was expended on, and for the present fiscal year before us, what the \$38,600 is budgeted for?

MR. MacMASTER: Salaries and expenses, Mr. Chairman, and it's being maintained now by people within the department who will keep a very close eye on the outstanding commitments that we have in this particular program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (7)—pass; — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat familiar with the programs that were administered by the provincial job office. One of those was the special Northern Employment Program which we had created in 1975, to give a grant assistance to northern communities. That program, as far as I know, Mr. Chairman, has been watered down to practically nothing, transferred over to CEDF, where it's largely inactive. The inner-city employment program was another program we established

to create jobs at the local level in the city of Winnipeg, the inner core, to give priority to native enterprises.

As far as I know, Mr. Chairman, that program has been watered down to almost nothing. If it isn't, then I'd like to hear the contrary. I would recommend in fact to the minister, that both of those programs be covered off at least to the level that they were funded under the New Democratic government, and I would hope that he would enhance the funding under those programs. Because, Mr. Chairman, they were not make-work brush cutting type of enterprises that we were funding under those programs. They were economic enterprises.

In the case of the Special Northern Employment Program, it was largely a program designed to fill the gaps necessary and of any other programs in order to assist a community enterprise, or an enterprise in a native community, to establish themselves, to provide long term jobs in an economic venture, not just a make-work program. We had the PEP Program and different other programs to provide the special, municipal make-work type of activities, which were one shot, one time grants to provide make-work type of employment. But these programs administered by the provincial job office were designed to create long term jobs and, Mr. Chairman, they were working very effectively under the New Democratic government.

I note that the government did follow through and make a few grants shortly after they took office, but as far as I know these programs have been largely inactive ever since that time. And just a simple fact, Mr. Chairman, that the provincial job office has been reduced from 116,000 down to 38,000, is an indication of where this government is going in terms of having the government active in promoting jobs in the Province of Manitoba. In other words, they're true to their word — they're leaving it all up to the private sector — let's not get the government involved in creating jobs or pushing for jobs or working in any kind of active way to promote the creation of jobs, whether it's at the local municipal level, or at the inner city core level, wherever. The government is going to wash its hands of all of that stuff — let the private sector do it.

Mr. Chairman, the past 20 months have demonstrated that that process has not worked, is not working, and I just cannot see it working for the future. So, Mr. Chairman, I'm again expressing disappointment that this government has seen fit to curtail, reduce and/or eliminate the programs that were effective under the New Democratic government to create jobs, to promote the creation of jobs, and to practically eliminate the provincial job office is certainly a step backwards as far as the creation of jobs in Manitoba is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (7)—pass; Resolution 79—pass.

Resolution No. 80: 4. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, can the minister provide us with a detailed list of the items that are contained within this rather large appropriation? I would suggest that we take that list and have an opportunity to look it over, and hold off on passing his ministerial salary item until tomorrow. Since we're past the hour of taking formal votes on this in any case, I would suggest that that would be the way we would want to operate. If we could be accommodated on that we'd appreciate it.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I can give the member, and I'll get him a further breakdown, Mr. Chairman, but there is \$5 million in the Manitoba Special Municipal Loans Fund, which is being administered this year. There's \$60,000 for the Inner City Employment Program; there's \$168,500 for the City of Winnipeg Community Services Workers Program, and there was \$27,000 for the three air compressor stations that are going to be established by the Fire Commissioner's office. I would suspect from his question that he wanted the \$5 million broken down as to what is taking place, and where, and I'll endeavour to get that for him tomorrow, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll pass the item then. Clause 4. —pass; Resolution No. 80—pass. Committee rise. We'll save the Minister's Salary until tomorrow. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the deliberations of the Committee to Mr. Speaker and asked leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have one more change on the Coittee for Economic Development. We'd like to substitute the name of Mr. Steen from Crescentwood for Mr. Orchard from Pembina. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honmurable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. (Tuesday)