

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Monday, 24 March, 1980

Time: 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): Call the committee to order. We're on 9.(b)(1). The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think in regards to licencing when a person loses his licence, his privileges, and has a restricted licence. Now I know that this was probably a previous Minister, maybe a Minister at the time when we were in government, I'm not sure if the Minister could explain how much flexibility is there in the . . . We have a case in our area where a fellow was charged three times, I think it was, for impaired driving.

MR. ORCHARD: How long ago Pete; how many years; what time span?

MR. ADAM: Well it was prior to 1977. And the last time his licence was suspended for five years. Now the member has got a restricted licence now for driving a big semitrailer, working for a transportation company, and he has been two years without - he's obviously solved his drinking problem entirely and he has been two years now with a very good record. There seems to be no flexibility there. I'm just wondering whether or not, does the registrar . . . He tried to have his case reviewed and he was refused. They would not consider his application for a reduction in the five-year suspension.

MR. ORCHARD: The five-year suspension is a statutory suspension which you only get if you have incurred two, I believe it is, two criminal code offences for driving while impaired within a five-year period. This chap would have had, as you say, three, eh?

MR. ADAM: Well, I think that would be prior to that . . .

MR. ORCHARD: And that suspension is statutory and there are no appeals to that. He's gone as far as he can go in that he's got a working permit that allows him to continue gainful employment as a truck driver. But in terms of getting driving privileges reinstated to the extent that he could operate his private car, that's not possible with a five-year suspension, as I understand it.

MR. ADAM: Yes, you know, the problem is there that if a person is, say, living 20 miles from his work or even less, how can he get to his work? Say, he lives five, ten miles out of town?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, has this chap got a conditional licence to drive to and from his place of employment?

MR. ADAM: I am not sure on that specific point, whether he can drive or not to his place of employment. I just brought that up as an example. There should be some flexibility, in my opinion, because if this fellow obtained a medical certificate from his doctor that he no longer has a drinking problem, it seems to me that his case should be able to be reviewed again on the basis of the past two years of - you know, the man was sick; an alcoholic is a disease, it is a sickness, and once you are cured of that disease - the way we are looking at it now is that there is a minimum of five years before you are cured of an alcoholic, that is what we are looking at. I think that there are some cases here that there should be some flexibility where you can look at it, where they can be reviewed again.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

I am not saying that he can obtain his full driving privileges; I am saying that there should be some mechanism that the man can plead his case if he has supporting evidence from doctors to show that he is no longer having a drinking problem. By the way, he can drive with a big semi to wherever he wants to go, and, you know, he is not supposed to but he could. I would wish that was looked at.

Another instance is a similar case where a person loses his driving privileges and when he comes to reapply for a licence he has to take a driver's test and there are some people that have problems with literacy; they are unable to read, but because of this they are discriminated against. There is no way that they can come in and take the test. They are just afraid to go because they have to take an oral test, a written test, and they are unable to do it.

I know we go down the highway, we go down the streets, you see all kinds of signs now of when to walk, they don't even put walk, they put a little man walking across, they show little pictures now. They don't say, Deer Crossing the Road, they put a picture of a deer going across a highway where there is. . . --(Interjection)-- Well, the members are laughing but you know if he couldn't read and he was in that kind of a situation, he wouldn't be laughing. He would be laughing on the other side of this mouth or the other side of his face because there are people, and there are a lot of people, that are unable to go back and get a licence, not because of their own fault, it is because they didn't have the opportunity to go to school, as probably the Member for Portage has or the Member for Arthur. You know, if they care to laugh at people who have not had the same opportunity as they have had, well that is their prerogative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I don't think they were laughing at anybody. They were making a comment from the side and I think the Member for Ste. Rose has some valid points, but he is getting down into individual cases. If he wants to plead an individual case, he knows very well he can go to the Minister or go to the Motor Vehicle Branch and plead that case, and I don't think this is a forum to plead individual cases. If he wants to generalize on the suspension of driver's licence I think that is fine and dandy, because there are some grey areas and I agree with him on certain points but I don't think he should get into individual cases and make a point of criticizing the members on this side for laughing at him, because they weren't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not sure the Member for Minnedosa has a point of order, but I would direct all members if their remarks would be directed to the Chair we would cut down some of this back and forth chatter.

MR. ADAM: Well, I was speaking to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, you weren't. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was talking with . . .

MR. ADAM: Well, I could hear this laughter in the background when I brought up a certain case . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: . . . where people have difficulty writing these tests or going in and taking this test, and I am just wondering if there isn't some other way that these people can take the test, because they are completely barred from going and taking this test because they are illiterate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are oral driver's tests available for people who are not conversant or read well enough.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. ADAM: Yes, I would like to ask the Minister on the licensing plans for reciprocity of licensing, also the expanded dealer plates, could the Minister give us some particulars on what is happening?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the reciprocity, it was agreed at the First Ministers' Conference that they attempt to reduce unnecessary regulation and over-regulation wherever possible, and the trucking industry was chosen as one industry which could very well fit the bill, because we have ten provincial jurisdictions plus two territorial jurisdictions, all of whom may have somewhat different regulations in terms of such things as vehicle length, etc., etc., weights and what not.

They also have a number of different licensing agreements across the country. The idea in developing a uniform licensing system is an effort to make the trucking industry less subject to some of the dual licensing; for instance, to free up the use and availability of the trucking industry's equipment for use in jurisdictions in which they are licensed to carry on the business of freighting. We have, on a tentative basis, agreed amongst the ten provincial provinces and the two territories to meet in September of this year to discuss the implementation of a Canada-wide reciprocity agreement involving all ten provinces and the two territories, and that reciprocity agreement will be basis what they call a mileage pro-rate system to establish the distribution of licensing fees to jurisdictions through which a trucking firm may operate.

MR. ADAM: I thank the Minister for his answer and his explanation on my first question. The second question that I had posed to him was the matter of dealer plates, expanded use of dealer plates; could the Minister give us a clarification on what's happening there?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, under the dealer plate, as it existed, they could only use the dealer plate for the actual test driving of a vehicle for the purpose of demonstration for sale and that was causing some difficulties. For instance, if one of the salesmen, per chance, went out and picked up. . . Let's say he went to a potential customer's home to pick that person up to give them a test drive and he was involved in an accident on the way to that person's home, you are running into a grey area as to whether the driver wasn't, in fact, covered and had a legally licensed and insured vehicle. So, basically, some of the changes that were made to the dealer plates was to allow a little more flexibility in the use of dealer plates in the auto dealerships to allow the use of those vehicles by salesmen to pick up customers, etc., etc.

MR. ADAM: The matter of licensing, I believe it comes under this department, dealer licenses, does that come under the same?

A MEMBER: Yes.

MR. ADAM: The raising of the bonding rates has been increased and I believe it has caused some problems for some dealers, some of the smaller dealers.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, basically, the dealer bond, I believe, was at \$5,000 and that dealer bond has been increased to \$15,000, and there are some pretty persuasive arguments for having it increased, particularly when you take into consideration the value of today's automobiles. It doesn't take too much of an automobile . . . As a matter of fact, there are very few, I suppose, new automobiles that are worth less than \$5,000, so a \$5,000 bond was, by and large, ineffectual in dealing with new car sales. The used car is, of course, a different story. You've got a whole range of values there. So that was one of the reasons for increasing the bond from \$5,000 to \$15,000, was in an effort to provide a little more per vehicle coverage, plus take in the possible situation of a multiple claim against the dealership, where \$5,000 would probably not cover one, let alone if there were two or three claims. And at the same time, the salesman bond was dropped. It was, I think, \$1,000 and it was dropped because a \$1,000 bond has never been claimed on, No. (1) and No. (2) was a lot of trouble to get the bond for \$1,000 and if there was a claim it probably wouldn't cover the value of the claim if it was over \$1,000.00.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. ADAM: Does the Minister have how many numbers of dealers had to go out because of this, to close?

MR. ORCHARD: We are not aware of any dealerships that had to close.

MR. ADAM: I'm referring to dealers who sell trailers primarily. There could be an exception here. For an automotive dealer, that's a different thing. You know if you sell one car it's almost \$10,000 or going close to it anyway. But I'm referring to the fellow that sells trailers, not mobile trailers, not the house trailers that have their own motors, I'm referring to a pull-type trailer. There's a dealer in our town that had to relinquish his dealership because of this change. He is no longer in business. So he's been put out of business with this particular change. Probably selling trailers that were worth maybe \$1,500 and a couple of thousand dollars a piece, to load horses, these ponys that they haul around, that kind of a trailer, but he's been put out of business because of this change and it seems to me that there could have been some exceptions made here for this kind of a dealership. As a result of the increase from \$5,000 to \$15,000 he wasn't able to swing the bonding requirements or whatever it was and so he just went out of business.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the unfortunate circumstances that the Member for Ste. Rose has brought to the committee's attention tonight but the difference in bonding costs between \$5,000 and \$15,000 is a little over \$100 and it hasn't been a major impediment to anybody that we have heard from to date.

MR. ADAM: It's not the \$100 that's the difficulty. It's to get the endorsement for \$15,000; that's the problem. It's not the fee. The fee is not a deterrent; it's that the man has to be worth \$15,000 in order to be able to get bonded to \$15,000.00. He has to have enough assets to cover.

MR. ORCHARD: In other words, Mr. Chairman, this particular gentleman's problem was not in coming up with the \$100 additional cost for the bond, it was in fact getting a company to write out a bond on him, increasing it from \$5,000 to \$15,000.00.

MR. ADAM: That's right. That's where the problem is and it's unfortunate that a fellow was put out of business because of this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Dauphin.

MR. JIM GALBRAITH: Mr. Chairman, I've just got one comment to make and the Minister covered it pretty well already. It's dealing with interprovincial licencing of trucks and semitrailer trucks. It's been brought to my attention in the Dauphin area that there are many trucks and truckers, some from Manitoba and some from Saskatchewan, hauling hay out of the Dauphin area to Saskatchewan. Apparently, they can haul a much higher load and a much wider load in Saskatchewan than they can in Manitoba and it sort of creates a few problems for them and I'm only too pleased to hear you say that you are working on these interprovincial regulations regarding loads and such, and I'm only too pleased to hear you say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: I note that, or at least according to my files and checking the clerk's office, the latest Annual Report of the Department of Highways which we have - and when I say which we have I'm referring to the one that was tabled or that ought to be tabled in the House under the provisions of the appropriate legislation - was for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978. I believe that legislation does call for the Minister to table the Annual Report within the first 15 days after the House goes into Session. Could the Minister indicate when he is prepared to table the most recent Annual Report, and that will be for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, which certainly would assist us in completing our consideration of the Estimates?

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Well it should be printed. We had a small difficulty with the printer which delayed its introduction to the House beyond the statutory 15-day requirement.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It is now approaching 30 days, which is much beyond 15 days, so perhaps we ought to defer the completion of the consideration of the Estimates until such time as we do have the Annual Report before us. Because I really do think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be of assistance to us if we had a report indicating the work which the department had done, which I take it is what the report is all about because from reading the letter from the Deputy to the Minister, it contains the traditional, statistical, and descriptive summaries of highway construction, maintenance, and operation as well as the Motor Vehicle Branch activities and the Highway Traffic Board, etc. It may assist the committee in dealing with the Estimates in a more effective manner than we can now by not having the report for the last fiscal year. Could the Minister indicate when he expects to table the report?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the report was to be ready on I believe it was the 21st, and it just has not arrived yet.

MR. HANUSCHAK: On the 21st, that was Friday. The Minister still hasn't answered my question. When does the Minister expect to table the report?

MR. ORCHARD: They haven't advised as to how many more days it's going to take. They're scheduling indicated that the 21st was an approximate delivery date.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the 21st went by. I appreciate the fact that the 22nd and 23rd were not working days but today certainly was. Now surely the Minister would have found time to inquire into the date when the report will be available. The House didn't go into Session until 2:30 this afternoon. Can we expect the report tomorrow?

MR. ORCHARD: Possibly.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Possibly. Well perhaps after the report is tabled tomorrow, that would give us some indication as to the manner in which we ought to proceed with the Estimates. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Recreation, Fitness and Sport.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess before I speak I have to declare I have a certain vested interest in the topic that the Member for Ste. Rose raised in that I've been an automobile dealer and the last time I checked, about a month ago, I still was, giving the time constraints of course all the members appreciate we have to put into this particular job.

However, let me say that I would like to just say that the changes made with regard to the dealer bonding as well as the dealer licencing are one which I believe are very positive, not only to the dealers that are involved, but also to the consumers. In this day and age when we are looking at automobiles costing a substantial amount of money, and I am talking now about not only cars or pleasure vehicles, I am talking about trucks and other things that can be bought by the consuming public, by the farm population. Very often we approach figures far exceeding the \$15,000 limit.

The other thing that the members of the Committee should realize is that there are such things happening as conversions going on right now, which means that the dealer is responsible for insuring that that particular item that he or she is selling is clear and free of liens and encumbrances, and \$5,000 wasn't nearly adequate to meet that particular responsibility. So I am glad to see that the Minister has moved in that direction.

The other thing is that there was such a wide opinion and wide problem dealing with the use of dealer plates that really the authorities under many of the

Monday, 24 March, 1980

circumstances really didn't know where they were at with regard to trying to administrate that particular section of the Act and the rules and regulations under which it was governed.

So I think that both of these moves are pretty positive moves. I think you will find that the consumer is going to be well protected in this particular instance. The motoring public will and I think it will serve to cut a little bit of the red tape and hopefully reflect on some of the benefits that the dealers will have and pass on to the consuming public in both consumer protection and decrease in the cost of doing business. The regulations are pretty onerous with the old dealer's plates, I think it is a pretty positive move and I want to express the appreciation of the constituency that I represent, basically Steinbach and the automobile city, for the moves that they have made with regard to that particular aspect of the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(b)(1) - the Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just on this matter of bonding, I think that is the type of thing that has some good news and some bad news attached to it. I think it is important for the protection of the consumer that there be something like that and in probably more substantial amounts than there are at present. On the other hand, I have frequently had complaints from small business people, who are just getting into business, who may well have assets but they don't have necessarily a track record in that particular business, who have a great deal of difficulty in getting bonding. They spend an awful lot of time trying to get it. In the province of Saskatchewan, for instance, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Corporation is involved in giving out bonds and I would certainly hope that in this province we could consider having the MPIC or some other public corporation get involved in there to alleviate that problem, because I certainly know of specific instances where people were unable to get into businesses because they were unable to obtain those bonds and I see that as being somewhat unfortunate.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, if I might respond to the Member for Rossmere. I am informed that MPIC in fact does offer bonding in the province.

MR. SCHROEDER: When did they start that?

MR. ORCHARD: I am not certain of the date on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to follow up the point that my colleague from Burrows had raised having to do with the Annual Report of the Department, and I think the Minister was a bit flippant with my colleague, really didn't give very much of an explanation and just said that a report will come some time, perhaps tomorrow. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that he owes us a more thorough explanation of the delay involved. After all the Minister is responsible for The Highways Department Act and probably a lot of other Acts as well, and it is a requirement of The Highways Department Act that the Minister shall within 15 days of the commencement of each session table the Annual Report. Now the Minister is clearly in breach of his own Act and perhaps we should ask him what disciplinary action he intends to take against himself and those responsible for not producing the report.

So I would ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, through you, to give us a much fuller explanation of why this situation has come to pass and why the Minister allowed us to proceed with the consideration of his Estimates without having this very important document before us?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we had the report, the Annual Report, ready for printing prior to the Session, not too much prior to the Session but nevertheless prior to the Session, and we put out a tender, basis delivery within 15 days of the opening of the Session, and we got no takers on the tender when we offered that kind of a time limit, no one would guarantee delivery by that time,

Monday, 24 March, 1980

and as a consequence we had to take a tender with a somewhat later delivery date. That is an unfortunate situation and I can do none other than to apologize to the House for the delay in having that Report tabled.

MR. WALDING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't whether the House will accept the Minister's apology, but he is still a little bit vague as to the actual details of this printing. He said that it was ready prior to the opening of the House, which as I recall was on the 21st of February. When did he in fact put it out to tender? How much time did he give various printing firms? Perhaps he can explain to us how he did go about getting it printed and how the printer was selected, and whether any time limit was given to the printer or any delivery date promised by the printer?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned we indicated that we needed the Annual Report within 15 days of the opening of the Session, which would put it approximately, if my mathematics serve me correctly, about the 2nd or the 3rd of March and no one tendered on the basis of that tight a delivery schedule.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is continuing to be evasive. When did he in fact put it out to tender and what was the date of the close of the tender?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, the 15 days, I stand corrected. It wouldn't have been the 2nd or 3rd, it would have been somewhere around the 10 to the 15th, because you only consider, as I understand it, working days in calculating your 15-day lead time. We did not receive a tender on whatever the closing date would be basis calculation of 15 working days. In getting our tender and our printing accepted we had to accept a later delivery date, and as I say, you know, that is unfortunate.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, let me try the questions one at a time if it's a little too complicated for the Minister to grasp when I ask two questions at the same time. Can the Minister tell me the date of the close of tenders?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the department didn't do the actual tendering. The Queen's Printer is the group that arranges the printing of annual reports.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister explain or give a date to the committee as to when the material was sent to the Queen's Printer?

MR. ORCHARD: We haven't got that date here but it's available.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister indicate whether it was recently, like in February or perhaps January, or was it a matter of perhaps more months ago than that?

MR. ORCHARD: The deputy thinks it's somewhere towards the end of January, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister whether it is standard practice for the Queen's Printer to put annual reports out for tender or whether there was an instruction from the Minister to tender the printing of this document?

MR. ORCHARD: Well I can't answer as to what is standard practice for the Queen's Printer but there were no instructions from myself to tender it out.

MR. WALDING: So as far as the Minister is concerned, the Queen's Printer could have printed it himself.

MR. ORCHARD: Well I had no objection as to who printed it, no.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister inform the committee as to the tendering procedures by the Queen's Printer when it comes to the Department of Highways Annual Report?

MR. ORCHARD: No, I don't have any details on their tendering methods, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Did the Minister receive from the Queen's Printer a delivery date for the annual report?

MR. ORCHARD: I didn't, but possibly my department did. That I can't answer for you.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, since the Minister has some of his senior staff with him perhaps he would be good enough to inquire as to whether that in fact happened?

MR. ORCHARD: As I indicated the expected delivery date was the 21st which is now past without delivery.

MR. WALDING: I presume them, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister or one of his senior staff would have approached the Queen's Printer immediately that deadline was passed and ask for an explanation, a new promise as to the delivery date.

MR. ORCHARD: That was not something that had taken place today, it was something that we were going to do tomorrow morning.

MR. WALDING: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems it's rather a slap-happy approach to this very important document. Does the Minister not care that the committee is sitting to consider his estimates for the new year without receipt of the Department of Highways Annual Report. Surely the Minister knows, or was advised, that within 15 days of the Opening of the House he was required to table such a report and in fact did not do so; and neither he nor his senior staff apparently contacted the Queen's Printer to find out the reason for the delay or even the new expected delivery date so that he could give an explanation and an apology to the House for his delinquent behaviour.

MR. ORCHARD: Well I think that question is quite well put.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, to assist the committee I would like to offer the Minister a suggestion. I'm sure that the Minister must have one or more draft copies of the annual report, a copy of which went to the Queen's Printer, and perhaps to assist us the Minister could send someone down to his office and bring at least two copies, one for the government side of the committee and one for the opposition and any other copies that he may have. Or if --(Interjection)-- Yes, that I said and any other copies that he may have, yes, yes. And if he hasn't that there's a photostat machine just down the hall and I'm sure that within a matter of minutes, the report is roughly about 200 pages, it wouldn't take him any more than 15, 20 minutes to photostat two or three copies of the report for the committee's use.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, that would be a rather difficult order to fill at this time of the day.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe that the door to the photostat room is open and I'm sure the Minister has a key to his own office and he could get a copy of the report from there which I'm sure he has, he must.

MR. ORCHARD: No, I don't have a copy in my office, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry, I didn't quite hear the Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: I don't have a draft copy in my office, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The Minister does not have a draft copy of his own report. That I find difficult to believe because if the report is following the same format of previous ones, the Highways Department Annual Report on Page II, has a photograph of the Minister - whether that's an essential part of the report or not I don't know, and then a message from the Minister, so it's his report. I'm very much surprised that he doesn't have a copy of a report for which he takes responsibility for writing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Johns was trying to . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, just a point raised by the Member for Burrows, it is really not conceivable that the Department of Highways wouldn't have one copy of the report, more than the one which was sent out to be printed. I think the suggestion by the Member for Burrows is pretty good. There must be an additional copy and if that could be laid on the table then at least anything that would benefit even for one day a review of it would be an indication of co-operation. I'm wondering whether there isn't available somewhere one copy that's not being used of the report which was sent for publication.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have one copy coming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(b)(1). The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, there was just one question that I omitted to ask and that was when the Minister first received the draft copy of the annual report.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it was in the end of January or thereabouts.

MR. WALDING: One further question, Mr. Chairman, why does it take approximately nine months to put together the annual report for the department?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, with the department we do all our work in-House and it takes a certain amount of time for each division in the department to make their contribution to the annual report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Does the Minister have a deadline for the receipt of these reports from various departments and can he tell us how many staff there are working on consolidating those reports into one annual report of the department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, there's no additional staff which is deployed in the department specifically to the drafting of the annual report. As I say, staff within each division does the drafting and draws up the report as pertinent to their particular department, or function within the department.

MR. WALDING: The other question I ask then, Mr. Chairman, is there a certain date set for receipt of those differing reports from differing sections of the Minister's department?

MR. ORCHARD: We usually target for about a month before the House sits to have the rough draft ready for print.

MR. WALDING: I ask the Minister then if he thinks that is not overly generous with time, from the Minister's point of view. He's speaking of something like ten months from the end of the previous fiscal year to having this draft material ready for his department, and by his own statement it is then ready in different sections. Presumably, there is some layout or editing work to be done by someone or some people in his department.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, in terms of drawing up an annual report, a lot of the accurate and statistical information is not available until June and sometimes on into July, which does reduce the amount of available time by a couple or three months, I would suppose

MR. WALDING: Well, given that there is a delay until perhaps June or July, as the Minister says, in gathering some statistical information, that still leaves six months to write it into a report from that particular section. Would it not make more sense, particularly in view of the fact that members of the Opposition would be waiting impatiently for such a report, to put an earlier deadline on it, perhaps October or November time, so that the Minister could get it to the Queen's printer with or without instructions for tendering and make sure that he had it back even before the opening of the session, which is, in itself, an indeterminate time, Mr. Chairman, because as you know and the Minister knows, it's the prerogative of the Premier to set such a date. And for the Minister to say a date such as some time in January or the end of January, not knowing when the Session is open, is to risk what has in fact happened here, not having the material ready for the opening of the Session, or within fifteen days of the Session.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, certainly, in view of the circumstances this year, an earlier deadline date is not only desirable but necessary.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(b)(1)--pass; 9.(b)(2) - the Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give us a breakdown of the estimated actual for the year ending March 31, 1980 for this item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: The requested vote is \$1,994,000, which is a decrease of \$1,174,000.00. The decrease is attributable to five basic areas. We have budgeted for an increase of \$39,700 in provision for payments of the driver licensing agents' commissions on a monthly basis, rather than the agents retaining the commissions as at present. We have a reduction of \$28,000, which last year was a non-recurring cost in purchasing microfilm equipment. We have an increase of \$117,000 caused by an increase in the number of commissionable transactions by the vehicle registration agents. That's to do with a normal increase in the number of vehicles registered, plus the fact that now commercial truck and trailer registrations are able to be given by MPIC agents in rural Manitoba. So we have a new category of registration functions which now has to be funded by flat fees, so that accounts for a fairly good portion of the \$117,000 increase. We have budgeted for a reduction of the fee paid to MPIC for administration of vehicle registration system of \$1,384,700.00. That, in accordance with the 55-45 cost-sharing, and then we have an \$82,000 increase as a provision for general cost increases. All of those increases and decreases give us a net decrease in this appropriation over voted 1979-1980 by \$1,174,000.00.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, you'll realize that was not an answer to my question at all. I asked the Minister for a breakdown of the estimated actual for the year ending March 31, 1980.

MR. ORCHARD: The estimated actual expenditure is \$3,153,000.00.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, to abbreviate the next answer, would the Minister say that the answer he gave to the question which I didn't ask, just before this last one, was related to the Estimates for that last year or to the Actuals for last year? --(Interjection)-- Well, no, even that doesn't answer it; when he says there is an increase or a decrease we still don't know the breakdown of the Actual for the last year. That is the question I asked: Not the total but the breakdown of the estimated Actual.

MR. ORCHARD: Those figures that I have gave him in answer to the question that he did not ask are in comparison to the voted amounts last year.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I do understand that. The reason I thought I would have to ask for a more extensive breakdown is that what was voted last year was \$3,168,000.00. I am asking the Minister for a breakdown of the amount spent, which is \$3,153,000.00. It can't be very lengthy.

MR. ORCHARD: There is a number of categories: Fees for Audit - \$2.8 thousand; MPIC Agents Commission - \$863.5 . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: How much?

MR. ORCHARD: \$863.5 thousand; MPIC Administration Fee - \$1,770,000; Postage - \$36.4 thousand; Private Mileage - \$418.8 thousand; Insurance Reimbursement - \$1.5 thousand; Publications - \$.1 thousand; Financial Costs for Writeoffs - \$29 thousand; Freight - \$2.6 thousand; Travel Expenses - \$14 thousand; Real Estate - \$.5 thousand; and a reduction in Registration Plates and Stickers of \$123 thousand; as well as \$142.4 thousand which is a number of items involving the Driver Licence Issuing Costs, which range from fees to agent commissions, to postage, to private mileage, to advertising, to publications, etc.

MR. CHERNIACK: Two items mentioned, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I got them down clearly but I think the Minister said MPIC Commission - \$863,000.00. If he said that, could he explain the nature of that expenditure?

MR. ORCHARD: Those are the flat fees paid to MPIC agents for the registration of vehicles on behalf of the Motor Vehicle Branch.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is that the 60 cents or the \$1.20 that he was referring to earlier?

MR. ORCHARD: That is the \$1.20.

MR. CHERNIACK: \$1.20 - that means that there was some 700,000 vehicles registered?

MR. ORCHARD: That would be an incorrect calculation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could the Minister give me a correct one, please? I said, could the Minister please correct it for me?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, there are certain functions which are paid out at a \$1.20 per registration transaction; however, we have other transactions, which, if my memory serves me correctly, are worth only 70 cents per transaction, such as snowmobile registrations.

MR. CHERNIACK: So, Mr. Chairman, that then means there were more than 700,000 vehicles registered. Is there that many in Manitoba? Over 700,000.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, when you have some of the 70-cent payouts in flat fee commissions that would reduce from the 863.5.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I thought I heard the Minister say it is \$1.20 per registration, \$863,000.00. I divided 12 into 86 and I got something over 7, and I just assumed that meant 700,000 registrations or more than that. Now the Minister says that some of these were 70 cent registrations; that means that there would be even more than I thought there would be because the 70 cent ones would add on more registrations. Now where is the arithmetic contradiction?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, 70 cent registration of snowmobiles would not add more registrations of motor vehicles.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, how many vehicles were registered last year?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, 863.5 are the flat fee commissions paid, but in the instance where a person mails in his registration directly to Autopac and does not go through an agent there is no flat fee paid, so one cannot correlate the 863,000 with the total number of vehicles registered in the province.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it would be helpful if we could get answers to our questions. It would save a lot of time. My question was pretty clear. I asked how many registrations were there last year.

MR. ORCHARD: 712,000, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for giving me that answer.

One other item he referred to was, I think, Private Mileage - \$418 thousand. I think that is what I wrote down. If that is what I wrote down, could he explain it?

MR. ORCHARD: Private Mileage - \$1.5 thousand.

MR. CHERNIACK: Pardon?

MR. ORCHARD: Private Mileage - \$1.5 thousand.

MR. CHERNIACK: Something like that, I should think. What is that item?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, I would assume that that is mileage paid to personnel who have used their own vehicles in carrying out government business.

MR. CHERNIACK: Did the Minister give me an item of \$418 thousand or is it that I didn't hear it properly?

MR. ORCHARD: I gave you a figure of \$418.8 thousand for Plates and Stickers.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program comes under this item or if not, which one?

MR. ORCHARD: Under Item (c), Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister whether he now has a draft copy of his Annual Report for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31st, 1979?

MR. ORCHARD: It is being delivered, Sir.

MR. CLERK: The answer is yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(b)(1)--pass. 9.(b)(2), I'm sorry.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, this might be an appropriate point for the Committee to rise to give it an opportunity to study the Minister's Report.

MOTION presented and defeated.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(b)(2)--pass; 9.(c)(1)--pass - the Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if the Minister can give us some indication of the need for compulsory seat belt legislation, based on statistics which the department may have available.

MR. ORCHARD: There are indications that seat belt legislation has been effective in reducing injuries in certain jurisdictions that have undertaken the compulsory use of seat belts. However, it appears as if some of the statistics that are being presented may be somewhat confused in their validity in that the speed limits were also dropped in and around the same time that compulsory seat belt legislation was introduced. As we see from statistics in the U.S. where the speed limits were reduced, they had very similar reduction in accident rates as to what we experienced in jurisdictions where seat belt legislation was introduced.

MR. CHERNIACK: What jurisdictions in Canada have compulsory seat belt legislation?

MR. ORCHARD: I believe there are four: B.C., Saskatchewan, Ontario and Quebec.

MR. CHERNIACK: And do any of those have lower speed limits than we have on our highways?

MR. ORCHARD: I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, assuming they have not, then the Minister indicates that their better safety record, better than Manitoba's, may be attributable as it is to United States jurisdictions where there is no compulsory seat belt legislation but where there is reduced speed limits. Is that the correct interpretation of what the Minister said?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want the Member for St. Johns to leave the impression that Manitoba is an unsafe place to drive, because Manitoba enjoys the second lowest accident rate in Canada, second only to Ontario.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I certainly did not intend to leave such an impresssion. I just want to understand whether it is suggested that reduced speed limits, with or without compulsory seat belts, create a better driving safety record on the highways. Is that what the Minister said earlier?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, what I indicated earlier is that in jurisdictions in the U.S. where the speed limit was dropped, their accident record and injury record reduced dramatically without having compulsory seat belt legislation. In some of the jurisdictions in Canada for which statistics are available they experienced, with compulsory seat belt legislation, at the same time or about the same time that speed limits were dropped, a reduction in accidents and injuries. It is difficult when you have the two things operating at the same time to determine what the by itself or isolated effect of the seat belt legislation was in comparison to the isolation effect of lowering the speed limit.

MR. CHERNIACK: But, Mr. Chairman, in the four Canadian jurisdictions where the Minister is not aware of any speed limits that are lower than Manitoba's, there was apparently an improvement in the safety record, regardless of the fact that the speed limit was lower, but attributable then to the one factor and that is compulsory seat belts. Is that not correct?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I was discussing with my Assistant Deputy and I missed the Member for St. Johns' point there.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, the impression I'm getting from what the Minister said was that in United States there was both a reduction in speed limit and compulsory seat belts in certain jurisdictions and there was an improved safety record. In Canada there are . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, to correct the Member for St. Johns, in jurisdictions where only the speed limit was dropped without compulsory seat belt legislation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Then, as I understood it, in the four provinces of Canada where there was no reduction in speed limit but there was an introduction of compulsory seat belts, there was an increase in the safety record. Is that a correct statement?

MR. ORCHARD: In Ontario and B.C. they had their compulsory seat belt legislation introduced at approximately the same time that they lowered their speed limits in converting to the metric, metrification of the highways, and yes, they did enjoy a reduction in accidents and injuries. But when two events happened at the same time it's difficult to isolate the statistical impact of one event in isolation.

MR. CHERNIACK: How about the other two provinces?

MR. ORCHARD: I'm informed that in the case of Saskatchewan, they attributed a reduction in injuries and accidents solely to the introduction of compulsory seat belts. We don't have information as to the province of Quebec.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well now, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we have dropped the speed limit in Manitoba due to metrification. Can we assume that there was an improved safety factor as a result thereof?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we did have a reduction in fatalities of 8.1 percent and a reduction in injuries of 2.3 percent.

MR. CHERNIACK: So we now know that there has been an improvement which may be attributable to the reduced speed limits, since that is the only factor of change. If we tie that with an introduction of compulsory seat belt legislation then can we assume there would be a further improvement in the safety records?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, that might be a fair assumption to make. And I say "might" because we only have one jurisdiction in Canada with similar driving conditions in which we can make a reasonably good comparison and, even there, their before and after statistics are possibly not the most beneficial, but that may be a conclusion that you could come to.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is the Minister prepared at this Session to introduce compulsory seat belt legislation?

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, moving to compulsory helmets for motorcycles, does the Minister have any statistics to present to us in that connection?

MR. ORCHARD: No, I don't have any statistics on compulsory helmets.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister may not have but does the Department not have statistics to indicate the advisability, or otherwise, of compulsory use of helmets?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Motor Vehicle Branch has that but we don't have that information with us.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I honestly don't know one who knows more about safety measures than Mr. Dygala, who is in this room, and I'm just wondering whether the Minister could not learn enough from him to inform us about the results of investigations on the compulsory use of helmets without using specific statistics?

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: My Assistant Deputy informs me that in the States and in provincial jurisdictions where compulsory helmet legislation has been introduced there has been a reduction in fatalities.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister stepped up his informational program to encourage voluntary use of seat belts and voluntary use of helmets, and to what extent in dollars is he asking for more money for that kind of a program?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, there is no provision for a stepped up wear the seat belt campaign in these Estimates.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if there is an indication that it is logical that there should be an improvement in safety statistics because of compulsory seat belts and recognizing, as I do, that there are certain arguments against the compulsory use of seat belts and recognizing, as we all do, that the government now does have a program to encourage the use of seat belts, I would like to suggest that the Minister should have a stepped up program, increased moneys for the very purpose of a strong campaign for voluntary use, in view of the fact that he doesn't want to make it compulsory and in view of the fact that he knows that it can't but be better to have that kind of a voluntary program.

I don't know just what item it should be in but I suspect it should be in this item that we are now discussing. I would like to know why it is that there is no attempt being made to increase the funds available to provide for that kind of very worthwhile program which does not carry with it the unattractive features of compulsion?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the member will recall approximately two years ago, I believe it was, the federal government undertook an extensive campaign nationally across all provincial jurisdictions to encourage the use of seat belts. You might recall the pumpkin ad. and the egg ad., etc. and apparently they monitored that program before and after quite well and did not find a statistically significant increase in the utilization of seat belts.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if you cannot, by some form of sales method which the free enterprise system has taught is so capable for selling products of a useless nature, if we cannot improve the safety records by encouraging voluntary use of seat belts, and by the same token voluntary use of helmets, then I marvel that the Minister without any justification rejects the thought of bringing in legislation for compulsory use of these safety features.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us how many vehicles have been tested for safety in the last year.

MR. ORCHARD: Last year, 39,000.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister tell us the reason for turn signals on motorcycles? Could he give us an overview of why this was required?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, since the 1975 model year the federal government has decreed that all motorcycles sold in Canada must be equipped with turn signals. Provincial enabling legislation was passed, I think a year and a half ago. It was not in sufficient time to forewarn the motorcycling public that turn signals were in fact required and implementation of that was delayed until this registration year.

MR. ADAM: Does the Minister have any statistics in regard to the safety features of the turn signals?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the turn signal legislation was proceeded with for signal identification at night because at night, of course, hand signals are not nearly as visible as they are in daytime.

MR. ADAM: The new regulation is going into effect on April 1st, I believe. Is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes.

MR. ADAM: The act does not show signal lights as being required; is a bill necessary?

MR. ORCHARD: The legislation is in place to require turn signals.

MR. ADAM: It is now in The Highways Act? This means that all those motorcycles that don't have turn signals will have to install them; is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: That's correct. Anything from 1975 on will have to have turn signals.

MR. ADAM: And those prior to 1975?

MR. ORCHARD: Since that wasn't under the blanket legislation passed by the federal government, we are in the process of developing an exemption for 1974 and prior model years.

MR. ADAM: That legislation is in process now?

MR. ORCHARD: That's correct.

MR. ADAM: For those vehicles prior to 1974?

MR. ORCHARD: That's correct.

MR. ADAM: The Minister is asking for \$300,000 more on this expenditure. I see there's two additional SMYs. Could the Minister explain why he requires the additional SMYs?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is one of these very successful safety programs. We have undertaken a snowmobile safety course in the wintertime and a bicycle safety program in the summertime, and the bicycle safety course has met with a great deal of success. We are expanding that bicycle safety training course this summer and that accounts for the additional SMYs.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister give us a breakdown on the increase in the \$300,000 or . . .

MR. ORCHARD: We have a portion of that in, of course, the salaries and wages, part of which is increased staff and part of it is general salary increase normal increments. In terms of the supplies and expenses, our major increase is increased fees to our driver education instructors throughout the province. That accounts for \$120,000 of the increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that 39,000 vehicles were tested in 1979. Is that increasing or planned to be increased this year?

MR. ORCHARD: That was about the same but we anticipate an increase this year, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, is it vehicles that are over five years old, I am trying to recall what the pattern of recall is for testing?

MR. ORCHARD: It was vehicles four years old last year.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. FILMON: Four years old and longer. Is there any intention to move that up into newer model vehicles? The reason I say that is that there are various things which the testing program tests that are not normally tested, such as headlight alignment and that sort of thing, that there is probably no other time at which that is tested on a person's vehicle and I think it serves a useful purpose.

MR. ORCHARD: We intend to increase the inspection notice for vehicles because it has been, by and large, quite a successful program.

MR. FILMON: Good. Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister about the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program and I suppose many of the answers to many of my questions would be in the report and had I had the opportunity to read it I wouldn't be wasting the Committee's time nor the Minister's time in asking the questions.

Can the Minister confirm that this program was in effect last year and is intended to continue in effect in the coming year, this year?

MR. ORCHARD: You are referring to the Vehicle Safety Inspection?

MR. WALDING: Pardon?

MR. ORCHARD: You are referring to the Vehicle Safety Inspector Program?

MR. WALDING: Yes, I believe in the previous report it was referred to as the Motor Vehicle Inspector Program. We are speaking of the same program, I take it?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister confirm that the program was in effect last year and will be in effect again this year?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister give me the figures for the number of vehicles tested last year and the anticipated number to be tested in the coming year?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, as indicated we tested about 39,000 vehicles last year and it is anticipated that we are targeting for an increase of 15,000 vehicles this year.

MR. WALDING: The Minister is expecting then about 54,000 vehicles this year?

MR. ORCHARD: That is correct.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister refresh my memory and tell me how many years the program has been in operation now?

MR. ORCHARD: Approximately nine years is my understanding.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister now if he can inform the Committee, approximately how many vehicles have been tested in those nine years?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we will have to provide that information for the Member for St. Vital.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, as I recall, when the program was first instituted that it was done so following claims that there were a certain number of unsafe vehicles on the road. There were pressures at the time for the annual testing of all vehicles and that this would cut down the number of accidents. In order to save the expense of testing all vehicles on an annual basis it was decided to test randomly selected vehicles over five years old and then to compare the results of those with a random selection of untested vehicles and to see if there was any benefit to the testing program. Now the Minister tells me the program has been in effect for nine years and I presume that some attempt has been made to check whether the safety program has resulted in a decrease in the number of accidents that those vehicles were involved in. Can the Minister report to the Committee whether any such testing has been done, testing of statistics that is, and whether any benefit has been found and if so the extent of this benefit?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, over a period of two years two groups of vehicles - one group inspected, the other group not inspected - over a period of two years it was found that the inspected group of vehicles had six percent fewer accidents.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. David Blake: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate to us the numbers of vehicles involved, how many vehicles; when he says six percent how many would that entail.

MR. ORCHARD: Each sample group, Mr. Chairman, was approximately 7,000 vehicles.

MR. WALDING: Seven?

MR. ORCHARD: Thousand.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister whether he feels that the 6 percent was statistically significant, and whether he has drawn any conclusions from these tests; whether, for example, he feels that there should be more frequent testing or testing on a wider basis and whether that is the reason for the increase of some 15,000 vehicles to be tested this year? Does he feel that the annual testing of all vehicles would be a good idea, and does he intend to bring in such testing?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, at a 6 percent reduction in accidents the program is cost-effective, and we are expanding it as I've said by 15,000 vehicles, and we hope to maintain that upper level or higher level of vehicle testing.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister, with respect to the 54,000, is he still working on an age limit of five years for the vehicles to be tested or whether he is reducing that age limit at all; and whether this is what accounts for the additional numbers of vehicles, or whether the computer is actually turning out a larger percentage of the number of vehicles?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are testing four-year old vehicles this year. The majority of the random sample will be four years old, there will be some three-year old vehicles in that as well. Four year old and older, with the odd one three year old.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister what's the criterion for picking certain three year old vehicles?

MR. ORCHARD: The same criterion, it's a random selection.

MR. WALDING: If it's a random selection then, Mr. Chairman, I assume that it's a random selection of all vehicles three years old and over.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: The majority of the selection will be in the four year old and older, and we will pull some three year old vehicles as well. The majority of the vehicles inspected will be four years and older, unless we have specific referrals by the police department.

MR. WALDING: I still don't understand the last point from the Minister about the three year old vehicles as opposed to the four and older vehicles. Would he explain why he says there are just some from the three year old group?

MR. ORCHARD: When we proceed, Mr. Chairman, to an area for testing to have enough vehicles on the random selection to justify the location of the testing equipment there, in some areas we will have to use three year old and older vehicles, hence, we will have some three year old vehicles in the random selection.

MR. WALDING: These certain areas where the three year old cars would be included, can I ask the Minister if those would be mostly in rural areas?

MR. ORCHARD: By and large, Mr. Chairman, in rural areas.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister now, whether the random selection process for the testing of vehicles is for all registered motor vehicles or just passenger cars and light trucks?

MR. ORCHARD: The random selection, Mr. Chairman, involves passenger vehicles, trucks, commercial vehicles and school buses. And this year there will be a special emphasis on the commercial vehicle selection to probably give us a higher percentage of commercial vehicle inspection than we have had in past years.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have a breakdown of the statistics for vehicles not meeting the standards of the safety program, say, passenger cars as against light commercial vehicles, heavier trucks and school buses? Does he have a breakdown by category?

MR. ORCHARD: I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have a breakdown by specific category, I think we've got statistics which indicate the percentage of vehicles that have failed the test through one safety criteria or another, and on an overall average it is approximately 59 percent of the vehicles are not successful in passing the safety inspection.

MR. WALDING: 59? Mr. Chairman, I was waiting for the Minister to give me that breakdown.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we don't have that. That 59 percent is according to all vehicles inspected and we don't have it broken down by passenger vehicles or cars versus trucks versus buses. We have it but it's not here.

MR. WALDING: I'd appreciate it if the Minister would supply me with that information at his convenience, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask him also whether bulk liquid vehicles, such as tanker trucks are a particular category?

MR. ORCHARD: We don't have a specific category for that type of commercial vehicle, but in the selection and as I indicated, we intend to have a greater selection of commercial vehicles with that as one of the target groups within the commercial vehicles to give us a handle on whether we should be looking at increasing the inspection frequency of transport tankers that are on the highways.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'm mostly concerned with the safety aspects of tank trucks that would be carrying, perhaps, gasoline, propane, vinyl chloride and any number of other explosive dangerous toxic or carcinogenic materials. Perhaps the Minister could give me an idea of how many vehicles of that type were tested last year and how many he intends to test this year?

MR. ORCHARD: Of which category again?

MR. WALDING: Of the tanker type of vehicle that might carry bulk gasoline, propane, vinyl chloride, etc., etc.

MR. ORCHARD: We don't have tanker trailers broken out specifically in past statistics.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have any estimate as to the percentage of such vehicles that were tested last year?

MR. ORCHARD: No, we don't have that kind of information, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: I would like to ask the Minister whether vehicles of that type would fit into the same criterion as the other vehicles tested, i.e. five years old or older?

MR. ORCHARD: No, I am informed there was no age criteria for commercial vehicles. One of the problems that we're possibly going to run into in terms of age is that the registration slip will show the age, or the registration year, the first time the tractor unit has been registered, but it will not necessarily show the age of the trailer unit itself, the tank, or the compressed gas vehicle, so therefore we're not using an age selection on the commercial vehicles.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister if there are any safety standards for such trailer units?

MR. ORCHARD: There's several jurisdictions here. The running gear itself is under regulation as to what's available or what is required in terms of lighting, brake capacity, etc., etc.

We have two different kinds of, let's call them liquid tankers, on the road. There's the liquid tanker which will carry the non-pressurized liquids and to my knowledge there is no specific standards for them in terms of construction or testing. In other words, a re-test.

When you get down to the compressed gas trailers such as carry LPG propane, anhydrous ammonia, those trailers, if my memory serves me correct, are all certified under a Pressure Vessels Act which is a national Act, and they have to be, I believe, static tested on a two-year interval to assure that they're in safe condition.

In terms of the transportation of hazardous goods, the members will recall that prior to the dissolution of the parliament in December there was a bill on the transportation of hazardous goods which died on the Order Paper in Ottawa. And in January of this year I attended in Victoria the provincial Ministers of Transportation's conference at which all the provincial Ministers, with the exception of Newfoundland and his Deputy was there, plus the two Territory Ministers were in attendance and a unanimous resolution was passed at that Transportation Ministers' conference urging the federal government - and at that time the election was in full stride so we didn't know to whom we were making the recommendation. But a unanimous recommendation went out of that conference urging the federal government to reintroduce their legislation on hazardous goods without modification. In other words, exactly as it was presented, so that there would be an immediate implementation of that hazardous goods transportation legislation. And we only trust that our recommendation will be followed when the new parliament sits in Ottawa.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister whether that federal Act dealing with the transportation of hazardous goods included the transportation of such hazardous goods by road, or only by rail and water such as the federal government has jurisdiction over?

MR. ORCHARD: No, it's my understanding that that legislation dealt with all modes of transportation of hazardous goods.

MR. WALDING: One last question I think, Mr. Chairman. When such a vehicle is called in for testing on this random basis, is it just the tractor part that

Monday, 24 March, 1980

comes in or is there a trailer attached to it and is that tested at the same time?

MR. ORCHARD: The entire unit, Mr. Chairman, is tested.

MR. WALDING: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question with respect to highway safety. I'm just wondering whether the Motor Vehicles Branch might have some statistics with respect to accidents per mile driven on divided highways as opposed to just two-lane highways.

MR. ORCHARD: We don't have any current statistics comparing divided versus two-lane accident statistics.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Are there any statistics within the last number of years, for instance with respect to the divided portion of Highway 59, be it up to East Selkirk or up to past East Selkirk as opposed to from that stretch in the road up to Grand Beach?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, on that specific highway, Mr. Chairman, we don't have statistics available. But the province does have statistics comparing two-lane versus four-lane divided. I don't know for what year, but we can make those accident statistics available.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could I ask the Minister for what highway he does have statistics and, if available, for what year?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I believe it's only for Trans-Canada Highway.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. If he has statistics available for the Trans-Canada Highway I would presume that he has to have something to compare them with, that is some two-lane highway. Is it Highway 75 or Highway 59 or Highway 44, which two-lane could he compare it with?

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that it's a comparison on Trans-Canada, the divided section versus the undivided section which proceeds from Brandon to the Saskatchewan border.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could I ask the Minister whether there is a traffic count then on that particular highway, that stretch of highway between Brandon and the Saskatchewan border as well as a traffic count on summer weekends on Highway 44 and Highway 59?

MR. ORCHARD: We have traffic counts, Mr. Chairman, on those areas.

MR. SCHROEDER: Are they available now?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman, they're not available here this evening, no. They're on master maps that we have.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. When might we expect to receive those figures?

MR. ORCHARD: We can make those available in a couple of days.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. ADAM: I don't know if I understood the Minister correctly to say just a while ago that in the vehicle inspection that was done at random, that there were more rural vehicles called in than there were urban vehicles. Is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: What is the percentage?

MR. ORCHARD: I don't have that breakdown here, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: Well, then, how is this done then, by alphabetical order or the numbers of the cars and vehicles?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, depending on how many vehicles we want to sample it pulls out every third or fourth, it's a random selection, every third or fourth or fifth vehicle in a run.

MR. ADAM: And that would apply to the rural as well as the urban?

MR. ORCHARD: That's correct.

MR. ADAM: It would be about 50-50 maybe?

MR. ORCHARD: It would be close but I would suspect that it would be more urban vehicles than rural vehicles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(c). The Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask several questions based on the report that we have. There are a number of factors or reasons that the Motor Vehicle Branch suspends drivers, one of which was the cancellation of a probationary licence for conviction or accident involvement while driving on a probationary licence. Is a driver, a young driver when he receives his licence at the age of 16, is he or she on probation for a one-year period?

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

MR. URUSKI: In what circumstances, let's say I'm that individual and I happen to be involved in a motor vehicle accident; I was involved in a motor vehicle accident of which I am not held responsible and there were no charges laid, the damage is fairly substantial but no responsibility of mine, I get my driver's licence in about two or three months after I'm involved in that kind of an accident, would I be called in for an interview or would my licence be suspended, making the assumption that those are the circumstances, as an example?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I can reiterate the circumstances, it's a 16-year old?

MR. URUSKI: Yes.

MR. ORCHARD: He's within his first year of having his driver's licence.

MR. URUSKI: Within several months, yes.

MR. ORCHARD: And within several months of receiving his first licence he's involved in an accident in which there is substantial damage and there is absolutely no blame attributed to the junior driver, to the young driver. Are those the circumstances that we're dealing with?

MR. URUSKI: Now the point the Minister makes of no-blame, by insurance standards he is not held responsible, he is responsible less than 50 percent with no charges being laid or no convictions.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, in a case like that, if the driver was not charged or convicted then there should be no action taken against his driving privileges.

MR. URUSKI: Okay, I go on for another three months and then I'm involved in a vehicle accident of very, I would say, minor damage - minor by what I would say less than \$200 - damage of which I have been held responsible for the mishap and still no charges being laid, in the same first year of probation. How would the Branch consider that kind of a . . . no injuries, no damages, no charges but there is some slight damage of which the driver would be held responsible for?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. URUSKI: I'm not trying to lead you on. I'm just trying to give you . . .

MR. ORCHARD: No, Bill, I never suspected you were trying to lead me on. The damage threshold is \$300 in an accident and should the damages be below \$300 no action is pursued by Motor Vehicle Branch. Should the damage exceed that and he is at fault, then the Motor Vehicle Branch will become involved at that time.

MR. URUSKI: What kind of involvement could one see in a case like that, in terms of would it be an automatic suspension, would it be an investigation or at least a calling in, a show cause, or what would the involvement of the Safety Division be in a case like that?

MR. ORCHARD: If I followed the member's question correctly, this young chap has been involved in an accident in which there is damage over \$300 and he is at fault.

MR. URUSKI: Less.

MR. ORCHARD: Oh, less than \$300?

MR. URUSKI: Less.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, there should be no involvement by the Motor Vehicle Branch if it's less than \$300, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: That's pretty well the procedures that are handled. Have there been many instances of suspensions of probationary drivers of the younger category, and I presume that any one who would have his licence suspended and be reinstated would be on probation after his suspension ends. The first year after he has a remission of his licence as a result of his suspension, he automatically is on probation for a year. Am I correct in that assumption?

MR. ORCHARD: If his licence. . .

MR. URUSKI: There are two categories I am referring to. There is the young age driver who is automatically on probation for a year when receiving a licence, and then, is there not another category of one who has been under suspension at one time and receives his driver's privileges back? He or she automatically then also is on probation for a year. Is that the way the system works?

MR. ORCHARD: I believe the system works this way: That upon reinstatement, his reinstatement licence, call it that, is a probationary licence in which he must go through a twelve-month probationary period.

MR. URUSKI: Would the department have statistics of how many of the probationary licences of the younger age are called in, in terms of for offences dealing with traffic offences, accidents, and the like, in a year, of new licences issued? Would there be statistics, say, last year I think there was a . . . I

don't know whether the Annual Report says how many licences were issued. I would like to know how many licences were issued last year in 1979, new licences.

MR. ORCHARD: The number of new licences last year, and these are rough figures, approximately 30,000 new licences last year.

MR. URUSKI: Of those new licences, how many would be in the age category of 16 to 17 years of age? Or is every new licence put into the probation, regardless of age of the driver?

MR. ORCHARD: If it's the first time that licence has been issued, regardless of age, they are on a one-year probation.

MR. URUSKI: So then there were 30,000. Of 30,000 new licences how many would have been called in within, well, we would have to go back now to 1978 to see how many were called back in 1979.

MR. ORCHARD: As a ballpark figure, it's somewhere in the 3,000 licence mark, or roughly 10 percent.

MR. URUSKI: Roughly, then 10 percent of the drivers are. Of those drivers who are called back, what kind of driver improvement are they requested or told to undertake before their driving privileges would be reconsidered or reinstated?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I am informed that there are basically three steps, increasing in severity, shall we say. All of the 3,000, upon reinstatement are interviewed by our driver licence safety personnel to assure that, let's say, they have learned from their sins of remission and omission. The second step, if the driver tester upon that interview believes that that driver would benefit from a defensive driving course, he will require that person to take the same. And then following that, may require a re-examination of that driver before allowing him his driving privileges back.

MR. URUSKI: Of those 3,000 that have been called in, of the first-time drivers, would there be an estimate or statistics to indicate how many of these 3,000 were involved in alcohol-related convictions?

MR. ORCHARD: That figure is probably not available, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: I see.

MR. ORCHARD: If it is available, we will make it available to the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Having as many years experience as some of the staff in the branch have, would there be a prognosis as to . . . Is it a large proportion or is it a smaller proportion in relationship to the normal suspensions that go on throughout the year?

MR. ORCHARD: As a very rough guess, it would be less than the 20 percent of those 3,000.

MR. URUSKI: Of those 3,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(c)(1)--pass - the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Have there been many new commercial driving schools operating in the province within the last year? Have there been new facilities opened?

MR. ORCHARD: Not that we're aware of, Mr. Chairman.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Motor Vehicle Branch does and certifies, if that's the correct word, the instructors as well as testing the vehicle, the training vehicles, for the road worthiness. Is there any, and I think the report says "practices and ethics of commercial driving schools"; has there been any offences or any what one would consider unethical practices carried on that the branch is aware of? And if so, how can the branch, and how does the branch deal with any unethical practices that may occur, such as overcharging or the like, of unsuspecting new driver students?

MR. ORCHARD: There have been very very few complaints but there have been the occasional complaint about molestation of the trainee, and any complaint that the department has received in that regard, they have followed up with a suspension of that particular . . . where it's proven. Where the charge is proven, that instructor has been suspended.

MR. URUSKI: The suspension, and that's one case, the suspension of an instructor can take what kind of forms? A permanent suspension from driving or what has actually occurred?

MR. ORCHARD: It wasn't a permanent suspension, Mr. Chairman. It was a suspension for a given period of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(c)(1)--pass; 9.(c)(2)--pass; 9.(d)(1) - the Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Chairman, relative to the Taxicab Board, I was wondering what, if anything, the Minister feels that he is able to do about the situation at the Winnipeg International Airport and the supply of taxis there. I realize that the airport comes under the Federal Transport Commission and so on, but this is a local problem and it's a serious problem for people coming in on the planes late at night. And is the Minister proposing to make any proposals to the federal Minister or to the Taxicab Board?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Taxicab Board has identified that as one of their problem areas, let's call it, and the airport situation is a somewhat unique one in that there was a ten-year service contract let to one taxi firm in the City of Winnipeg to pick up passengers at the airport. Any taxicab company can off-load passengers, but only the one with approximately 200 vehicles has the contract to pick up passengers at the airport. That contract, Mr. Chairman, is to expire in the beginning of 1981.

The board is currently investigating the taxicab airport service offered in other cities. We have obtained for the Taxicab Board through my office, the service agreement that is in use, for instance, at Calgary International Airport. We have statistics available on the type of contract and the service provided, etc., etc., at the Edmonton Airport. And the board is actively pursuing methods by which the service hopefully can be improved and some of the complaints and some of the problems that have been encountered over the past few years at the airport hopefully can be eliminated at the expiry of this present ten-year contract with the renewal of a new contract for taxi service to the airport.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Chairman, I have been at the airport when there hasn't been one single cab there from that company and of course, acting on their legal obligation, another taxi has let off people and have had to drive off. And of course this just compounds the annoyance of being a passenger coming off one of those flights.

Now I wanted to suggest that even if the one company with the greatest number of cabs was to receive a renewal of the contract, perhaps in the off hours when their drivers are not prepared to be there it could be made open to one of the other companies. It's possibly an alternative that could be looked at and the other companies may welcome.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that is one of a number of options that may well be available. There is some indication as to the potential value of a corral

system, for instance, where anyone who so desires can go in and, with the use of a credit card type identification plate, have access to deplaning passengers and pay for the privilege of having that service available via a computer billing system charged up by the use of their entry card through the corral system.

There are a number of variations of taxi service that are in use in various places in North America and the Board right now, the Taxicab Board, is getting a pretty good handle on the potential systems that are available and hopefully will be able to come up with a system that will service the airport properly and, at the same time, have an eye out on not only just the passenger but also the taxicab industry and its many members as well.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Chairman, through you, please. I would just like to suggest that if you're taking a count of the number of people needing cabs at the present time, you should realize that an awful lot of the people coming in on late flights and the charter flights are now arranging private transportations so they won't be dependent on taxis, so any count that's taken at the present time or over the past winter wouldn't be a true count. People are driving out there and leaving cars for people coming in.

MR. ORCHARD: That's true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many members are on these different boards, and who they are; and if there is a backlog in any of these departments, particularly the latter.

MR. ORCHARD: We have, Mr. Chairman, ten members on the Licence Suspension Appeal Board. They have successfully reduced the - I think there was about a four or five month backlog at least - a four or five month backlog of cases in front of the Licence Suspension Appeal Board; and they are now in a position where they are offering the hearings within the 45-day period of the temporary driving certificate. They're right up-to-date.

MR. ADAM: Does the Board sit throughout the province, wherever, they travel?

MR. ORCHARD: That's correct.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister read the names of these people on this Board?

MR. ORCHARD: We have Ronald Johnson as Chairman; Grant Holmes as Vice Chairman; Gerald Brown from Wawanesa; Frank McClymont of Thompson; Barton Dowler, Dauphin; Susan Hoplock, Winnipeg; Tom Hannesson, Winnipeg; Rene La Coste, LaBroquerie; Eleanor Hainsworth, Winnipeg; and I don't have an address on Al Stechishin.

MR. ADAM: Winnipeg?

MR. ORCHARD: Stechishin, Winnipeg, sorry.

MR. ADAM: And on the other boards?

MR. ORCHARD: On the Highway Traffic Board, we have four members: Al Mackling as Chairman; Michael Capri, Winnipeg Vice Chairman; Frederick Manness and Herman Buechler as members.

In the Highway Transport Board we have five members: Al Mackling as Chairman; Fred Wood, Vice Chairman; Howard Mitchell, Adolf Sabeski and Roy Ramsay, Winnipeg, as members.

And in the Taxicab Board, Mr. Chairman, we have: Brian Jakobson as Chairman; James McTaggart, member; Geoff Dixon, member; George Provost, councillor, City of Winnipeg is the City's member; and Inspector Wes Langley of the City Police Department as the Winnipeg City Police member.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, in speaking to the Taxicab Board, as the Member for Fort Rouge indicated, I too, have certainly had many comments and, in fact, complaints from constituents about the problem of taxis, not only at the airport but throughout the city. I noted with interest that the Taxicab Board was interested in bringing in dress code uniforms or something of that nature. I think the problem is one of lack of competition within the taxi business in the city.

On two occasions on a business trip I came into the city late at night, in the 1:30-2:00 in the morning range, and there were many people deplaning at the time. There were many people in need of taxicabs and there were not nearly enough taxis at the airport, despite the fact that that's a pretty low period of time for service, pretty low usage. There's absolutely no reason that I could think of that the taxis were not out at the airport. When I asked the people at the airport, the taxicab drivers, the response was they didn't want to waste their gas in going out to the airport in case there might not be somebody there to use the cab.

It seems to me that they put it on the reverse, that the customer should wait for them, and they should have no responsibility to be out there to service customers that are waiting. And, by and large, my experience in dealing with taxicabs in the city is of that nature and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that what we should be endeavouring to do is to increase the number of licences that are available within the city; to increase the competition and through better competition increase the service, and I'm sure that you will find that you don't have to institute dress codes, that those people who want to get more business and wanted to do a better business will make sure that the drivers are properly dressed and attractive to the customer so that there will be cleaner cars and all those things will come along. I don't think it's a matter of further regulating the business by bringing in such things as dress codes, but rather by increasing the competition and letting those who are better able and more willing to serve the customers set the standard for the rest of the business. And I suggest, rather strongly, that the Minister look into that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows. I believe he had the Chair, if not, then, the Member for St. George, if not, then the Member for St. Vital. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to find out from the Minister and I would like him to indicate how many provinces have instituted the class licensing system?

MR. ORCHARD: Nine provinces have instituted the class license system, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: With the exception of which?

MR. ORCHARD: Newfoundland and I'm informed, Mr. Chairman, that they're in the process of instituting a class license system.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, recently the Motor Transport Board held a hearing on an application of Grey Goose Bus Lines to reduce service to a number of rural points throughout the province of Manitoba, points in the southwestern portion of the province, in the western portion, northeast of Winnipeg through to Grand Beach - that was probably the greatest cut in service from a daily service they were attempting to cut to weekly service - and some cuts into Northern Manitoba and into the Interlake of a re-scheduling of buses, possibly not as great a cut in service as to the Grand Beach area. I presume that he's aware of the board's decision, is he aware as to what the final outcome of the board's decision has been in this case?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, now, I'm not absolutely certain on the specifics. As a matter of fact, I'm not certain if the board has made a final decision in all

cases of the application. I am aware that in certain of the routes, that the bus company voluntarily agreed to introduce, let's call it a stepped-up service schedule not to what they had prior to their application, but above what they were wanting to get down to; and they tried to accommodate as much as they could some of the unique problems that were going to be created with their original proposal, and they reinstated certain days of scheduling.

MR. URUSKI: Has the Minister got anyone in the department who does an assessment and the implications of this type of service-cut on to the rural communities that may be affected, because I know that the general complaint that has been made by the public to bus reductions has been that there has been very little notice and the notices that have been put up, in terms of notification of passengers that the routes will be cut are where the ticket vendors are being sold. I presume that in many instances the ticket agents, to some degree, if there is a very small flow of traffic to purchase tickets from their area where people would maybe buy the tickets in Winnipeg and buy a return ticket that they'd have very little ticket traffic, that the public that uses the bus service is not adequately - and that was borne out in some of the hearings - adequately notified. Is there a way that the Minister or if not his department, the Department of Economic Development is able to assess the impact of those service cuts and to be able to, at least, advise or intervene in the hearings on behalf of the travelling public as an intermediary because the board, of course, sits on behalf of the government and hears the submissions. But there's no one with the expertise to, at least, come before the board on behalf of the motorist or the users of the bus system to be able to provide impact analysis as to what the implications are of such cuts, other than, of course, the members of the board, and do they have, if there's no one in the department, does the board have the expertise to be able to assess the implications of certain cuts and the long-term effects on rural Manitoba?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the board, who is charged with the responsibility of dealing with these applications, part of their mandate is to ensure that service to the rural communities is maintained at an adequate level. Now, there is a discretionary area in there as to what constitutes an adequate level of service, and should they need, should they not have internally, and they do have some expertise internally to ascertain the potential impact on communities affected by the reduced scheduling, should they not have sufficient expertise within their board or immediate department to which the board is a membership, they have available a fairly competent research group in transportation in the Department of Economic Development. They are charged, as I say, with a mandate of assuring that any reduction in service to the communities is a legitimate request; that the company asking for that kind of a reduction in service is, indeed, suffering fairly substantial losses before they would allow the abandonment of scheduled service into some of these communities or a reduction of scheduled service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital or the Member for St. George. Please, if you will put your hands up, because I don't know whether you're coming on again. I have to look at a bunch of pages. Just signal, then we're clear.

The Member for St. George. Have you got the floor or not?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I presume that you will be keeping a list of who picks up his hand, and then you will have a list and there should be no great difficulty there. Mr. Chairman, to follow along the lines that the Minister has indicated, I presume that the board from his answers are able to utilize the expertise in the Department of Economic Development. I wonder what policy direction does the government give a board of this nature in terms of . . . what concerns I have is that while the overall profitability of the industry or the situation here in Manitoba, primarily Grey Goose and they have the majority of the running rights throughout the province, the profitability may be fairly healthy, while in some lines the passenger counts may be not what might be considered totally profitable, and there would be losses incurred on them. I am hoping that

Monday, 24 March, 1980

the government direction is that the board does look at cross-subsidization within the total industry so that certain communities, while the lines may not be profitable in certain areas, that there is, from the point of view of service, cross-subsidization within the industry as they have, in effect, the total running rights of the monopoly of providing the service throughout the major portion of Manitoba. If it is not Grey Goose, then it is one of its subsidiaries in the Brandon area and the like. I am hopeful that that kind of direction from government is very clear to the board and I would like that confirmed.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, in viewing these applications the board has the mandate not just to consider the individual run per se, but just the combination of factors which the Member for St. George is mentioning. It's much similar to the situation that we have with rail line abandonment. They're very similar in nature in that if you forewent or reduced the level of service strictly because of the economics to a given point or to a given series of points along the run, you may well drop that particular bus service. But as with rail line abandonment, any reduction or application for reduction of scheduled bus service must take in to purview the area served, not just the specific line of communities. And the board is keenly aware that they should consider an overall picture, not only from the standpoint of service, but from the standpoint of profitability and revenues derived elsewhere within the system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions to ask of the Minister. First, following up earlier questions on taxis, I would like to ask the Minister why pricing for taxis is given in fractions of a mile.

MR. ORCHARD: Is the member wanting to know why it isn't metrified?

MR. WALDING: No, Mr. Chairman. Any time there is a change in the cab rate, it's given as \$1.25 to get into the car and then so much per seventh of a mile or eighth of a mile, or something like that. I would like to know why the price is given in those terms, fractions of distance.

MR. ORCHARD: I don't really know. It's a longstanding meter measurement that's been in existence in the taxi industry for some time.

MR. WALDING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Minister realizes that it's not a meter measurement because the meter continues whether the cab is moving or stationary or whether it's going forty miles an hour or zero miles an hour. Would it not be simpler to give the rates for taxis in terms of time rather than some artificially computed distance?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, as the Member for St. Vital has correctly pointed out, the meter continues to run whether the taxi is moving at forty miles an hour or sitting still. And the meters compute fare on the basis of two criterion, time and distance travelled, and that accounts for the more rapid advancement of the meter when one is going forty miles an hour than when one is going ten miles an hour.

MR. WALDING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wasn't aware of that. I'll have to check it the next time I get into a cab, but it was always my impression that meter kept ticking over according to time only, and that it was not distance related.

However, the other question I had was on a different topic and it was either the Traffic Board or Transport Board. I wanted to ask the Minister if he had received a report from either of those boards having to do with billboards alongside of highways.

MR. ORCHARD: No, not recently, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that one of those boards had given a report with recommendations to one of their Ministers predecessors, having to do with the rather unsightly nature of billboards alongside roads. I would like to ask the Minister if he is familiar with that and can he advise what the recommendations in that report were.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that was a committee which reported in 1975 or 1976, and I suppose as a direct result of that report we have what is known as - what's the specific term on that? - the signing committee which recommends certain signing standards, which hopefully are universal across Canada.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to follow the lead that Prince Edward Island has made in banning all billboards from the countryside. If he has ever travelled in that province, he will recognize the difference immediately that there are none of these unsightly and rather distracting billboards littering the main roads. And as a tourist attraction, it really makes a big difference as a source of attraction, I am sure, for some of the many thousands of visitors that Prince Edward Island enjoys.

I would like to recommend to him that he give consideration to abolishing many of these billboards that litter our countryside, and I use the expression advisedly. I am not suggesting that information signs say, at the cut-off to a village or a new town be abolished but so often mile after mile along the main highway there are billboards that really mar the tourist attractiveness of this province.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I think probably except for the complete ban of billboards which, if I understand the Member for St. Vital he indicates Prince Edward Island has undertaken, I would suggest that the Province of Manitoba has probably, over the past several years, probably taken stronger initiative than most other highway departments in assuring that billboards are not placed helter skelter at random throughout the province. And I think he will find the incidence of new billboards appearing on our highways is indeed very very rare. Now I will make the distinction there of the jurisdiction under which we exercise control over billboards being the PTH, PR road system throughout the province and contrast that to within city limits of Winnipeg where we are not the traffic authority to establish the billboard signing criterion.

But by and large, in rural Manitoba, I would venture to say that year to year very very few billboards crop up beside our highways. And the intent of the signing committee is to provide some semblance of uniformity and we do. For communities, for instance, have a standard sign which will indicate the number of services and the variety of services that are available within that community. For instance, the symbol for the hotel or the restaurant symbol, gasoline and service station, washroom, telephone, hospital symbols. Those will become part of our, let's call it our community signing program, as time proceeds. Those, it is intended, will hopefully replace the desire by many entrepreneurs in the various communities to have their own billboard advertising their particular hotel placed a mile outside of the town. By and large, I think we've had a reasonably good program assuring the pristine beauty of our highways and our countryside.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I know that the Minister doesn't have jurisdiction over the urban areas as far as signs are concerned and I was not referring to those. I was referring only to those in the countryside. I accept his statement that there has not been the indiscriminate placing of new signs. What I am asking him to do is to get rid of those that do exist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Referring to the Highway Traffic Board, I would suggest the Minister give consideration to changing the powers of the board, particularly with respect to the traffic matters within the City of Winnipeg. It's been my experience in having gone before the Highway Traffic Board on a number of occasions on behalf of the city requesting changes to the speed limits or requesting installation of overhead pedestrian corridors, that I can't

think of any good reason why the board ought to have jurisdiction over the City of Winnipeg. In particular, the expertise that is being presented is normally that of the city's traffic engineers who are dealing with urban transportation and traffic problems, and their expertise is probably at least equal that of the provincial technical people who make presentations to the board and advise the board. In fact, it's probably greater because they are dealing with those urban traffic considerations and transportation considerations on a day-to-day basis.

Beyond the advise of the technical expertise of the highway traffic engineers or the urban engineers who make presentations, the decision as to whether or not to grant a reduction in speed limit or an increase in speed limit or an installation of an overhead pedestrian corridor boils down in many respects to a political decision, and there is no question that the Highway Traffic Board ultimately, in considering both sides of an issue, sometimes doesn't always side with the best technical advice given but makes a political decision. And it seems to me that the control or the political decision-making should rest with an elected body as opposed to an appointed body such as the Highway Traffic Board, if a political decision is indeed going to be made after consideration of the best advice available from the urban transportation engineers. And because of that I think it should rest with the elected body who is responsible for all other traffic matters in the City of Winnipeg, and that is the City of Winnipeg Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Several weeks ago I had talked to the Minister with respect to the Licence Suspension Appeal Board holding hearings outside of the City of Winnipeg. This is a recent innovation within the last several years, and what is happening is that individuals in rural Manitoba are being forced to go to specific places; that is, in eastern Manitoba, people from Pine Falls, people from Altona are required to go to Steinbach. A lot of those people have no trade connections whatsoever with Steinbach. Their connections are with Winnipeg. Their connections are with other centres, and in times past they used to be able to go to Winnipeg to have their appeals heard.

I am not opposing the idea of having a rural centre in which to hold these hearings and in which to give people the opportunity to come to the hearings. But what I am suggesting, however, is that it is unfair to the many rural people who would find it more convenient to come into Winnipeg, to force them to go to Steinbach. And certainly I have very frequently in the past year been involved with people who would have found it more convenient to come in to Winnipeg than to go to Steinbach, and I'm just wondering whether the Minister would consider changing the policy to give people the freedom of choice.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member did draw that to my attention and we are trying to see if that is easily resolvable.

There is some problem with scheduling if you have a strict freedom of choice and maybe what has to be done in each case is where the hearing is scheduled, possibly having the applicant indicate which centre he would like to have his hearing held in, rather than having, as the member puts it, a freedom of choice for a hearing because you might have difficulty in indeed scheduling the various hearings if you allowed strict freedom of choice. Maybe you can allow freedom of choice in choosing the location.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what I was asking for, freedom of choice in locating the hearing where one goes before this particular board. And currently there is in fact an application for these hearings. One of the questions on that application is, "preferred choice of hearing" and there's three locations, Thompson, Brandon and Winnipeg and it does not matter that we put an "X" in the box "Winnipeg", we find that in fact people are required to go to Steinbach. So I would certainly hope that the Minister would look into that.

Another area under this section dealing with the Highway Traffic Board is the matter of signs alongside our major highways and this would again come under the jurisdiction of the Highway Traffic Board.

It seems to me that in the last several years there's been a proliferation of advertising materials alongside our major highways and I'm just wondering whether

Monday, 24 March, 1980

there's been any kind of change in policy. Up until, I would say, 1978 our highways were remarkably free of that sort of material, the billboards and flashy stuff that you used to see only on American highways, where now it seems seeing them here in Manitoba, and I'm just wondering whether there's been a change in policy with respect to allowing these things alongside our highways.

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCHROEDER: Could I then ask the Minister how many applications for such billboards have there been before that board in the last year, possibly in each of the last five years, so we have some indication as to any trend?

MR. ORCHARD: We've got, Mr. Chairman, a category called "miscellaneous" which has as part and parcel of that category, signs, weight restrictions and limited access designations.

In 1978 we had nine applications for those combination of miscellaneous applications and in 1977 we had 17; and in 1976 we had 15, as we did in 1975; and 32 in 1974.

So it would appear as if indeed those kind of applications are decreasing, part of which is the sign portion of that, and I can't identify how many of the nine are specifically signs or how many of the 32 in 1974 are specifically signs, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm just wondering whether the Motor Vehicles Branch has detected any increase in unauthorized signs along our roadways.

MR. ORCHARD: There has been no significant increase drawn to our attention, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. My colleague, the Member for River Heights, was mentioning to the Minister that he thought that decisions made by the Highway Traffic Board were often political decisions and should be made by elected persons rather than appointed persons. I'd like to ask the Minister a political question. Is it his intent to follow the precedent set by his predecessor and that is to continue on with Mr. Mackling as the Chairman of the Highway Traffic Board or perhaps make a new appointment at some time in the future?

MR. ORCHARD: That is a very political statement, Mr. Chairman, or a very political question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STEEN: I said it was political.

A MEMBER: Is that a political answer?

MR. ORCHARD: That is a political answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George. He was on the list quite some time ago.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister recently granted an increase in taxicab fares in this province after several months of procrastination, after he was, as I understand it, given a recommendation by the board. Could the Minister indicate his reasons for delay in announcing that increase?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, whenever one has the rather interesting proposal of agreeing to or disagreeing with any rate increase, I think rather than having it branded as "procrastination" I think it is incumbent upon the responsibilities of the office to ensure that a number of factors are checked out, in the end some of those factors to do with the benefits to the user-public; and if assuring the user-public has been well served and will be well served with a price

Monday, 24 March, 1980

increase is procrastination, then, Mr. Chairman, that is quite a different definition of procrastination than what obviously members in the NDP Party have.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, then given the Minister's answer of indicating he wanted to review the reasons for the increase and whether the service will be affected and what effect it will have, could he also indicate what review he undertook in the case of Grey Goose Bus Lines in their application for reduction of service throughout the province of Manitoba, which affected I would say six or seven Tory constituencies in southwestern Manitoba and western Manitoba along with the Interlake and eastern Manitoba? What studies did he and his office undertake to examine the impact of those kinds of service cuts on the people of rural Manitoba?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, to-date recommendations for reviewed and renewed scheduling of Grey Goose Bus Lines has not crossed my desk.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, the same board, as I understand it, or virtually the same members of the board make recommendations. Since the Minister held the recommendation of the taxicab board, could I ask him whether he held the recommendation of the Transport Board?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I haven't received the recommendation of the Transport Board.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Minister attended a interprovincial Ministers' meeting on, I believe, on Transportation in Victoria last month. Could he indicate what the nature of the discussions and the outcome of those meetings were in Victoria?

MR. ORCHARD: As I indicated earlier on, Mr. Chairman, the establishment of a reciprocity agreement for the trucking industry across Canada was the first item on the agenda.

The Ministers agreed to have presented to them in their annual meeting in Toronto in September a program of pro rate reciprocity. That is being undertaken by the CCMTA to provide us with that proposal.

MR. URUSKI: What kind of reciprocity - pro-rate?

MR. ORCHARD: Pro-rate reciprocity, Mr. Chairman.

As well we, as I mentioned earlier, unanimously urged the federal government to reintroduce their dangerous commodities legislation in its existing form without amendment to assure rapid passage of same. And we discussed and increased the funding level to the CCMTA in order that they may undertake the presentation of the Pro-Rate Reciprocity Agreement for the trucking industry to our September conference.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister, for my benefit, explain what pro-rate reciprocity means?

MR. ORCHARD: Pro-rate reciprocity means that a trucking firm with operating rights in three provinces will establish on the basis of the mileage travelled in each jurisdiction a percentage of his licensing fee to each of the jurisdictions through which it has running rights.

MR. URUSKI: Will that require the trucking firm to have separate licences in the three provinces or in the province of which its head office is maintained?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to know, no what? Will it require neither or what will it require then?

MR. ORCHARD: It will not require the truck to be licensed in each jurisdiction.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know then, what will it require of the trucker? Or what will be required?

MR. ORCHARD: It will require the trucker to purchase a plate in its home jurisdiction. If it has running rights in other provincial jurisdictions, by virtue of purchasing a home plate and pro-rating the aforesaid fees for that home plate to the jurisdictions in which that truck will operate, that is the requirement of the trucker to obtain licence in the jurisdictions in which it will operate.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, is there any discussion with respect to the increasing of weights with respect to interprovincial hauling?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are no moves to immediately raise the weight limits but a sub-committee of CCMTA is of course always meeting and discussing the uniformity of weights, trailer lengths, etc., etc., throughout the province and that is an area that is always under discussion with an eye on standardization across Canada.

MR. URUSKI: How much of a differential in standard truck weights is there between the three prairie provinces and British Columbia? Are the weights of these four provinces fairly uniform?

MR. ORCHARD: In speaking of the Trans-Canada Highway, there is very little difference between the four western provinces.

MR. URUSKI: And how does that relate to the province to our east, Ontario?

MR. ORCHARD: Ontario does have a higher TWW, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Are there many trucks that come into the province of Manitoba being legal in the province of Ontario and are overweight within Manitoba? What procedures do they follow?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, that's a problem that we have but it's not as much our problem as it turns into the trucker's problem because he has to become legal when he reaches the Manitoba border.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, okay, when the Minister says legal, the Manitoba authorities are not concerned with what the trucker does with his cargo, the onus is on the individual hauling from Ontario westward to make whatever arrangements are necessary. Is that well known in Ontario?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes it is, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Fine, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, with respect to signs, the signs advertising services of private entrepreneurs placed on shoulders of highways, who provides the sign? Is it the department or the private entrepreneur whose business is advertised?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, in the provision of the standard signing which, as I indicated earlier, will indicate if restaurants are available, if hotel and motel services are available, those signs are available, are standard, and are paid for by the communities requesting them.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not referring to those signs. I am referring to signs naming one particular private entrepreneur advertising his business mounted on the shoulder of the highway.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, can the Member for Burrows give me an example?

MR. HANUSCHAK: There's one on the Trans-Canada Highway, or it was there a few months ago. --(Interjection)-- No, not blueberries for sale nor strawberries but advertising a campground, a private campground. I think it's called the Westwinds Campground.

MR. ORCHARD: My understanding, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: As I recall it, the name of the campground appears right on the sign and it's mounted on the shoulder of the road in the similar location to where you would have a sign erected to direct travellers to publicly-owned campgrounds.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, those signs are requested of the Department of Tourism. They are provided by my department. We charge the Department of Tourism for the sign and its installation and they charge back the private entrepreneur for the costs that they have incurred from our department.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, if I may make a suggestion to the Minister, I think if he would examine those signs, he would find that there is somewhat of a similarity in its appearance between the sign of the private entrepreneur, and I am referring particularly to the campground operator, the private one and the public one. The colors are similar. I can't recall off-hand what other similarities there were on the sign but it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that particularly a traveller from out of province and unfamiliar with our signing symbols, would not really know whether that's a publicly-owned campground that's being advertised or a private one. So what I am suggesting to the Minister is that he take that matter under advisement and that he do come up with some form of a sign which would distinguish a privately operated facility from a public one.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Member for Burrows that any visitors visiting this great province of ours, upon entry of the province, if they were to call into a government tourist bureau, that they would pick up information on the tourist facilities that are available, plus they may will pick up a copy of the road map. And on that road map is indicated all the government campgrounds.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, yes, I believe that it is shown somewhere, although I doubt . . . There's a very very tiny one. There is a large picture of the previous Minister and I believe of the present one, too. In fact, I think the present Minister, he's in color, the present one, which would indicate a little bit of extravagance on the part of this . . .

My point is that there should be a clear distinction between the signing of a publicly owned facility and a privately owned facility and that the two signs should not bear the similarity which may, for the benefit of the Chairman and particularly for the benefit for the Member for Portage, who appears to be at a loss as to what my point is. But the question was directed from him, and so it appears that there are some members of the committee who are very anxious to know what my point is. That is my point, that I feel that there should be a distinction between a sign mark indicating the presence of a publicly owned facility and a private one because I, for one am one of many, if I have a choice between the two, I would prefer to stay in a public facility rather than in a privately owned one. And the same is true of a very large percentage of Manitobans, a very large and in fact, an increasing number of Manitobans, as evidenced by the last election and which the Tories, of all parties, should know best.

My other question, I would like the Minister's views, has he received any recommendations from the Licence Suspension Appeal Board on the advisability of instituting dual licencing? You know, a driver's licence for work and one for pleasure.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Do I understand correctly that the Member for Burrows definition of dual licensing is one for work and one for play?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, yes, for driving other than for his employment, for example, yes. If I am a plumber, I may have a licence that I use that qualifies me to drive, going about my work, as opposed to the type of licence my daughter may have, who is not engaged in employment that requires the driving of the automobile to and from it.

MR. ORCHARD: I still don't understand, Mr. Chairman, where the Member for Burrows daughter fits into this dual licensing system.

MR. HANUSCHAK: She doesn't have to fit into the dual licensing system. I am attempting to answer the Minister's question.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I am attempting to make sure that I understand the member's question. A dual licence is one for work plus for play held by the same individual?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I don't give a damn whether it's play or not, but for driving other than as part of one's employment. A salesman may drive a vehicle during portions of the day in the conduct of his work. He drives that vehicle at other times of the day for other purposes. It might be shopping or a Sunday afternoon drive to church, whatever.

MR. ORCHARD: What the member wants to know is if we are entertaining the possibility of dual licensing system.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, you're putting words in my mouth. I merely asked you whether you had received any advice or recommendations from the Licence Suspension Appeal Board to that effect.

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: But you say that you would take under consideration such a system of licensing?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Is the Minister considering it?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I just have the one question. On the uniform Canadian plan that was under discussion a while ago the Minister mentioned sharing of the fees with the different provinces. What's the criteria to determine the fees? Like, say, how much time a vehicle has spent in one province or another; how does that work?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the criterion is on the pro-rating of the mileage incurred in each jurisdiction, which is easily identifiable via such cross-checks as the gasoline tax collection, which is based also on mileage operated within a jurisdiction.

MR. ADAM: And that is how you are going to determine if you are getting the right amount of fees, by how much the trucker buys fuel in this province?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman. I said that that is the pro-rating system. Upon application, a trucking firm will indicate . . . Let us choose a figure and let us say they are going to operate in three jurisdictions and they are going to put on 1,500 miles, 500 of which they are going to put on in Ontario,

500 in Manitoba, 500 in Saskatchewan, and they indicate that breakdown on their application for licence.

MR. ADAM: Times the trips?

MR. ORCHARD: No, well, that the trips are independent because once you pay your licence fee you can make any number of trips you wish. There is no restriction on the number of trips once you pay your money. And on the basis of that one-third, one-third, one-third split, each jurisdiction would receive one-third of the licence fee. If the trucker is playing games and is in fact running 750 miles in Manitoba, that can be cross-checked when it comes to the fuel tax collection which is audited and to make sure that the individual firm is paying the proper amount of fuel tax.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 9.(d)(1)--pass; 9.(d)(2)--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,039,200 for Highways and Transportation, Motor Vehicle Branch--pass.

We revert back to Item 1., Resolution 80, the Minister's Compensation.
The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the debate on this item, which is a most important one and which I am sure will take a fair amount of time, I just want to make one brief suggestion to the Minister. And I would hope that he would draw to the attention of his colleague, the Member for Roblin, that the NDP did not refuse to support the following expenditure, the facts, dollars, by Lyon's government during the year ahead and the item that would be of particular concern to this Minister, because his colleague said that we refused to support the approval of \$76 million for Highways and Transportation Construction and \$37.8 million . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. MERCIER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I see no relevance in this matter as it pertains to the Minister's Salary, referring to the comments of the Member for Burrows with respect to comments from another member of the Legislature, completely unrelated to the Minister's Salary.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with, under the Minister's Salary, all the items from 1 to 9 that under his jurisdiction, one of which is construction of provincial trunk highways and roads which was \$76 million, another was road maintenance which was \$37.8 million, and I simply wish to correct the erroneous impression created by the Minister's colleague, namely the Member for Roblin, that the New Democratic Party members of the House voted against this, because that did not happen. And, Mr. Chairman, in fact we passed those particular items. And the Chairman and the Minister ought to know that that did not occur and I would hope that the Minister would make it his responsibility to write to the Grandview Exponent and to the Roblin newspaper, correcting the article which previously appeared, leaving the people in the Roblin and Grandview areas with the impression that the New Democratic Party members of the government voted against the appropriation of funds for the building and the repair of roads in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would be the ruling of the Chair that there will be some latitude given here with the understanding that this is the Minister's Salary and, as I said, there will be some latitude but we're certainly not going to thresh straw and, to go back to the newspaper article which we've discussed in the House earlier in the day, I think there has been discussion on this thing and we will carry on to a limited degree, but . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, then, Mr. Chairman, very well, I will abide within your rules . . .

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do have the Chair and when I'm finished, I will let you know and I'll recognize you.

MR HANUSCHAK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the Minister whether he has any information arising from the proceedings of this committee that would indicate that the members of the New Democratic Party caucus voted against the approval of the appropriation of funds for the construction of provincial trunk highways, roads and related subjects, and for the maintenance. Has he any evidence of us voting against the appropriation of funds for those two items?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I could probably answer that question after we deal with the resolution that's at hand.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the proceedings of this committee up to this point in time, the Minister will recall that at the end of every appropriation the Chairman called "pass" and was there a negative vote? Was there a rejection of either of these two items by the New Democratic Party members of this committee?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very obvious that the Member for Roblin's article in the newspaper was most timely, because it has seemed that it has cowed the opposition into voting for all of these things that he has mentioned.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, it goes back to the Throne Speech Debate and I ask the Minister again, can he produce anything from the record of the proceedings of this committee that would indicate that the New Democratic Party members voted against the appropriation of moneys for the maintenance and the construction of highways in Manitoba?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said, it's very timely that the Member for Roblin did have that article in the newspaper, because it's obviously put the fear of God into the Opposition and they have passed the Construction and Maintenance Items, much to their benefit, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, if the Minister chooses not to answer my question, that's his privilege.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks, and I don't get on this side very often. I must apologize, I haven't had time to confer with my honourable colleague for Ste. Rose. He was indicating that I've got a lot of hardtop. I really don't see it, but I'm thankful for the small bits that I have got, such as 250 north of Rivers. If my Member for Minnedosa was here, I would share a part of that mileage and certainly, 259, is base asphalt and some seven miles, and that's taking, which I've said many times, 259 and 250 are very important to the constituency of Virden.

I might also say that I have been always pleased and this is a repeat, with the staff in the sub-offices and the office. Often it's very easy to criticize the district people and I've never said that, because I've never believed that. I find them good, conscientious civil servants, regardless who is in power, and they've been there not quite as long as I have, but I've had to work with them and I find it easy to work with them no matter what those conditions.

But the one I would like to refer to, I'm sure it's four or five years ago, when I begged consideration of a chunk of No. 1 Highway and this is not my constituency, but it's a chunk west of Kemnay to what I know as Griswold. I say most of that is on the four-lane and I've related to you before the many many people - the deaths - and I think one year ago or two years ago, when we were in the Esti-

Monday, 24 March, 1980

mates we had a little discussion. It was a stormy day but we quit a little earlier and I went home, and I always know how to get to hell off No. 1 Highway, and my garageman at Lenore didn't and he was killed, or I could say that their family from Maryfield that were, they're dead. Hughie Mann's daughter, dead; the McCahon boy from Harding, dead; our babysitter McLean, dead; a hired man was badly crippled. I think he's back to fairly good health now. All in that chunk of road. My ex-postmaster, crippled for life.

So I say to the Minister and the staff, it wasn't one Minister, it wasn't one year of planning; it was a hell of lot of years to end up four-lane at Brandon and leave that stretch a single lane and go to another four-lane but I think that's a real, a proper, a Christian way of doing it because that's going to save lives. Every time it's stormy, I just think, well, who of my friends are going to get it. I never find myself on that chunk of road, but I know many people do. It is still No. 1, and I just thank to God that's it's in the program. By this time next year or the year later, it'll be four-lane because it's a bunch of curves; and we could easily criticize the administration when that was built but it was a tight-fisted budget. They were forced to do those things, to make those little curves that are most troublesome, and I just think that I am reasonably pleased as I haven't had time to look over the entire program, 250, I appreciate; 259, and that 8.1 miles of No. 1 is most urgently needed and certainly is appreciated by anybody in Manitoba. I don't look at these sort of things parochial. If I see the Highway Budget is up \$30 million, I just think Manitoba is generally a benefit by that, and if MacGregor and Virden doesn't get it, is it important? I'll cry to the Deputy and Minister but really, if the program is there and there's highways being built, Manitobans generally benefit by that, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I haven't read the article that the Member for Burrows had before him a while ago in regard to the comments made by the Member for Roblin but if what he says is correct, that the Member for Roblin wants to advise his constituents that the members of the Opposition have opposed the Highway Budget that's presented by the Minister, I don't know what we've been doing here for the last week passing almost \$150 million. I'm sure that the truth will always come out, anyway, in the end. So, his constituency will eventually find out that wasn't the case but, Mr. Chairman, we're on the Minister's Salary now and I find it very difficult to find words that would be parliamentary and still express our utter disgust at this Minister.

I don't believe the Minister really realizes and is fully aware of the ramifications of his program for this year and what he has perpetrated on a large section of Manitoba by introducing this road program, which excludes most of north central Manitoba. Many rural towns and communities and business people will suffer economic slowdown because when there are public investments, public works, public roads going on, no matter where it is, there is always a spin-off, there's a lot of business activity taking place and there is a multiplier effect throughout any district where public investment is taking place, whether it's roads or whether it's hospitals, whether it's nursing homes or senior citizens' homes, it doesn't matter. There is gravelling going on; there's construction taking place, and the restaurants are busy, Mr. Chairman, and they are selling meals. Hotels are busy; there's traffic going on; there's rooms being sold. The tire shops are busy and bulk fuel business are going full speed ahead. The tire shops, the mechanics are busy and these people, Mr. Chairman, they draw wages. The business people hire people and they draw wages; and they spend their money, and that is the multiplier effect.

So we are very disappointed with the program that the Minister presented this year, but more so on what's going to happen next year. Because we find that in the acquisition area, there is a far overweight in favour of Southeastern Manitoba, and particularly in the Conservative constituencies. We're happy for the people that are getting roads, but we say that they've gone overboard on this particular program, Mr. Chairman.

I recall that the Minister in the House referred to me in an unparliamentary manner by accusing me of being a hypocrite. The Member for Gladstone . . .

Monday, 24 March, 1980

A MEMBER: Who accused you of that?

MR. ADAM: The Minister of Highways and Transportation accused me of being a hypocrite in the House, and the Member for Gladstone

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. ADAM: And the Member for Gladstone attempted to do likewise here but, since it wasn't parliamentary, he didn't say it. But, Mr. Chairman, for years I have been listening to members opposite - how opposed they are to public investment and opposed to public involvement. And, Mr. Chairman, they've always opposed public investment, and deficits, and expenditures and I've never heard a member support public involvement. They've always stood up and condemned socialist public spending, Mr. Chairman, but I would like the --(Interjection)-- Yes, I'm talking about highways. I'm talking about highways, yes, public socialist expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee, order.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I'm not surprised at, you know, who do you find now that's in the public trough? Who are the hypocrites, who are the hypocrites, Mr. Chairman? Those who say we shouldn't spend public dollars for public expenditures, and who are the first with their noses in the public trough. Well, if we look at the map, Mr. Chairman, it's very clear to see. Who likes socialism around here? Who is always in the public trough? The map is clear, Mr. Chairman. --(Interjection)-- Well, you know, the Member for Minnedosa, who chatters from his seat all the time and has a very rich supper with a lot of liquid in it most of the time. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that they will regret what they have done and I know that the Minister wasn't alone in his decision.

I wonder if you could control the member that's chattering at the other end, Mr. Chairman.

The members will eventually find out that, you know, sure, highways are perhaps political to some extent, but you don't have to go overboard to that extent, Mr. Chairman. There's got to be fairness in what's going on and the people of Manitoba have every right to expect that government programs and expenditures should be applied fairly to all people in all regions of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Highways and Transportation with the presentation of his program this year has flagrantly abused his position, and has betrayed the trust placed in him by the people of Manitoba by introducing a highways construction program which has largely ignored regions of Manitoba which are not represented by Conservative MLAs.

And, more specifically, the Minister has proposed that this committee approve 142 projects in Southern Manitoba which, by the way, we have done, Mr. Chairman. He has asked us to approve 142 projects in Southern Manitoba of which 126 projects are allocated to constituencies represented by the Conservative MLAs, and only 16 projects in constituencies represented by the NDP MLAs.

AND WHEREAS the Minister of Highways and Transportation has proposed right-of-way acquisition of some 262.3 miles in constituencies represented by Conservative MLAs and only six miles in constituencies represented by Conservative MLAs and only six miles in constituencies represented by NDP MLAs;

AND WHEREAS the road system will not be improved or upgraded in a large part of Manitoba because of this callous policy of this Minister;

I have no regrets, Mr. Chairman, in moving that:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Minister's Salary be reduced to \$1.00.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, just to help the Member for Ste. Rose, I think that is a most heartless motion to . . .

Monday, 24 March, 1980

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

MR. ADAM: There's a motion now on the floor. That is the first order of business.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ste. Rose is the one who is being very crass, political and very callous tonight in attempting to reduce my salary to \$1.00 and he points out a number of so-called alleged reasons that he has for doing that.

And, Mr. Chairman, I'm out to the quick with such a crass move. I thought the Member for Ste. Rose had considerably more integrity as critic of this department, which serves all Manitobans, than he obviously has demonstrated here tonight.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the Member for Ste. Rose and to the members in the opposition, that they have indicated a number of very serious allegations against myself as Minister for the Highways Department and in developing our construction program this year.

Mr. Chairman, it may well appear that significant amounts of work are being undertaken in what are now Conservative ridings in southern Manitoba but, Mr. Chairman, I don't have to point out to anyone around this table, including members in the opposition, that the vast majority of the road network in the province of Manitoba is found within Tory constituencies because they represent the majority of the constituencies in the area that my department has jurisdiction over.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this crass political statement that the Member for Ste. Rose is accusing me of and has made this very infamous motion upon, fails to recognize, Mr. Chairman, that we have undertaken almost 175 miles of road construction in northern Manitoba in which we only have one constituency, if constituencies are indeed a consideration that the Member for Ste. Rose indicates. Now that is the most colossal blind-eyed observation of an inequitable road program that, Mr. Chairman, I think anyone in any opposition has ever made. He completely fails to recognize 175 miles of road construction in northern Manitoba, serving those residents of northern Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that shows to me that the Member for Ste. Rose should resign as critic for the Department of Highways because he knows not what the program contains.

Now, Mr. Chairman, another point that I want to make to the Member for Ste. Rose for his information, the road program as I've indicated, appears by their analysis to be concentrated in Tory constituencies, of which there are the majority of in the jurisdiction under which this department has.

Now, Mr. Chairman, several things happen in the development of a road program. First of all, the road program is prioritized on the basis of needs. Under eight successive years of construction programs by our friends in opposition, when they had their day in government - and we drew this out, some of the members in my caucus outlined the road programs in those very crass political years that were the NDP regime - and, Mr. Chairman, it's highly coincidental that the areas in which I am now forced to build roads by this year's construction budget, coincide with the areas that that crass political government of eight years in this province saw fit to neglect, not for one construction budget, Mr. Chairman, but for eight consecutive ones. And if it so happens that in this year's budget there is road work being undertaken in those constituencies, it is a direct result of the colossal neglect that that administration undertook in their eight very political years of road programming in the province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, at the same time that those road programs were being neglected in Tory constituencies which currently are getting a little bit of road work, at the same time what was happening in rural Manitoba, Mr. Chairman? There was 670 miles of rail line being abandoned while the ND party did nothing, nothing, Mr. Chairman, to protect the rail lines in those Tory constituencies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we're not talking protecting rail lines strictly for Tory members, Mr. Chairman. We're talking about protecting rail lines for the people of Manitoba. That government in their term in power, their eight years in power, chose, Mr. Chairman, to not do anything to protect the rail lines of this province. As a result, Mr. Chairman, we are now forced with building and upgrading roads to accommodate the extra grain haul, the extra freight movement which has to

Monday, 24 March, 1980

go by truck and by road now, Mr. Chairman, because 670 miles of rail line were abandoned during the NDP years of government.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, this program, and I would suspect bases the need caused by eight years of neglect in construction in those areas, plus the rail line abandonment, that successive construction budgets of this department, regardless of what party is in power, are of necessity going to have to concentrate on those areas to provide those residents and those communities with proper transportation facilities.

Now, if that's crass politics, Mr. Chairman, then I suggest the members in the opposition know not the meaning of the word. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question? Do you want me to read the Resolution or do we just . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour of the Resolution? Those in favour of the Resolution?

The Member for St. Vital on a point of order.

MR. WALDING: My point of order is that if you refer to the rules you'll find that the Chairman might not accept any resolution or motion that might alter or vary an amount in the Estimates.

The rule further goes on to say that "in these cases it should be taken as the first item of business on the next day".

MR. CHAIRMAN: I need a little guidance here.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Section 65(9) says: "The Chairman shall not accept any vote that defeats or varies an item in the Estimates of the government where the Committee of Supply sits after 10:00 p.m. So I think we can have a vote. --(Interjection)--

But if it's one that defeated an item, or varied an item, that it couldn't be accepted by you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we could have a vote?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Yes. The matter has arisen several times previously and it has been our practice quite clearly, that when such an occasion occurs after 10 o'clock, that the matter is not dealt with in that evening but is put over until the first item of business on the next time the committee meets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm led to believe that the Honourable Member for St. Vital is wrong in his assumption.

So I will put the question. All in favour of the resolution?

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, to the same point of order. There are several precedents for what I am proposing, and I would suggest that if . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order. The member has a point of order.

MR. WALDING: I am trying to finish the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that for you to make a differing ruling at this time would be to set a completely new precedent, one that was not intended by the Rules Committee when these rules were drawn up. And I speak from some experience because I was present when the matter was discussed at some length with members of the Conservative Party who were in opposition at the time, as I recall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have taken the advice from some of the people. The Rule Book isn't here and I was led to believe we could take the vote.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

To the committee I'll read out: "The Chairman or the Deputy Chairman of the committee shall not accept any vote that defeats or varies an item in the Estimates of the government."

So the Chair would recognize, we would take a vote. If it is lost then it would go to the House. That's the way I would clarify it. The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: On the same point of order. One reason I believe it was worded in that manner, is that normally when a vote is taken members can request Ayes and Nays, and it was recognized that the difficulty of calling in the members was recognized. That some of the members would have gone home, others would have been sitting in the other committee, and for that reason it was worded in that manner so that tomorrow afternoon, when all of the members are here, that the bells can ring and the members can be called in to take the vote.
--(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, to the point of order. I think that the rule is quite clear, where the Committee of Supply, or a section of it, is sitting after 10:00 p.m. on any day, the Chairman or the Deputy Chairman of the committee shall not accept any vote that defeats or varies an item in the Estimates of the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour of the Resolution? Those opposed? I declare then . . .

A MEMBER: You can't call for Ayes and Nays after 10 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the Resolution lost. --(Interjection)--

MR. WALDING: There being no further business before the committee. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,573,600. . .

MR. WALDING: No, Mr. Chairman. On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . for Highways and Transportation . . .

MR. WALDING: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, we are asking that the members be called in for a formal standing vote. Please ring the bells and call in the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can't call in after 10 o'clock.

MR. WALDING: Exactly. That's the whole point, Mr. Chairman.

A MEMBER: That's the point, you're ruling on the acceptance of a Resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Okay, we're ruling on acceptance. That has not been granted. So there is no ayes and nays. --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: Oh yes, you can ask for ayes and nays on any vote.

A MEMBER: Not after 10 o'clock you can't.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. HANUSCHAK: Oh, oh. Then the government can railroad through anything . . . --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: Yes, they're a ruthless bunch, of course.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, yes, of course.

A MEMBER: I've sat with you guys long enough to know. . . --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairperson, if that motion cannot be voted on now, then it is not in order to accept that motion.

According to the rule, the only time you can ever accept that motion is if it defeats or varies the Estimates.

I think you are proper in calling the question. It has been defeated and I think we should proceed with the completion of the Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I did read it once but I'll resolve it. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1 million. . .
The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly have to challenge your ruling in accepting the motion.

A MEMBER: Too late, too late, the vote was called. The vote was called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the ruling of the Chair be upheld, as I would understand? Those in favor? Those against?

MR. WALDING: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman. Call in the members.

MR. MCGREGOR: But the Rule says we cannot have. . . after ten o'clock.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, a point of order, I wish to appeal to the House. I wish the House to make the decision, and surely I have the right to have the House make that decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, as the rules would stand, you cannot accept any motions after 10:00 o'clock.

MR. ORCHARD: That's right. Except for a motion to adjourn.

MR. FERGUSON: So consequently you have ruled, we have gone along with it, and so I would say, read the resolution and that's it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm looking at all members for just a little bit of guidance. I believe to be right in my judgment; I think was right according to the way I interpreted the rule. But I am certainly not perfect. I have made errors before and if I'm wrong, I want to be proven in what area I'm wrong. Otherwise I will read this resolution one more time.

The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: I sense a danger here in making a precedent that we will live to regret in the future. There are many precedents for proceeding the way in which I explained to you before. Can I suggest to you that rather than set a wrong precedent at this time, that somebody make the motion that the committee rise. You can take it under advisement and confer with others and we can deal with it perhaps tomorrow. In fact, it has just occurred to me that the Rules Com-

Monday, 24 March, 1980

mittee is meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock and perhaps they might wish to clarify the matter there as to what the intent was. I move committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe I can get some guidance from the House Leader, if he would think that to be a proper. . .

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we would be prepared to hold the vote on the resolution until tomorrow and have committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one clarification. Which resolution are we talking on? On the Minister's Salary? Resolved that granted to Her Majesty . . . that resolution? All right.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that after 10:00 o'clock the only motion that can be accepted by the Chair is for a motion for adjournment. All other motions are out of order. Is that not correct? --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chairman wants to know. . .there are two resolutions before us, one moved by the opposition and the one that resolves the amount of money. Now which. . .

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we will be prepared to revert to the motion to reduce the Minister's Salary. I must say, Mr. Chairman, there is an uncertainty among a lot of members as to the precise rules that apply. We are going to meet in the Rules Committee tomorrow morning and hopefully we can clarify the rules which are applicable for the benefit of all members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So then, I believe if I interpret what the Leader of the House has said, both this resolution and the money one also will be passed tomorrow. Thank you. I move Committee rise.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have the privilege of reviewing the film of the former Clerk, or Assistant Clerk, Mr. Anstett, at a later date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, would you repeat it?

MR. MCKENZIE: I wonder if we could have the opportunity, as members of the Legislature, to review the clip which was on television the night of Mr. Anstett, the former Clerk of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think that we have the right to make that decision at this time, to the honourable member. We are in Committee of Supply, and I would have to rule your request out of order.

This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members to page 76 of the Main Estimates, Department of Natural Resources. We are on Resolution 102, Clause 3., Resources Executive Administration, Item (c) Resource Allocation, (1)Salaries--pass.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, as we were adjourning at 4:30 this afternoon, the Minister was just beginning, I believe, to explain to us what the function of this section would be in terms of the resource allocation function of the department, and also what policies he has developed, or is in the process of developing, regarding the resource allocation, with particular emphasis on how he

Monday, 24 March, 1980

determines or will determine access to resources by individuals, groups, companies, communities, or whoever may apply for access to resource.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't just beginning to explain, I was actually concluding my explanation of what this group was doing, and I said that as we got into individual branches, then we could deal with priorities if they wish on allocation of those resources. I had just reviewed the structure or the general objective of the allocation group and of a general priority for local communities. I think the only other thing that I could add to that would be recognition of the Treaty rights of Indian people as being a priority, - say, on the use of fish and wildlife - that stands at the head of the line in terms of the allocation of those resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was hoping we would get more of a response than that from the Minister, since he did indicate that the individual branches of the department such as the Forestry Branch, Wildlife Branch, Fisheries Branch, etc., are branches that tend to be advocates for their particular resource area, and thereby would have a particular client group for which they have a particular affinity, and would be pushing for policies and allocation programs that would deal with their resource and the interests of that branch in allocating the resource. I was hoping that the Minister was going to explain to us more fully what role this particular group would play in the overall policy development for the department. Not just what are you going to do in Forestry - what are you going to do in Fisheries, what are you going to do in Lands, as we come to each section - but what are the overall principles and policies guiding the allocation of resources as a whole. I believe that this section of his department could play that kind of co-ordinating role. I would hope that he has some policies regarding an overall thrust or thrusts in the area of resource allocations. He must have some concept or some idea of what he wants to achieve as Minister of Natural Resources in terms of resource development in the province, or is he, as Minister, simply going to act as a policeman and ensure that existing regulations are followed and make no new initiatives of his own, or attempt to solve many of the resource allocation problems that we are facing in the province. I think that's where we could have a good general discussion, in this area, and I had hoped the Minister could tell us how this section, and the staff associated with this section, could play a role in advising him and in the development of resource policy in general.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I attempted to point out earlier that one of the things that the allocation group has to do is determine what demands exist in any given area of resource use. That is easily said, is quickly said, but it's really quite a significant task to undertake.

Secondly, we have to have a bringing together of our various inventories of resources that have been conducted over the years, but perhaps have not been brought together and analyzed from an overall perspective, and that given those kinds of tasks being done, we then must move to see how we meet those demands. And it's difficult to set out priorities on a theoretical basis till we have arrived at actual situations. But I have outlined for the honourable members the priorities in terms of the local communities' requirements, of Indian Treaty rights requirements, that local domestic uses of resources would have to rank higher than the commercial uses of resources, and that uses of recreational resources by Manitobans would have to rank higher than, in effect, the commercial export of recreational resources. That type of allocation is outlined, and it's difficult to give much more detail than that until we're dealing with specific situations of how a given unit of resource has been allocated. And if there are some questions about that, of course, I will attempt to answer them specifically.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I could just make a comment, we are investigating the department on an individual basis, and I would think that possibly as a summing up under Minister's Salary, that these things could all be brought forward, rather than lose the opportunity of investigating it on an overall picture.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, the Minister has described the function of this section as to look at the overall picture of resource allocations as opposed to section by section, which might defend their own interests. And therefore, the Minister has defined the function of this section in a fairly broad way. Therefore, I'd ask the Minister, Mr. Chairperson, what specific recommendations has this group brought forward to date? They were funded last year' and the Minister wants an increased funding this year. I wonder if he'd give us an example of specific recommendations that have come out of this group, or what have they done.

MR. RANSOM: The group was really only made operational in early summer, I guess, of 1979, Mr. Chairman, and that was with the first one or two people that were brought into that area; and as the year progressed, and with our reorganization, others were brought into the group that had existed elsewhere. And to date, there are no written reports, as such, that I can refer to as hard, fast recommendations that this group has brought forward.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I am having trouble seeing why we have this section at all, or why we should approve this section of the Minister's Budget, because he does have the specific sections of his department working on their aspect of it, and they have the Minister and the Deputy Minister and others to have the overall view from all those sections of the department. And yet the Minister has this section in his budget, and this is the second year he is asking for approval of this particular section called "Resource Allocation".

So I wonder if the Minister could tell us if, in fact, this group has looked at wild rice policy and harvesting wild rice policy, or whether this group has looked at. . . was this group the one that made recommendations in terms of changes in fish licencing, or have they taken a look at the conflict between commercial fishing and recreational or sports fishing. Has this group looked at forestry allocation in terms of local community use of forestry resources? Has this group looked at the wild fowl propagation and the relationship with Ducks Unlimited, where that comes into conflict with what's requested by local sportsmen or by local farmers in terms of what area should be used for farming or for wild fowl propagation?

I wonder if the Minister could give us a little bit more detail of why we should have this section and what, in fact, if they have done any of those kind of things; and if not, what kind of things have they done?

MR. RANSOM: The group is not intended to be one that reviews policy, Mr. Chairman, but is more a group to see that allocations that are carried out are done according to government policy. And some of the other examples that the honourable member used, potential conflicts between the sport fishing and commercial fishing, and that sort of thing, would be the types of situations that the group would like at, where lands might potentially be reserved for parks as opposed to being used for forestry purposes, or being reserved for Wildlife Management areas, and that sort of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Park Planning or the use of resource in terms of parks, report that the Member for Rupertsland has been waiting for for a couple of years now, whether this is the group charged with that responsibility, or what is their relationship to that study and those recommendations?

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: I'm assuming that the Minister didn't understand my question, Mr. Chairperson. There were detailed recommendations that were expected in terms of the Whiteshell and all provincial parks and park usage. Was this Resource Allocation Group involved in that study, or not?

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: I wonder then, Mr. Chairperson, if the Minister could tell us what types of expertise then, what would be the experience, ability and training of these eight people that are in this section.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I'll get a list of the people, Mr. Chairman. The group was headed by the former director of Fisheries, Dr. Doan, and former director of Parks, Mr. Moffatt is involved, Mr. Tomasson who used to be with the Land Use Planning group, and there's a resource planner, resource technician, with their support staff of administrative secretary, a drafting technician, so that there are two senior officers and two administrative secretaries, a classification called Senior Land Use Planner, a resource planner a resource technician and a drafting technician. That makes up the eight.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. The problem I'm having with this particular section is one is sort of fitting in with the whole department in terms of a worthwhile and necessary function. And the other question that comes up as we look at the administration, as we look at the bureaucracy, is that - and I guess I'm getting suspicious because the Minister isn't able to give much in terms of specific, of what this group does - that this is the depository for lateral transfers, that in fact there is not a real job here, a real important function for this group. But it's when the Minister wants to put another person in another position, he transfers somebody into this section to get them out of the way, so that he can have the staff in place that he wants within his department. And that's one of my concerns.

The other concern, Mr. Chairperson, is that function that he described in answer to my last question in terms of this particular section, was to make sure that what allocations had been done were done properly, with almost the same definition he gave us for his internal audit service, was to ensure that things were done in the way that was defined or set out. So that's why, Mr. Chairman, the Minister sort of hasn't satisfied my curiosity in terms of what this section is supposed to do, and what value it is within the department.

So I would ask the Minister if he could give me some more information to allay my fears about this section of his department in terms of why he sees this as an important function, or what is the importance of the function.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me hasten to say that there is no overlap, no resemblance, between the two functions that the honourable member refers to, that of internal audit and the allocation system. Internal audit deals with the management, the processing, of information and bills, and that sort of thing, within the department. This group deals with the allocation of resources.

As an example, it stems from the period of the previous administration, the sort of thing that I would hope could be avoided with this kind of a group, would be the situation at Molson Lake, for instance, where a lodge operator runs a tourist lodge which was dependent on a trophy fishing operation and dependent upon being a remote location without access. And at the same time as the previous administration was approving the transfer of the licence on that lodge, at the same time they approved the construction of a road into Molson Lake. And now we have the situation where the local community and the lodge operators are wanting us to close the road, to stop the access that was provided previously. That's the sort of thing that should be avoided if a group like this is functioning properly.

Plus, I referred to the overall recreational strategy that I would hope to see developed for the province, wherein the role of the Parks Branch, for instance,

would be just one agency with a mandate to fulfill part of that overall recreational strategy. The people who manage the wildlife or sport hunting would be fulfilling another part of that strategy, and the management of Crown lands and waters outside of parks would be another part of it. I think it is very essential to have that kind of overall framework and perspective within which to direct the individual management efforts. And I believe that the concept is quite well received by advocate groups outside of government who are interested in seeing management of our resources put on a more sound base. And while I do not have concrete results from the group yet, it is, to a great extent, because it has only been put together over the space of the last year, and that some of these activities are going to require some time to complete and to come up with some positive recommendations.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this group then has reviewed all roads that are going to be constructed or planned by the Province of Manitoba this year, and whether they've looked at those in terms of their resource use implications.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that roads being - well, I know that roads being constructed now are examined by the Interdepartmental Planning Board in terms of environmental impacts. It's when we look at the allocation of the resource, let's say the fishing resource, that they then have to look at the implications of road construction, for example, and, of course, this was one of the reasons why we had attempted to put at least a temporary freeze on allocation of fishing resources while we attempted to get some of this framework operational to keep us from getting into more problems, such as we've gotten into in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I'm still not clear. The Minister said earlier on, if I heard him correctly, that this was not a policy group, and now he talks about, in terms of their planning of resource uses, as if they were going to recommend policy. I wonder if the Minister could clarify whether this is a policy group or not.

MR. RANSOM: Well, perhaps the honourable member is having a little difficulty understanding what policy means, or what I understand by policy. I see this group as being useful in implementing policy, rather than seeing them as developers of policy. To identify demands, for instance, recreational demands is not a function of a policy group. It's not a policy matter, but when we set out to meet those demands, then those programs will have to fall within the context of the policies that are established for recreation, for park management.

MR. McBRYDE: Again, to the Minister. The Minister indicated that this group is useful in implementing policy, to quote his words, and I wonder if he could tell us what area of policy implementation they've been involved in to this date.

MR. RANSOM: I think, perhaps, the honourable member is misinterpreting what I said. I don't believe I said that they were implementing policy, but that they would be assuring that implementation of programs was done according to policy.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if you could tell us what areas they are ensuring that implementation of policy is being done.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been attempting two or three times to point out to the honourable members that the group has only been put together over the course of the past year and is not in, what I would consider to be at a fully functional stage yet. I said that I do not have copies of reports, for instance, that they have studies or programs that they've monitored, that sort of thing. I would hope that over the course of the next year that we will have, for instance,

Monday, 24 March, 1980

some, at least the preliminary recreational strategy that will have been put together by this group as one of their. . .but I would regard as one of the the major undertakings that they will be doing in this next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)-- pass. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, I'm still having a lot of difficulty with this section. This group was only established last year; I accept that from the Minister, and he is asking for additional funding for this group this year. There are eight people in this section. They have issued no reports, or have not completed any studies, and they have not been involved in seeing that policy implementation is being done to this stage. And therefore, Mr. Chairperson, I am still having considerable difficulty seeing why we have this section.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister talked about the individual management of the other sections of his department, and I still see a considerable overlap here. And I guess, Mr. Chairman, what I see it is in terms of how you manage or the organizational development or the organization of the department. Because one of the problems, if you have a nebulous group like this, that is supposed to somehow have some input in terms of checking to see if there is an overlap in policy - which is my interpretation of what the Minister - said to ensure that people that are interested in fisheries also consider the wild rice, or people that are interested in propogating ducks also consider the muskrats. I am assuming that that's what the Minister has in mind when he is talking about this particular group. But the Minister talked about the management areas of the section, and then the Minister talked about how this group could be useful, and I am assuming that there must be some studies, then, that cross those jurisdictional areas that this group would be involved in, or that this group is the one that you send to committee meetings. Whenever there is a committee meeting on something, you have to have to some bodies in the bureaucracy to send to committee meetings, otherwise the committee couldn't meet. And maybe this is the group that the Minister sends to committee meetings.

But, Mr. Chairperson, I see this as being either unnecessary or ineffective, in terms of that they are not recommending policy or they are not setting policy. And yet the Minister seems to have some idea in his mind that this group could be used in strategy or preparation or resource allocation in some way. And one of the weaknesses of this department, overall, and of this government overall, has been the inability to set policy directions, or to outline in a clear manner the policy directions, and this has been especially evident in the area of resource allocation, where they have not been able to say clearly what are their goals, what do they hope to accomplish in the area of resource allocation? Why allocate resources? How do you determine the guidelines or the priorities for allocation of resources if you have no policy or no strategy to follow in terms of development? And therefore, this section, Mr. Chairperson, in my mind, is really impotent. . .it's like sending a eunuch into a harem, I guess you could say, because the department - and this is one of the problems that my colleague, the Member for Rupertsland has mentioned on this department before and that we've mentioned last year, is the lack of clear direction.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is correct, that this group shouldn't be determining the policy. The Minister and the government have to determine the policy. And when they set out in some way clearly what the policy is, what the program is going to be, then the department can carry out those policies. The department can provide information to the Minister, ideas to the Minister, but the Minister has to make a pretty clear distinction and direction in terms of what the policy is going to be.

So what you have, Mr. Chairman, that comes out of it, is that you have the fiasco like the fishing licences, and the proposed changes in the fishing licences. When there was no clear goal, or no clear strategy stated, so we had a policy that would tend to. . .now maybe, Mr. Chairman, this was the goal or was the policy, not articulated by the Minister or his government, that would in fact concentrate the fishing in fewer and fewer hands. And, Mr. Chairman, if that is the goal or the strategy, and if this section is studying ways to get less and less fishermen, or to get fewer and fewer people in the commercial fishing industry, then maybe he should have this group studying that effect and how to

Monday, 24 March, 1980

accomplish that. Or whether, in fact, the new fishing regulations will do what the fishermen are concerned they will do, and that is, end up having fewer and fewer people in the fishing industry.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have a section here that I have considerable difficulty seeing its function, seeing why we have it here, seeing what in fact they have done, and therefore, being suspicious of how the bureaucracy works, begin to think that maybe the real reason for this is in terms of the management or the structure of the department, a place to laterally transfer people if you want them out of the way, a place to have people that attend committee meetings with other departments, because it takes up a lot of staff time to go to all these meetings, and so we have a group here that can attend committee meetings.

So I am not clear, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister has a clear idea of what this section is supposed to do, whether he has given them a clear definition of their job, a clear indication of the strategy that he wants them to pursue or the goals that he wants them to pursue, or whether the goal is a bureaucratic one in terms of making the rest of his bureaucracy work better by having this as a depository for people. And I am very concerned that because, or the main problem faced by this Minister and by this section, is still the lack of a strategy, the lack of the goal, of the department. What is the purpose? What is he hoping to accomplish in the area of resource allocation? And this is the area, Mr. Chairman, where this government and this Minister have fallen down very badly in terms of having that kind of policy direction of clearly telling people where they stand in terms of resource allocation. So, Mr. Chairman, I am hesitant to support, to vote for passage of this section, for those reasons.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the main reason that I was bringing this up earlier, is the same discussion which my colleague, the Member for The Pas, has brought up. And just looking at the chart which the Minister provided us with at the beginning of his Estimates, it's obvious that my colleague has discovered the correct description for this section. And one can understand the Minister's vacillation in his answers on this, because we see that at least one of the individuals in here was the former director of fisheries and has been replaced by someone the Minister has chosen for that position. We see the former director of Parks has been moved into this section and has been replaced by someone the Minister has selected. And there are other people from various other sections of the old department, I assume, that are within this section.

And as yet the Minister is unclear in his own mind as to what he's going to do with these people and what function they're really going to play in the department. And given the philosophy of the Progressive Conservative government, in terms of how they operate as a government, I can see that there will not be much function for this section, or in fact for any other section that's active in the way of developing policies for the development of the resources of Manitoba. Because this government and this Minister, following the Progressive Conservative theory of government will simply operate as policemen of the resources and will not do anything in the way of looking at the resource as a real potential for playing a major role in the development of our province.

And I mean by that, Mr. Chairman, if we were the government, we would want this department to play an active role, not a passive role, as the Progressive Conservative Party is prepared to do in this case and in other cases in government.

The idea seems to be that government should just do as little as possible; that those sections of the department that deal with resources should simply be policing the resource and at most, reacting to requests that come in from time to time from individuals or groups.

There's no attempt to look at the resources and overall package and try to determine what areas require development, and to seek out and find ways of developing that resource, to make our province a richer place, to get a greater return for all the people of Manitoba from our resources. And we will not see any of that kind of development, I'm sure of that, in listening to the way in which this Minister is approaching this department.

I can see that he has really no intention of looking at his department as a

Monday, 24 March, 1980

tool for development, as a way of using the skills that are available within government, to look at the broad resources that we have in our province, and really making out a plan, both short and long-term plan, for the development of those resources, to get a greater return for Manitoba.

So all I can express is our disappointment with this attitude towards government, and make the commitment, Mr. Chairman, that when we are returned to government that we will certainly operate in a way which is in great contrast to the way in which this government operates the Department of Natural Resources. We will look at the resources of Manitoba as a potential for development, and we will do everything in our power to utilize all the technical expertise within the department, to study that resource and to determine the best ways of developing the resource for the benefit of all the people of Manitoba.

This is something that this government just does not seem to want to do. In fact, if anything, they are sitting back and saying they don't have policies, because for two and a half years now, we've been pressing this government to outline to us what their policies are, and it's obvious they'd rather not have any policy because they don't want to do anything. And if you don't want to do anything, you don't need policies. All you have to do is sit back, and that's what they're doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, a couple of additional comments on this particular section. This section that we're dealing with is perhaps one of the ones that has the greatest potential, in terms of this department, if the Minister wanted to make use of that potential - if the Minister gave this group the direction, that is.

How can the people of Manitoba and the people living nearest the resources, get the maximum benefit from our resources? . . . if he was to give this group that question to deal with, so that group would come in with concrete recommendations in terms of how the resources of Manitoba could best be used for the benefit of all the people of Manitoba and for the maximum benefit of those communities close to some of the natural resources, like light trapping and forestry and in the fishing resource. But, Mr. Chairman, this is not the direction that the Minister has given. He hasn't even given this group the direction in terms of how best can we give our resources away, making those decisions as to how best to give the resources away.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we basically have here is a section in a department, which is the lateral transfer section, which I'm sure that members of the department live in fear of, because if they get notice that that's where they're going, they know that their day is done and their usefulness is pretty well over in terms of this government's procedure and how this department's going to work.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister does have an opportunity, but I'm assuming because he is a Conservative and because he is within the Lyon government, that he will not take the opportunity to ask that question, to have anyone address themselves to the question of how best can those resources be used for the benefit of Manitobans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Just a brief comment, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the Honourable Member for The Pas and the Honourable Member for Rupertsland have identified what is in fact a very real difference between their philosophy and ours.

We essentially believe that government is there to assist individual people and groups of people to do things for themselves. They essentially believe that people must act collectively through their government, to do things that will then somehow be to the benefit of individuals, whether it's in the ownership of farmland or whether it's in the ownership of one big petroleum company, or a mining company, forestry operation, or whatever. I think that's the difference. It's a very fundamental one. It's not one that we're going to decide one way or the other, it's the first one that the public eventually chooses between.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

We are in the position of being able to provide assistance and advice and information to potential users of resources and can assist them in carrying that out, but if they're talking about the government being the instrument of development, then they're correct in that that is not the direction that this department is going and is not the direction, generally, that the government is going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister is correct in that there is a basic fundamental difference, Mr. Chairman, in terms of our approach and their approach. What the Minister does, though, is not define that difference in a correct way.

Mr. Chairman, the emphasis on our side of the House, and my colleague from Rupertsland and myself, is to in fact get the people of Manitoba involved in their own resource use and their own resource development and get the benefits from their own resources. And, Mr. Chairman, this department under the direction of my colleague, the Minister for Rupertsland, was one of the main instruments to help people, especially in remote communities, in terms of the resource allocation, to be able to get benefits from the use of our own resources in the province of Manitoba. And, Mr. Chairman, that wasn't the government. The government was only providing assistance for them to do that and not taking control, or not taking charge of that development. But, Mr. Chairman, what this government does, what this Minister does, is abdicate that responsibility.

The resources of Manitoba belong to the people of Manitoba. Our direction was in resources near local communities, the wild rice resource, the trapping resource, the fishing resources, is to attempt to have those communities get the maximum benefit from those resources, because those are areas of high unemployment and where the local need is great, to get people to take advantage of the resources in their particular area.

But, Mr. Chairman, what this government has done, is abdicate that responsibility for the resources of Manitoba. They have given up the responsibility that they have to make the best use of those resources, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, and to make sure that the people of Manitoba are involved in developing those resources by in fact giving those resources away - giving those resources away to Abitibi, giving those resources away to Inco and giving those resources away, perhaps, we don't know for sure in the Minister's policy, to a few fish buyers, to give those resources away to a few wild rice buyers, instead of getting the maximum benefit for the people of Manitoba and for the residents and citizens of Manitoba from those resources.

So that is the basic difference in policy, Mr. Chairman, not as outlined by the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I hope this is the right place to ask these questions.

I understand that the cabin owners lots now, formerly leased, are up for sale. Is this the right place to . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that under the Lands Branch would be the appropriate place to deal with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Lands Branch, under Section 6. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could I ask the Minister, it was approximately 15 years ago that the province of Manitoba issued 15-year cutting rights to timber operators in the southeastern portion of Manitoba, and I am given to understand that those 15-year agreements, giving the sole operating rights to those timber operators, are coming due either this year or next. Could the Minister indicate whether the policy that his government is contemplating is

Monday, 24 March, 1980

one similar to that that he, as Minister, was contemplating in the fishing industry that began last fall?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the item would be more appropriately dealt with under the Forestry Branch, but I can tell the honourable member that there will be a continuation, with slight modifications, of the existing policy.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain further, to continue on with further 15-year agreements? Is there any thought of allowing some of the local operators who did have, at one time, cutting rights, but some of whom were purchased by the large operators and I presume that many of them now, or some of them now, regret that they made the move that they made and are hoping they can get back into the forestry industry? What kind of consideration might be given to those operators? Is there any intent of allowing those operators into the forestry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It has been suggested that this would be more aptly discussed under the Department of Forestry, Item 7, rather than allow the continuation of this questioning. I think there might be some other people who might have some questions on it also. So I would rule that it would be, not out of order, but rather discussed under a different section.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. One of the specific, or at least one of the jobs the Minister assigned to this group was to avoid overlap or contradiction in resource allocation - that's one of his hopes for this section, in a very general way. I wonder if his group then, Mr. Chairperson, could check into and study a conflict of resource allocation, in my mind, more serious than the examples that the Minister gave us. And that is that in the signing of the Grand Rapids Forbay Agreement, the community of Easterville was assigned certain timber rights in their area. And the signing of the ManFor Agreement, the Churchill Forest Industries Agreement by the province of Manitoba in Churchill Forest Industries, which now goes to ManFor, gave the same timber area that the Forbay Agreement assigned to the community of Easterville, assigned that to Churchill Forest Industries.

Mr. Chairman, that's a clear overlap, a clear contradiction, in terms of resource allocation, and I wonder if the Minister could give this section something to do by having them look at that particular problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I recall, when I was attending some of the fishing meetings in northern Manitoba, that one of the reasons that was outlined by government officials at those meetings, for implementing a new policy, was to make a more efficient procedure for allocating the fishing resources in northern Manitoba. In other words, it was a suggestion of some government officials that certain lakes were not being fished; other lakes may well, in fact, been fished too heavily; or there could be that possibility of them being fished too heavily in the near future. So they had devised this new policy in order to deal with that situation.

I would ask the Minister, then, if this department had directed its attention to that matter and it might not have been responsible in some way for implementing or - excuse me, because it was not implemented - for suggesting the policy for a different allocation of fishery resources in northern Manitoba.

MR. RANSOM: This group is not involved there, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that discussion of the fisheries policy would better take place under the Fisheries Branch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (c)--pass. (d) Program Evaluation (1) Salaries--pass; (2). The Honourable Minister.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. RANSOM: This unit, Mr. Chairman, consists of three staff man years, and its primary function will be to evaluate or assist managers to evaluate on-going programs, as well as to praise justification for new, proposed programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, has there been a staff cut in this section?

MR. RANSOM: There were five staff man years in 1979-80, and there are three in 1980-81.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to recommend to the Minister that the program evaluation section evaluates Section 3.(c) of the Resource Allocation section, because I don't think they have very much to do and they are probably greatly in need of an evaluation, in terms of program evaluation. I wonder if the Minister could clarify the difference between what he described as a function of the internal audit system, the function he described as the operations administration system, and what he described as Program Evaluation. Why does he need three sections to deal with fairly similar functions?

MR. RANSOM: They're not the same functions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister could, at this point, indicate which section under which we would discuss the forest management agreements that we see on the schematic diagram of his department.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I would suggest we could deal with those under the Forestry item, Mr. Chairman, since we've passed the Resources' Administration Item 3.(a). Probably the Forestry Branch would be the appropriate place to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under Forestry, (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (d)--pass; (e) Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement - Technical Services: (1) Salaries. The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: This function that was in the branch before, Mr. Chairman, under Technical Services, that capability now exists in the Department of Northern Affairs. This is in keeping with the explanation that I gave previously, this department is in a position to provide information about the resource, and Northern Affairs will provide a technical service to individuals or groups of individuals who wish to undertake development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But to be discussed under this item now, there was moneys allocated.

MR. RANSOM: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we want to discuss the item of money this year, it will be found in the Department of Northern Affairs. Now, there was money in this area last year in this department. We don't have it now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fair enough. (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I'm then having trouble with the layout of the book, because in any other departments where function was transferred, they just listed the front reconciliation statement, transfer of function to Northern Affairs. In this case, there doesn't seem to be that indication for this amount of money and we have the item appearing in the main context of the Estimates. I wonder if that was just a mistake or an oversight, or if there is a reason why that remains in the main context.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. RANSOM: I believe the reason would be, Mr. Chairman, that the entire amount of money and expenditures were not transferred to Northern Affairs, that in fact there were two positions that had remained in the department and were deleted, and funds were deleted along with them. Some of the services are to be found in Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, then in light of that explanation, I think we need to know on this side what we're talking about here. What were the functions and what functions have been deleted entirely from this department, and what functions were transferred to Northern Affairs.?

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, there were two positions, for instance, in 1979-80, that were vacant, and funds were voted for them, and those have been eliminated, so that the vacant positions obviously didn't do anything. They were funds that had been voted for support and were not utilized as well. So I think that I'm correct in saying the amount that was transferred to Northern Affairs is proportional to the activity of the group.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'd still like some further clarification on this item, because in 1979-80 the Minister saw fit to have two staff that gave support, in some way, I guess technical advice to the Department of Northern Affairs in terms of their programs. And now, for some reason, the decision was made not to fill those positions and not to give that advice and support. I wonder if the Minister could tell us why he reached that decision.

MR. RANSOM: Well, the positions were vacant, Mr. Chairman, in 1979-80, and so they were not utilized. They were not utilized because there was not the demand for the service that they would have provided.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, in order for us on this side to understand what is going on within government and the government expenditures, last year the Minister came before us and asked us to approve a \$309,700 and now he's telling us that apparently none of that was spent for the purposes that he explained to it last year that it was going to be spent for. I think there needs to be more of an explanation as to why he decided the service that he asked us to approve last year was not even delivered last year, let alone that he's not asking for it to be delivered this year.

MR. RANSOM: It's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that those funds were not utilized in 1979-80 because the anticipated demand for them didn't materialize.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what demand was anticipated when we approved this item last year, and why there was no more demand for that particular service.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it's a service that was provided, as I understand it, to a considerable extent, to groups outside of government that might have been undertaking resource development, community groups with the forestry development or some such thing. It was not advice to the Department of Northern Affairs, and if they called for the services not generated outside of the government, then it's not generated. I can't answer for why it would not be.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, on questioning we've learned that this particular item reflects the kind of thing that my colleague for Rupertsland and others on this side of the House have been talking about in terms of this government, and in terms of Northern Manitoba, and this was under the Manitoba-Northlands Agreement, Mr. Chairperson. But, previously, in Northern Manitoba, there was a considerable excitement, thrust, effort, to bring about resource development. And the province of Manitoba was geared up, not to do the resource development for the people, but to give technical advice, financial assistance, etc., so the people could do their own development of resources in this area, in their own area. And what the Minister describes here is technical advice available in specifically and

Monday, 24 March, 1980

exactly those areas where effort is needed in northern Manitoba and, Mr. Chairperson, I am assuming that basically the government decided not to give that kind of advice, not to give that kind of assistance to the communities in northern Manitoba, and therefore delete this kind of backup service that, in fact, people need if they are going to move forward with their own resource development and not just sit back and wait for somebody else to develop our resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would assume, then, if I were an individual or a group in northern Manitoba that were wishing to avail myself of these particular services, I would have to make application to the Minister or to the department at least, in regards to. . .--(Interjection)-- Well, if this was last year. The Member for The Pas says, it's no longer there. Of course, that's correct. But what I am trying to ascertain now is why it is no longer there. The Minister has told us that it is no longer there because there was no demand. But there can be many reasons for a demand to either decrease, or not to exhibit itself in the first place. One of those reasons is that if people do not know of the service, in other words, if it was a new service and it had never been advertised - and by advertised I don't mean an ad placed in the paper, but I mean made known to the persons who might want to avail themselves of it - and they did not know it existed, then one can understand why there would be no demand. Or, if it was an old service and there was no demand for it, that would lead us to a different conclusion.

My question to the Minister then is, did this service in fact exist before the last year, and if so, was there ever a demand for this sort of service? In other words, is this a program that came in for the first time last year and there was no demand, or actually it didn't come in because the positions were vacant; so is the program that was anticipated to come in last year for the first time, or had this program existed in fact in years previous to the last year; and if it did, was it being utilized by northern Manitobans?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: The service did exist previously, Mr. Chairman, and has been used to some extent, and continues to exist. And in response to the honourable member's question, if he were a person other than a member of the Legislature and seeking some advice, some assistance, in terms of a resource development, then he would still be able to get that advice, he would be able to get the resource information about the resource and its productive capabilities from this department, the advice in terms of organization or setting up a structure to go about the development of it, could be obtained through the Department of Northern Affairs. And I would expect that the difference between our handling of this service and the previous government's is that we are not out attempting to force-feed this type of service onto people in the communities, but the service is available for those individuals or groups who are interested in development, and the advice is available to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I guess I find it a little bit humorous that people didn't ask for service that wasn't there. We were asked last year under this section to approve two staff people and funds for them, and the people were never hired. So how can you ask somebody to help you if there is nobody there. It reminds me of a poem, Mr. Chairman, this section. It goes: "As I was walking up the stair, I met a man who wasn't there. He wasn't there again today, I wish to God he'd go away." And that's what happened, Mr. Chairman, the Minister made him go away.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member is very eloquent, but he wasn't listening when I told him that there were more than two people that had been involved in this service. The level of service that was being utilized has been transferred to the Department of Northern Affairs; that portion of the program

which was not, remained shown in the Estimates of this department in 1979-80, and therefore there is no service shown here. But they will find that there is service in the Department of Northern Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, that makes the shell game even more complicating, because when members of the public in northern communities request information of the Department of Northern Affairs with respect to resource use, they refer them to the Department of Resources. And here the Minister is saying that the Department of Northern Affairs will have that capability. I can assure him that as far as the people in northern Manitoba are concerned, they are convinced that the Department of Northern Affairs has been reduced to one of simply providing municipal services to local councils, and no longer has a developmental function. And therefore, when the Minister tries to make us believe that there is a capability, or will be a capability in that department for that function, I beg to differ with him, because it certainly is not apparent to people in northern Manitoba. It's like the imaginary man that my honourable colleague from The Pas just described.

And, Mr. Chairman, it's regrettable that the government has taken this position, because in the long run it will cost the people of Manitoba more to maintain a population in many northern communities on welfare, rather than make an effort through the instrument of government to make it possible for them to have useful productive employment through the harvesting of resources. And that is a legacy that this government is creating for itself, and one which it will have to live with in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would just like to comment briefly on a statement that the Minister made just a few moments before, and he said that the difference between his government and the difference between our philosophy on how a government should act, and indeed, how we acted when we did have the opportunity to be the government of this province, is that his government is not out there attempting to force-feed these types of services onto people in the communities. Those are not his exact words, but I think they are a fairly accurate representations of what he had to say. Now I think that point in itself is quite enlightening, especially to members on this side. Because what he is saying is, we are not going to provide the type of services to the people in the communities that will enable them to take some control over their own destiny, that will enable them to participate more fully in the economic fabric of their area. We talk about utilizing resources. Well, somebody is going to utilize the resources. The resources are there. The resources are being used. Someone now, in fact, is utilizing them. And what they have done by reducing this particular item by pulling back from our position of providing information and support to people wanting to utilize the resources, is they have made it more difficult for the small entrepreneur, or the individual, or the person with less experience in business and/or bureaucracy, to utilize those resources. In doing that, they have made it easier for the larger entrepreneur, or the person that is more experienced in these sorts of dealings, to utilize the resources. So what they are doing, in fact, is that they are reverting back to the traditional stance of allowing certain elite groups, within the society, to control the resources. And one of the purposes of these kinds of programs was to allow a broader segment to enjoy the fruits of those resources, to enjoy the benefits that can come from those resources. What they're really not doing is not trying to make it any easier for the smaller entrepreneur or for the less powerful individual by taking away from them a force-feeding situation, but they are trying to make it more difficult for that person.

Because as that person becomes aware of ways that they can take advantage of the resources, they want to take advantage of the resources. It creates an expectation that they can do it and that they will do it. With the support, they can and will also, that's a fact. That creates a conflict, because there are certain groups that already control those resources, that have historically con-

Monday, 24 March, 1980

trolled those resources, and that wish to maintain their control on those resources. So the conflict then becomes between this group that has had historical control, and because they've had historical control have become powerful because that control, in many respects, manifests itself in certain types of power. A conflict between them and between the people who have never had that control, and for that reason have always been less powerful and have always been less knowledgeable, and they are locked into a pattern - they're locked into a pattern, that is, a historical pattern, and one in which the Progressive Conservative government, I believe, one in which they believe very strongly should exist. That is, that there should be powerful groups that manipulate control, and that there should be less powerful groups that are made available to these more powerful groups as labour forces, as back-up, as support services; but they should in no way be allowed, or encouraged, or enabled, or supported in their efforts to wrest some of that control away from the more elite groups.

So, as we go through this department, we see time and time again that the thrust of the Minister's department is to revert back to the old ways, to go back to the good old days, which were good for some people and not so good for other people. And this is just one more example of how they are doing that, or how they are attempting to do that, by making it more difficult for the less powerful, and for the non-elite, to manage their own lives by being able to manage some of the resources that are available to them. So, what we see in specific, in this instance, is not an attempt on the Minister's part, as he would like to infer, that they are making it easier for people by giving them more freedom to be poor. It's a difficult concept to put into words in 20 minutes or less.

But what the Minister is saying is, we're not force-feeding them anymore. That's what he's telling us and that's what he would like. We're giving you the freedom - the freedom to do what, though? They are not giving them the freedom to manage their own resources, to play an active part in resource management. They are giving them the freedom to remain stuck in the old positions that they have always historically occupied. They are giving them the freedom to remain trapped in a support role. They are giving them the freedom not to play a more viable and a more active role in the management of resources and, in fact, are giving them the freedom to be poor. And when they give them the freedom to be poor, Mr. Chairperson, they are also giving their opposite group the freedom to be rich. And it's not in such absolute terms that we see all this manifest itself.

What we're talking about is they're giving them the freedom to become poorer, and they're giving the other group the freedom to become richer. So, what we have to do when we go through the Estimates - and I think what the Member for Rupertsland and the Member for The Pas have been doing very ably, as well as others on this side - is consistently point out the thrust, the general nature, of this government's involvement in the management of natural resources, which is to bring the control more into line with the historical patterns where a few elite managed all of our resources, and where the bulk of the workers, the bulk of the residents of the area, looked in from the outside at what was happening and never had a chance to participate and, therefore, never had a chance to benefit by that management. So I, with my colleagues from Rupertsland and The Pas, in specific, and with most on this side, do regret that this sort of service has been taken away from people who have so desperately needed it and so desperately wanted it; that had they known that it did exist, had the Minister made some effort to encourage them to use this service, I'm certain we would have seen a far different scenario. We would have seen them utilizing it to their utmost, instead of what the Minister tells us has happened, and that is, that they have failed to utilize it, and that's why they're taking it away.

It's not because of any failure on the part of the residents in northern Manitoba to wish to escape from the historical patterns that they've been locked into, it's more of a failure on the part of the government to wish to allow them the opportunity to do so because of the conflicts that it creates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, what are the facts that we're looking at here? The fact is that last year the Minister came before us and asked for \$309,700 and two staff people - what the Minister tells us - to provide a technical assis-

Monday, 24 March, 1980

tance. The fact, according to the Minister, is to community or outside groups that want that kind of assistance. The other fact is that no one was hired to fill those positions, and therefore the service could never be provided. So, Mr. Chairman, I think my little poem fits in quite well. There's a theory of government, Mr. Chairman, that I read a number of years ago in a novel about a Metis community - and I forget the title and the author of that book, since it was quite awhile ago - but it was the wheel theory of government. Government is like a big wheel and you go to one spoke on the wheel, and you talk to them and they send you to the next spoke; and you talk to that department and they send you to the next department; and you talk to that department and they send you to the next spoke. And pretty soon, Mr. Chairman, you go right around till you're back at the department you started with. And, Mr. Chairman, this government and the Minister tonight are proving that is a valid theory of government, the wheel theory of government. And I don't know if it's appropriate that one of the symbols of the Manitoba Metis Federation is a cartwheel, which would demonstrate the effect of the Metis people, how government relates to them, and to northern people in general.

Because what we have here, Mr. Chairman, is that this Minister has, in fact, cut off, closed down, never started this section that he asked us to approve last year. And he says, well, now the people can go to Northern Affairs. What's the reality of that situation, Mr. Chairman? People go to Northern Affairs, they say, "Our function now is just municipal government. We're not going to assist you with resource development, we're not going to assist you with economic development. Go to the Department of Manpower, Manpower and Labour." And so, they go over to the Department of Manpower and Labour. Department of Manpower and Labour says, "Oh, no, we don't have those functions any more. Go to the Resources' Department, they'll help you with that." And, Mr. Chairman, or they'll say, "Go to the Communities Economic Development Fund. We'll help you with that." The person goes to the Communities Economic Development Fund, they say, "Well, we can only fund programs, we can only provide interim funding to special ARDA grants, and so you better go to the Department of Natural Resources." Of course, they go back to the Department of Natural Resources and they say, "Go to the Department of Northern Affairs," and Northern Affairs says, "Go to the Department of Manpower", and Manpower says, "Go to the Communities Economic Development Fund." And that's how we go around, and around, and around, Mr. Chairman. As my colleague for Churchill points out, that the effect of that is, is that the resources of the Province of Manitoba that belong to all of the people of Manitoba are being utilized by and for the benefit of a few people instead of the majority of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about force feeding. Well, Mr. Chairman, he is not force feeding but he and his government are feeding; they are feeding the people of northern Manitoba through the welfare system. So, Mr. Chairman, what we have now is the freedom to welfare. That's the kind of freedom that is a reality for many people in northern Manitoba and that's the kind of freedom that this Minister is advocating or causing or bringing about because of the inaction of this Conservative government and the inaction of himself as a Minister of this Conservative government. So a few outsiders are getting the benefit of the resources. The local people are getting the benefit of welfare.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (3)--pass; (e)--pass; Section 3.--pass; Resolution 102--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$565,800 for Natural Resources, Resources Executive Administration, \$565,800--pass.

Section 4. Water Resources, Resolution 103 (a) Administration, (1) Salaries--pass - the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: There are 12 staff man years in this group, Mr. Chairman, and that is the same as last year and the section is responsible, of course, to the administration of the Water Resources Branch, responsible for the control and supervision of their programs and administrative support to other sections in the branch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister would care to give us some overview on the program that he is planning for this fiscal year or for the next fiscal year. We have his Annual Report for the last fiscal year ending March 31st, but it seems to me that we should be able to have some idea as far as what he has planned in terms of water resource projects in Manitoba this year.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, when we come to the last item in the Estimates, the Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets, I will be distributing some information then on the different projects: the drainage reconstruction and flood control projects, and that sort of thing. I will be distributing those at that point, Acquisition and Construction, Item 13.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister indicating that that is also where the maintenance program is to be discussed, the maintenance of provincial waterways, etc.?

MR. RANSOM: I believe that item is included under (c) Water Management in Other Expenditures, \$3,166,700.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (a)--pass. (b) Water Licencing, (1) Salaries - the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: There are nine staff man years, 1980-81, that's the same level as in 1979-80 and it is pretty much as described. It's water licencing, in terms of water rights or licences under The Water Rights Act and The Water Power Act dealing with the use of ground water, and also has some licencing function in terms of establishing designated reservoir areas and designated flood areas, and working with the Department of Highways in the opening, size of openings etc., required in highways for water flow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (b)--pass - the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, on (2), could the Minister explain why there is a reduction, and I am talking about water licencing. There is an approximate reduction . . . In fact, it is a reduction of \$60,000 from last year's expenditures. Just what has caused a reduction in expenditures this year? It seems to go counterflow to all the inflationary trends that we have.

MR. RANSOM: There is a final payment of principal and interest for control works on Lac Sewell that relate back to the natural resources transfer agreement and that those, as I understand it, have been completed last year. And that accounts for the \$60,000 in reduction.

MR. JENKINS: Well then, in the other expenditures in this section, there is no increase in the expenditures? There has been no inflation in this part of the Estimates whatsoever, a \$60,000 payment which I understand the Minister to say was completed last year? Then \$90,500 was the actual cost of expenditures last year or has there been an increase? Because if this figure of \$60,000 is the final payment for the Lac Sewell agreement, a payment on the Lac Sewell control is true, then last year's other expenditures, outside of the \$60,000 final payment, was \$90,500.00? There has been no inflationary cost? How is the Minister been able to achieve this wonder that no other department seems to have been able to achieve?

MR. RANSOM: Well, the explanation is, Mr. Chairman, that they will be operating with the same level of funding for the other expenditures as they had the previous year and I think as we go through you will see a number of places where there have been some efficiencies brought about through organization.

Now in this case, it just happens to be that we believe that it's going to be possible to function in the same level of funding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)--pass; (b)--pass. (c) Water Management, (1) Salaries - the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: This area, Mr. Chairman, is quite a broad one that has responsibilities for dealing with planning and programming relative to water supply, conservation, drainage, flood damage, reduction and control, construction and maintenance of water control works. It deals with conservation districts and planning districts as well as with some interdisciplinary studies undertaken with other departments. There has been substantial reduction in the number of staff man years from 56 in 1979-80 to 35 in 1980-81, but those positions quite an extent were either vacant positions or were term positions whose term was coming up at the end of March or at least close to the end of March of this year.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, again, am I to believe that this is the area where the Minister is prepared to outline the drainage program, the maintenance program, the improvements along provincial waterways?

MR. RANSOM: The improvements, Mr. Chairman, are dealt with under the Acquisition and Construction. The maintenance money is included here where we attempt, I think overall, to maintain the capacity of drains at a minimum of about 85 percent of their original capacity. Now, some of the maintenance work starts to come perhaps pretty close to what might be considered as reconstruction work but we do try and separate them out and the year-to-year maintenance work is in here, the rebuilding is in the Acquisition and Construction and I will distribute a copy of what we plan in that area.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have a water resources map outlining the provincial water system or the drainage system and the programs that are marked on that map? I think there is a map within the department and I'm not sure if he normally or usually distributes that to the members or not to familiarize the members of the House as to the program that he has planned.

MR. RANSOM: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that all that has ever been distributed is a sheet that outlines the anticipated construction work according to region and they can be found on the provincial waterways maps, which are a fairly significant scale and there are quite a number of them, of course, to cover the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us then what section in here deals with the evaluation in terms of the needs, in terms of the drainage construction, and then does the surveys and the engineering work, and then makes the recommendations to the Minister, who gets the cost estimates, etc., etc. Where is all that planning and work done, in terms of his department, in preparing the drainage program?

MR. RANSOM: That work is essentially done in here in this section under discussion but the delivery of construction works is going to be done by the regional services, engineering and construction. But the branch will function as the branch responsible for the planning in saying what kinds of projects should be carried out and the actual engineering delivery of it will be done by the engineering and construction group.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, that puts us at some difficulty in discussing this particular section of the Minister's Estimates and I wonder if the Minister, if he has the program prepared, if he would be willing to table it at this time so we can get a better idea in terms of what this section is doing and how we can evaluate the passage of these Estimates.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the item in question has always been dealt with under Acquisition and Construction. I don't know whether there is some new development that's of concern at this point but I would simply plan to proceed the way it's always been proceeded with and deal with all the Acquisition and Construction projects when we get to that because there are more than water projects. There are park projects of a fairly significant portion of that money plus flood control, as well as drainage works, involved, and I would prefer to deal with those items under that together when we get to Acquisition and Construction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, to facilitate discussion and to make it easier for the Opposition to know what the Minister is planning in these sections, I wonder if he could circulate at least one or two copies of his intended Acquisition and Construction program to this side of the House so that we may have an opportunity to look it over before we get to that section. It's a rather significant item and may require a fair bit of discussion depending on what is in there. We would certainly appreciate having as detailed a list as possible of the proposed maintenance work and the proposed construction work for his department; and in particular on the Water Resources section, we would want to know what maintenance work was done in the past fiscal year, perhaps a schedule comparing the two years would be useful to us for that purpose, showing what was done last year in maintenance, what was done this year in maintenance, what is being proposed, that is for this year, in maintenance. And also on a construction side, a comparison of what was constructed last year, what is a carry-over to this year; much like the highways program comes up with for discussion of the Estimates in the Highways Department. It facilitates discussion there and I am sure it would be useful here for discussion purposes.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the details of maintenance work has never been provided, it's not to say it can't be provided, it's extremely time-consuming to get it. It's all done on a regional basis and consists of a great number of small projects that are undertaken. We can get the levels of funding that were expended last year and break that down as opposed to what we intend to do this year. If they would like the amount of money spent on a regional basis that's not too difficult; and even by watershed, it's not too difficult to provide that information.

MR. BOSTROM: Perhaps the Minister does not have the information readily available at his fingertips right now but it would be okay with us if he could make a commitment to have that list prepared showing precisely which projects and the amount for each that were done in the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1980, and a similar list of projects with the funding attached to each which are projected for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1981. That should not be that difficult to do and it would certainly facilitate discussion. And as I say, we would like such a list for maintenance, we would like such a list for construction on the part of Water Resources, and any other construction or acquisition projects that the department may have. I mean, we're talking about significant amounts of money here when we're looking in this area of water management, some \$4.8 million, and in the area of Acquisition and Construction for the department, some \$10 million if one includes the moneys within the Northlands Agreement, over \$10 million, \$10.7 million there. So, Mr. Chairman, there is a significant amount of money. A major proportion of the Minister's budget is contained within these items and we would like a detailed list of the projects that were done last year and those that are proposed for next year.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would refer to the Annual Report, for example, to page 124, he will see a listing there of money expended on maintenance on a watershed basis. And we can provide that, the expected levels of maintenance on a watershed basis, as included in the Estimates before us if that's satisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to rise to urge the Minister to consider tabling that section because, Mr. Chairman, I don't think before the item we're dealing with, the Water Resources Branch was ever that far separated from the item. And now we have, between this item, we have Parks, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries, Wildlife, Surveys and Mapping, and then we get to Engineering and Construction. And, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that in the past, for example in the Parks section, any new park construction was explained, outlined by the Minister right in the Parks Estimates and not waited till after we finished dealing with the whole Parks section. So because of the additional responsibilities of the Minister, and I am especially concerned about the next item, Mr. Chairman, the Parks item, that it will be very difficult to deal with that item as well as the item we're on without basically the program for this year. And within the Department of Highways, Mr. Chairman, the Minister tables the program for highways under the Administration section right after he talks on his salary item, Mr. Chairman.

So I would like to urge the Minister, to help us to facilitate the procedure of his Estimates, if he would consider tabling those as soon as possible.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I think I can probably do that as soon as I have them in the form for tabling. It's just that it has not been done that way in the past and normally when we got to Acquisition and Construction, that's when we provided the details of those items. Previously, under the Water Resources division as it was called, you simply used to have two items in the Estimates of Operations and Planning, I believe. And the way it's broken down now, we have attempted to give some additional detail and in the Engineering and Construction that doesn't provide the program money in that area. It just provides the staff and their support to deliver the programs that are funded under the Water Management. But we have not yet put together in a similar basis to what appears in the Annual Report our expectations in 1980-81. Those have never been provided in that form to the House before but that's a fairly simple matter to do that if that is the level of detail that would be acceptable to the honourable members.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I thank the Honourable Minister for that information and his willingness to co-operate with us. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister under this section about a section in the Ombudsman's report for this year, or for 1979, a case of the Water Resources division in the Municipality of Grandview, a licence issued to the Town of Grandview to impound water for municipal purposes, provisions of licence not enforced allegedly having adverse affects on land drainage. And, Mr. Chairperson, this case goes back at least to 1967 and probably before and I am wondering if the Minister can assure us that that direction, that is compliance with the licence, has been enforced and if there has been any problem since this report was done. Now I don't know whether this report was done early in 1979, Mr. Chairman, or late in 1979, so maybe the Minister hasn't had that much experience with that particular case. Is the Minister familiar with the case? Okay, the Minister indicates by a nod, Mr. Chairman, that he is familiar with that case.

Mr. Chairman, there have been others besides the Minister involved in this particular case, and I would just like to quote from page 35 of the ombudsman report: "On November 15th. . .

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

MR. RANSOM: We have just passed the Water Licencing item and I am wondering how much we're going to go back and forth on these items. This was the intention, of providing more items within the Estimates, was to better identify areas of concern. And as I said last year in Water Resources there were simply two items of Planning and Operations in which it was rather hard to zero in on a given area of concern. We have broken them down now. The topic that the honourable member is dealing with is Water Licencing which we have just passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not familiar with it so I would have to be guided by the Honourable Minister. Would the Honourable Member for The Pas accept that explanation?

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, yes, I see now that it would have been more appropriate to bring it up under Water Licencing, although this case we're talking about, the management of the water and the problems that are related thereto. Mr. Chairman, I just have a few more comments to make on that if I could proceed. If you rule me out of order, Mr. Chairman, then I will certainly accede to your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under Water Management, if there is any association with Water Management, I would allow you to carry on.

MR. McBRYDE: Now, Mr. Chairman, the association is that there is a water management problem that is seriously affecting a farmer in the Grandview area and the fact that the way that the water is managed now is causing flooding in his area. And, Mr. Chairman, the Minister and his department have been involved in this case and, Mr. Chairman, apparently other members of the government side of the House have been involved.

On page 35, the Ombudsman says: "On November 15th, 1979, I was rather surprised to receive a copy of a letter from a member of the Legislative Assembly, the original of which was addressed to the Director, Water Resources Division. The letter stated that the honourable member had been in discussion with the mayor and council of the Town of Grandview and that concern had been expressed about the manner in which the Water Resources division had been 'conferring under the Water Rights licence no. 78-31'. The matter has been under discussion for several years and a final solution had been agreed upon. Even so, the town had been plagued with phone calls and letters regarding the manner in which the dam on the Valley River was being managed." The letter then stated as follows: "No doubt the Ombudsman, Mr. G.W. Maltby, has been putting pressure on your office to continue the discussions regarding the management of the dam which your office in turn passes on to the town. I responded to the honourable member setting out in summary form my involvement in this case. I concluded my letter as follows: If my involvement in this matter is interpreted as putting pressure on the Water Resources division, my response is that I was doing my duty within the provision of The Ombudsman Act in respect of which I am accountable to the Legislature."

Mr. Chairman, the question to the Minister was, whether that situation has now been settled to the satisfaction or whether there is still an ongoing problem with that situation.

MR. RANSOM: I expect, Mr. Chairman, that the terms of the licence will be met.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would guide us on the item to determine whether or not we can discuss a particular drain and improvements to it on this point. I refer the Minister to Waterrshed No. 13 in Region 1, wherein he is familiar to some degree as far as the problem that I am trying to draw to his attention in that we had some discussion, and as a matter of fact, I did receive a letter from the Minister some time ago indicating that nothing was going to be done on the question for the moment. And I referred to a box culvert which the Municipality of St. Clements and the Municipality of Brokenhead believe should be enlarged, or a new culvert placed that would have greater capacity.

And the logic of that recommendation rests on the fact, Mr. Chairman, that on the upstream side, on this particular drain, we have a larger culvert; the downstream side we have a larger culvert; but in the middle we have a small one, or one with less capacity. And there are a number of people in the area but in particular one farmyard and farm that have been severely flooded in the last year because of this bottleneck. And so I am trying to understand, from the Minister, just where the logic lies in denying that there is a problem when we know, and I believe the Minister can correct me if I am wrong, that there is larger capacity upstream and larger capacity downstream, but in the middle we don't have adequate

Monday, 24 March, 1980

capacity to allow the water to flow through. Consequently, it floods a farmyard - well, two or three yards, but in particular one very severely - where this particular farmer has to remove his cattle; he finds his buildings in two or three feet of water and so on. And it's completely created because of the size of this culvert.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I suggest to the honourable member that maybe this item, you know, rather than limit debate on it later because it had already been discussed, it would be best discussed under Construction or, rather, New construction, under the Construction item.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe this probably falls within the area of Maintenance which is the item that we're on. It's not New Construction that we're dealing with. If the Minister wishes that we deal with it under the Construction program, I have no problem with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I think this is probably an appropriate place to deal with it, Mr. Chairman, in that it is as the member says, a maintenance problem rather than a reconstruction one, and, as I recall, the explanation for that situation is that it's an agricultural drainage standard rather than a flood control standard. And this is a problem that we very often run into in that people experience ponding of water in the springtime or after rains, which causes a flooding problem, and our system is put in place to provide agricultural drainage, which means it's to get water off in time to allow or not to hinder the cropping practices. And the two are not the same thing. Almost exclusively, our system in the country is designed for agricultural drainage rather than flood control. In this specific situation again, as I recall, that was the explanation.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Minister is saying but then he has to justify why there are larger capacity culverts upstream and downstream from this one. What is the logic of having a smaller capacity in between two larger capacities, one upstream and one downstream? And this is the only area where the bottleneck shows up, Mr. Chairman, because this one has not been rebuilt or upgraded. There has been a recent upgrading in the next point, I believe upstream, which provides for a larger flow of water per second or per minute, and as soon as the water hits this particular point it then starts to back up and spread all over the countryside.

So if the Minister is saying that this is adequate to handle agricultural flow and drainage, then he has to explain to us why it is that he has provided for upgraded facilities, culvert sizes, upstream and downstream.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that when some of the existing structures are replaced that they are replaced to a better standard than was existing. But the program has not been to simply begin upgrading of entire systems, rather, they have been upgrading structures as was required. Now, rather than debating this one in detail here again, the honourable member has brought it my attention again and I'll have to examine it further again and see if in fact I gave him a rational explanation the last time.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the Minister is prepared to review that again. I would like to draw to his attention that the view is held on the part of some people in the area, not necessarily the person affected but some locally elected officials have expressed the view to me that it appears that there might even be a legal claim out of this one, you know, that that's the way they see it. They feel that the department is not treating the matter fairly. Now, that's an opinion and I give it to the Minister for whatever it's worth. It may be valid; it may not be valid. But I think because of that, I think it's worthwhile reviewing it again.

I would also like to put the question to the Minister on another drain, which is the Thorarinson drain, Mr. Chairman, wherein a whole series of new culverts were installed by the department, all of which are a smaller capacity from the old

Monday, 24 March, 1980

wood bridges that existed. And therefore, there is no doubt in my mind, just from what I would consider a visual impression, that we are going to have very serious flood problems, given the right circumstances for flooding. The people upstream are very unhappy with the fact that their position has not been adequately protected when these new smaller culverts were installed, and perhaps the Minister might want to indicate what action is being planned to deal with one building site on the intersection of that drain, namely, the Thorarinson residence, which is the one that really suffers the most whenever we have a flood situation in that area.

MR. RANSOM: Once again, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the engineering design of the structures is adequate to handle agricultural drainage and that's the best engineering advice available in terms of meeting that standard or meeting the agricultural drainage requirement.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to dispute what the Minister is saying; the department has established a certain standard. What I do want to suggest or ask the Minister is whether he can confirm that on that particular drain that the new culverts have a lower capacity than the old wood bridges have, in terms of cfs per minute or per second or per day or whatever. Can the Minister confirm or deny that the new culverts on that drain will have less capacity than did the old bridges?

MR. RANSOM: I'm not familiar personally with the situation, Mr. Chairman. I'm not in a position to comment on individual drains, but if the honourable member tells me that the capacity is smaller than the bridge that was there before then I have to accept his statement as having a significant amount of fact involved. All I can undertake to do is to check with my department and determine in fact whether that's the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, it appears the Minister is willing to determine whether or not that is the case and I wonder whether we will have that information before his Estimates have passed the House, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister would give us that indication, that is satisfactory to me.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is the right area to discuss this one and, if it isn't, I don't mind being advised or corrected. The Lac du Bonnet sewage lagoon drain; is this the point in which we debate that, Mr. Chairman or is it under a different section?

MR. RANSOM: The money for that item, Mr. Chairman, is included in the Acquisition and Construction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass - the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying there is money allocated for that particular drain, for that particular purpose, and if so, that's fine, I accept that and we'll debate it when we get to that point. The Minister nods his head, Mr. Chairman, in the affirmative, so that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (3)--pass; (c)--pass. (d) Water Investigations, (1)Salaries--pass - the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: There are 32 staff man years in this section, Mr. Chairman, as opposed to 34 last year, and the two positions that were deleted were vacant. This section deals with investigations into hydrologic and ground water problems. It deals with stream flow; flood forecasting; the hydrologic standards; operation of hydrometric networks systems and computer programming; surface water data;

Monday, 24 March, 1980

recommendations for licences; ground water technical services for the Manitoba Water Services Board and for Parks Branch; for the Agri-Water Agreement; and they are responsible for the administration of The Ground Water and Water Well Act.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would indicate to us today whether or not he has been able to completely clean up the pollution in the ground water at East Selkirk, which is now some two or three years since the problem arose, whether the Minister can give us any report as to where that is.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I'm afraid I have to say that that's best discussed under the Estimates of the Environmental Management Division with Consumer and Corporate Affairs because it deals with contamination of ground water, which is a . . . --(Interjection)-- Well, it's not in my department, Mr. Chairman. It's in Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that I would have to agree with the Honourable Minister inasmuch as when the questioning was taking place in the Question Period that the questions were directed to the Honourable Minister of Environment.

MR. USKIW: I have some difficulty here, Mr. Chairman, in that this department is charged with the responsibility of the technical aspect with respect to ground water development and so on. I presume it has a major role to play in conjunction with or co-operation with the environment people in the other department. Now if the Minister is telling me that he has no capacity whatever to deal with that question, then that's fine. We will have to deal with it in the other department. But it seems to me that this is a closely related area of involvement of the two departments.

MR. RANSOM: That's true, Mr. Chairman, and our people have been working with the environment people in providing the technical advice as to what might be taking place underground with the flows of water, etc., but the actual contamination problem of water is one that falls under The Clean Environment Act. But to my knowledge, the problem still exists there if that's the information that the honourable member is looking for. To the best of my knowledge, the problem has not been resolved.

MR. USKIW: Well, yes. Could the Minister indicate whether or not it was his department that was responsible for re-routing the drain from Right Angle Farms into the creek or whether it was another department that was involved in that connection, Mr. Chairman?

MR. RANSOM: My understanding is that we provided some engineering advice to the municipality in that case.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding and it may not be correct, but I stand to be corrected, that it was the provincial Department of Highways or Water Resources that undertook the construction or the deepening of the ditch along Highway 59 in order to facilitate the drainage from that particular farm and to keep it out of the natural drain that it flowed into which was flowing through the Village of East Selkirk and which found its way into an abandoned quarry. Now if the department was not involved, that's fine, but I rather think it was, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RANSOM: Well, I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that my department did not undertake work to alter the flow of water, to redirect the flow of water there, other than to provide some engineering advice to the municipality.

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

MR. USKIW: Well, could the Minister then indicate to us what that engineering advice was, Mr. Chairman?

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. RANSON: Well, I will have to get the details of it. I am just assuming that it had to do with some design work for drainage, but I will have to get the details for the Honourable Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (d)--pass. (e) Regional Management, (1) Salaries - the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSON: There are six staff man years in this section, Mr. Chairman, and the Regional Water Managers are going to be acting as the representatives of the Water Resources Branch in the regions to coordinate development and implementation of Water Resource Programs, and to provide the contact between the branch and the municipalities and the conservation districts and other government departments. There are six positions in this 1980-81 Estimates, there were six in the 1979-80.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (e)--pass. (f) Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement. (1) Salaries--pass; (2)--pass. I'm sorry, the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSON: There were four staff man years in 1979-80, one of these was vacant, that position has been deleted. There are three staff man years in 1980-81 and under this section the department provides advice to the Northern Affairs Department with respect to geotechnical land use studies on request.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (3)--pass; (f)--pass. (g) Canada-Manitoba Flood Damage Reduction Agreement. (1) Salaries. The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSON: There are seven staff man years in 1980-81, that is the same level as was provided for in 1979-80. This, of course, is part of the Flood Damage Reduction Agreement which I believe was signed in 1976 and we are providing some substantial additional funds to carry out the terms of the agreement simply for mapping and identification of flood prone areas in some 33 communities throughout the province. We expect to have this work scheduled for completion in about 3 years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, yes, I am wondering what the - I am trying to remember the nature of the program, Mr. Chairman. Does this involve assisting people in relocation and things of that nature or the raising of the level of their yards?

MR. RANSON: This is identification of the flood prone areas and then once an area is identified and designated then neither the province nor the Federal Government will assist in the funding of construction that falls within those areas, nor will buildings be eligible for compensation should there be flooding and a program of compensation later on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Could the Minister, either now or later, provide us with a list of those areas that have been identified to date and which will be recipients of whatever program is developed or added to existing programs in the future.

MR. RANSON: There have been, I believe, three designations on an interim basis in Melita, Wawanesa and the City of Winnipeg, as of the 15th of February, and others are in various stages of mapping. I could provide the honourable member with a more detailed update of where the agreement stands if you wish.

MR. USKIW: Well, all right, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister can provide information later on, that's fine. Perhaps he might be able to indicate to me whether the Brokenhead River area is included in the designation or in application for designation.

Monday, 24 March, 1980

MR. RANSOM: I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman, but we'll have to confirm that.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am just trying to determine what connection this department has with the flood compensation or is it within this department. As a result of last year's flooding, what is this department's involvement with the Compensation Program of last year?

MR. RANSOM: We handle the Municipal Assistance Program, the Compensation Program and the Moving and Raising Program were handled under the Minister of Government Services.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I would like to know from the Minister whether he has any involvement by way of making recommendation to the other Minister, the Minister of Government Services, with respect to the question of eligible areas or persons eligible, or should be eligible, for compensation?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, again my understanding is that we recommend the watersheds or portions of watersheds that are to be eligible, and that those are designated by Order-in-Council.

MR. USKIW: Well, then it brings me to the question then, Mr. Chairman, if this department is responsible for making the recommendations, could the Minister then advise as to why, in the department's view, the Brokenhead River area is not a problem area that should be recommended for this kind of program?

MR. RANSOM: I would have to take that question as notice, Mr. Chairman, but I can advise the honourable member that there have been perhaps three or four other watersheds that were not included in the original designation, and that we subsequently determined that they should be eligible and they have been added to the list, so we will have a look at this specific situation as well.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (g)--pass. (h)(1)--pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Prairie Provinces Water Board has two staff man years in 1979-80 and in 1980-81 it is the same staffing level. This is a Board that was established, as it says, for the Prairie Provinces and with the Government of Canada to conduct studies concerning the administration and the apportionment of waters across the prairies and to promote the integrated development of the water resource of interprovincial streams.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass, (h)--pass. (j) Canada-Manitoba Value-Added Crops Production Agreement: (1) Salaries--pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: This a program that staff positions have been established in 1980-81, 2.1 staff man years. There are some projects involved here involving the Almasippi Wet Sands Management, or an amount of \$150,000 and some related productivity projects and technical investigations to be undertaken to determine land and water management strategies related to expanded production of special crops at the base of the Manitoba Escarpment. Then there is another \$54,000 associated with the staffing for this agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (j)--pass; (4)--pass; Resolution 103--pass:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,958,500 for Natural Resources, Water Resources; \$7,958,500--pass.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: I think, Mr. Chairman, that this would be an appropriate time for the Committee to rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.