

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 18 March 1980

Time: 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order.
2.(a)(1)--pass - the Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. We were discussing the aspect of Safety and Research. The Minister spoke just before we broke up for supper, and I had assumed when I looked at the Estimates that the section under Number 3. Planning and Design for \$1,411,000 dealt with Safety and Research, and that basically that amount of money was spent in order to ensure that there was safety to the best of the ability of the department in the operation of the highway. Am I correct in making that assumption?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, to a certain extent because in the design of a road you incorporate as much safety as you can. In other words, taking out hazardous corners, poor bridge alignments, that sort of thing. But part and parcel is safety analysis on traffic, etc., within this appropriation as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1)--pass; 2.(a)(2)--pass; 2.(b)(1)--pass - the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I wonder if the Minister could advise us in regard to laboratory and materials what he has to report to us this year in new materials or new innovations that have taken place in the past year.

MR. ORCHARD: I'm certainly pleased that my honourable critic has brought this matter to the House because I have great news to report. What we are doing this year, Mr. Chairman, in laboratory materials, as you will note by the SMY sheet that we are increasing our staff complement by two, what we are doing, Mr. Chairman, is putting a mobile laboratory and a core driller on the road during the construction season to analyze materials as they are being laid down on our roads, to make sure that our quality control is vastly - well not vastly improved but is improved.

MR. ADAM: Is that the short commentary that the Minister has to make to us? Is that all that's happened in the last year in regard to experiments of materials and so on?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the member asked me what dramatic new things we are doing, and that's the dramatic new thing we are doing. We are increasing our staff by 5 percent in this department to accommodate a more intensive testing program of the materials that go into our construction program.

As well, over the past year, numerous activities have been ongoing. A number of staff have attended various information meetings on surface quality, and we have done the normal things under this appropriation, Laboratory and Materials, plus added the mobile lab and core drilling unit to our staff complement to ensure greater quality control on our construction jobs.

MR. ADAM: The \$50,000 or \$56,000, or not quite \$56,000, is just the staff man years salaries; is that it, the two . . .

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ORCHARD: The two additional SMYs plus general salary increase and we do have some normal annual increments in there as well.

MR. ADAM: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that there were some experiments undertaken last year in regard to dust-free construction with a material called terrazime, and another one that has also been experimented with called verglimic. Is this a Swiss product? I wonder if the Minister could tell us the results of those experiments.

MR. ORCHARD: On the terrazime experiment, we won't be able to properly evaluate that until this summer's driving season is well passed. We'll get a pretty good feel for it on that, after this summer's driving.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister tell us just how much road work was done with this kind of . . . what is it, anyway?

MR. ORCHARD: Terrazime is a compound that has come to us from a firm in Alberta and basically, as I understand the process of terrazime, it's a clay stabilizer which firms up, stabilizes the clay component in your road base and allows you to make almost, if I can make a non-engineering comparison, almost a soil cement-like sub-grade with this terrazime and clay mixture. It's a stabilizing and hardening agent for clay.

MR. ADAM: Would that allow us not to use chloride in our road works?

MR. ORCHARD: That would be a net result, but that wasn't necessarily the prime function for using terrazime. Along with the hard surface which you would lay an oil surface on top of, an oil treatment, you would naturally end up with a dust on the surface, but primarily terrazime has been experimented with not only by our department but by a number of municipalities in terms of the sub-grade stabilization to lower construction costs over conventional methods.

MR. ADAM: How much have we done? I asked the Minister awhile ago to tell me how many, what have we done. Half a mile, a mile, five miles, ten miles?

MR. ORCHARD: About five miles.

MR. ADAM: About five miles. Is there a cost to that? What is the cost? Is there a big cost?

MR. ORCHARD: We'll have to get that figure for the Member for Ste. Rose, but it seems to me that in some of the work the municipalities did at home, I think around \$10,000 a mile would give you the . . .

MR. ADAM: How much?

MR. ORCHARD: \$10,000 a mile sticks in my mind from memory only from some of the work that a municipality in my constituency did, but don't quote me. We'll get a firm figure.

MR. ADAM: Where is the five miles? Where is it? What kind of conditions . . .

MR. ORCHARD: We've got the strip east of Winnipeg, I believe it's on PR 205, and you can only use the terrazime system with a clay subsoil. If you've got a sandy subsoil it's not effective, it has to be a clay type subsoil.

MR. ADAM: And what about the other product?

MR. ORCHARD: The verglimic.

MR. ADAM: Yes.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ORCHARD: We've got to test incorporation of that on the asphalt overlay on the overpass west.

MR. ADAM: On the overpass . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Over Portage Avenue on the bypass.

MR. ADAM: Oh, I see, west. I see. That's the only place that we have that?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes.

MR. ADAM: I see. That's all for now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes. On the item of laboratories and materials. I take it this is the area where your department tests materials which are being used to construct our highways in the province. Is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: That's correct, yes.

MR. SCHROEDER: What is the general procedure? Is this done for every road that is on occasion you have inspectors going out and scooping up material to see whether it meets qualifications or what are the criteria on which you decide to do this testing?

MR. ORCHARD: In preparing a road job, for instance you may have (a) base and (c) base, the quantities of (a) base and (c) base will both be tested several times throughout the batch, like you may be talking 10,000 yards, considerable quantities, 20,000 yards, 50,000 yards. It will be tested on an ongoing basis on each job to assure that they're within the specification tolerances for that particular grade of material.

MR. SCHROEDER: Do you generally have someone on site to do the testing or is the material taken into the city to a lab or is it a combination?

MR. ORCHARD: We have both testing available, on site for on the spot quality control and then more extensive tests if necessary in Winnipeg.

MR. SCHROEDER: How often does it happen percentagewise that the material is found by your laboratory not to be satisfactory and is therefore rejected?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that's not an easy one to put a figure on but it's not all that large. In terms of percent, I wouldn't even want to put a percent on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b) - the Member for Lac Du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the department whether there are any jurisdictions in North America which have found a way of dealing with the problems of our climate and what it does to our road system? Perhaps it's the input we put into the roads, I don't know, but if you go into the United States it seems to me in the northern states their climate is not much different than ours and yet we don't see the surface deterioration as we have here in Manitoba. What is it that we are doing wrong or what is it that they are doing more than we are doing that makes it so? It's probably money but . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think what often happens to us north-erners when we visit our neighbours to the south, we end up on their interstate freeways which are magnificent structures and I think probably the only road that we have of comparable construction standards in Manitoba might be TransCanada

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

Highway which by comparison --(Interjection)-- Well the honourable member indicates it doesn't compare. I think by and large its pretty close.

But the construction methods that would vary between the interstates and here might be in terms of several inches of aggregate for base and several inches of concrete for the riding surface to give them their apparent durability over ours on the interstate system itself. When you get down to North Dakota's secondary road system, I've spoken to those people and they don't enjoy any particular magic formula for keeping their secondary roads in shape. They're having much the same problems that we are. They're finding that, due to changing factors, their secondary system isn't able to stand up as well as they would like to see it stand up.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could quantify for us the difference in cost per mile as between our TransCanada and their interstate? What is the difference in cost and what is the longevity of the road, the difference?

MR. ORCHARD: It would be, Mr. Chairman, not the easiest cost comparison to make. I suppose those kind of figures might be, but if we got a standard, a construction standard for an interstate highway and compared it to the construction standard that we have in the TransCanada, we could probably come up with a dollars per mile difference in construction cost. That information is not available here tonight.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to be precise, but is it half a million dollars a mile, or is it a quarter, or is it 100,000, what parameters are we looking at?

MR. ORCHARD: My Deputy indicates to me that Interstate 29 was approximately \$400,000 per mile, whereas Trans-Canada came in at about \$200,000 per mile. So we're talking roughly multiples of two.

MR. USKIW: Twice the cost.

MR. ORCHARD: Those are rough figures. Those aren't precise figures, but I think he'd have a ballpark ratio of about 2 to 1?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, let's pursue it another step then. If we were to double our expenditures on that kind of a highway, on a per mile basis, what would be the reduction in maintenance costs per annum, or whatever the yardstick is, given the fact that we have a much better road to begin with? I'm wondering whether it's six of one and half a dozen of the other over a 20-year period, is really what I'm trying to find out.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, when you're talking concrete as we were in that case, there's very little difference in maintenance to our construction standard to the American construction standard, and I guess the problem I would face, as other Ministers in this department have faced in making that kind of a decision, is do you spend all your money on a few miles or do you attempt to upgrade many many more roads; and we are, Mr. Chairman, always working with a limited budget which doesn't lend itself to putting \$400,000 or twice the money per mile in. When we can get a riding surface that's going to stand up for, well, for example, No. 3 Highway, that concrete section to Carman that's been down 20 years and has had very minimal maintenance; last summer it had some patching and other than that I think it's been very minimal maintenance.

MR. USKIW: The whole point of my question is, Mr. Chairman, that if you spent the extra money to begin with and over a reasonable period of time you recovered that difference in maintenance savings, then it's not altogether a bad argument to say, let's do the job right in the first place. If there isn't that much to be saved by maintenance savings, or less maintenance costs, then of course I won't pursue the argument. But if it's a trade-off situation and you end up

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

with the same dollars virtually, there's a lot of argument to be made for going the best route to begin with, going for the higher quality or higher standard construction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1)--pass; 2.(b)(2)--pass; 2.(c)(1)--pass. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I'm wondering, these figures that we see here, the first one I notice that comes to my attention that last year it was shown in the - I don't have last year's Estimates book - but we show on the left-hand column here \$497,000, and I see in Hansard that it was \$486,500.00. Does this mean that we've spent actually more than what was appropriated?

MR. ORCHARD: That, Mr. Chairman, is the adjusted vote for salary adjustment.

MR. ADAM: Salary adjustment. Okay. What's new in surveys? Are there any changes?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we're operating with the same staff complement and basically the same branch offices, the program in this division hasn't changed from last year.

MR. ADAM: There's one vacancy; that will be filled, I presume.

MR. ORCHARD: It will be filled in the course of the year, yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I assume this will be the section under which to enquire as to the Surveys and Titles and to enquire into acquisition of right-of-way; and I wonder if the Minister could explain the problems and the present situation in regard to acquiring right-of-way for . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the acquisition of right-of-way is not part and parcel of Department of Highways. That comes under Land Acquisition Branch, Government Services. We basically file a plan of survey for the right-of-way that we may require in upgrading a road, and it is then Government Services via Land Acquisition Branch which does the acquisition.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I wonder if the Minister could inform me as to the acquisition of land so that he can upgrade and pave Highway No. 283, whether that land has been acquired yet so he can proceed with that work, or whether the Minister does not have that right-of-way as yet.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we can check that information with Planning and Design and provide it to the member tomorrow.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate that because this particular acquisition has been going on for four years now.

MR. ORCHARD: We'll provide you with that information. It's not complete yet.

MR. McBRYDE: I wonder if the Minister could outline in a general way what the problems are, why it's taken four years to acquire that right-of-way.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I can only assume that we've got a problem with a, or several, land owners that have yet to be resolved, and I can provide you with the details tomorrow as to the exact location of the land that still isn't acquired for the purpose.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I'm just trying to remember the proper words, but I wonder if the Minister, when he is making that inquiry and providing more information tomorrow, could tell when the province began its expropriation of that particular land, and how long after initial negotiations they undertook expropriation?

MR. ORCHARD: Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)(1) - the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, this is the department that looks after the acquisition, is it? No?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)(1)--pass; 2.(c)(2)--pass; 2.(d)(1) - the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, could the Minister tell us how many bridges did we construct this year, and is our program under the Highways Improvement Program cost-shared with the federal, is that program ongoing, are there still more bridges to construct? How many have we done this year?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we've got 20 bridges outside of . . . when I mention 20 bridges those are considered to be, let's call them a major bridge, we have an ongoing fund which allows us to replace smaller bridges on PR's which come up as a matter of urgency, and that isn't included in the 20. We may replace two or three of them for instance in this construction year. But we don't have any particular timing on them. They're a matter of an emergency replacement, shall we say. There are no funds available via the highway strengthening program which is where we received funds for the past several years for the upgrading, strengthening of our highways and portions of that going of course to bridge and structure rebuilding.

MR. ADAM: Then the program that we undertook in previous years, has been completed insofar as the funds that we had available. Is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: As far as the funds that were available on the highway strengthening program, yes they are expended.

MR. ADAM: Yes, last year the Member for Flin Flon had a concern in regard to a bridge on No. 10 and he wanted to know if a bridge that the Minister had mentioned in his comments, whether it was a bridge at Bakers Narrows and the Member for Flin Flon asked the following: "Does that take in the bridge at Baker's Narrows that you're going to replace for a higher load capacity." And the reply from the Minister, "I'm advised by staff that is the one remaining bridge on the designated route." And Mr. Barrow said, "Just the one, there are two bridges. Does that just include one bridge? There's two bridges in that area." And the Minister replied, "We call it one location, there are two bridges involved." And Mr. Barrow said, "They will both be replaced in this program?" And the Minister replied, "Money permitting they will be replaced." So I presume that they have been replaced or they haven't been replaced?

MR. ORCHARD: Those bridges were not replaced under the highway strengthening cost sharing. The money ran out before those bridges were replaced. We will be replacing them but it's going to be at provincial expense; it's going to be our expense. We're rebuilding one and moving the second one. So we are actually going to be building one new bridge.

MR. ADAM: Is that shown on the program? I doubt whether that is shown on the program so where are you going to get the appropriation to do it?

MR. ORCHARD: It's not on the program but it isn't going to be built this year, Mr. Chairman.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ADAM: I see. So, they were not built last year and they're again not going to be built this year.

MR. ORCHARD: That's correct.

MR. ADAM: So some distant day in the future they may be built? They will be replaced before they fall down? Mr. Chairman, how many bridges have we replaced this year, 1979-80?

MR. ORCHARD: All the bridges that were in the program have been completed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: There's no figures for that, how many bridges we replaced? How many on secondary roads?

MR. ORCHARD: We'll have to give the member an exact figure tomorrow on PTH and PR.

MR. ADAM: Good enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I think the Minister is aware of the problems with the bridge that's been constructed at Grand Rapids, the main bridge over the Saskatchewan River on No. 6 Highway. The problem there, Mr. Chairperson, being that there - a number of problems. The bridge has a very high camber; it's arched quite extreme so it's hard to see very far in front of you when you're driving over it. The bridge is also affected by fog because there is open water below the Grand Rapids hydro dam. And the other particular local problem that's very concerning related to that is the fact that there are a large number of pedestrians from the Grand Rapids Reserve that walk into town over that bridge, and I wonder what definite actions the Minister has taken so far on the request from the people of Grand Rapids to have improvements to that bridge to make it a safe situation. One of their requests was, Mr. Chairperson, for improved lighting on that bridge so that pedestrians could be seen easier. Another one was to ensure that the sidewalks were kept clear at all times so that pedestrians wouldn't have to walk on the main roadway and could always use the sidewalk. I think the Minister is aware of that situation so I wonder if he could report to us what actions have been taken by the department.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we had instituted several measures to help alleviate the problem there. First off we lowered the speed limit down to I believe 50 kilometers. The second thing we did was instruct the department to make sure that there was a high level of maintenance on that walkway this winter so that we would encourage the pedestrians to stay on the sidewalk. And then the third thing that we are hopefully undertaking this summer is the installation of a pedestrian guard rail. Not so much to assure that anything else happens other than the pedestrians stay on the sidewalk and don't inadvertently wander back and forth because that bridge does have a high camber and your line of sight as you approach in a vehicle is not all that great and that's the prime reason why we lowered the speed limit so that we have slower moving vehicles crossing the bridge.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I was going to get the Minister to confirm that he has budgeted and has plans now to do the guard railing; and secondly, does he have any plans to improve the lighting on that bridge?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we are going to install the guard rails this summer. The lighting was not something that we were going to undertake.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, that was one of the main, I think, recommendations from the people of Grand Rapids, was the lighting aspect of it. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, to move on to another; there's a provincial road that goes through the Fairford Reserve and a bridge over the Fairford River and that bridge

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

seems to me as a non-engineer to be getting pretty shakey, I wouldn't want to take something over it when there is high water, and I wonder if there is any concern by the department or whether there is any money for further maintenance or repair work on that particular bridge?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that bridge is on a main market road and the department hasn't been advised of any request for upgrading on that bridge.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister, one, clarify the legal situation on that bridge, whose responsibility that bridge is, whether the province is 50 percent responsible or what would be the arrangement, and then, who would the request or the concern come forward from?

MR. ORCHARD: I'm sorry, I was anticipating your question and I missed it.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, the question to the Minister, Mr. Chairperson, was the - what was it again? Who is responsible for that bridge, and is the province only 50 percent responsible or 100 percent? And secondly, the second part of the question was, where would the concern, where would the request for repair on that bridge come from?

MR. ORCHARD: That is a main market road, and when main market roads are within the territory of Reserves, we share the cost with the federal Department of Indian Affairs on a 50-50 basis. In terms of initiating the request to have the bridge upgraded or a study done on it to see if it was structurally sound, I would assume the Band Council would initiate that kind of a request, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: So the Band Council would make a formal request to the Minister for engineering studies on that bridge to have its condition checked out and recommend repairs if any were necessary?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, that would be the proper procedure.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, again through you to the Minister, one of the items on the list of the residents of Norway House, when they visited us at the Legislative Building last summer, was a request for a bridge in that community. I believe one bridge, as they have some there now, and I wonder if there is any planning at this stage or whether the engineering feasibility studies have been done on that bridge, and cost estimates done, and whether there is any intention of work being done on that bridge.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the design for the bridge has been completed. We have got an approximate cost. We have got a location picked out, and we are in the process of - at least the last information I have received from the department - negotiating the land right-of-way for location of the bridge.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, as I understand the Minister's relationship with the Manitoba NORTHLANDS Agreement, I'm wondering if this particular bridge has been one of the items put forward to the NORTHLANDS Co-ordinating Committee to the federal government, whether he has actually asked to have this in his submission to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, to include it in the Manitoba NORTHLANDS Agreement.

MR. ORCHARD: The NORTHLANDS' money that was available was expended before we got to this bridge, so it isn't part of the NORTHLANDS' funding.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I assume from the Minister's other answer that, in fact, there is not funds for actual construction budgeted for this year; is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: No, we have funds budgeted for construction this year.

MR. McBRYDE: For construction of this bridge for this year?

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ORCHARD: That's right.

MR. McBRYDE: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us an indication as to some of the cost estimates or projections for that.

MR. ORCHARD: In the neighbourhood of \$800,000, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, this is one reason why I wanted to get some breakdown earlier from the Minister in terms of the NORTHLANDS Agreement but he was unwilling to give me that information until we get to those particular items, but they would help as we proceed through this section "Others", and I wonder, now, if the Minister has changed his mind and is willing to give me some information on the Highways part of the funding under the NORTHLANDS Agreement.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, there has been discussion for a number of years on a bridge at Berens River and I wonder . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, might I offer a correction. We just checked that and, in fact, the \$800,000 or rough cost is part of NORTHLANDS funding for this year. It is part of the \$3 million or about \$3 million we've got left over to fund this year, and that project is included in it.

MR. McBRYDE: I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Chairperson. My next question to the Minister was in regards to Berens River. There has been some discussion of a bridge in that community for a number of years, and I wonder if the Minister has done any initial planning, engineering studies on that proposal.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, there's no funding for that bridge this year.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I wonder how far long that is in terms of has there been any engineering studies or is there money for that, or is there zero funds for any work on that.

MR. ORCHARD: The Bridge Department has done studies on the location. That much work has been done, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, earlier on in these Estimates we had some discussions of the Cross Lake road and I'm wondering, under this particular section, if the Minister could give us some indication. My recollection of the original guesstimates on the construction of that road is that there were two bridges required and if I'm wrong there would be three. I wonder if the Minister could inform us of the engineering work that's been done in terms of the bridges to put an all-weather road into Cross Lake, and whether those will be included under NORTHLANDS' fundings and whether those bridge will be proceeding this year, as well as the construction that's presently under way.

MR. ORCHARD: As I mentioned to the member on Friday, cable ferry is what will be used there. There are no bridges on the road construction that's being undertaken right now.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm assuming then that the Minister's department did some cost estimates of bridge construction and I wonder if the Minister could tell me how many costings there are on that road and what the cost estimates were if they were actually going to use bridges on that road.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, we'll have to get that information from Planning and Design. We don't have it available this evening.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could make sure of the number of crossings and the proposed methods of each crossing, because there might be two or three crossings on that particular road so there might be a combination of cable ferry, fill-in or whatever, a causeway or whatever.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

Mr. Chairman, that's the questions I have under this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the Minister whether or not there is any work contemplated, or what is the position of the government with respect to the Winnipeg River bridge, that narrow one north of Lac du Bonnet, the old railroad bridge that was converted to a Highways Department bridge. We've dealt with that one before. The question is its narrowness and what can be done about it in order to facilitate a flow of traffic in a reasonable manner. It's an issue that's always raised locally up there and I don't know what the traffic volume is, but I know that there's quite a backup at either side of that bridge during the summer months.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are no plans for any new structure there in this year's program.

MR. USKIW: The question I have though, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not there's any way of widening the present structure.

MR. ORCHARD: We'll check that out for certain but it appears doubtful if that bridge could be widened.

MR. USKIW: Does the department have any idea what the cost would be to then add either a brand new bridge or another lane, independent of the one that exists?

MR. ORCHARD: We don't have any figures at hand here this evening. If the member would like a guesstimate on the cost, we can provide him with that.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that I don't know what the solution is. I have to assume that it's an expensive proposition to talk about a new bridge. Does the department have statistics to indicate the severity of traffic jams in that area? What's the traffic count that goes across that bridge? I'm sure the department has been monitoring that for some period of time.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we no doubt have those traffic counts on record but of course they're not with us this evening.

MR. USKIW: The point of my question is, Mr. Chairman, do the traffic counts justify an expenditure of money in order to facilitate the traffic flow? That's in essence what I'm trying to get at. And is the Minister in a position to say, yes, there is justification for some work to be done there, or no, the traffic is not significant enough for an expenditure of dollars?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, when we get that information on traffic count, etc., etc., I can give the member an indication of where that bridge replacement would fit into the overall priorities that we have to work with in the province. At this stage of the game I can't give him an indication whether it's a pressing need or a very remote need. But we will undertake to provide that kind of information to him.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that it's not a remote need; I just don't know how it stacks up with other needs in the province relative to the same volume of traffic, and that's the point I'm trying to make.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't offer any more comment until we get the traffic counts and we'll provide those tomorrow or, for certain, on Thursday.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be prepared then to provide, for the benefit of this committee, a number of such projects with their traffic counts in order to indicate some sense of priority as to which sort of

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

location is the one heading the list, in terms of whenever moneys are made available, in terms of their traffic flow, and so on.

MR. ORCHARD: If the Member for Lac du Bonnet would like, we could probably pull out some traffic counts on, for instance, the bridges that we're replacing this year, to give him a comparison and the dollars that we're guesstimating them to cost and make a general comparison to the dollars to be invested there, for the traffic count there, certainly.

MR. USKIW: Yes. My next question with respect to bridges has to do with . . . Well, there are two questions. One has to do with a new bridge location north of Lockport that has been studied for some years now by the department, and the other question, Mr. Chairman, is when are we going to receive an answer with respect to the approach to the existing bridge at Selkirk, the area across the flood plane which the department has been looking at now for a good number of years as to finding a solution to the virtually annual flooding that takes place in that area and which forces the traffic many miles around in order to get to its destination? And especially truck traffic, Mr. Chairman; heavy trucks have to go all the way round the perimeter if that bridge is closed.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, in this year's Estimates we've budgeted moneys for a study on the Selkirk bridge and its location to find out where a proper location would be, and part and parcel of that study is an effort to alleviate, the best way we can alleviate, some of the flooding problems that he's indicating.

MR. USKIW: Yes. Well, then to pursue it further, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying then that he is looking at the question of a new location for a new bridge that would also answer the flood problem or is he abandoning the existing location?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm not saying that the proposed bridge or the bridge that may well go in there is going to alleviate the flood problem completely. That is a question which is going to get hung up of course on how many dollars it's going to take to provide that kind of protection. Sometimes you have to, unfortunately, make a trade-off between economies and in realization of absolutely no flooding.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would really like to know whether the department is looking at two bridges or one bridge; whether they're looking at the existing one plus one or whether they're just looking at the existing one.

MR. ORCHARD: Hopefully, we will come up with the most economical, whether it be existing plus new, etc., when we undertake a complete review of the needs in the area and also the changing patterns of traffic flow in there, which we hope to accommodate for some 25 to 30 years, if and when we decide upon a location. It's not just for one location for one year. We have to make sure we invest our dollars wisely in that structure. So, you know, basically I guess what I am saying is I can't tell you whether we're going to eliminate the old one and put in one, leave the old one and put in a brand new one at a different location. That's the purpose of the study.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, just for the benefit of the Minister, and I don't fault him if he doesn't know the history or the full story, but there was a great deal of discussion within the department about a new bridge, additional to the one that is in existence now, that would link up the road to Stonewall across to the 44 Highway on the east side of the Red.

Now I am pleased to hear the Minister say that they are looking at it from the point of view of tying in traffic arteries and, at the same time, facilitating the bridge problem, the flood problem. And if that were the case, then it really would follow or flow from the suggestions that I have made to the department for a number of years now that we ought to really look at traffic flows when we talk in

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

terms of building and new structure across the Red River, so that we take a completely futuristic position in terms of location. And if that were reasonably located, then I don't think that people would be upset, Mr. Chairman, if they had to travel a few miles out of their way to the new location if the old location was flooded, and so, that makes a lot of sense.

What amount of dollars have been allocated? I thought we did location studies for the last two or three years, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, I know that in 1976, I believe, we had given instructions to the department to do location studies. Surely there must be something determined by this point in time; it's now four years later.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, as is not unusual with a rapidly growing traffic area like Selkirk, your choice of a best location is the old moving target again and the tie-in with the Stonewall Road is a consideration and the tie-in with the Selkirk by-passes is another consideration and, you know, I think we're taking the right attitude in attempting to provide the greatest utility in that crossing location that we can for the present and the growing traffic flows that are going to be in that area.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that if there is to be a new structure built, I would hope that it be a structure that would be futuristic, that it would be a four-lane structure, even though you may not have four-laning of highways on each side for the moment, but that it be so located that it would facilitate traffic in and out of the Town of Selkirk in particular. That is the heavy area of traffic flow.

I know that the department had some ideas of simply linking up the Stonewall Road with Highway 44 just east of the Red but considerably south from Selkirk. And with the 59 Highway having been built and Henderson Highway having been rebuilt, it would seem to me it might make a tremendous amount of sense to link in 45 and the Stonewall Road somewhere closer to the Town of Selkirk than to the community of Lockport, as an example. It seemed to me that might service the traffic flow much more in tune with what the public wish would be than to simply make a link at a convenient geographical location per se. It doesn't take much imagination to swing a road in a couple of miles one way or the other if it's going to make a world of difference to the community involved.

MR. ORCHARD: Fair comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d) - The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister was replying to my colleague for Ste. Rose about bridges and preparing small ones on an emergency basis he said that the department has an ongoing fund to deal with it. May I ask him what he means by an ongoing fund?

MR. ORCHARD: We've got a set-aside fund of about \$800,000 or \$900,000 to undertake emergency repairs and replacement of some of the smaller bridges that aren't part of when the road program is drawn up, aren't part of the construction appropriation. It's an emergency replacement fund and has been in existence for a number of years.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the word "ongoing" suggests to me something that carries on from year to year and it's one fund that is still there and is added to and is taken from. Is this what the Minister is inferring and how does that square with the statement he made earlier that all appropriations lapse at the end of the year.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, it fits in quite well. As I say, we've got about an \$800,000 addition each year and, should we not expend it, we're in rather difficult straits. But we've got some 2,800 bridges and on an annual basis it is proven out through past experience that we pretty well have to expend. It's not a choice of trying to, it's pretty well have to expend that kind of money each year on undertaking emergency repairs.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister really didn't answer the question as to whether it's a fund that does continue over from one year to the next or whether any amounts from that \$800,000 or \$900,000 that he mentions do in fact lapse at the end of the year.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, anything that is left over of the appropriation certainly will lapse, but it's replenished. Each year we make an appropriation to that fund to assure that we always have dollars in place to undertake an emergency repair program which is unforeseen when we draw up the road program and select our major bridge locations for replacement.

MR. WALDING: Could the Minister tell us which appropriation that \$800,000 to \$900,000 comes under, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ORCHARD: 15(6), Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a 15(6); mine only goes up to 9.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, we better call it Resolution 85 then, Appropriation 6, No. 6.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have it now. I am not sure whether the question was asked at the beginning of the Estimates but I would like to ask the Minister whether there were any special warrants in this department since April 1st?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: Would the Minister give us details of them, please?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we've got a special warrant in the amount of \$6,598,800.00.

MR. WALDING: Is that one single warrant and was that the only one issued, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's one single one and it's the only one.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister indicate the purpose for the special warrant and the date of its issuance and what has it been used for?

MR. ORCHARD: I would have to check on the exact date for the member. We've got roughly \$1 million in the general salary increase. We had an increased winter maintenance budget last year because of the prolonged spring, and we had extra gravel that were used to restore the provincial roads which were ruined by the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: I wonder if the Minister, while we're on that item, if he would give us a breakdown on that in dollars.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the figures are roughly available and I don't know whether it would be necessary to give the exact dollars that we have in here or not. We've got a number of items, including a \$2 million over-expenditure in our construction because of last fall. We had two things working in our favor on this special warrant, if you want to call it working in our favor; we had an extremely poor spring which caused unusual levels of expenditure in the spring season and then we had a very good fall which gave us an extra shot in the arm in the construction season and got a little more construction done than what we had anticipated.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. WALDING: I wasn't asking to have the amount broken down into very great detail. I would like to ask the Minister then that, apart from the \$1 million that he has still unexpended from the special warrant, can he then assure us that the two major reasons for the special warrant were, first of all, the flooding that we had last year and the opportunity to do a little extra construction in the fall? Would that be the reason for the . . .

MR. ORCHARD: As long as you include the general salary increases, as well, because that took up very close to \$1 million and it wasn't only the prolonged winter and the extra maintenance, it was the spring weather which caused us to have to put extra gravel on provincial roads, so it was the prolonged winter and the long break-up period in the spring. But yes, and plus the construction period resulted in the majority of our special warrant.

MR. WALDING: Then, Mr. Chairman, since the Minister indicated to my colleague from Ste. Rose this afternoon that the balance of the approved authorization as of a year ago is likely to be expended by the end of March, clearly the figures that we should be comparing here is not \$137 million to \$149 million, but more like \$143.5 million to \$149 million, which would then indicate to me, Mr. Chairman, that the increase in Highways is more of the nature of \$5.5 million than the \$12 million which would appear from reading the Estimates. Would this be correct?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, close, Mr. Chairman, except that we did lose under lapse of two areas, \$1,668,000 or thereabouts, about \$1.7 million that we lost in the lapse which equated to the capital overexpenditure on our construction budget. So that, by and large, the majority of the increase that we have by special warrant, has taken general salary increase and the adverse spring weather takes up the majority of it.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the lapse to funds there that the Minister refers to of \$1.7 million, I think, was surely for the previous fiscal year, 1978-79. My comparison was with the 1979-80 year as with the projected 1980-81 year. So the lapsing really had nothing to do with the spending for the year which we are just ending.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, the lapse is in last year's capital.

MR. WALDING: So what we are then looking at, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to Highways, is an increase of some \$5.5 million for the coming year over the actual for the year 1979 to 1980.

MR. ORCHARD: Did you say what figure increase actually?

MR. WALDING: The figure I used was \$5.5 million, Mr. Chairman, and I arrived at that by adding the \$6.5 million that the Minister mentioned in Special Warrants to 137 that's shown in the Reconciliation Statement for the last year, which brings it up to \$143.5 million. I am then comparing that with a 149 that the committee is being asked to approve for the coming year, the difference being \$5.5 million.

MR. ORCHARD: Right.

MR. WALDING: No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(d)(1)--pass; 2.(d)(2)--pass; 2.(e)(1)--pass. The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Minister could tell us just very briefly what this section does, first of all.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, this traffic section is very legitimate. It's involved in a number of the traffic-related activities in the department such

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

as signals at intersections, your electronic flashing lights at your median divides, when you've got construction ongoing you've got your sequential arrow signs that divert traffic from one lane to the next, pavement markings, the kind of identification and signing projects, that we see on the highways.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, through you to the Minister. Where do they count cars? Where do they count traffic? In this section or somewhere else in the budget.

MR. ORCHARD: No, traffic counts are done under Planning, which is Appropriation 3., the next group.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, just in case I happen to miss Section 3, I would like the Minister to - or maybe I could forewarn him that I'll be asking for traffic counts on the Easterville Road, Camperville Road and 283.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes. I'm just wondering on this particular item, if there has been any studies made in regard to the intersection of No. 5 and PR 235; there have been a number of serious accidents, including some fatal accidents, on that particular section, and I'm just wondering if any studies have been made to improve the problem there.

There is a filling station there and there is a number of posts with reflectors on and if there's traffic coming from the west and anyone approaching that curve to turn to the west, it just almost blanks you out there, because of some of the signs that the business establishment - which is a legitimate business and we certainly don't want him to move away from there - we just want to know if there's any possibility or any studies made that we can improve there, because I know of at least two deaths that have taken place there, and maybe more.

There has been some other serious accidents where very serious injuries were involved.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that intersection is under some study with the District Engineer and the RCMP to see what might be a good solution to solving some of the problems that are at that intersection. There's a motel there as well, if I recall, from some of the correspondence.

MR. ADAM: That motel is no longer there.

MR. ORCHARD: That burned down, didn't it?

MR. ADAM: It burned down, yes. But I mean further east I think is where the accidents occur, is on that big curve there, with the business establishment, with the lights of the garage, the Shell sign there, and if you're coming from the south, really - even the other day when I was driving there - a car coming from the west to go east and maybe going to make a turn and turn at that filling station, you're just blanked out completely.

So it's a very serious accident-prone corner and I know that the Chairman brought up some points last year in some of the problems he was having in his area, and I just thought I'd bring it up.

Also I'd like to ask if, I think under this Appropriation here, the Highway Metrification, which nobody likes too well, but I guess that's all complete now, is it, the Highway Metrification Program?

MR. ORCHARD: By and large, all the road signs are converted to kilometers now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)(1)--pass; (e)(2)--pass; (e)--pass. (f)(1)--The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes. Could the Minister tell us how many district offices there are and where they are situated?

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ORCHARD: There are 12 District Offices. They are at Selkirk, Steinbach, Carman, Boissevain, Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Minnedosa, Dauphin, Swan River, The Pas, Arborg and Winnipeg.

MR. ADAM: Yes. I'm just wondering, looking at the Highway Program, where some of the . . . the Arborg District office, perhaps part of Dauphin. Is there one in that area, too, Lac du Bonnet or is that Steinbach?

MR. ORCHARD: Selkirk is the District Office.

MR. ADAM: Selkirk? It seems the way the program has been set up this year that some of these District offices could just as well be closed down. Is there going to be any . . . ?

I notice that there's an increase in staff of 12. Where are these people going to be situated since most of the major construction will be in southern Manitoba? --(Interjection)-- I'm concerned about the people who work on a part-time basis at these particular District offices, are they going to be transferred to other areas where all the work is going to take place, or are they going to have to go on . . . Their unemployment usually runs out come April and May and they usually go back on the highway for the summer months, but in view of the fact that there's practically no highway construction in all those areas represented by New Democratic Party members, I'm just wondering what is going to happen to all these people who worked in those areas?

Are we going to close out the Dauphin District office, the Arborg and Selkirk, or are we going to reduce the staff? Where is all these 12 people going?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, the Member for Ste. Rose has asked a number of questions.

First of all, construction is not the only undertaking that our district office has, so that the level of activity in a district office is not solely related to the construction program in any particular area. There's the ongoing maintenance that has to be undertaken, and patching and sign changing, and all the number of routine duties.

Now it has been past practice, an accepted practice in the department, where the road program does, from year to year, vary from area to area. . . . Call them "surplus staff", in the district offices, will be and are redeployed to areas where they may be needed to undertake construction projects.

MR. ADAM: Yes. Well, I had made a note here on my Estimate Book that it appeared that the district offices, some of them, would be relegated to road maintenance offices rather than to be in charge of any construction.

But my main concern is, what is going to happen to all those part-time workers from those areas who are depending on this work all summer? Will they be called up to go to other areas and to long distances from home and disruption of income for the summer months, because of the policies of this government, who sees fit to build out of 900 miles of road, probably 700 and 800 miles in southern Manitoba, mostly?

I'm excluding northern Manitoba here. I wasn't able to talk to the Member for Flin Flon on what's going up in the north there.

We're really shocked, Mr. Chairman, on what's taking place and we'll go into that when we get into the Construction and the Maintenance, I suppose.

But could the Minister assure us that those people who have been on call for a number of years, 7, 8 years, 10 years in some cases I suppose and perhaps longer, being on call to the district offices every spring as part-time employees, will they not be called this year in those areas, like Dauphin and Arborg and Selkirk?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly a great number of those people are going to have their routine job, because as I have said, the part-time employment in these offices is not solely hinged upon the construction program. There is a peaking of activities in the highways program in the summer months because that's when we do a vast majority of our maintenance and our summer maintenance work is a high level of activity. Those who have undertaken construction work will have available to them the job opportunities where available.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ADAM: In view of the fact that there is going to be a major decrease from some district offices and we see here a request for 12 extra SMYs. Where are these SMYs required if there is going to be a surplus of people in three or four district offices? Surely you don't need to have a district office in The Pas. We sure could close it out for this year or at least cut the staff down by 50 percent. And we could cut the staff down in Dauphin by 50 percent and we can cut the staff entirely out in Arborg, or 50 percent. We're just going to be dealing with maintenance. Where do we need 12 extra people, where are they going to go, Mr. Chairman?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the 12 extra people are taken on by district offices in accommodating the integration of the transportation services into the Department of Highways. And we have taken on 12 of the construction division and they have become part of the staff complement that was necessary when our department workload increased because we took over the transportation services.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I was looking at the figures here a while ago and it will be a little difficult to find the page, but I think we thoroughly looked into the transfer last year and it seems to me that there was 242 or 252 people that were transferred over because of this transfer. And I am just wondering where are they all now? Where are they all deployed? Is that in the construction area, the 796 that we see here further down?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman. What we had in the construction division of transportation services was 44 SMYs from last year, from 1979-80, and of those 44, our district offices have taken on 12 SMYs and at the same time, of those 44, as the Member for Ste. Rose is well aware, part of the construction function in Northern Affairs involved a water services program and as a result of that some 15 SMYs were transferred to the agricultural department to become part of their water division; and of the 44, 12 as I say, were absorbed within our district offices, 15 went to agriculture and 17 SMYs were declared redundant and eliminated.

MR. ADAM: Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there were 242, Mr. Enns advised us last year. How many of these were laid off and how many were absorbed in other departments?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, now I don't know whether the Member for Ste. Rose has arrived at his 240-some-odd members. We've got 44 under the construction division of northern transportation services which became part of the Department of Highways; and in that particular 44 category, or 44 SMYs, as I say, we were able to use 12 of them to accommodate within our district offices the construction function that was undertaken by the transportation services division prior to incorporation, or prior to amalgamation; 15 who were involved directly with the water services went to agriculture and 17, in that particular category, were declared redundant. So 17 job descriptions were no longer needed after the amalgamation.

MR. ADAM: There were more than 44 people involved in the transportation services, were there not?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, that may be, Mr. Chairman, that may well be, but not in the construction division which we are referring to here where the 12 men come from that went into our district offices.

MR. ADAM: I see. Is that the 12 we see here?

MR. ORCHARD: Yes.

MR. ADAM: That's a transfer from transportation services, and I thought that was done last year.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, it was done last year and we have now fully integrated them and put 12 of them into our district offices, 15 to agriculture and 17 were SMYS that we do not need and were declared redundant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)(1)--pass; (f)(2)--pass; (f)--pass; (g)(1)--pass. The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I hope I'm going to be in the right category here. Is this where I can talk about gravel trucks on the highway?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that would all depend on what the discussion on gravel trucks is going to be about.

MRS. WESTBURY: Well, there is quite a lot to be said. I'm concerned about the fact that they - and I suppose this is in part an Attorney-General's matter, I don't know, but it's something that happens on the highway anyway. And the fact that they are not properly covering their trucks. . .

MR. ORCHARD: Tarped, they're not tarped.

MRS. WESTBURY: . . . they're not tarped. Their method of driving and I don't care whether we're talking about private truck drivers or employees of rather large companies who send their trucks up on the highway, their methods of driving, and I have complained directly to companies, are really appalling. I think it obviously has to be a police matter as well.

But one of the things I have noticed is that in my frustration the licence plates seem to be on the back of the cab, and when they get the part with the gravel on it there's no licence plate at the back so that you can report them to the appropriate authorities. And this is something that I found extremely frustrating when I've been up on the highway and I don't know who, if you or somebody else is able to look after that.

I was just concerned with the general inspections. I was wondering if the weigh station, for instance, can't be brought in to help with the inspection of these vehicles. We get gravel and dust all over the cars as they pass and it's really quite appalling, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, let me assure the honourable member that in some regards I sympathize with her in some of her concerns, because I have met gravel trucks and got sprinkled. It is a matter which is subject to police enforcement, and in terms of the specific traffic inspection function, that our people will undertake at the weigh scales which is primarily the only place they come in contact with these people, is to recommend to them that indeed they tarp their loads or to assure. . . You see, if they are going through the weigh scales first off, they are apt to have a heaped load that is subject to falling over the sides because they are close to a scale and will be prosecuted or charged for overweight.

And that primary contact with our traffic inspection people normally, and I say normally, because there are always exceptions, there's not that great a problem with gravel in a position to fall off or blow off on oncoming traffic. And I can appreciate the problem on the identification of the plates. It's pretty hard to say to a police officer that that big red gravel truck dropped the gravel on you when you just met 25 of them on the road. I suppose there is no other way if you can't get the licence plate, is to take the fleet cab number off the truck to identify a specific truck unit. It's an ongoing problem and we certainly complaints from time to time on that.

MRS. WESTBURY: The only time I've been able to get a decent identification on the licence plates is when they are tailgating me so close that I can get it in my mirror. And, you know, this isn't necessarily all that reassuring.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)--pass. The Member for Ste. Rose.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ADAM: There is an increase of approximately \$100,000 in the highway traffic inspection and also perhaps a \$40,000 or \$50,000 increase in Other Expenditures. Well, there is 4 SMYs increase; could the Minister give us an overview of what's happening here? What these people are going to be used for? And why such a substantial increase in this traffic inspection?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the increase of the \$95,000 some odd dollars that the Member for Ste. Rose refers to in Salaries is due to the 4 additional inspectors that we are bringing on staff this year as well as general salary increase in normal increments. We are in a, I guess, a rather unique situation in that we're having to change our staffing patterns at both the West Hawk Scale and the Headingley Scale. Those Scales, Mr. Chairman, are operated on a 24-hour basis and due to some employee concerns about single men staffing on the graveyard shift, that concern has been recognized and we're now staffing the graveyard shift with two people, primarily for security purposes, I guess, it would be fair to say. And that's resulted in having to add 4 inspectors in order to now schedule a shift on the basis of 2 at midnight instead of the 10-4 shift pattern that we had in place prior.

MR. ADAM: The Minister mentions staff increases in this appropriation. I didn't think that there were any increases in that because I believe the last time we met the Minister indicated to us that the agreement hadn't been signed yet with Civil Service, with MGEA.

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

MR. ADAM: That came under. . . I'm not finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN Well, the Minister is speaking though.

MR. ORCHARD: Let the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: The Minister in his reply to the Member for St. Vital, he mentioned that there were special warrants issued last year in order to pay those salary increases. And I am wondering what's happening this year.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, whenever we're discussing an item, I think it's always best that we talk apples and apples, and oranges and oranges, and not apples and oranges. There is a major difference between the MGEA negotiation on salaries for existing Civil Service employees, and the increase of \$95,000 where we are in fact adding 4 brand new staff men, or staff persons to the inspection staff. It's an entirely unrelated situation that has no correlation whatsoever to the ongoing discussions, negotiations between MGEA and the Civil Service Commission. The MGEA fit in this discussion because some of the inspection staff voiced the complaint that they did not think it was safe for them to be on the midnight shift by themselves, with which the MGEA concurred and required us to double-staff the graveyard shift, a totally unrelated situation.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I understand that perfectly well. I'm not arguing that point, that it's going to cost us \$100,000 or \$95,000 more for four staff, SMYs. I was advised by the Minister awhile ago that when I questioned the difference of the figures on the left-hand column here, as far as Surveys and Titles, that was because of salary increases. Now, the \$95,000 doesn't disturb me because we have more staff on, but the Minister indicated that part of this increase was for increase in Salaries. Is that not correct then? Perhaps the Minister would want to correct himself on that.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, in each and every appropriation that we've dealt with under Salaries and Wages, part of the increase has been for the general salary increase and in increments. That's been the case in every single Salary and Wage appropriation we've had to date. We budget a certain amount for general salary increase, but we do not budget sufficient to cover the total salary increase. That's where the catch-up comes in.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ADAM: Is there anything else that the Minister could tell us on Highway Traffic Inspection?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Chairman, basically the ongoing duties of our Highway Traffic Inspection Division are to assure that franchises, equipment licences, dimensions, weights are all adhered to according to the regulations that we've got in place and to make effort to protect the integrity of our highway system by proper and legal use of the highway system by the driving public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)(1)--pass; (g)(2)--pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,435,500 for Highways and Transportation, Management Services and Engineering--pass.

3.(a) - the Member for Emerson.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I have a few concerns about Planning and Design. When your departmental people work in terms of PTHs and PTRs in terms of taking up right-of-way, is there a standard formula that is being used throughout the highways?

MR. ORCHARD: If I understand the Member for Emerson's question, is there a standard width of right-of-way that is acquired for road reconstruction?

MR. DRIEDGER: That's right.

MR. ORCHARD: By and large, yes, although it can vary for our heavier roads, the ones that are going to be 80,000 to 110,000 pound, gross vehicle weights, we will generally acquire a 200-foot right-of-way. On some of the provincial roads where the traffic is lighter and not, say, as numerous as the 1,000-2,000 vehicle per day average that we have on our PTHs, we can go for somewhat less of a right-of-way take.

MR. DRIEDGER: The reason for raising this question was that I listened to the former Minister of Highways this afternoon explaining the need for long-term planning and the situation in Manitoba, where we have one major city where over half the population lives in Winnipeg, I can foresee that on the main arteries leading into Winnipeg where they should be definitely long-range planning in terms of possible four-laning, etc., etc. When we talk of forgotten constituencies, something like Emerson, where we have lesser traffic coming through, I wondered whether the same rules should apply in a situation like that, where at a time when we're concerned under land use policies, about use of agricultural or losing agricultural land, whether we should apply the same kind of criteria in situations like that as we do closer to the city.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, we can get into an interesting discussion here, and I don't disagree in general terms with what the Member for Emerson is saying that, for instance, and let's use a corridor which is familiar to all of us around this table, the Winnipeg to Selkirk corridor, where we have had substantial development pressure, substantial strip development along the highways. Definitely the circumstances of control, should we be able to go back 25 years and impose them, would be much more stringent in that area where there is high traffic count and high development pressure than quite possibly it would be for an area such as yours and, let's say, down in the Piney area.

Our concern shouldn't have to be nearly as much as it is in that Selkirk area. However, the main purpose of particularly our PTHs is to offer, not only local traffic access to a decent highway, to a good highway, but generally they provide through corridors and in accommodating through traffic the main objective is to get them from point "A" to "B" as quickly and as hazard-free as possible. That's where we can say that the same sort of rules may well apply, even in Piney, in terms of putting a subdivision with access on to PTH.

MR. DRIEDGER: I can well appreciate the concern but normally, when we get closer to the larger centres, we have a much heavier traffic load type of thing and I'm wondering whether it would be . . . You know, just a suggestion that your

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

department has all the traffic counts available, in terms of traffic moving in and out on the various roads, whether a different set of standards could be used on the more extreme rural areas than we do closer to Winnipeg.

MR. ORCHARD: I think there is a certain degree of latitude in that right now to accommodate some additional access to, particularly PRs, not necessarily PTHs, particularly the main thoroughfare PTHs, but that's certainly a subject that I haven't got a closed mind on and I'm open to suggestions and discussion on it.

MR. DRIEDGER: I just wanted to make the point that possibly sometimes, maybe, your departmental people get a little over-zealous in terms of the right-of-way that they acquire and tie up, which in some areas possibly isn't quite warranted. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a) - the Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I have a less important point, I think, but, nevertheless, it's one that I'd like to raise and that has to do with signs and one particular sign in particular. The Member for Lac du Bonnet would be also, perhaps, familiar and make sure that I'm not making a mistake but I've noticed it on several occasions and I still think I'm right.

When you are coming 59 South to Winnipeg and you hit the Perimeter Highway, the sign says Brandon to go on to the Perimeter, and Winnipeg straight down 59. I am thinking, Mr. Chairman, in the context of tourist who doesn't know Winnipeg, as a stranger, because that's the way I frequently find myself driving in other places, if I was driving on the highway coming into Winnipeg, I would not know that I could get to Winnipeg by taking the Perimeter and going down No. 9. I would drive, because that says Brandon and when you go straight, it's Winnipeg. The Member for River Heights is nodding, so maybe he has seen that as well.

Now, I would assume, and I'm not saying that it's a great number of people but a large majority of people driving down 59 would know that they could go the Perimeter and come in through North Winnipeg, but I'm talking about the person who is not familiar with Manitoba, who may come down Highway No. 15 or may come down Highway No. 4, having taken the sort of scenic route, rather than No. 1 east from the Falcon Lake area. If he goes up No. 4 or if he goes up No. 44, if he goes down No. 15, then he will - excuse me, he won't hit it by 15, he has to be on 44, excuse me - that, and maybe I'm being somewhat chauvinistic, I don't know, but I think that the way in which you see Winnipeg best is coming through the north end of Winnipeg, that you come down, you see the large Ukrainian Church on Redwood and Main, which stands out as a beacon. You drive through the north end, which is a wonderful place, as we all know. You see the older downtown area and then the Richardson Building as you approach Portage and Main.

You don't get that kind of a view going down 59, which brings you into St. Marys Road; not St. Marys Road, Marion, you come in on Marion. You go straight down 59, you have to come in through St. Boniface, that's what I'm saying. --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry, all right, I don't know the street, although I do it all the time myself. I believe that there should be a sign there saying, "Winnipeg via North Main", or "via Main Street", or "via Highway 9", so that the driver who's coming in has an option of either going straight or making that turn and hitting Highway 9 and taking the cloverleaf into Winnipeg. And I'm not an expert on why they sign things in that way; I rather suspect that the people who make the signs hope to keep traffic off that route, so as to relieve what may be a heavy traffic load going through to Main Street.

But it wouldn't largely interfere with the amount of traffic that comes in because you're just dealing with people who don't know the area. A person who knows will pick whatever route he wants, in any event. A person who doesn't know, they follow the signs. He drives and is guided entirely by the signs and you cannot tell, coming 59 towards Winnipeg, that you can get to Winnipeg by taking the Perimeter and going down No. 9. Now, is there a reason for it that has escaped me? I believe I may raised this in the House several years ago and nothing was changed, so is there a reason that has escaped me as to why it must be the way it is?

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the member's observations. It's the first time I've heard him mention this.

MR. GREEN: No, you weren't here.

MR. ORCHARD: No, that's the first time I heard him mention that.

MR. GREEN: Is it right . . .

MR. ORCHARD: The first observation I might have, Mr. Chairman, if this was to the benefit of the tourist public, who are unfamiliar with Winnipeg and the scenic route that the Member for Inkster has indicated in coming into downtown Winnipeg, would "Winnipeg via North Main" mean anything to those people unless they knew that North Main was the scenic route type of thing?

MR. GREEN: They would at least know that there are two ways. The way it is now, you think if you turn that sign you go to Brandon, period. I mean that's the way to Brandon, not the way to Winnipeg; whereas it is a way to Winnipeg, and a person coming in at least knows that I can turn here or I can go straight. I can take my choice. Some traffic would then take the North Winnipeg route. Now, how you indicate that this is a - and I can't even say it's a more scenic route; I don't want to run down the other route - but at least it's an optional route and some North Winnipeg . . . First of all, I think it's a better view of the city, myself; I think it's the best view coming in from that area. Secondly, it would, I suppose, do something for some of the entrepreneurs in that area, some of the drive-ins or restaurants, etc., would get some of the traffic that is just arriving in Winnipeg. As the way it is now, that escapes them completely. And I hadn't been approached by anybody to say that I'm losing business. I'm not suggesting it from that point of view. I'm suggesting it from the point of view of indicating to people that there is another way of getting into Winnipeg from Highway 59.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairperson, the Minister indicated this is the section that does traffic counts and I know that the department guards those traffic counts as if they were the formula for the Atom bomb or something.

MR. ORCHARD: Zealously.

MR. McBRYDE: But, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if they would loosen up their security enough to give me some information on a couple of roads in my area that I mentioned earlier.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, we would want to have of course the utmost assurance from the Member for The Pas they have no ulterior motive in requesting this traffic count information.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, one of the uses that the department gets upset about is if you use these traffic counts and say, well, there's more traffic on this road than that one, therefore you should upgrade this road first before you upgrade the other one. And, Mr. Chairman, that's precisely one of the reasons that I want the traffic count.

MR. ORCHARD: Are there any particular roads that the Member for The Pas would like traffic counts on?

MR. McBRYDE: As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairperson, the Easterville Road or the Easterville shortcut to Winnipeg joins No. 10 and No. 6, and the comparison to that would be further down No. 10; that is if there's a traffic count below the Easterville cutoff, between there and Swan River or between there even and Overflowing River, if they have that information.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we have a traffic count on 327 just west of the junction with No. 6 Highway. Would that be of value?

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that would be of value. That would give the traffic both going to The Pas and going to Easterville.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we haven't got them here but if the Member for The Pas would like to give me a list, we can make those available.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, for it to have some accuracy you would need a couple of traffic counts on that road, if they have them. I'll take whatever they have in terms of information. If they have one where the Minister mentioned, that is fine, and if they have one further on that wouldn't count the Easterville traffic that's travelling between Grand Rapids and Easterville or Winnipeg and Easterville but would grab the The Pas-Easterville traffic, that is further west of the Easterville turnoff.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, when we get on what is classically known as the Easterville road, that portion that's beyond the surface section that goes up to Easterville itself, we don't maintain traffic counts on that stretch of road, the by and large undeveloped section of road. We don't have traffic counts on that.

MR. McBRYDE: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, the Minister lost me when he says "undeveloped" because hopefully it's going to be even more developed than it is but it's a main road at this particular point in time, as the traffic count will show.

MR. ORCHARD: Right. But to explain my comment on "undeveloped", the member, I think on Friday, indicated that that road should have been in this year's program and was not, and that's what I meant by the unreconstructed portion of the Easterville road, shall we say.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, one other purpose of these traffic counts is some comparison or to understand where the traffic is moving. So then besides the Easterville road traffic count, then a traffic count on No. 10 south of the Easterville Road; that will be between the turnoff to Easterville and Overflowing River or anywhere between Swan River and that turnoff would do.

The other traffic count, Mr. Chairperson, that I would like is Highway No. 610, the ManFor access road and the second ManFor access road which is unnumbered, which is known as the Umperville Road.

MR. ORCHARD: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. The member wants the traffic count on the ManFor access road.

MR. McBRYDE: On the ManFor access road, No. 610, Mr. Chairperson.
And I would also like . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Are those one and the same, though?

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, 610, that's one ManFor access road. There's a second ManFor access road that is known as the Umperville Road and that cuts a number of miles off a person going from The Pas to ManFor. I'm informed by the workers at ManFor that the Umperville Road in fact has as much traffic on it or more traffic on it than the ManFor access road because it's a shortcut for the workers who work at ManFor.

Mr. Chairperson, I believe that road of course is also used by the residents of Umperville and passes through part of The Pas Reserve. I know that there's been a traffic count on that particular road so I wondered if I could get the figures from that particular count.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, if we do have that Umperville Road count, yes, we'll make that available.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, the reason I would like that especially is for a comparison because the Minister is planning on spending some dollars this year on 610, the main ManFor access road, and I've been urging the Minister, the government, even the previous government, Mr. Chairperson, to do some work on the Umperville ManFor access road because that road is, I understand from the workers, more used and these figures will give me that information, whether or not that Umperville Road is used more than the main ManFor access road and paved one.

The other one, Mr. Chairperson, is the traffic count on Highway No. 283, which is the other one that the Minister should be proceeding with work on. It's paved on the Saskatchewan side. It's paved part-way on the Manitoba side, but there's a section that's not paved and that's been in the planning, as I said earlier, for four years or five years.

So if we'd get some count from that particular road to see if that would back up my contention that people from Flin Flon and Thompson use that road as well, we're going into Midland, southern Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Chairperson, those are the key ones. But I'm assuming that as situations come up during the year that the Minister would also be willing to make that information and other counts available to myself, and other members, from our side of the House.

I wonder if he could just confirm that.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, we will make the traffic counts that the member's requested, available. There may be a couple of them that we just don't have, and if we don't have them, well, we can't make them available.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, my other question on this section is a more general one, and that is: How do the decisions get made in terms of what is to be designed and what is to be planned?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of factors enter into what goes into the planning and design stage, safety factors as we've mentioned earlier on. There is the general condition of the road surface. The traffic count is a consideration. The utility of the road, i.e. is it a dead-end road servicing, let's say, a dead-end group of communities? Is it part and parcel of a major thoroughfare or a major traffic corridor? There are a number of factors fit into the equation of what road it's going to survey and design.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. The Planning and Design section of the department would be a Winnipeg or a centralized function. Is that correct?

MR. ORCHARD: No, not completely. This particular appropriation deals with our Planning and Design division, which is located in Winnipeg. But each of our district offices has a Planning and Design function inherent in the district office, as well.

But this is the central co-ordinating group.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. I wonder if each regional office, then, prepares its priorities in terms of things that should be planned and designed and forwards them to the Assistant Deputy Minister, or the Deputy Minister. How does it work?

MR. ORCHARD: Each district has a, I suppose you would say, a set of priorities that they have for their particular district, and they are fed in to the system by a Planning and Design in Winnipeg, for an eventual decision on a total road program.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, does this section then - and I'm not sure what the designation of the person in charge of this particular section would be called, whether it's an ADM or a director, or whatever - are decisions made there then or does it go straight to the Minister's office, or how does it work?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, as the Member for The Pas can well appreciate, the number of requests that we receive from the district offices plus the number of

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

provincial requests, which originate in the Planning and Design directly in Winnipeg, which they are the overall planning authority for the total province to get - as you can well appreciate every district office has parochial interests - and the planning function has to correlate between a balance of parochial interests and the overall provincial need in a given area.

And each district office, coupled with the Planning and Design in Winnipeg, will have a number of projects which are going to be put before the department any given year for any given value of construction voting, and I think it's fair to say that there's roughly three times the requests in terms of work requests, to the amount of funding that is projected to be available to undertake that construction, at least three times.

So a considerable filtering out has to be done to prioritize a road program on any particular year.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the planning and designing stage would be like one stage of a series of stages have to be gone through before we get to drive on a new highway, and I'm wondering whether the decision to do planning and design is basically a decision to construct, or is there a number of plans and designs done before any decision is made, that it will go beyond that stage?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Member for The Pas' question, the planning and design stage itself does not necessarily mean that next year you're going to go into construction, because maybe when you undertake your planning and design, you will run into some unique problems that take longer to resolve.

But planning and design is the initial step to the upgrading of any road. No road goes directly into a construction type of thing. You have to have your survey and design done at some point in time. If you need it right away, that has to be done at some point in time, before you get to your construction program.

MR. McBRYDE: I'd ask the Minister then, Mr. Chairperson, if there's ever, or very often a no-go decision, i.e. the design work is done, the planning work is done and then that road is never constructed.

MR. ORCHARD: It might even be fair to say that that decision is probably made more often than the decision to construct, because as I've said, on any given year the plans and designs for roads, there might be three times as many roads in the program ready to be constructed as can be undertaken in a given year because of the limitations of the budget.

So naturally I think there's more times a road is turned down for construction than there are times when a road is approved for construction.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, how long would it take then for the Highways Program that the Minister presented us with last week? What is the lead time required? When would the planning and design work for these particular bits of work have been done?

MR. ORCHARD: Well, that would vary quite a little bit. Some of the planning and design may well have done four and five and six years ago. Probably the minimum time it could have been done for actual construction, which is what I think the Member for The Pas is referring to, would be probably two years ago because you have to have your planning and design and right of way, which is generally a two-year step.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I guess I was pursuing this line of questioning because I am wondering if I have been unfair to the Minister giving him the full responsibility for the present program and the fact that it seems to be, especially in this other area and in certain constituencies, giving him full blame or credit for the fact that there seems to be a lot more work being done in Conservative constituencies than NDP constituencies, if in fact the planning has been done and had to be done one or two years ago in order to get the program ready to go. So maybe I've been unfair to the Minister giving him the full responsibility and blame for what I see is the existing program when some of that should go to the

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

previous Minister, who is not here, and whom I was giving some credit for for being more fair in terms of the allocation of highway expenditures.

But, Mr. Chairman, it would appear then from the Minister's comments though that this section does planning and design, also would get considerable direction from the Minister's office in terms of what priorities are and where to proceed with the design work because of the time consuming and expensive work to prepare for new road building and upgrading or paving of a gravel road, etc.

I am assuming then, that at this particular stage, the planning and design stage, that the Minister would have a pretty direct input and I wonder if the Minister could comment on that.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, you know, the planning and design, I certainly, as Minister, as all Ministers, not only in this administration but in previous administrations, have had a very direct input as to where the planning and design on roads and the road program goes to in the province. And that has always been the case, Mr. Chairman. The planning and design in terms of my particular interests as the current Minister, is to try and accommodate some of the road upgrading that needs to be undertaken in this province because of rail line abandonment as one immediate concern that we have in the province, and naturally we had diverted some of the planning function to address that very urgent and very pressing problem.

MR. McBRYDE: I don't think I have any other questions on this subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, just in response to the matter that was raised by the Member for Inkster earlier, having gone before the Highway Traffic Board on a number of occasions on behalf of the city and had discussion regarding the signage with the transportation and traffic planners of the Highways Branch, I know that some of their considerations are, that as people are driving on the highway and you have signs up, that it's well to keep the verbiage on the signs to an absolute minimum because they're driving at 90 or 100 kilometres an hour and it becomes confusing if you give them several options. I suggest that if you were looking at a sign such as he is suggesting, say Brandon, you could say - or Winnipeg via north Main, or Winnipeg via McPhillips, then you start to offer them many options and it becomes rather confusing and tends to actually be a danger factor. I think you would find that as you were approaching there, earlier on would have a sign that had the Maple Leaf emblem and a No. 1 that said West Brandon via Perimeter or via 101, which is the numerical designation. That would be maybe a mile or 2 kilometres before you hit the sign that actually says Brandon West, so they would define it ahead. And I think they have to assume that people who are approaching the city are approaching it with a map like this, so that if they are coming to the Perimeter they know ahead of time that they can go directly through St. Boniface into Winnipeg, or if they want to take their options and they know they are coming in, the map tells them they can go on to one of the other designations such as north Main or McPhillips.

That, I think, are some of the considerations that the traffic engineers have. And they like to keep the information on their signs to a minimum. I know we tried to convince them on behalf of the city to put some additional information on signs at the Perimeter and it ended up taking us three or four meetings to convince them of this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Member for River Heights for at least something that has the rationale of an explanation. Having been experienced in driving, and doing a lot of it, it doesn't work that way. You don't . . . especially when you are coming to a place like Winnipeg, which is not a tremendous metropolis, it's 550,000 people, you follow the signs and get to Winnipeg. And the fact is, if you are coming in on 59, you miss the north Main route. It's not a terrible problem which should cause anybody to lose any sleep, but I would ask the department to look at it and see whether, when you're coming south on 59, you

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

can't do something more sensible, or more informative, about advising that there are other ways into Winnipeg.

Speaking of signs, I too was a municipal councillor back in the days of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, which was foisted on the citizens unilaterally by the provincial government. I like to use those terms now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to municipal governments, so I will revert to them.

And I can remember an argument, out of which, to this day, I can not make sense out of. The idea of having traffic routes through Winnipeg, which could be identified, was an excellent idea. If one wanted to go from the northern part of the city to Charleswood, and one had a map and could follow the major routes, there'd be no problem. But they insisted on numbering these routes like 90, 80, 70, and I said, "Why do they have to be numbered that way? Isn't it possible that somebody will look at that 90 and say 90 kilometres?" At that time it was 90 miles, or 80 miles. And they had like encyclopedic explanations as to why it had to be that way, none of them which made sense, as far as I am concerned. And now we have all of these signs in Winnipeg, which are route signs, and a person not knowing that they are route signs - and many Winnipeggers don't know route signs, look at them and they see a figure which could be a speed limit.

Now, it's been my impression that highway signs avoid that. I mean, No. 9, everybody knows you're not going 9 miles an hour; No. 44, No. 15, No. 610, etc.. But in Winnipeg the route signs are 90, 80, I can't think of all of them, but they are signs which --(Interjection)-- there are 50 and 60, well that's just awful. If they're that bad, then it's even worse. And I know this is not your jurisdiction but --(Interjection)-- well, 41 I don't think a person would mistake as a speed sign; 50, yes, but not 41; 75 is a tough sign. 75 is a sign, because I think that Highway 75 extends and extends. In other words, if you started changing that number, it extends down right through the middle of the United States, No. 75. 83, well, but 83 is not a speed sign. I don't think anybody would recognize 83 as a speed sign. 75 is a problem. --(Interjection)-- They've changed which? Well, if they've changed some of the route signs, then I would hope that they would change the others so that they cannot be mistaken.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)--pass. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: I tried, Mr. Chairman, to follow up on the Member for Inkster on the point of the signs. The member makes a very good point, Mr. Chairman. For the tourist or the person who is not fully familiar with the road system, who hasn't studied the map in advance, it is a problem. They do get misled. I know that I've had a number of MLAs who couldn't find my particular residence, because when they get down to No. 44 Highway, it says Selkirk that-away, and so you take the Cloverleaf. You take a different route altogether; it doesn't say Selkirk further down north, you see. So I suppose it's something the department should take a look at.

If you look at Lac du Bonnet, there is a sign just before you get to Sedden's Corner, and it's Lac du Bonnet straight ahead, but it should be Lac du Bonnet through Milner Ridge, but it doesn't say that, you know. So people head straight down to No. 11 and 44, which is quite a piece further. You could go a short cut, ten miles less, through Milner Ridge and you come right into town. So there are a number of these anomalies, and I don't want to be terribly critical. I think the Member for Inkster made the point, and I would hope the sign department takes note of it and perhaps comes up with something. I just wanted to support the position that the Member for Inkster. . .

MR. GREEN: Thank you for your support.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, while we're on these large matters of urgent public concern, there is some validity in that. I am still personally mad at the City of Saskatoon, because three times trying to just go through it, I got lost because it's not posted well enough to tell you how to get through the place; you have to stop there.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

And in light of the signs that the Minister mentioned, I'll mention another one that the Minister might want to take a look at while he's looking in that particular area. And that is, when I first came to Winnipeg, I guess probably the first or second session I was in, I wanted to go to this place called Birds Hill Park, and so I just got in the car and drove out 59, that would be the way to get to Birds Hill Park. And there was a sign that said Birds Hill, and it pointed off, so I went up there and found this nice little community but I couldn't find the park there anywhere at all. Along with the sign that says Birds Hill, which is the small community there, there should be another sign that says the park is straight ahead. A major point for you to consider.

MR. ORCHARD: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)--pass; 3.(b)--pass. The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, is it proper on this item to discuss a great separation? Mr. Chairman, I believe that, again, this is within the confines of the City of Winnipeg, but it is part of the provincial program I believe, in co-operation with the city that they discuss these major thoroughfares, and particularly such a thing as a great separation. Now we've had the experience, Mr. Chairman, in north Winnipeg, of having it acknowledged without a shadow of a doubt that there is need for an additional route crossing the CPR tracks. I believe that when I was born, which is fifty years ago, there was the Main Street Subway, the Salter Bridge might not have been built, it was built in the mid-Thirties, the Arlington Bridge, and the McPhillips Subway. That's what you have now. That's 30, 45 years of progress. And in the meantime, the population of that area has, oh, I would think it would be four times at least. I mean, you've had all of West Kildonan, you've had Tyndall Park. And for years, north Winnipeg has been put off on the basis that they were going to get heaven, that they shouldn't settle for a different route, because they were going to get - the Messiah was coming. The tracks separating central Winnipeg from north Winnipeg were going to be removed and therefore why build another route if it's not going to be necessary? And, I suppose, when you hear that for the first time, it sounds plausible.

But, in the meantime, the linking of central Winnipeg to north Winnipeg has been avoided year, after year, after year on the basis that there may be a rail relocation. And if anybody says, "Are you in favour of rail relocation?", it's like saying, "Are you in favour of motherhood?" Yes, I am in favour of rail relocation. I don't dispute rail relocation. But I do say that one should not avoid making the artery on the basis that rail relocation may never come, and if it does come, we will have an additional artery. It's possible to build an overpass which would travel at a separated level from the ground, even though it didn't cross rails, and that is done in many cities. I mean, there are many thoroughfares which cross over land where there are no railways underneath.

So, if Winnipeg is to have rail line relocation, that's all very well and good. But, in the meantime, there should be something done to deal with this problem. And it's acknowledged, nobody disputes it, nobody says that you don't need another route. I am, Mr. Chairman, going to suggest that, at the very least - and I'm not even suggesting this, that it should be the least - that there should be another grade separation going into north Winnipeg, and I suppose the obvious place is Keewatin, where there is a completely new area there, the Tyndall Park area, and north of Tyndall Park, the Inkster Industrial Park, is held up and it's more than five minutes. Some, I think Mr. Doern, the Member for Elmwood, used to talk about that there's a law that you can't block the intersection for more than five minutes. Now, the Nairn overpass came, after much agitation on that point.

Well, there should be, in addition to Sherbrook and McGregor, in addition to rail line relocation, none of which we've got, but in addition to these other things that we don't have, there should be a grade separation on Keewatin so that the traffic does not have to wait to go to those streets. And I am just wondering whether there have been any discussions with the city of Winnipeg with regard to that type of a facility for north Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)--pass; 3.(b).

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, can I have an answer to the question, whether the city of Winnipeg has made any application to the provincial government for that type of facility, for grade separation at Keewatin?

MR. ORCHARD: To put it into a country boy's terminology, you're talking about the McGregor overpass?

MR. GREEN: Oh, no, this is in addition to the other things that we don't have. We should have another thing that we don't get, and that is that there should be a grade separation planned for on Keewatin, which we have to wait until . . .

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that we haven't had any discussions with the city of Winnipeg on the Keewatin one.

MR. GREEN: There has been no discussion? What you're telling me is that the city of Winnipeg has never approached the provincial government for a grade separation at Keewatin.

MR. FILMON: It's in the five-year capital plan and it has been approved both by the city and the province.

MR. GREEN: It's been approved both by the city and the province?

MR. FILMON: Right.

MR. GREEN: I'm getting that from the Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: As former chairman of Works and Operations, that's factual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: But, Mr. Chairman, if I might - under the block funding that we have undertaken with the City of Winnipeg - that may well be part and parcel of their five-year capital budget for upgrading, but it's nothing that the dollars aren't specifically earmarked by the provincial government to go into a specific project, a block of dollars are set aside.

MR. GREEN: I gather that the City of Winnipeg has indicated that this is in their five-year plan. What is the plan - the five-year start from, the year 2000?

MR. FILMON: 1979 to 1984.

MR. GREEN: 1979 to 1984; so we're even talking within four years, if the city of Winnipeg proceeds as planned, there will be a grade separation on Keewatin. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)--pass; 3.(b)--pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,411,000 for Highways and Transportation, Planning and Design--pass.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - LABOUR AND MANPOWER

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members to page 70 of the Main Estimates, Department of Labour and Manpower. We are on Resolution No. 91, Item 3.(e)(4), Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement--pass.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to address the member behind me. What item are we on, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The one I just stated, I think. Item 4; no, I'm sorry, it's item (5)(e) Subsection (4), Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement.

MR. USKIW: Yes, there's no figure opposite that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've run into that problem before. It's listed, so it is under discussion.

MR. USKIW: I see. I wonder if the Minister would explain to us what that particular item is for.

HON. KEN MacMASTER: It was all gone through before the break, Mr. Chairman, but I can certainly go through it. It's the northern travel program to assist people in the northern communities, to help them have the opportunity to travel to other parts of the province of Manitoba. Last year, there were approximately 1,800 children that took advantage of that particular program, of which many toured this particular building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll just add to it. It is Sub (a) Northlands Youth Travel, and (b) Less: Recoverable from Northern Affairs, and there is money allocated to those departments.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, the Minister indicated how many people took advantage of that program last year. Could he indicate how many people took advantage of that program in 1977, 1978 and 1979, and who is anticipated to take advantage of it in 1980? We're talking about numbers of students now.

MR. MacMASTER: In the previous year there were 1,200; last year there were 1,861; and we project about the same number next year, approximately 1,800 again.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, I just want to check and make certain I am on the right item here. I have a number of press releases from the Information News Services discussing the Northlands Travel Plan. Would that be the particular program under discussion now? And it says that on February 2, 1979, it says that the Minister said that he expected that 2,200 students will be able to participate in an educational travel experience through the assistance of this program. Last year, he said, just over 2,000 students, grades 3 to 12 took part, so in 1978 we would have 2,000 students and then it would be expected I guess in 1979 to be 2,200. And then in 1980, we see the same news release, and we don't have the specific . . . excuse me, we do have the specific numbers. It says, "During the 1978-79 program year, assistance was provided for 45 travel groups, including 40 schools, and a total of 1,207 students." So there seems to be a wide discrepancy here on the actual students participating from year to year, and also on the anticipated rate of students participating and the actual numbers of students participating. Perhaps the Minister could take the opportunity to explain why it is that discrepancy seems to follow from year to year.

MR. MacMASTER: I can't explain it entirely. I know that in the year 1978-79 there was approximately 80 percent of those that were eligible to apply, and so applied, and that equalled 1,207. I know that last year, there was 91.4 percent of those eligible to apply that applied, and that equalled 1,861. So, the 8 or 9 percent that did not show a desire to participate in the program would have brought it up over 2,000. We could project quite easily another 2,000 next year.

I am saying with the excellent increase in participation, there is a good chance that next year it might be 2,000.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, in the press release on February 2, 1979, it said that the Minister said last year, he said just over

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

2,000 students, Grades 3 to 12, took part in this program. Is that a correct figure then, that just over 2,000 students took part in the program in 1977 - it would be the 1977-78 year?

MR. MacMASTER: I haven't got that number for 1977-78.

MR. COWAN: Well, that's from his own press release, Mr. Chairman. I'm not certain as to whether I'm interpreting the data correctly or not. But the point that I would like to make is that the funds for this have stayed constant, or have stayed relatively constant, yet we know the cost of travelling. Anyone who travels to and from the north knows the cost of travelling has increased drastically over the last number of years.

So, if that is the case, and if the funds have stayed constant, what we've actually seen is a decrease in the service under this particular program. And it is a program that's of some value to - well, it's of great value - to the students in the north, because it gives them an opportunity to come down to visit this building, which is of some significance to some, but also to go into other parts of the city to acquaint themselves with the city.

So, we can only hope that the level of the funding for that program keeps up with the level of inflation so that at least, at the very least, the same number of students will be able to participate in that program in the future. It's not a major point, but I think it is a pertinent point that one has to make, that inflation is eating away at a number of the programs, and that they are suffering service-wise because of that. So, having made that point, I would just encourage the Minister to build in increments in this program so that the inflationary rate does not soon dissipate the program entirely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass; (b)--pass; (4)--pass; (e)--pass. Resolution No. 91--pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,242,900 for Labour and Manpower. Manpower Division, \$8,242,900--pass.

Item 4. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, Resolution No. 92--pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, the Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets is composed of three items: Manitoba Special Municipal Loans Program, which is for \$1 million; the Community Services Service Workers' Project for the City of Winnipeg, a program that we cost-share with the city to enable them to take people off the welfare roles and put them in meaningful employment throughout the city, \$182,000; and there is \$30,000, which has been an ongoing thing for the last several years. This is the air compressor stations for the Fire Commissioner's Office, and that will supply three of them for areas throughout the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4). The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Could I ask the Honourable Minister if he would elaborate a little bit on the city employment program, \$182,000.00. Does he have a report on how - I have had reports up till about a year ago - how many of those people have moved off this program into regular employment outside of this, and what the turnover is, and how many have sort of fallen back onto the welfare roles as not having found the program successful? I know it was working very successfully. I just hope that it continues to do so.

MR. MacMASTER: I don't have the precise assessment of the program. It's another area that I have said on the way through that we think we should reviewing along the exact lines as the Member for Fort Rouge said, where they are going and how successful the program is. Her words echo some of the words that I spoke of here two or three times, in fact, before we broke at suppertime, where I said that all programs of this type, all of them, should be reviewed as to the clientele and where they go, and to follow up on them and see just how successful your program is, and to keep in touch with them and see what success they're having as they enter the other work market.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

We know that there are 33 positions, and we know that during the course of the years, these positions are filled by other people. We do not have a total number of involvement from last year; we're waiting for the final audit from the city, to go over it with them. We hope at that particular time to initiate a follow-up of whether - let's pick a figure - 12 people got into this program out of the 33 and moved on to better jobs. We certainly hope that is the case. We're going to be reviewing the audit with the city of last year's - what is deemed to be a "success", and I put success in quotation marks because I'm sure we can do a better job of it. And together in the forthcoming year, we're going to put in a system where we know, in fact, and we have a follow-up, in fact, of where the people are going after they've leave this particular program. So, the points that the member has made are very legitimate ones, I agree. I have said repeatedly that that's the type of follow-up that we plan on doing with all our programs.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Chairperson, I take it then that the Minister will share that information with the House when he receives it. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. There seems to be a misnomer in the heading of this department. From the figures that the Minister has given us, the item is headed Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets, but the Minister is now talking about programs. I understand that the first one is a Manitoba Municipal Loans project. Am I correct in what the Minister said; \$1 million? The one for \$182,000 is a joint project that they have with the city of Winnipeg, which is again labour-oriented, and the only amount that I think the Minister - I just didn't quite get what he said, it's something to do with constructing of fire stations or something, \$32,000. Can the Minister explain why it is headed up Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets, when we are really not constructing or acquiring physical assets for this line that appears in the Estimates? And while he is getting that information, I wonder if the Minister could explain why we see nearly, well, in fact, over a \$4 million reduction in this program from last year, which we had an item of \$5,255,000 and this year it's \$1,212,400.00?

Of the program that was in place last year, how much was actually geared to acquiring or constructing physical assets that are required by the department, and how much of that item that is under consideration at the present time was in actual job-oriented, labour-intensive projects, or programs? Because either there is a wrong description of what this line in the Estimates are, because I take it, to my understanding of the English language, acquisition and construction of physical assets is something tangible that you can see. And if they are - I'm not arguing that we shouldn't be spending this money on these types of projects, but I think that there is something wrong with the heading of the item as we see it here. Because if we are only acquiring \$32,000 worth of actual physical assets out of the \$1,212,400, I think that the Minister owes us a better explanation than what he has given us so far.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, the Municipal Loans Program is, in fact, partly a capital intensive program where the government many years ago set up a large fund to work with municipalities, and that fund is coming to an end this year. The program, all stages of it, ends this year, this fiscal year. The \$1 million is meant to carry over any of the programs that haven't been quite completed, so that's why it's under Capital and Physical Assets. The air compressors certainly are pieces . . . they're assets; they are compressors that go to air compressors.

And the other program was from the Inner City Works Program which was, I suppose, one time, some place, possibly had some capital in it, and this is a chunk of it that's been carried over in that particular heading. It's a good point. I suppose that could fit better some other place, and I'll take that particular program . . . I'll keep that program in mind next year and locate it someplace else as a cost-shared program with the city of Winnipeg on manpower development of some type.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. JENKINS: Then the \$182,000 item, the Minister said that this program is coming to an end. This is the end of the program, with the exception of the one that we cost-share with the City. Is that what the Minister is saying?

MR. MacMASTER: The \$1 million Municipal Loans Program, that's at an end this month, March. Next month, I'm sorry. And the \$1 million we're asking to carry over next year to finish off the projects. The other two programs are not ended, and next year I'll certainly take into consideration that inner city works' program, and I think it's fair to say, we'll locate that some other place.

MR. JENKINS: Of the reduction from last year to this year, how much of that was under the Manitoba Municipal Loans' project last year? Was the bulk of the \$5 million - \$4 million of that remained here was for Physical Assets?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)--pass. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I wanted to know if it would be appropriate, and I presume from the sort of questioning that has been going on, that it would be, to discuss welfare subsidized employment programs relative to the City of Winnipeg on this particular point. --(Interjection)-- Yes, programs that are subsidized by this level of government in the welfare employment related area. I say that to you, Mr. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . honourable member that this is Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets, rather than welfare subsidized programs.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, and I don't what I - I wasn't listening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister admitted that one of the items, in respect to this, which is a cost-shared city and provincial item, is not really physical acquisition of any assets, but is a cost-shared employment program, and I think that's what the Honourable Member for Wellington is trying to refer to.

MR. CORRIN: I thank the honourable member for his assistance. I should have probably been paying more detailed attention to what had transpired. Mr. Chairman, as I'm sure the Minister is aware, roughly in January of 1979, the federal government by virtue of its Canada Works' grant regulations, was called upon or saw fit to withdraw its support for an employment program in the inner city of Winnipeg, known as the Community Home Services' project. At that time, there was considerable controversy because neither the federal government, nor the City Welfare Department or City Council, saw fit to extend funding to the program in order to facilitate the continuation of the program and retain, not only the employment of the former welfare recipients but also the level of service to the community that has been put in place.

And just digressing further, Mr. Chairman, in this regard, I would indicate that Community Home Services' project was providing a service whereby welfare recipients went out to projects involving senior citizens and handicapped people, whose homes needed repair and maintenance. They did things like shovelling snow, cleaning yards and basements, attics, painting, things of that nature, around these people's properties. In any event, the funding that had been authorized pursuant to the Canada Works' grant came to an end. The project was beset, of course, with funding shortages, and was in a position where it appeared it would have to either lay off most of the people that were employed through its auspices or drastically reduce the service level in some area or another. And, although there was a great deal of discussion and controversy, neither the federal government nor the city government were able to provide any assistance, at least initially. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that a request for funding assistance to the province was also denied.

I'm not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the province had any direct responsibility for the ongoing success of this particular project. They certainly weren't

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

responsible for any sort of ongoing maintenance subsidy or assistance for Community Home Services. But it seemed to me at the time - and that's why I raise it tonight - that there should be some means, some mechanism, that allows the provincial government or, at least not allows the provincial government but would move the provincial government to provide this sort of assistance in order to redress that sort of situation.

I'm advised, I've done a bit of research and, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that ultimately the Home Services project was maintained because the Winnipeg Foundation provided bridge financing assistance. And I would indicate that the Foundation did that on an exemplary one-time basis. It's not really within their terms of reference to provide this sort of exemplary assistance to this type of service. But they decided, after evaluating and assessing the program, that although it was outside the general terms of reference - or I should say the specific terms of reference - of their agency, that it still merited this sort of consideration. And, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, what upsets me is that, if not for the intervention of this community-minded organization, we in Winnipeg would have lost a very beneficial program, a program that put approximately some 50 former welfare recipients to work doing very constructive and useful tasks for people who would otherwise go without.

Mr. Chairman, in the few years I've been in this House, I am aware that such programming is supported by the provincial government. There are these sorts of affirmative action programs funded through the auspices of this level of government. But I wonder, Mr. Chairman, why we can't take a more activist and interventive approach in those sorts of crises. I would advocate not only that we participate fully and assume responsibility for that sort of programming, but also be ready to sustain it and maintain it in times of critical emergence.

And, having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask you whether - or I would ask the Minister through you - whether there are any plans afoot to work in closer co-operation with the civic welfare authorities in order to promote this sort of concept, this sort of employment - call it what you will - affirmative action employment concept in the welfare employment area.

I don't have the figures with me, Mr. Chairman, but I certainly know that there are certain substantial, call them cost transferences, simply inherent in this sort of concept. Rather than direct funding by way of social assistance the government simply can transfer that sort of assistance, that sort of social allowance to the recipient in this less direct, but more constructive fashion.

It seems to me that conceptually this makes a lot more sense, Mr. Chairman, than the more traditional form of welfare goal. It seems to me that this sort of programming implies virtually a certain dignity. It gives people an opportunity to acquire and attain a certain dignity and allows them to fulfill a much more useful function and role within society.

So, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I would ask whether it's within the scope of feasibility and probability, that this government will entertain a more activist interventive approach to this sort of programming, a firmer adherence to this sort of concept in the future, in order to not only ameliorate the lot of those who are on social assistance and welfare but also in order to better the lives and the quality of life of our more disadvantaged people, namely, handicapped and senior citizens.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, the first thing I have to say in reference to what the member has been alluding to, he made the point that he had thought someplace that maybe the provincial government had been involved with a request. I know of no such request in my particular department. This is the one program that I am involved in. I know that Community Services are possibly involved in other programs and I am not really sure what they all are.

The member might not have been present, possibly in the other committee, when I was explaining to the members. And I've explained it to them on several instances as they relate to several programs, that we have to evaluate our programs in about three different ways.

We have to evaluate the people - and that's the important part of any program - and we have to evaluate the program itself, how it's successfully serving the people. And as I think the Member for Lac du Bonnet - I forget who it was - a member opposite mentioned while you're doing those things you certainly must

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

evaluate the dollar value of the program, as it relates to the program itself.

I mentioned before the member came in that we expect to receive the audited statements, not only audited dollar-wise but audited program-wise, how the city saw that program go last year.

We expect from that point on to set up a system in conjunction with them, seeing as we are funding this and spending the taxpayers' dollars in the year 1980-81, that we expect to set up a system of evaluating the program I presently am responsible for.

So I guess the simple answer to the member is that I, personally, have not had a request. I don't know if Community Services have. I intend to evaluate the program that we are now involved in, evaluate it very thoroughly.

I intend to set up a system in conjunction with the city of a follow-up where the people are going, what's happening to them? Are they getting in and getting their feet wet and moving on from there to something better?

Hopefully I think we all share that and hope that that is the case. And once I have determined that then I may suggest to others, who might be involved or might not be involved at that particular point, if the values of the people and the program and the hours all look good, then I'm not adverse to expanding this program, or something else, at a future date.

But I want to evaluate what I have in place and what I'm responsible for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.--pass. Resolution 92--pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,212,400 for Labour and Manpower. Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, \$1,212,400--pass.

We will revert back to Item 1.(a) Minister's Compensation, Resolution 89. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we're now back to the Minister's Salary, after what I think has been a very constructive review of his Estimates, and which I think all of the members of the House, whilst maybe not agreeing with all of the programs or the philosophies as expressed by the Minister, at least appreciated the fact that he dealt in a conscientious way with the various questions that were raised.

At the beginning of these Estimates, Mr. Chairman, I did speak on a particular subject which is very close to me, namely, the state of industrial relations in the province, and particularly the state of collective bargaining, which is an area which I have been involved in both in the legal and political sense and as an individual, for many many years. The Minister certainly indicated that he saw no reason to depart from the principles that have guided this Chamber for some years with regard to freedom and collective bargaining, and I appreciated that.

I also indicated, Mr. Chairman, that I would bring to the attention of the Minister, from time to time, what I think are problems in this area, and particularly pressures which are designed to improve the position of one group or another at the expense of the broader position of free collective bargaining.

I do, Mr. Chairman, have some information which I would think is of potential danger, because it explains and relates to some of the activities that have taken place over the past year, and also can relate and explain some of the problems which the Minister made be confronted with in the future.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will recall that there was a construction strike in Winnipeg in the spring of 1978. It was a bitter strike, and a long strike, and largely brought about by an employer agency which thought that it was time to create a strike for the purpose of undoing conditions of employment, which had already been achieved by people in the labour force.

And that strike was unsuccessful, Mr. Chairman, both from the point of view of the people who perpetrated it and also from the point of view of its results for the province of Manitoba, which proved quite disastrous in terms of the amount of productivity that we got that year.

And from time to time, Mr. Chairman, I have indicated that it's been my view that the strike was caused by the Builders' Exchange, and particularly by one of two persons who bargained on behalf of the Exchange.

Now I want to pass to the Minister copies of two pieces of correspondence, and I will read it into the record before I table it, Mr. Chairman. This is December 1978. Now I don't know. Had the strike ended by December of '78? I believe it

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

did. The strike had ended. And it's addressed, Mr. Chairman, from the Winnipeg Builders Exchange Labour Relations Council to C.H. Desrochers, Secretary, Special Project Sub-Committee, 85 Albert Street, Ottawa, Ontario. I would assume that's a department of the federal government, but I am not certain of that. What is important to me, Mr. Chairman, is that a copy of this letter was sent to the Manitoba Hydro as information and responded to by Manitoba Hydro. And I am not certain, Mr. Chairman - the letter makes my hair stand on end, not so much the letter itself, but the response, and I'll read it to you:

"Dear George: Re Manitoba Situation Major Projects. Because Manitoba has been outside of the main stream of industrial development, our experience with major projects has been sparse. We would summarize as follows: Manitoba Hydro, for the past ten years, has customarily entered into ten-year no-strike, no-lockout projects' agreements for each major northern hydro power development project as each was started, . . ."

Departing from the text now, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that these agreements were hailed by both management and labour and the government as being the most healthy form of labour relations, and which did result in construction of the Nelson River projects with virtually no problems, no industrial breakdowns, which apparently is not satisfactory to the writer of this letter, that something has been done without industrial disputes for a period of ten years. I'm going back to the text:

"currently has several and final stages of completion and one limestone just starting. Agreements with the Allied Hydro Council of Unions and fixed conditions of work for all trades, monetary items, 'free ride' on local agreements. Picking up Hydro agreement is prerequisite for working on site. In peak years, 1976-77, up to 50 percent of Manitoba's total unionized work force was employed under Allied Hydro Council agreements. Since local unions hold strike and ratification votes on the basis of their entire membership being the voting constituency by means of mail-in ballots or by placing ballot boxes on northern projects, we would judge the impact on local settlements as severe during peak years. No firm commitment for future projects exist, but it is generally assumed that even Manitoba Hydro recognizes that any extension of their current 'free ride' system to thermal projects in southern Manitoba, would cause the collapse of local bargaining with consequent ruinous settlements.

Accommodation proposed by our Council is:

1) In return for Manitoba Hydro, not opposing sector accreditation or seeking a separate sector, we would live with their existing 'free ride' agreements. A Hydro development trade division would be set up within our Council to handle bargaining for their future projects if requested.

2) Both Council and HPMA", I guess that's Hydro Project Management, "to advocate", listen to this, "both Council and Hydro Project Management Association, HPMA", those are the initials, "to advocate a change in the existing Labour Relations Act, to restrict strike and lockout votes to those who will be participating in the work stoppage and provision for ratification votes on the same basis, both to be government supervised.

3) Failing 1) above, as an absolute minimum, no 'free ride' collective agreements would be entered into outside of the Nelson River Hydro Development Plan.

Other Project Agreements: Atomic Energy of Canada, Pinawa site; Churchill Forest Industries, The Pas; and Simplot Chemicals, Brandon; have all used 'free ride' project agreement approaches.

Established Mining Companies: Certain mining interestes have encouraged project or interim agreements for development projects and have been accommodated by their contractors. We now understand that following the Cominco initiative in B.C. their next move may well be to have their construction done with steel workers either in-house or by contract.

New Hydro Initiatives: Although no policy statement has been published, we understand that Manitoba Hydro is considering an open tender policy for future power development projects. That is, bids will be accepted from union industrial craft or non-union contractors and awarded on the basis of price and competence only. Certainly this policy is applicable to their 1979 Great Falls project.

Consensus of Council: Despite the fact that all our members are tied to international craft unions, the open tender method appears to us to be the only viable

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

long-term solution in the public interest. The competition in such cases does not end with the award of contracts. Industrial craft and open shop work forces would quickly recognize that future employment was a direct function of job site performance. Frankly, we are unable to visualize any other effective mechanism for assuring productivity and controlling settlements on major projects."

And the next line, Mr. Chairman, is an indication of what this man is prepared to do. You see, he knows what he is suggesting, because his next line is: "Any resort to labour violence to curtail this competition would require rigid application of the rule of law."

So what he is suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that what he is proposing will result in labour violence, and that the way you deal with that is rigid application of the rule of law. For ten years, for twelve years, we have had comparative industrial peace in this area. We have had the projects proceed without hardly a dispute, or any material dispute. But this man says, "We are unable to visualize any other effective mechanism for assuring productivity and controlling settlements on major projects", and then says, "Any resort to labour violence to curtail this competition would require rigid application of the rule of law".

"Workers would have to be protected in their right to be mobile between competing work forces (right to work) and contractors would require the right to spinoff corporate entities to avoid being trapped in an uncompetitive environment". And if you had a . . . I mean, this is one of the oldest forms of labour avoidance known, that you spinoff a corporate entity and run it under a different operation. "Yours truly, George R. Akins, Director of Labour Relations".

Now, Mr. Chairman, nobody should be surprised with hearing a letter like that from Mr. Akins; nobody. And I don't read it to astonish anybody. I read it as typical George Akins. And the Minister then knows the problem that he has in the Builders Exchange and in the construction industry, and what type of thinking caused the strike last year.

Now I will read what I believe to be hair-raising, Mr. Chairman. Not Mr. Akins' letter, but the response. Because the response, Mr. Chairman, is from G.M. Feldmann, Project Manager, Long Spruce Kettle Projects, and A.A. Gould, Administrative Manager, Long Spruce Kettle Projects. We are no longer talking about the Builders Exchange. We are talking about the people in charge of a construction project of a Crown agency in the province of Manitoba, and this letter is dated the 26th of January, 1979. Labour Relations, it's from J.M. Feldmann, Project Manager to A.A. Gould, Administrative Manager. It's an internal memo.

MR. FILMON: How do you spell that name?

MR. GREEN: F-e-l-d-m-a-n-n. Do you know the man? --(Interjection)-- Oh, I see, no, no. Boy, there's quite a difference, yes, that's right. Labour Relations Letter, G.R. Akins to G.H. Desrochers. "The subject letter reviewed a no-strike, free-ride, sector accreditation, interim agreement, open-tender, etc., is obviously a major situation the field of labour, that the HPMA is best equipped to influence, if not determine, Manitoba's Hydro's policy. This review is intended only to articulate the present situation and, hopefully, to assist in determining a more appropriate management-labour framework, in line with societies' today needs. The contractor's representative, G.R. Akins', letter to the Labour Relations Council somewhat overstates the case, in view of Manitoba's Hydro's postponement of large construction projects." He says that Akins overstates. That's being charitable.

"Nevertheless, this subject, which has contractors under negotiations with unions on one side, and the Allied Hydro Council umbrella for all trades with the no-strike, free-ride situation on our projects on the other side, is not conducive to healthy management-labour climate. There is no doubt that the larger AHC umbrella, compared to the number of southern trades people, the more influence on labour negotiations. The costs cannot be calculated. We should not put off implementing changes today just because we are a smaller portion, hence less influential on the labour situation. Indeed, because of this smaller labour portion, it may be less difficult to implement and set a precedents." I think that Mr. Cass-Beggs said that engineers are illiterate. I really don't think that's a kind remark, but it says "set a precedents."

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

"G. R. Akins says that even Manitoba Hydro recognizes that extending the no-strike, free-ride to southern Manitoba would cause ruinous settlements. I don't think anybody in Manitoba Hydro has any intent towards that extension, but rather the reverse intent is or should be manifest. We have an open tender for Great Falls and we might realize some measure of success, especially if right-to-work legislation was enacted.

The make-up of this relatively small repair job is a favourable field to re-introduce open tender. This project is largely civil with small electrical mechanical content, its schedule doesn't have the financial burden, jobs are scarce and the work force will not live together in a camp, all of the things which, hopefully, militate against collective bargaining." Jobs are scarce, the work force won't live together, therefore, they won't talk together, therefore, they won't organize, etc. "All of these things are of influence, and the measure of success should not be interpreted as applicable to all projects, regardless of size, location and complexities. We have to follow the law of the land, and we should not forget the fact that it is one law applicable to all people, contractors and labour, not only Manitoba Hydro. All too frequently, we tend to overreact to the possible damage that might be caused by militants and because of over-worry on the". . .but if this occurs, etc.

"We end up by forgetting the most paramount concern. This concern is the long-range effects and the responsibility we have to society at large, of which we are a part. Unfortunately, most labour situations are emotional and do not stand up to a reasoned analysis, and assumptions have to be introduced. No doubt, everyone will agree that trade unions are irresponsible." I repeat, this is the Hydro management people. "No doubt, everyone will agree that trade unions are irresponsible. However, the contractors have contributed to that irresponsibility and Manitoba Hydro, by the no-strike, free-ride situation, have also contributed." That this allied, trade counsel for the Hydro has also contributed, apparently.

"There is no way a price can be put on this situation. Manitoba Hydro savings versus Manitoba Hydro increased direct costs, plus the increased overall cost to society, cannot be clinically measured. Let us make a few widespread assumptions to picture how this might unfold. Let us assume right-to-work legislation is enacted and a no-strike, free-ride item in the AHC umbrella is turfed out. This item could be turfed out, merely by having a collective agreement terminate each year, coincident with the union agreements. In spring, all agreements have run out, an impasse is met, and a general strike is called. Long Spruce, as an example, is struck. No doubt, a very high portion of striking staff would leave the site for Winnipeg. We would not close our camp, but would have to cancel our subsidy to board and room. A similar treatment should be accorded those accommodated to Gillam." Look at the scenario that is being painted to substitute for industrial peace. Isn't that something?

"A contractor on our project should be treated the same as any contractor elsewhere in the province, that is, an extension to contract schedule work time is available. That if the contractor has a problem, because there is a strike - an extension to contract scheduled work time is available. I haven't heard any substantive argument to underwrite any of the contractor's losses during a strike, but must support a helpful attitude towards strike settlement, but non-interference in the contractor's business." So there would be a helpful attitude, and I don't know what that means, Mr. Chairman. Frankly, it frightens me silly. G.R. Akins mentions AECL use of free-ride, AECL hands-off policy. It sounds like a good theory but, in practice, it doesn't work.

"As an example, at Dorsey station, during project 81, the carpenters had installed the urinals and the plumbers objected. To settle the impasse, D.K. Mason had the plumbers remove the urinals, carry them downstairs, carry them upstairs again and re-install them, all during off-hours. All strikers went back to work, with both the carpenters and plumbers thinking they had installed the urinals." So that was as a result of some suggestion that is made here, which I'm not frankly able to understand at this point. All we know, is that in order to get the thing continuing, they had to resort to a subterfuge.

"There is no question that this jurisdictional situation resolution was unorthodox and that Manitoba Hydro AECL, the AECL station manager prompted the contractor to this action and illustrates hands-off doesn't work. The contractor would have undoubtedly resolved it by himself at some time, but not as quickly as

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

he did with some unofficial prompting. At Radisson station, all contractors took out temporary permits with the union to similarly illustrate that, in effect, the hands-off policy of AECL is unworkable.

"Summary:-

- (1) The no-strike, free-ride system should be terminated.
- (2) the open-tender system at Great Falls cannot be compromised or credibility is lost." Now, the open-tender means that it doesn't matter whether it's union people or non-union people who do the work, and they don't have to enter into this contract.
- (3) "It would seem an open-tender and AHC system are not compatible. Perhaps with AHC in a modified form as labour co-ordinator and the HPMA in an ombudsman role, a workable complimentary system could be devised for large projects.
- (4) Right-to-work legislation would be very desirable.
- (5) Manitoba Hydro's posture should be helpful towards strike settlement but non-interference in the contractors' business.

"Whether or not Right-to-Work legislation is enacted, Manitoba Hydro should seize this opportunity to implement changes. G.R. Akins' letter is timely, and the climate is conducive to change." What does he mean by, "the climate is conducive to change"? If Mr. Akins' letter is timely, and the climate is conducive to change.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that that man wrongly perceived the climate, that he perceived that the climate was, that the Minister of Labour was going to be pushed around by groups of that kind, that the government was conducive to affecting changes on behalf of the Builders' Exchange.

And I said, Mr. Chairman, last year, and I say this year, that I will compliment the Minister if he released that, but I will also bring to his attention, that he is dealing with very difficult forces to resist. And I bring this to his attention - I expect that it has not been brought to his attention before - and that he get in touch with his Minister, the Minister responsible for Hydro, and find out whether Hydro's policy is to try to affect labour relations - not by collective bargaining - because I would almost be willing to take anything if it's freely negotiated, even if the employer uses his strength as against the strength of the employees.

I have put myself on the record many times in saying that unions are going to lose some strength, and I will accept that in the name of collective bargaining. But this isn't free collective bargaining. This is saying that we're going to get the government to make these changes so that we will have a better climate, so that he will be able to deal with these people, and part of the climate, as is envisaged by Mr. Akin, is labour violence, which we will deal with by rigid application of the law.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I introduced this subject to the Minister so that he will know that at all times - at all times, and it never ceases - there are people on both sides of the fence who are looking for the inside.

I'm really quite happy to have sat in this House during the entire Labour Estimates without hearing from this side of the House, that the Minister has to introduce all kinds of changes in the Labour Relations Act to help the employees. I mean, I thought that that was a major thrust on the part of the New Democratic Party. Needless to say, I have been badgered about it until three or four months ago and now it's no longer a problem, which is a great accomplishment as far as I am concerned.

But that kind of thing will happen, and I am giving you an example of the kind of thing that you are going to have to cope with, and particularly when it comes to unions that are engaged in crafts and when we are dealing with people who are hoping that their problems will solve - not by free and legitimate collective bargaining - but by using the government to accomplish what they themselves cannot accomplish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Member for Inkster bringing these points to my attention. He did say he would send me over a copy of the other letter from Hydro. That's an extremely interesting document.

The member makes reference to the free collective bargaining process, something that I first became familiar with I suppose when I was approximately 16 or 17 years old in the logging camps in British Columbia. And I think the concept of free collective bargaining is one that is probably the best in the world, even with its faults. And I intend to, as Minister of Labour, to preserve that concept to the best of my ability.

The strike that took place that the member made reference to in 1978, was one that certainly was damaging to the industry, to companies, to people, to the economy, and one that I have often said publicly to construction people, to trade unions, to Chambers of Commerce, to anybody who wanted to listen, that in my opinion there was a degree of hatred that was building in to that particular situation between those two bodies, and I describe them, Mr. Chairman, as a disease that I wasn't prepared to let spread.

I think our departmental staff, my Deputy Minister, my ADM in particular, and the Cam McLean Committee, some of them have worked extremely hard to cut out some of the disease that was growing and festering in that particular situation.

I am not dreaming that things are going to be all well forever. That isn't the way it is and that isn't what collective bargaining is all about. You do have your difficulties, and a good many people, much better men than myself, in the past have learned to live with that. You learn the words of compromise and accommodate, and I think that's what we're going to see in that particular industry in the future. I take great pride in the fact that I have good people around me; that's helped to resolve this situation to a degree.

The 10-year long term agreements that were established with the Hydro and northern Manitoba are ones that I think were good ones. I think all parties did well by them. There may be those that feel they can demonstrate that that's not a fact, but I haven't had that demonstrated to me.

The Great Falls and Seven Sisters upgrading contracts that the Hydro had, there is an agreement in effect with three particular trade unions, who are the bulk of the unionized people who are in that particular operation, and that's the labourers and the teamsters and the operating engineers. Hence, similarities on a smaller scale to the long-term contract that was established in northern Manitoba.

I should say to the Member for Inkster, and to anybody else who wants to listen, that regardless of what Mr. George Akin has written, regardless of whether he was representing the Builders' Labour Relations Council of Builders' Exchange, that that particular group, Northern Manitoba Federation of Labour, or any other particular group in this particular province, do not dictate to me precisely the type of labour legislation that will be brought into this particular House.

I think that I can rationalize with the little sense that God gave me, to sort out in my mind in consultation with, again, an awful lot of good people, the types of things that I think - and my philosophy - it's a very simple one and it goes back from a working one, not one that I got out of a book - that the types of labour legislation that will be brought forward in this province will be ones that I have worried about, and quite possibly worked at during my particular life or that good people advise me there's a need for change.

I don't know where Mr. Feldmann or Mr. Gould get the idea that they hold any particular position with any particular Crown corporation in this province, that think that they are going to convince me to introduce any type of right-to-work legislation in this House.

Other people may try. Obviously there's been conventions of associations of people who have tried. That has not been successful. There may be those in the future who try, but the gentleman who sits in the seat to my left here when this House is in session, the Premier of this Province, has said very adequately, "It shall not be," and the Minister or the MLA who is blessed with - and I call it a blessing - to be Minister of Labour of this province, I have said, "It shall not be."

So I don't know where these two gentlemen think that in any way, shape or form that they'll have enough influence in this particular province to bring about that type of legislation. I am sorry that the two gentlemen in question felt a need - felt a need, Mr. Chairman, to put the type of words - and that's the kindest

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

expression, because they are part of the English language - but I don't know where they got or felt they had the right to put those types of words into a letter and send it away where it could be read into this House.

To the best of my knowledge they're not involved in the industrial relations' scene with Manitoba Hydro, so I don't think they should, in all rights, be talking about the posture of Hydro as it relates to its workers in this province.

Manitoba Hydro today has without question some pretty tremendous tradesmen, some good people employed, they have a pretty good relationship with their employees in the province of Manitoba. And I don't reach that conclusion by reading that in a book either. I know literally, dozens and dozens of men who work for Manitoba Hydro, and they're pretty pleased with their employer and I should say here, that their employer is pretty pleased with them. I suspect that when the Hydro projects go on line, that Manitoba Hydro will work along with the government and anybody else who's involved in an effort to establish good, long-range planning in the form of long-range agreements with the construction trade unions in this province.

So I hope that nobody takes offence by these two particular individuals putting something on paper, trying to project falsely the position of Manitoba Hydro. I think the people in the industrial relations' sector of that particular Crown corporation are understanding and reasonable people. The facts are before us. The facts are that they are signing agreements. The facts are that I personally know, and I put a great deal of faith in the particular knowledge that I have about a lot of union friends of mine who work for that particular Crown corporation. They talk to me, and I understand that they have a pretty good relationship with that particular Crown corporation.

So I'm sorry that they put that on paper. And I don't know what climate they're talking about creating. I just look back on the last year or two, and I don't particularly care if the members opposite want to find fault with what's taken place in Manitoba. I suggest they look pretty deep to try and state in this House authentically, that labour relations in this province has deteriorated, because I don't think it has. I think with a little bit of help from a lot of people, and all the effort that I can put into it, I only hope - and I think everybody shares it - that we have better labour relations and industrial peace in the future. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I was going to apologize, because I'm going to go back to something - I understand I'm allowed to do that under this item.

I was going to apologize for not having been in two committees at once, but I realize that's a futile apology and I'm not going to be able to rectify it, so I'll just continue and thank everyone in the House for their patience in helping me as a new member to find my way around these Estimates.

I'm concerned. I'm talking now about (e)(2) Youth and Student Employment. I am concerned about the fact that there was a reduction in the budgeted amount of over \$200,000 in this item. It seems to me that students looking for employment in government in the past few years have been becoming increasingly frustrated about their opportunities, Mr. Chairperson. This cut indicates to me that there's a continuation of a policy of cutting back on student employment in government departments, in the hope that the private sector will pick this up. Well, the trouble with the private sector jobs very often, is that they don't offer on-the-job training in the student's field of study in most cases. The salaries offered, while they don't look too bad when you look at it as a per week or a per month salary, considering the fact that it's only a part of the year and it's not a per week or per month all year. Very often, or most of the time it's not enough to enable the student to continue with his or her studies through the year unless the student has additional help from the family or from other sources.

Students need more than minimum wage salaries if they're going to continue with their studies, Mr. Chairperson, and I suggest that if we're not going to provide the jobs for them in the government departments as has been done in the past, which will enable them to continue with their post-secondary education, whether it's university or community college, then we have to be looking at giving more

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

generously in Student Aid Programs, if we're not in fact going to be talking about education again becoming the prerogative of those whose families can afford to send them to the universities and community colleges - and I don't think anyone in this day and age really anticipates with any pleasure, a reversal to that kind of attitude to post-secondary education.

The students themselves have expressed concern over the tendency, and I felt that it was my duty in turn to bring it here and ask the Minister if he can give an explanation of this reduction in the budgeted amount, that differs from my assumption. I hope he can. I hope that we are not in fact cutting further back on student employment within the government departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: No, Mr. Chairman, we're not cutting back on student employment within the government. What we've done, is done away with a program that the federal government has an identical program in place.

The program we called was the Work-Stay Program, and the program the federal government has is where they were - I'm going by memory now - a \$1.00 or \$1.50 an hour that the federal government gives to industries to hire young people.

It's an incentive that the federal government has. We talked to the federal Minister. Both - how many governments do I go back? Last spring we talked to the federal Liberals' administration; - I'm guessing - last fall to the federal Conservative administration; and now the federal Liberal administration is back in place, and they have an identical program to this particular one, in place, Mr. Chairman. So that's why we cut that particular program out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's at this juncture that I want to take an opportunity to discuss Workplace, Health and Safety.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, this is an area which perhaps too many of us are unappreciative of, and certainly speaking just for myself, I can indicate to members present that the incident which has taken place near MacGregor, Manitoba, has dramatized, for me anyway, the need to be more vigilant with respect to this very important governmental responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday we in this House were regaled by the Minister of the Environment. He advised us that it was his - and he's in the House, and if I'm wrong, he can correct me, we don't have the Hansard records yet - but it's my recollection that he advised us that the clean-up at the MacGregor site was essentially the Canadian National Railway's responsibility and not the government's. He indicated that the province's concern was to ensure that there was no damage to the environment, that CN's responsibility was to protect the interests of their own property on the right-of-way, and the interests of course, of their working people on the site.

Now, Mr. Chairman, quite sincerely and candidly, I would tell you that at the time I felt that the Minister of Environment was playing a bit of an awkward and self-interested shell game. It occurred to me, Mr. Chairman, that he was not being absolutely responsible, not only in his relations to all the members of this House, but also with respect to his relations with members of his own front benchers. A member asks what this has to do with Workplace, Health and Safety and what we're discussing, Mr. Chairman. Well, I would indicate to the Minister responsible for Resources that it has a lot to do with it. Because it implied, Mr. Chairman, that - to me anyway, I drew the direct inference that he was suggesting - the Minister of Environment was suggesting, that it was the Minister of Labour's responsibility to deal with the fundamental, "non-environmental" aspects of the crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I would indicate that the Minister of Labour is, and he is aware, and has been aware for some time, of the dangers entailed in the usage and transportation of not only this potentially dangerous chemical, but also others. And I suggest that, Mr. Chairman, because I can tell you, I can tell all members of the House, that the Honourable Minister has for some years had the question of dangerous chemical mishaps on his plate.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

Mr. Chairman, it has come to the attention of members on this side that, as far back as November 17, 1978, the Minister of Labour and Manpower of this province was demonstrating a concern for the identification and handling of hazardous products in transportation in this province. Mr. Chairman, on that date, November 17, 1978, the Honourable Minister issued a news release. And, Mr. Chairman, with some degree of pride, I suppose, because he pronounced it to the world at large, he indicated that his Ministry was going to convene in conjunction with the Transport of Dangerous Goods Branch of Transport Canada, a seminar dealing with the handling of transportation accidents involving dangerous chemicals and other goods. Now, he made that announcement, as I said, some two years ago, almost some two years ago. He indicated, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps I should go into some detail, in the issuance of his press release, he quoted the remarks of an employee of his Ministry, Fire Commissioner, Auguste Thorimbert. And the quotation goes as follows, Mr. Chairman, and this of course reinforces the contention that, at least one Minister on that side was fully aware and cognizant of the inherent danger entailed in this sort of area.

Thorimbert said, and I quote: "During the past few years there have been several accidents in Manitoba involving dangerous goods such as anhydrous ammonia, explosives, radioactive materials and acid. With the amount of dangerous goods being moved by all modes of transportation increasing each year, the potential for incidents involving such goods is on the rise".

Well, Mr. Chairman, those remarks attributed to the Fire Commissioner Thorimbert were indeed timely, and did indeed forecast the critical emergency situation which has now arisen with respect to such an incident. Mr. Chairman, we would indicate that the government can't have it both ways. If the Minister of the Environment is only responsible for the environment, then I would submit that the Minister of Labour must be responsible for the formulation of standards which regulate the safety of workers in all workplaces.

And obviously, Mr. Chairman, this responsibility has been acknowledged and accepted by the Minister of Labour, because as far back as November 1978, the Honourable Minister saw fit to have a seminar - and I would indicate that there was an enrolment of some 100 people at the seminar convened in Brandon, Manitoba, in order to deal with this matter in some detail.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with what topics were on the order paper for discussion by the applicants enrolled in that particular seminar. Mr. Chairman, they dealt with the recognition and identification of dangerous goods in transit. That was one of the topics to be discussed. Mr. Chairman, they dealt with classes of dangerous goods and their hazardous properties. And you know, Mr. Chairman, one can't help but wonder, with respect to those types of items, whether they discussed the chemical known as vinyl chloride. One can't help but, and we're going to ask the Minister whether that was the case, Mr. Chairman; if he is banking questions, we want to know whether or not vinyl chloride was discussed. We want to know what sort of regulations pertain through his department to the handling of vinyl chloride. We want to know whether there was any concern expressed at that meeting by people who are familiar with the properties of vinyl chloride, and whether such concerns were ultimately translated into specific regulatory policy. Mr. Chairman, we want to know whether or not there was adequate information disseminated to the persons participating in that seminar relative to the hazardous properties of vinyl chloride.

To be very specific, Mr. Chairman, we want to know whether people at that seminar learned whether or not they should wear respiratory masks and protective clothing in dealing with that sort of chemical.

The Minister of Environment has told us yesterday that this is not his responsibility. Perhaps he is right. Perhaps the CNR is responsible for those matters, Mr. Chairman. But surely, it is the Minister of Labour and Manpower that sets the standards that the CNR must enforce in the workplace. Surely no one here will suggest that the CNR is a law unto itself. No member here will suggest that we have no power to regulate, we have no power to enforce certain standards in order to assure the well being and welfare of workers at the workplace.

They won't do that, Mr. Chairman. I submit they won't do that, because they have already acknowledged the significance of this sort of regulation in legislation. If it was important enough to hold a special seminar, if it was important for the fire commissioner of this province to report that there had been several

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

accidents involving these goods in this province, then one wonders, Mr. Chairman, why we hear so little of this. One wonders why it's only when several dozen rail cars go off a line, that we hear of these sorts of accidents. One wonders whether or not perhaps in some isolated incidents, a valve may have broken on a car carrying vinyl chloride in the main marshalling yards in the centre of Winnipeg. One wonders because of the rather undramatic incident that would be, whether or not there may have been a cover-up, whether or not the circumstances of that sort of mishap may never have been made public. One wonders whether or not there is any regulation that requires the reporting of that sort of event. One wonders whether or not people at this seminar were advised that it was the law of this province, or soon would be the law of this province, that all such incidents be directly reported to the Minister's office in order that his inspectors could immediately assess the impact and monitor the situation adequately.

One wonders, Mr. Chairman, one wonders whether the Minister of Environment and his departmental staff immediately contacted the Minister of Labour when those dozens of cars overturned. One wonders whether they had recourse to the regulations set down by the Minister of Labour's department. It's a bit of a shell game, it's a shell game, or a tennis game, Mr. Chairman, as long as they can keep the viewer wondering whether or not the responsibility lies in that court or this court. The Minister of Labour, CN, the Minister of Environment, federal government; as long as that can keep up, as long as they can maintain that sort of activity, the citizen gets short shrift, he or she gets short changed. Because the taxpayer can't identify who is responsible, who has imminent jurisdiction, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is the question that really devolves from this entire incident.

Who is it that's responsible? Is Mr. Axworthy correct? Is it only the federal authorities' responsibility to come in after the spill and make some assessment, perhaps do an evaluatory study? Is that the role of the federal authority? Is the Minister of Environment correct when he says that it is the employer's responsibility, they are the common carrier and must therefore bear the lion's share of responsibility and carry that burden?

One wonders what the Minister of Labour, because he has been auspiciously silent, one wonders what's passing through his mind, whether he feels it's fair that the ball be passed over to the CNs court, and indirectly to his court.

But we on this side, Mr. Chairman, I think at this juncture want answers. We think that the Ministers and the members opposite should advise us who they perceive as being responsible for what. What do they perceive as their areas of responsibility and jurisdiction? Because probably, Mr. Chairman, we can all agree, that if they misperceive their own jurisdiction, and they can do that, Mr. Chairman, without in any way being devious or unethical, they can honestly and sincerely believe that they are not responsible because something lies outside their jurisdiction. But, Mr. Chairman, if they do, and they are wrong, then who is responsible? Which public authority is indeed responsible for this sort of emergency?

Now, Mr. Chairman, even the people working on the site, a representative, an officer of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Workers, a Mr. A.F. Currie, called for a complete re-evaluation of railway safety with respect to the transportation of dangerous chemicals. He wanted to know, he wanted to know why his men were on that site without respiratory masks, without gloves. He wants to know why CN didn't advise them. Now the Minister should tell us. Was the CN wrong? Should the CN have had recourse to his departmental regulations, and should they have, after notifying the Minister, or after taking special precautions to monitor the environment, instruct that all these people pursuant to governmental regulations, that they were to don their protective garments? Were these available? We don't know, Mr. Chairman. We don't even know if there is an emergency supply. One presumes from this November 1978 press release, that there is in Canada a 24-hour emergency response centre. Fire commissioner Thorimbert indicates that the federal government was setting up a 24-hour emergency response centre to become operational January 1st, 1978, or excuse me, 1979, and he says that it will provide emergency personnel with technical information to deal with dangerous products transportation accidents anywhere in Canada.

So one wonders, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister of Labour tell us? Does he know? Did CN, since they were responsible, we're advised, did CN phone the

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

24-hour emergency response centre? Did they contact them? Did they say, what do we do? We've got vinyl chloride on the ground and in the air. We don't know exactly how to handle it. Did they have recourse to that sort of advice? You know, people have suggested, on the other side, that there is no need for an inquiry, that we don't need an inquiry into this matter, that the is being dealt with in a responsible fashion. Well, we don't know that. We don't know whether CN made that phone call. Now they may not have made that phone call for a number of reasons. If they didn't, one can speculate that they may not have even known about the 24-hour emergency response centre.

We were told that there is a special individual who works with the railway, or, excuse me, with Dow Chemical, who is on call for these sorts of situations. Did he know about the 24-hour emergency response centre? What sort of interrelationships exist? What sort of communicative liaison mechanisms exist as between the private sector and the public sector in this regard?

I mean, we now know that there was a resource. Yesterday we talked about Chemtrec in the United States, a similar resource, albeit it's a cooperative enterprise between the private sector and the public sector, but very similar to the 24-hour emergency response centre. Now the Minister for Community Services indicated yesterday, Mr. Chairman, that that was a sort of a red herring, that it was irrelevant, that was somehow misleading. But here we have evidence that we have a similar agency in Canada and we don't know, nowhere have I seen it reported anywhere whether or not they were plugged in to this crisis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the seminar I was discussing earlier did more than just deal with those first two items I mentioned, recognition and identification of the goods and classification of the goods in detailing their hazardous properties. They talked about crisis management in the vital first moments after an accident. That was on the agenda. They discussed that, they discussed the question of how to obtain help, emergency planning and also the command and control of the accident and various other related topics.

So, Mr. Chairman, this particular Ministry was aware of the potential hazard that dangerous chemical transportation presented to the people of this province, and indeed, to all of Canada. The question is, Mr. Chairman, what came out of that seminar? What sort of process did that seminar, and all the work that has been done by that particular Minister's department, precipitate in the public domain? This is what I want, and I think all members of this House want to know. Why were the CN workers not wearing masks? Was it simply because somebody came out, they knew all the details of vinyl chloride, and knowing all the propensities and properties of vinyl chloride they were able to through sophisticated equipment monitor the air standards and come to a purely scientific conclusion based on technical and empirical evidence, that the situation was safe, that there was no danger to human life?

Was that the case, Mr. Chairman, because, Mr. Chairman, if that's the case, if we can have that sort of assurance that that happened, and we can be told who came out, what sort of equipment they used to monitor, what sort of readings were determined, what sort of liaison went on between the Dow Chemical and CN and the Minister's office; if we can be assured that all those various liaison points were touched, then, Mr. Chairman, I suppose respectfully we owe the Minister, we owe several Ministers opposite, an apology. We've wrongly maligned their, what we perceived as being their inadequate response to a critical situation, and I will acknowledge that.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of any such pertinent data, in the absence of any information tabled in this House, in the absence of any recourse to a critical analysis and investigative inquiry into this particular mishap and its handling by private and public authorities, I say that we're entitled to make the sort of inferences, leave the sort of implications that we have. And I would respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that members opposite if they were on this side of the House, would do exactly the same thing.

Yesterday the Minister of Environment made what I thought were some callous and rather uncalled-for remarks about his departmental critic on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman. He indicated that he thought that that gentleman was making some sort of political hay out of the issue.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it wasn't until the Honourable Member for Churchill stood in his place, I think it was last Wednesday afternoon - it may have been Tuesday

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

afternoon, but it was after the first Ministerial statement presented by the Minister of Environment, it wasn't until then that members of this House and the public even knew what vinyl chloride really was. He had in anticipation of the Minister, been able to detail the harmful properties of vinyl chloride. And one wonders, when one member, with no research resources, without the comforting backdrop of an entire Ministry and it's staff at his behest, can bring that sort of information to bear to the House, one wonders why the Minister of the Environment couldn't have done likewise. And I say that with respect.

Mr. Chairman, and I don't like to do this, but I would suggest and I think it's incumbent for me to say this publicly, I would suggest that if there was a politically opportunistic thing that was done, it was the employment of a government airplane to fly the Honourable Minister of the Environment to the site of the derailment. And I am not given, Mr. Chairman, to making those sorts of statements lightly, but I would suggest, I would suggest that there was very little he could do in conferring with the workers at that site, he would have been better in contacting the 24-hour emergency response centre in Ottawa, or wherever it's located in this country, and gathering the information that the Member for Churchill brought to bear a few moments after he made his prime time Ministerial statement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we heard the Minister of the Environment tell us that Dow Chemical has never had a report of anybody ever getting cancer from the use of this product. He said that. He was on his feet a few days ago and he indicated to us that he knew of no such case. And that was reported as well in the paper, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a textbook which my honourable friend from Churchill has provided to me known as "The Chemical Hazards of the Workplace", published by J.B. Lippincott & Company in Toronto, authored by Dr. Proctor, Ph.D. at the Keiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation, Oakland, California. That qualification should recommend itself to the Minister of the Environment because he is always dependent on private sector or participation in the affairs of his ministry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Mr. Arnold Brown (Rhineland): The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is, as I said, a textbook, rather current, which talks about vinyl chloride and, Mr. Chairman, it's easily obtainable. It's on reference, as the Member for Churchill found out, at the University Library, and I'm sure at several other places throughout the province, maybe even in the Minister's office. It says, and I'll just read, because I don't want to in any way distort the findings of the author: "In four facilities engaged in the polymerisation of vinyl chloride for at least 15 years, the study of workers exposed for at least 5 years, revealed a significant number of excess deaths due to malignant neoplasms. Thirty-five deaths were observed; 23.5 more expected." They go into considerable detail about the exact nature of the cause of death.

Another analysis in another report, I quote: "Over 30 cases of angiosarcoma of the liver," and I believe that's cancer, Mr. Chairman, "have been reported among vinyl chloride polymerisation workers in the United States and nine other nations." One presumes that Dow Chemical's polymerisation workers are not included, Mr. Chairman, but in that regard, I would indicate that from the reference and the footnotes that certainly several major corporations active in Canada and the United States seem to have been able to make that finding, not Dow. They indicated that this tumor is extremely rare. The author indicates that the occurrence of these cases under similar occupational conditions strongly suggests the cause of a relationship to some phase of vinyl chloride production.

Dealing with another matter, another incident, reported in the textbook, Mr. Chairman, 25 cases of acroosteolysis, which is degeneration of the terminal phalanges, which I guess is fingers and toes, Mr. Chairman, have been reported in vinyl chloride workers.

Another report, Mr. Chairman, with respect to animal experiments, vinyl chloride has been shown to be a cancer-causing agent. They noted that there were tumors prevailing in rats, ranging from 16 percent at certain exposures to 39 in another. Mr. Chairman, I think with respect to the Minister's submission that there has been no finding that there was any linkage between cancer causation and

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

this particular chemical, we can suggest and we can submit that that comment was wholly unfounded. That was not the by-product of research; that rather, was the by-product of a very desperate politician, Mr. Chairman.

So when the Minister of the Environment suggests that my honourable friend is playing politics, I would suggest that if the shoe fits, he should wear it. I think that the truth is, Mr. Chairman, that this, indeed, has been a great embarrassment, not only to that particular member but to several, if not all of the members on that side.

But the question is now, Mr. Chairman, what we do with it? Having come to the realization that we're dealing with a critical problem, a problem that could have been multiplied in its consequences immeasurably if it had occurred in the city of Winnipeg, in the major marshalling yards - if one of those working men's cigarettes were allowed to remain ignited and sparked the vinyl chloride in one of those cars, we could have had a major environmental disaster.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter to be taken lightly. I recommend to you, Mr. Chairman, and I recommend to the Ministers opposite, particularly to the Minister whose Estimates we're discussing this evening, that it's absolutely incumbent on him to give us some idea of what he perceives is his departmental responsibility and role with respect to this matter. We want to know what his department is doing to assure that workers will not in future be exposed to this sort of hazard. We want to know frankly, Mr. Chairman. We could go on; we could ask him what he's going to do. And I don't want to go off topic.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member's time is up.
The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I'll endeavour to answer some of the questions. A good many of them have been answered, as a matter of fact. I don't want the Member for Wellington to infer that my particular department is not concerned about the particular situation. But, repeatedly, he makes reference to the fact of my jurisdiction in this particular situation, and either he was absent when I made my statement or he has been absent when we've been discussing it time and time again, and over and over again, or he was absent during the deliberations yesterday. And he makes specific reference to the fact that, absolutely it must be within my jurisdiction, and what am I doing, that certainly this particular operation has to be within my jurisdiction. I don't know how many times I can make it clear to him. I think most of the members opposite realize what could be considered a frustrating sort of a position, and the matter of the fact is that it is not in my jurisdiction and I think every member opposite knows that, except obviously, the Member for Wellington.

It's a federal jurisdiction. The member is sitting two seats away from him. The Member for Flin Flon is very aware of the problems with federal jurisdiction. He and I have discussed it in the House, and I have discussed it with the steel workers, I've discussed it with HBMS in Flin Flon. He knows what the problems with a federal jurisdiction is, he knows them very well, he's lived in that area and represented that area for a good period of time. So if the Member for Wellington had conversed, I think, either with his friend for Churchill or his friend for Flin Flon, either one of them would have told him that, yes, in fact, there are federal jurisdictions. --(Interjection)-- Well, I thought maybe they conversed with each other, I don't really know, Mr. Chairman.

In this particular case, the Railway Transport Commission is, in fact, the jurisdiction that handles the workplace conditions on the work site in federal jurisdictions as it relates to railways. Now, whether we like what they're doing is a different sort of a problem, but the federal people, the CN people, we know, we're in touch with the Canadian Transport Commission. Within hours after it happened, I suspect within the first hour or two, and I haven't got all the details of the phone calls that took place but I know there was innumerable phone calls that took place, and I know that federal people were on site the first day. And I know that they did, in fact, set up their reading monitors, and I do know that the Railway Transport Commission has a procedure which railway workers, union people, are well versed with, that is, that you do not go near a train that's been wrecked in any way, shape or form that's carrying chemicals. This is all repetitious, Mr. Chairman, I've gone through it. And the men that are on the train know

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

what the train is carrying, so the men knew not to go near that particular wreck and, in fact, to the best of my knowledge, they didn't.

The procedure that is followed in relationship to a federal incident such as this is that they report to the federal authorities. The seminar - I'm trying to jump around and it may appear that I'm jumping around, I'm trying to get all the answers - the course that was put on in Brandon was put on by the fire college. It relates to hazardous products. We put on several courses like that, and we will continue to put them on. We put them on, not only for our own information, and our own people and interested firefighters, but we also put them on for police and for other people, other firefighting associations and groups within the province. This is nothing new, it's been an ongoing one, and the one that the member referred to certainly was a big seminar that dealt with the handling of hazardous products.

What else did we have here? There was, out of a lot of provinces, taking representations to the federal government over the few years, there was a bill, which I think the members opposite are aware of, called The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, Bill C(2) 25. That particular federal bill died on the Order Paper when the election was called last fall. That's for the information of the Member for Wellington. I think, Mr. Chairman, that all responsible legislators in this House would hope that particular bill is brought forth by the new federal government. I'm aware that the proposals are being put together by the Minister responsible for the Environment as it relates to reporting procedures within the Manitoba boundaries. Those, he can talk about himself either during his Estimates or when he tables the bill. But the reporting procedure that the Member for Wellington made reference to, the reporting procedure is that they report federally, and federal people handle it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution 89. (1)(a).
The Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to sum a few areas in respect to this item of the Minister's Salary. First of all, I'd like to say that it gives me some optimism to realize the Minister is interested in maintaining industrial relations without any coercion or intimidation from the Building Exchange Council or their spokesmen, because I was a little disheartened to hear about the approach, not by George Akin, but by the people that are involved in our Crown corporation. I would certainly hope that the Minister, through his good office, would try to indicate to the people at Hydro at top management level, that we want good industrial relations, that we are not going to go in the direction of right-to-work laws - at least that's what the Minister has indicated and I'm going to take him at his word - because I think that would be a regressive step and would do the province a great disservice. I can concur with him that the Allied Hydro Council Agreement has served this province well and that we should carry it out and carry on in the same manner as we have done in the past.

I should just like to take issue with the Minister in one particular area, and that is my first area of concern, the Mechanical and Engineering Branch. Basically, I think, the greatest disservice that can be done is, if we have good statutes, good regulations, and we don't follow them; or if we do follow them, we follow them inequitably. And, as I said, although the Minister has indicated that Hooker will now shortly be serviced by qualified personnel in the power engineering field, he has given us no assurance that this will happen to Simplot, because he's not aware of how long it will take for them to come to terms in order to hire qualified people or else to train qualified people. I think that's a bad situation. This kind of lackadaisical approach, this kind of non-enforcement for allowing someone to have a greater opportunity than others, who have to qualify under The Power Engineering Act is not good for Manitoba as a whole.

Now, I know it's just one exception but, you know, you can quite easily use the analogy, for the sake of a nail, a shoe was lost; for the sake of a shoe eventually a horse was lost. And that is the problem that the Minister creates when he gives one industry an advantage over others in respect to this kind of enforcement.

Further to that I should like to suggest to the Minister that, with the technological change that is taking place, I am totally unhappy with the approach by

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

the member in charge, the power engineering, the mechanical engineering branch, because I believe the Institute of Power Engineers and the advisory board, all are of the opinion that we should not relax regulations just because we have some technological change which gives us automatic equipment which operates without too much monitoring.

I think what is critical is that the monitoring may not be necessary, but the servicing of that equipment must be necessary if it's going to operate automatically. And the relaxed regulations do not indicate any place that there must be any kind of specific and timely maintenance.

I also believe that there should be a little more stress in respect to training in the mechanical engineering field, especially in respect to anhydrous ammonia. As I indicated, there is a greater and greater change occurring within the industries that utilize this form of refrigerant to the flooded system. The flooded system works better, probably more efficiently, but it has greater hazards.

When we were discussing this particular area, the Minister indicated - and when I asked the kind of safety training that had been applied, there was none, except he indicated that the fire department was carrying out some training in this regard. I don't think that's good enough, because the fire department only comes in after an emergency has happened, and when the personnel on the plant site cannot handle it.

I do believe that through The Workplace, Safety and Health Act, the Minister should emphasize that this kind of training and the proper equipment to do with it, the wet suits, the masks, and everything else, have to be supplied. Now, some of the industries are supplying some of it, but it's not mandatory, and I know that there are no wet suits around, that I'm aware of, except at the fire department level at the present time. Now I may be in error and I stand to be corrected, but I do believe that this is an area of great concern.

I should also like to say that, in respect to the inspection - and we are into an area, we've had some considerable debate in respect to federal/provincial safety inspection and of course the parameters that this entails. And I think that this is an area where there has to be a greater effort made to have some more negotiations so that the lines are more firmly defined, more precisely identified, so that there should be no confusion as to who takes care of what in case of an emergency, and that one department doesn't say, well, it's your problem, and the other one says, well, yes, it's my problem but from here on in it's your problem.

Now, I just would like to know the people who are working on the wage and maintenance in respect to the railroad, how many yards beyond the railroad property do they operate? And once they get outside of that distance from the railroad, do they come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour or not? Now, maybe I'm making an absurd case, but I do believe that this has to be negotiated to a greater extent because we are getting into more and more problems of transporting and carrying these kinds of dangerous commodities. And if we don't get to discuss these and straighten them out, we're going to have the problem as to who's at fault and who isn't, and who's responsible and so on.

There's one other area that I wish to touch on in respect to this branch and this department, and that is that I believe - and the Minister indicated that it was an area of his concern as well - but I believe there should be further research done in respect to the potential that is lost when people retire. Senior citizens, some of them, have tremendous potential and there's no place to utilize it. Now, the number of areas that have to be researched is not only how to utilize that resource that is lost when they no longer can operate in the milieu that they were involved in, but also whether it is necessary to have an arbitrary cutoff age.

I do believe that this is a responsibility that the Minister should take a look at and see if he can't, at the next sitting of this particular department, give us some answers as to what his branch has done. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution 89. Mr. Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Just a couple of points on the power engineering's training. The member, I informed him the other day that the numbers of people participating in training in that particular trade will be increased by approximately 100 percent this year. And I do expect recommendations shortly from the Power

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

Advisory Board which I think they've been sitting for about a year now, trying to draw its recommendations for consideration and I can't tell you exactly when they'll be coming down, but I expect them sometime in the near future.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I haven't taken any part in the debate on this department before. There was just one issue I wanted to bring to the Minister's attention, realizing very well, Mr. Chairman, that it's not within the Minister's jurisdiction. But I bring it up to ask the Minister if he could use his good offices to perhaps look into the matter and see if anything could be done about it.

Someone contacted me last week shortly after the spill at MacGregor, and brought to my attention the manner in which liquid propane gas is handled at the Symington Yards and of the potential hazard involved in it. And you might be aware, Mr. Chairman, that they have a switching arrangement at Symington called "the hump" whereby cars are moved up one side and by gravity they run down the other side and then they're switched into the appropriate places and trains are made up in that manner. Apparently, propane tank cars also go the same route, that they are shunted up one side and are allowed to roll down the other side under the effect of gravity. I'm also told that there is a mechanical retarding device, if any of these cars are measured to be going over a certain speed. However, it is a mechanical device and mechanical devices fail.

It might be argued that there is a risk in all operations, in that it is an acceptable risk, but I'm also told that there was an occasion at the same location, Symington Yards, about two years ago when one or perhaps two of these propane gas tanks were ignited - and I don't know the circumstances causing it - but apparently any rupture of a tank car, the gas itself is ignited by the spark and it burns very fiercely to begin with, and then when the level gets down to a certain level, there is a tremendous explosion and the whole car is just blown apart. The instance of two years ago, they found the remains of the tank car half a mile away in a farmer's field. I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that there are at least a couple of housing developments within fairly close proximity to the yards at Symington.

Again it might be asked as to why this is permitted there, and that perhaps the safety regulations allow for a certain degree of error. But I'm also told, Mr. Chairman, that the CNR has certain safety regulations whereby when propane tank cars are switched by a normal engine on a flat railway yard, I believe is the term, that it is a regulation that the switching engine and the car itself must come to a dead stop close to the position that the car is to be moved into, and then it's very gently nudged into position. And it does raise the question of why the CNR has a regulation to enforce a complete stop for a propane car on level ground, yet the same organization is permitting these very dangerous propane tank cars to be lifted up over the hump and to be allowed to run down by gravity.

I suppose it doesn't take too much imagination, Mr. Chairman, to imagine several propane tank cars already in a siding awaiting for a further one to come down, something goes wrong and there is a collision there, at relatively high speed, that could rupture the two tanks involved, which would then spread to the others. The danger is considerable, and I'm told that it's standard practice when a propane tank car catches fire to immediately evacuate the whole yards. The railway company realizes the danger involved in such a fire, and this is the standard reaction to it.

My request to the Minister is, would he make note of this and perhaps bring it to the attention of the C.N. officials. I understand that the government is in quite close contact at the moment with some of C.N.'s safety people, and perhaps in the aftermath of Mississauga and the MacGregor incidents, that they might be perhaps a little more amenable to re-examining this problem and perhaps doing something about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Abe Kovnats): Before I acknowledge the next speaker, I would strongly support the last speaker, and I guess as Chairman of the Committee I really don't have the right to make any remarks, but I'm going to anyway.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

As a member who stayed in the area and didn't move away and is subjected to the things that are happening at Symington, because I guess I am the closest member who lives closest to Symington, I do have that concern also. But I don't think that --(Interjection)-- Thank you very much.

It has given us some concern, but I've lived in that area for a good amount of year and I don't really see the danger. But if there is a danger I would hope that we would be advised of any danger that there might be in living so close to Symington Yards.

The Honourable Minister. I'm sorry. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you. I'll give you a minute after I'm finished.

Mr. Chairman, some members wish to make extemporaneous remarks, but we're going to proceed and not deviate because, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has suggested that I am unfamiliar with governmental practices and the division of responsibility and jurisdiction regarding the regulatory standards that are set for transportation of dangerous chemicals such as vinyl chloride.

And, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't help . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order please. Could I just suggest to the honourable members that repetition is out of order. We have had a pretty good discussion on this subject. If it's a new line that the honourable member is going to undertake to discuss, I would be happy to allow him to carry on.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can assure you that it only flows in a supplementary to the responses elicited from the Minister with respect to my earlier remarks.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, he thinks that I attempt, perhaps, to muddle the issue, and I suppose he may even imply, or he may have implied, that I did so purposely and he's suggested that I've suggested to him that his jurisdiction goes further than it actually does.

Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Minister, I would ask - and I do so as a person who has never been the Minister of Labour, I'm not a critic of his department. I'm removed from that area of expertise but I ask him - when does vinyl chloride, as an inherently dangerous substance, come within the ambit of his regulation, of his regulatory authority? And I say that, Mr. Chairman, because common sense tells me that vinyl chloride isn't always attached to wheels. Mr. Chairman, there are, I am sure, many commercial and industrial applications of vinyl chloride in this province, one presumes. We know that it has something to do with the processing of plastics. Well, I presume somewhere in this province there is some manufacturer, or some commercial user, that uses it in this fashion or some other. One presumes that he will have to store some sort of inventory of the commodity on or about the premises at some time or another.

So I am asking the member, and with respect, when does vinyl chloride indeed fall within his jurisdiction? Is he suggesting to members of this House that when it hasn't got wheels, and it doesn't happen on a rail right-of-way, that it directly impacts his departmental responsibility, and when it does, it has something to do with the Canadian National Railways and the federal transport authorities?

Because, Mr. Chairman, if that's what he would have us believe, I would suggest that we must be in a rather nightmarish situation. I would ask him, for instance, whether or not there are consistent standards. I mean, are the standards that govern the handling of the substance different when they apply to a rail car or some sort of commercial transport vehicle, or do they differ when they apply to the handling of the substance in a warehouse or in a manufactory? I would, with respect, ask, Mr. Chairman, through you, whether or not the Minister is suggesting to me that because of the division of responsibility, as he perceives it, that we would have many different standards pertaining to the handling of the goods, many different thresholds of danger, defined and announced by governmental regulation? Is that, Mr. Chairman, what he is suggesting to the members of the House? It's possible that's the case, Mr. Chairman, and if so, I suppose then the Minister has contributed to part of my education.

But, Mr. Chairman, if indeed that is the case, and that there are differential standards applied to this chemical in different context, then, Mr. Chairman, I

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

would submit to you that something is very much the matter. It doesn't become more or less dangerous to handle this substance just because you are adjacent in the premises or about the yard of a manufacturer. I would presume that it's always equally dangerous. I would presume, from the standpoint of public and worker safety, that commodity is always of equal hazard. So I would like to know, are the standards different? Do we in Manitoba have the same standard as has been adopted by the federal government? When did we formulate the standard and on what basis? Is it consistent with the standards, the definitions set by the federal government? By other provinces?

The Member for St. Vital was talking about Symington Yards, and I suppose I could talk about something immediate to me, the central CN Yards downtown, that I think we all so dearly want to relocate, particularly after Mississauga and MacGregor. And, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Vital might well have gone on and asked the Minister what he knows about the tank cars that are towed about the city and on the highways of the province; I don't know. And perhaps there are federal regulations that sharply circumscribe their activities. Perhaps I am wrong if I suggest that some of those cars travel through densely populated and congested areas of the city of Winnipeg all days of the week. Perhaps they are travelling empty. Perhaps they are prohibited by federal regulations from travelling through populated areas. But I know when I am driving along in traffic, Mr. Chairman, and you see some of these vehicles moving about - and they may be empty - but you often think, gee, if that container car or truck is loaded with some highly volatile substance such as propane or natural gas, God forbid what will happen to me and everybody within a half-a-mile radius of that truck, if it gets struck, if it becomes involved in an accident. You know, one wonders whether or not there are adequate safeguards in place in order to prevent that sort of catastrophe from occurring. And we can make light of it and suggest this is an isolated incident, but I don't think it is, Mr. Chairman. I'm a skeptic now. I think this sort of thing probably happens quite often and we don't know about it. I think when Fire Commissioner Thorimbert says there have been several accidents in Manitoba involving these sorts of goods, I take that as gospel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I must suggest to the honourable members that repetition is out of order, and reference to that same Fire Commissioner has been made in the past again, and again, and again. And I would recommend to the honourable members that we have got great liberties under Minister's Salary, but these liberties have been extended almost to the breaking point. I would suggest, please, let's get down to the subject under discussion, and I would acknowledge the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to be argumentative, and I am not rising on a point of order, but I would indicate that the context in which I use the fire commissioner's remarks was different. So to simply suggest - and I think it's almost an insult to me, Mr. Chairman - to suggest that I am being repetitive on an unpurposeful basis is simply, in this case, incorrect. And I say that with respect to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, to pick up the flow, I would once again suggest that we have not yet had a response from the Minister with respect to the question of standards. I want to know, if we are to accept that he is not responsible for the transportation of dangerous chemicals when they are on the move, even though he convened seminars of 100 people to discuss standards, methodology to be employed in these sorts of accidents. If we are to accept that, that that is only superfluous and that's done peripheral, tangential, to the business of his Ministry and department - and I for one, Mr. Chairman, am not willing to accept that, then I would ask him when they get off wheels, when the substance is off the wheels and it's into the manufacturer's premises, it's in storage, what sort of standards apply? Because you can only, you can literally follow that argument to the point where it leaves the rails. And it does leave the rails, Mr. Chairman. It won't hold water. I want to know how long we've had the standards that apply and whether they are consistent with other standards.

Mr. Chairman, those are my questions. But I would, through you, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the Minister be more forthcoming in a response than that. That will curtail the debate.

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Robert Anderson): The Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks standing in my place rather than as Chairman of committee, and I think that I have the opportunity to do so right now. I think that the subject under discussion is of great importance, but the points have been made for and against, and I find the discussion starting to deteriorate to the point where I think that all that can be accomplished is that a great fear be raised upon the people of the province of Manitoba. Now, I think that the people of the province of Manitoba must know what's going on, and to my knowledge, have been advised what's going on.

The subject under discussion has been discussed, repeated, and when the Chairman has advised the members of committee that it has been repeated, they have acknowledged, yes, it has been repeated, and gone to a different outlook and finally returned to the subject under discussion again and again. And I feel that, as a member, I am allowed to point that out rather than as Chairman of committee.

I think that the Minister has answered all the questions that have been asked of him, and I don't think that this debate can be carried on too much longer with getting any additional benefit. And I would suggest to the honourable members that we are under Minister's Salary, and I think that under Minister's Salary there is a great latitude that is allowed. But I think that latitude has been extended to the point where it is not the Minister's Salary any longer, it is just discussion on the same debate that has been carried on for days now, and I think that it's not going to do the province of Manitoba any good to carry on in this debate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Now, that's a hard act to follow, but the only reason that I do - and that's not to say that I won't speak about some of the issues that we have spoken about here in the past number of days - but I will begin about speaking about some of the issues that I had unfortunately missed during the debates on the Workplace Safety and Health Division when it went through very quickly through the normal procedures of this House, and I happened not to be in the House at the time. And there were numerous items that I believe should be brought up, and I don't expect a great deal of detail from the Minister on these items, because I realize he does not have his staff before him and would have much preferred to have carried this debate on during the particular segment of the Estimates that would have been on line.

But not being able to have accomplished that, I would ask the Minister a number of questions and would hope that he would be able to provide me with as much information as is possible.

In the Throne Speech, there is mention of two workplace safety and health developments, one of which was the program on carcinogens, and I have spoken to that. We will speak to that more, but not at this particular time. The other was an announcement of a program in regard to noise pollution, and we did not have any time to quizz the Minister as to the details of that program, and at this point I don't know whether it will take the form of regulations or legislation, and whether or not we will have opportunity to discuss it in this House through other procedures. So I would ask the Minister if he would be kind enough at this time to give us as much background information on this particular program as he has before him now, so that we may acquaint ourselves with the specifics of it.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, the objectives of the program are to reduce, or in fact eliminate excessive exposure to noise in the workplace and to prevent occupational noise which induced hearing loss. That's basically the general premise of what we have to do. There have been a series of reviews of the situation over the past few years in Manitoba, and it's certainly indicated to me that there is a loss of hearing problem in the province. And we intend to attempt, during the forthcoming year, to do something about that. To date, concerns have been received from individuals working in a variety of industries. To date, several industries have implemented hearing aid sort of programs where protective

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

equipment is issued to employers in certain particular areas of their operation, of the employer's operation.

It's my feeling, and I suppose a lot of it worked out in co-operation between the unions and the companies in some industries where it's agreed upon that in certain areas, protective hearing equipment should be worn. And that's fine. I know that some areas in the province are more advanced than others. We're right now endeavouring to establish just what industries have in fact implemented programs, to what degree of success, to what co-operation those programs, why they were implemented, was it solely on the part of the employer, was it a joint sort of an understood program by the employee and the employer. We want to compile this if what, in fact, has been done in the province of Manitoba. Then from there, of course, we hope to establish proposals of possibly regulations. It may take regulations establishing maximum acceptable noise standards which are consistent with other agencies in North America. That's going to take some bookwork, but some of it has already been established and I'm not, at this particular moment, going to allude to the limitations that we will be bringing forth. But I'm sure the members opposite have some knowledge of the regulations that are in place in other jurisdictions, in our country and in the United States.

The program will be developed over the course of the year in consultation with personnel, other agencies, associations, such as the Department of Health and Community Services, and the Manitoba Speech and the Hearing Association. We'll be contacting unions to find out how successful the field programs are that they have been involved in in reaching a joint understanding between themselves and their employers, and we'll be contacting employers to find out what programs they, in fact, have in place. Yes, there's a very real possibility of regulations being implemented during the course of the next fiscal year, and I think that was possibly one of the key questions that was asked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, then if I understand the procedure properly, what will be done first since the identification of what has been done in the industry per se, is the Minister at that point going to be examining areas that do not have programs, so as to find out why they have not implemented programs? In other words, he's told us that he will identify the programs that are in place now in industry, on whatever level, and that there will be some analysis of the success of those programs, and there will also be some analysis as to why those programs were implemented. What about the areas where there are no programs now? How significant a problem is this in Manitoba's industry? In other words, are there 50 percent of the places where we have excessive levels of noise that now have programs in place, or is it 25 percent, is it 75 percent? This is a crucial question on this issue, because what you have to do is identify the areas where the problem is the largest problem at the present time. In other words, if you identify where something is being done, certainly you have a base upon which to work. You can judge as to whether or not more should be done. You can judge different programs and how they're working. But you aren't doing that, ignoring the areas where there are no programs, and those are perhaps the areas of the most need because those are the workers who are suffering hearing loss through excessive noise at the present time. So if the Minister could indicate how that particular segment of the program will fit in with what he's already told us, I think it would give us a better overall perspective of this program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I think we'll find as we start gathering our information that, even though in Manitoba, and I think many jurisdictions in our particular country do not have specific regulations, we're going to find that there are regulations in place in other jurisdictions which we can look to. And I think rather than the chasing around, the footwork, that may be involved in going throughout our province establishing areas that do in fact have a problem, I think you'll find, Mr. Chairman - and I have a fair amount of degree of confidence that we're going to find other jurisdictions that have in fact established regulations and I don't suppose the information would be much more than a small pad of paper

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

that's going to outline the industries that they have established those regulations in, the problems that they had, the cooperation they had, and the ones that they're working at.

I don't want the Member for Churchill to think that all we're going to do is look at those, but I think looking at those that have programs in place now is a very meaningful exercise, and certainly conferring with others who have programs in place and reviewing what they did to implement them, what type of industries and operations and workplaces that they're in and how it's working, I think will speed up the implementation of a program to the province.

MR. COWAN: Can the Minister indicate how many staff will be involved in this particular program on a full-time basis?

MR. MacMASTER: The pulling together of the material initially will be done by one person. It will be supported by the entire Workplace Safety Division and the inspectors that are in it.

MR. COWAN: The Minister has indicated that it will be done under the authority of the Workplace Safety and Health Division. Can the Minister indicate if this matter has been brought before the Advisory Council for discussion and, if so, at what stage that discussion has reached in that council?

MR. MacMASTER: The advisory council is aware that we are embarking on this particular program at this time.

MR. COWAN: Has the Advisory Council provided any input into the development of the program, or analysis of the program, or an evaluation of the proposal?

MR. MacMASTER: Not at this particular time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister has indicated on numerous occasions, both during this session and last session, and the Minister previous to him in this particular division, that we could expect a report on the Mines Safety Committee Review eminently on a number of occasions, and in all fairness to the Minister, I understand the problems that have occurred in the reporting stage, not only during the reporting stage but also during the developmental and the actual hearing stage of this particular program; that there were certain problems in particular with one person on the committee who was unfortunately in an airplane accident that disabled him for awhile, and now that person has other health problems which have in some respect slowed down the whole reporting process.

But we are getting fairly anxious for this report. It's a significant report; it is one that I, for one, and many others that I know of in the northern mining industry have been awaiting with some degree of interest. The Minister mentioned today that there were jurisdictional disputes. I knew of the problems that were involved with those jurisdictional disputes. He was referring to the mine at Flin Flon and also at Snow Lake where we have a federal-provincial jurisdictional dispute. We've had that for some time now, and I believe the report was to address itself to that. There's also been a number of accidents, a number fatalities unfortunately in the mining industry since the initiation of this review, and I would hope that the report in a significant way will provide us with information, provide us with recommendations that will be implemented. And that's extremely important, because we need to see the implementation of the recommendations in this report, to see that report play the most useful role that it can.

We would hope that the report would be forthcoming as shortly as possible. I had expected it - the last notice the Minister had given us, I believe, was the end of February, and of course there have been problems beyond the Minister's control, but I would ask the Minister now if he can indicate to us in specific terms when we can expect the tabling of that report before the House?

MR. MacMASTER: Well I can't be any more specific than I was before. We have a conference scheduled in Flin Flon; I'm guessing now it's in April, and I am very hopeful. I have told the unions and the companies, and my own staff is aware that a good portion of the discussion at that particular conference will be around

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

the particular report that we're talking about. It's my hope that we get it as quickly as possible so that we'll all have, all parties concerned, government, unions, industry, will have a good length of time to discuss the contents of it and the recommendations in it, and certainly government. I want to have an opportunity to review it and if possible, if there's portions of it that can be implemented immediately, fine. If others, that we want to refer to that conference to look for advice from the participants in the particular study, if that's the case then I want all the parties to have that report as soon as possible, but I can't give you a definite date. There have been a lot of unfortunate problems involving the people on the commission, but I think it's going to be well worth waiting for. We've waited for it ten years, twelve years, another few days or another week or two or whatever the case may be, but we certainly hope that we have it in lots of time so all parties can review it, digest it, and go to that conference in Flin Flon full of some very meaningful thoughts as it relates to that report.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, well that conference being in approximately 12 days, I'd ask the Minister if the report is now at the printing stage, has it been compiled, and is it before the printers? Can he provide us with that information?

MR. MacMASTER: I understand it is, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I'm going through these items in perhaps a faster manner than I would want to. I would have far preferred to have the other opportunity, to discuss them when the staff were present, but I do believe that some comments have to be put on the record now, and also we have to have some answers and we would hope to pursue those answers in more detail at different opportunities during the upcoming session. And I'm speaking now more to people who had expected certain questions to be asked and perhaps feel that we're not doing as comprehensive a job as we should right now. I just want to inform them that we will be pursuing what is being said here this evening but it is difficult to pursue it in this particular form without the staff present. So these items are not being laid to rest, they are just being clarified for the moment.

The Minister at one point during the last year said that his department has come up with a comprehensive plan to deal with asbestos. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairperson, the press release is dated November 9, 1979, and it is entitled, To Establish Asbestos Control Program in Manitoba. I would wish that the Minister could provide us with an outline of exactly what is happening in regard to that asbestos control program.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the handling of asbestos in all ways has been a point of concern for some time, not only in Manitoba, I think right across our country. In November, I decided to get together a large number of people representing a large segment of society that would have an interest in asbestos in one way, shape or form. We called this meeting together and there were 30 representatives from 17 different organizations, including for example, five different unions and four companies, professional engineers, and the Manitoba Medical Association. We wanted them to give to us their thoughts on asbestos as a product, handling it and applying it, taking it out of old buildings, and the method in which you should particularly deal with that particular product.

From there they established a committee, and from there they have had discussions through my direction with the Advisory Council, and I understand now that committee is in place. I don't know just when they're starting their meetings. I understand that there was a hold-up for a variety of reasons why the meetings didn't get going, but that things are in place now and the meetings will start taking shape in the near future. I expect, hopefully, not too far down the road, that they will be making recommendations to myself on methods of handling and dealing with asbestos in the province of Manitoba.

MR. COWAN: Well, Mr. Chairperson, asbestos is a very specific problem, and it is specific problem right now, has been for a number of years. It's not a problem that came about in October 1977, it's a problem that's been around going back to ancient times, actually they knew the hazardous properties of asbestos,

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

they knew that there were some problems with asbestos. As of recent they have had the type of comprehensive scientific documentation, medical documentation, that can outline the problems. And when you can specify exactly what the problem is, then you can begin to develop ways and means of dealing with that particular problem, but you must deal with it. A committee is not a program, a committee may be put in place in order to come up with a program, but the committee itself is not a program. And yet, we know that there's some very serious asbestos problems right now in the province.

I would ask the Minister if he can indicate, and it would come under his jurisdiction, I believe, but he may believe it to be under the Minister of Education's jurisdiction, I know it is his department that is doing the testing in this regard, and it seems to be his department that has made the public pronouncements on asbestos and its control in the province. I would assume that it is a departmental function of the Department of Labour. Can he indicate how many schools have had asbestos removed from them as part of the province's program to remove this hazard from public buildings where children and work staff for the schools must occupy a goodly portion of the day?

MR. MacMASTER: I haven't got that number, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Would the Minister have any general numbers, has there been five or ten or would he not know? I know it is a difficult question without the staff, and we recognize that. I would appreciate if the Minister could get that information to me.

I had asked him about two specific areas and I would appreciate if he does not have the information available to him at the moment that he can get that to me also, because I had sent a letter to the Minister of Education last year in which I indicated that it had come to my attention that there were two areas that might contain asbestos. I did not say that they did, I was told that people had come to me expressing some concern that there might be asbestos that the public will be coming into contact with. One was in my own constituency, and that was at the Leaf Rapids Town Centre, in the hockey rink. I had mentioned that to the Minister. And another was at a school here in the city. I don't have the letter before me now, and the name escapes me, although the Minister was forwarded a copy of my letter by the Minister of Education, and I was informed by the Minister of Education that this would come under the program that the Department of Labour was implementing in testing analysis. I did not provide him with any samples, because I did not have samples at the time. I just hoped that they would do the testing and come back with some report. Having not heard any further information on that for a number of months, I would ask the Minister if he can provide me with any specific information, and I am most particularly concerned tonight about the area that is in my own constituency, and that is in the Leaf Rapids Town Centre.

MR. MacMASTER: I will get that information for the member, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well, I would ask the Minister if he is going to provide the Committee that is dealing with this problem about asbestos with any full-time staff in order to enable them to come up with a comprehensive plan in the shortest period of time as is possible, because I believe that the matter is an urgent matter. And again, by saying urgent matter, I don't want to leave the impression that it's a matter of the Minister's making. It is not, it is an environmental and it's a workplace problem that faces us all, but we must start directing our attention specifically to these sorts of problems, and we must act with as much sense of urgency as we can and yet still provide a program that is comprehensive and will deal with the problem in an efficient way.

So I would ask the Minister, knowing that, is he prepared to offer any staff or is he prepared to assign staff to this Asbestos Control Committee which is beginning to function now, I understand.

MR. MacMASTER: The Director of the Workplace will be working with these particular people. The staff, or the information, or the research that they will be requiring, our department will provide that for them and do what is absolutely

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

necessary to make that a very meaningful committee so that they can come forth with positive recommendations.

MR. COWAN: Now, Mr. Chairperson, we have the staff working on the carcinogen problem, we have the staff working on the asbestos problem, we have the staff working on the noise problem, we have the staff overworked is what we do, because there is just not that much staff. They are good staff, I am certain of that, because they have been able to deal with some significant problems in the past, but they are overworked if the Minister expects them to do all these programs. And for that reason, these programs are going to be doomed to failure, as I said about the carcinogen program which we discussed during the actual Estimates on this Item.

The reason I said that was I believe that you can't take one person and try to have them, in any sort of a comprehensive way, deal with a problem as large as the carcinogens. Why do I say that? Well, I don't want to raise the ire of the members opposite by discussing a sensitive subject again, but let us just discuss very briefly the derailment in MacGregor. We are dealing with one carcinogen out of a suspected 2,000, out of a known 20, we are dealing with one specific carcinogen, and we are dealing with one site, one contamination problem. And there is contamination of vinyl chloride all over, it is not just at MacGregor, it is a common problem, the short-term contamination, long-term contamination. It is one of the workplace hazards that we all face, and that is why there are such specific standards set for it. Yet Dow Chemical, which is the company responsible for this, flies in at least five that I been informed and perhaps more, experts, doctors. More public relations officers than doctors, I don't understand that. But doctors, people to do testing in the area, people to provide information which doesn't seem to be provided properly. But there is a flurry of activity over one site, over a short-term, very short-term problem, although it is appearing to be longer and longer a problem as time goes on. Yet the Minister expects to have one person in this province deal with the carcinogen problem. It just can't be done. That is a failure, it has to be a failure right from the start. So it was a false promise.

I was quite enthusiastic when the members of the media came to me after the Throne Speech Debate and they said, what do you think about this. I commend the Minister on his efforts, on the initiative; I reserve judgment on the Program. Well, I still commend the Minister on the recognition of the fact that there is a problem, but I condemn the Minister on the fact that what the program he has devised and put in place is not going to deal with that problem. He is raising false expectations. He is raising false hopes. It just can't be done the way that he wants to do it. I know that, and I should hope that he would know that.

On the noise program, Mr. Chairperson, we are going to see the same thing happen. They can develop regulations, they don't need a special program to develop regulations, they don't need a program outlined in the Throne Speech to develop regulations, if that is all they are going to do. I tell you that because, he can correct me if I am wrong, I don't have my files, no, I don't have all my files before me at this juncture in the debate, just as the Minister does not have his staff before him. But I do know that they are looking at, right now the Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Council is looking at first aid regulations, it is looking at electrical regulations, there have been regulations draft codes on confined entry. There are maybe five or six different regulations that the Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Council are looking at right now, and yet there is no mention of that in the Throne Speech, but they are doing it. I don't know as if it is proceeding as quickly as the Minister would want, and I don't know if anything has come from it, if actual regulations have been put in place, but there is certainly no mention of those sort of activities in the Throne Speech. The Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Council has dealt with stress a bit in their discussions, yet there is no announcement of a program on stress.

So I think, if I can be blunt about it, I believe that the announcement of the program on carcinogens control and the announcement of the program on noise control, and the announcement of the program on asbestos control, is a bit a hype. I believe it to be a bit of hype, and I don't mean to discredit the people who are doing it. I know they are going to do the best job they can, the staff. And I don't mean to discredit the intention of the Minister in recognizing that there is

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

a problem, I think he has to, we all know that there is a problem. But I do mean to say that when we recognize there is a serious problem, we must act in a serious way, and we are not going that in the area of Workplace Safety and Health.

We recognize there is a problem in that there are not enough committees, yet we see no new committees. We hear talk, we hear talk about the fact that we are examining methods and ways of putting new committees in, but we see no new committees. We see the one, excuse me, at Canadian Bronze, the only one since the Order-in-Council in August or September of 1977, and I don't know how we overlooked that in the first place. I mean that was a mistake on our part not to have included that very hazardous work site on the list of designated committees, but we did, and they corrected that oversight and for that we thank them. And, of course, the people at that plant thank them, because the implementation of a committee does give the people in that plant a certain amount of power and control and clout to deal with the problems that they have. But the fact is there are no other new committees. As a matter of fact, there are fewer committees today than there were, excuse me because I want to phrase that absolutely correct; there are not 313 committees today. There were 313 designated, some of which were never going to function because the designations were incorrect, two of which I believe have been exempted from having committees, and a number of which the businesses have gone out. So instead of maintaining the level of committees, we have seen the number of committees decrease. And that is not right; that is not right to the department, that is not right to the people out there working, because those committees are put in place for a function. They serve a useful function, and without them the workers are not getting the full benefits of The Workplace Safety and Health Act, so we see a weaker Act, Mr. Chairperson.

I could on and talk about, I could talk at great length on this subject and I don't want to because the hour is late, and I am not certain that I would accomplish that much by going into great detail on this. I don't want to put the Minister at a disadvantage, not having his staff here because of a mistake that I made earlier and wasn't here to speak to the subject. So I would feel that would be unfair, so I will talk in these general terms about it. But we do expect, we do expect to see some changes and they are not coming.

I would ask the Minister, because this is a general question and he does not have to have his staff present to answer, I would ask the Minister where he has interpreted, or how he has interpreted the fact that we have in this province a standard of five parts-per-million for exposure to vinyl chloride, and what information he has that indicates that Canada overall has a recognized standard of five parts-per-million for exposure to vinyl chloride?

MR. MacMASTER: I have been advised that Canada recognizes five parts-per-million. I know that Quebec does. I know that Nova Scotia does. I know that Ontario does. I think Alberta does. I think there is another province or two, and we have assumed the same level, as far as we are concerned that is adequate at this particular time.

MR. COWAN: Well then we don't really have a standard of five-parts-per-million. We may recognize the American Conference of Government Industrial Hygienists' standard of five parts per-million, which is under review, but we don't have a standard for five parts-per-million. As a matter of fact, we don't have a standard for anything. We don't have a standard for lead. We have a ministerial direction for lead, but there is nothing in the regulations or legislation that says we accept the standards of the American Conference of Industrial Hygienists. I don't think there should be, quite frankly, because those standards in many respects are higher than the standards of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which has standards that are accepted by the United Nations, standards that are accepted in the instance of vinyl chloride by the international labour organizations, standards that are accepted by the Republic of Germany, standards that are accepted by Sweden, a whole host of other countries, some of which I haven't mentioned even have lower standards than that.

I just would like to speak very briefly on that, because this is an opportunity to expound just a bit on the standard of one part-per-million. What does it mean? One part per million standard means no exposure. That is what it means. They are not saying we want you to be exposed to one part-per-million. What they

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

are saying is we have placed a limit on one part-per-million because that is what we can easily detect. And if we know there is one part-per-million, the first point at which we can detect it, we know there's a problem. We know that there's a very specific problem.

And they also put that standard in place because they know that no industry is going to design a system that allows for a leak of one part per million. They're going to design a system that allows for no leak, because you can't design it to allow for a leak of one part per million. It's just too small a standard to design a system to allow for that specific kind of a leak.

As a matter of fact, there is a ceiling on that standard also, on the OSHA standard, and that's something we haven't had time to discuss, because you can't really get into it in a short ten-minute debate, or in the Question Period. But not only is there a standard of one part per million, but there is a ceiling level of five parts per million. Now we're up to the five parts per million level. But that ceiling level is for a period not to exceed 15 minutes. Not to exceed 15 minutes.

Now, the Minister is using the five parts per million on a time-related average for an eight-hour day, etc., etc. That's his choice. That's not Manitoba's choice. Manitoba never made that choice. Nothing in the regulations, nothing in the legislation. The Minister could have chosen to use the figure of 500 parts per million, which was used a number of years ago. As a matter of fact both Ministers over there in the House gave us a run-down as to how parts per million has been dropping. He could have made that choice. He didn't. He didn't. But it was within his power because there is nothing in the legislation and regulations that says we have to accept certain standards, or we have to develop certain standards, if that's what we want to do. And we can. We have the power to do that.

So that's an area that demands attention. We can't just keep relying on the Minister at one point to accept one standard, at another point to accept the recommendation of another group, and hope to have any sort of comprehensive way of dealing with some very dangerous and potent toxic substances, including carcinogens.

So I would hope the Minister would take that advice in the manner in which it is given, which is hopefully that something will be done.

It's my understanding, I may be wrong on this, and the Minister may be able to correct me on this, so I'll put that caveat in place, but it's my understanding that Canada has no mechanism for determining that five parts per million is a proper standard either, as a federal jurisdiction. But that may indeed not be the case, and I intend to look into that in the next few days.

But, let us use the Minister's standard, without placing a value judgment on its appropriateness. Let us say that five parts per million in this instance would be a threshold limit value, permissible exposure level for a time related average. The information that came out today tells us that there were 200 to 300 parts per million at that train site. I had a call before I came in here from someone who works out there and says he was one of the first ones on the scene, and they're telling me that when they went out there, no one told them about respirators, nobody told them about protective clothing, nobody told them about vinyl chloride. Nobody did that for them. Now we know there's a Dangerous Commodities Officer; we know he's supposed to be there. It just didn't seem to be working in that instance, Mr. Chairperson. They were the ones that have to clear the track. He told me that they were the ones that had to go in there and physically work on those cars that were leaking. No one told him anything. He told me that he could smell it, smell the liquid. Now, it has to be 260 parts per million. I shouldn't say it has to be 260 parts per million, because that's not absolutely correct. The odour threshold limit is 260 parts per million, which means you're going to start smelling it at that. So we know the concentrations were in that area, not specifically that, but fairly high. No mask; no protective clothing; the gentleman is going to see a doctor and try to determine whether there's going to be any problems from this. I'm not saying there's going to be, we just don't know whether there will be problems or not.

But the fact is, the more we find out about this situation, the more we realize that there's a need for some programs and procedures, as the Minister has recognized, to be put in place to deal with some very specific problems. Now,

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

notwithstanding the fact that this is federal jurisdiction, there is a provincial obligation here which the Minister has recognized. There are people who are not employees of CNR on site; there are people who are not employees of the federal government on site, most of them in an advisory capacity. I know that there are ones in advisory capacity; it's my understanding that there may be ones that are actually doing the manual type work, and I haven't been able to confirm that. But whether they are or not, we do know that there is a provincial responsibility here for those people, especially from the provincial government, who were on site to ensure that the standards that they are dealing with are being met.

I don't believe, from all the knowledge that I have been able to glean over the past few days, and let me make this very clear, I'm not an expert on either train derailments, and I'm not an expert on vinyl chloride, and I'm not even an expert on occupational safety and health, Mr. Chairperson. I understand some of the questions that need be asked; I understand when the answers I get are not correct; that much I do understand. Not always, most of the time I understand when the answers I get to my questions are not correct. Sometimes I'm fooled; I was fooled on this one for the first day or two. I stood up in my seat, and perhaps I'm as much to blame as anybody, because I knew it was a carcinogen, and on Tuesday, I said to the House, "It's a carcinogen." I said that. It's a matter of record. I knew it. And yet I believed what I was hearing, that there was no problem out there.

So perhaps I stand even condemned more than others on this. Perhaps, having known that, having been aware of it, having brought it forward, I should have been more of an activist, but I was lulled into a sense of false security by the statements of the Minister who flew in on his helicopter and somehow got to the site. I hope he got to the site because that's what he told us he did, he got to the site. And came back and said, it's okay, and when it's all done, we're going to spread it a little. They were spreading it, right throughout they were spreading it. It wasn't snow they were spreading though, Mr. Chairperson.

But I didn't want to get on that subject. I just want to point out to the Minister that when my seat-mate, the Member for Wellington, stood up and said there is a provincial responsibility, that indeed there is. There is a jurisdictional hassle, also, and I agree with the Minister in that respect. And that's complicating the whole situation to a great degree.

But let us not just say it's a federal government problem. It's a problem for all of us, any workplace safety and health hazard is a problem for all of us, any environmental hazard is a problem for all of us.

It's too bad that both the Minister's wishes and my wishes on Tuesday didn't come true. I think he said that they wished for a speedy - I'd have to look it up in the record - but a speedy and successful solution to this problem of the derailment. And I stood up and said, "I hope that's how it happens." And I sat down, feeling comfortable that that would happen. Now I know it's not going to happen that way, it didn't happen that way. And I'm quite concerned for the workers. I have learned a lesson in this regard, and that is to be more vigilant, which I will. To be less statesmanlike, which I will be.

I have always thought that in dealing with environmental problems, that they were so huge and of such extreme importance that one had to assume a statesman-like role, so I did ask the Member for Logan. I thought it was at least very statesman-like. I didn't like how it felt, but I did it nonetheless because I thought that was the proper clothing to wear. And while I was being statesman-like, they were thinking about spreading snow. So enough statesman-likeness, it's not working. We're going to have to be more vigilant; they're going to have to be more vigilant. Because as I was the victim of bad advice sitting over here on this side, I think they were the victims of bad advice sitting over there on that side. So none of us were vigilant enough. That is a problem that happens from time to time and one that we have to recognize. In the future we will be much more vigilant on these issues, both in the workplace and in the environment, because the two are so inter-connected that they are inseparable. You cannot put a hazard, a toxin, a carcinogen in a workplace and not expect it to out in the environment. It's going to do it every single time. It's going to go home on the worker's clothes, it's going to go out the smoke stack, it's going to go out a ruptured car, it's going to go out in any number of ways, through the sewer system

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

- what goes in the workplace comes out of the workplace, as night follows day and day comes later again.

So we must deal with these problems. We must not be lulled into a sense of false security that we are actually dealing with them, or the government is dealing with them in a responsible way, when they say - and the point that I have to make is that I am concerned about the carcinogen program, I am concerned about the noise program, I am concerned about the asbestos program, that all they are are tranquilizers. Tranquilizers that are fed to us in the public to say, don't you worry, there's a problem, we know there's a problem, something's being done. That's not the case. Not enough is being done.

And if the MacGregor incident pointed out anything to myself and my colleagues on this side, it pointed out that we are as susceptible tranquilizers as anybody, that if we let down our guard, that we can be as easily fooled and fed wrong advice as the Minister of the Environment can by people who would wish to do that to him.

So that is not enough said on the subject, Mr. Chairperson, but there will be other times to say more and I'm certain that we will. But the facts remain, (1) the MacGregor spill has not been handled in a competent way. That is a fact, I don't think there's any doubt in any person's mind. (2) the Minister tells us there is a level of five parts per million, that that is a Manitoba standard; it is not a Manitoba standard, it is Ministerial standard. The Minister has as much right to make a standard for Manitoba, and say that this is how it should be, as I do to stand here and say that the standard for the occupation safety health administration is one part per million and that's what we should have. There's as much authority in what I say as what the Minister says on the standards, until there is enabling legislation or regulations that empower him or empower his department to make those sorts of standards. So let's not say, because the Minister thinks five parts per million are safe, that five parts per million is in fact safe. (4) the levels are away above that anyway. The levels are much higher than that anyway out there, and Dow Chemical told us that.

I was fooled again, because - very shortly this time - you begin to catch on after a while, you begin to question more, but the Member for Logan will be interested in this because we were talking about it earlier. Someone said that there were 200 to 300 parts per million, but don't worry about it, that's when we first went there, and first measured around the tanker cars, and a person would have to be bending over tying their shoe to be breathing those parts per million. That's what the media had reported on this. And so I said, who's going to be foolish enough to be standing over a pile of vinyl chloride tying their shoe? So then, in fact the 200 and 300 parts per million are irrelevant. They don't mean anything. And if I were to use those figures in this House, saying there are 200 to 300 parts per million out there and knowing that, they could accuse me of scare tactics. That's what it would have been. So I didn't. I didn't use those figures in here, Mr. Chairperson.

But then this person tells me, you know, somebody has to crawl around those cars; somebody has to hook the cables on, somebody has to run up there and do the job to get those cars out of the way. I had been talking to the wrong union. I had been talking to the Maintenance of Way workers. They're the ones who come out after all that dirty work has been done. Somebody may well have been exposed to those levels, Mr. Chairperson, 200 to 300 parts per million at that time of the wreck. They were out there Monday night, I believe it was, or Tuesday morning early, is that the time of the derailment? They were out there within hours of the derailment, they're the "go" team. They're the team that gets out there real quick. As a matter of fact, they had that track cleared in 48 hours. --(Interjection)-- No, it's not repetition. Someone is saying it's hour and hours and hours of repetition. Well, No. 1, it's not repetition. Okay. This is new information that I didn't have before this evening's session. No repetition at all. And No. 2, Mr. Chairperson, that one has to repeat in order to allow them the benefit of the knowledge that we possess and to be able to use that knowledge in order to ensure that this sort of fiasco does not occur again, because what is done is done. Let's protect the workers as best we can. Let's make sure they have the proper medicals. Let's make sure they know the facts when they go back out there, because that spill is going to be out there for a long, long time. No doubt about it. Let's do that. But let's not cry over spilled vinyl chloride,

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

Mr. Chairperson. Let's try to develop and devise plans and mechanisms to deal with these problems.

And that's why I hope the Minister will provide that carcinogen program with more than one staff, will provide it with more backup support, will really put in place an important program that can work, because I say I think it's going to fail; that's not because I want to see it fail, that's because I do not want to see it fail. I say that because I want to see it succeed. I don't mean to perform a self-fulfilling prophecy here, I mean to provide suggestions and input, and I don't think it can work at one person. I don't think the asbestos program can work with no people - full time people - there's good people who are doing it on a non full-time basis. I don't believe the noise program can work with one full-time person. I can't see how the Minister does either, Mr. Chairperson, because it's obvious that when we have a short-term incident of this nature, the number of people that have to become involved - and then it doesn't go well. It's obvious from that there's going to need to be more than one person involved.

Mr. Chairperson, I don't believe that the Minister is doing a good job. I'm not going to stand up here and move the customary. I think last year we moved some sort of a salary deduction. I think the year before on the other Minister we moved a salary deduction. I'm not going to do that this year. We may do it next year, I'm not certain. I'm not going to do it this year because I don't think it's necessary. I think it's obvious that he's not doing a good job. That's not to say he is doing a totally bad job. That's not to say he's not trying his best. That's not to say that he's working under very difficult circumstances with his caucus and his colleagues in this Cabinet. That's not to in any way attack the Minister personally. I don't want to do that, but it's to say I don't think that department is being handled well. Maybe that's a better way to do it, Mr. Chairperson.

Department of Labour and Manpower, well, Mr. Chairperson, we see that unionization in this province is down. That's not the Minister's fault. Certainly not. And any Minister in his place could not correct that situation, but it is occurring under his government. Maybe it's his government that's not doing a good job. Maybe that's what we should say rather than, because if I say it's the Minister that's not doing a good job then I'm singling out one person, and perhaps it's not the Minister, perhaps it's the whole government that's not doing a good job. At any rate we see that occurring.

We see the minimum wage not keeping up with the cost of living, so what we see is low wage earners falling farther and farther behind. We see our unionized workers increases in wages not keeping up with the national average. We went through all the statistics before on income and the statistics hold true today, that the people in Manitoba are not keeping up with the cost of living, working people, that the working poor especially are not keeping up. They are falling farther and farther behind.

It's not the Minister's fault. He can't pay everybody. He can't run out and say, you're only making \$3.15 an hour, here's an extra quarter, to all the minimum wage earners per hour, so that you'll make enough, couldn't do that. But he is a part of the government that's responsible for creating a climate that is resulting in these sort of - perhaps the kindest word to use is slippages, these sort of slippages in the standard of living of Manitoba worker's. That's one point.

Workplace Safety and Health, conditions aren't getting any better, Mr. Chairperson. They are not out there. There's no more committees. How are they going to get better if you don't provide them with tools, and committees are tools. There's not enough staff involved. The Minister is biting off more than he can chew when he wants to develop a carcinogen program, one person, and an asbestos program, and no full-time people in the noise program, and one person. He's biting off more than he can chew. And perhaps he has to do that. Perhaps he wants so much to get something put in place, but he can't get the funding, he can't get the approval for the funding from his Cabinet; that he says, I'll go with what I've got. He says, I'll go with what I've got. That's not enough. I'm not saying that's his motivation at all, I'm just suggesting that might be motivation for that sort of a process of putting in place a program that's doomed to failure or putting in place a lot of programs that are doomed to failure.

The government in the area of job creation where we're talking about Manpower programs, is failing again. And we can throw the statistics back and forth. I

Tuesday, 18 March 1980

don't think we will tonight, maybe we will, but the fact is if you look at the statistics and you look at the picture and you compare left and right and you compare it center and front and back and from the provincial comparisons, in provincial comparisons, year by year comparisons, it's a failure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. Well I'll try to finish up in five minutes. There may be others who wish to speak after me and I want to allow them the opportunity to do so at an early enough hour in the night that we don't get locked into any posturing or acrimonious debate.

Mr. Chairperson, the fact is that in my constituency conditions are much much worse than they were before. You go into Churchill, you go into Gillam and you see what can happen to a community when there isn't work around. We'll talk about that in more detail. But it's having a disastrous impact on the northern part of this province, the policies of the government. And that's no longer the Minister's full responsibility, there's another Minister that has to deal with the problems that are being created in the north because of lack of opportunity, because of lack of work. But the fact is the problems are there, and I don't mean to be a doom and gloomer. I'd like to say it's blooming in northern Manitoba, that everything is going fine and great. I'd much prefer to be able to say that. I can't, it's not the truth. Things are bad. Things are bad all over.

So when I say that the Minister is not a good Minister, what I am saying in fact is the Minister is among a group of people who are not good Ministers. What I'm saying is, the government is failing in its responsibility to the working persons of this province, notwithstanding some small successes here and there. What I'm saying is, the government is failing in its responsibility to provide a safe workplace, and by doing that it is failing also in its responsibility to provide a safe environment, because the two are so interrelated. And what I'm saying is, the government is failing to provide a climate that enables human beings to reach their full potential through productive work, through productive work - that's very important, Mr. Chairperson, through safe and healthy work and through work that provides them in return with a standard of living to which they are entitled; which does not see them lose year by year in their purchasing power, but rather sees them at the very least hold their own, and better yet become even wealthier, because each of us individually, as we become wealthier, add to the sum of the whole total and we become a wealthier province. And that not having happened, and the slippages having occurred over the past 27 months or whatever, leads me to believe, Mr. Chairperson, that that Minister, no matter how hard he may try, cannot live up to the responsibilities to which this province has entrusted him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--pass; 1.--pass; Resolution No. 89--pass. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,219,700 for Labour and Manpower, General Administration, \$1,219,700.00. Pass.
Committee Rise.