

*Adjournment Debate*

of work while they are paying Air Canada employees between \$2 and \$4. I ask the minister to explain that to me.

I have another account submitted for contracting work out dated May 7 in the amount of \$5,937. What is going on? Here is another one, May 18, from Accountemps in Vancouver for \$8,382. This is for work contracted out while Air Canada's employees in Winnipeg are sitting in the office doing nothing.

I have another one dated May 7 for \$5,268, Accountemps in Vancouver. Air Canada is also contracting work out in Montreal and Toronto. I have another one from Accountemps in Vancouver for \$4,989. I only have part of this. I have another one dated May 28 for \$5,547. Again Air Canada is contracting work out while its employees sit and do nothing. And they are going to ask for a fare increase, Mr. Speaker. Over my dead body will they get a fare increase. I have another one for \$3,429 dated May 29, 1976.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has now expired.

**Mr. Arthur Portelance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, Air Canada has no intention, plan or proposal to move the airline's finance branch out of Winnipeg. On the contrary, it has emphatically insisted on a number of occasions that the finance branch would remain in Winnipeg. There is no question on the part of Air Canada management that this important financial section, which includes the accounting and related offices, would be moved from that city. Charges that Air Canada is considering moving this facility from Winnipeg are both inaccurate and unfounded.

The airline's current negotiations with members of the Canadian Airlines Employees Association regarding clerical workers in Winnipeg are proceeding and Air Canada remains hopeful of a settlement.

I can only repeat the assurance which the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) gave to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie) on April 13, 1976. At that time the minister stated clearly that Air Canada had no intention of phasing out the finance branch in Winnipeg. As far as the other part of the hon. member's question is concerned, I am sure the minister will be glad to look into it.

MANPOWER—LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM—REQUEST FOR  
DECISION ON EXTENSION OF PROJECTS

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I want to debate my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) in the House today, and one usually has to wait a couple of months, not with the idea of criticizing but merely in order to try to substantiate what I feel is a reasonable request that is, to establish a basic consideration for providing some form of flexibility in the determination of achieving the benefits of last year's Local Initiatives Program.

While I am sure the problem is national in scope, it arises in respect of some projects under last year's program which could not be completed within the required deadline

[Mr. McKenzie.]

of June 26. The reason is that several programs started late due to weather conditions.

In the particular case to which I refer there were three projects that had to start late, not only because of weather conditions but, more important, due to the fact that they were approved as a result of my district being provided additional funds after the original projects were approved, for which I happen to be very thankful to the minister.

There is no question of the need for additional funding, but only the need for an extension of the time to complete the projects, which is justifiable for the reasons I have mentioned that is, weather conditions, and the late start on the projects for the other justifiable reasons I also mentioned.

What is difficult for me to understand is the source of the reason for hesitation and why the minister could not give me an assurance today that the projects could be extended, particularly when he indicated his promise or his commitment not only to provide new job creation programs as a result of the predicted savings by extending the qualifying work period for unemployment insurance benefits from eight to 12 weeks, but also his commitment to augment the regular manpower budget by \$40 million in institutional and industrial training, an extra \$2 million for expanding the mobility budget, and an enrichment of job funding and placement services involving an additional 150 staff in Manpower centres.

Finally, there is the \$100 million job creation program which, indeed, is a repeat of the \$135 million LIP announced last year but which was cut back by \$35 million under the restraint program. Taking this into consideration it is impossible for me to understand why the minister, without hesitation, cannot extend the projects under last year's LIP program, because the funds are already allocated, the personnel are on the job, and if the extension is not approved this would put employees back on the unemployment insurance rolls, without even mentioning the unnecessary workload that would ensue.

Further, the situation is hypocritical when the remaining funds would have to be returned to the Treasury Board, with no advantage to anyone, to say nothing of the loss of jobs and the additional costs that would be created.

I might say that I know where the dilemma lies that the minister is facing, and that is with the Treasury Board. I am sure the Treasury Board is demanding that Manpower live within the terms of reference laid down under the criteria of the Manpower LIP as advanced by the minister, and so I cannot blame the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. I express concern about the lack of common sense on the part of Treasury Board which has no consideration for the facts of life as they exist, and takes such a ridiculous attitude towards realism.

● (2220)

I can only ask the minister to take a look at the problem more realistically and demand that Treasury Board show more humaneness and common sense in respect of the approval of extensions of time for these LIP projects which cannot be completed in the required time through no fault of the sponsors of the project; and at the same time fulfil the objectives of the LIP program to provide the opportunity for initiative and to provide jobs in the areas