



**Third Session — Thirty-First Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

28 Elizabeth II

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Harry E. Graham  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXVII No. 16B**

**8:00 P.M. Thursday, March 8, 1979**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, March 8, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson):** Committee come to order. The Estimates of Highways and Transportation, Resolution No. 72; 5. Assistance Programs — \$6,200,000. 5.(a) Work in Unorganized Territory — \$2,800,000 — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could give us a report on what is happening as far as the assistance programs are concerned, it appears there's a substantial increase — I'm not sure now; we'll check back for last year at how it looks. . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We're talking about 5.(a) Work in Unorganized Territory — \$2,800,000, page 56.

**MR. ADAM:** Oh, I see. Last year, Mr. Chairman, we show. . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** \$2,762,700.

**MR. ADAM:** . . . we show \$18,320,000 last year on the program. Am I correct?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Under 5.(a).

**MR. ADAM:** And this year, we show . . . I think that is probably where the assistance to the City of Winnipeg is. Am I correct on that?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister. — To the Member for Ste. Rose — Resolution 72.

**MR. ADAM:** Resolution 72, and I am looking at last year. We had a figure on the right-hand column of \$18,320,000, and that shows up on our current Estimates as \$3,677,200.00.

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Chairman, that is the bloc funding impact on this resolution, the \$15 million of moneys that are part of the Reconciliation Statement on the front page again, and part of that \$28,420,000 that has been transferred out of this resolution. Is that right, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. ADAM:** Yes. Is it only \$15,000 that has been . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Million.

**MR. ADAM:** . . . to the City of Winnipeg, or is there more, and would it be possible to get a breakdown on what happened, where the money went, and where the money is going this year.

Mr. Chairman, there is \$3,677,200 on the left hand side. There is almost \$15 million that has been transferred somewhere.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, transferred to the Department of Municipal Affairs, is a figure of \$3.5 million which, I assume, was the figure for the Fairlane Mile grant transit support; an additional \$9,120,000.00. That intake encompasses in substance the transit grant amount, and I believe there

was some purchasing of buses last year in that figure. Is that . . . And then the \$800,000 was the support the province gave to the City of Winnipeg for innovative transit systems, the handicapped bus, the trials of the Dash service, etc.

And those, Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, are the . . . and in addition to that of course, the street capital program, the major item which last year you know, showed up as \$15 million. Now the City did not draw down the entire \$15 million. I think it was in the area of \$13 million, \$12,800,000, or \$13 million, and the balance of that capital lapsed under the new bloc funding process now. We will not be showing it separately or determining separately what the City — indeed how the City wishes to apply these moneys. To give the Honourable Member a breakdown of how the City streets capital works project was built, the City would have to supply that kind of information. A substantial portion, if I can highlight it, a substantial portion of it went for the major costs that occurred in this last year for the completion of the South St. Vital bridge. That was one of the major capital works constructions that were undertaken by the City, but it was a 50 percent contribution that the province makes to the City in their capital works program.

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

**MR. ADAM:** I wonder if the Minister could advise the committee what programs are contemplated this year insofar as assistance programs are concerned. It's quite a reduction in this area from last year, and . . .

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps if we can just deal with it, the assistance that has been traditionally supplied by the department to the various jurisdictions is unchanged, both in scale and scope and in formula. We undertake assistance work in the unorganized territories for which some \$2,800,000 is being requested under 5(a) this year. You'll note that's just a normal bit of a growth there; last year the actual amount allocated in this appropriation was 2,000,762, so that appropriation is up some 40 odd thousand, which, I would assume, is just normal growth, salaries and expenditures.

The kind of assistance that we provide to other jurisdictions in terms of aid and grants to smaller cities, towns, communities, is again based on much the same formula. When the Honourable Member says there's quite a drastic reduction here, and there's quite a bit less shown here, that's quite true in the way it is shown here, but you have to keep in the back of your mind constantly the amount of money that is now being put into the bloc grant that the city is getting. If you take that bloc grant money back and put it back in here, then there is no reduction, indeed you could find the normal kind of growth pattern develop.

**MR. ADAM:** I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could have the Minister advise us if there was any funds under this item that were unexpended last year, and if there were, have they lapsed? Did they lapse last fall if there was any funds that were not allocated last fall? — on the left-hand column.

**MR. ENNS:** Any unused capital funds that Department of Highways had were lapsed last April 1st, and I would assume that it would happen again this year. In other words, under the new financing or accounting method that is being applied by the Department of Finance, they do not have capital carry-over funds, or revolving funds if you like. I'm told that in the Department of Highways, one of the few, if not the only remaining revolving capital type fund continues to exist and that's in our machine replacement fund. I understand that that is one of the few, if not the only funds of that nature that currently exist in the Government of Manitoba.

**MR. ADAM:** I wonder if the Minister is able to provide figures to show what amounts were lapsed in April, if any.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, we would have to check with the Department of Finance. I have no reason not to undertake to provide those figures for the honourable member. I'm advised that they were provided last year, and were provided by finance. I think the matter of lapsing unspent or unused capital has always been carried on by this government and by other governments. There is a difference between funds that have been allowed to stand in a carry-over account or a revolving

replenishment account, but the concept of lapsing funds in any appropriation — in fact, some people would say that that is one of the built-in characteristics that we have in government service, that defeats efforts of fiscal responsibility within departments. In other words the service recognizes if x number of dollars are allocated in that appropriation, and if they're not spent, then they're lapsed. So there is a kind of a built-in mechanism to, particularly towards the end of the year, to hurry up and spend the money, whether it serves the purpose, whether it's useful or not is not the case. It is that kind of lapsing that we're talking about, Mr. Chairman. Now, I would have to check with the Department of Finance, but that kind of fiscal information comes from the Department of Finance. I understand it was made available last year by the Department of Finance and I assume it would be made available again this year, indeed I think it would be an appropriate question to ask the Minister of Finance when his Estimates next appear before us.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, well, Mr. Chairman, I guess perhaps, you know it seems to me that the Minister would have liked to have spent all the money that he was allocated last year; I understand that. But he should have the amounts that he spent under this item. he should have that somewhere. Surely the department must know how much they've spent, don't they? You have nothing to show in your books how much you spent?

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, our year is not over yet; our accounts have not been closed off for the year; we are obviously in a position to come reasonably close to what we estimate our position to be, but we have another month to operate, and we have another month of this kind of weather and snow storms to worry about in terms of clearing off highways, you know, we haven't closed off the books on the Department of Highways yet.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I wonder if the Minister can give us assurance that that information will be available to us at some time?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by my Deputy Minister that that kind of information is available on a regular basis, published in the annual report. But in addition to that, I will undertake to see, as I have attempted to on other matters requested by Members of the committee, to make the information available as soon as possible. I think it may be of help to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose to remember when last we met we talked about the extra warrants or supplementary supply and the question then was brought up that we had, because of the inability to transfer funds from certain appropriations we had a \$3.5 million surplus in some accounts but a \$2.6 million deficit in other accounts and had to go to supplementary supply for that \$2.6 million. So I suppose, in effect, that \$3.3 million or \$3.5 million — I forget the figure — surplus gives you some indication of the amounts of money that were unspent or were lapsed by the Department of Highways.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, did I hear the Minister say that there was no capital carry-over into the year that we're now in, that it all lapsed as of April 1st?

**MR. ENNS:** That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. WALDING:** I would ask the Minister to explain in the Reconciliation Statement what the amount of carry-over of capital authority, \$1.5 million, refers to.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that within the Department of Highways it had already, since last year, went on to the new accounting system. There was no capital carry-over in the Department of Highways, but we do show, in this set of Estimates, a capital carry-over that came to us from Northern Affairs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a) \$2,800,000—pass; (5)(b) Maintenance and Construction \$3,400 million—pass, the Member from Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes I wonder if the Minister could elaborate, there seems to be an increase of \$2,500 million or thereabouts. Could he explain what maintenance and construction does he anticipate would

require this additional funding? And also could he advise where the recoverable portion come from, from what other . . . ?

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that prior to 1978-79 fiscal year all major projects, for example: roads for Manitoba Hydro, railway crossings etc., were financed through capital accounts on a net basis. Under existing policy these projects must now be shown for and the moneys provided for on a gross basis and then the recoveries are credited to, unfortunately not to Highways, but to General Revenue. In other words when Highways undertakes to build a million dollar road for Manitoba Hydro up North somewhere or we're engaged in some other crossings or whether they are rail crossings, etc., that aren't under the explicit responsibility of the Department of Highways, we undertake to do the work. The money used to be in a special capital account system that Finance provided for the money to be drawn down from. We now have to — because we've done away with these capital amounts sitting around anywhere in government — the Department that will be charged with the responsibility of carrying out the work has to show it in their Estimates and the recoveries, although the member is quite right, in this instance there would appear to be a fairly substantial increase from \$3.1 million to \$5 million. The recoveries will be coming directly to revenue, consolidated revenue in the Department of Finance.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I'm not sure yet where the \$1.6 million, where it comes from, Hydro or . . .

**MR. ENNS:** We have for instance in the '78-79 Estimates, we showed as service to non-government agencies by that is not the Departmental responsibilities, of some \$914,500. This year because of the change in the accounting, we have to show a total of some \$3.4 million in that account, which is the \$2.485 million increase that is now in question. In other words, we have to provide and show it in a gross accounting way for all anticipated work and in the requests that we are in receipt of, that we know we'll be carrying out this year.

Hydro is the principle, or has been the principle, we have on one project alone a commitment to Manitoba Hydro to pave a portion of the road between Gillam and Long Spruce, which is in the amount of \$1 million, just, I think, just in the neighbourhood of \$1 million. That's one project alone. Now that kind, if you want an example, to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that kind of project, which is not a project being carrying out on a Provincial Highway or on a Provincial road system, it's not being carried out, you know, under our normal aids to municipalities or cities and towns. It is a program, a piece of work that we are doing at the request of an outside agency, in this instance, Manitoba Hydro, to build some roads for them. They will pay back to the Provincial Treasury the \$1 million but I have to show it in my Estimates here. It's a little confusing, but it's not meant to be, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, it doesn't show in the preamble here that we're doing work under this appropriation here for, such as Hydro, and I'm wondering why it isn't shown here more clearly, and I believe the Minister said that any unexpended funds went back to general revenues, is that what the . . . This is appropriation for highways, and then if it's not spent it goes into general revenues to spend for hospital sheets or . . . Well, that money, what happens to it?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, it goes to the Department of Finance and I would certainly hope and assume that it then becomes part of the general revenue picture of the Province, enables the reapplication of total resources. It might even make it possible to put regular linen bed sheets into the hospitals rather than tarpaulins.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, this is certainly a bit confusing, and I think it's because of the change in bookkeeping system and it's perhaps not as bad as what we ran into last year, but it does indicate that there are some problems, it does create some confusion.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, just one further word. I'm advised that last year, or in years previous, work of this kind would be undertaken by the Department but then very often the money would be raised by special warrant or supplementary supply. The decision of Finance has been to reduce as much as possible, the need for supplementary supply and special warrant, and I think that should be something that the Opposition would generally favour in the sense that as much as possible of the government's anticipated expenditures are laid out before you in the Estimates, for your examination. We have been instructed to anticipate, to the greatest extent possible, the kind of possible expenditures that will be carried out by the Department, and have them shown in the

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, did the Minister indicate where the \$1.6 million appropriation was transferred from, recoverable from? Where does that come from?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised that is a service to other government agencies.

**MR. ADAM:** . . . be Hydro?

**MR. ENNS:** In this case, other government departments, it can be Mines and Resources, it can be Parks, it can be again, I suppose, Tourism, if we're involved in developing, you know, some access roads to a road, if we're involved in providing some services, forestry trails and roads.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, any roads . . .

**MR. ENNS:** Not that I can specifically identify, no. Now that's not to say that there may not be some at the end of the year, but I think you would determine that better when you examine the Estimates of the Tourism Department, the Parks Department as to the specifics of their improvement program which would include, whether it is the building of some docks, or roads, or access to different lakes.

**MR. ADAM:** As far as the Minister is concerned, there is no funds as far as he knows that are intended for the Whiteshell at this time. One more question, Mr. Chairman. If the department has to build a road for Hydro, specifically for Hydro's use, is Hydro responsible for the cost of that construction, or where is the Recoverable there shown?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, we showed in its gross form, that is the reason for the \$2.4 million increase in this appropriation. Hydro is totally responsible for it if it is not part of the provincial road system in any way, and Hydro reimburses Finance with the amounts that we have spent on their behalf on that kind of a road.

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

**MR. GEORGE MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could advise, under the section of Gross Expenditures, would there be any moneys in there for capital works that were done at Gull Harbour, say in last year's figure, or this year's?

**MR. ENNS:** I am advised that is not the case, Mr. Chairman. **MR. MINAKER:** There wouldn't be any work at Gull Harbour that was initially done for capital commitments shown under Highways then, in this section?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate if the Minister would provide to us, a breakdown of the various projects that are being paid for under this appropriation.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised by my staff that that is difficult to provide at this particular time. I would assume that it is anticipated that we will be called on to carry out certain projects; the nature of them, the specifics of them are not particularly known to us at this time. If I understand the appropriation correctly, we know from previous experience and indeed within the priorities of the funds available to us, that we set out X number of dollars that are available for us to respond to different territories, different departments, different organizations that ask for them. I suppose what we could do, is undertake to provide you a breakdown of the work undertaken in the year just concluded.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a very significant increase under this item. I would assume that the Minister would be in a position to give us some more precise indication as to why such an additional sum of money is being expended and would be able to provide some itemization as to the projects which he has in mind to warrant the additional expenditure.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I will try to say it once more. I know, I'm perhaps not saying it very clearly, that the \$2,485,500 which, in effect, represents the increase, is brought about by the requirement by finance that we now show this on a gross accounting basis. It's the kind of money

that was previously drawn down from an existing Capital Account not within the Department of Highways, but within the Department of Finance, probably managed by the Management Committee of the abolition of that Capital Account and the request from Finance to show these kinds of moneys that used to be in Capital Accounts in the Estimates in these ways. That's what makes it appear to be a significant increase when in effect, for the amounts I just read out here, prior to 78-79 fiscal year, all major projects, example, roads for Manitoba Hydro, railway crossings, etc., were financed through a Capital Account on a net basis.

Now, under the existing policy, these projects must be provided for as on a gross basis and the recoveries that then come back to government are credited to General Revenue. I think it would be clearer if I showed the recoveries coming back to the Department of Highways and I might well wish that that were the case. What it does, quite frankly, is that it shows and puts the Department of Highways in a position of spending, in this instance, more dollars, when, in effect, we're not doing it for the Department of Highways.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, then, if I could just pursue that Maintenance and Construction — Other Jurisdictions. Now, Hydro has been mentioned as one of the other jurisdictions. Could the minister indicate what other jurisdictions beside Hydro?

**MR. ENNS:** That is the single kind of substantial outside agency. The principal reason for this account of course, is the ongoing support that is provided to the LGDs towns, cities and hamlets and villages throughout Manitoba. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition comes from the community of Selkirk, is aware that every year the province undertakes to share costs of certain arterial and approved streets within a community on a 50-50 basis. We share this on the same basis with the LGDs and unorganized territories and that is the traditional, roughly \$3 and one-half million, in that area, that is spent in this manner. That is, we anticipate spending these kind of moneys, making these kind of services available to our smaller centres, towns, villages, and unorganized territories again in the coming year. That accounts for the ongoing program, the \$3.6, several million dollars. Now, what throws this kind of out of balance, is that on top of that now is added on the gross accounting of the outside agencies, like Hydro, which accounts for \$2.485 million in itself.

And the listing, you know, the listing, it's a very large number of relatively smaller projects. They can range anywhere from several hundred dollars to more substantial dollars, 50, 60, 80, or 100,000 dollars, but in most instances, the grants are running in the form of 8, 10, 15,000 dollars to help a community put a better paving on their main street. It's under this program that communities such as Swan River make their major improvements to their Main Street. It's under this program that in earlier years the Town of Selkirk received its 50 percent contribution by the Province to improve their streets.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, under recoveries last year we heard a great deal about the now famous Jarmoc matter and the road which was built into the Jarmoc property. And, if I recall correctly, there were to be moneys recovered for the expenditure of sums in the construction of that road. Would that fall under this section within the Highways Department?

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

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that would fall entirely within the Department of Tourism and Recreation.

**MR. PAWLEY:** So the recovery would be within that Department?

**MR. ENNS:** That's right.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that the type of work that the Minister has outlined for us that could be cost-shared with the LGDs and villages would be an ongoing basis as he indicated perhaps on a two or three year ongoing basis?

**MR. ENNS:** Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I did not get the first part of the Honourable Member's question.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I'll be glad to repeat, Mr. Chairman. I said that the cost-shared work under the Assistance Program and Maintenance and Construction Programs, would be on an ongoing basis as the Minister has indicated and therefore if a request came from a municipality or a village for assistance to do paving of certain streets within their towns or villages, that once the program was accepted that it would probably be two or three years before it could come onstream. Therefore, it seems to me that the Minister should be able to provide some breakdown of what applications are on hand in order to ask for say \$2.8 million, and the difference between \$2.5 and \$5 million. There should be some applications on hand from Alonsa, from Rorketon, wherever; there should be, under an ongoing program. Is that not correct, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, that kind of list is that long and is carried on very often at a pace that the city or town or village itself can handle and is very often the determining factor at what pace the program or improvement will be undertaken. It has to be remembered that the community has to raise 50 percent of the dollars and if the community, we often find ourselves, the community has been involved in several other major public works undertakings in a year, they may well defer a year or two because of their concern about their own mill rate in that community. Otherwise, there could be an unacceptable tax increase loaded onto that community.

So we find ourselves, as the Member correctly indicated, working out with a mayor or his counsellor or reeve improvements to streets in a community. We have a criteria by which certain streets are approved and essentially the streets that service the business area, the major centres within a community, that is the recreational facilities or school facilities, we have maps of all the villages and communities like this on record and it is an ongoing business that the mayors and Reeves from the villages and towns and communities of the province come and see the department with requests that they hope will eventually come onstream, and they do.

But the two governing factors of what pace the program is carried on, one of the principle ones is the ability of the community to pick up its 50 percent of the share without an inordinate increase in their tax burden.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, it's my understanding that if a community or a village does not proceed with their project because of what the Minister has just outlined, this program would lapse. The work has to be done by the 31st of March. Is that correct?

**MR. ENNS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have many requests that the department is aware of that have maybe been presented several years back. Very often there is a fair bit of engineering work that has to be done. Very often we find in some of the communities before any improvements can be undertaken, we have to resolve drainage problems or other problems not specifically related to the road improvement problem. These have to be sorted out by the community involved in advance and it is a continuing program.

It has been part of the services the Department of Highways has provided for our smaller communities every since its existence. I think if I'm reading the member correctly, he's looking for some kind of carry-over capacity here to assure the Department's capability of responding to these requests that may be deferred a year or two in the planning stages. All I can tell him is that this is an item that appears regularly in the Department of Highways' estimates.

We have found from experience that this is about the level of money that we can afford within the Department of Highways and also I might say by and large, what the communities can afford. With them picking up 50 percent of the tab they have to pace themselves at a level that their tax mill rate can accept.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I take it then that if a project didn't proceed within the fiscal year that the community would have to reapply if they wanted it done.

**MR. ENNS:** Yes, we update the applications constantly but all I'm trying to indicate is that when we know that we are on. We'll often get, if I can just describe the situation, a mayor or the counsellors or a city will come in and say that we would like to over the next three or four years do work on this street, to our hospital, to our school; we'd like to do work on this street and that street and then we will sit down with them and firstly within the capability of our own budget and say to them the total work may be \$100,000 for which the community has to pick up \$50,000.00.

Well, they look at their own budget and say well we're only prepared to do about \$12,000 or \$15,000 work in any given year. So then we will program that out for them on a two and a three year basis. But each year the specific work to be undertaken that year is reapplied for because our staff people have to be able to budget for the exact amounts to be undertaken. Also we try,

as much as possible, to marry that to, if we can, particularly if they're out to be small jobs, to a neighboring job that perhaps is in the area. Very often then the prices can be materially affected and reduced.

If, for instance, if we are letting, that is, the Department of Highways, a paving contract within the vicinity of Alonsa, or of Virden, in that area, that's usually an appropriate time for the city then, or the town, to take advantage of the presence of that contractor or somebody else to say, well, now's a good time, we can get our per unit costs down considerably to get what otherwise might be a fairly small paving job and difficult to get a contractor to come out all the way from somewhere to do.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Vital. I'm sorry, were you through?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm through, yes.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister if anything under this item appears in the program lists that will be available, I think, tomorrow is it?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman, the listing when the members will see it is already long enough and, as I say, this covers items ranging from several hundred dollars to several thousands and up to hundreds of thousands of dollars but it is simply not possible to list that and we're certainly not in a position to put up a list today or indeed in the next month.

Applications come in for this kind of work throughout the year, it's an ongoing kind of thing and if we know for a fact that when we are going to be doing a bit of a paving contract past the great community of Reston that the mayor and the councillor and the member from that area will come in to say, "Well, gee, we hadn't really planned on fixing up 85th and State Street in Reston right now but we do now want to take advantage of while that contractor's in the area to have this \$800 project carried out."

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

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to go back with the Minister if I could to his explanation of the increase here and his explanation that previously the account was with finance but now it's been shifted over to Highways but the money, I believe he said now goes back directly to finance in the recovery from other appropriations. Can he explain to me perhaps again the fact that there was a little over \$3 million in gross expenditures last year and \$2.2 recoverable from other operations? Now, is this new amount something that is tacked on? Is it two separate accounts? I'm not clear on that.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I've alluded it to having been an account in Finance. My staff is not particularly suggesting that that's where it was. It would appear to be from our information that there was a capital account. I'm assuming it was set up in Finance. All I know, it wasn't set up in our department. That work for other agencies carried out by the department — the moneys were drawn down from that account. Those kind of accounts, capital accounts, have been abolished, and that is where the bulk of the increase, \$2.485 million, that was previously in that account is now shown in our regular Estimates on a gross basis.

Now, the government will get those recoveries, but with all due respect I would perhaps request the members to reserve some of these questions — I appreciate that I'm not answering them to their satisfaction — but to reserve those concerns when dealing with the Department of Finance in the manner and way in which the changeover or the abolition of certain capital accounts are being handled and the instructions that were then sent out by Finance to line departments such as Highways, as to how we have to show them in our books.

**MR. WALDING:** Is the Minister telling me then that the same sorts of projects were carried out last year and paid for from two separate accounts, one of \$3.1 million and one for \$2.48 million?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, let me try this out on the members. The Highways Department provides specialized services to other government departments and to such other jurisdictions as cities, towns, villages,

municipalities, local government districts and private parties. Receipts for services to other government departments are credited back to this appropriation while receipts for services to other jurisdictions are credited to General Revenue. Consequently expenditure exceeds recoveries by an estimated \$3.4 million. I thought that sounded pretty good, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, does the Minister then expect to, in the fiscal year in which we're in now, does he expect to spend \$3.114 million and get back \$2.2 million, or does he expect to spend somewhere in the region of \$5. something million?

**MR. ENNS:** We will spend the \$5 million. We expect to spend the \$5 million and we will have a recovery of \$1.6 million to the department's appropriations.

**MR. WALDING:** No, Mr. Chairman, not the coming year.

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

**MR. WALDING:** The '78-79 year. The \$3.114.

**MR. ENNS:** Last year in this account, or in this appropriation, on the adjusted vote we had the figure of \$3,114,000.00. We had recoveries of \$2,200,000 as shown on the left-hand side here, so we've had in effect a net expenditure on this account of some which is shown here.

**MR. WALDING:** A somewhat ephemeral account, that it was with Finance or somewhere that the Minister has been drawing on for some projects.

**MR. ENNS:** That accounts why we are on the right-hand side now showing \$5 million. The that formally came back to us — \$2.2 million it doesn't come back to us, it goes to Finance.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Pass — the Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** No, Mr. Chairman, I'm still not satisfied that I really understand this properly. Is this then an absolute increase of almost \$2 million that is being spent on Maintenance and Construction jurisdictions?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman. It is an accounting exercise that we are faced with here.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister explain that last statement?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to be difficult. If I could explain it better I would. I am merely advised that owing to a previous capital account, appropriation from a source outside the department, and the request from Finance to indicate any anticipated work that we will be doing for outside agencies to be shown in their gross position in this accounting, accounts for the increase' the rather substantial increase. But inasmuch as the Department of Highways is concerned in terms of, and in as much as the villages and as much as the service that we intend to carry out, we don't anticipate more than a status quo or a slight increase for regular growth.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is going to spend \$5 million this coming year, \$3 million for the past year, that would look like an absolute increase of \$2 million, in round figures. Now, if he says that it is not, then can he tell me where the \$2 million was last year that is the same as this year.

**MR. ENNS:** In a capital account administered by the Department of Finance, I assume, but I believe that question is more appropriately asked to Finance.

**MR. WALDING:** But did the Department of Highways actually administer that additional \$2 million? Did it pass through their hands into the physical construction?

**MR. ENNS:** I don't believe so. I believe we did the physical construction. We did the work for other parties, but the dollars to do that work came from this Capital Account which was not administered by the department, and the recoveries did not come to us as well.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. I appreciate that this is a particular area that the member and other members wish to clarify. That is the matter of how accounts are being treated and shown, but it is difficult for me to provide that information for him without the assistance of the Department of Finance from whom we received instructions to show accounts in a somewhat different way than we ourselves have in the past in the traditional way.

**MR. WALDING:** Can the Minister assure me that for the last year there was approximately \$5 million worth of work done by the department under this particular heading?

**MR. ENNS:** I would assume that could be the case.

**MR. WALDING:** I think I'm now a little clearer, Mr. Chairman. So what the Minister is saying, that this \$2.5 million, he feels shouldn't be in this department and wasn't last year, and serves to artificially inflate, or to inflate the Estimates of the Department of Highways for the coming year.

**MR. ENNS:** I'm not prepared to comment on that, Mr. Chairman. It is a matter in the way in which the government generally wishes to show its total dollar figures in terms of whether there are Capital Accounts, Capital carryover accounts left sitting here and there, obviously that is not the direction that the Department of Finance wishes to take. I'm not suggesting, I'm not prepared to comment that this is not as realistic or a more realistic way of showing the kind of works undertaken by the department. I can assure the honourable member that the dollar figures shown, whether it was \$5 million work done, is highways' type work done. The difference is perhaps that in the previous year it was not shown in such a clear way. One would have to find and examine the accounts in other departments such as Finance to find out that \$2 million worth of highways' work was carried on by the department for some other agency. I think in total this could well be a clearer way of showing the actual work undertaken, whether it's specifically under the jurisdiction and the responsibility of the department, or some related outside agencies.

**MR. WALDING:** What the Minister is now telling me is that this amount, this figure, does not represent \$2.5 million more work by the department than it did last year.

**MR. ENNS:** I think that's true. I believe, staff has advised me as best they can that we anticipate that more work would be requested. There is, within the rationale of the organization, re-organization of the department to undertake more of the responsibility for highways' work generally to be, that heretofore existed in numerous other departments, principally Mines and Natural Resources, Parks Tourism, the Northlands in the northern agreements, I think that there will be a genuine increase in the amount or the workload of the Department of Highways because we feel that it's the Department of Highways that is best equipped to do this work, so it will show as a real increase as far as the Department of Highways is concerned, but that is not to say that it is more in total. If you examined, if you went to compare the budgets of the Mines and Natural Resources, you would find dollars set aside there. If you examined the budgets of Tourism and Recreation, you would find dollars, and indeed equipment set aside there for the maintenance of fireguards, maintenance of parks roads, and so forth. So there is an increase in the workload activity of the department here, but the recovery will also be made correspondingly.

**MR. WALDING:** That's exactly what I'm getting at, Mr. Chairman. It would appear, from looking at the figures that there would be \$2.5 million more of maintenance and construction done, but since it's a bookkeeping change, there will not in fact be that much more, unless there is some extra demand at a later time for it.

**MR. ENNS:** I believe that observation is generally correct.

**MR. WALDING:** Okay. Then as a conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it seems that members on this side would owe the Minister and perhaps the government an apology, that rather than an increase in this Department of Highways of \$1.2 million, there is in fact an effective decrease of \$1.2 million in Highways, and that perhaps the government's emphasis is not primarily on highways and concrete, but it's maybe somewhere else.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Virden. The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Will there be the same situation that we're running into now under Section 8? That is another area where the Finance Department is doing the bookkeeping, or whatever it is.

**MR. ENNS:** No, that is a little more straightforward in the sense that the Recovery Agreements with Canada are fairly clear and set out. Our co-operation, our work with the Department of Northern Affairs in terms of the winter roads systems is again pretty well established over the years and is carrying on in the same manner. We have transfers of funds coming from Northern Affairs to this department in this Resolution, and I think we'll be dealing with the matters there in a somewhat clearer way.

**MR. ADAM:** The Minister, in outlining the different programs of assistance under this preamble here mentioned private parties. I wonder if we could get an elaboration, what he means when he talks about assistance to private parties.

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised that this is kind of an ongoing specialized service activity which is available to government departments and others when required. The services include snowplowing — for instance if you, as an individual require snowplowing, if we are capable of responding to it, we will, but we will charge you, as the members are aware of — dragging, rental of specialized equipment to specialized services to cities, towns and villages and municipalities, and the total of this amount that is carried out, while we again have to show it, is recoverable.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** We will get our request in sometime.

**MR. ENNS:** Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. For the services of a maintainer to drag an access road to private property or to a private business, but on the established charge basis, that charge is made and the amount spent is recoverable.

**MR. ADAM:** Is there any part of this program here where work is done on regular work, like say, No. 1, or intersections, or whatever.

**MR. ENNS:** My staff advises me that that's not the case.

**MR. ADAM:** That would show up under the previous item that we passed under Maintenance.

**MR. ENNS:** Right.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize for not being able to be here and listen to the Honourable Minister's submission in total. I was also interested in the other debate that's going on in the House. I assume this is the appropriate section to inquire as to whether any municipal works were . . . whether the department had funds to cover all requests in terms of cost-sharing of cost-sharable streets and roads within towns and cities and municipalities?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, it would be more appropriate to discuss that item under Resolution 8. On the top of Page 57, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, 8(a), Aids to Cities, Towns and Villages.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the assistance program on the recoverables here, which relates to unorganized territories, etc. I wonder if the Minister could just give an overall indication of the total amount that would be spent by his department out of the Northlands Agreement, to save me trying to find each one if he would be so kind as to come up with that figure.

**MR. ENNS:** We have allocated the figure of some \$6 million that will hopefully be spent by the Department of Highways and Transportation. I should indicate to the honourable member that that may not be all-inclusive, that I would assume to be additional work to that carried out as well under the Northlands Agreement by the Department of Northern Affairs.

**MR. McBRYDE:** What transportation functions are left with Northern Affairs that might come under

the Northlands Agreement.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, the honourable member would have to ask that of Northern Affairs. The reason why I say that is that Northern Affairs has the responsibility of initiating and identifying projects that they wish to, and they feel fall within the gambit of the Northlands Agreement. The member asked me a question, I've indicated that our current figures indicate that we in the Department of Highways intend to spend some \$6 million. And perhaps that item could be best discussed under, again under 8(d) Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement.

**MR. McBRIDE:** This is why I asked the Minister this question, because the Canada-Manitoba Northlands appears a number of times in here and that's why I would like the Minister to do the adding rather than me to do the adding, because I'm sure his adding, with his departmental officials here would be more accurate than mine would be and he might understand some of the nuances that I can't pick up from out of this book.

But on the general question, Mr. Chairman, looking over the Estimates, I don't believe that there are any transportation costs coming out of the Northlands Agreement in any other department, and that's why I asked this Minister if he could give me the summary of the transportation items that would come out of this department. In the previous years the amount available for northern road construction — and that's new construction, not upgrading and not maintenance but only new construction is covered under the Northlands Agreement — new construction of transportation services, whether that be roads or barges or other transportation services that could be justified to the federal authorities.

And, Mr. Chairman, it appears that most of the other Northlands Program have been reduced by Northern Affairs or whatever other department deals with them. I made an assumption with this Minister, Mr. Chairman, that there would not be a reduction in the Transportation Services section, that he would fight and defend and make sure that there was no reduction in the Transportation Services, and that he would have no trouble in this glorious fight to protect these funds and construct the necessary roads for the benefit of all the people, especially in northern Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I assumed he would have no trouble doing this because the Conservative Party's campaign ads in the north said that the NDP government was not doing enough to build northern roads and yet, Mr. Chairman, I am having some trouble here because the yearly expenditure under the Northlands Agreement for transportation was \$8 million, and now we see that the only figures I can find in the whole Estimates now is \$6 million, which is hardly an expansion of that construction of necessary transportation services in northern Manitoba.

Now it's quite possible, Mr. Chairman, that the department has so many other sections in here that are not cost-shared that they are getting work done under but, Mr. Chairman, I would doubt if this Minister, in his astute ability to extract federal funds if there were another \$2 million available that were 60 cent dollars, would let those go by the wayside in his quest to return the Department of Highways to its previous level of percentage expenditures of this government.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, staff in the interim has advised me that the \$6 million that has been referred to can be located under the next Resolution 6 on Page 56, item 6.(c), where an amount of \$5,100,000 is shown. The reason that is shown as \$5,100,000 and not the straight \$6 million is that there has been a general 15 percent deducted from all the Northlands Agreement's and/or other cost-shared agreements that the government has undertaken with Canada and placed in an enabling fund. The financiers assured the department that that 15 percent is available to us. What it does is it provides for some degree of flexibility in the whole range of programs that are covered under such agreements as the Northlands.

The former Minister will be aware that it does happen, from time to time, that for different reasons a particular program is stalled or is not being capable of being carried out to its full fruition. It then enables us to sub-transfer, if you like, within these agreements a certain amount of funds and, for that reason, the 15 percent enabling practise was put in place.

I can only indicate to the honourable member that I have every intention of using that 15 percent for road construction to make that figure accountable to its full \$6 million. I point that out for the members' information that that can be discussed and will be apparent to honourable members when we look at the construction program for the coming year.

Now, in addition to that, there are — and the member is quite correct — the department has last year carried, in addition to that, some between \$2 million and \$4 million worth of work under the regular program, not shareable under the Northlands Agreement, which would be added to this figure. And, again, that total figure will become more apparent when the program is before us.

Let me just indicate that the amounts shown — and I was in error — the amounts shown on

Page 57 under 8.(d) are additional Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreements that are within the Department of Northern Affairs to carry out related road access type projects.

**MR. CHAIAN:** Order please, I wonder is there any of the area that we're covering right now under the present section, Maintenance and Construction? If not, possibly we can leave it 'til that time, with the agreement of the Committee, as such. I think we're getting into an area here that we're not, at the present time, discussing. Is it agreeable? (Agreed)

5.(b) \$3,400,000—pass; Resolution 72: \$6,200,000 for Highways and Transportation Assistance Programs—pass; 6. Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways and Provincial Roads and Related Projects, 6.(a) Regular Program \$56,000,000 — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I would like to ask the Minister if, since we do not have the program for . . . This is the biggest appropriation in the Estimates and we do not have the program before us to indicate where this money will be expended, I am wondering if the Minister would be agreeable if we would proceed to the Motor Vehicles Branch and come back to this item once the programs have been distributed to all members of the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, if we proceed with this at this particular time it would be just like asking the taxpayer to sign a blank cheque and handing it over to the Minister, and I have a great respect for the Minister and we love him very much but without knowing the payee at the top it makes it somewhat difficult, and I wonder if the Minister would kindly agree to that.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am hurt to the quick. Can you think of a better fellow to give a blank cheque to?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** But what is the discretion of the Committee? The Honourable Minister.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I don't mean to be facetious; I am prepared to acknowledge the legitimacy of the request by the Member for Ste. Rose, and I have asked the department' who have under some duress been working diligently to prepare that program. I am hopeful that it will be available perhaps some time late tomorrow, but there is a considerable amount of work that has to be done inasmuch it was only towards the end of last week that we had come to the conclusions with respect to the new program of construction to be carried out in the coming year. That, as the members are fully aware, has to be dovetailed into the carry-over and on-carrying programs from last year, and it results in a fair bit of paper work that has to be done to put this together. If it's the wish of the Committee to put off the consideration for Resolution 73 at this time and proceed to the Motor Vehicle Branch, I'm prepared to do that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is this the desire of the Committee? (Agreed) The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** I want to thank the Minister for being so co-operative with the Opposition and the members of the Committee. It's rather difficult to look into this particular Estimate. It's the biggest one and I appreciate his co-operation.

**MR. ENNS:** I must caution the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, it may be more difficult for him to consider it after he has seen the program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 74: Motor Vehicle Branch \$9,457,500, 7.(a) Management Services: Salaries (1) \$873,300—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Where are we now?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(a) Management Services: (1) Salaries \$873,300 — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Could the Minister give us a report on what's happening at the Motor Vehicle Branch and are there any changes in organization? Give us a general outline of what he hopes to see happen in the coming year as far as the Motor Vehicle Branch. What changes are anticipated or expected to take place under this item?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Motor Vehicle Branch is a substantial operation of the department, perhaps it would be helpful for it to be permitted for me to read into the record precisely what the honourable member was just requesting, a short over-view of the activities of

the department as a prelude to the general questioning of the details that I know the members are interested in.

During the year '77 Manitoba experienced a 4 percent growth rate of licensed drivers. Numbers rose from some 546,000 to 570,000, reflecting an increase of 24,000 licensed drivers with 66 percent of the active driving population being 44 years of age or younger. Vehicle registrations during the year '77 increased from 627,000 to 664,000, for a 6 percent growth rate. Commercial vehicle registrations increased in 1977 to 19,245 from 16,731 in '76, reflecting an increase of some 2,514 vehicles or 15 percent.

I find that rather interesting, Mr. Chairman, that the commercial growth in the registrations increased substantially by 15 percent over and above the 6 percent increase in the general thing.

Do you have some copies that the honourable members of the Committee might have?

The most substantial increases were in the area of PSV trucks, which rose from 3,766 to 4,565 vehicles or a 21 percent increase. CT trucks also rose from 9,567 to some 11,476, or a 20 percent increase.

To provide better service and achieve savings in operating costs, the registrations of all commercial vehicles was now computerized.

In 1977 the snowmobile registrations increased to 38,879, which has reflected about a 33 percent increase. During the '76 winter season I am pleased to advise the honourable members that the Snowmobile Safety Training Program developed by the Motor Vehicle Branch was recognized by the Snowmobile Safety and Certification Committee as being one of the best in North America.

Final figures reveal that accident statistics have increased in Manitoba during '77. A total of — this is now for the automobile and the entire motor vehicle areas of activity — a total of some 40,897 accidents were reported, reflecting an approximate increase of 8 percent. Injury accidents also increased from some 7,381 to 7,695, reflecting a 4 percent increase. Although loss of life is a tragic event, the final total indicates 183 lives were lost on Manitoba highways during 1977, which compares to 213 deaths in the year 1976. A preliminary total for 1978 — the year just finished — indicates 155 fatal accidents occurred, resulting in 186 deaths. Over the last three years there has been a reduction of approximately 20 percent in the number of lives lost, giving Manitoba one of the best records in the country.

44-00 Convictions under the Highway Traffic Act dropped from 88,800 to 88,600, representing a negligible decrease. It is interesting to note that 66 percent of the convictions registered under the Highway Traffic Act were for speeding offences. During '77 preliminary figures reveal that a total of 8,924 convictions under the Criminal Code relating to the operation of a motor vehicle. Of these, 7,229 related to drinking and driving, an increase of 15 percent over the previous year.

The number of suspended drivers dropped from 26,500 to 25,700 in '77 representing a decrease of some three percent. Four leading reasons for the suspensions imposed were as follows: alcohol related offenses, failure to pay fines, cancellation of probationary licenses, multiple convictions and/or accidents.

The Motor Vehicle Branch conducted a total of 3,500 show cause hearings and written submissions during 1977. A total of some 5,606 new driver improvement road tests were conducted under the driver improvement program; failure rate being approximately ten percent and in addition to the road tests some 13,400 counselling interviews were conducted with approximately 2,000 drivers being referred for a defensive or performance driving course.

These persons came to the attention of the Motor Vehicle Branch and were acted upon due to the fact that they either had become involved in too many accident violations or accidents or both.

The driver testing administered some 47,090 road tests during the year '77, excluding the driver improvement tests aforementioned. The failure rate on an overall basis for the first attempts was a fairly high figure of some 33 percent. Class 3 reflected a six percent failure rate as opposed to Class 1 and 2 which revealed a general nine percent failure rate. A total of 112,131 written tests for the various class licences was completed. The failure rate ranged from 41 percent in the higher classes reflecting that drivers in this category require more skill and knowledge to an overall average of 25 percent for all drivers.

Physical Standards Section, whose function is to process medical information on drivers to insure that they meet the minimum medical standards processed some 21,029 medical reports during the year '77. As noted, this section was extremely busy due to the fact that some 12,900 class licence medical recalls were processed in order that the first phase of the class licence conversion from Class 1 to 4 inclusive could be completed. The remainder of the 21,029 transactions consisted of dealings in the areas of medical suspensions, registrar recalls, interview letters and renewal

The Dealer Section issued some 611 permits in 1977, an increase of approximately 5 percent from '76 a total of 1,422 permits were handled by this section, including 773 salesmen permits and 38 record permits.

The Motor Vehicle Inspection Program was in operation from April to November of '77. Three units operated which serviced three city locations and 12 rural communities. A total of 33,500 vehicles were inspected. The inspection lanes again demonstrated that a substantial amount of vehicles on the highways are defective to varying degrees. Upon first inspection 34 percent succeeded in passing the inspection, 62 percent failed and four percent were found to be in hazardous condition resulting in immediate cancellation of registration. Of the heavy duty vehicles inspected 61 percent failed on first inspection, a decrease of some eight percent over the previous year. However, upon initial inspection six percent had serious defects.

The Snowmobile Safety Program during 1977 included some 305 instructors throughout the province. During the '77 season 1,490 snowmobile operators took the course which brings the total to some 7,000 persons successfully completing the course. Accidents involving snowmobiles during '76 to '77 decreased from 95 to 84, or approximately 12 percent. Injuries also decreased from 83 to 65, which is approximately 19 percent. There were six fatalities during the '76 to '77 season as opposed to seven during the '75 to '76 season, reflecting an approximate decrease of some 14 percent.

The province's Driving Education Program is in its 12th season of operation. During '76 to '77 a total of 5,700 students successfully completed the course. A total of 235 instructors are conducting courses in 43 Winnipeg high schools and 72 rural high schools for a total of 115 schools where the course is available.

Mr. Chairman, that's a brief overview of the activities of the Motor Vehicle Branch. I think it can be readily understood by the recitation of just the figures and the numbers in the areas of responsibilities that the Branch is occupied and that it is a busy branch. It has been able to carry out the work assigned to it, I think with diligence and I'd like to take this opportunity to recognize the continuing work of the Motor Vehicle Registrar, Mr. Peter Dygala, ably assisted by Mr. Carl Procuik, who more or less runs their show when Peter is running interference on behalf of the Minister on other occasions.

With those few comments I commend the estimates of the Motor Vehicle Branch to the Committee for their consideration.

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

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I noticed that the first item, there's a decrease in salaries. Has there been any staff reduction in this area? .

Pardon me. I'm just wondering if in the breakdown of staffing that the Minister gave us, do we have a breakdown of the figures in the Motor Vehicle Branch?

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

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that with the increasing changeover to computerization that there has been an overall reduction of five staff persons in this general area of the administration.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (7)(a) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I'm just trying to reconcile the staffing breakdown that was provided to us previously. I believe there's a breakdown here of the Motor Vehicle Branch Administration 37, '78 to '79 staffing, driver licensing 85, safety 173, boards 22, positions vacant as of February '79 in administration 1, driver licensing 7, safety 17 and boards 0. Could the Minister advise. . . that would be in the management that there's been a reduction.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, the Registrar is just making himself familiar with the figures that we handed out for the total department.

**MR. ADAM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed with this a bit further, the figures of '78 '79 and the figure of February '79 only shows a vacancy of one so I'm just wondering. . .

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that that's the case. There was one vacant position and it's not anticipated that that position requires to be filled.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, there's approximately \$50,000 reduction in the salary now. I'm not objecting to that at all. I just wanted an explanation as how that came about, the \$50,000.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Can I ask the Minister which is the appropriate section to ask a question on the Physical Standards Section.

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

**MR. ENNS:** I'm sorry, I didn't hear that question.

**MR. WALDING:** Which is the appropriate section to ask a question on the Physical Standards Section?

**MR. ENNS:** It would be appropriate to ask it under this one, I'm advised.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you. And which section for the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program? Would that be under safety?

**MR. ENNS:** Under (7)(c) entitled Safety.

**MR. WALDING:** I then ask my question under the Physical Standards Section? Is there any mandatory age that a driver would be called in for a medical examination and/or driving test?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised for a person who is holding the more general license classification from one to four the answer is yes, there is a periodic requirement to recall for interview and/or rechecking of the licensee's capabilities of operating vehicles under those licence classification. Under Class 5 I'm advised that that is not the case. However, the department is often called upon, all too often, very often by close members of the family to indeed contact say a person of some age to come in and to be talked to be counsellors under this program.

**MR. WALDING:** Then there is no automatic call for a person of a certain age or on attaining a certain birthday to get a physical examination or to submit him or herself for a driving test?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, part of the branch's activity is to monitor the driving habits of all the drivers and as information is received either by way of rate of accidents or other reports that would indicate that there needs to be a re-examination of a person the member is correct, there is not a mandatory requirement.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to be out of order. I wanted to peruse some of the points that were made in the written report of the Minister and I believe that that would be in order under Management Service. What I'd like to do is just review the figures that are outlined in the report which I find interesting and revealing.

First, the indication that during 1977 there was a four percent growth rate of licensed vehicles, six percent growth rate insofar as registrations were concerned, a 33 percent increase in snowmobile registrations and an indication that accidents increased by eight percent and injury accidents increasing by four percent and then an indication that there's been a 15 percent increase in respect to convictions under the Criminal Code relating to liquor, drinking and driving.

Now, arising from those figures, then I wonder if in fact this is correct, that despite these increases of registered drivers and vehicles and accidents that we in fact do witness a decrease of three percent in the number of suspended drivers during that same period of time according to this report. Am I correct that that is the case? Then I suppose my question is an obvious one and that is, is there any explanation that despite what appears to be an increase in the number of drivers and vehicles and accidents and convictions, we're witnessing a decrease in the number of suspended drivers?

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, the regulations that call for the automatic suspension of a person's

driving privileges are fairly clearly set out and I think understood. The point I was trying to make, the relationship between the number of accidents need not be parallel in precisely that way. In other words, and/or convictions if they're spaced properly. In fact we could have an increase in the number of first offenders, if you want to put it that way, that would not call for the automatic licence suspension. I am also advised by the Registrar that in some areas there has been increases in the numbers of licences suspended; in other areas, decreases.

I provided these figures; I believe it's my responsibility to do so, in the interests of having the members aware of the activities of the department. There has always been a — and I would be the first one to acknowledge it — there is always some danger, in terms of the too literal translation of some of the increases or decreases. I note particularly, for instance, the rather surprisingly large increase in the number of snowmobiles registered this year. That is perhaps more accountable simply because of the fact that we had more snow in the year '77 and the year '76 was a particularly poor year for snow and that if you ask the distributors and the sales people involved in the snowmobile industry they would be quick to point out that, you know, you don't have much snow, you don't sell too many new snowmobiles and subsequently we don't have too many new registrations that year. If you go a year back, there was an actual decrease in the snowmobile registrations. The year that we're now talking about we've had a more normal snowfall and that activity was increased quite a bit. It looks very dramatic to say a 38 percent increase in the number of snowmobile registrations. I just point that out to the honourable member. But the conclusions that he draws are his to be drawn in any way he sees fit.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to particularly draw conclusions, only to wonder if there is any explanation because the pattern is there: more drivers, more vehicles, more accidents. Yet an indication of a decrease in the number of suspensions. And I know that statistics and figures can be misleading, but the pattern would seem to imply and rationally one would assume that there would be an increase in suspensions that would be consistent with the other increases.

**MR. ENNS:** The Registrar of the Motor Vehicles Branch assures me that there has been absolutely no change made in terms of when, and under what conditions, driving privileges are suspended. He also informs me that there has been an increase, for instance, under the suspensions that follow criminal convictions, particularly alcohol-related offences under The Criminal Code of Canada, which calls for automatic suspension of driving licences. There has been a decrease — if the Leader of the Opposition refers to Page 2 of that report — under the items 2, 3 and 4, for instance. Which were also reasons for suspension of driving privileges. The mere failure to pay a fine, the cancellation of probationary licences would indicate a higher approval of probationary licences that were issued and then allowed to full remission.

I perhaps could ask the Registrar can he break down that accident figure in terms of the suspensions related to, say, for instance, the Criminal Code?

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

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, this particular Committee of Supply is distinct from many other committees; it's only the Minister who is permitted to answer questions of members.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The point of order well taken. We will refer the question to the Honourable Minister and he can relay the answer.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't wish to break the rules of the Supply Committee. I am advised by Mr. Dygala that the increase in the Criminal Code offences related directly to the increase in the number of offences, on top of the page where I indicate that some 7,229 related to drinking and driving was in fact a 15 percent increase over the previous year. I am advised that there was a corresponding increase in the number of drivers licences suspended for this reason. However, a corresponding reduction in the number of drivers' licences suspended for reasons of failure to pay fines and, item No. 3, cancellation of probationary licences leads us to the conclusion that perhaps people driving under probationary circumstances are driving more cautiously and considerately, and avoiding suspension.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Could I ask the Minister if presently — I don't think it has to do with the material time in question here — but if the difficulty that the Department of the Attorney-General is now confronted with in that there has been acknowledged inability on their part to serve warrants arising

from failure to pay fines, whether or not we do face now a situation in which licences are not being suspended that ought to be suspended, because of the breakdown in the particular chain of the administration of justice, the failure to serve warrants upon those that fail to pay fines in many of our rural provincial judges' courts at the present time?

**MR. ENNS:** We have not the available data on the year '78 or the period that the honourable member is now referring to. These figures and these statistics report the situation as they were for the year ending '77.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Does the Minister sense a particular trend in rural areas where there appears to be no record of suspensions arising from failure to pay a fine due to the fact that these warrants are not being served presently?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman. I'd rather believe that rural people, when so fined, promptly pay their fines, knowing the character of the average rural person. I also know, in reading the Attorney-General's reports, I believe on the number of fines that are levied against rural persons in proportion to our city cousins is inordinately high, and that mention has been made note of from time to time in the House when I believe the Liquor Commission's Annual Report comes out. No, in direct answer to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I can't indicate that we have noticed any particular trend. Again, I have to say that these figures relate to the year completed, the year '77.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Would the Minister be prepared to review the 1978 situation, due to the fact that there is this acknowledged difficulty or problem, apparently, in serving warrants in many instances where I assume that warrants ought to be served in order to enforce court judgments?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared and the Registrar is prepared to, as we draw this year to conclusion and can examine our read-outs, in many cases now computerized read-outs, we would be in a position to indicate whether or not there is reason for concern on the part of the Motor Vehicle Branch in carrying out its function and its responsibilities in this particular area.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Yes, the difficulty is if a Branch of government is unable, due to a breakdown in a particular notarial area of importance then it has a spill-over into other Branches and there is very little the Motor Vehicles Branch could do, given that situation, in the Department of the Attorney-General.

I would like to ask if the Minister can assure me — because I am concerned about this decrease despite these figures showing increases in every other category — if the Minister can assure me that insofar as juveniles are concerned and their convictions in Juvenile Court, that all the records of conviction are in fact being transmitted from the Juvenile Courts to the Motor Vehicles Branch.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am advised that in that particular area we do not receive the records and the conviction notice of juvenile offenders. Mr. Chairman, it's a question that I suppose the Honourable Leader of the Opposition may wish to raise with the Attorney-General.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, the response of the Minister is most disconcerting because reference has been made — I understand very much the problem Mr. Dygala faces and I thought this problem had maybe been wrestled with successfully because I think it goes back a number of years — that certainly there would be a reduction in the cancellation of probationary licences, a reduction if in fact the records are not being transmitted, because where the cancellation of probationary licences should take place is, insofar as a young motorist just starting out with his licence, and if convictions in Juvenile Court covering those 16 to 18 are not being transmitted then what means does the Motor Vehicles Branch have, in that case, to remove a juvenile from the highway that is involved in a conviction in the court, and not yet the Motor Vehicles Branch receives no notification from the court as to that conviction?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that this is a matter of concern to the Motor Vehicle Branch. However, it's a matter that has been with us for some time. It's not something that has resulted . . . something that has just happened in the last little while, certainly not just in the last 15 months. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is undoubtedly indicating a particular area that deserves attention and resolution.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I want to just ask the Minister a further question. I had understood that in the past one provincial judge — I won't go into names here — had taken a very strong position that records of juveniles should not be made available to the Motor Vehicles Branch. I had thought, though, that other provincial judges were not taking that position. Am I to understand that all the provincial judges now are taking the position that the records of juveniles ought not to be transmitted to the Motor Vehicles Branch?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that it's not a clear picture, in terms of how the judiciary responds to this situation. There is the position that some take that it is federal legislation involved in terms of the Juvenile Delinquent Act, and, as such, some justices do not co-operate in sending records and other information over to Branches such as the Motor Vehicle Branch. The Honourable Leader refers to a particular justice in a provincial bench. I am advised that there is not a cut-and-clear situation there either; there is co-operation in this area in this respect from some but not from others, and there is not a clear pattern or a clear directive obviously, that is being given or pursued by the justice.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Has the Minister held any meetings with the Attorney-General in an attempt to resolve this?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman, not as yet, but it's a point that I think is worthwhile and demonstrates one of the reasons why examinations of the Estimates that allow us to go into the actual operations of different branches of government, precisely in the way that we're now doing it, why the exercises is worthwhile. I recognize and there has been a continuing area from time to time of concern between the Motor Vehicle Branch and/or some form of the judiciary. We have a concern, Mr. Chairman, that I don't mind voicing that after we have suspended drivers for what we think to be every reasonable and good and justifiable and defensible cause, and that being sustained, that suspension, by our own Driver Licence Suspension Appeal Board, after having given the affected person a hearing or an appeal opportunity, that when that same person then, who still has a further right to appeal it to the County Courts, all too often these considerations, that have been exercised and made by (a) the Motor Vehicle Registrar in the first instance, supported by the Driver Licence Suspension Appeal Board and then we find them reversed all too often in the County Court system. And that is an area of concern to us because we feel that our system of keeping non-desirable drivers' with poor behaviour records as far as their driving is concerned, off our highways.

I don't raise that to detour the Honourable Leader of the Oppositions off from his present line of questioning. I'm just simply indicating that there has been and there continues to be some area of concern with the Attorney-General's Department, if you like, or with the general justice system, that calls for — and I would certainly undertake to have those kind of discussions or meetings with the Attorney-General in the hope of some resolution.

I might add in the matter that I have just mentioned, with respect to the County Courts, this Minister has made a recommendation to Cabinet and to the government to consider the advisability of whether or not what we consider to be the second appeal, to the County Court system, is indeed necessary in terms of how we handle the suspended driver.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I want to avoid the Minister getting me into the second area of discussion because I would like to make some observations there as well. But insofar as the first area, I think it really is a much bigger problem than the second because — and I would like to say to the Minister, he certainly has I believe I can say, the support of Opposition, with what I think to be a very unfortunate situation. Unfortunate from the point of view of the juvenile driver, that they receive a licence, that that licence is interpreted as a right rather than a privilege, that a conviction can occur and yet the record of that conviction not be forwarded to the Motor Vehicles Branch, so that sooner or later the juvenile may end up in difficulty from serious accident, while it's possible that if the transmittal of the record had been forwarded earlier to the Motor Vehicles Branch the juvenile's licence might have been lifted earlier during a probationary period. And I just can't understand really the position of the judiciary because by forwarding the record to the Motor Vehicles Branch the Branch is not publicizing the record, the name of the juvenile is not furnished to the world at large, but it certainly would be the exercise of insuring that a juvenile driver is treated the same way as an adult driver. Now, if I could proceed from there unless the Minister wants to comment further on that to the second point.

I want to ask the Minister to be just a little bit careful in his suggestion that he is tempted to take away the right of appeal from the board to the court. Whereas on the first position I must say that I take a much more stringent attitude than I do in respect to the second. For this very

reason. I know of a particular case where a young linesman appeared before the Licence Suspension Appeal Board, with a minimal record, and failed to obtain the reinstatement of that licence. The young linesman, who lives some miles out in the country from his place of employment and had to use a Hydro truck in order to drive about from one farm, one community to the other, would certainly have lost his employment except that he was able to make an application to the court. The court reinstated his licence, overruling the decision of the board.

And I think that there are cases where maybe that the board from time to time becomes overly rigid. In that particular case, the record was not so serious that the court felt that the driver created a hazard on the road during work period and where the driver had in fact infringed the law he had been pleasure driving. Now, if you take away the right of appeal in an instance like that and other instances that I've heard of, then there's no opportunity for justice to be considered in instances where it ought to be considered because a board can become very rigidified and I'm not speaking of the present board, I'm speaking of previous boards. So that I urge the Minister to be very, very careful because there are a lot of working people in this Province who never would get into any trouble during their working hours of driving a vehicle. And you take away that right of appeal and working people are going to be thrown out of a job and your welfare rolls and your unemployment insurance payments load is going to be, I think, increased significantly.

So I want to ask the Minister whether in fact he was really suggesting to us that he would eliminate the right of appeal entirely from the Licence Suspension Appeal Board's ruling in his discussions with the Attorney-General he made reference to earlier?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, this Minister is very much aware that in our society today the privilege of driving is a very important one, an important one to the economic well-being of many of our citizens. In those circumstances that he relates, taking away that privilege often means a very serious hardship and a very serious dislocation of a family or of a breadwinner or of the persons, individuals capability of holding on to an otherwise worthwhile job.

I point out that the suspension of a driver's licence doesn't come overnight; it's usually earned, and it doesn't happen from one isolated case, and that the appeal mechanism is there, is set-up in the form of the Licence Suspension Appeal Board. The suggestions that I made, and there's no suggestion that the appeal from that Appeal Board's ruling should not be continued to be allowed to the County Court through the courts system. The suggestion that I have forwarded to the Attorney-General for consideration is that when that person, after having perhaps been granted a conditional licence by an Appeal Court, by the County Court overturning or remitting a suspension by the Branch, when he, for the second time around, causes reason, because of his record, to have his licence suspended again, keeps on going back to the County Court system and unfortunately, the records indicate a very high degree of remission.

Now, I'm only putting that in its proper context. On the other hand, this Department, this Branch, gets criticized by the media and people at large for allowing persons back on the road that in their judgement have no business being on the road, for endangering the lives in the community in general by not more rigidly enforcing the suspension of driving privileges from persons who have a record that is long and is wide, that would choke a horse. That's the conflict that the Department finds itself under.

Now, the law is there to work out the differences and the comprises that have to be made, recognizing how serious the removal of driving privileges is in today's society from any individual. I want to make that point and ask the Honourable Member whether or not, after having a person's full rights and limits of appeal process assured, including the court system, but who then goes on and proceeds to add to his record and demonstrates in a manner that he is not prepared to change his driving habits, where does the responsibility of this Department, of this Branch, and/or government or society, where does it step in to suggest that that person ought not to be able to drive on our streets and highways and endanger the lives of our fellow citizens?

**MR. PAWLEY:** I have no objection if you wish to define more clearly, the guidelines by which the courts should operate insofar as the reinstatement of the driver's permit. I do want to warn the Minister though against removing the right of appeal from a board, a government board, or commission to the court. I think that should be done only rarely, under exceptional circumstances. If you wish to define the guidelines more, then I would think that that would be something worthy of consideration, but it would seem to me to be rather paradoxical, the present system, if a juvenile's record is not transmitted to the Motor Vehicles Branch so that the suspension doesn't take place there because of a lack of record.

On the other hand, the working motorist, his record is transmitted to the Motor Vehicles Branch and as a result of his information being made available, he loses his licence and sometimes losing his ability to earn bread for his family, whereas the juvenile may have gone through the same process

without any suspension taking place in the first instance.

**MR ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, let me say very clearly that I welcome the support of the Leader of the Opposition and his group in any attempt that we ought to make to resolve this problem. I recognize it, and I think in the same light that he recognizes it. I don't think that there's any question that the senior staff at the Motor Vehicles Branch don't recognize it in a similar way and would like to see a resolution to the problem.

On the other matter, I think we've had a discussion on it and I will accept the Leader's advice and caution about removal of any additional rights of appeal. I must point out that we are the only jurisdiction in Canada where those rights exist. No other Province enables a motorist, once suspended, to go to the courts. No other Province enables that person to go to the courts for reconsideration of driving privileges, and we are one of the few Provinces, jurisdictions, that has an Appeal Board. I'm advised that in most jurisdictions the actions taken within the Department, that is by the automatic suspension, by the Registrar or the equivalent of the Registrar of the Motor Vehicles Branch, is final. There is no appeal, anywhere. That's how seriously some other jurisdictions take the business of insuring to the maximum extent possible the exclusion of the driving privileges to those who have demonstrably demonstrated their unwillingness to drive by the rules.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before we proceed, I wonder if we could have the guidance of the committee. Are we under 7(d) under The Licence Suspension Appeal Board, or do we want to continue it under Management Services? —(Interjection)— The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Could the Minister advise me, in reference to conflict from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, if a motorist arriving in Manitoba from another jurisdiction, who has had his licence suspended in that jurisdiction, whether upon his entry into Manitoba, then proceeds under the rights of Manitoba legislation and can proceed toward appeal mechanism, or does he still bear the legislation from the province from whence he left?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised that he has no appeal in that instance.

**MR. PAWLEY:** And the resident that leaves Manitoba to another province, neither does he have a right of appeal?

**MR. ENNS:** The same situation applies. He, in fact by moving his residence, or leaving the province, loses his rights that are accorded to him here.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Has there been any discussion with his confreres at the Ministers of Highway meetings in connection with this very subject to ascertain if there is any way by which there can be some minimum structure established throughout Canada, dealing with the question of appeals from suspensions of licences?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, through the organization of the Ministers, or more appropriately, CCMTA Group, I won't try to — Canadian Conference of Motor Transport Administrators, I'm told that stands for — have set up committees and are currently working at, it's an ongoing effort that involves the entire area of motor vehicle laws, regulations, but more specifically, particularly in the area of the issuance of driver's licences, conditions under which they're issued, the interchange of information from one jurisdiction to another, there is some movement towards greater uniformity, and certainly, I think some movement toward the treating of offences in a more uniform way across the country.

The Registrar of the Motor Vehicle Branch, in discussion with him just recently, indicated that there needs to be a better, it needn't be an elaborate system, but there needs to be a system that apparently, to some extent is already operational in the United States where the problem one would assume to be much greater, whereby at least information on suspended drivers is more freely passed between the various jurisdictions. We don't know, as it now stands, when a driver applies for a driver's licence here in Manitoba, who has recently come to us from Alberta or from Saskatchewan or Ontario, under what circumstances he is now applying for a new licence here. We don't have the access to his status as a driver from the jurisdiction that he's left.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(a)(1) Salaries, \$873,300 — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** I just wanted to make a short comment on the number of convictions having dropped from — we're talking about the overview now — from 88,800 to 88,600, and it doesn't give a breakdown of the categories, whether that is snowmobiles. There are no snowmobile convictions? Pardon?

**MR. ENNS:** They would be included. This is a general totalling of convictions.

**MR. ADAM:** I was wondering if because of the statistics that are here before us, if the enforcement is indeed adequate. In view of these statistics, we have an increase of 24,000 licensed drivers and an increase of almost 40,000 vehicles, and a decrease of 200 convictions. And I'm just wondering whether somehow either what my leader has raised, that the warrants are unable to be issued because of backlog in the courts, or is it because of enforcement they are not taking place. It's not difficult, especially with snowmobiles. It doesn't matter where I drive, I can see infractions all over the place from snowmobiles. They're just driving right and left across PR roads, provincial roads, and they're just going right and left. Even last week when I went home I had occasion where I was driving on PR 276 and two snowmobiles snowballed across the highway just ahead of me. They never stopped. That is a clear infraction, you know. And I think probably there is a weakness in this area as far as enforcement is concerned.

Perhaps that number, while it looks good, the decrease of accidents in snowmobiling, a decrease from 95 to 84, that's nice statistics but even if you can save one life, that is important. I know that they are going all over the place and it's getting out of hand. I just wanted to make that comment.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised, I perhaps incorrectly indicated to the honourable member earlier that the snowmobile statistics are separate from these. These relate to traffic related offences and accidents, the snowmobile offences are separately listed and not shown in this. I can undertake to try and find out what those figures are for you when we next meet.

**MR. ADAM:** The reason why I brought it up, because it does make reference to the snowmobiles at the bottom of Page 3.

**MR. ENNS:** We'll have that information for the member when next we meet. I appreciate the member's concerns, what with the increase in the registrations in number of vehicles that they automatically assume that there should be an increase in convictions. I like to look at life a little bit more optimistically. I would like to think that I've managed to convince motorists to drive more carefully and to avoid the infractions of the law. I would like to think that my colleagues and individual members have exerted leadership within their communities to ask all their constituents to drive within the rules and regulations of the law and that we needn't necessarily be ringing our hands because we haven't been able to nail more people.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(a) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I asked the Minister to explain the \$40,000 or \$50,000 reduction and I don't know whether I got an answer on that.

**MR. ENNS:** That is as I explained earlier . . .

**MR. ADAM:** One less employee, is that . . .

**MR. ENNS:** No, the bigger portion of that is successful conclusion of the computerization of major aspects of the whole driver licensing program which in effect, over a period of time now has reduced by some five staff men, not necessarily in this year, there's only one reduction here but it's a reduction in supplies and expenses and some staff components that were required when this work was being done manually.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(a)(1) Salaries, \$873,300 — pass; 7.(a)(2) Other Expenditures \$1,257,800 — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Would this be the computer costs, Mr. Chairman? We have a reduction in staff and an increase in Other Expenditures. Would that be the equipment, like, computer?

**MR. ENNS:** The department has been engaged, in the last several years, in the design and the

putting in place of the new computer system and what that has done, is, while there has been some corresponding reductions in some areas, there have been equally some corresponding increases in putting this relatively sophisticated equipment into place, is what the additional expenditure indicates, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. ADAM:** This is not done by MTS, it's done by the Motor Vehicle Branch?

**MR. ENNS:** We use the MTS computer system, we are totally tied into their system, but these are the charges relative to that use to the branch.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(a)(2) Other Expenditures \$1,257,800—pass; 7.(b). . .

**MR. ENNS:** Page by page, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(b)(a (1) Salaries \$623,700—pass; the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** There is again a decrease here and an increase on the second item. Could the Minister explain, and also could he advise when the next issue of plates will be available? When will we be providing a nice, new color to colour to look at?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised by the Registrar of the Motor Vehicle Branch that that will depend on when the next election will be called, but it would appear that we will be replacing plates on or about the year 1981 or 1982.

**A MEMBER:** Is it true they'll be blue?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(b) — the Honourable Minister.

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised that in the commercial vehicle registration section, there have been three vacant positions that account for some of the decrease here. Some of them will be filled — no, I'm advised they will not be filled. I don't know, and the Registrar will correct me, but it is possible that part of the reason for the reduction is that last year, I believe we introduced, or broadened the extent of the commercial registration to agents — not this year, next year — but that measure is being put in effect where up to now, for commercial licensing that was all done within the branch. The members will know that there are agents of the Motor Vehicle Branch throughout rural Manitoba with whom you can register your vehicle; they are now also being given the authority to license commercial vehicles as well. So the demand on the department here will lessen somewhat in terms of meeting that requirement.

**MR. ADAM:** The sheet that we have before us on the staffing breakdown shows a vacancy of seven. Will these positions be filled?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that all but three will be filled.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, could the Minister advise, if there have been new agencies, how many new agencies have been appointed?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, there is a kind of a continual turnover of these agents as people that have issued the licences before either move out of a community or change their residences or businesses, or indeed are deceased. There has been no expansion of the number of agencies as such, just the normal routine replacement of an agent when and where somebody leaves a particular area and a new agent is required.

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

**MR. MORRIS McGREGOR:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think I got the Minister right that in 1980 the CT licence will be handled through Autopac. Is that what he said or did I infer that is a possibility?

**MR. ENNS:** That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. McGREGOR:** Well, that's a very encouraging sign.

**MR. ENNS:** It was made because more and more people within the farm community are requiring this service and in an effort to make it a little easier for them to get that without necessitating a trip all the way into Winnipeg the individual agents can now, in the different communities where there are now agents, the service will be made available.

**MR. MCGREGOR:** Mr. Chairman, I am sure that that will be appreciated in my area where the smaller firms with six or a dozen trucks do have to drive into Brandon to do that now, and I'm real happy to report to them as of next year they'll be able to get it through the local agent.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Members, I'd like to caution them if they would wait recognition from the Chair they will be recorded properly, if not the possibility is there that they will not be recorded. So if they would wait until they get recognized it will be a little easier for the recorder. The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he does anticipate expanding the agencies the coming year?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, we normally respond to requests that we receive. If somebody in a particular area, community or town will write to us or complain to us about lack of service, a member of the Legislature, in carrying out his responsibilities, will call on the Minister's office and indicate that people are being asked to drive an inordinate distance to get their vehicles licensed. Under those circumstances we send out somebody to investigate the matter from the Branch and if we feel it's a reasonable request we certainly comply. I think it's a desirable means. The agents do not receive a great deal of remuneration in this. It does, though, reflect on the staff required within the department, and very often in association with, whether it's another insurance agency, an Autopac insurance outlet or in some instances perhaps just a businessman or what have you, depending on the nature of the situation, it works in conjunction with other work he is already doing of a public service type. Very often it can be a secretary or the Municipal Office performing this work, but there is no plan to greatly enlarge this. This is dependent entirely on — as the need is demonstrated we would provide an agent.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, the Minister mentioned Autopac. He brought in that subject matter into his response. I'm just wondering if he could advise if he has any plans to remove the insurance part of the driver's licence?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman, I have not given that any consideration.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(b)(1) Salaries—pass; 7.(b)(2) Other Expenditures \$3,168,000—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** I wonder if the Minister could advise is this also computers, this increase; there is \$168,000, approximately, there.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there is some price increases involved here in the material required, paper. One of them is that we have to allow for the item that we just previously discussed, the costs involved in the commercial plate issuance to agents. That is the fee structure that is built into it. From the over-view you will realize that there has been a fairly considerable growth in the number of CT plates that are now being issued, and we perceive that to go up and not down. But the major portion for the increase is, again, the cost of computerization.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(b)(2) Other Expenditures \$3,168,000—pass; 7.(c) Safety (1) Salaries \$2,087,100 — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, in this area, we have 17 vacancies. Is this a seasonal layoff and these positions will be filled in the spring when the program gets under way?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, that essentially is the case. I am advised that they all will be filled but one.

**MR. ADAM:** Could the Minister advise if there was any planned reduction of the safety driving course? Is there any planned reduction in the schools as far as driver training is concerned?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman, there is no planned reduction. We have recently just increased the amounts payable to instructors in the hope that we can continue to attract instructors. That's one of the areas of concern to the department. I would be remiss if I didn't indicate a concern to the honourable members that, by having increased the cost of the course from \$29 to \$40-\$45 that we have a concern that in itself may cause a reduction in the number of students availing themselves of the course. We think the increase is totally justifiable in terms of what similar courses are being offered in all other jurisdictions, with the exception of Saskatchewan. But in all other jurisdictions the cost of this kind of a course is considerably higher.

I don't wish to be premature in making further pronouncements. It would be my hope, however, that we would be able to provide some incentive for the taking of the course by provision of some recognition of having completed that course on the insurance the successful applicant then purchases. I can indicate to the honourable members of the Committee that the Registrar of the Motor Vehicles Branch has, under my instructions, been in touch with the General Manager of MPIC and has been working together with the Minister responsible for MPIC to consider whether or not we cannot introduce a bonus, if you like, or a reduction in the insurance premium that we think is entirely justifiable to somebody who completes this course. Our safety figures show that there is a marked improvement in the driving habits of those students and young drivers who have completed this course, and we think that from actuarial insurance reasons that there is every reason to offer that successful graduate of this course a savings on his insurance and that that savings, in effect, should offset or be substantial enough to offset the increased cost of the course that I mentioned at the outset of these remarks.

**MR. ADAM:** This driver education program is open to every citizen of Manitoba; is that correct?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I wish I could say that. Unfortunately, it's again a question of geography of our province. That doesn't make the program universal to that extent. It is certainly open to every school division in every area where there is sufficient interest shown and/or persons can be found to do the instructing. It's available to every division; it's available to every school, but I would be misleading if I indicated to you that in some of the remote and smaller communities that this course is in fact being offered. It's regrettably a penalty that geography and population location puts us in.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, the list shows 235 instructors, and the list for '78 show . . . Is that the instructors — 173?

**MR. ENNS:** The 235 instructors referred to in the overview are not included at all in there. They are not considered departmental employee.. They are contract, if you want to call them, temporary term. Many of them are teachers, for instance. They agree to teach this course, which has a start and finish date, but are not permanent staff people within the department. So that they are not to be confused with the figures there.

**MR. ADAM:** Where are the funds for that? Where is the appropriation for paying these term employees?

**MR. ENNS:** I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that they are under the item (c)(2) Other Expenditures.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, there is a \$50,000 reduction there. The Minister indicated just a few minutes ago that they were increasing the salaries to encourage more instructors to come into the program. Can the Minister explain?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, the program was originally set up and designed that the course itself carried roughly 50 percent of the costs and, over the years, that has fallen out of whack and has cost the department increasingly more dollars, as we had to pay for the instructors and pay for other associated costs with the courses offered. By increasing the per student contribution that reduces the necessary costs somewhat to the department and that is part of the reason for this reduction — not totally, but part of the reason.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions on this matter of driver education. I have a personal interest in it in that I have just recently paid the \$45 for my eldest son to take this course. Does that \$45 go to the department to help offset the costs, or does it go directly to the Minister of Finance?

**MR. ENNS:** I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that that \$45 goes to the school and the school then, in effect, pays the instructors. We subsidize that cost and we subsidize the entire program to the tune of roughly 50 percent. I think with the increase from \$29 to \$45 it is now back to about a 50-50 subsidization, the student paying 50 percent through the school and to the teacher, and we picking up the other 50 percent of it. It had gotten out of whack to about 70-30, I suppose, prior to that increase.

**MR. WALDING:** In the Minister's discussion with MPIC about giving some sort of break to students that have taken this course. Is the minister considering some form of reduction on the insurance premium that is paid on the driver's licence or the other part of it.

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

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, we believe that it could possibly best be administered by reducing the insurance portion as it is now paid on the Driver's Licence, in the sense that it would be applicable to all who successfully completed that course and apply and hold a driver's licence. It's not necessarily that all would necessarily have a car. Your son, and I hope he would complete that course and graduate successfully, or he has, I don't know whether he necessarily has a car, you know. But, let's take it in the instance that he didn't have a car, but he was now a qualified driver, our interest is in recognizing the fact, that by having taken that course and having completed it successfully, we know that he will be a better driver.

**MR. WALDING:** Can I ask the minister if he's given any thought to, instead of doing it in the form of a break on the dollar premium, whether he's given any thought to awarding such a successful driver maybe one or two merit points to be going on with.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by the Registrar that they will get them automatically if they keep out of trouble. And, also, I must say, that their chances of keeping out of trouble are statistically considerably better than those who haven't entertained that course, but, seriously, I think that this whole area is a matter of ongoing concern to the department and to me, personally. I would like, very much to move in this direction. We have taken, I think, not just these drivers, but with the introduction of the merit system last year, we have set in place, at least the framework for some further expansion or consideration of the thought that the Member from St. Vital expresses, that is, that ought not, you know, the good driver be recognized period, in some way and at some level, whether it is at the 3 merit points — which means that he has driven 6 years, continuous years, without any infraction of any rules. I think, in my own mind, that that requires and should be noted, somehow, in a way that would encourage the maintenance of that kind of a driving record.

I think the honourable member appreciates, though, that we are talking about involvement of other jurisdictions. We are talking about other people's dollars and budgets, in this case, perhaps MPIC's, in terms of any premium reductions that might be offered as an incentive for good driving; that these negotiations obviously have to take place with other interested parties. But I certainly want to leave the impression with the committee members, that it's a goal that the Motor Vehicle Branch wishes to pursue.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member from St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** I'm glad that the minister is actively pursuing this and I wish him well with it. The other matter I wanted to bring up with him was the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program. I assume what is being referred to here, is a program that's been in effect for several years, whereby, vehicles over a certain age are randomly selected for a safety check. Is this right?

**MR. ENNS:** That is correct.

**MR. WALDING:** The paper here says that a total of 33,500 vehicles were inspected. I would like to ask the minister if this random selection process refers randomly to all vehicles or if it's randomly within sections of different types of vehicles?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised that it is random in terms of passenger cars and trucks, general trucks. There are more stringent and codified inspection systems in place for such other public service vehicles, such as school buses which get their annual check from the department, and I believe, in addition to that, the school divisions maintain their own additional annual inspection or semi-annual inspection of say, the school buses. Taxi cabs, for instance, come under a different set of regulations and are required for annual inspection, so that I think these inspections that we're referring to here, are truly at random.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted then to refer to the heavy duty vehicles that are mentioned, specifically, in here and ask the minister what is meant by the term "heavy duty vehicles"?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm told that they refer to the heavy duty trucks and/or the large public service buses, semi-trailers, etc.

**MR. WALDING:** Does the minister have any estimate of what percentage of the registered vehicles would be randomly selected in any year for this vehicle test?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, I think the honourable member can do his arithmetic as quickly as I can do if we are checking some 33,000 to 35,000 vehicles and there are some 600,000 vehicles registered.

**MR. WALDING:** But not all over 5 years old.

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised that we don't have the figures here, but will be more than happy to supply him with them when next we meet.

**MR. WALDING:** Is it likely to be in the range of 1, 2, 3 percent, as small as that, or perhaps, 5, 10 percent?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised that it's somewhere closer to the figure of 5 percent.

**MR. WALDING:** I'm wondering if this term "heavy duty vehicles" would also refer to tanker trucks, trucks that might transport hazardous or explosive or dangerous materials. What brings it to mind is an accident that happened in Spain last year, where a tanker truck loaded with gasoline or kerosene went out of control or there was some accident with it as it was passing a holiday camp. Apparently the vehicle went across the road and plowed into a holiday camp and exploded and killed many, many people. I'm wondering if that type of vehicle, carrying those types of loads, are included in this or whether there are any extra or more regular safety checks on such vehicles or is the department or the branch giving any consideration to a more regular or a more comprehensive type of safety check of vehicles of this type?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that, while they're not specifically singled out, as such, they are included in the general inspection at random of heavy units or heavy trucks. There are additional efforts made for inspection, though, that are carried out at our weigh scales, for instance, when these units which have to regularly pass through our weigh scales, are checked by branch inspectors. I might add, though, in this particular case, there is a coming together of a national consensus of passing the kind of regulations that generally concern all citizens of, not just Manitoba, but Canada, about the movement of dangerous and highly inflammable material and that through the Ministers' Conference that I attended last fall, there is, I think, every opportunity that we will have, with the cooperation of other provinces and the Federal Government, some regulations or legislation in place, addressing itself to the problem that the honourable member raises.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

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

**MR. ENNS:** If I may interject, Mr. Chairman, at this time, we, in our own way, and in the area of jurisdiction that we have, we are concerned as a branch about the increasing amount of liquid fertilizer — I can never pronounce the name of it properly, "anhydrous ammonia," of which there has been some discussion in this legislature, particularly during the last Session, we're concerned about the amount of liquid fertilizer that is being moved around and in the manner. The practise is developing where farmers are towing 2 or 3 of these anhydrous ammonia tanks behind what we consider to be, you know, in unsafe conditions, when they tie them up, several of these tankers behind, say, a half-ton truck and then take off down our highways or provincial road systems, so that, it would be my hope that we will, during the course of this session, pass legislation, not restricting the practise, but setting down some guidelines and regulations as to how they can and ought to be transported. Now, I know this is of concern to the farmers and to the rural members and that's a matter that will be brought before the members, but I can indicate that, in that sense, in the area that the branch has some capability and responsibility for setting up the necessary regulations, we are actively considering that, hopefully for inclusion for the legislative package that will be before the House during this session.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, I note from Page 3 of the paper, that 6 percent of those heavy duty vehicles inspected had serious defects. Now, there were no details here as to what those serious defects were, but it doesn't require too much imagination to imagine a heavy duty vehicle loaded with an inflammable or explosive or radioactive or noxious gas, having some blowout or brake failure or axle damage and causing all sorts of problems. Can the minister tell us whether he would favour some form of more stringent inspection of vehicles falling into that category?

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we are always concerned about the possibility or potential of kind of accidents or situations arising that the member is alluding to. It's a fact of life, however, that, again in the province such as Manitoba, gas has to be transported to many rural communities throughout the province. In the viability of our agricultural community there's going to be fertilizers and chemicals moved throughout the length and breadth of this province. I think we have to, in a continuing way, be looking at how we can, without interfering unduly in the necessary movement of these goods or without adding, you know, unnecessary expense and cost to the movement, because, in many instances, these are pretty important to everyday living goods that are being transported and moved. If we devise a system that is so prohibitive and so expensive, say, in the movement and the capability of providing heating fuel to a northern community or to a rural community, that cost is going to be passed on to somebody. I think we will attempt with common sense and with development of technology, as it's being developed here and in other parts of the country, and indeed in other countries, try to apply them in a way that meets the concerns that the member expresses.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (c)(1)—pass - - The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, I would like to make a comment on the road tests - driver-testing administered last year and the failure rate seems to be quite alarming. The first attempt was 33 percent. There was another category, a failure rate range from 41 percent in the higher classes, reflecting that drivers in this category require more skill and knowledge to an overall average of 25 percent for all drivers. And this would indicate to me that there is an area here, a very gray area where we should be looking more seriously at — you know, I'm wondering how many in this room would pass the test of even signs.

**MR. ENNS:** I'd fail you all, I think.

**MR. ADAM:** We'd all fail.

**MR. ENNS:** I think so, yes.

**A MEMBER:** Don't read metric yet.

**MR. ADAM:** I believe that, and I'm making these comments in the hope that maybe the department, maybe they are — could I ask if they are looking at these statistics now? They are here in a very alarming amount. Could the Minister advise what steps the Safety Department is taking, or whatever

that department comes under to try and ameliorate this situation.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, firstly, I'm advised that the failure rate, although they're substantial, are essentially at a level that has prevailed over a number of years. It is not either substantially going up or down. I think what the honourable member is suggesting, that we can perhaps do a somewhat better job in terms of the material that we send out to applicants, would-be drivers, applicants of licences. The higher failure rates there refer to the written tests, not the actual physical driving test. I think perhaps that also is indicative that there are, in some instances, language problems involved in terms of being understood, you know, just comprehension and understanding of the tests.

We are trying to recognize this by developing a new manual, a new book, that relies more on symbols and pictorial illustrations, because we do have a number of new Manitoba residents who — you know, one of the first requirements very often to gainful employment is to be able to drive. So you have people that are still just learning the language applying for these tests, and failing, obviously at a fairly high rate. But on the other hand, I don't think for a moment that anybody is suggesting that we reduce the standards or reduce the qualifications for a driver test. Indeed, I think in our ongoing concern about safety and our ongoing concern about having people that use our highways and roadways are fully familiar with the regulatory signs on them, are fully familiar with the rules of the highway, and are capable of physically driving the vehicle.

I can't really add too much more to that, Mr. Chairman, other than to say the department is constantly reviewing its situation and looking at the problem.

**MR. ADAM:** I have one more question before we adjourn.

**MR. ENNS:** I was hoping, Mr. Chairman, that we could conclude with the Motor Vehicle Branch, seeing as how we were so co-operative in other matters.

**MR. ADAM:** Has the department made any comparisons with other provinces in that gray area? How do we stack up with other provinces as far as . . .

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that we have made these comparisons and we are somewhat higher than some of our sister provinces, but we don't feel at this time that that calls for any basic change in the requirements that we lay down for the successful applicant of the driver tests. We think perhaps we have to address ourselves a little harder to some of the areas that we just mentioned, namely to overcome and make the informational material, the educational material that we provide, a little easier to understand and perhaps make it more available through school systems and so forth.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I dread having to go and take the first driver's test.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that I could arrange it. It's just a matter of pulling a card out of a computer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(c)(1)Salaries \$2,087,100—pass; 7.(c)(2)Other Expenditures \$901,000—pass; 7.(d)(1)Salaries \$447,300—pass. Page 57 (d)(1)Salaries. The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** I asked the Minister a question in the House which he undertook to provide the information as to the reasons for — well, I asked the Minister in the House if the Licence Suspension Appeal Board was no longer hearing the appeals in the Highway Traffic Building, and if they were no longer hearing the appeals in the Highway Traffic Building, could the Minister provide the reasons? Was it a shortage of space, or was the space used by the Suspension Appeal Board required for other purposes?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, the practices of the Appeal Board have been somewhat changed, and I think one again that will be welcomed in particular by rural Manitobans. We are firstly hearing more appeals in a few more rural centres, notably Steinbach which covers off that large south-eastern portion of the province, which formerly all had to come in to Winnipeg. We are also hearing appeals periodically in Portage la Prairie, which covers the central area a little bit. We have always heard appeals in Brandon for the south-west corner, as well as, of course, in Thompson in the north.

In addition to that, the Appeal Board does continue to use the facilities of the board room of the Highway Building at 1075 Portage Avenue. What has happened is, that in addition to all this,

in an effort to clean up a rather serious backlog of some 1200 cases, there have been additional hearings held where for a brief period of time space has had to be rented in other facilities. I should indicate to the honourable member that in the year 1978 there have been some 244 hearings held in Winnipeg, 44 hearings held in Brandon, 27 hearings held in Dauphin, 10 in Thompson, 10 in The Pas, 2 at Steinbach and 2 at Portage. So we are spreading out and covering a greater portion of the province in the holdings of these hearings.

I would assume that in most of these instances I would have to check the sites that are being used, for instance at Portage — we would have to get that information; it would likely be in the new provincial building that has recently been erected there.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, the facility at the Highways Branch is adequate then for the hearings in the Winnipeg area — is that correct?

**MR. ENNS:** No, Mr. Chairman . . .

**MR. ADAM:** Or is it my understanding that there are other facilities that are rented . . .

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the facilities at the Motor Vehicle Branch and the Highways personnel generally has to put up with at 1075 Portage are far from satisfactory. It is possibly the most overcrowded and short of space building in the government service. And there is a great deal of inconvenience and difficulty being experienced in that particular area. It's my hope that we can do something to alleviate that space problem, but so far I have not been able to accomplish it.

**MR. ADAM:** I realize that the building itself— I've been there, in fact I was there this morning— is very crowded, but we're referring specifically now to Licence Suspension Appeals. Was that board room not adequate, or do we have to rent spaces for that?

**MR. ENNS:** It is adequate in most instances. I believe there have been one or two instances where outside space has been rented when obviously the board room was being occupied for some other purposes. This board is a very active board, it meets several afternoons, two, three, up to three afternoons or mornings a week, and I can report that currently they are managing to maintain a satisfactory level of processing in terms of the applications. We were in a situation where we were automatically, because of the inability of the applicants to get their cases heard, we were issuing 45-day permits, not just one, but a second one, and sometimes a third one because the appeal backlog was that great. The majority of the appeals, certainly the intention of the appeal board to substantially hold their Winnipeg hearings in the board room at 1075 Portage, but I would not say that there would not be occasions where, for reasons of pressure on space generally in that facility in that building, that they would not find themselves perhaps having to go outside on occasion.

**MR. ADAM:** Then, Mr. Chairman, renting outside space is not done on a regular basis. It's only on an ad hoc basis. Could I say that it's less than 5 this year, or less than 3, am I . . . ?

**MR. ENNS:** I don't have that information, Mr. Chairman, but the honourable member has asked me that question in the House. I certainly would be prepared to answer it in the House when I get that information.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(d)(2)—pass; pardon me, my apologies, it's 7.(d)(1) Salaries, \$447,300—pass; 7.(d)(2) Other Expenditures \$99,300 — the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Could the Minister advise the increase in this area? What is that cut?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that that increase is made up totally of the general increases of the cost of supplies' forms, paper, etc.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, if I could just have the indulgence, Mr. Chairman, if I could just ask the Minister. . . we spoke about the Licence Suspension Appeal Board. I was wondering about the Highway Transport Board and the Taxi Board. Where are those hearings held?

**MR. ENNS:** I'm advised that over the last number of years, the Highway Transport Board and as well, the Taxicab Board, uses facilities that are rented on Weston Street, in that area. They have

their own facilities, have had over the last number of years.

**MR. ADAM:** In other words, they don't use any facilities in the Highways, there is none there available for them.

**MR. ENNS:** This board, again, sits for full hearings very often, full days — there simply isn't room for that board and the move out of 1075 took place some two, three years ago.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(d)(2) Other Expenditures \$99,300—pass; Resolution 74: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,457,500 for Highways and Transportation, Motor Vehicles Branch—pass.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Chairman, I move Committee rise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The motion is Committee rise. Agreed? (Agreed) Committee rise.

### SUPPLY — MINES, RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would draw the honourable gentlemen's attention to Page 65 in the Main Estimates. We are on Resolution No. 84 for Water Management: (d)(1)(a) Salaries — pass— the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, just before we ended the discussion before, I was asking the Minister about the termination of the Canada-Manitoba agreement, and I believe he was explaining, or going to explain why these programs were continuing under total provincial sponsorship and the nature of the program involved. At that time, Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the Minister that in light of another program that had been cut because of the end of an agreement, and he looked sort of puzzled what I was talking about, and I was looking over my material here, and it was last year's Estimates that a study was finished and the total staff was eliminated, not in this year's Estimates. So I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could just fill us in a little bit more on this section, in terms of what is left of it and what it still does and maybe he could jump back up momentarily since he related this item to see how does he recover this fund from Canada, if it doesn't relate to the agreement any more, or is there still part of the agreement finishing up this fiscal year?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that I had just briefly explained that some of the people that had been working in this area were dealing with conservation districts and some were working on ground water, and that the programs were really of an ongoing nature, and it was necessary to continue them, so three of the people have been picked up in Operations and seventeen in Planning. The other expenditures item of \$1,204,600 went last year for drainage projects that have been essentially completed now, so some of these projects that were on a cost-shared basis, the province is now having to continue without cost-sharing.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could just enlighten me as to whether this particular Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement was always scheduled to finish now, or whether it was terminated early as some of the Northlands programs were terminated early.

**MR. RANSOM:** It was scheduled to expire at the end of March this year, Mr. Chairman. December, pardon me, last December 17th.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)(a)— pass— the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the one part of my question the Minister might have missed was that he said some of these items were covered in the item above. Could he say why the \$56,700 is recoverable from Canada?

**MR. RANSOM:** That's on a water demand study that's being carried out jointly with the Federal Government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)—pass; (1)—pass. (2)(a) Salaries— pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain why this section is in the book at all. Since it shows no expenditures last year and no expenditures this year, why is it in the Estimates book?

**MR. RANSOM:** It's just that the money comes from Northern Affairs, but the people are located in this Department and we provide the service to Northern Affairs as requested.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, then I wonder if the Minister could give us a little bit of detail in terms of which part of the land use study is this? I'll get the Minister to explain that. There is a couple of different things that were being done and I'm trying to figure which one of them this one is.

**MR. RANSOM:** These are, as it says, geotechnical studies, and one of the things that they've been involved in is defining the severance line under the northern flood agreement. And some land use studies, I believe, in the vicinity of settlements.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased that this work is continuing because one of the problems that we had with northern communities is the fact that some of the community boundaries, some of the land that communities wish to use for development for residential or other development are within Hydro severance lines. But these severance lines are very rough and just drawn on a map in many cases, and so very detailed work has to be done to figure out exactly what the high water lines would be to more accurately determine the areas that should be restricted for development, because of possible Hydro usage, and I wonder if, besides those communities affected by the Hydro development, by the northern flood agreement, are there other communities? I know there are a number around Lake Winnipeg that were having a similar problem and others on the Nelson River system. I wonder if he could indicate what communities might be having this service provided to them this year.

**MR. RANSOM:** I'm advised that it's just communities affected by the northern flood agreement.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the staff then that's required, this appears because of the staff that's required. What has been the change in staff — I'm assuming that salaries are 60 percent recoverable — the Minister recovers all the funds from Northern Affairs, but I assume that Northern Affairs then recovers 60 percent from the Federal Government. Is that correct?

**MR. RANSOM:** That's correct.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** The first part of the question was "How many staff are in that section?"

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

**MR. RANSOM:** There were four people in positions last year; there continues to be four but there were four additional vacant staff man years that have been eliminated.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)—pass. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, since the Minister indicated that the geo-technical land use that's being done now relates exclusively to the Northern Flood Agreement, I would like to know what involvement Manitoba Hydro has in this, what role they play in this, whether they play any financial role or any technical role and how is this item covered in the Northern Flood Agreement, I'm trying to recall. Is there in fact a specific reference in the flood agreement that this work will be done?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe it was required in the Northern Flood Agreement although I must point out that this department doesn't have the responsibility for the flood agreement. We do it at the request of Northern Affairs. But I understand that Hydro does some of the severance lines and we are doing some.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, how do they decide who does which?

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess that question would best be put to the Minister of Northern Affairs because we do the work that we are requested to do by Northern Affairs. We don't make the decisions about which pieces of work to do. We just provide a service.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)— pass; (b)— pass; (c)— pass; 2.— pass; 3.(a)— - pass; (b)— pass— the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like the Minister to explain this item a little bit further.

**MR. RANSOM:** This is an agreement between Canada and Manitoba to identify map flood risk areas and then to develop means of coping with the flooding problems. It's going to deal with a number of communities as well as the City of Winnipeg and it is just on the second year of the agreement now and the expenditure is at a level as called for in the agreement.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the communities are already defined and fixed, whether there is any chance of getting the Fisher River included under this particular program for cost-sharing with the Federal Government.

**MR. RANSOM:** The communities to be done are designated in the agreement.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b)— pass; 3.—pass; (d)—pass; (e)— pass; Resolution 84 — pass. Resolution 85— 5. Regional Services, (a)(1) Salaries— pass— the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, at the early stages of the Minister's Estimates I was asking about some regional breakdown if possible and this is one of the sections that I would be especially interested in in terms of regional breakdown of staff positions and whether there's been any change in the number of people located outside of Winnipeg increase or decrease in the people located outside of the city. I would really like that information for the whole department and I asked the minister about that earlier and he said he would see what he could do. But for this section, I think it's quite important because this is the regional service section of the department which, as I understand, the structure and operation of the department carries out basically a number of the other services we'll be talking about, carries out at the local level the Fisheries and Wildlife Management, the Forestry Management, the Resource Planning Functions, it is done in these regional offices. So I wonder if it's possible for the minister to locate that information, especially for this section, but for the whole department, as well.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** I expect to have that for the department by tomorrow morning, Mr. Chairman. I could give some breakdown of figures for regions now of numbers of people, if you wish to have that, or if you wish to wait for the whole thing. The northern region has 57.08 staff man years. There are now 8 vacancies. The southern region has 32.18 with 5 vacancies. The eastern region has 48 with 4 vacancies and the western region has 47.4 with 5 vacancies and the rest head office.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, well under the Divisional Administration for the Regional Services. There has, on occasion in the past been certain regions, for example, Mr. Chairman, where the fishermen became particularly upset with one Fisheries biologist and I wonder if the minister could indicate whether there's been any transfer because of local pressures, local dissatisfaction with particular staff, or whether there's been any changes for that reason in the Regional Services?

**MR. RANSOM:** Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. McBryde:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister has had the privilege, yet, of meeting with a group of irate fishermen from any region on that kind of an item?

**MR. RANSOM:** I've had the pleasure of meeting with a number of groups of fishermen, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; — The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the minister in this section, Divisional Administration could answer questions with respect to the overall Regional Services delivery system.

I'd especially like to know how many conservation officers are now in the employ of the division; in total that is all the regions, and if he could perhaps, if he doesn't already have them, give us the breakdown by region at this point rather than ask the same question for each region.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** In the northern region, Mr. Chairman, there are 37 staff man years covering Conservation Officers, three are vacant. In the southern region there are 24, with 4 vacant; eastern region 29, with 2 vacant; the western region 33, with 3 vacant, a total of 123 SMYs, with 12 vacant.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (a)—pass; (b)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (c)—pass; (d)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (d)—pass; (e)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (e)—pass. Resolution 85—pass.

Resolution No. 86. 6. Parks. (a)(1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I asked the Minister if he could bring us up-to-date on the proposed Park along the Red River up to the estuary of the river where it joins Lake Winnipeg, especially since the Leader of the Opposition raised the matter with the Minister this afternoon with regard to the River Road area north of Winnipeg which was quite a scenic drive at one time but now is an area that really one has to be very careful when driving along there that he doesn't wind up in the river because of river bank erosion. If the Minister could give us a bit of background, how far we've progressed so far with the proposed new parks that will be going in along the Red River up to the estuary.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** As I said this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that is indeed within the Parks Division of my department but it falls within the Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets in II.(c)' and I would be happy to give the honourable member the details when we get to that.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The item itself is very brief and very general so I'll raise it right at the start and if it doesn't fit somewhere in one place the Minister can tell us where it does fit.

The Whiteshell study that's been done — the Green Paper in terms of the land use in the Whiteshell — I wonder if the Minister has the first draft of that yet, if that study has been basically completed?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Green Paper report is being drafted and should be available shortly, but as I answered in the Question Period some days ago, the Paper itself is really only going to be a presentation of the issues and will not in itself resolve anything. I said then, at that time, that the next step had to be the development of an actual plan for the Park which there has never been, and I stated again in Question Period that that would be done and that there would be no major developments take place until that was done.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us some idea of when he first received that Green Paper report.

**MR. RANSOM:** Oh, probably six weeks ago thereabouts.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister or more senior people than those involved in preparing the report found it necessary to make alterations or to change the basic nature of that Green Paper.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, there haven't really been any changes made by senior people in the department. All we've asked is that the Paper outline the issues in as clear a fashion as possible. The technical work, of course, the technical reports, have been done by technical people and they have been completed since mid-December thereabouts so, in addition to the Paper, the Green Paper itself, which as I say is a presentation of the issues, there are a number of technical reports that will be available as well.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether, either the technical reports or the general presentation of issues, make any recommendations or contain any conclusions.

**MR. RANSOM:** No, they will not, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, was there a stage in this preparation of the Green Paper where recommendations and conclusions were included, or were the original guidelines set out for those doing the work that there should be no conclusions or no recommendations?

**MR. RANSOM:** I don't believe there were any recommendations or conclusions in it, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, I believe I heard the Honourable Minister say that pending the completion of the study of the plan for the Whiteshell Park area there will not be any major developments. Could the Honourable Minister be a bit more precise and specific in what he means by major development? In other words, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure what the Minister means by what, in his mind, is a major development and what constitutes a minor development.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, I suppose what we might call minor developments would be simply the maintenance of what is there, Mr. Chairman. We're not contemplating any new sub-divisions, that sort of thing, prior to having a plan in place.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, my question is, with respect to the planning which is going on for the Whiteshell Park, what is the Minister's intention with respect to the plan which was already adopted, already prepared, for the Whiteshell Park before his government came into power?

The Minister earlier made a statement, I believe, that no plan had ever been developed for the Whiteshell Park. I might remind him that one, indeed, had been developed for the Whiteshell Park, had been discussed with the various departments concerned with associated resource development, and particularly the department I was responsible for at the time, Renewable Resources had input into that plan and had concurred with the classification scheme which the Parks' officials had developed with respect to that plan which was adopted by the Minister at the time for the Whiteshell Park. Is the Minister rejecting that plan completely and now going through the exercise of developing a completely new and different plan with different sets of criteria, different terms of reference, etc.?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Perhaps If I said that a plan had never been developed, Mr. Chairman, then that was perhaps not a correct statement. I would say that a plan had never been adopted as government policy.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that to be the case since the Parks Act, I believe, states that the Minister has the authority to adopt plans for Parks, and the Minister of the Day, as I recall, adopted the particular plan that the department had prepared in conjunction with other departments of the government with respect to the Whiteshell Park, and Mr. Chairman, they were in the process, I believe, of implementing that plan at the time that this government came into power and now I believe what seems to be happening is they're rejecting this plan, throwing it in the basket, trying to come up with something which better suits their particular ideology with respect to Park development.

Now, if the example we had last Session is any example, Mr. Chairman, what they appear to be moving towards is large scale, massive developments within the Whiteshell Park and, Mr. Chairman, the fear of members on this side is that the present government is going to be running amuck in the Whiteshell Park, developing huge developments, putting undue pressure on resources such as the one in particular that came to light last Session, the Jarmoc case, where the Minister of the Day, which is not the present Minister, but the previous Minister had agreed to allow that development to proceed. I believe that in the midst of the controversy in the House here that plan was put off to the side for a moment, but the Minister in his own words during Question Period earlier this Session, Mr. Chairman, indicated that that plan had not been completely rejected but was simply put on the back burner awaiting this new plan which this government is coming up with. Mr. Chairman, if that advertisement which they had put in the newspaper last Session as a Citizens' Enquiry regarding people's intentions and desires regarding the Whiteshell Park is any indication, then this government is going at a particular direction in Park Planning because that particular advertisement was designed to elicit certain types of responses from the citizens of Manitoba, in particular the theme of that particular survey form which was printed in the Press eliciting responses from citizens was, that the government wanted to have more development, more intensive development in the Whiteshell Park. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from this Minister clearly what his intentions are, what his instructions are, to the staff who are preparing such a plan for the department because I know that the government can influence the way in which that plan will come out, the way in which the particular people in the department will prepare the plan. My fear is, Mr. Chairman, that this government is interested in such large scale developments, proceeding with massive developments such as we saw indicated last Session in the case of this Jarmoc Condominium project, that they will be putting undue pressure on the resource base.

In that particular case, Mr. Chairman, that would have practically wiped out those two small lakes which are already under undue pressure by the existing users of those particular lakes. Mr. Chairman, I'd like an assurance from this Minister exactly what his plans are with respect to the Whiteshell Park.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe I outlined some steps which would be taken in order to develop plans for the Park. Now the honourable member is asking me to state what those plans are before they've been developed, which is something that I obviously can't do. But I do agree with him on one point, and that is that the sort of plan that is developed will very definitely reflect the philosophy of the government. That's why government's are elected — to provide some direction — and we will be providing a Parks policy and the direction will be given to staff to follow those sorts of principles, that we will have a procedure for having public involvement, and the purposes will be clearly stated and the public will understand the direction that development is going to take and I'm quite satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that when the process is completed that it will be seen to be a very satisfactory process.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. If one can read between the lines of what the Minister is saying, he is admitting that he will be giving direction as to what kind of plan will be coming out of his department. If he's following the example of his predecessor in this department, who seemed to be giving the back of his hand to those professional people within his department who had given advice on the resources and how the resources should be protected within that Park, then I fear for the resources within the Whiteshell Park because, Mr. Chairman, we saw the example last Session, where the Departmental Assistant Deputy Minister and the Director of the Day had advised the Minister not to accept this proposed condominium project by Jarmoc and Associates and Mr. Chairman, the Minister gave that professional advice by his staff the back of his hand and instructed his Deputy Minister to sign an agreement in any case. Mr. Chairman, that's the point I'm trying to make is that if this Minister is going to use that kind of influence on his staff then we will have

a Park plan that will not be a plan that will be developed by professional, technical people who will be able to give good advice with a reasonable assurance that their advice will be respected.

Mr. Chairman, there are Citizens Groups also who will be coming forward to the Minister, if they have not already come forward to the Minister, giving their professional and technical advice on the proposed developments within the Whiteshell Park, and Mr. Chairman, if this government is going to act like the previous Minister acted and give the back of their hand to that kind of advice and just proceed in the direction of their particular ideological bent then, Mr. Chairman, we will not have a Park that is protected. We will have a Park that will be over developed, and that's a concern I have, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm rather surprised that the honourable member doesn't seem to understand the role of elected people and the role of Civil Servants, and very definitely the elected people give direction. Just as we have given direction with respect to our mining policy we will give direction with respect to a Parks policy. There is no right or wrong method of developing or using a Park, Mr. Chairman. There's no right or wrong method that is determined by a professional.

What happens is that the resources are a resource naturally that belongs to the public; the public elects a government to give some direction; the government sets the philosophy and the policies and they hire the experts to tell them how best to achieve that policy. Now if the Honourable Member is saying that we do not have the right, that I do not, as the Minister, have the right to determine policy and the direction that we will go, then I cannot accept that position. What I would not do is once given professional advice in an area where a professional person has the expertise, I would not ask that person to change their recommendations. We might ignore it as people often do; they take counsel from many sources and they then make a decision at their own peril, Mr. Chairman. And that is the sort of thing which must be done in this case. We will establish the policies, the planners will develop plans to achieve those policies, the public will have an opportunity for input and ultimately, I as Minister, and we as Government, must make the final decision.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well we saw what the public thought of the particular policy of this government in the last session when that present Minister of Parks got into a lot of hot water over the proposed Jarmoc development in the Whiteshell and, Mr. Chairman, there was an example of a policy that was obviously being accepted by the Progressive Conservative Government and was also an example of a government Minister just completing rejecting out of hand competent, professional advice from people in his department who were warning him that there would be severe environmental damage if that project went ahead on the scale that it was being proposed.

Mr. Chairman, that Minister who was following blindly the policy of the Progressive Conservative Government to develop, develop, develop was prepared to reject that professional advice and instruct his Deputy Minister to sign an agreement which this government is still bound to honour in some fashion. We still haven't heard the end of that story, Mr. Chairman, because there's a road built pursuant to that agreement that was signed and now, Mr. Chairman, this government has simply put that project on the back burner. It still has not told us unequivocally that they will not proceed with that project. Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba, particularly those people who are interested in the Whiteshell want to know the government's intentions with respect to that project. Using that project as a specific example of the kind of senseless development that can take place, Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba want to know what this government's policy is with respect to development in the Whiteshell Park and other parks in Manitoba and this Minister can't sit back and say well it's all under review, we're monitoring the situation, we're doing this plan.

Mr. Chairman, he sounds like the Minister of Health and Social Development. Every time there's a problem in government, every time there's a concern, every time there's a serious issue, this government is monitoring it, they're studying it, they're looking into it, they're carefully reviewing the situation. Well, Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba want to know what this government's intentions are, what this government's policies are, what kind of policy direction this Minister and this government has given to the planners, to the people who are working on the plan for the master plan or whatever you call it for the Whiteshell Park. What kind of policy direction has this Minister given them?

Mr. Chairman, if this government is following the policy that was established by the former Minister of Parks, who got himself into a lot of hot water, who's obviously an embarrassment to the government side because they gave him this minor portfolio Fitness and Sport and they split up the Jarmoc controversy over two or three departments. Mr. Chairman, we now have the Jarmoc controversy partly divided I believe between the present Minister of Parks and the former Minister

of Labour who is now the Minister of Tourism and maybe even the present Minister of Fitness and Sport has a piece of that controversial action yet because there may be some kind of sport attached to this condominium project.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister has to give a clear intention. The people of Manitoba want to know this government's intention and policies are. What kind of policy direction is this Minister giving to the policy people who are the policy planners who are working on that park plan?

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Well, the Honourable Minister in answering my colleague, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland could at the same time respond to a question related to this matter which was put to him last year the Member for Gladstone which the Honourable Minister's by his colleague' predecessor was unable to answer precisely. I'm reading, Mr. Chairman, from page 46-7 of Hansard of last year, Thursday, June 29, 1978 when the Honourable Member for Gladstone asked the previous Minister responsible for Parks, "I have one question for the Minister, Mr. Chairman, and that would be, how much has the Jarmoc episode cost the taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba up until this point?" The Minister's reply, the Minister of the day, was as follows, "That is hard to evaluate because there has been some staff time spent on it as I mentioned going back to September 15 and it's pretty hard. You have to sit down and evaluate the time spent on the particular proposal by the different staff. It's pretty hard to come up with a figure." Well, that was a year ago, practically a year ago' Mr. Chairman and perhaps in the ten months following the Honourable Minister's predecessor and this Minister may have had an opportunity to come up with a figure as to the cost of the Jarmoc episode, in the words of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, and an updated figure on this particular episode.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Point of clarification, Mr. Chairman. Did he say September 15th?

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** He said September 15th and perhaps he could have been referring to some discussions that he may have had with Mr. Jarmoc during the election campaign. I don't know.

**MR. RANSOM:** It could have been September 15, 1977, then I guess, Mr. Chairman. No, I haven't made any attempt to document those figures, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland raises a very good point that there is a necessity for policy direction and as a matter of fact we're in the process of developing those policies right now and they will be available prior to the process of plan formation for the Whiteshell Park so the public will know what the position of the government is and the direction will be there.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Would the Honourable Minister undertake to document the figures that his colleague, the Member for Gladstone asked for last year in the very near future?

**MR. RANSOM:** No, Mr. Chairman, and I think I can probably persuade the Honourable Member for Gladstone that that's probably the best course of action, that we would only expend additional money without having any return for it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems rather strange to me that we have a government here which has had no less than two Ministers responsible for Parks for the last sixteen months or more and they have yet to come up with a policy with respect to Park development, and this Minister is still studying and monitoring the situation and not coming up with anything definite, and even today even though he admits that government, as elected representatives of the people, must provide policy direction, and here we have him standing up again and admitting that he hasn't provided any policy direction yet. So, Mr. Chairman, here is a government that is not living up to its responsibilities. For sixteen months, is he telling us that the Parks Branch has operated within a policy vacuum, that nobody at the Ministerial level is able to explain to the staff of the Parks Branch, the Parks Department, what the policy of this government is, and that the previous Minister and now this Minister is still operating in a policy vacuum and is not able to tell us what his intentions are with respect to Park development in Manitoba.

How much longer do we have to wait, Mr. Chairman? Last Session the former Minister of Parks

told us that he would be having a study, a very quick study, in six months they would have an answer. They would have their Park Plan and we would have an answer on this Jarmoc condominium deal and what the obligations of the government are with respect to the agreement which they signed, a clear statement of the government's intentions with respect to not only that project but other potential projects within the Whiteshell Park. Mr. Chairman, it's not six months but it's over sixteen months. We still don't have an answer and we have this Minister telling us that they're still developing policy and that some day, without even giving us any indication of when, someday soon, maybe, there will be some kind of policy direction which the public of Manitoba will be able to judge.

Well, Mr. Chairman, what about the staff who are operating within the Department of Parks? What kind of direction are they getting if the Minister can't tell the House today what the policy is and what this government's intentions are with respect to Parks? Is the Minister telling us that for sixteen months the Parks Department has been operating without a policy?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not only saying that for sixteen months it's been operating without policy statements at the Ministerial level; I'm saying it operated without them for eight years previous to that.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that's an absolute falsehood —(Interjection)— because, Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows full well that there was a park plan in place for the Whiteshell Park which was a clear indication of policy direction by this government. That park plan had been approved by the Minister of the Department, it was the operating plan of that department previous to this government taking over the administration and, Mr. Chairman, this Minister is saying that his government has given the back of their hand to that particular plan, and now they've allowed the department to wallow along without any policy direction for sixteen months after they give the back of their hand to the previous government's policy, which is not only a stated policy, Mr. Chairman, it was not a verbal policy; it was a written policy; it was a plan that had been developed with the maps and all of the areas of the Whiteshell Park designated as to their best use. Mr. Chairman, that plan had been developed in co-operation and conjunction with all the departments of government that related to resource use, and now this Minister, although he admits that government should be giving direction to public servants, is obviously abdicating his responsibility as a Minister and admitting that the Progressive Conservative Government has abdicated its responsibility as a government for over sixteen months in not giving direction, policy direction, to the Parks Branch.

Now, Mr. Chairman, can this Minister tell us today in his own words what his policy intentions are with respect to the Parks Branch?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I would challenge the honourable member to present written policy direction that the previous government provided with respect to Parks development, and I'm not talking about one particular development plan; I'm talking about government policy direction with respect to Parklands, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that it didn't exist and I'm saying that it now is being prepared by this government and will be available and will be publicly stated.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has access to the government files which I do not have access to. There are certainly copies of that particular plan in the files. If he can't find it, his staff should be able to find it for him, if they have not gone to the ridiculous extent of putting up in smoke the previous government's policies as they seem to be wanting to do with all of the previous government's projects and programs. They seem to want to destroy them and give them the back of their hand so they may have put those in the fire and now the Minister can't find the Park plan, Mr. Chairman.

The Honourable Minister knows full well, if he's had any kind of briefing from his department, if he's taken the time to check with his department he knows that there was an ongoing Park development plan that had been developed very conscientiously and carefully over a number of years by the Parks officials and the officials of the Department of Renewable Resources.

Now I was aware of that, Mr. Chairman, because at the time it was being completed the Minister that was responsible for Parks at that time consulted with my department, my officials discussed that plan with me, I discussed the plan with the Minister in conjunction with policy advisors and Mr. Chairman, that particular plan was available to the Parks officials in that department, and that was a policy that they were following with respect to the Whiteshell Park.

It's obvious now, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister is operating, trying to operate his department in a policy vacuum and he is ducking questions on the Jarmoc agreement by saying that this particular agreement is put on the side while they develop their plan. Well, Mr. Chairman, the people

of Manitoba want to know if they're going to finish their plan this Session or by next Session they will come in, maybe there'll be a new Minister of Parks and then we will have another study. Meanwhile the Parks Department won't know which direction they're supposed to be going in, there may be more Jarmoc proposals, there may be more roads built, more roads built in the Whiteshell Park on Crown land without any policy direction as to what kind of development they intend to follow. Mr. Chairman, there's a road there now which leads to a proposed development which is simply put on the side and, Mr. Chairman, is that road going to be used? If it is going to be used by the Provincial Government, as I understand that agreement, this government has to reimburse Mr. Jarmoc for the road which he built. He claims to have spent \$100,000.00. So while this government has been operating without a policy they have allowed this man to build a road at his expense for \$100,000, which they will have to reimburse him for if they intend to use that road, because it's in the agreement. Mr. Chairman, it's not entirely clear yet that they're not going to allow this individual to proceed with that project, even though professional people in his department, professionally competent people, informed the previous Minister that that particular project would be disastrous environmentally to that lake and the adjoining small lake, where there is a very significant wild rice crop which is harvested by the native people each fall.

Mr. Chairman, not only the people who are in that area but people who have cottages or who travel to the Whiteshell for weekend outings want to know what this government's intentions are, and we can't just continue hearing from the Minister that there will be studies going on.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister should make clear what his government's intentions are and what his general policy direction was to the planning people who were developing the park. Did he tell them, for example, that the park should be developed with a view to maintaining the delicate environmental balance that is present in that particular park or did he tell them that this government is hell-bent on development and therefore they should bend every environmental rule in order to provide a plan which will make provision for more and more condominium-type projects of the Jarmoc variety? Now, which end of the scale is he on? Which policy direction did he give to his department? Can he tell us that much?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, we have just had a presentation from a former Minister of the Crown who not only didn't have a policy, he doesn't even understand what a policy is. Because if that government had a policy and it is so well hidden; it is so well hidden that I must go into my files and dig out for them what their policy was, Mr. Chairman, then I say they didn't have a policy for eight years and I challenge them to produce one. I have said that we do not, at this stage, have the kind of written policy that the public needs to have to know where the government stands, and I say that policy will be made available and the public will know it as the development plan proceeds. And the public will have an opportunity to comment on our policies; they will know what those policies are. They will not be something that are hidden in the files.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, speaking to this matter I want to acknowledge that the present Minister hasn't had the responsibility for this section for a long time and probably does need some time to familiarize himself with what is happening. Certainly it shows the confidence that the First Minister has in him to appoint him, to put the Parks under his jurisdiction, to clean up the mess that the previous Minister left in that particular department. The previous Minister engaged in what is called "action" research. In order to research the possible environmental effects of the condominium development, the action research method is to build the condominium development and see what negative effects it has and then you have researched the subject matter. Mr. Chairman, when the public reaction was so strong the previous Minister knew that he had made a mistake and this Minister has to now attempt to look after or correct the mistakes of his colleague.

Mr. Chairman, what I would like to get from the Honourable Minister is some idea of the time frame of how he sees it unfolding, because the green paper will not contain recommendations and I'm not clear whether the Minister will then get recommendations from officials of the department or whether the Minister will just use the green paper for his discussions in Cabinet to get a clear policy direction. I know that this Minister has been quite good at involving people, in terms of the decision-making process. So I wonder how the Minister sees it unfolding: The tabling of the green paper, the public input into the determination of policy and then a decision? I wonder if the Minister could outline the series of events he sees taking place and the possible time frame for that series of events.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some misunderstanding between myself and the honourable gentlemen opposite as to the difference between a policy and a plan, and what I'm saying is that we, as elected people, will state what our policies are. Then within those policies naturally the public will have a chance to react to them and presumably if they don't accept those policies we, as politicians, naturally will read that and decide whether we should alter our policy. But I don't expect public involvement as I develop my policy; that's what I have been elected to do and appointed to do. When we come to developing the plan, a specific plan for a park, whether it's the Whiteshell or whether it's Asessippi or Turtle Mountain, or whatever, that is when there would be an opportunity for public input.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable member for his clarification. I'm in a bit of a dilemma, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get to the Highways Estimates. One of my colleagues suggested if I speak loudly enough they might hear me over there and I could participate in both at the same time.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, the Minister outlined a sequence then, in terms of there would be a general policy determination. And then there would be specific . . . In this case we're talking about the Whiteshell because there was a policy adopted by the previous Minister that was publicly unacceptable and the Minister withdrew that policy, or withdrew that development program, at least, which demonstrated, maybe, that there wasn't a policy.

I wonder if the Minister could then put some kind of a time frame on it? Like, when does he see the general policy statement and when does he see the tabling of the Green Paper, and when does he see specific public discussion of the Whiteshell proposals, and then when does he see the final approval of the Whiteshell plans — just approximately.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, the development of a policy, of course, is an internal thing, Mr. Chairman, and one can never be completely certain how long that process takes as one thrashes it out with their colleagues. I would certainly hope that it's quite soon. It could be a month or two, or something like that. The Green Paper, if we don't run into too many difficulties with printing and that sort of thing, I would hope to have available in approximately a month. But I would see that the whole process is still going to take several months to work through. As you go through the various stages of it, it's just not something that you can telescope into a short period of time.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I can understand the situation of the Minister having to discuss with his colleagues to get the general policy approval. I know that the Minister himself is a person that's quite concerned, in terms of the environmental impact of various activities and of conserving the environment that we have in our Province. I wonder if the Minister could give us some general idea of the direction he would like to see things taking in terms of park development, in the framework of the type of things he's outlined in other matters in the House in terms of the environmental directions he would like to see.

**MR. RANSOM:** Much as I would like to be able to discuss those things right now, Mr. Chairman, it really must await the development of policies of government, at the government level, and I know they will be available before too long but I'm really not in a position, naturally, to discuss them, until they are government policy.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very obvious that this Minister has failed to adequately brief himself or be briefed on the activities of his Department because he simply does not know what has been happening with respect to this Department over the years. He does not know that there was a park plan developed by the Department in conjunction with other departments, which was the guideline or policy which that Department was using in their management of the Whiteshell Park. And, Mr. Chairman, this government, I believe, must have some kind of idea where they want to go. The former Minister knew where he wanted to go; he wanted to put in more development, and he was prepared to give the back of his hand to experienced policy advisers within his Department, who advised him against, on sound environmental reasons, advised him against proceeding in that way, Mr. Chairman.

Now we have this Minister, who doesn't even have the intestinal fortitude of his colleague, who was a former Minister, to at least tell us which direction he wants to go. And, Mr. Chairman, he must have given his staff some direction when he told them to prepare a plan for the Whiteshell Park, or is he so devoid of any ideas about what the Progressive Conservative Government wants to do that he just told his staff, "Go out there and develop a plan and bring it in and I'll see what I think about it".

Mr. Chairman, if that's the way in which this Minister is going to give direction to his Department

it's a sorry state of affairs. Because, Mr. Chairman, there won't be very much of a plan if his Departmental officials don't even know which way he wants to move. And, Mr. Chairman, to try to focus the Minister's attention and to try to get some idea from him, what the general intentions are of this government, I would simply ask him, is it his intention to instruct his Department to come up with a plan, which would provide for more development in the future in the Whiteshell Park? Now that's a very simple proposition. Is that the general direction that he seems to be moving in?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. Before I acknowledge the next speaker, I would just like to bring to the attention of the honourable members that repetitious questions are out of order. The wording has been changed, but the questions appear to the Chair to be quite similar, and I would rule that questions that are repetitious are out of order. I will acknowledge the next speaker. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I'd only say in passing that if the Ministers refuse to answer, what option does the Opposition have but to attempt to elicit an answer. That's our function, and the answers are either non-existent or unsatisfactory.

Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions that I would like to ask if that bird-brain won't interrupt me. My questions are for the Minister of Mines, and I would like to know what the problem is when well over a year ago I put an Address for Papers to the government for the correspondence between Mr. Jarmoc and the government, and that has still not been answered. That was the first Address for Papers in this Session and it has still not been answered and we're still waiting and we'll probably put in an additional Address for Papers for correspondence, if any, of the present Minister. I would hope that at some point we'll get an answer. And I found it very remarkable, Mr. Chairman, the other day, when I sat in the Highways Estimates, and the Minister was asked for an Order for Return one year old, he was then pressed by the Member for St. John and suddenly the Minister of Highways said I'll have it within a week. Now that can only lead one to the conclusion that he had it and it was sitting on his desk, and that he was somehow or other moved to then provide the information. —(Interjection)— It is an assumption, it is remarkable that after a whole year it wasn't forthcoming but after one stinging question it suddenly appeared.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister when we're going to get that yearold correspondence. I also asked the Minister a couple of weeks ago whether he or any of his staff had met with Mr. Jarmoc, and I understood from the answer of the Minister of Mines, that he said that they had. That Jarmoc in fact had met and he's now agreeing with either the Minister or members of his Department. I would ask the Minister then this specific point, has he personally met with Mr. Jarmoc?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, the Order for Return will be filed shortly and I'm told that the record of this government in terms of filing Orders for Return happens to be substantially better than the record of the previous government. It will be filed, and indeed I have.

**MR. DOERN:** Could the Minister answer my question as well, which was has he met personally with Mr. Jarmoc? —(Interjection)— He has, okay, fine. Fine, I just want to make sure that that is clear.

Mr. Chairman, one of the first government actions that we encountered, I think, one of the first actions of this government and there's been little since, was that they entered an agreement with Mr. Jarmoc, and then we recall last year, I won't repeat for the benefit of the House what ensued in the House last year. The former Minister of Tourism got himself into an impossible situation when he misled the House, and as a result, there was a considerable debate, and I'm choosing my words carefully, I don't think what I said is incorrect, and there was a considerable debate about the road to nowhere. Now, I would like to ask the Minister the following:

Mr. Jarmoc, and I personally had a discussion one day to attempt to hear his side of the argument. He believes in his project; he has a right to believe in it; he's a businessman. He made arrangements of some sort. He had an understanding with the government or with representatives of the government and on that basis he went out and constructed a road; he hired architects and developed, I suppose, either conceptual plans or working drawings. Now, I also asked the Minister a number of weeks ago this question, whether or not Mr. Jarmoc had, in effect, threatened a law suit against the province, and I gathered, at least my impression from the Minister at the time was that he had not, but I would ask the Minister to clarify the situation.

I am assuming that Mr. Jarmoc spent, which is what he indicated to me and I believe what he indicated publicly —(Interjection)— I said I met him, I said I met him. He asked to meet with some of our people to tell his side of the story, and he told his side of the story. I'm now relating

what he said. He had an understanding with the Minister and/or the department, and on that basis he spent, on his own account, \$100,000.00. Now, I don't know what he spent. I don't know if he spent \$10,000 or \$250,000, I know he said he spent about \$100,000 for architectural plans and for the development of a road.

It strikes me that any businessman who put that kind of money out, obviously believed that he was going to be able to complete his project. Very few people are so irrational as to simply throw away \$100,000 on a wild goose chase. —(Interjection)— I assume that he had an understanding in writing or a verbal commitment, that on that basis he proceeded to make an investment.

Now, at this point in time there has been no talk of a law suit. We have had cases where contractors have sued the government, we have the case in The Pas where they have slapped a \$700,000 law suit on the government because — not of our actions, Mr. Chairman, but of the slowness and the lack of decision-making on the part of the present government, the government asked them to delay, they delayed, they waited again and again and again and finally, in desperation, after getting nowhere with the government, they sued the government. Mr. Jarmoc does not appear to be pursuing that course.

Therefore, I conclude that he believes that the project is still alive and well, because he has not, as I understand it, and I ask the Minister to clarify. He has not sued the government, and he has not apparently threatened to sue the government. Therefore I conclude that he is attempting to develop his plan in such a way that it will meet with the approval of the present Minister of Mines so that he can proceed. So I ask the Minister again to clarify that point because I understood him to say that there was no legal action, and could he comment on that.

I'd just like to know if the Minister is going to answer that.

**MR. RANSOM:** I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I indicated in Question Period some time ago that he would have to ask Mr. Jarmoc that question. I am unaware of any lawsuit. But if he's been in conversation with Mr. Jarmoc, perhaps he could ask that.

**MR. DOERN:** Then I conclude that the Minister is saying, in effect, that there is no lawsuit. —(Interjection)— There is no lawsuit. That's fine. That is the information that I am attempting to elicit from the Minister.

I would then ask the Minister a couple of questions, and that is, whether he has exchanged, he or his department, has in the past few months, exchanged any correspondence with Mr. Jarmoc and whether he would be prepared to table that. That's one question. I would also like to ask the Minister whether he has met with representatives in his term in office in this portfolio, has he met with representatives of the Big Whiteshell Cottage Owners' Association, because he has told us, Mr. Chairman, that he has met with the principal developer, I would like to know whether he has heard from the other side, which is the residents and the cottage owners in the area.

And finally, I would like to ask him whether he is receptive to a revised, or smaller plan from Mr. Jarmoc in comparison with the original concept?

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Over the last few hours and last year we had a barrage of questions dealing with the Whiteshell master plan. The gentlemen across the way felt that they had certain UU plans and they were adhering to certain plans and they knew what they were doing, but Mr. Chairman, I would just like to talk briefly about a certain road. A road from nowhere that goes to nowhere. 14.2 miles of road that cost them \$1,026,750.00.

**A MEMBER:** Whose is that? Where is it?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, this road was developed under the direction of the then Minister in charge of the Transportation Services, the Member for Rupertsland. Let's ask what the master plan on that particular Deer Island, or Black Island road was. The master plan for the development, which was for Hecla Park was for Deer Island, was for Black Island, was that it was to be maintained in its wilderness state, with perhaps some primitive campsites developed, providing for shore access by motor boat only.

But what happened? We had a department that was determined to build a road across an island. Mr. Chairman, I think the member opposite, when he gets up to say a few words on this particular problem, and if he will search his mind and look back in the files, he will find out there was a real battle between his department and the Department of Parks with regard to this particular project. I have flown over the road, instead of it becoming a tourist attraction — you know, there could

have been some benefits from that road — but that road is built right in the middle of the island, right smack across the middle. It was supposed to be operated by having two ferries, one at the east end and one at the west end.

In 1977, the road was open for a month and a half with two ferries operating on it and it carried a lot of tourists and a lot of cars, Mr. Chairman. It carried 222 cars. 222 cars, for over a million dollars. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Member for Central Provincial, no, it's not Central Provincial Garage, from Elmwood, says, "Did it have whitewall tires?" Well, let me tell you, from what I can gather of the cars that went through there, you couldn't tell whether they were white or pink, and they were lucky if they had any tires at all, after spending \$1 million on the road.

So Mr. Chairman, when the members opposite get up and start talking about development policies, they had master plans for everything, all you have to do is go back into the files and see the running battles between the Deputy Ministers with regard to this one isolated incident. Just the one incident. We've got a road there that's sitting there right now, there's no population on Black Island, the member knows it better than I do, I don't know if it's part of his constituency or not —(Interjection)— but Mr. Chairman, when you talk about moneys being expended and problems between departments and people not agreeing on things, this is a very classic example and this is the type of thing that we faced when we came in, thinking that the former members must have had some kind of policy that they were working with and when we started to look at the whole thing, we had certain problems coming up; one of which the members have been talking about tonight. But then we found out that we didn't really have the mechanism in place to handle that type of thing and that's what the problem was.

One of the members is saying it's our fault. All I'm pointing out, very clearly, Mr. Chairman, is that, you know, when you start throwing stones, make sure you're not in a glass house and that's where we're at right now. So, lest any of them think that their hands are lily-white, let me say, we've got a road 14.2 miles long leading from nowhere to nowhere with nobody living on the island.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, I find it hard to understand how you've found this discussion relevant to the item which we are now discussing, but if you're allowing the honourable member to proceed on this issue then I assume that I will be able to discuss this issue as well, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. To the honourable members, I have been paying close attention to all of the discussions that have been going on in the House. There was some discussion about a road that went through a park and I found it to be relevant. If it wasn't I would have ruled the honourable member out of order.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** The honourable member is obviously very embarrassed about his performance in the last session and the fact that he made such a mess of park development in his short term as minister, that his honourable first minister had to remove him from that department, divide up the Jarmoc scandal in between him and the now present Minister of Parks and the former Minister of Labour, who is now Minister of Tourism, and Mr. Chairman, I've never seen such a mishmash of responsibilities and they obviously, either one of them, don't know what they are doing, Mr. Chairman. It seems to be getting no better with this present minister, since after a number of months in his portfolio, he still doesn't know what the policy is in his department. He doesn't know what the former minister's policy was. He doesn't know the policy that the former government had when it was in power, the plan that had been developed by his department. He refuses to accept the advice of his department.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Fitness and Sport, indicated a road across Black Island did not fit in with the master plan. Mr. Chairman, that plan was developed, that road across that park was developed in close co-operation with the Parks Branch at the time the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of parks was involved in laying out that road, had assisted in locational design of that road, Mr. Chairman, and that is a matter of record.

So, Mr. Chairman, there was no operation that resembled the operation of that minister, when he was in government when the Parks Branch wrote him a memo, when that same Assistant Deputy Minister made a recommendation to him to not proceed with the Jarmoc Plan and this minister rejected that completely, went ahead and instructed his deputy minister of the day to sign an agreement which is still binding on this government, which is going to cost this government a lot

of money, either way it's going to cost them a lot of money; either they're going to have to pay him for that road if they don't allow him to proceed. If they allow him to proceed, it will even be more disastrous, Mr. Chairman, because the proposed condominium development on that lake will be a disaster to that lake. It will destroy that lake and it will be the fault of this particular government, Mr. Chairman, and the cost of that kind of environmental damage, one cannot put a dollar figure on.

Mr. Chairman, the minister talks about a road across the island and Mr. Chairman, there was a road built across that island with a proposed ferry connection on either end to provide a very efficient east-west connection across Lake Winnipeg, and Mr. Chairman, it would have become a very popular tourist attraction; the only one of its kind in this province.

The Progressive Conservative Government abandoned that plan, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Chairman, the result of their activities in government, just over this last year, is indicated in its statistics, not only are 10,000 people leaving Manitoba, that used to live in Manitoba, but the number of tourists that are coming to the province is also declining. So you can't keep them here and you can't bring them here. So, Mr. Chairman, and now you hear this minister getting up and complaining about what would have been a very nice tourist attraction; a road across an island on Lake Winnipeg, an island I might point out, which is one of the most beautiful islands in the lake with about 15 miles of beach on its north shore, which would have been accessible to the public with that road and with the ferry connections, and this Progressive Conservative Government abandoned it.

Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in saying that if we are re-elected as government, I will be pushing to have that connection made. I will be pushing to have that connection renewed, Mr. Chairman, because it will be a very popular east-west connection across Lake Winnipeg, leading from one natural park on one side, Nopiming Park, to the other park on the other side, Hecla Island Park, with 15 miles of beach in between, Mr. Chairman. It would be connected.

Mr. Chairman, I would recommend to this government that they proceed with that project instead of abandoning it. I would advise them to abandon the Jarmoc proposal because that one will destroy a lake in the Whiteshell. Mr. Chairman, I believe that there are indications that the Whiteshell Park is already at the point of being overcrowded. Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is evidence to back up that assumption and I believe that the minister's own departmental officials would advise him that there is danger of overcrowding in of the Whiteshell. Chairman, I would like to know if many areas this minister shares that belief or is he attempting to push his departmental officials to come up with recommendations which they would not ordinarily come up with if they were left to rely on their own professional advice in providing that information to the minister.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** In response to the questions from the Honourable Member for Elmwood, Mr. Chairman. I did, indeed, meet with the Whiteshell District Association and if he would care to place an Order for Return respecting any correspondence, I would be happy to comply with it and soon. It won't take long. It won't take long, Mr. Chairman, and there has been no assurances given with respect to any development. As the honourable member is probably aware, I have met with Mr. Jarmoc and listened, as you have met and listened.

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

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I would simply ask the minister if he insists on an Order for Return, I will place one or an Address for Papers, but I would ask him whether he would, across the Chamber, simply table the correspondence he had with Mr. Jarmoc and if he would also endeavor to produce the earlier correspondence which was requested a year ago. I would ask him, if he would simply, of his own accord, produce that. If not, then, I will go through the formal process, but, again, I ask him this second question and that is: Is he receptive — I assume, first of all, he has not said "no" to Mr. Jarmoc. He has not said "yes" to his main, original plan and he has not said "no", but I ask him whether he is receptive again, to a smaller, revised plan along the same lines as originally proposed, but a smaller revision of that plan?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I do seem to be having some difficulty in getting the honourable members opposite to understand the steps that I have outlined to them and I do not propose to make any judgment on the sort of question that you place until we have gone through those steps. I have said that a number of times and I only ask him to review the record. To the best of my

knowledge, and I must admit it is occasionally possible to send a letter and not recall it, but to the best of my knowledge, I have had no correspondence but if I have, I would be happy to make it available to the honourable member.

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

**MR. DOERN:** The Minister will then table any correspondence he had. I also ask him whether he'll endeavour to produce the earlier correspondence which we requested well over a year ago.

**MR. RANSOM:** The honourable member should be taking notes because I have already given that assurance that that Order for Return would be filed shortly.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, while we're on this general subject of parks, can the minister indicate if he is planning any park development other than in the Whiteshell Park, if there are any new parks being proposed, if there are any developments within other parks that he is responsible for within the province, and if he would just give us the highlights of those proposed developments within the other park systems and/or any new park systems in Manitoba.

**MR. RANSOM:** If the honourable member would care to place that question, Mr. Chairman, when we come to Item 11.(c) Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, I would be happy to discuss that with him.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, could the honourable minister indicate whatever funds the government may have for the settlement of the Jarmoc Account for services rendered to date. Is that under parks or would we be able to deal with that under Resolution 91, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** If the honourable member has somehow conjured up the idea, Mr. Chairman, that there is an account to be settled and that there is money in there, perhaps he should point it out to me.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** I did not specify in my earlier question the Acquisition of Physical Assets for parks, but could the honourable member indicate in general terms, what new cottage development and/or campground development and/or developments of a major nature like this, which the Parks Branch is planning for the fiscal year which we are examining here.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, the money for those sorts of things is included in 11.(c) Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, what section would we ask questions on the actual numbers of people within the park system, that is, the park management staff?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, if he wanted it in Field Administration, then I can give him that, and if he wants it in Park Maintenance and Operations, I can give him that. Obviously, there are people in each of those sections. The Park Maintenance and Operation is where the major amount of staff are located.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Chairman, is it the honourable minister's intention to keep the level of fees, park admission fees, and lot rental rates at the same level or is it his intention to further increase the tax burden upon the people of Manitoba by raising such fees?

**MR. RANSOM:** Park entrance fees, Mr. Chairman, we're not contemplating any changes in them, and if the honourable member somehow can construe that an individual who is paying some money for a service — and I might say that I believe the figure in the operation of parks in Manitoba is that only approximately 25 percent of the operating costs of parks are recovered in fees — now if the honourable member wants to make a case that that is taxation, for someone to have to pay for a service that they're getting, it is not a case that I can accept, Mr. Chairman.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, with respect to park fees, some years ago the Province of Manitoba recognized that the Assiniboine Park should be considered as a provincial park rather than as a park which should be financed by the residents of the City of Winnipeg for the total province. It was argued with some cogency — and I say that with all modesty, since I presented the argument — that there was every reason to believe that a park within Winnipeg was also within the province, and that all of the citizens of Manitoba used Assiniboine Park and therefore it should be one of the ways in which we removed a financial burden on the City of Winnipeg taxpayer and spread it out through the entire province.

When this proposal was presented to the City of Winnipeg they, for some hysterical reason, regarded this as the province trying to steal a City of Winnipeg park. I don't know that they could satisfy their residents with that regard. I was a resident of the City of Winnipeg. Somehow the province operating the park, as against the City of Winnipeg operating the park, my friend, the Member for Wolseley, relieved me of some of the financial responsibility for that park in favour of the Honourable Minister, who lives in Souris-Killarney and whose family, I would think, would make use of this wonderful facility with its wonderful zoo.

When the aldermen of the City of Winnipeg were seeking ways to maintain their power base at the expense of City of Winnipeg citizens, they conjured up the argument that the province was doing this with the intention of putting fees on the zoological gardens at the Assiniboine Park. We assured them, Mr. Chairman, that the province had no intention of doing that, that the province regarded the efficiency of the park to be directly related to the number of people who went to it, and that any fee would increase the cost of the park, not reduce it. And if anybody wishes to look at it mathematically, if the park costs \$1 million and a million people see it, the cost per citizen is a dollar a citizen. If the park costs \$2 million and 2 million people see it, it's 50 cents per citizen (sic) so the way of increasing the efficiency and reducing the cost of the park would be to have the lowest possible fee and not any fee at all.

But, Mr. Speaker, the councillors at City Hall continued to suggest that we were going to put a fee on the use of the zoological gardens and we continued to insist that we wouldn't. We did assume responsibility for that park, as the people of this province, and are now paying the responsibility for that park to the largest extent. I believe that we accept the full responsibility for Assiniboine Park. Lo and behold, Mr. Chairman, the councillors of the City of Winnipeg are now suggesting a user fee for the zoological gardens at Assiniboine Park, and I would ask the Minister whether he can assure this House that the province's policy has not changed, that we will adopt every means to see to it that the greatest number of citizens use the park, in order to reduce the cost and increase the efficiency thereof, and that the continued support by the province of that park will be conditional upon the City of Winnipeg doing exactly what they said we were not going to do. Namely, that they would not impose a user fee on the zoo at the Assiniboine Park, and that the Minister should immediately inform the City of Winnipeg Council that we are living up to our undertaking, which they pretended to pry out of us because we never had any intention of putting a fee on, that that park would be made available on a universal basis at social rather than individual cost and thereby providing the greatest efficiency and at least cost the facilities which the province is paying for for all citizens of the Province of Manitoba, no matter whether they reside in the City of Winnipeg, in the north, or in rural Manitoba.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, I just would point out that the grant even now for Assiniboine Park is included in bloc funding and there is no item in my Estimates that deals with it. I would suggest that any discussion of the agreement between the Province and the City would best be discussed under the Estimates of the Minister of Urban Affairs.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, this is one of the more serious of the indications that bloc funding is a fraud on the people of the Province of Manitoba. The reason that the City of Winnipeg got that money was that the Assiniboine Park was to be a provincial park and, Mr. Chairman, whether under this department or any other, we are going to insist that provincial moneys made available to that park be for the benefit of all the citizens of the Province of Manitoba. If the City now uses that money and charges rural people for the use of that park it will be a breach of faith by the City and by the Province with the citizens of this province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a principle involved here. The Whiteshell Park is not charged to the citizens of the Whiteshell. The Birds Hill Park is not charged to the citizens who happen to reside in the area of Birds Hill. Falcon Lake is not charged to the people who happen to live on the edge of Falcon Lake. The local parks are charged to the local municipalities. Assiniboine Park was not a local park, and whatever else is done with bloc funding, Mr. Chairman, and I'm glad the Minister brought up the point because it shows that what Mr. Currie was saying and that what my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, will say, and what my colleague, the Member for St. Johns, will say with regard to this fraudulent deceptive course of action known as bloc funding will do is it will permit the councillors at the City of Winnipeg to use a provincial park, revert it back to a city park, have it charged to the City of Winnipeg citizens and lose the principle of provincial support for Assiniboine Park.

That is why it was a designated fund and if that agreement has now been tossed to the winds in the interest of bloc funding I know of no better example to demonstrate the total deceptiveness of this notion of bloc funding. If you're going to bloc fund, then fund the park out of provincial funds, because bloc funding will mean that the City of Winnipeg residents will again have to pay for Assiniboine Park because the bloc funding will be used for roads, or perhaps to reduce taxation — and that is a euphemism — because if they reduce taxation by taking \$30 million and not collecting the money that would normally be used for parks, then they are going to tax them at the zoo, at Assiniboine Park, and that's exactly what has been talked about by these hypocritical councillors who said that they were trying to retain Assiniboine Park as a city park so that the province couldn't impose a fee and now they're imposing that fee under the dubious policy followed by this government with regard to bloc funding.

I want to know whether the Minister doesn't regard the Assiniboine Park as being a provincial park rather than a city park? Because that's the entire principle upon which this proposal is based, and if that's part of the money that has gone into bloc funding then you have undone for the City of Winnipeg what was a major progressive step with regard to responsibility for the Assiniboine Park under the fraudulent label of bloc funding.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)(a) — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Minister opened up this subject and mentioned the Assiniboine Park. Yes, I think Hansard will show that he indicated that Assiniboine Park in the reconciliation is now shown as having been transferred to Municipal Affairs. That was \$2.5 million, I believe, which was transferred over.

Mr. Chairman, what we are witnessing here is a shell game of the most tragic proportions. The citizens of Winnipeg did indeed spend millions of dollars over the years building up the unique park in Manitoba, the only park of its kind. The only zoological botanical park in Manitoba. And for years the citizens of Winnipeg paid for it. When we took office we recognized the inequity of the citizens of the city having to carry the entire burden, the entire burden, for this unique park, and we said to the City of Winnipeg, "The truth is, in all fairness, you haven't been treated fairly for decades. This should be a provincial responsibility. This should be picked up by all the citizens of Manitoba, each and every one of them; we all share." It's the greatest tourist attraction, any statistic will tell you that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when we talked to the city about it we said, "We will take over the park." And they said, "Now, wait a minute. We spent so many years building it up. We don't want to give up title to it. It's our park and we're not sure if the province takes it over what may happen with this government or a future government. They may decide to impose fees and we don't want fees to be imposed at Assiniboine Park." So we said, "All right. I will tell you what we will do."

Also, they had another problem. They had staff — administrative staff, maintenance staff, people who had worked for the city for many years — and they said, "We don't want to go through the agonizing problem of transferring him or, perhaps some of these people who have given so many years having to be let go." And so we said, "All right, retain your staff. Maintain the park. Keep developing it. We will enter into a five-year agreement, and the agreement calls for the total operating costs of Assiniboine Park to be paid by the province from the general revenues of the province,

where it rightfully belongs. The capital costs, after discussions with our parks people, we will determine how much will be spent annually on capital improvements." And we picked that up.

You know this is funny how it comes back to haunt you sometimes. In order to discourage the city from ever thinking in terms of somehow thinking in terms of taking that park back because of their obvious ties to it, we said, "It's a five-year agreement which can be abrogated or ended at one year's notice after five years." But, in order to, as I say, prevent them or reduce them from not abrogating the agreement or ending the agreement we said, "If at the end of five years you choose to cancel the agreement or terminate it with one year notice, that you would have have to pick up the capital costs that the province put into it, if you want this to go back to the solely operated and run and paid for by the citizens of Winnipeg." And this was really put in in order, as I say, to discourage them from taking that step.

But now we have the interesting situation, because the agreement worked both ways. Either party could give notice and this government, because the five years are up now, took advantage of that situation and has served notice on the City of Winnipeg that they're terminating the agreement, that henceforth they will not pick up the operating costs of Assiniboine Park and Zoo and they made the grand gesture, a hollow gesture, that they will not ask the City to recompense them for the capital costs that were put in over the last five years.

I was absolutely shocked that some of your colleagues in the City Council said it's a good deal, we don't have to repay the province the capital costs of the last five years, totally ignoring the fact that \$2.5 million was picked up in 1977-78 by the province and that amount was not a burden on the citizens of the City of Winnipeg, a burden which they should never have paid in the first place because if any park is to be considered a provincial park it should be Assiniboine Park and Zoo. If Birds Hill Park is a provincial park then damn it all, Assiniboine Park must be visited by at least twenty times as many people from all over the province, from every state and every province in Canada, from the American states the visitors that come here they pour through Assiniboine Park and Zoo. And you have the temerity to say, "Sorry, it's been transferred over." Where were you, Mr. Minister, when this was being discussed in Cabinet. Were you silent? Simply say talk to the Minister of Municipal Affairs? This is a collegial decision and you're part of that collegial decision so you can't shirk it by saying look at some other page. We're dealing with the responsibility that was yours. The province has taken the step as they have in many other things, slough off the costs, stick somebody else with the cost. In this case, you're sloughing off the costs and you're sticking it to 550,000 Winnipeg rate payers and citizens. That's what you're doing. And you're trying to look better in your own budget. That's an absolute falsehood, it's a deception. And the argument that it's part of the \$30 million bulk funding. Well, even the city councillors, some of them, know that what you've given them there is a time bomb. Because under that bloc funding it will come out in other areas, highways and other places. What you've done is you've backed away from a basic responsibility that you the senior government had. You're the senior government. You created municipalities. You tell them what they can do and what they can't do. You're the one who sets the ground rules for how they operate and now you are simply shoving off to them a basic responsibility for a unique park, a unique facility in Manitoba of which this is the only one of its kind.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you this manoeuvre is not going to wash with the citizens of Winnipeg. It's not going to wash with any Manitoban who has any sense of understanding of decency and fairness.

For decades the City of Winnipeg took the short end of the stick and although I don't know if all of them really understood the importance of what is happening, it'll come through to them. They'll understand it. They'll understand full well that for 1979-80 they are going to have to shell out in excess of \$2.5 million in operating costs alone and I don't know how much more in capital costs, I don't know what their capital plans are for 1979-80 but it's just the tip of the iceberg and next year it'll go up again and this government sits there smugly and says well we gave them bloc funding and they turn our back on it as they're turning their back on every elderly, all the citizens, the youth, you name it. Because this government believes they should do as little as possible and if ever there's a proof that they're doing as little as possible it's in these Estimates and in this particular item. They're doing not only as little as possible they're doing less than what they as the senior government are responsible for. It's as if the federal government suddenly turned around and said to the Province of Manitoba, Clear Lake is a beautiful park but it's in your province, so I think from here on in you pay for it, you take it over. From here on in it's your responsibility you run it. And, how would the Minister react? He would scream, he would holler, he would say you can't do this, it's a national park, it's terrible, you can't do this, no way, just as the Alberta government would scream if Banff was suddenly tossed on their doorstep.

Mr. Chairman —(Interjection)— you want Clear Lake back? You want the entire Riding Mountain National Park back? Like heck you do. Mr. Chairman, now you're talking about fees, now you're

not talking about a basic understanding of responsibility, that there is a basic responsibility on the part of this government as there should be, that you have a responsibility for a facility of this kind, I'm not saying all parks in Winnipeg. No one ever suggested it that all the parks in Winnipeg should be paid for by the City of Winnipeg. They are doing it. They are carrying the burden themselves. But this unique facility. To say that it is the responsibility of the City at the cost to the citizens of Winnipeg to spend \$2.5 million this year, at least because that was the figure last year is absolute nonsense. Mr. Chairman, the people of Winnipeg are not going to forget this, even if some of their councillors choose to sweep it under the rug today. It's going to haunt them next month and next year and thereafter and for the province to have served notice as they have that they want to terminate the agreement is the blackest day as far as the citizens of Winnipeg are concerned.

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

**MR. WILSON:** Mr. Chairman, when I was on City Council and Environment we fought these same two envious ministers who wanted to take this particular city asset away from the citizens of Winnipeg and they stood up today and reconfirmed it. Keep yelling it's a provincial park and they didn't want to pay the City of Winnipeg Council one dime for the asset that they had acquired over a particular period and many particular periods of time and the citizens of Winnipeg and the city councillors were proud of that asset. It was the same as the ballet and the symphony and the pride that they have in their snow removal program. The City of Winnipeg pays for the operation of that city park. What that minister wanted to do, he wanted to take over that park and rename it. —(Interjection)— Definitely. I was there at the time. They wanted to take over that asset and I remember the staff people, the people in the city staff, the experts that said we can't give up this asset, you have to fight for this. The City Council at the time kept the province from taking that over but then they played their own shell game. In the wording of the agreement and I don't know how it passed some of the fellows but if you read the fine print you found out that all the capital improvements that were going to be made at that park that if the city every tried to get out of that agreement they would have to repay every dime for every building that was put up, every bear pit that was put up, they'd have to pay this all back. And I suggest that the City of Winnipeg owns this park, operates this park and the City Council is responsible for it, it's in their ball park and I don't see how we can interfere anymore in that particular park unless the decision is made by Cabinet to follow the line that they wanted to take which was to take over that particular asset that belongs to the citizens of Winnipeg and make it a provincial park. To take over an asset without transferring one dime to the taxpayers, the mill rate payers of Winnipeg. They just wanted to take it and it was a way.

What happened is all of a sudden they knew the city was running into financial difficulty; they knew the political power of the former mayor and they thought of a way of giving the city some money without offending the other municipalities. They didn't want to offend the rural guys because then they'd have to give the same amount of money to the people in the country so they come up with this deal to pay for part of the operating cost as it was supposed to be a sugar coated candy and what they should have done is give the city the money and let the city decide what capital improvements were going to go in there and not have that type of influence. And I would hope as I say and I'm sure the Urban Affairs Minister is going to probably have to stand up because I'm sure they're going to be questioning him, but I'll be listening for his answers and I would hope that if and when he ever does decide to get out of an agreement that he doesn't demand that the taxpayers of Winnipeg have to pay for all the capital improvements that have gone in there in the last five years. I hope that would be a forgivable type of capital expenditure by our government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, I think I have to respond to the Member for Wolseley who now, I'm reminded, was a member of the council of the day and, Mr. Chairman, what he said reflected pretty well what I have said. The City was reluctant to give up ownership of that park. We respected that. We thought that they were being somewhat a little silly about it and when he says that the staff certainly urged them to, of course they did, because they indicated staff was concerned that they may end up as provincial employees instead of city employees and staff, any staff, anywhere, doesn't like a change. You know, the known devil is much better than the devil you don't know and they knew exactly where they stood in the City of Winnipeg and they were concerned what might happen so . A/ the city said : "No, it's our park, Assiniboine Park and Zoo, we've had it, we want to retain it, our staff wants to maintain it, they know all about it." So we said: "Fine."

. But, Mr. Chairman, did that gentlemen there who just spoke, did he get up in righteous anger

at the City Council and say: "We don't want the province to relieve us of a million and a quarter dollars of costs," — because that's about what it was at that time. Did he say that? Did he say: "We don't want the province to take over this money. We as rugged individualists in the City of Winnipeg, we want our tax payers to pay a million and a quarter dollars. We don't want the province to do it, we don't want the province to do it." Like heck he didn't, he took it and said thank you very much. And the next year they kept taking it. And what's more they wanted even greater improvements in it, of course they did. And the reason they wanted it is not just because it's a park of the city, because as I said earlier, it's the only park of its kind in Manitoba. We weren't as concerned about other municipalities and local parks coming forward, because we weren't supporting the local parks in the City of Winnipeg either. We identified this park as being one of a kind and it should be recognized by the province as a provincial responsibility.

So what the Member for Wolseley said is totally off base. The citizens of Winnipeg welcomed the provincial participation. They were happy to get the provincial participation. They were happy to have the province assume what should have been assumed decades ago, a financial responsibility for the park whether its provincial employee work there or a city employee, it didn't matter. The Province actually did it with the city in a sense administering it on our behalf and that was perfectly all right with us. But the moment the five years are up, it's that group there who simply took the agreement and said, "that's it, we're giving you one year's notice, the deal's off."

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I've continued to say, although from time to time it's been very difficult, I believe in the democratic process. I believe in the democratic process, even though the Member for Wolseley is my member, I believe in the democratic process. But, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Wolseley has just said that I as one of his constituents and a resident of the City of Winnipeg, that I am more happy to have the City of Winnipeg have ownership of that park so I have the pleasure of paying the entire operating costs of it than if it should be shared throughout the province. I challenge, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member to find one constituent of his, in Wolseley constituency, all of whom are residents of the City of Winnipeg, who say that we feel better about ownership of this park so that we can pay for it rather than have it paid for by all of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman' there isn't one citizen of the City of Winnipeg who has found any difference in the service that has been provided by that park, or would find any difference, if it was declared to be a provincial park and paid for by all of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba. He talks about it as if its an asset which once it is given to the Province is lost to the citizens of the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairman, how stupid can my representative be? I tell my representative that I am a citizen of the City of Winnipeg, that if the province owns that park it will be no less available to me than if the city owns it. My ownership will be retained. As a matter of fact, what I'm finding out is that if the city owns it they're going to charge my children, myself, and what is more important all of the children and all of the people, a user's fee, rather than have the park paid for at social expense by the combined wealth of the citizens, the corporations, the mines, and all of the other taxation that flows into the Province of Manitoba. And if my honourable friend will go to the people of Wolseley at the next election and run on that platform —(Interjection)— Oh, you've changed your position now. Mr. Chairman, it was pretty shaky last time. I mean there were 80 votes — 30 — I'm ashamed to say, Mr. Chairman, all in my poll. Until my poll came in we had it beat.

But I want you to go to the people of Westgate, Eastgate, Middlegate, and to the rest of the people of Wolseley and say to them, "I want to keep you the owner of City Park at the expense of \$2.5 million a year to you rather than letting it be owned by the citizens of the province at an expense of \$2.5 million to everybody and, Mr. Chairman, he won't lose by 30 votes, he'll lose by 2,000 votes if that is his platform. —(Interjection)— Oh, well Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is now saying it is a City Council issue. I happened to read his —(Interjection)— no, the province gave notice, my friend tells me, but I happened to read the honourable member's literature — and in the first campaign that he ran he ran on City Council issues and what he did about getting this done or this stop sign on the corner of Broadway and gee, I don't even know the street — —(Interjection)— That's right but the difference is I'll be joined by many others because I want this speech of the Member for Wolseley that the province tried to steal that park without paying for it.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder what the honourable member would say? What's the most expensive thing that the City has to do? Let's take the Transit System. We own the Transit System. We are the great owners. The deficit of the Transit System is \$10 million a year? Fourteen million a year? Sixteen million? Who'll say \$18 million? —(Interjection)— But by God, it's ours.

Now, the province will make a proposal to the Member for Wolseley — Transit, urban transit

should not be foisted on the citizens of the City of Winnipeg. We will take all those buses, we will take all of the drivers, and we will make it a provincial transit system and we will pick up the \$16 million deficit, and the Member for Wolseley will say, "You're stealing our transit system, not even paying us \$1.00 and you're taking our transit . . . —(Interjection)— . He'd go for it. Mr. Chairman, he says he'd go for it. —(Interjection)— I was in a position of having thoroughly discredited my representative to myself and to everybody else. Now he says he'll go for it. I'm in trouble.

Mr. Chairman, the business with the City Council had nothing to do with the asset of the City of Winnipeg and Assiniboine Park. If Assiniboine Park was a provincial Park, which I urged that it should be, the citizens of Winnipeg would be no less the owners of that park and there should be no money to transfer to the City of Winnipeg. As a matter of fact, the City of Winnipeg would get a great benefit and the citizens would lose nothing. It was all politics. The councillors of the City of Winnipeg, in majority Liberals and Conservatives, were seeking ways of trying to discredit the province and my learned friend was one of them. Did I say my learned friend? I take that back. My friend was one of them. My representative was one of them. And they were looking for all kinds of crazy issues upon which to discredit the Provincial Government, and they were so crazy that they said that we don't want the Province of Manitoba to assume responsibility for a Provincial Park.

The Member for St. James will recall — the Member for Sturgeon Creek will recall — the Member for St. James will recall, for St. James-Assiniboia, when the City of Winnipeg used to do that stupid thing with regard to major streets. The Member for St. James will recall that St. James wanted Ness Avenue to be included as a metro street. They weren't stupid. If Ness was a metro street it wasn't paid for by St. James it was paid for by all of Winnipeg.

It's only the City of Winnipeg who said, "We want Garry Street, we want Fort Street, we don't want Metro to have these streets, they're ours", and the suburbs used to laugh all the way to the bank. It's true. And that's the kind of mentality that we were getting from the Conservative and Liberal Councillors in an attempt to discredit the province with Assiniboine Park. The City of Winnipeg claimed, in an attempt to answer our position, they claimed that we were going to put on a fee. That was the one last straw available to them. They said, "If the province takes it they're going to charge people", because they knew that that was an emotional and a valid issue, which it can be both, it can be emotional and valid, that the citizens of Winnipeg were much more astute than the Tory Government.

They know that a user fee does not reduce costs; it reduces efficiency. It's that simple. The cost of operating the Park remains the same. What you have is a certain amount of taxation paid at the toll, but your cost of operation goes up because cost of operation has to be measured in accordance with use, and the fewer number that use related to the money that is spent, the higher the cost of operation, and the citizens said, "We don't want a user fee at that park. We'll pay for it. We'll pay for it provincially, we'll pay for it municipally, but everybody will be able to use it because that's the most efficient system, and the City Councillors . . .

**MR. RANSOM:** Would the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. GREEN:** Sure.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Does the honourable member believe that there shouldn't be any entrance fees on all Provincial Parks, all parks in the province?

**MR. GREEN:** Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. If the Honourable Minister wishes to make a Motion to eliminate the guy standing at the gate — talk about inefficiency, talk about inefficiency — that a man is sitting at a gate, a man sitting at a gate —(Interjection)— oh, I'll give him something useful to do — that's the difference between me and you. I will make him a lifeguard, which you want to reduce. You will reduce lifeguards but you will have a man sitting in a little box stopping every car — think of what that does to the tires, the Member for Steinbach — stopping every car on the road, looking at a tag, charging him \$2.00, paying his salary, —(Interjection)— well, but Mr. Chairman, the honourable member now says that it creates employment. I tell you I will find something useful for him to do. He doesn't have to stop the cars. He can be a lifeguard. He can beautify the sand. He can beautify the parks. He can do something with regard to planting flowers or foliage instead of sitting in a box 24 hours a day manned — or if it's not 24 hours, it's certainly manned during all the daylight hours — which means that some people are sneaking into the park when he's not there.

Can anybody imagine anything so stupid, in order that we waive this great principle of user

fee? So my honourable friend said, "Well, we did it." It's true. It's true. We didn't wipe out every stupid thing that happens in the Province of Manitoba. But when he asks me do I believe in that? Every time I drive to the Whiteshell I say, "Isn't it silly that we've still got this guy sitting here on the road charging people or looking at a sticker to see that they've got a park . . . ?" For how much? For how much? What is the net gain to the Provincial Park by user fees? Would the Minister answer that? What is the net gain to the Park by user fees? How much user fees do you get out of the Provincial Parks? Is it a million dollars? Is it? Is it a million?

**MR. RANSOM:** I don't have the figure at hand but I know it's approximately 25 percent of the operating costs.

**MR. GREEN:** How much is that? Twenty-five percent of the operating costs is collected in user fees? The net user fees, after you take off the price of the guy sitting there and everything else, you should have a user fee on parks, how much? Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like the figure. Since you have asked me the question, I want to try to determine how much you are getting out of the net fee. That's after you take off what you are paying to set up the little sentry box and pay the salary and the administration and the printing of tags and the sticking them on of the cars, etc. How much do we get out of it?

**MR. RANSOM:** The figure in total, Mr. Chairman, is \$2,400,000.00.

**MR. GREEN:** I would say that the net may be a million, 1/40th of one percent of sales tax, 1/40th of one percent of sales tax is the revenue that's collected by charging a user fee at the Provincial Parks. It's not money that you're after. It's some type of Tory — you know, they laughed at us when we collected \$8 million out of Estate Taxes. They said, "You're not getting any money, it's ideological" — but 1/40th, because each percent picks up \$40 million of one percent of Sales Tax in order to maintain the principle that you will not drive into a park unless you pay at the gate.

It has nothing to do, Mr. Chairman, with money. —(Interjection)— What's that? You're right. Mr. Chairman, you're right.

If you will make the criticism of me that I didn't do it, I will accept it. I will plead — my friend from Seven Oaks says mea culpa — if you will say that, I will say mea culpa — if you will say, "This is a good thing. We've got to keep it", that's a different story, and my honourable friend asked me and I gave him the answer that that is a silly tax, a silly tax, and to the citizens of Winnipeg at least we have not gone backwards.

At least, with regard to the zoo we have said that we are not going to set up a stupid administration and bureaucrats and Civil Servants to do nothing. We have said that this will be open to the public. The question is not now whether I have stayed in the same place, which I did with regard to Provincial Parks, the question is now whether you're going to lead us backwards by putting on a tax on the user of the City Park and therefore reducing the efficiency and reducing the cost of the Park, reducing the efficiency of the Park and increasing the cost of the Park. That's exactly what you do.

The Member for Wolseley — I started to get into it — it was strictly politics. The ICEC read expletive deleted, Liberals, Conservatives, said that they're going to hit the Provincial Government by saying that they're going to put a tax on. But what have they done now, Mr. Chairman, what have they done for me lately? They now say that they're going to put a tax on, and they have abandoned and permitted their friends, who they're prepared to accept any kind of rape from, to take away the provincial responsibility for Assiniboine Park, because that is a provincial responsibility. And they are going backwards, Mr. Chairman.

The Member for Wolseley is agreeing with them, and he's telling me, as a taxpayer of the City of Winnipeg, that as long as I am your representative in Wolseley, I am going to fight for your right to pay more money, so that you can be the owner of Assiniboine Park. And I hope he tells that to all his constituents in Wolseley, Mr. Chairman, of which I am one.

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

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak more to the members on this side than on the other. I don't think anything I could say would change the opinion of the government, but I want to caution the members on this side not to attack our member because I moved into the constituency also, so there's three votes left. —(Interjection)— I was sitting there while the member was speaking, and there was one advantage of having my friend as an opponent, he does all the work for me. I was writing a headline for my second brochure during the upcoming campaign,

because Winnipeg Centre disappears, and the headline on my second brochure, "Your present MLA insists that the Province of Manitoba be relieved of \$2.5 million and that this be transferred to the City of Winnipeg taxpayer, either by an increase in mill rate, or by a user fee." And I'll just print the Hansard. It's wonderful, he does my work.

This is following along the mining policy that he announced the other night that we suck in the mining companies, and then we tax the hell out of them. So please, I just speak briefly to my colleagues on my own side of the House, let our member talk. Let our member talk, and let the people decide.

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

**MR. WILSON:** Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to be brief, but I wanted to put on the record that it's the City of Winnipeg council at the time that approached the province for a share of the growth taxes, and they were led by the former Mayor Juba, and what we were suggesting is, there had to be a recognition for the different levels of government. And the Member for Inkster stood up and said it was the mentality of the councillors of the day, of which I was one that said, we want to retain the asset. The mentality of the councillors today that make up the city council, I haven't seen any change in that type of mentality. The faces have changed, the individuals have changed, and they're still saying, we want to have City Park, Assiniboine Park, as a city asset. And the Member for Inkster is still insisting, as he did back when I was there, that it become a provincial park.

So he is right, it is an issue. It was an issue then and it's an issue now. And I've been removed of that responsibility because that is the responsibility of the City of Winnipeg councillors.

If the bloc funding as our government increases every year and the members of the city council aren't down here en masse like we were, we had to take on the former Schreyer government to get more money out of them for a better share of the growth taxes — either that or we would have had to cut a number of services — and the Member for Elmwood wanted to almost do away with the urban affairs, i.e., he wanted to almost create a Minister of Winnipeg. I get the feeling the Member for Inkster also wants to continue to take away piece by piece, the responsibilities of the city councillors and transfer into the provincial arena. Then what is going to be left?

He was talking about the suggestion that if he was in government, he would talk about taking over the transit. Now, the problem with that is that it would probably reject it, too, if the same thing that he wanted to do with the park, not give the city any money for the capital assets, namely the plant, namely the buses, namely everything, and that's what he didn't want to do. He didn't want to give the people of Winnipeg anything for that particular asset, Assiniboine Park, and they wanted to even rename it, I understand.

I have seen nothing in the newspaper other than probably a suggestion by some civil servant or administrator in the city recommending ways that the city might raise money — and somewhere in that suggestion may have been that they think about having some form of a user fee — but I have seen nothing in the paper, no vote on city council, that has ever suggested, in the last couple of council meetings that I have information on, that they were going to have a user fee at Assiniboine Park.

So what the Member for Inkster and the members on that side are trying to do, is use scare tactics, and I suggest that the mentality of the councillors today will probably remain the same. We want to continue to own Assiniboine Park.

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to very briefly tell the Member for Inkster that one of the concerns that I had when I was in charge of Parks, was very much along the line that he was talking about before, is the number of people employed at the booth, sitting, collecting moneys, and especially at locations which saw very little traffic flow. So hence, what we did is, we did a study in the department — and I haven't the exact figures with me — but I know there were some six different parks, such as Moose Lake, Asessippi out at Roblin, different parks, where traditionally over the last number of years, the government had been collecting. We took a look at these particular spots and we found that, for instance in Moose Lake and Asessippi it was costing us more in wages than we were collecting. So what we did, Mr. Chairman, is we took the first big step forward and said, listen, if you pay out more than you get, you might as well not have them here. So we did away with that.

Also, what we did to try and alleviate some of the problems, under the previous policy there was 24 hour vigilance, I call it, at West Hawk, at Falcon, at all the different locations. That was changed. We have people there at peak times, and I think if the member will check, and I haven't got the figures, but I think if you check, there was a substantial saving and that was a concern

of the government. We inherited certain policies that didn't drift that direction, but I know that the member has concerns in that area and maybe he'll reconsider and next time cast the ballot for the Member for Wolseley.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, credit where credit is due. I congratulate you. And I won't even call you a Communist for doing it, as would be suggested by the other side if we were to do the same thing. I congratulate you. If you found that that was there, now I say, go all the way. Tell your Parks Minister, 1/40 of one percent of sales tax for this, for all this work, we have an expression in Yiddish, let them go to work. Let them do something useful instead of sitting there collecting \$2.00 from a guy driving through a gate, for no reason. But, that's not the issue. That's the question that was asked to me by the Minister. The issue is, whether we are now going to impose, go backwards, and do it at the City Park.

My honourable friend says the mentality of the city councillors hasn't changed. He's right. Neither has your politics changed. Their mentality and their politics have been consistent for the last four years. We have heard the mentality. My learned friend, my honourable friend, says that if the provincial government were offered to take over the operational debt, the operational costs of the transit, which is \$15 million per year, that he has the mentality, that he would resist it, unless the province paid for the buses. Mr. Chairman, I said he'd lose by 2,000 votes, he'll lose by 3,000 votes if that's the position that he takes, because nobody in Wolseley constituency will vote for somebody who says that we won't relieve ourselves of an obligation of \$15 million a year unless they pay for the capital assets.

It's different if the capital assets were going to be taken off the streets and put into Morris. The capital assets, the bus that runs on Sherbrook, will still run. Don't you understand that? The bus that runs on Broadway will still run. It's still going to be there, nobody's going to take it away from you. The only thing they're going to take away is an obligation of \$15 million a year, but the mentality of the city councillors — and I'll have to tell them what you said about them — is that they wouldn't do this unless we paid for the buses. We already paid half the cost of the buses at the provincial level, you know. —(Interjection)— Pardon me?

Mr. Chairman, you know, the honourable member says, we had to buy them. In the Province of Quebec, Flyer cannot bid on buses. In most other places where we low bid, they didn't buy our buses. That was also political. In every other city in North America, if they had a bus company operating within their city, they'd be talking about how lucky we are to be able to buy our own buses from people employed by our own residents. But the mentality of those councillors, ICEC, read expletive deleted Liberal Conservatives is that we forced them to buy the buses.

Mr. Chairman, I want my honourable friend, the Member for Wolseley to run in our constituency on the proposal that he will resist provincial operation of the transit system which will save each of us, it will save our city \$15 million a year, unless the province first of all buys the buses, which they're going to run in the same places. Please, run on that platform. Show your mentality, wave it on your sleeve. —(Interjection)— No, you didn't. Mr. Chairman, he didn't do that with City Park. He didn't say to the citizens of Wolseley that we, the citizens of Wolseley, should pay for the park, rather than the province.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet when you started to ask the question on Number 1, and I think you've allowed quite a latitude in the debate on this particular subject and I think that after listening to the Honourable Member for Inkster try and create an issue and divert away from what, in fact, was the issue at the time relating to City Park, relating to transit, that I had to get on my feet to give the proper story of the City's viewpoint on the issue that was before the council at that time. The major issue before the council at that time dealing with the then government was, did we in fact need a Municipal Government in Winnipeg? That was the issue, because they set up the City of Winnipeg Council but didn't give it any powers of its own with relation to major financial problems. That was the issue. And the issue at the time was that the government of the day at that time said, "We will give you so many million dollars for transit, but we will tell you what you do with it and how you use it. We will give you so many million dollars to operate the park but we will tell you how we're going to make you use it". That was the issue, Mr. Chairman. That was the issue under the thumb.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we're taking a step forward, not a step backward relating to the park because this government, our government has said to the City of Winnipeg, "Here is \$30 million, you spend it, you operate your City efficiently, "that's exactly what we have said to the City of

Winnipeg. And if they choose to use part of it for the park to operate the park out of the those funds then all the citizens of Manitoba are paying for the operation of the City of Winnipeg Park.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. I must apologize to the Honourable Members for not strictly adhering to the rules and allowing the Honourable Members to such latitude that I was hoping that when we were discussing buses that would be running through parks, and I realize that buses do run through parks and I thought that there might be some reference to it, but I do apologize to the honourable members for allowing the latitude and getting off the subject. We are discussing parks and I would hope the honourable members would stick to parks. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, the bus does run through the park, incidentally.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. James rose to his feet and said the issue before the City Council was, as I gather, sort of a feeling, a threat to their autonomy. You know, the power, what are they going to do? They needed funds. You know, he totally ignores the fact that there are two ways of giving funds. One is to take over the cost of the service, in this case the park. The bills were very significant, identifiable costs which the province was prepared to take over. And let the City run it. You see, you had all the responsibility in the world. You had to maintain that park. You had to administer that park. You had to plan the park. You had to keep it. You had all the responsibilities in the world. But you know what he did? They needed funds. We turned over to them an amusement tax and we said, "There is a source of revenue." And we gave it to them. That amusement tax in 1977 was worth \$1 million to the City of Winnipeg, because they were the largest single collectors of the amusement tax, being the largest city. And now what do we have? Those clowns at City Hall, they have just given up part of that amusement tax to accommodate the expansion for the Jets. And in doing so they have established a precedent so that the Assiniboia Downs is after them, so that other enterprises are after them — I forget the other one — and it's a precedent that's going to be difficult to cope with.

So even when you give those dolts the money and the power to do it, they blow it.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that Assiniboine Park and Zoo, which, as I indicated earlier, is special, is unique in Manitoba, is going to suffer because the City, in trying to stretch this \$30 million in dozens of ways, for transit deficits, for other works, for major thoroughfares, for bridges, for buses, and for parks, I am afraid that the citizens of Winnipeg are going to get the short end of it and Assiniboine Park and Zoo is going to suffer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Before we move past this section of Administration and Management, I'd like to ask the Minister if he can tell us what his policy is in one specific area and that is with respect to the allocation of cottage lots to the public of Manitoba when these lots are developed at public expense by his department. What policy does he intend to pursue? Is it similar or the same as the one followed by the previous government, and that is to allocate the lots on a lottery system with a full recovery of costs from those who are successful in the lottery system?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that will become evident when the lots go on the market, or when they're put up for disposition, I guess is the proper word, and I can't assure the honourable member at this time just exactly what procedure, whether it will be exactly the same as the previous government's policy or not.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, here again we're in the dilemma of not knowing what this government's policy is, and it's obvious they don't have a policy. They don't know what their policy should be, even after 16 months of office. They still are not sure what they're going to be doing with respect to cottage lots in the Province of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that question was with specific reference to those lots which are developed by the government. That is at public expense. Last year we were discussing an example in the House of a pilot project which was being discussed at the time. I don't know if it proceeded but the concept was for a private developer to move in and develop cottage lots on Crown land and the location of this proposed pilot project was in the vicinity of . . . It was in the LGD of Alexander. I believe it was near Pinawa Bay, or whatever they called it.

Now, can the Minister tell me what is the status of that project: Is it still in the pilot stage;

are they planning to proceed with it; have they had discussions with the LGD of Alexander? Last year I asked the Minister for a specific commitment of whether or not he would be complying with the feelings and the desires of the LGD of Alexander with respect to developments of that nature, if he would proceed on the basis of consultation with them and not proceed with the development, if they were opposed to it and if it did not fit in with their overall municipal planning.

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, we're still waiting for the LGD to complete their plans and, in respect to the previous question, although I can't give him the details I can assure the honourable member that we will be recovering costs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, since the Minister is being that specific, could he indicate what his policy is with respect to the pricing? Will it be simply to recover the costs or will it be to allow the lots to go on some kind of a market price basis?

**MR. RANSOM:** Those policies will be announced when the lots are made available, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (a)—pass; (b)(1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Before we pass this section I'd like to have the Minister's description of what exactly is being requested here: How many staff man years, what this section is responsible for, and so on.

**MR. RANSOM:** These are the park rangers, Mr. Chairman, and there are 55 staff man years. There were 57 last year. There have been a deletion of two vacant staff man years.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate where those positions were located that have been deleted from his list? What area of the province, for example, if he has that information.

**MR. RANSOM:** Winnipeg Beach and The Pas.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would assume that in this area you would have the operational staff of the park, including the summer complement of staff that are hired for the peak period of use of many of our natural parks. Could the Minister indicate what changes, if any, in the staffing — that is of a general year around SMY nature and the staffing of a seasonal nature — in each of the parks that come under his jurisdiction?

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, we don't have it available by park, Mr. Chairman. There are 490.22 staff man years in 1978-79. There are 492.32 in 1979-80, with the addition being for some beach patrols and some staffing requirements for new campgrounds and new vacation home subdivisions.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate if there have been any cutbacks in staffing at any of our provincial parks for the summer period? Are there any cutbacks in the number of people hired on a seasonal basis? I realize these are staff man years. Now, where would the seasonal people come in? Would it be in the next section there, Other Expenditures, or are they located in this section as SMYs?

**MR. RANSOM:** There have been no cutbacks, Mr. Chairman. In fact, there is somewhat of an increase — a small increase.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it appears, from reports I have been receiving, that there have been some cutbacks in the hiring of seasonal people in some of the parks. Is the Minister saying that in this present fiscal year that we have not experienced cutbacks from previous years

in the park system?

**MR. RANSOM:** I am talking about the Estimates before us, as compared to the year we're in.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Chairman, in the specific area of beach patrols, the Minister indicated a specific example there. Is there going to be a decrease or increase in the number of beach patrols and, if so, where are those increases or decreases?

**MR. RANSOM:** In total there will be two additional in 1979. There are some internal or some adjustment . . . Grand Beach is up two and West Hawk Lake is up one. St. Malo is up one. Asessippi and Norquay Beach are down one, and The Pas is up one, and Thompson is down one. For a total increase of two.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (c)—pass; (d)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. .

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate what these salaries are for; what special studies and projects are under way this year and being proposed for next year?

**MR. RANSOM:** This is basically Dutch Elm disease control and some forest tent caterpillar control.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (e) Grant Assistance— —pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** What specifically is being requested here by way of grant assistance?

**MR. RANSOM:** It's for the International Peace Gardens.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 86—pass.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

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

#### IN SESSION

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.