



**Fifth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**  
**(Hansard)**

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan  
Speaker*



**Vol. XLIII No. 51B - 8 p.m., Monday, June 20, 1994**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

---

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Crescentwood	Liberal
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
KOWALSKI, Gary	The Maples	Liberal
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MACKINTOSH, Gord	St. Johns	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCORMICK, Norma	Osborne	Liberal
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROBINSON, Eric	Rupertsland	NDP
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 20, 1994

The House met at 8 p.m.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

(continued)

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

(Concurrent Sections)

#### STATUS OF WOMEN

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau):** Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply will be considering the Estimates for the Status of Women.

Does the honourable Minister responsible for the Status of Women have an opening statement?

#### Point of Order

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson):** On my matter of privilege, it is fitting that we are in the beginning of the Status of Women's Estimates here tonight. I think there is no better place to have my matter of privilege come forward since it does affect my status as a woman in the Legislature. I also want to clarify that I want to deal with this matter not only as it is affecting me personally but as it does affect women throughout the province.

I think when I look at the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) and I realize he has had a chance in the Chamber to clarify the situation, he has had a chance to apologize, as members have had on numerous other occasions, and he has not used that opportunity, I think the seriousness of this has increased. It seems that the minister has made the decision to dig himself even deeper. I want to assure the committee that I feel quite confident, particularly with the member for Osborne (Ms. McCormick) and the amount of support I have received from my own caucus and from the second opposition and from members of the community.

I have received a number of phone calls from members of the community saying they think it is about time these kinds of things in the Chamber were addressed. They are horrified when they hear of some of the other examples of disrespect and reference to violence and reference to members in a sexist and racist manner.

I think the comments that have been made in terms of the Legislature reaching a new low when we have threats being made or insinuations of violence being made, it does cross a line, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, and you were in the Chair at this committee when the incident occurred. I know in my discussions with you, you have indicated that you heard some commotion at that time which indicated, I think as well, that you knew that something of seriousness had occurred.

I think it is important that women do take a stand, that we are not being victims when we voice our concern when we stand up and we say that this has happened. I think some of the comments that have been made in the community in terms of women being victims if they are going to voice these kinds of concern, it is like you are put in a position where you are walking a fine line. On the one hand, if you do not defend yourself, you are considered to be a wimp or you cannot cut it. On the other hand, if you do defend yourself, it is like you are no better than they are. So it is really putting people, I think all of us as MLAs, in a very disadvantageous situation, in a very narrow, narrow mode of being able to function when we have this kind of behaviour, when we have this kind of approach being taken in the House.

I also want to deal with the issue in terms of other areas where it has occurred, because one of the first things that happens, as I can see it, when someone is going to be discredited, is they are called names. When someone does not want to deal with the ideas or the issue that you are raising,

they will try to call you names and attack you personally, and that is supposed to somehow take away your credibility rather than dealing with the issues. I think that is really one of the things that this is about. This is about saying that we should be debating ideas and issues and stick to the high road and that we cannot continue to have these kinds of personal attacks, whether it is coming at members opposite or people in the community who are voicing concerns and issues that the members in the House may not agree with.

So I think that this has to be taken seriously, and I think that some of the members opposite have made the comment that we are trivializing women's issues. I think that there is no better way to show how seriously we take these matters than to bring them forward in a way that is going to force everyone to consider the way that we behave in the Legislature.

Now it would not have made any difference if I had raised the matter in the committee. It would not have made any difference since the Minister of Energy and Mines' (Mr. Orchard) comments were not on the record. So I just want to state that unfortunately the rules do not allow the member for Osborne's (Ms. McCormick) comments to stand as evidence as they would in other situations. So, with that in mind, I think that what we have to do to see this matter through is have it referred from this committee into the House where we can have the chance to look at it more closely. I know that there were a number of other people in the room from the Department of Environment. There were the members of the staff on the committee.

So I move

THAT the comments of the Minister of Energy and Mines of Monday, June 13, to myself in the Committee of Supply indicating "she needs a slap" that violate my privilege as a member of the Legislature be reported to the House and that in accordance with the provisions of Beauchesne Citation 107 this committee recommend that this matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Can I have the copy of the motion in writing, please?

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** I must inform the committee that, in accordance with Beauchesne Citation 107, it has no power to deal with a matter of privilege. Such matters can only be dealt with by the House itself on receiving a report from the committee. Therefore, I am prepared to entertain this motion and report the alleged matter of privilege to the House. The motion is debatable.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Energy and Mines):** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the member in presenting her alleged matter of privilege, made the specific reference that the comments were not part of the record. How can you have a matter of privilege in which comments are not part of the record? Comments, if they are made, are picked up by those interjection mikes on the middle of the table which are in closer earshot than my honourable friend was, allegedly, in sitting on the other side of the table. You cannot have a matter of privilege on words that are not spoken and part of the record.

Sir, this is an incredible matter of privilege to be raised on an admission that it is not part of the record. What do we do next in terms of raising matters of privilege? What allegations do we bring forward as matters of privilege with no substance to them?

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, first of all I want to indicate, as you indicated, the motion reports the matter to the House. The House will deal with the specifics in terms of the question, first of all, whether there be a prima facie case of a privilege.

\* (2010)

I would also like to point out that this is, in essence, the first opportunity to raise it since the ruling of the Speaker in the House on Friday. That is why this matter has been brought back at this particular point in time.

I do not want to make comments strictly in terms of its weight as a matter of privilege, but I think we should define what the concern is here and why the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) is so concerned about the remarks that were made and indeed why comments that have been made in the House,

outside of the House in various different rooms, have been, according to precedent, ruled as matters of privilege in the past, and there are various precedents for those types of comments.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, for any member of the Legislature to be able to uphold his or her responsibility to this House that that member has to be able to do so expecting that there might be some disagreements in debate. There might be even some heated disagreements in debate and discussions of issues. I believe that there has to be a line drawn in terms of comments that can be viewed as direct personal attacks, particularly where there is concern on behalf of the member that those comments are in some way, shape, or form being used to intimidate the person, the individual member, into not performing his or her duties.

By the way, there are various different precedents in terms of privilege where this has been the case, including press comments, individual comments, threats. There are specific citations in Beauchesne that refer to that matter.

I believe, based on what occurred last Monday, the best way of dealing with this matter would be, as the motion presents in the form of a remedy, first to report it to the House and then to have the matter raised at Privileges and Elections, because I believe and I think anyone who has heard the debate on the matter in the House both on Wednesday and Friday, I think it is very clear to my mind that the member for Radisson believes that the comments that were made by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) fell in that category.

Indeed, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I hate to say this, and I do not mean this as a reflection on the House in general, but I do believe the member for Radisson has been subjected to a number of comments, most of which were certainly not in the same category as the comments we are dealing with now, which do border on certainly harassment in the generic sense, whether it be some of the comments that are hurled across the House in terms of the form of nicknames, et cetera.

Those are not what we are dealing with. We are dealing with comments here that were made in the committee that were witnessed by at least one other member of the Legislature. The Minister of Energy and Mines has a different version of what happened. The Minister of Energy and Mines rose on his feet on a statement in the House on Friday and added further comments to the record which, in the context of the point of order which was raised, will probably result in a further Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the right thing to do is to refer this matter to the House and have it referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Now, I would hope, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in the process—and I say to the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) that the way, I believe, to deal with this matter would be, to begin with, the minister doing what I thought he was going to do on Friday, which is to make a statement withdrawing comments, clarifying comments, whatever, but in some form—what I would have expected in the way of some form of an apology or a clarification, instead of raising further issues. That would be the first step.

But, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in doing that, I do believe that if there is one thing we can all do, and I say all of us as members of this Legislature, following this incident and reflecting on the fact that this is not the only time that comments have been made of a personal nature and certainly not only to the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli). I remember when I was elected to this Legislature, I thought that was the way it always was. But this is the 1990s. Maybe it is not the way it should always be.

Maybe we say things at times which we do not realize the consequences of, and I say this to the Minister of Energy and Mines. Maybe we say things that may be viewed as an extension of some of the give and take of debate, but I believe any objective analysis of what was said on Monday would, I think, lead to the same conclusion that many people have taken, that the Minister of Energy and Mines went beyond the normal give

and take of debate and indeed did raise comments which, to my mind, apart from being something that would reflect in terms of privilege, just have no real place in the Manitoba Legislature.

So why do we not do the proper thing? Get this matter referred to the House, refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and perhaps in the process, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, do some soul-searching as an institution, because I believe we have made a lot of progress. I can say that I believe there is a lot less acrimony certainly than a number of years ago in this House, a lot less, in terms of personal comments back and forth, personal attacks.

I think that there is a great deal of courtesy shown by the vast majority of members, whether it be in terms of gender sensitivity, Mr. Deputy Chairperson—and I know I was asked that question when this issue came up, and quite frankly, I believe the vast majority of MLAs do not need gender-sensitivity training. I believe some perhaps might.

I believe some of us collectively might need some personal sensitivity training, because I think what we forget here is that when people see the kind of a display that takes place here, they would expect that if a concern was raised it would be dealt with by a committee of the Legislature and that all sides of the concern be dealt with and there be some remedy, because that is the important thing here.

Comments were made. It is not the first time that comments have been made. It will not be the last, unless we act and do the right thing and make a commitment as a Legislature to try to remove some of the type of personal, acrimonious and, in this case, in the view of the member for Radisson, threatening comments that in this particular case would certainly to my mind justify being considered a prima facie case of privilege in the parliamentary sense, but I think in terms of the general public view would be considered as absolutely inappropriate in terms of the kind of debate they expect from us, because that is the truth here.

The members of the public watching us the last few days I think have been dismayed, and I think they would expect us, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, to deal with this matter and to make sure that we all collectively make an effort to ensure that this type of incident does not happen again.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I just wanted to add a few words to this particular motion, a motion in principle which we can support, and it is primarily because of this. We have an allegation, a very strong allegation, that comments were put to the member for Radisson Monday last, and those comments have been substantiated by at least one other member, my colleague the member for Osborne (Ms. McCormick), who also heard those particular comments. The matter was brought up in the Chamber, as we all know. Those comments were categorically denied. We have an individual who feels that there has been a matter of privilege, based on her ability to be able to represent her constituents, which I think has to be taken seriously.

I believe that there is some merit, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, in terms of the committee doing what it can to try to resolve this matter. There are a couple of things that come to my mind, such as the pulling of the tapes from Monday last. Even under the pulling of the tapes, I know the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) had made mention that the interjection mikes should have picked it up. Well, I have been inside the Chamber when a number of comments are made, and members will hear what those comments are. Quite often, they will be called to account for those comments and in many cases will stand up to apologize or to retract the comments that were said. Not in all cases do those words show up in Hansard and ultimately be heard through the interjection mikes, so I think that we do have to take this very seriously in the sense that we have two members of the Legislative Assembly who have claimed to have heard what the Minister of Energy and Mines said.

We have a minister who is categorically denying it, and by sending it to the House, we have a better

chance at trying to resolve the issue. As the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) pointed out, there were other individuals who were in the committee at the time, and anything that would seek further clarification to demonstrate one way or the other, I think would be to the benefit of all members of the Chamber, in the best interest of all.

\* (2020)

**Ms. Norma McCormick (Osborne):** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, much has been made of the fact that the comments made during the proceedings of the Department of Environment Estimates were not on the record. Having witnessed the event, I can say that in fact the comments were made while the Minister of Energy and Mines was at the table. The presence of nonparticipating members at the table in the Estimates debate is clearly oriented to a goal of intimidation. The question is this: How far are we prepared to let members go in the name of intimidation?

I wish to put two statements on the record; firstly, I am under no illusion that the problems and obstacles faced by women in this Chamber will disappear no matter how this issue is resolved. Secondly, I think it is important to recognize that women politicians have to answer to the same constituencies as men do to get elected and re-elected. Public sentiment is clearly on the side of ensuring a standard which promotes a courteous and respectful treatment of each other, and I support the motion for referral to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Urban Affairs):** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I was not here the night in question, so I do not know who said what to whom. I do know, however, that there is nothing I can read that tells me how this conversation went or did not go. I am intrigued by the comments made by the member for Osborne. I am intrigued by the comments made by the member for Radisson. The member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) has indicated that things are a lot better in the House now than they used to be. I shudder to think what they used to be like.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I know that from time to time each one of us in the House has had

comments hurled at us that are, to say on the kindest interpretation, meanspirited and cruel. I have sat there and had things hurled at me that cut through to the heart and hurt very deeply. I know that other members of my caucus have experienced the same thing from members of the official opposition and from members, less occasionally because maybe there are less of them, of the second opposition party.

Those comments have been hurled back and forth across the House since I became a member. I came in—and like the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski)—with the view that I was not going to sink to the depths of being as rude and cruel and everything in my heckles as other people had been. I held to that for, I think, about two months before I cracked and entered into the heckling and the kinds of comments that are made in the House.

I noticed with deep regret the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) sitting in the front row of the third party two weeks ago screaming like a banshee after he had vowed that he would not ever do that.

So I guess what I am saying is that I concur with the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) that the acrimony in the House is regrettable and I would love—love—to see that end.

We have a rule that if we called to order on it every time it came up in our own blue book of rules and procedures—not Beauchesne—rules 42, 43, somewhere in there, that says you cannot interrupt and you cannot do that type of thing in the House, and we never rise and call it as a point of order.

Although I know that the greatest abuse of points of order are used by members opposite who are on their feet constantly calling for a point of order when they know full well that it is not a point of order they are rising upon. They are abusing the rules of the House by using a point of order to get some other message across they know does not apply.

Frequently, the messages coming across are based upon erroneous assumptions, known to be

erroneous assumptions, a false premise presented as fact and then arguments built upon the false premise in a way designed to destroy the integrity of a people who have integrity in a cruel, malicious and vicious way, and that is what we present to the public. The member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) is correct in that.

The member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) should recognize that sometimes comments hurled our way are as bad, if not worse, than anything she has allegedly claimed to have had said to her in recent weeks. I suppose maybe when you are government you just sit and let it roll off your back. Maybe we should not. Maybe we should be rising every single time something is said. I would be up all the time if that happened to me.

I think the motion is out of order, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, and I look for you to rule on it appropriately. I just felt those comments needed to be made, because it is very well for us to rise up in self-righteous indignation when perhaps we should—as the member for Thompson says (Mr. Ashton)—look to our own selves. That advice goes both ways.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture):** I tend to have a reasonable amount of respect for the experience of the government House leader, the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), the official opposition. I think he, in his presentation just a few moments ago, recognizes that this is a very tenuous matter of privilege according to the rules of our Chamber. It may well be another matter that he wishes to raise, but not a matter of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am certainly not prepared to enter into this debate except to put on the record officially that I and other members were sitting immediately adjacent to the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) when this incident took place. I categorically put on the record that the references made in this resolution were not made by the Minister of Energy and Mines.

In saying this, I do not say that they may—the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), the member for Osborne (Ms. McCormick)—well have heard a remark that is alluded to in this resolution, that

may well be. I cannot categorically say that that remark was not expressed in the Chamber, I did not hear it, but I can categorically, being the closest, put on the record it was not made by the Minister of Energy and Mines.

So, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, you have simply a genuine dispute of the fact. But it is patently wrong to put on the record a resolution of this kind that specifically singles out a particular member for an alleged conduct and puts words in his mouth that he in fact categorically denies and has immediate people closest to his presence when they were allegedly made who categorically say that they were not made. Now, I believe that is the ruling. The ruling is simply that this is not a legitimate matter of privilege for the House and the rules committee to deal with.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Order, please. I would just like to inform the honourable members that under Citation 107, this committee cannot deal with a matter of privilege. All matters of privilege are dealt with by the House. What this motion is doing is taking this, referring this motion to the House to be dealt with by the Speaker. We do not deal with whether it is in order or not; the Speaker will make that decision when it gets to the House.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I also have a great deal of respect for the skills you have demonstrated as Chair. You can certainly decide whether any issue, any motion is in order or out of order. I am suggesting to you this motion is out of order, and I look for a ruling from you.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** The honourable minister does not have a point of order. I do not have the ability to rule on a matter of privilege within this committee. Under Citation 107 of Beauchesne, we cannot deal as a committee, or myself as a Chair, on whether or not the matter of privilege is in order. The matter of privilege has to be dealt with in the House.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I would ask you to seek further advice from your table officers, but I find it incomprehensible that a Chair of a legislative committee cannot rule on the appropriateness or inappropriateness of a matter



raised. I would like to be shown where you cannot rule in such a manner.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** If I may, for the honourable minister's benefit, I will read Citation 107. "Breaches of privilege in committee may be dealt with only by the House itself on report from the committee. Thus should a witness refuse to attend, or refuse to give evidence, the committee must report the fact to the House for remedial action."

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader):** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, this is a very significant issue and one that carries a lot of gravity to it. The question of whether persons in the banter and repartee that takes place in the House are attempting to intimidate people or attempting to denigrate people in the process or not, I suppose is 99 percent in the eye of the beholder. I, quite frankly, find it objectionable that I am classified, for instance, by members here in the debate this evening, that I would be lumped together along with every other member of the House in imputing motives, if you will, as to why banter and repartee take place in the House.

\* (2030)

There is no question in anybody's mind that all of us deserve a lesson, I suppose, to one degree or another with respect to what may or may not seem to be a put-down or in some degree denigrating to an individual member of the House. I suppose it is important that we have this discussion so that we all understand and we all respect, to a greater degree perhaps than we have in the past, that every member is an honourable member in the House.

I do not think for a second that the kind of repartee that does take place is aimed particularly at trying to intimidate anybody or trying to denigrate anybody in this process. Since I have been here and since I have been involved, not just here but in another chamber as well, comments and repartee do take place.

What is the goal here? What is the intent? What do we want to achieve collectively as members of the Legislature in this process? I suspect in the first instance, Mr. Deputy Chair, it is a recognition by all members that we ought to be careful in terms of

what we say and that innocent remarks given sometimes are not received in the same manner in which they were given. I know from time to time that matters that are intended to be humorous sometimes are taken in a different vein, but what is the intent? What is the purpose? What do we want to achieve collectively as members of the Legislature here? Is it to sensitize ourselves collectively to the problems that may or may not occur in the House, or is it to carry on with the—I do not like to say persecution—but carry on with a process that ultimately may or may not lead anywhere.

I think ultimately the process that we all want to be involved in, the understanding I think that all of us need to have here is that sometimes we make statements that are taken by those made to in a different vein from which they were intended or may certainly be taken that way. But the process ultimately I think is a learning process for all of us here, and I think we ought to maybe understand that. I certainly hope that is the purpose behind the member for Radisson's raising the issue again this evening, that ultimately we need to collectively understand more appropriately the feelings and how members sometimes take issues or understand statements that are made in the House.

At the same time, to proceed hopefully not in a meanspined way, but to proceed further with this issue I do not know is necessarily going to resolve a great deal, Mr. Deputy Chairperson. The raising of the issue, the discussion of it amongst ourselves, the members voicing their opinions as to how they feel certain statements and nicknames and whatever else you want to have come forward in the House and in committee, how they feel about those circumstances, I think serves to the benefit of every member of the House.

No one is innocent in this process. No one. I have sat here for eight years and heard all kind of statements being made either on the record or off the record, or picked up by the interjectory mikes or not picked up, by members of the Legislature. If we were to rise on a point of privilege each and every time one of those statements was made, Mr. Deputy Chair, we would do nothing but that. We

would not do Estimates. We would not debate bills. We would be simply meeting on points of privilege and having discussions about points of privilege.

I suspect that what we have experienced to date in this matter has been healthy I think and helpful in the overall process. To carry it further, Mr. Deputy Chair, I see offers little I think in the way of education, in the way of understanding, in the way of members collectively learning from this experience and hopefully for the better.

I also suspect that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns), with his long-standing experience in the House, may well be right, that what we have is a dispute over the facts and not a matter of privilege per se.

The member does not, in her motion, indicate how her privilege was violated; she simply says that it was violated. So, Mr. Deputy Chair, I do not wish to challenge your ruling, if the advice you have been given is that this matter simply needs to be referred, but I suspect that any Chair of any Legislative committee would have the right to determine if a motion is in order or not. The question of privilege cannot be decided by the committee, but the question of it being in order I suspect can be decided by the Chair of the committee.

**Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson):** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I have listened very carefully to what has been said on this issue and specifically the motion that has been put before the committee.

First of all, it would appear to me when I read the preamble or the first part of the motion, that the motion in itself is questionable, No. 1. As Chairperson of the committee, you might want to pay very close attention to the actual wording of the motion before you decide whether to allow the motion to in fact be dealt with at this committee or whether you might want to rule it out of order.

Secondly, the term, and I quote from the motion, "she needs a slap"—the allegation as made by that term is something that clearly astounds me, because I was sitting that day in the chair that is now being occupied by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), and the Minister of Energy and

Mines (Mr. Orchard) sat right next to me, to my right, when the reference was made as to whether the member had been taken to the woodshed.

The term "taken to the woodshed" has clearly been coined by her own Leader in the House and has been time and time again referred to and pointed specifically at members such as myself when I was removed from cabinet and referenced clearly that I was severely reprimanded in the woodshed. That is recorded in Hansard.

I find it astounding that we now want to put on the record that a member should be slapped when the term was never, is not anywhere indicated, on the record and that we are allowing that kind of statement to be included in a motion before this committee and allow that motion to stand and be dealt with.

I would ask you, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, to give very serious second thought before you allow this motion to be dealt with in this committee.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** I would like to thank all honourable members for their words during this debate. It is not that you are challenging my ruling. I understand you are questioning of my ruling. It is not a ruling as such because we, within this committee, cannot rule on a matter of privilege. That is what the honourable member is bringing forward at this time, is a matter of privilege.

What we are dealing with is a very serious matter here. The honourable member is bringing forward a matter of privilege. This committee is not able to deal with that matter of privilege. This committee can only refer that alleged matter of privilege to the House. That is what this motion is recommending we do.

Is the committee ready for the question?

\* (2040)

**Mr. Ernst:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, a motion that is required to be voted on presumes you can either vote one way or the other, that you can refer it or not refer it.

If, in fact, the committee is incapable of dealing with it, then there should be no motion to vote at all. The question should simply be referred without

vote, unless there is some ability for the committee to deal with it.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** I am going to have to ask the advice of the committee. Is the honourable House leader challenging my ruling?

**Mr. Ernst:** I am asking a question, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, of you. If a motion cannot be dealt with in the negative, then the matter should simply be referred, period. There should be no vote. If, however, it is expected that there is a vote and an ability to vote one way or the other, then, in fact, if the committee chose to vote no, it would be, in your view, based on your ruling, dealing with a matter of privilege.

Now alternately on the same point of order, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the question then could arise, is the motion in order or not? Similarly, you can deal with the matter in that way as well, I would assume. Otherwise, the rules would say that the matter would simply be referred to the House for consideration and being dealt with.

So the question is, do we vote on this matter or is it simply referred? If we do vote on this matter, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, then I suspect that your earlier ruling may not have been entirely accurate in dealing with the question of whether the matter is in order.

**Mr. Ashton:** If I might be of some assistance, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the provisions of Beauchesne in terms of parliamentary privilege are clear. The committee does not have jurisdiction in and as of itself to review matters of privilege and breaches of privilege. However, when breaches of privilege do occur, then the appropriate mechanism is for the committee to refer to the House because the House has jurisdiction to deal with those matters of privilege as they occur.

So what we are essentially doing here is deciding whether this matter should be reported to the House. Committee members have the option of voting yes on this motion or voting no on this motion, on any component of the motion, but you are quite in order in ruling that this matter is in order, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, because it cites a specific citation by Beauchesne, Citation 107. What it does is refer the matter to the House, and

then the specifics of whether there is prima facie case of privilege will then be dealt upon committee report in the House. So this matter is in order, and I would suggest that if there is any disagreement on the motion, we put it to a vote.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Order, please. Just to clarify it, I am not ruling this matter in order or out of order. I have not the ability to do that. As Chairperson, this motion is being—you are being asked whether you want to refer this matter of privilege to the House.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, correct me if I am not right. This matter was brought up in the House. The Speaker ruled that this committee should deal with it. Now you are saying you are not going to deal with it, you want to throw it back to the House to be dealt with. What kind of revolving door system of rules have we got here?

At issue is, is the alleged statement, as many members indeed more who are prepared to corroborate that was never made in the House, very important? To that extent, it is a question of the orderliness of the issue that is being raised. I am simply, again, and I will desist from any further comment saying that by reference, by this committee's acceptance in referencing the motion before us to the House acknowledges that what is contained in the motion in fact did take place. And that simply, Sir, did not take place.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Just to advise the honourable member, it is the Speaker who will decide on whether or not this is a prima facie case for a matter of privilege. The Speaker, when he referred this matter back to this committee: therefore, I am ruling that this matter is out of order as a matter of privilege. The honourable member may, however, wish to raise the matter in the Committee of Supply and the committee could decide whether or not to report it to the House.

That is what we are doing. We are dealing with the matter on whether we want to report it to the House or not, and I have not the ability to rule it in order or out of order. We are referring it to the House. Is the committee ready for the question?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I have before me a motion. It says, I move. Motions,

whether they be in the House or be in committee, are ruled in order or out of order. The subject of the motion is not of interest. It is whether the motion itself is in order. Now, I might submit to my honourable friend, that as Chairperson, that in introducing this in the preamble to introducing the motion, the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) indicated that there is no evidence of any statements as she alleges in making the motion.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, what I think all honourable friends have a responsibility to do, in fact it is part of the rules, is that if, in fact, you have a matter of privilege, that your privileges have been abused during the course of the House or the committee, it is the responsibility of the member so offended to immediately raise that matter. I realize that my honourable friend one week later is saying that she believes certain phraseologies were used, and it stems from a committee meeting approximately seven days ago. The duty of the member for Radisson, if those comments were made, was to raise them immediately and have them dealt with in the committee immediately.

Such was not the case. It was not raised that evening. It was not raised the next day, as is the next earliest opportunity to bring that matter before the House, where the House, Sir, can deal with a matter of privilege which my honourable friend did finally bring before the House on Wednesday, some two days later, not at the earliest opportunity of the evening when she alleges this happened.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, this motion is out of order. This motion does not have substance. This motion is based on the member who moved its admission that the statement does not exist anywhere in the record of Hansard. It has been collaborated that it has not been said. I have indicated for some time it was not said. Now, my honourable friend, the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) has brought up a motion which has no substance, in fact, and is moving a matter of privilege one week late which is not within the rules of the House. That is grounds by itself to have this motion ruled out of order.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I would say that the motion is dealt with by this committee, and

you, Sir, as Chair of this committee, should rule the motion in order or out of order and the committee will decide whether it is in order or out of order.

\* (2050)

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Deputy Chairperson, first of all, I believe there is some confusion here. You are not ruling whether this is a matter of privilege or not. Indeed, the Speaker in his ruling on Friday said that the appropriate mechanism was for a report to come from the committee and that would then be referred to the House, and then the House would decide, in this case the Speaker would decide whether there is a prima facie case, and then a motion is put to the House if indeed the Speaker decides it is a prima facie case.

That is the normal procedure for a matter of privilege. What this motion does is exactly what the Speaker said should be done on Friday. It is the first opportunity since that particular ruling, although any of the technical aspects of the matter of privilege would be dealt with by the House itself. The committee has no jurisdiction to deal with the matter of privilege, but the reason this mechanism is put in place is to ensure that when breaches of privilege occur in committee there is some mechanism by which they can be considered, and that mechanism if for the committee to decide whether to report this matter, and Mr. Deputy Chairperson, for that to be reported then to the House.

If the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) and any other member of this committee wishes to oppose this matter being reported to the House, they need do one thing and one thing only and that is vote against this particular motion. I will be glad, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, to debate the question of privilege. I would point out, by the way, there are specific citations in Beauchesne, Citation 64, of comments that were made in a particular case of an individual seated at his desk. These comments were the subject of a matter of privilege, and in fact, the member at that time was summoned to the bar to apologize, and that is outlined in Citation 64.

You know, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that is irrelevant at this point in time. The member is wishing that this matter be reported. It is the first opportunity since last Friday, but we have no jurisdiction at this committee to decide over the technical nature of it. The point is, it should be referred to the House which is the appropriate mechanism, and I would suggest we get on with it, have a vote and decide whether this matter be reported. That is the appropriate way to proceed.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Is there any further debate? Is the committee ready for the question? The question before the committee, moved by the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli),

THAT the comments of the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) of Monday, June 13, to myself in the Committee of Supply, indicating "she needs a slap," that violated my privileges as a member of the Legislature be reported to the House and that, in accordance with the provisions of Beauchesne Citation 107, this committee recommend that this matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

#### Voice Vote

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** The motion is defeated.

#### Formal Vote

**Mr. Ashton:** I ask for a recorded vote, Mr. Deputy Chairperson?

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Is there a second member to request the—~~the~~ honourable member for Radisson seconds it.

We shall recess and go to the Chamber for a counted vote.

*The committee recessed at 8:54 p.m.*

---

#### After Recess

*The committee resumed at 9:36 p.m.*

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply will be considering the Estimates for the Status of Women. Does the honourable Minister responsible for the Status of Women have an opening statement?

**Mrs. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister responsible for the Status of Women):** Mr. Deputy Chair, it is my pleasure to introduce the Estimates for the Department of the Status of Women for the 1994-95 fiscal year. As Minister responsible for the Status of Women, I would like to outline the accomplishments of the department during the past year and to present some of the goals and objectives for the coming year.

The department includes both the Manitoba Women's Advisory Council and the Manitoba Women's Directorate, each with an important role to play in the enhancement of the status of women in Manitoba. The advisory council is an arm's length body whose members are appointed by the government to represent the different geographical regions of the province. Council presents to government the concerns of women in the community and advises government on these issues.

Working to meet its goal and mandate of enhancing the status of Manitoba women, the advisory council has achieved the following. In response to the overwhelmingly positive response by Manitobans, council updated and reprinted the handbook "Just Me and the Kids" in consultation with women's organizations and agencies, which addresses the issues and concerns of single parenting. This edition, under the title "Parenting on Your Own: A Handbook for One-Parent Families" has been dedicated in commemoration of the International Year of the Family.

In November 1993 the Manitoba Women's Advisory Council in partnership with the Junior League of Winnipeg and the Manitoba Women's Institute held a conference entitled "Damsels in Distress: A Manitoba Sequel". The 251 delegates

in attendance from across Manitoba explored strategies for empowering young women to meet and to accept the challenges and opportunities of today's world. A healthy lifestyle, positive self-image and education and career planning for young women were the themes explored in detail by conference delegates, speakers and facilitators.

Council continued to monitor health issues such as the new reproductive technologies, breast cancer, obstetrical services and others. Council was among those who brought to the attention of the Minister of Health the need for enhanced mammography service in rural Manitoba. As a result, in October 1993 the government announced a breast screening program with centres in Winnipeg, Brandon and Thompson to offer regular screening for women between 50 and 70 years of age.

As a member of the provincial government's Task Force on Midwifery, the advisory council presented a number of recommendations to the government. The task force, chaired by Dr. Patricia Kaufert of the University of Manitoba, was made up of community and government representatives and organizations such as the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses, the Faculty of Nursing, the Women's Health Clinic and the Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Canada.

The report of the task force was released on May 5, 1994, when the Minister of Health announced the establishment of a Midwifery Implementation Council which will oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the report. In response to overwhelmingly positive comments from the public about its collection of resource materials, council continues to develop its reference library. Increasing numbers of students are accessing council library materials and are requesting research guidance and support. Council continued to make photocopying and mailing assistance and the use of its board room available to nonprofit women's organizations. Council looks forward to another productive year. In keeping with its

mandate, council will continue to distribute and make information available to Manitobans.

In addition to work done by Manitoba Women's Advisory Council, the Women's Directorate works to ensure that government programs have addressed the needs and concerns of women. The directorate carries out its mandate through the establishment of partnerships with other departments of government, other jurisdictions across Canada, community groups and other external organizations. The directorate is not involved in the direct delivery of services.

\* (2140)

At this time, I would like to tell you about an important relationship which has developed between the Women's Directorate and a major employer in our province, Eaton's of Canada. In October 1993, Eaton's stores across the country highlighted the contributions of Canadian women during Women's History Month. In developing the Winnipeg Salute to Women's History, Eaton's approached the Women's Directorate, and together they developed a tribute to Canadian women that I understand was the best in Canada. Eaton's and the directorate have continued their partnership working together to celebrate the International Year of the Family and International Women's Day. Governments, individuals and business all have roles to play in promoting women's full participation in all aspects of Manitoba life, and I am pleased that Eaton's has championed the women of our province.

The Rural Child Care Registry, also a result of a directorate partnership, continues its operation in rural Manitoba. Pilot projects are currently underway in nine communities across Manitoba. The directorate continued to represent Manitoba as a lead jurisdiction of the Federal/Provincial Territorial Co-ordinating Committee for the Status of Women on gender equity in the justice system. Jurisdictions continue to monitor progress towards the achievement of equality within their justice systems. This item will continue to be an important agenda item for all ministers responsible for the Status of Women across the country.

As Minister responsible for the Status of Women and Attorney General of Manitoba, the issue of violence is a priority one for me. This government continues its strong commitment to the policy of zero tolerance. Every means available is being utilized so that the best possible service is provided on family violence cases. Supports for victims and abusers have been enhanced. The Women's Advocacy Program has seen its staffing almost double, while resources for counselling male abusers have been substantially increased.

The government will address the problem of youth violence and crime by acting on a nine-point action plan developed as a result of the Summit on Youth Violence and Crime. The directorate has worked hard to address issues surrounding violence against women. The directorate actively participates on government Family Violence Court Implementation Review Committee and the Internal Domestic Violence Review Implementation Committee through its representation on these very important committees.

The directorate also co-ordinated the province's response to the federal government on the recommendations of the report of the national panel on violence against women.

The directorate partnered with Winnipeg School Division No. 1 to co-sponsor a school-based antiviolence program held on April 7. This program, developed and presented by the London Family Court Clinic of Ontario, is a pilot program to train teachers to teach antiviolence curricula in the schools. This workshop is one of eight workshops which the London Family Court Clinic is conducting across Canada to familiarize schools and community groups with this program.

As Minister responsible for the Status of Women and Attorney General the issues of violence against women and youth violence will continue to be a priority for me personally. This government will continue its tough stance on violence, a stance necessary to ensure the safety of all Manitoba citizens.

In addition to its research and analysis function that it performs within government, the directorate

provides an outreach function to the women of Manitoba. The outreach unit provides a joint function on behalf of both the Manitoba Women's Directorate and the Manitoba Seniors Directorate. The outreach staff has been a source of information referral and support services to women and seniors groups as well as to individual women and seniors throughout the province. Members of the outreach staff are based in Portage la Prairie, Thompson and Winnipeg to ensure a truly province-wide service. Staff at the unit have reached out to a number of rural and northern communities including Cross Lake, Snow Lake, Cranberry Portage, Russell, Carman and Oak Bluff to name a few.

A toll-free women's information line has been established in order to provide women from any part of the province with easily accessible information on programs and services within government and the community. In support of this initiative the Women's Directorate is developing an extensive database of government and community-based programs and services. Information capabilities will include retrieval according to specific concerns and according to geographic regions of the province. Information gathering for the databases will be ongoing for update on a regular basis.

In order to keep up with the steadily increasing demand for speakers on a variety of topics of interest to young girls and women the directorate established a Speakers' Bureau which includes speakers from within government, the private sector and the community. The bureau provides community groups and other interested organizations with knowledgeable speakers for their functions.

During the past year two expanded issues of the popular About Women newsletter were produced and distributed to interested Manitoba women. In both issues a new feature entitled Profiles on Women was included. Several prominent, successful Manitoba women have been profiled through this feature as a tribute to the contributions of all Manitoba women. The directorate will continue profiling the successes of Manitoba

women in future issues of About Women through this ongoing feature.

Manitoba Status of Women continues to work hard towards fulfillment of its mandate which is to promote and to enhance the status of women as well as women's full equality. I am very proud of the successes of both the Manitoba Women's Advisory Council and the Manitoba Women's Directorate, and during the coming year I am confident that both organizations will continue their work to ensure equal opportunities and equal participation for Manitoba women in all aspects of our society.

Thank you.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** We thank the minister for those comments. Does the official opposition critic, the honourable member for Wellington, have any opening comments?

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Mr. Deputy Chair, no, I will ask my questions in due course, but I think it more appropriate to actually get into the discussion rather than any opening statements.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** I thank the critic from the official opposition for that. Does the critic for the second opposition party, the honourable member for Osborne, have an opening statement?

**Ms. McCormick:** Mr. Deputy Chair, yes, just a brief one. I am interested to learn about the workings of the advisory council and the Women's Directorate, and in my questioning I am going to be asking the minister for more detail on what issues have been raised by the advisory council, what advice was given and what action was taken. There are issues relating to the health and well-being of women which were not on her list of issues that were raised, and I will be asking detailed questions in that area.

As well, with respect to the Women's Directorate and the work done to monitor government programs, I am interested in exploring issues of cutbacks in social assistance and the functioning of the Maintenance Enforcement Program, home care cutbacks and other issues to determine whether the Women's Directorate has in fact assessed the impacts of some of these

activities or these initiatives on women. With that, we will turn to the questions.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** I thank the critic for the second opposition party. At this time we invite the minister's staff to join us at the table. We ask that the minister introduce her staff present. We are on page 142 and pages 14-15 in your Supplementary.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** It gives me pleasure to introduce to you Theresa Harvey, who is the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Women's Directorate; Ruth Mitchell, who is the manager of the policy area; Olivia Flynn, who is the executive director of the advisory council; and Betty Nordrum, who is a policy analyst for the advisory council.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** I thank the minister. Page 142, is it the will of the committee that we deal with it as a whole, or do we want to deal with it line by line? What is the will of the committee? [interjection] Deal with it as a whole? Okay, then we will pass it all as one item.

\* (2150)

**Ms. Barrett:** Under the Activity Identification for the advisory council, there are three general categories: One is advise the government; second is consult with women and women's organizations; and the third is work in partnership. I will be asking the minister to expand on those three areas. Number one, could she give us some detail or an outline of how the Women's Advisory Council actually advises the government, through what processes? How does the advisory council actually do its work?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Issues are presented to council in several ways, first of all, through members of council in their regions who bring issues to the council meeting, also through the chairperson, by women and Manitobans who write letters expressing their concerns, by women and Manitobans who visit the advisory council office in search of ways to deal with various situations, by women and Manitobans who telephone the advisory council offices in search of ways in which to deal with various situations, and by women who request and are invited to make presentations of issues at the council meetings.



**Ms. Barrett:** Can the minister tell us how often the advisory council meets, where the advisory council meets and the regional representation of the members of the advisory council?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the council is to meet approximately six times a year. Representation on the council is from parts of Manitoba, such as Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Norway House, Bagot, Thompson, Stonewall and Winnipeg.

**Ms. Barrett:** Are there any vacancies on the advisory council at this time?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I neglected in my other answer to say that meetings are also held in Winnipeg, Brandon and Portage la Prairie, in terms of where meetings are held.

The council can have up to 18 members. It has to have a minimum of eight members. There are currently 11 members.

**Ms. Barrett:** The second area of activity is consultation with women and women's organizations throughout the province and representing various communities within Manitoba. Can the minister expand on what has been, over the last year, meant by "consultation"? With whom has the advisory council consulted, and around which issues?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the advisory council serves as a resource to women's organizations in a variety of ways, such as reviewing educational materials for use in training workshops, serving as resource persons on committees, and council has also played a major role in working with women's organizations such as resource persons on conference planning committees.

The following are some of the organizations with which the advisory council has worked in these capacities: the Northern Women's Resource Centre, the Women's Health Network, Family Dispute Services. The council in this case reviewed a standards manual for women's shelters in Manitoba.

They have also worked with the Group Against Pornography or GAP; the Women's Health

Network; the Independent Living Resource Centre; the Association of Women's Shelters; Women's Forum of the Winnipeg Film Group; Business and Professional Women's Club of Winnipeg; and the Community Legal Education Association; also the Manitoba Telephone System retraining for women in call management services, including the use of the blocking feature; and also alternatives to end violence against women's educational committee.

(Mr. Bob Rose, Acting Deputy Chairperson, in the Chair)

The advisory council has also provided assistance with mailing. It has a policy of assisting nonprofit women's organizations with mailing up to a maximum of 250 items at 43 cents each or the equivalent per year.

During '93-94, the advisory council was able to assist the following organizations: Women's World Finance; Single Parent Resource Centre; Manitoba Traditional Midwives Collective, Thompson Action Committee on the Status of Women; Women in Second-Stage Housing; Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women; Winnipeg Council of Women; Alpha House; Altrusa International of Winnipeg; International Women's Day committee; Women's Health Research Foundation; Children's Home of Winnipeg, and Women Healing for Change.

There is also a list of groups that have received assistance in photocopying, and also they have provided the use of their board room as well.

**Ms. Barrett:** When the minister was talking about the groups that the council had met with, and I did not get all of them, but for example, the Group Against Pornography, the Women's Health Network, and the Association of Women's Shelters, can the minister explain what was the purpose of those meetings or how the council was able to work with those particular groups?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, the Group Against Pornography or GAP, it was work with GAP and the Manitoba Telephone System to make sure that the 900 numbers were not freely available in Manitoba. The Women's Health Network was to work on the midwifery

recommendations, and the Association of Women's Shelters was, I am told, a consultation process, but details of the information I will have to undertake to get for the member.

**Ms. Barrett:** The final Activity Identification is: working in partnership with women's organizations to support and facilitate community activities aimed at improving the status of women.

The minister in her opening remarks talked about several things that had happened last year, the Just Me and the Kids printing, the Damsels in Distress conference, monitoring of health issues such as the enhanced mammography services, the midwifery recommendations and the reference library. Are there other examples of the working in partnership with women's organizations that were undertaken by the advisory council?

\* (2200)

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The projects that I spoke about in my opening remarks were the key project undertakings which were of a larger nature. The work ongoing otherwise was the work in terms of ongoing consultation or something specific with that group as opposed to producing a booklet or putting on a conference which was what was named in my opening remarks.

**Ms. Barrett:** There are a number of expected results this year for the advisory council and I would like to ask some questions about some more detail about what is expected and also what happened this last year. In particular, the second result is presenting recommendations by council to the government regarding issues relating to the Status of Women. I assume that some of those issues were reported on by the minister in her opening remarks.

I am wondering if there were any additional recommendations of an official or unofficial nature prepared by the advisory council to government, and also what recommendations, what issues the minister believes will be issues of concern for the advisory council this year, if she can look ahead.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** In response to presentations made to council, council reviews information and makes recommendations to government.

In 1993-94, council presented the following recommendations: In Health, regarding the availability of mammographic examinations in rural Manitoba; in the area of pornography, regarding the need to ensure continued application of the Stentor Program, that is the name of the program, S-T-E-N-T-O-R, Stentor Program Content Guidelines, which prohibits sponsors from offering sexually explicit programming through the 900 numbers.

There had been some concern that Manitobans could lose the protection of these guidelines after the Manitoba Telephone System comes under the regulatory control of CRTC. As a result of the efforts of the advisory council, council was credited by the Manitoba Telephone System with playing a major role in influencing public policy in their efforts to prevent sponsors from offering sexually explicit programming through the 900 number service.

In the area of Justice: The need for stated guidelines on handling cases of criminal harassment and stalking to be clarified and to be also reinforced. The need for the women's community to be informed and invited to participate in justice issues with respect to gun control. The need for the across-the-board ban on the nonmilitary use of the large-capacity magazines, and that no exemptions be granted for the purposes of legitimate competition, and that in fact occurred.

Also, that in response to recommendations on judicial discipline, prepared by the Law Reform Commission, the advisory council recommended that a clear definition be put in place which plainly states when and under what conditions the Judicial Council is convened and when it is not, and as the member knows, there is now a bill before the House.

The advisory council further endorsed the recommendation of the Law Reform Commission to include three nonlawyers as members of the Judicial Council. The advisory council also had some concern on initial recommendations that there be out-of-province judges on the Judicial Council, a concern regarding the costs, but now

that has been worked out through Justice that their salaries and so on would continue to be paid by their home jurisdictions.

In the area of education, the advisory council wrote to the Minister of Education (Mr. Manness) in support of recommendations contained in the report, Needs Assessment of Newcomer Black Youths and Families, and recommended that Manitoba Education and Training define a policy standard and require that all school divisions establish antiracism programs in each school, and that the inclusion of cross-cultural education and awareness in the curriculum for teacher training be a requirement, and that such a standard be supported and maintained and promoted.

**Ms. Barrett:** In the area of pornography or that general area, I am wondering if the council would look at an issue that has been brought before the House and that the Minister responsible for the Telephone System (Mr. Findlay) said he would undertake to look at, which is the issue of the adult video stores being allowed to advertise with display advertising in the Yellow Pages. Is this an issue that the advisory council would undertake to make a recommendation to the government on and if so, how would one go about getting that issue raised, or any other issue raised, before the advisory council?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** My understanding is that the minister responsible has given an undertaking in that area and that individual is the one charged with the responsibility, and my understanding is he has given an undertaking in that area. In a more general case where people do have concerns which they would like the advisory council to look at, or at least to explore as an issue, then that can be done by a letter for any issue.

**Ms. Barrett:** So if GAP or even a member of the Legislative Assembly wanted to ask the council to look at a particular issue, that would be an acceptable thing to have as an undertaking?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Yes, that is correct.

**Ms. Barrett:** In the area of education, there were some recommendations made. The minister in her earlier answer under Needs Assessment—forgive me, my notes are sketchy—for, I believe it is

Newcomer Black Youths and Families, antiracism programs in schools and cross-cultural training for teachers, these were, I understand, recommendations made by the advisory council to the, I would assume, Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mr. Gilleshammer) in the first place and the Minister of Education (Mr. Manness) in the latter two cases. Can the minister tell us what the status is of those recommendations?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, the recommendations were made by a member of the advisory council to the Minister of Education. That member also brought these recommendations to council who were supportive of the concept. At the moment I am not able to tell you what the status is of those recommendations other than to say that they have been raised for consideration to the Minister of Education.

\* (2210)

**Ms. Barrett:** This raises another more general question. The advisory council or members of the advisory council make recommendations to ministers or government, how are those recommendations followed up? Is there a process in place by the advisory council where, if they do not hear from the minister or do not see some action taking place on a recommendation, they contact the minister after a period of time and say, what is the status of these recommendations, or is it just left to the minister without any follow-up?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The advisory council is, as its name suggests, advisory to government. It is able to make recommendations which support concepts or a specific action and that may come again from citizens who bring it to the council, from council members themselves, and the council then will make a recommendation of support. But council recognizes in its advisory capacity to government, the government then has to make a determination as to whether or not it is able to implement that recommendation at this time or within the scope of other initiatives.

The chairperson of the advisory council also has meetings with the Minister responsible for the Status of Women. These issues can be raised again with that minister with the suggestion or

recommendation that that minister look to follow up with colleagues about the status of issues which have been raised over the past period of time.

**Ms. Barrett:** So the basic follow-up procedure is in the meetings between the chair of the advisory council and the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, and the chair then will raise issues or has an opportunity to raise issues that may not have been responded to adequately at least to the council's satisfaction. Is that an accurate process?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Fairly accurate in that the council may simply be asking for a status report on exactly what is happening in terms of those recommendations. The answer may be that they are in process, the answer may be that they are within initiatives of government. So sometimes detailed information is not able to be provided back because it is contained in an initiative of government which may not be announced yet; however, that is the way that it has worked in that the minister responsible then undertakes to look into the status of initiatives.

**Ms. Barrett:** Is that a regular part of the meetings of the advisory council, a report on the status of recommendations that have gone forward to government, or is it more ad hoc in that the chair will ask the minister at their meetings?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The recommendations to government are formally recorded in the minutes of the meeting and then following that, it is then council which may decide to check on the status as they review minutes of the meeting in future meetings, or they may decide that they would like to send a second letter which, again, would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

**Ms. Barrett:** I would like to ask a question again about one of the Expected Results areas, which is the examination of strategies on the enhancement of skill development for women and the communication of this information to women's organizations.

Can the minister explain what some of those skill development enhancement areas are, and how they anticipate the communication of those strategies?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** This refers to the contents of the publication, "Take that Seat," and it is putting out the information and also encouragement for women to enter into political life or to take positions on boards and commissions. The information is given out through the booklet, "Take that Seat." The advisory council is also looking at putting out a newsletter. The information is also given out through telephone conversations and in one-to-one consultations with women.

**Ms. Barrett:** I think, finally, can the minister tell us now what her understanding is, at this point, of the existing equality issues and on emerging priorities of women that is an item under Expected Results? What are some of the areas that are being worked on currently and that the advisory council thinks probably will be important issues in the next year?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, the issues which the advisory council sees being important in the coming year are the education and training issues dealing particularly in the area of their relationship to economic independence. Secondly, following the conference, "Damsels in Distress: A Manitoba Sequel", there have been a number of requests from community groups and from educators in particular to put on another conference, and within that conference, there would be looked for a large representation of young women. I understand a number of teachers have said that they would like to bring young women students with them. Then there is the continuing issue of concern, and that is the issue of violence against women.

In addition, there are two other issues which have also become quite important, the issue of the breast implants and also the issue of child support and what the Supreme Court may decide in the case before it.

\* (2220)

**Ms. Barrett:** Just a question—the issue of breast implants is one that I am quite concerned about. What does the council see as its role in dealing with this issue? How can it make its presence felt?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, the advisory council sees their role as making sure information is available to women, also monitoring the lawsuits which are in progress, also making sure that there is information about the supports available to women, supports in the area of health care and also support in the area of legal support.

**Ms. Barrett:** How does the council anticipate being able to provide these legal and informational supports? Are they going to be reactive or proactive in this regard?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed the council would see its role as supportive. At the moment, that may appear to be reactive in that they are looking at what the needs are, what are the needs that women are expressing, and how can they begin to meet some of those needs which are, by and large, informational?

So at the moment, they see themselves as moving in concert or collaterally with the issue.

**Ms. Barrett:** Has the council consulted with any of the organizations that are more directly involved with this issue, such as the I Know Network and the Women's Health Clinic?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The advisory council has consulted with the Women's Health Clinic. When we begin to discuss the directorate, there will be other information available from the directorate.

**Ms. McCormick:** In preparation for tonight I sat down and made a list of the issues with which I have had varying levels of dialogue with individuals and groups of women since I was elected in September. I would like to ask the minister with respect to whether or not the advisory council discussed or gave advice on these issues of concern to women. I am pleased to say that some of them have been identified, and I will just knock them off my list and I will not even ask any questions on them.

The first has been touched on, and that is the issue of breast implants. I would like to know, though, was the impact of women on the June 17 deadline for participation in the class-action suit in the United States regarding breast implants

discussed or was advice given to the government in this area?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The advisory council is interested in asking that the government might consider a funding proposal from the Women's Health Clinic to set up a primary care program for women with breast implants. However, this has not been formally submitted to government yet. So it is not a proposal sitting with the Minister of Health at this point, but there is a proposal which they were interested in.

They also were interested that the Manitoba government become a claimant and opt out of the American MDL class-action lawsuit on breast implants.

I am told that the advisory council can provide further information later. We do not have further information at this time. I would also just remind the committee that this is one of these times where I cannot split myself in two. As Attorney General, I have not made any comments on that. It is a legal action taking place in another jurisdiction. As the chief prosecutor, I am not able to speak about it, and yet I understand the concerns from the Status of Women. So I have tried through the directorate, and making sure the advisory council is also able to consider this information, to make sure that we have been able to be active, and yet I have had to be very careful about any public statements in terms of the lawsuit.

**Ms. McCormick:** I want to make it clear that the order in which I am putting these issues forward are not necessarily a prioritized one. It just happens to be the result of some rather convoluted thought processes.

The next one is the use of Prozac in treating patients with depression. There has been some considerable concern that women are not always well represented in drug trials. I am wondering if there has been any discussion or advice given to the government on the status of Prozac.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed, no, none has been given.

**Ms. McCormick:** The next area relates to the broader issue of violence against women, which you have addressed in some ways.

The question that is primary before the Coalition on Violence Against Women right now is the issue of double charging and the impact of an aggressive stance by the police, where a woman in the name of defending herself against physical injury may in fact inflict a visible injury on a person who has assaulted her. Has the advisory council discussed or given advice on the issue of double charging?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** No advice has been received from the advisory council in that area, though the member knows now that there has been a directive to Crown attorneys from the Justice side.

**Ms. McCormick:** The next area is the access of women to child care resources. Did the advisory council discuss or give advice on the cap on the number of subsidized daycare spaces and the freeze on the creation of new child care spaces?

\* (2230)

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed that council has not given advice on a specific issue in relation to child care but has spoken about the issue broadly in terms of child care being a need and also in support of the need.

Also, I am informed that both the advisory council and the directorate attended the annual meeting of the Coalition on Child Care in order to make sure that government was well aware of the issues which were being raised in that forum.

**Ms. McCormick:** The next area is with respect to social assistance. It was apparent at the beginning that the cutbacks which were aimed at single people on provincial assistance were done in such a way as to spare single parents and their children or families, but recently, we have learned of a cutback on the eligibility for the \$150 special needs fund, which at one point in time was taken as a given and now appears to be no longer widely available.

Has or would the advisory council intend to address the impact of the constraining of the \$150 special needs and the impact of that on women and their children?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed that the advisory council has not discussed that specific issue that the member raised. However, they do discuss

issues relating to single parenting more broadly, and in 1991, I am informed, they did make a report on single-parent families and now are very interested in the single-parent initiative that the Department of Family Services and the federal government are jointly working on. I understand there have been consultations around the province on this particular initiative.

**Ms. McCormick:** Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, the next area is the cutbacks in foster care rates for extended-family foster care. This is expected to have a significant impact, to be felt most particularly by native women who care for children of extended-family members. Did the advisory council discuss or give advice on that issue?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed that the council has had no concerns expressed to them directly to date so far.

**Ms. McCormick:** You have spoken of the tax treatment of child support payments as being an issue that you will be monitoring in a future way. That being said, has the advisory council discussed or given advice on the issue of the Maintenance Enforcement Program's success in getting child support payments to custodial parents in a timely fashion?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that the advisory council will be active in the round table part of the task force which is being organized by the federal minister on child tax support. At that time, issues relating to Maintenance Enforcement will be raised.

**Ms. McCormick:** The next area is with respect to chronic fatigue syndrome. Many of us wore green ribbons on the day on which attention was brought to this disease. Did the advisory council discuss or give advice on chronic fatigue syndrome, given that many who are affected are those who work in female-dominated professions such as teaching, nursing and child care?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Acting Deputy Chair, I am informed, no, that issue has not been discussed.

**Ms. McCormick:** The next area is with respect to the special needs of women in their educational and skill development aspects of their lives. Did

the advisory council discuss or give advice to government on the issue of cutbacks to the funding of the ACCESS program, given that many of the people who are participating in that are not only women but are also single parents.

(Mr. Deputy Chairperson in the Chair)

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed that council did not deal with that issue this year.

**Ms. McCormick:** Has the advisory council undertaken any initiatives to address the special needs of women in nontraditional occupations or in trades training?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that the advisory council has been distributing information on the nontraditional training that is available to women, that they also have been monitoring what training is available and that has been the focus of their work so far.

**Ms. McCormick:** Another area which actually was my first introduction to the politics of cutbacks and the impact on women was in the area of the Home Care cutbacks. The belief is widely held that the impact of Home Care cutbacks in the provision of support to seniors in their homes in fact transfers responsibility onto the adult children of seniors, and that this burden is likely to be most borne by women who will function as caregivers to their parents and parents-in-law, often at the expense of the time and resources available to give their own children.

Has the advisory council discussed or given advice on the issues of Manitoba's Home Care program?

\* (2240)

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed no.

**Ms. McCormick:** We continue to discuss the issues of problems of sexism in Manitoba's workplaces. Did the advisory council discuss or give advice on the issue of sexism and sexual harassment of women in workplaces?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed that the council has provided information to callers and also has provided referrals to callers who have called on the issue of sexual harassment in the workplace.

**Ms. McCormick:** I noted with interest that when the debate with respect to the treatment of the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) first hit the newspapers, the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women was fairly quick to speak out with respect to importance of gender issues and the treatment of women in workplaces.

Would it have been appropriate for either the Women's Advisory Council or the Women's Directorate to take a position and speak publicly on this issue?

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Order, please. I would ask the honourable member to choose her subject matter very carefully. This matter that the honourable member is bringing forward at this time is before the Speaker for a ruling, so if we could just leave that matter alone at this time.

**Ms. McCormick:** I will move then to the issues relating to part-time work and minimum wage. Given that many women rely on nonstandard employment for their incomes, has the advisory council discussed or given advice to government on issues relating to part-time work and minimum wage?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am informed the council has not given that advice in this past year.

**Ms. McCormick:** I am about to wrap up here. Finally, much attention has been given to Manitoba's dubious distinction of being the child poverty capital of Canada, the province with the highest rates for adolescent pregnancies, for female-headed single parents, and for the highest rates of child welfare apprehensions. Have any of these topics been discussed by the advisory council, or has advice been given to the government?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chair, I am informed that a number of these topics were covered at the November conference of "Damsels in Distress: A Manitoba Sequel," and that the advisory council is interested in the concerns for single parents. They do provide information on how to get access where individuals have need, how to access the system to try and meet that need. They do that through one-on-one discussions and also telephone

conversations. They also attempt to provide referrals so that the individual can get to the point where they need to be rather than just trying to find it by themselves.

**Ms. McCormick:** To the minister, is there a way of compiling the inquiries which come in so that a composite of the issues being brought forward and which the advisory council's office is being requested to respond to have a way of translating into some kind of priority setting for initiatives?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that the council does keep a list and a way to keep track of the kinds of concerns which are raised either by phone conversation or by walk-in individuals. However, the priorities of the council's work are set by the council members. Council members may choose the priorities which have shown themselves in terms of inquiries, or they may choose priorities which are based on areas which they represent and other priorities which council decides to adopt.

**Ms. McCormick:** One final question, I note that you have as part of your Activity Identification the issue of women with disabilities. Has there been any special initiatives conducted by the advisory council? Have the special needs of women with disabilities been discussed, and has any advice been given with respect to the breaking down of barriers for disabled women? I am thinking specifically of the issue of the Handi-Transit cutbacks. When I attended the demonstration, it appeared that there were a good number of women who do rely on Handi-Transit to get access to their lives outside their homes and apartments.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chair, I am told that issues relating to women, in particular with disabilities, are raised at every council meeting, that the issue of the Handi-Transit was raised specifically at a council meeting. The staff were directed to collect some information, and council will be reviewing that information.

**Ms. Barrett:** I would like to return to one of the issues that the minister had said was being addressed this year, and that was education and training as it relates to economic independence. I am wondering if the minister can expand a bit on

what that issue is and how it is going to play itself out.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed that, for council, it has been a focus on distributing information for single parents, that the initiative for single parents seems to be coming very much connected with single parents becoming employed where possible, that there is the initiative between the federal and the provincial government. That has been the focus for council, I am told.

**Ms. Barrett:** So this issue of education and training leading to economic independence, which is a major concern for women in the province, the way that is being played out by the advisory council at this point is mainly as a distribution of information on current programs and activities rather than any series of study and recommendation to the ministers, say, of Family Services and Education and Training. It seems like a fairly narrow view of the role of the advisory council in this very important area.

\* (2250)

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chair, I am told that in its 1991 report on single parents, which the advisory council prepared, that there were recommendations for the Minister of Education and Training. The advisory council, I am told, also works with women in the community to help them prepare resumes and also packages which would assist them in finding employment. So their work is not at this time research based. It has tended to be more practical, more community focused, in one-to-one case work, where they have been attempting to assist women to join the workforce.

**Ms. Barrett:** The 1991 report on single parents obviously had recommendations to be followed. Has the advisory council undertaken a regular follow-up with the various government departments on the recommendations of that report? If so, can the minister provide me with any information on the status of those recommendations?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that following the 1991 report there was a consultation on single parents in 1992. At that point there was a further clarification of the issues. Following that, we now have, which



has been spanning '93-94, the initiative for single parents which the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) has been leading and has been working in consultation with the federal government.

As the member knows, a lot of the training dollars are also federal dollars, which would need to be made available. There is, at this point, uncertainty. We do not know yet what the new Liberal federal government will be doing in terms of programs which tend to fund a number of those individuals into programs.

**Ms. Barrett:** I just want to make a final comment, and I do not want it to be interpreted as really a negative comment on the work of the advisory council because I do know that these are women from all across the province and they meet—well, they meet every other month. There is an enormous amount of work to be done, et cetera. I do think, particularly in light of the 16 issues that the member for Osborne raised, many of which were either not discussed by the advisory council or discussed only in very broad terms, if I were to make a recommendation to the advisory council, it would be that these issues and others are issues that are of immediate, long-standing and important concern to many of the women in the province, and they have enormous political and social ramifications for the women and families in Manitoba. I would recommend and advise the advisory council to maybe look at providing some advice to the government on these issues.

The advisory council and the Status of Women ministry has very little resources of its own, and one of the best things that it can do is provide that advice and be one of the conduits, if you will, of issues that are facing women today to the government. I think that there is a list here that I would like to suggest the advisory council look very seriously at.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I understand the way that the member has made her remarks. I believe the context she wants to place them in is that there are a large number of issues which affect women and which can be examined and would be helpful to have examined, but I know she is not suggesting

that I interfere as minister in any way. I know that she understands that the advisory council is arm's length, and were it my effort to, for some other reason, reach in and try and direct the work of the advisory council, that would certainly be seen in a highly negative way. The advisory council operates at arm's length, operates with its members of its council who bring forward issues, who also receive issues, though. That was our starting point tonight, to say issues can be raised by way of letter, by way of community meeting for the consideration of the advisory council, and then they have to look at how they do their work.

I would really like to be very careful to say in this instance it seems useful to add to the number of issues which might be considered because they are important ones. However, I also offer the other side to acknowledge my own caution as minister not to appear to be directing the advisory council because they are at arm's length to government. They do their work and offer advice to government, and I would not want to be seen as being interfering.

I understand the comments being made as a number of issues to be examined, and I believe the advisory council has accepted them in that light.

**Ms. Barrett:** Just one final comment and I promise it will be. Of course, I am very cognizant of the need to have an arm's-length organization such as this. I do, however, think that the asking for advice can, I think, legitimately come from not only the community or issues that are raised through the community to the members of the advisory council, but I think that without jeopardizing that arm's-length process, ministers of the Crown can, through the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, ask that there be advice given to them by the advisory council. I assume that advice process can go two ways without jeopardizing the independence. That basically is what I was saying.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Yes, it can, again, always keeping in mind that fine line of not wanting to appear to be directing the council because the council represents the community. Where I have other concerns or other issues, I have the ability to ask

the directorate for information also, but I understand the point. I just wanted to make sure it was on the record that there was a recognition on my part of the issues as being important but a recognition, also, of the arm's-length relationship of the advisory council to government.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Item 1.(a) Manitoba Women's Advisory Council (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$171,700—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$115,200—pass.

Item 1.(b) Women's Directorate (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$528,700.

\* (2300)

**Ms. Barrett:** There is a whole lot of information on the Women's Directorate here, and I am not sure if I can get down to it all, but I do have some questions, particularly in the results area, the area of facilitating initiatives to promote the economic self-sufficiency of women. I am wondering if the minister can expand on that Expected Results area.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The directorate has undertaken a number of partnerships, a number of partnerships in the area of education with school guidance counsellors looking at the needs of young women. They also have been invited to put on a workshop in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba to look at the educational and social issues of women to prepare teachers. The underlying issue has been that it is very frequently an issue of socialization, and so the directorate has been working with education to get at some of the socialization issues as early as possible.

They have also been doing an analysis of the 1991 census looking at information relating to women to find factors that would contribute to the economic inequality of women.

They also, back to education, partner with the A Cappella Network, and they have been examining, again, socialization as one of the major underlying issues and recognizing particularly that women have, by and large, that competing issue of work and family and how they can devote the time and the energy to work on both.

**Ms. Barrett:** So they are working with the Department of Education at the University of

Manitoba. They are analyzing these 1991 census data and they are working with something called the A Cappella Network? Could the minister explain what the A Cappella Network is?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The A Cappella Network—I am told they get their name, a cappella, from singing alone, being the meaning. The A Cappella Network is an action-oriented group of educators and government officials and it resulted from a conference on socialization. Just so the record is exactly correct, the workshop is with the faculty of education at the University of Manitoba. I only say that so there is no confusion with the Department of Education in government, that it is the faculty of education at the University of Manitoba.

**Ms. Barrett:** It is my American background comes out every once in a while.

The minister, in the Estimates book, talks about a Speakers' Bureau and the minister mentioned that in her opening remarks that includes government representatives, private sector representatives, and community representatives. Can the minister outline some of the particular issues that have been requested of the Speakers' Bureau and numbers of engagements that have been undertaken by the bureau?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that the directorate gets approximately 50 requests a year. The main themes of the speaking engagements through the Speakers' Bureau are education and training, women and work, women and economic equality.

Examples of some of the places where they have spoken: Atomic Energy of Canada; CMHC; they have spoken at urban and rural high schools, the University of Winnipeg Department of Sociology and Revenue Canada.

**Ms. Barrett:** As well, the minister talked earlier about the Rural Child Care Safety Registry. That is a pilot project that is currently involved in nine communities.

Can the minister give us an update? I frankly cannot remember what the minister said about the role of the Women's Directorate in regard to the Rural Child Care Safety Registry, if the minister could explain the connection between the directorate and the registry.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that first of all the relationship is that the directorate was the funder. The directorate was approached by the Women's Institute and the directorate provided funding of \$15,000 through Lotteries disbursement.

The issue is that Manitobans who farm, and I know the member knows this because we had debated it in the House, require child care at very specific times of the year. So the Rural Child Care Safety Registry was an innovative pilot project which was established through a collaboration between the Manitoba Women's Institute and the provincial departments of the Status of Women, Family Services and Agriculture.

The evaluation of the pilot, which has only operated through two harvests and is in its second seeding, is currently underway. The registries were established in nine communities: Swan River, Glenella, Minnedosa, Stonewall, Arborg, Riverton, Killarney, Gladstone, Virden, Winkler-Morden.

**Ms. Barrett:** This is in its second seeding. I am assuming it will go through the third harvest this fall. Is that then the end of the pilot project?

\* (2310)

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that the pilot project is in the process of being evaluated by the Department of Women's Studies at the University of Manitoba. It is hoped or expected, I gather, that it will remain operational within these nine areas, but at this point, it is difficult for me to say that that will specifically be the case. However, I gather that that is certainly what is being looked at at the moment. It will also be based on the evaluation in each one of those areas.

**Ms. Barrett:** Members of my caucus have had discussions with members of the government, particularly the Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey), regarding the outcome of pilot projects and what happens to pilot projects upon completion of their being pilot projects. I am wondering if the minister has any sense of what is anticipated to be the funding scheme, if you will, for these nine communities and maybe more that might follow through, assuming of course that the evaluation is

positive, and it is hoped that this program will go ahead.

Is it anticipated that the government may participate in ongoing funding of these projects or will it be such like other projects which will be then asked to be funded outside of governmental funding?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The project is owned by the Women's Institute, and that was at their request. That was not something which occurred subsequently.

The funding was to provide or to develop the prototype. That prototype is now there. It also was to explain and provide support for what the intention of the Rural Child Care Safety Registry was to be and what it was to accomplish. So that has now been accomplished and, therefore, it is operational because the prototype is there. The registry is operating and, therefore, it is, I am told, not expected that it requires ongoing funding especially in the amount that was given to develop the prototype and to actually get it going.

So I am told that it is expected that these will continue because they are now there; however, it again depends upon the evaluation and whether or not people in the communities have found it to be useful and exactly what they want.

**Ms. Barrett:** So what the minister is saying is that because the prototype and the information to establish the Rural Child Care Safety Registry process has been developed that the registry should be able to be continued in, at the very least, these nine communities without any cost to any level of government or community organization whatsoever. Is that accurate?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** That is what I am informed, that that is the case. The registries are maintained at the local Ag offices, so there is a specific place where there are prototypes being developed, how work will be developed, and the concept has now been spoken about and people know about it. But, again, the evaluation has not been done yet, so we have to look at the evaluation as well to see if it is exactly what the communities want.

**Ms. Barrett:** When does the minister anticipate that this evaluation by the Department of Women's Studies will be concluded?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that Women's Studies tell us it will be the fall.

**Ms. Barrett:** In the Rural Child Care Safety Registry prototype, were there any training or basic standards established for people who would put their names on the child care registry?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that arrangements were made with individual farm families that the police departments were to provide the security clearance and that then there were interviews with the farm family between the individual and that farm family. That is how they worked out what was required.

**Ms. Barrett:** So the police or the RCMP did do a security clearance on every person whose name was on the child care registry.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chair, yes, that is our understanding. To our knowledge, that is what occurred.

**Ms. Barrett:** I have one other question to ask. I hope it is appropriate to ask it here rather than in the advisory council, or I could have asked it, I guess, both places.

I would like to ask the minister to outline the process and the rationale behind the putting together, if you will, of both the advisory council and the Women's Directorate in their new offices.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Let me, first of all, dispel anything that that question indicates around a putting together. There has been not a putting together. I gather that may have been a concern, that there was an effort to somehow join or have the advisory council lose its independence. That is absolutely false. That did not occur. That is not at all what happened. In fact, that has continued to be respected.

I can tell the member that in the previous location, the rent was very high. It was very expensive. It was expensive both for the directorate, and it was expensive for the advisory council. This is a time in which there are very difficult fiscal decisions, and government has tried

to preserve as many program dollars as possible to have money available to provide the service and not just to provide an extremely large working environment, but we wanted to make sure that there was a working environment provided which respected for both the work that they did and also their separateness.

I can tell the member that the directorate and the advisory council did move into their new premises on the 31st of May, '94. They are located across the hall from each other. They have separate entrances. They have separate reference libraries. They maintain their functions separately, as they did before. The advisory council maintains its walk-in area so that it can assist community groups with Xeroxing and with postage, and there is the reference library. There is also a small informal meeting room in the area of the advisory council.

\* (2320)

The directorate has its own separate area. It is not joined to the advisory council, and it continues its work. So one is located at 107-175 Carlton, and one is located at 100-175 Carlton. In choosing this location, and we did look at several and tried to find the one that would provide the greatest advantage to both the directorate and the advisory council.

The new premises offer significant improvements in its present location. First of all, they are at street level: they are easy to see; they are easy to find. It affords greater accessibility and, we believe, creates a higher visibility for both the ministry for the Status of Women and also for the advisory council.

They are also fully wheelchair accessible. They offer ample and safe parking, and they offer an excellent bus service so that individuals can get there and can get home, and we believe they are in a safe place. The space provided is consistent with the government guidelines. It does allow a saving in rent, and it does allow us to protect the programs and the community activity.

Obviously, I would hope that there would be co-operative working attitudes as there have been in the past, but they are not required to share space. No one has given up a library or a xeroxing

facility. There is, however, a common boardroom, a boardroom able to be used by both, a large boardroom not in use all the time. It has a separate entrance. The entrance to the boardroom, one does not have to go through either the advisory council or the Status of Women to reach the boardroom.

So there has been every effort to maintain the integrity, the separateness of both, while looking to provide for Manitobans a space that allowed us to protect the programs and also provided a visibility.

**Ms. Barrett:** Could the minister—and you may not have this information—give me the difference in square footage between the former facilities and the current facilities?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** We do not have the differences in square footage; we can undertake to provide it.

It is smaller. It is somewhat less space. The previous space was very large, and again we were looking to use the dollars in the area available to programming. The work of the advisory council, I look at and recognize that there is some travel involved, that there is a need to have meetings in other parts of Manitoba. So there was an effort to make sure that was available. I look at the directorate and the community work that they undertake and want to make sure that continues to be possible.

So they have moved into their new space now.

**Ms. Barrett:** Could the minister tell me exactly what the savings are in the rent?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** In total for both, \$38,000, and that is on an annual basis.

**Ms. McCormick:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am interested in returning to the detail of activities listed on page 16 and would like to begin by determining what areas of legislation policy and program have been analyzed in the last year.

Just specifically—we will start with the numbers—how many areas were the subject of formal policy analysis?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am told that the analysis has been in the area of education programs, labour legislation, pay equity and in the area of justice, justice issues, particularly those issues as they relate to violence.

**Ms. McCormick:** So I am counting five issue areas?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Because we do work and we have analysts who do work looking at the initiatives in every department, we do not have a specific single list that I am able to read off to the member. I am told that, and I see that there are certainly analyses done on initiatives in just about every department in government and also on issues which cross government departments, such as aboriginal issues.

Also, there are analyses done on federal legislation and also federal initiatives, particularly in the area of economic initiatives, entrepreneurship, the Business Start program, women and credit issues as well.

**Ms. McCormick:** How many of these policy analysis initiatives resulted in recommendations to government?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The way the directorate works is that the directorate's role is to provide the women's perspective on initiatives in other departments. It is not necessarily to provide a list of recommendations regarding that initiative but, instead, to look at the initiative and to give it the women's perspective and to make sure that the Minister for the Status of Women has that information and that information is able to be shared.

\* (2330)

**Ms. McCormick:** I notice that the first statement in Activity Identification ends with the words, makes recommendation to ensure women's concerns are addressed. You are saying that while it does not take the form of formal recommendations that in fact it is more of a dialogue or a discussion with the minister responsible?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The directorate, in the analysis, tries to look at where consideration might be given to women or to an area affecting women.

I am trying to think of an example that might be helpful. One that crosses both of my areas of responsibility is the antistalking legislation. When we have looked in Justice at the issues that relate to

women and violence, the changes to the Criminal Code last year and the recommendations for change to the Criminal Code this year were in looking at women as victims in a violent situation, asking that the changes occur that would provide greater support for the victim. The previous changes in the antistalking, which certainly were a step in the right direction, dealt with the offender.

What we are asking this time is that consideration be given in changes to look at the needs of the woman as a victim in the antistalking legislation. So there were direct recommendations. I took those direct recommendations to Ottawa. I also took them to the conference for Ministers responsible for the Status of Women that was held recently in Regina and presented those when we came to the part on the agenda, and it was a large part this year on the issues of violence.

**Ms. McCormick:** I am back to concluding that there are specific recommendations which come forward attached to the product of policy and program analysis.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am not trying to be vague; I can just say that in some cases that is the way. In other cases, it is to analyze an impact. In other cases, it is to look at an issue and to say where women should be bringing forward a particular issue to be considered in that initiative.

There was also a recommendation to the recent meeting of the Ministers responsible for the Status of Women for consultation and co-operation with Education to ensure that women's concerns were addressed in programs. Again, it was important for us to—there has been a lot of discussion about training and the training impact on women. There was also a recognition that there needed to be some discussion and inclusion of Ministers of Education since across the country that minister of training, that Minister of Education is not always the same person. There have been recommendations to try and make sure that the initiatives have a very comprehensive methodology or comprehensive way of application.

**Ms. McCormick:** The final statement in the Activity Identification says: "Reflects feedback

received from its community outreach activities in the formulation of policy analysis and recommendations." It comes back to the same questions we were asking with respect to the advisory council, and that is how the agenda is set and how the work priorities are established for the unit in a given year.

Can you give me some indication of how much of the work of the directorate is on request and how much is internally initiated?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the directorate receives information from a number of sources. They attend conferences, also. They attend annual general meetings of groups within the women's community. They also receive delegations, by way of example, the immigrant women's group. They also participate in the national agenda, and they participate in the working groups that are set up by the national agenda, the violence working group being one that was set up recently, and, also education and training by way of another example. There is also direction given in terms of issues of interest to the government. In areas of education and training, for instance, it may also ask then that the directorate look at particular issues there.

**Ms. McCormick:** Mr. Deputy Chair, I guess I want to try and come back at this another way. Given that you have a manager and seven professional/technical people within the department, how would the process of workload assignment and prioritization be done? I am sure it is not quite as serendipitous as it sounds, like you go to a meeting and somebody raises an issue and come back and do analysis. I mean, women do not work like that, so I would be very interested in knowing what the process is of negotiating and achieving consensus on what kinds of things will be the priority and how much time and resources are assigned to any given initiative.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The numbers that the member has spoken about are not quite accurate because two of those individuals are outreach workers. Those outreach workers work directly with the community. Then we have an administrator. We have four analysts. One analyst works on

economic issues. Other analysts then divide the work up by department or portfolio or social policies. We have an analyst who deals with a lot of justice issues. We have an analyst who deals with educational issues. We have another analyst who deals with health and family services issues. We have one analyst who is on secondment to the single-parent initiative.

**Ms. McCormick:** I now have a better sense of its being four as opposed to seven, but still do not have a better sense, aside from that you have people identified as economic, justice, educational, health and family services, about what the process is for determining internal priorities. For example, if I were the health and family services analyst and I decided that it was intriguing to me, for example, to go off and explore the impact of the foster care cutbacks on aboriginal families. Could I simply do it because I was interested, or would I have to go and negotiate that with somebody?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I agree, I do not think it is as simple as an analyst just coming up with an idea and being able to go off and do that. Where analysts do have ideas, I am told that, yes, there can be a process of negotiation if there is an issue, which, you know, one head has not thought of and another does think of.

\* (2340)

The work of the analysts is to look at the issues of government priorities, to look at initiatives being put forward by government to make sure that there is an analysis of the women's perspective within government initiatives. They also monitor the press. They monitor Hansard. They act as a clearing-house for reports which come in nationally and make sure that the information of those reports is then able to be given to the minister and available where it might be helpful in other government departments. They also work cross-jurisdictionally so that where there is an issue that would affect the work of analysts where an initiative may cross several departments, then they are able to work co-operatively to look at that impact or to look at the perspective of women in that area.

**Ms. McCormick:** So it might be reasonable to expect then, for example, that an initiative such as has been recently passed in the Alberta Legislature where they are denying defaulting parents access to driver's licences and hunting licences might be something that your Women's Directorate might be familiar with, might be coming back to you and determining whether or not there is a role for such initiatives in Manitoba.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, yes, that would be true in that the directorate does do briefing notes which provide information about initiatives which are occurring across Canada and to make sure that we are aware of what those initiatives are. We try to make sure that those briefing notes are as up to date and comprehensive as can be for the time.

**Ms. McCormick:** I wrote the words down as you spoke them: The Women's Directorate would look at the issue of government priorities. Can you describe how that comment or input might be offered with respect to the legislative agenda? For example, would there be a review of the throne speech? I am very interested in knowing how the Women's Directorate comments on or influences government priorities.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the directorate does analyze the throne speech and the budget. It also looks at areas of government initiative or priority things like—I keep coming back to the single parent program which is a major initiative which affects women. Again, we have tried to offer support through the secondment of a staff person as well to assist the single parent project.

In the area of wanting to make sure that information was available to women around education and training or the proposed changes that may be occurring regarding the social safety net, those are the kinds of things which the directorate would then be looking at the work of government and wanting to make sure that the women's perspective was reflected or at least noted and where possible acted upon.

I say where possible, because in some cases with the new information flowing from changes to the

social safety net—we do not know what they are yet, but perhaps the Women's Directorate would be one way in which we could get information out or in which we could analyze the effect.

**Ms. McCormick:** There are two other areas that I would just like to explore briefly before I wrap up. One comes out of the statement in the Expected Results, the statement being: "initiatives to address the socialization of girls and young women which impacts self-esteem, employment and career choices."

Before asking for detail on what kinds of initiatives might be occurring in this area, I want to declare a bias. I have come to believe that it is less a problem with the way that women and girls are socialized and more a problem with the way in which we socialize boys and young men to view and treat women. As a single parent and a mother of three sons, I have spent a good deal of my time, I feel, competing for the minds and opinions of my children.

That being said, can you describe for me some of the initiatives directed towards socialization of girls and young women with respect to self-esteem, employment and career choices?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chair, some of the specific things that we have done in the area of gender socialization are: to sponsor Heather Jane Robertson when she came to the SAG conference recently, special area grouping conference, she spoke to the guidance counsellors; the ongoing consultation and relationship with the A Cappella Network; we have been invited to speak to school superintendents; working with the Department of Education for the expanding Choices.

Also, we sponsored the theatre group for young people at the career symposium which dealt with the issues of socialization. We also participated in the development of the Coulter paper. We participated in the F/P/T Working Group on Education and Training.

We also have been a participant and supporter of the video on gender socialization. This was a project that was undertaken by the Ministers responsible for the Status of Women across Canada. It was a national project. We are looking

forward to that being completed. It will have guides for parents and for teachers, and it will provide discussion.

The whole issue of gender socialization, as Coulter said, as being an underlying basis for women to be able to have confidence in a very simplistic way to proceed and to make choices. Those choices are not just career choices, but they are also choices in terms of relationship and also looking at power within relationships. The whole issue of gender socialization has been seen as a very important basis of part of the work done by the directorate.

\* (2350)

**Ms. McCormick:** The final area—I will not spend a lot of time on, but I do want to raise some of the concerns. I had the opportunity to review the Hay report, and I had some questions which I will, in fact, be bringing up in the Civil Service Commission. I really am interested in knowing whether the Women's Directorate plays a role in determining what the barriers are to women's progress in our provincial Civil Service and whether there are any initiatives currently going on in the directorate to track the progress of women towards a goal of fair treatment and equitable participation in the public service.

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I am not sure if this is a complete answer, but the directorate has access to the Civil Service reports on a quarterly basis, and in 1993, I am informed that women comprised 20.76 percent of applicants to competitions for male-dominated classifications and were successful in 24.24 percent of appointments.

**Ms. McCormick:** So there is some interest in the department in tracking progress towards women in nontraditional or in areas in which the hiring of a woman would redress an imbalance within a classification. Is it sort of hit-and-miss, or is it some kind of a thorough, across-department analysis?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** The directorate looks at the Civil Service report. That is the information that they receive, and they do monitor it. They also analyze it as well, and we believe it is quite a thorough



analysis. We also look at the labour force survey, which comes out monthly, and are able to look then at what issues are affecting women within the labour force survey. They also look at information that comes from academic enrollment as well and what women are enrolled in, so that it provides a forecast for the pool of trained women in certain areas.

**Ms. McCormick:** This is my final question in this area. I can see that the labour force survey would give broad trends and the academic entry looks at the progress of women into various disciplines, but it still does not answer or address my concerns with respect to women in our own public service. For example, there is a belief that women's needs can best be addressed by access to opportunities for advancement. Is there, in addition to your point-of-entry analysis—who gets the job at the entry level—any ability to or interest in tracking professional career development opportunities which lead to advancement within the Civil Service?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** Mr. Deputy Chair, I am told that we monitor the Civil Service Career Development program and also the Executive Development program, but these are development programs. They do not lead specifically to a job at the end. Most jobs or positions are filled by competition, so we also then try and look at women participating in the competitions and then what their success rate within the competitions is. We try and examine it from the two parts.

**Ms. McCormick:** The final question, are women making progress, then? Is that your conclusion?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am informed that in the last quarterly report of the Civil Service for '93, women were now 50.67 percent of the Civil Service, for the first time over the 50 percent mark, and that in the last 12 years their representation in the executive ranks has increased seven times. So it does speak to some progress.

**Ms. McCormick:** I cannot let this event of Estimates go by without asking about one number in your appropriation. On page 17, subappropriation 22-1B, Indirect Salary Costs, in the 1993-94 Estimates, it was set at 31.3; it has

increased to 53.1. Can you explain? I think of all of the numbers that is the only one with the significant increase—in Indirect Salary Costs. Can you describe to me the reasons for that increase?

**Mrs. Vodrey:** I am told that that reflects the cost of the interchange agreement and also the career development—we have an individual within our branch on career development and we provide the dollars.

**Mr. Deputy Chairperson:** Shall the item pass? The item is accordingly passed.

Item 1. Status of Women (b) Women's Directorate (2) Other Expenditures \$99,100—pass.

Resolution 22.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$914,700 for the Status of Women for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

This concludes the Department of the Status of Women.

Committee rise.

\* (2000)

## HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

**Madam Chairperson (Louise Dacquay):** Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

This section of the Committee of Supply is dealing with the Estimates for the Department of Highways and Transportation. Would the minister's staff please enter the Chamber.

We are on item 3.(a), page 93 of the Estimates manual, Planning and Design.

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** I believe we had just started Planning and Design when the Estimates last ended. Can the minister tell me, since there were three positions that were eliminated due to the consolidation of services, were these jobs filled or were they vacancies, and were they within the city of Winnipeg or were they at some other points within the province, and where did we consolidate the services and with whom?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** We have joining us here at this point in time Mr. Dave Selby, Director of Northern Airports and Marine.

I would like to distribute to the opposition critics a summary of information as requested at previous sittings.

With regard to the question the member asked, all three positions are vacant. All three positions were in Winnipeg. One of the positions is an Engineering 5 which was vacant since 1993. The person who was in the position took VSIP in '93. Another position was an Engineering 4, the same thing, it was VSIP in '93. The third position was a Tech Officer 2. I will stress to the member, all three were vacant, all in the city.

**Mr. Reid:** It seems a bit strange that we have entered into the SHIP program with the federal government and we are looking to expand it as far as a National Highways Program, and we are cutting back on the planning and design which is the first step of any activities towards road building. I do not understand why we are continuing—I believe it had occurred last budget as well where we had cut back staff. Why are we continuing to cut back staff in the planning and design phase?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, the three positions we are talking about here are support functions. They are not the people directly involved in the design process. Through the process of regionalization and the reorganization of the department around putting the positions in the regions, the department has over this course of time over the last year strengthened its capacity in design by putting people in the region and has increased the capacity in the field to do the design jobs, and these three positions are only support positions for those planners and designers. So it in no way compromises the ability of the department to do its planning and design.

**Mr. Reid:** At our last sitting on Highways Estimates, I had asked the minister about some planning that was underway with the Nora-Florence Lake group. It is my understanding that the minister and/or his staff may have had a

meeting in the last week with the residents group. Can the minister tell me what has transpired at that meeting?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, we have met in Estimates last on Tuesday. It was while we were in Estimates here that the meeting was held, and the residents met with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Driedger). As I told, I think, the member last time, we had done some design work at where a road might go. They have in front of them the requirement for an environmental licence. They are going to be talking with federal people about cost-sharing with them, and Minister Driedger is going to convene a meeting in due course with myself and federal Transport Canada people to talk about what can be done here.

**Mr. Reid:** Then I assume from that the minister's department knows what the issue is with respect to the requirements or the need for a road for the area. What is the position of the department with respect to the request that the residents or the property owners would have brought forward to the minister's department? Are you going to do it or not?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, the federal government has closed a rail passenger service which is what the people were using. Our belief is that they have saved about \$730,000 in that process. We feel that the residents who want a private road should be cost-sharing with the federal government to build the road. In other words, the province should not be involved in the construction costs of the road.

\* (2010)

Our basic understanding is that the cost of the road might be around \$850,000. I said the federal government is saving \$730,000, so by closing off the services they have saved money. I think they have the capacity then to contribute to another means of land transportation in there.

**Mr. Reid:** If I understand the minister correctly then what he is saying is that the department will undertake to do the construction as need be, but they are not willing to provide any of the capital or the funding necessary to do that project.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, I think the member has summed it up right. We have indicated we are prepared to do engineering work. If the citizens want it as a private road, we are prepared to do our part on the engineering side, but in terms of the cost of construction, it should be between them and the federal government.

**Mr. Reid:** I just wanted to switch a bit here now to the northeast Perimeter project, because I believe that is partially in the planning and design phase and partially nearing the construction phase for a portion of it as well this summer. It is my understanding that you are going to be looking at grading portions of two lanes this summer, this construction season. What is going to take place with the structures, because it is my understanding in looking at the annual report that you are looking at construction for the Oakbank corridor and you were doing studies on that? What point are you at with those studies, and when do we anticipate that there be a need for a Gunn Road interchange for that link?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, there will be two grading contracts this year. Both grading contracts will grade four lanes. The intention will be, in subsequent budgets, to budget for the base and paving of the two interlanes. So one of those grading contracts has been awarded, and the second one is about to be awarded very, very soon.

The member asked about Gunn Road and—okay, one other thing. We will be grading this year the embankments for a CP line overpass. With regard to CN, it will be a level crossing, and we are not planning at this stage to build interchanges at either 59 or 15. With regard to Gunn Road or Oakbank corridor, that is in the planning stages at this time, and a public meeting is being planned for Dugald on June 27. I believe it has been advertised for June 27 at Dugald. They have about three different options on the table as to how to hook in from the floodway to Highway 206. All three of them are south of Oakbank. So it would take a lot of that traffic that now comes down 206 to Highway 15, it would be able to go straight into the city and interconnect to the Perimeter.

**Mr. Reid:** Okay, I understand. So it will be somewhere down the road before we see any construction take place on that. It will be a long-term plan yet.

Can the minister tell me—because the planning people are here now, I take it there must have been some cost analysis done on what the projected underpass was going to be on Highway 15, CN main line—what the projected cost of that underpass was going to be and what we are looking at now before we can anticipate any kind of construction of any structures for that site?

**Mr. Findlay:** The original plan was to put some structure in place if CN line was going to be there forever. Once it became apparent that because of discussions between CN and CP that one line might not be there in the future—and I stress might not—it became very difficult to spend money there to build a structure that would take the road under the track, the CN track, and under Highway 15, at considerable cost. We do not have a definitive cost. We have very crude ballpark estimates, none of which I would like to say at this time. They are substantial millions, put it that way.

That is only a portion of it. I would dare say in excess of 10 would be a—definitely in excess of \$10 million. So until such time as there is a definitive decision on the use of that line by CN, it would not be appropriate to invest any money to go over it or under it. As I say, we are going to go over the CP line, but the plan that had been roughly designed was going under the CN and under 15, and none of that will be done until there is a clear signal as to whether that expenditure is warranted.

**Mr. Reid:** Then what discussions has the department had with CN to determine what their long-range plans are for that line, and has any indication been given on when we can anticipate receiving some direction here, or are we going to have to wait in perpetuity? If CN never makes up its mind and gives a definitive position, are we going to wait forever before we construct an overpass or an underpass?

\* (2020)

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, I think the member could understand why we would want to

be raising this question with CN, given the public information that has come out over the past few months. We have had reasonable amount of discussion with them. We are led to believe—I guess one could say there is a—although you hear of one topic being discussed, and that is CN-CP merger east of Winnipeg, one would have to surmise that if that ever did materialize, it might really be more effective east of Thunder Bay than east of Winnipeg because of the amount of grain that is moving between here and Thunder Bay. So there is always an option that merger east of Winnipeg would still leave those two lines in place. I would think that would be a reasonable option that would still be considered.

We expect to have some more definitive comment from CN before the end of this calendar year. Within six to eight, nine months, we should have a reasonably firm understanding of what the future of that line is. Then from there, we will plan highway design based on volumes and available dollars, but at this time, we do not see it appropriate to spend dollars to anticipate what the decision might be.

**Mr. Reid:** It is my understanding that there will be a decision some time this year as well on the merger between the two. We will get into that discussion when we get into the policy area.

I take it then that with the construction of the structure itself over the CP main line, which the minister says there is going to be some preliminary work started on that this year, the embankments for it, then I take it we are going to do the actual construction of the structure itself and any of the asphalt overlay for the two lanes of traffic in the next construction—in the spring project then perhaps?

**Mr. Findlay:** In building bridges, the normal process is to build the embankments and let them settle for up to a year. So the department will be looking at building the structure in '95, with the paving of it in '96. Our object is to have traffic running in '96.

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (River Heights):** I have done a perusal of the last Estimates, for which I

was not here, so I am hoping I am not repeating anything.

I want to get into the planning and design program for Highway 59. As the minister knows, there was a very large public meeting held, which he was not able to attend, but which the former Minister of Highways attended on his behalf. Some of the programs there then were indicated.

There did not seem to be a five-year strategic plan with respect to Highway 59. I am specifically addressing the area south of Winnipeg. What are the long-term initiatives for this particular highway, and what kind of a target date does the minister anticipate for the twinning of that highway?

**Mr. Findlay:** The member asks about the twinning of Highway 59. Really, what the design is, it is a total rebuilding of 59 on a new alignment. The existing highway has got a lot of development along it. The cost of acquiring land there is very high, and you certainly would not improve the safety an awful lot by just building more lanes in an already congested area. So the basic design is a new alignment.

Effectively, it is east of the existing Highway 59 and somewhere north of Ile des Chenes. It crosses over the existing 59; and then south of Ile des Chenes, it is back on the alignment, I believe. The present plan takes the new construction to about four kilometres south of Ile des Chenes.

The first major project in that is a new bridge over the floodway. The plan is to do some grading of the approaches to that bridge in late '94, with the expectation we can be building the bridge soon thereafter. So it is a very major project. I think the total cost is something like \$60 million.

There is no question about the need for it, no question at all, but there is need in many places, and I can assure the member that we will be very soon completing 59. There is major work now on the northeast Perimeter; 59 follows right in behind in terms of a sense of urgency to do it as soon as possible. But there is commitment to approaches to the bridge and the bridge soon thereafter.

\* (2030)

We expect final environmental approval to come very soon. Once that final environmental approval is in place, then detailed design will commence on that structure. It is always a very long process to meet all the requirements in today's society with building infrastructure of that magnitude.

So we do not expect to have any difficulty with the environmental approval, but at this time it is still not here. We expect it soon, and then we will get on with detailed design and then build the approaches and then follow with the bridge. Obviously, the road has to follow that.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** I think it was clear at the meeting that there were individuals there who of course would hope that the Minister of Highways could wave a magic wand and the highway would be built tomorrow. That is obviously unrealistic. I think to be fair to the minister, both of the critics recognized it was also unrealistic. But they were looking for some time lines, some planning. I mean, is this a 10-year project, a 15-year project, a 30-year project? Has the department given any time-line definition to this particular project?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, the building of the four lanes is planned in two stages. Land acquisition can sometimes be a very difficult process, but the member asks for some time line, and you know, the minute you say something you put yourself into difficulties with the budget process because it is always, with a \$60-million project, just not something you can give hard guarantees to. But the member mentioned 5, 10, 15, I think, if one took the shorter period on that list, that would be a realistic vision for the project.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** In the outline of the highway construction program for '94-'95, it refers to some 40 kilometres that would be this year submitted to environmental assessment. At what stage is that environmental assessment?

**Mr. Findlay:** The section the member is referring to, the 40 kilometres, is from the U.S. border north to St. Malo. No work has been done on that yet, but the plan is to do that in the very near future. This is for grading and resurfacing of that 40 kilometres from the U.S. border north. The environmental

approvals for the Highway 59 section just south of the Perimeter are already in process.

**Mr. Reid:** With the Highway 59 project—Highway 59 south because there has obviously been over the years a fair amount of money expended on the northern portion north of Winnipeg, and there is more money, looking at the spring program listing, to be expended this year as well—has the department ever approached the federal government, the new federal government that is in place now, to look at, and I am not sure if this has already taken place, if Highway 59 can be part of the Strategic Highway Improvement Program since it is obvious, and the minister has said this many times in the House, that there has been a shift in the traffic flow patterns between Canada and the U.S., having another link to the U.S.? Have we asked the federal government to participate in this program by way of funding or cost sharing of any improvements to Highway 59 south?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, in the process of negotiating with the federal government on the SHIP program, Strategic Highway Improvement Program, with which we are in the second year now, one of the requirements was that all highways of which the monies would be spent by the federal government had to be part of the National Highways Program.

Highway 59 is not part of the National Highways Program. The routes where the expenditures have been occurring, Highway 75, Highway 16, Highway 1, east and west of the city, and the northeast Perimeter, are all part of the National Highways Program.

The \$70 million, \$35 million federal, \$35 million provincial, that has been dedicated in the SHIP program has all been allocated. It is really all allocated basically at the beginning, so there is no more money to allocate, and 59 is not part of that National Highways Program.

I guess it is fair to say that 59, the majority of traffic, particularly in the area of where we need to do the reconstruction, is residential movement. It is citizens moving in and out of the city as opposed to commercial movement. I guess there is a general

feeling that 75 is the main route from Manitoba into the United States or from Winnipeg at least to the United States. If there was a second commercial route of significance moving from Winnipeg to the United States, it probably would be Highway 12 as opposed to 59.

**Mr. Reid:** Well, obviously the minister has more expertise available to him, not only just dealing with road construction, but also transportation in general.

What is it that draws the minister's department to conclude that Highway 12 should be the one that is the preferred option for twinning versus Highway 59?

**Mr. Findlay:** I just want to be very clear to the member that we are not talking about automatic twinning or four-laning it. The reason I make the statement Highway 12 is probably of more significance than 59 is that is where commercial development or movement of commercial traffic is increasing.

It seems to be origination, destination, and it is moving toward Duluth, I guess, Chicago, I guess. That seems to be, as commercial traffic increases in some route other than 75, a more preferred route. If we were to upgrade it, the first thing would be upgrading in the two lanes. It would not be automatic four-laning. The four-laning we are doing on 59, as I said earlier, is to do more, much more, with the movement of citizens in and out of Winnipeg to areas where they live as opposed to commercial movement of traffic.

In order to be part of the National Highways Program, it has to be a significant commercial route.

**Mr. Reid:** I am not going to belabour this, but can the minister indicate how he determined whether it is the significance of the route, and who makes that determination on whether or not it is going to be part of the National Highways Program and the National Highways plan itself? Who makes that determination, and what criteria do they base it on?

\* (2040)

**Mr. Findlay:** Well, Madam Chair, in terms of determining what routes are part of the National

Highways Program, there is significant criteria set up and it is part of a long, ongoing negotiation with the federal government as to what criteria certain roads meet or whether they come to meet those criteria over the course of time.

I would not want to leave the member with any presumption that 12 is more important than 59 or the reverse. I mean the question is clearly up in the air and subject to development of patterns in the future. I just wanted to relate to him that 59 to the United States is not an automatic second route after 75, and those national criteria will be used in the process of determining in due course whether 12 or 59 or any other route is designated as part of the National Highways Program.

I just say at this time our information is commercial desire would be more 12 than 59, but that does not preclude the reversal of that in a couple of years depending on developments that may take place. Let us face it, once the four-laning of that portion to Ile des Chenes happens, it may change commercial interest in moving between here and the border. Time will tell.

**Mr. Reid:** I just want to go back to the SHIP program for a minute because with the O/C that came out last year, O/C 176-93, for the Perimeter Highway program, part of the cost-share for this was the construction of the structure of Highway 15 interchange CN overpass, and there were estimated expenditures of \$7.2 million. I take it that was monies that were to be expended by each of the partners in the arrangement for a total of just under \$15 million.

Because there was supposed to be some cash flow to that project of \$3 million for last year and \$3.7 million for this year, what is happening with those monies as part of that program?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, what the member sees is an original intention, and to just go back to our earlier discussion, after that decision was made and the O/C was passed it became apparent that CN and CP were into some kind of negotiations that put the future use of that CN line in some kind of doubt. So the monies that were allocated there under the SHIP program were reallocated. At that point in time the overall SHIP intention from the

northeast Perimeter was to build structures. It did not include grading. It did not include the CP overpass which we are now doing. So money is designated there but reallocated with the intention, you know, in my mind to put it bluntly, to get traffic moving sooner on paved road as opposed to building the structures.

The original plan had traffic that would be running by the year 2000. The current plan will have traffic running by 1996. So what you saw was initial intention to build structures, structures no longer as necessary as it used to be given the future of CN, reallocated the money to grading and a CP overpass with the intention of getting traffic running sooner. Once we know where CN is going, decisions on what to do there will take place from that point on.

**Mr. Reid:** One last question. Then I take it the money has not been lost, we are still going to get the same amount of money towards that project, and it is just going to be reallocated to another portion of the project which will include the CP overpass and the grading itself?

**Mr. Findlay:** I can absolutely assure the member monies are not lost at all. The \$70 million committed initially will still be spent. We have extended the agreement really from two years to three years, so over the course of three years \$70 million will be spent on projects on northeast Perimeter, Nos. 1, 16 and 75. No money will be lost in the process.

**Mr. Reid:** One last question. The \$7.2 million that was the estimated expenditures for that structure, was that the overall cost or is that the provincial share?

**Mr. Findlay:** That figure is the overall cost but just for the CN structure. It had nothing to do with any structure that might be necessary on Highway 15.

**Madam Chairperson:** Item 3.(a)

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Just to get some clarification, the minister in discussing Highway 12 and Highway 59 indicated that there appeared to be more commercial traffic on 12 at the present time than there was on 59, which is contrary, by the way, to the information that was given at this public

meeting. If the minister has any figures of commercial traffic, and I do not expect him to have it here, then perhaps he can distribute that information to the two critics.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, we do not have any information, but we will let the member know what the figures are. As well as knowing what the figures are, we have to know what the probability is in the future, and that we get in discussions with, you know, the commercial sector. That is where we get a bit of a feeling that as time goes by in terms of origination/destination routes there is probably going to be a lot of interest in Highway 12—put it that way—and how one will stack up versus the other remains to be seen. That is where the criteria for determining what is part of the National Highways Program will come into play in the process. The figures may be different today than what they are projected to be in the future, and we will supply what we have as well as some idea if we have a better idea about commercial intentions for the future.

**Madam Chairperson:** Item 3.(a) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,753,400.

**Mr. Reid:** When we were in Estimates last year, the previous minister said that, and I will quote: we will be working to negotiate a further cost-shared agreement post '94-95. Has there been any discussions ongoing on that process? At what point are we at with those negotiations?

**Mr. Findlay:** Well, Madam Chair, I am sure what the former minister was referring to was the National Highways Program which he and the former deputy had spent a lot of time on over the course of the last few years.

It is fair to say that all provinces agreed with the network that the ministers and deputy ministers had arrived at over the course of time, the network right across the country, across the 10 provinces, of what should be in the National Highways Program.

The question then becomes how to pay for it. The provinces, particularly in our case, we have put a fair bit of money into capital into highways every year, along with the maintenance of highways. We certainly feel that the highways are

a national network as much as they are a provincial network and that the federal government has a role to play to try and maintain this national network. The process of deciding how to fund it, I guess we will say we tossed it upstairs to the Minister of Finance.

\* (2050)

Mr. Young, the new federal minister, has acknowledged that a plan does exist for a National Highways Program. The issue is how to fund it.

The proposal that has been put on the table really involves two pools of money, what is called an A pool and a B pool. The A pool would be 80 percent of the expenditures, and it was proposed to be cost shared 65 percent federal, 35 percent provincial. The B pool—obviously for urgent roads or for more destitute provinces—would be 20 percent of the money to be cost shared, 90 percent federal, 10 percent provincial. So that is the framework of an agreement that the provinces, at least, all support.

Now it requires input from the Ministers of Finance to determine whether that is the right formula or what other kind of formula they would be prepared to fund.

I do not think there is any question any more of what the network would be that would be part of the National Highways Program.

**Madam Chairperson:** Item 3.(a) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,753,400—pass; (b) Other Expenditures \$658,800—pass.

Resolution 15.3: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,412,200 for Highways and Transportation, Planning and Design, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Item 4. Engineering and Technical Services (a) Management Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits.

**Mr. Reid:** There has been one position eliminated and the Supplementary Estimates indicates consolidating northern airports with a regional office administration. Was this position filled or was it vacant, and can the minister tell me where that job was?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, the position was filled. It was in Winnipeg and the individual who was in the position has been accommodated elsewhere in the department.

**Madam Chairperson:** Item 4.(a) Management Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$116,900—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$20,600—pass.

Item 4.(b) Mechanical Equipment Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits.

**Mr. Reid:** There has been considerable staff year changes in this section again, as we have seen in the past couple of years. We seem to be continually eroding the Mechanical Equipment Services department and it leads one to wonder what the long-term goal is, whether or not we are going to be able to provide the necessary services to different parts of the province.

The Supplementary Estimates indicates its staffing is downsized to reflect current activity, which is a pretty ambiguous statement. I mean, if you want to confuse people, that is one way to word it. So I am going to ask the minister to expand or elaborate or explain what that is supposed to mean.

### Report

**Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Deputy Chairperson of Committees):** Madam Chairperson, in the section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 to consider the Estimates for the Status of Women, the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) moved the following motion to refer a matter of privilege to the House:

THAT the comments of the Minister of Energy and Mines of Monday, June 13, to myself in the Committee of Supply indicating “she needs a slap” that violated my privileges as a member of the Legislature be reported to the House and that, in accordance with the provisions of Beauchesne Citation 107, this committee recommend this matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A voice vote was held on the matter and the motion was defeated. Two members then requested a formal vote on the matter.



\* (2100)

**Formal Vote**

**Madam Chairperson:** A formal vote has been requested. Call in the members.

The motion before the committee reads as follows:

THAT the comments of the Minister of Energy and Mines of Monday, June 13, to myself in the Committee of Supply indicating "she needs a slap" that violated my privileges as a member of the Legislature be reported to the House and that, in accordance with the provisions of Beauchesne Citation 107, this committee recommend that this matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

\* (2130)

*A COUNT-OUT VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 27, Nays 26.*

The motion is accordingly carried.

**Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas):** I was paired with the Minister of Education (Mr. Manness), and if I had been allowed to vote, I would have voted yes.

**Madam Chairperson:** The motion is accordingly carried. I will report the passing of this motion when I report to the House tomorrow, and the Speaker will deal with the matter of privilege at that time.

**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION**  
(continued)

**Madam Chairperson:** We will now resume the line-by-line consideration of the Estimates. This section of the Committee of Supply is dealing with the Estimates for the Department of Highways.

Would the minister's staff please enter the Chamber.

We are on item 4.(b) Mechanical Equipment Services, page 94 of the Estimates manual.

**Mr. Reid:** When we left, Madam Chairperson, I had asked a question of the minister to explain the ambiguity of the statement, staff downsized to

reflect current activity, and he was just, I believe, in the process of responding to my question.

**Mr. Findlay:** I will try to help the member understand what current activities are. What you see is a reduction of 15 staff from 230 to 215. One must remember that 2,000 kilometres were given back to the municipalities, which is about 10 percent of the mileage of highways that Highways was looking after. So that is part of the reason.

Secondly, more services have been—what the member would hate to see—privatized. Mowing of the ditches and that sort of thing is being done under contract. Out of the 15 that the member sees as reductions here, it is only really five positions that were eliminated. Ten of these positions, which were vacant, were transferred to the new private vehicle inspection program, so minus 15 here, plus 10 under private vehicle inspection program, the one that is coming in on July 1 of 1995, but they were vacant positions that were transferred.

**Mr. Reid:** I was not aware that 10 of those jobs were associated with the vehicle inspection program that was tied with the legislation from the last session.

What were the functions that were performed by these employees that would allow them to be transferred to this new program that would be undertaken by a private inspection point?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, it is not the people. It was the positions. Ten positions were vacant and we transferred the positions, not the people. We transferred the positions to PVIP, not the people because those 10 positions were vacant.

**Mr. Reid:** I must be getting tired because I do not understand how he can transfer positions and not have had some people in those positions at some time in the past. So I must be missing something here.

**Mr. Findlay:** There were people in the positions in the past, but at some time in the more recent past those positions were all vacant. There was nobody in them. So we just moved the positions from MES over to the private vehicle inspection program, not people. There were no people in these positions. Why they were vacant is a matter of probably a number of different reasons over the course of

time, but there were no people transferred with the positions, just the vacant positions.

**Mr. Reid:** I still do not comprehend that unless I am missing something here. Whether the positions are vacant or not, those were still jobs that were undertaken by MES and now they are being done by private vehicle inspection programs. So how is it that we are transferring these to a private service for something that was originally done under departmental control?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, to try to help the member understand, we are moving the positions from one program—positions, not people—positions from one program of government to the other. The private vehicle inspection program is an inspection program to be carried out by service stations, garages across the province. The people—these 10 positions that are moved over there—do the inspection and the certification of those stations.

\* (2140)

**Mr. Reid:** Sometimes I am a little slow on these issues, Madam Chairperson. I thank the minister. Now I understand what it is. It is still going to be a function of his department under the private vehicle inspection program to enforce the criteria of the program upon the private inspection points. Now I understand. Okay. So it will be a lateral move for these people then, those 10 positions into that program.

When do we anticipate that we are going to fill those jobs, or are they currently filled now?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, we expect to start filling the positions in about a month's time in order to meet the start-up date of July 1, '95, for the private vehicle inspection program.

(Mr. Jack Reimer, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

**Mr. Reid:** I believe this subdepartment is also responsible for new equipment purchases for the maintenance program. Last Estimates I asked the minister about the ages of the equipment we had because there seemed to be a reduction in the replacements of aging equipment, which would lead me to conclude that somewhere along the line

we are going to pay for equipment failures by being unable to provide the necessary services, whether it be through snow clearing, et cetera, in the future.

Have there been any changes in the program for equipment purchases, and have we made any equipment purchases this year or do we anticipate making purchases?

**Mr. Findlay:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, there are equipment purchases planned for this year, but in terms of determining whether a piece of equipment should be replaced or not, age, although it is one criteria, by no means is it the only criteria or by no means is it the significant criteria.

I think it is fair to say that throughout industry, the private sector, I do not care what you are talking about—construction, whether it is farming, whether it is transportation—people are finding that by proper maintenance you can certainly keep a piece of equipment in service much longer and, obviously, at lower cost over a 20-year period of time. It is far cheaper to maintain and maintain properly as opposed to replace.

Although 10 or 15 years ago we certainly operated on a replace turnover with old equipment by new equipment as a way of life, that is no longer the way of life in government or in the private sector.

The way of life is to maintain it more effectively to prolong the life. That by no means means that we have equipment that is less capable of doing the job.

**Mr. Reid:** I understand that the department I am sure tries to be as efficient as possible and not replace equipment just based solely on age. That was not my intent in my question.

I was interested in the condition of the equipment and what the requirements are of the department, because it says here that this subdepartment prepares an assessment of equipment requirements—and for timely provision of the appropriate equipment delivery. That is why I am asking the questions about what equipment is being purchased and basing it on my perception of some of the criteria that would be utilized for those equipment purchases.

I am not sure if the minister has the information available here. I am not saying that it should be, but if he has information relating to the purchases for this year as a replacement, then I would like to receive that information, if possible.

**Mr. Findlay:** For this year, we estimate that we will be purchasing about \$1.1 million worth of equipment. The equipment fleet value is approximately \$40 million.

**Mr. Reid:** Getting back to staff, because only 10 of the people were transferred and another five staff years were deleted from the Mechanical Equipment Services, were those staff that were moved out of the department through a buy-out package, a voluntary separation package or was there a transfer within the government departments?

**Mr. Findlay:** The other five positions were all vacant. Nobody was in the positions.

**Mr. Reid:** The minister—and I thank him for the information—provided a sheet on snowplow contracts. It indicates on the information he has provided that there was only one successful bidder, Evergreen Construction, and it was out of Riverton. Is that the only contract that has been let for maintenance, because that would replace some of the services under MES, or are there other contractors that do that work as well that the minister has not provided information for?

**Mr. Findlay:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, this was a snowplow contract in a specific area of the province where there was deemed to be a shortage of department equipment. It was a contract for the entire winter, and the contractor was paid for the hours of use, but he was required to guarantee that a machine and a man would be available at all times in case there was a storm.

**Mr. Reid:** I take it then that there were no other contracts that were let for snowplow contracts as a result of the changes in the departmental policy for winter maintenance programs.

\* (2150)

**Mr. Findlay:** Yes, that was the only contract. In other locations at different times, if there was a severe storm, private contractors were hired on an

hourly basis to fill in, to give us additional equipment to meet the urgency of the situation. I would have to say there probably was very little of it last winter because there were little or no storms. It is not uncommon to call in equipment in emergencies to add to the fleet to get it done faster.

**Mr. Reid:** One last question there. On the Accommodation under Other Expenditures, it shows a decrease. In fact, there is a general decrease in all of the costs, whether it be fuel for the trucks, tires, maintenance and repairs, utilities. I guess the only one that has increased would have been the insurance or the equipment rentals. All the rest of the items have been showing a decrease in the costs.

What can the minister attribute all the decreases to? Is that because we are now looking at a decrease in the amount of maintenance or that the number of pieces of equipment has decreased year over year? Why is there a change, an increase actually, in the amount that we pay for the accommodations for the MES services?

**Mr. Findlay:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, the accommodation is for building rentals. It is charges that we pay to Government Services, and the decreases in the rest of the categories, probably as much as anything, are due to the fact that we are maintaining 10 percent less of total roads.

**The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Reimer):** Item 4.(b) Mechanical Equipment Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$6,981,400—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$10,364,800—pass; (3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations (\$20,250,100)—pass.

4.(c) Warehouse Stores (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$531,500.

**Mr. Reid:** Just one question there. Does the minister anticipate there will be any changes in the warehousing stores, and will the changes in the Dauphin Sign Shop impact on any of the operations or change any of the way the warehousing store operations function?

**Mr. Findlay:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, the member asked if the Dauphin Sign Shop would cause any changes here. Previously, when we owned and operated the store, we bought the raw

materials that passed through the stores. Now that a private operation is producing the signs, we buy the signs from them. So the completed signs will now pass through the stores or through the department. So it may reflect some differences in costs, but instead of raw materials passing through, you now have a finished product. It is what we buy and what we maintain in a certain storage capacity in the department.

**Mr. Reid:** Does the minister foresee any impact on the staffing levels for the warehouse and stores then?

**Mr. Findlay:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, no changes are reflected in the Supplementary Estimates that the member sees in front of him. That does not mean that the department is not looking at trying to improve its efficiencies in this areas in the future, and I would not want to predict whether that will cause a change in staffing or not. It does not mean that they will not be looking at it. They certainly will be looking at ways and means to improve efficiency of doing the operations.

**Mr. Reid:** I take it, then, that there are some serious considerations being given to changing the staffing levels then. [interjection] Well, one can almost see the handwriting on the wall: as soon as there were changes within the sign shop arrangement, other functions will be impacted by that decision as well. So it is not just the one area, the Dauphin Sign Shop, that is going to change. There are other functions impacted by that same decision.

That is all the questions I have.

**The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Reimer):** Item 4.(c)(1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$531,500—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$132,000—pass; (3) Purchases \$4,940,000—pass; (4) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations, a credit of \$5,603,500—pass.

4.(d) Northern Airports.

\* (2200)

**Mr. Reid:** There has been some concern on the part of northern residents since word came out earlier this year in March that the airport control tower at Thompson was being seriously

considered by the federal government for closure, at least a portion of its operation was being seriously considered by the federal government, the Minister of Transport and/or Transport Canada.

Can the minister give me some idea of what has taken place with respect to that issue? I have not heard any more about it since that point. Is the federal government still considering closing down either the tower operations or their flight services?

**Mr. Findlay:** I think the member recognizes that Thompson is a federally controlled regulated airport, and our information at this time is that Transport Canada has made some recommendation to the federal minister on the flight services and the tower about what to do with them in the future.

We are not aware that they have made a decision, at least no information on the decision has been transmitted to us.

I can tell the member that certainly the town council in Thompson is concerned from the standpoint of safety and the impact that closing the tower might have on future economic development for Thompson and region. We supported them by a letter from myself outlining the same concerns that the federal minister should take into account before making a final decision.

**Mr. Reid:** Well, I am aware of some of the correspondence that has taken place between the minister and my colleague the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), and the letters that have gone to the federal Minister of Transport as well.

I have the information here. It says here that Transport Canada recently completed a study consisting of a cost-benefit and operational analysis. Has the minister's department received that information, because to me it appears here that Transport Canada is placing this decision as one based solely on the analysis of the dollar value from a commercialization aspect of it versus one that would include safety.

So it seems, at least by the information that has been provided here from the federal minister, that they seemed to have ignored the safety aspect of it. I am just wondering if there has been any other

decisions, or has the department received the study from Transport Canada relating to the Thompson airport?

**Mr. Findlay:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, the member is right in terms of the federal government has done cost-benefit analysis and our staff have been involved in presentations from federal people. We are reasonably convinced they have taken the issue of safety into consideration in their analysis but whether they have taken the impact on economic development into consideration, we do not know. It clearly was the second element that we raised as an issue of concern, along with safety, when we wrote to the federal minister. The City of Thompson has raised that and I assume other individuals also. Whether they will take that into consideration in the decision process, I am unable to comment on.

**Mr. Reid:** Has the federal Minister of Transport indicated whether or not his department or he would be responding to the province and to the Department of Highways and Transportation prior to any final decision being made with respect to the airport?

**Mr. Findlay:** All I can tell the member is that we have sent a letter. We do not know whether they will come back to us or not. If they have any further questions, if they want some information from us, I presume they will. To this point, they have not responded to my letter which was some time ago. I think I mentioned earlier that we have written some 14 letters to the new federal minister and got replies on four of them, so this is in the group of 10 that has not been responded to.

**Mr. Reid:** All right, I guess we will wait. The minister will probably make an announcement in due course then as information comes to his attention.

I think it is important to northern Manitobans and, indeed, to Manitoba itself that we have Thompson airport with the current operations in place, otherwise I do not see how we can have further enhancement of northern activities without complete air services to serve northern Manitoba.

I know I have flown in and out of Thompson airport many, many times. I am not sure how they

would function in inclement weather conditions without having a full range of services available for the people of northern Manitoba. It is hazardous enough to fly through some of those conditions without having to think for a moment that when you are in the air you do not have somebody on the ground end of the flight service kind of guiding you and making sure you are able to reach your destination safely.

\* (2210)

There are quite a few airports that the province maintains, and there has been a reduction in the number of staff years by eight and a half. Why did we move to the two-person operations at the provincial airports in northern Manitoba?

**Mr. Findlay:** The department is involved with 30 airports in northern Manitoba; 22 of those 30 airports are manned and about two-thirds of those 22 are manned with two people. So we are creating the same standard of service at all airports that is deemed to be appropriate and sufficient to supply the services that are necessary.

(Madam Chairperson in the Chair)

**Mr. Reid:** Maybe the minister can then tell me what functions were eliminated from those airports if you are going to harmonize the level of service to all of the airports. Also, can he give me an idea if we are planning to upgrade any of the northern airports, either by runway condition length, servicing, et cetera?

I know the previous minister had indicated that he had some thought that maybe the department should be moving in that direction and, in particular, trying to upgrade some of the runways. I am just wondering what plans the department has to make any of those changes.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, of the 8.5 positions, 3.5 were building workers, two were flight officers at Gods Lake, and three were clerical support staff. With regard to capital activity in northern airports, this year there was some \$685,500 being spent on northern airports. I will just give the member a quick breakdown of some of the items here. There is Gods River airport—construction, \$15,000; airport safety equipment, \$10,000; airport equipment in a number of airports, \$75,000,

terminal roofing at Red Sucker Lake and Brochet, \$11,000; terminal reservations at Norway House, \$7,000; shop and fire hall construction, \$115,000 at Brochet, \$50,000 at Oxford House; terminal building siding at various airports, \$22,000; purchase of self-contained fuel tanks at Shamattawa and Brochet, \$60,000; fencing around the airport, at Red Sucker Lake, \$26,000, and at Shamattawa, \$84,000; gravel at Gods Lake Narrows, \$200,000; runway improvements in Norway House, \$6,500; and a runway survey at Pukatawagan, \$4,000. There were quite a number of projects in the \$685,000.

**Mr. Reid:** I can see that there is money being spent, and I am not sure if that is the complete list of projects, and if not, maybe the minister could just photocopy and send a copy over to the critics at some point to speed up the process a bit and make it easier for him, so he does not have to read it into the record.

The minister mentioned some funds for the \$685,000 in funds being expended. Is a portion of those monies recoverable from Canada under the \$495,000?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, no. It is all provincial expenditure.

**Mr. Reid:** Then the \$495,000 is expended for?

**Mr. Findlay:** The \$495,000 the member is referring to is monies we recover from the federal government for Atmospheric Environment Services at Berens River, Island Lake and Norway House, plus a subsidy for the Norway House airport.

**Madam Chairperson:** Item 4.(d) Northern Airports (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$2,889,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$1,900,200—pass.

#### 4.(e) Marine Services.

**Mr. Reid:** In prior Estimates the department and the minister have provided information relating to a summary of the ferry operations. It gave a breakdown of the individual ferry operations themselves, their season start and shutdown dates, hours of operation, the number of operators. It also gave the traffic flow, passengers and vehicles, year

over year. It also gave the expenditures by way of salaries and maintenance costs as well.

I am wondering if the minister could provide similar information again to allow us to see the cost of the individual operations.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, I have a copy here of information on the six ferries that we run in the province from breakup to freeze-up, with the kind of information the member is looking for. We will just have it as part of the next package, as opposed to reading it now, if that is okay?

**Mr. Reid:** That would be fine, Madam Chairperson. I look forward to receiving the information.

The minister said six ferry operations, too. I must have missed something. The annual report makes reference to seven ferries, and I know there were seven ferries in the past. I am wondering which one has been deleted from the operations.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, the member is right. We have talked about seven ferries in the past. Six are operating now. The one called the Ingmar Carlson ferry [phonetic] is no longer needed because a bridge has been built in the community of Cross Lake by Indian and native affairs. So there is a bridge to replace the ferry, built by federal money.

\* (2220)

**Mr. Reid:** That is a good point that the minister makes, Madam Chairperson, that federal dollars—which brings me back to the point I had raised earlier when we were talking about a prior portion of the Estimates here pertaining to Cross Lake. It was my understanding that at the conclusion of last week there was an arrangement that was struck between the arbitrator, the band councils, the federal government and the provincial government dealing with the bridge at Pipestone crossing in Cross Lake. What impact is that going to have on the departmental operations? I am not privy to all of the details to this point today. Has the agreement been struck that we are now going to construct a bridge crossing at that point?

**Mr. Findlay:** At Pipestone?

**Mr. Reid:** At Pipestone.

**Mr. Findlay:** This may sound like a cop-out, Madam Chairperson, but we are not privy to the discussions that have taken place. Northern and Native Affairs is, and you had better ask them. But, at this stage, we are not directly involved.

**Mr. Reid:** So then I take it the department has not been involved in those discussions, even though it is going to impact on your operations as a department. I would have thought that if there had been some agreement pertaining to structures that the department would have been at least included in some of the discussion taking place. So it seems to me a bit unusual that they would not be part of the—well then, maybe not part of the final decision, but being involved in some of the discussion because the final decision could ultimately impact upon the department. The minister indicated previously that there was going to be some delay in the planning and design phase of at least two years, and even with a speed-up process, I am not sure how much that could be advanced. That is why I am asking the question here of what the impact is going to be upon the department.

**Mr. Findlay:** Well, any information we have from Northern and Native Affairs is: we are not yet committed to building a bridge. Even if the government was committed, it does not automatically mean it comes out of our budget. That would be for future discussion as to who is responsible for paying.

**Mr. Reid:** There has been an elimination of one position with the regionalization of the Airports and the Marine administrative resources. Was that position vacant, and when it says eliminated, where was that eliminated from?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, the position eliminated was a Clerk 3 in Winnipeg, and the individual has been redeployed in the department.

**Madam Chairperson:** Item 4.(e) Marine Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$608,200—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$454,000—pass.

Resolution 14.4 RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,630,500 for Highways and Transportation,

Engineering and Technical Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

Oh, I am sorry. I got ahead of myself again. I apologize.

Item 4.(f) Materials and Research (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits.

**Mr. Reid:** Can the minister explain, because there are jobs eliminated here as well, or positions, I should say, one position eliminated due to the amalgamation of laboratory services. What kind of laboratory services do we do under the Materials and Research?

**Mr. Findlay:** The laboratory services here are soil testing, and there was an amalgamation of those kinds of services with Natural Resources, which led to the elimination of the one position. All five positions that are eliminated here are all Winnipeg positions.

**Mr. Reid:** I take it, then, that if there were people in them, they were either redeployed within the departments.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, the one position I referred to earlier was vacant, and of the other four, two people have been redeployed in the department and two are still pending redeployment.

**Mr. Reid:** What does “pending” mean? Does that mean some decision being made about their future redeployment within the department or voluntary separation?

**Mr. Findlay:** The options on the table are to find jobs in the department or in government when you are on the redeployment list.

**Madam Chairperson:** 4.(f) Materials and Research (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,469,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$501,600—pass; (3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations \$1,009,200—pass.

(g) Traffic Engineering (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits 895,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$4,688,200—pass.

Resolution 15.4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,630,500 for Highways and Transportation,

Engineering and Technical Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1995.

5. Transportation Policy and Research (a) Salaries and Employee Benefits.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chairperson, I have quite a number of questions dealing with policy-related matters, and I know when we did our opening statements I made reference to many of them. I suppose we could start off on some issues that are lingering still, even for a number of years now, that had involved the department.

I make reference to the Riverton Boat Works. This is an issue that has been unresolved now for a number of years. It involves a manufacturing firm located at Riverton, Manitoba. My colleague the member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans) has raised this issue with me and with the former Minister of Highways and Transportation.

This firm constructed the tug that is currently in service at Churchill, and through some reasons that are unknown to me, there were portions of money that were withheld.

\* (2230)

This current minister may not be aware of all of the details. I hope that his staff will be able to brief him on some of the issues that are outstanding. This is an issue that is still to this day unresolved, and this firm has had to undergo severe financial hardship as a result of the failure of the departments of the federal government to pay monies that were, from my understanding, due and owing and payable to this firm. The firm has had to take or initiate legal action in the courts, which has not proceeded to this point, but they have expressed a willingness to stop any of those legal proceedings if there was a willingness on the part of both the provincial and federal governments to sit down at the table and to discuss in a serious way how we can resolve this matter to the satisfaction of all parties.

I know my colleague the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) has indicated that when he was Minister of Highways and Transportation this ERDA contract had been signed with the federal government making sure that work on the

construction of the tug was undertaken in Manitoba. We thought at the time that it was a good project. It was creating jobs in Manitoba and work for a Manitoba company, but it has turned out that this has been a nightmare for the company.

I know the minister, through comments that he has made in this House over the years that I have been here, has expressed an interest in making sure that Manitoba companies, where they want to compete—and this company is obviously competing in the private market—should be given the opportunity, but it appears here to me from my studying of the file information available that the company was penalized for some reasons that are unknown to me.

Maybe the minister, through his advisers, can make me aware if there are some conditions or some outstanding issue that prevents the department from acting as an advocate on behalf of this firm in communicating or dealing with the federal government so that we can sit down at the table and resolve this issue.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, this is an issue that I am sure the member realizes dates back several years. It flows out of an ERDA agreement entered into by the province and the federal government. The contract to build the tug was strictly between Riverton Boat Works and the federal government, and there is some dispute between the two parties on, I guess, various matters. I guess some penalties kicked in. The end result was that it would appear that Riverton Boat Works received less money than their costs were. They initiated court action with the federal government and prior to that, my predecessor in the department certainly did try to intercede on the person's behalf to resolve his differences with the federal government.

Now that there is a court action pending, court decisions pending, launched by Riverton Boat Works, as the member must realize, it is not something one should comment on as to what is right, what is wrong, where the issue is at.

From what staff has just told me, it is a long saga of significant difficulty for that individual and that company, but I do not think it is appropriate to comment when the matter is before the courts at



this time. As far as we know, it is still before the courts. We do not believe that there has been a resolution.

**Mr. Reid:** Well, I have had the opportunity to not only talk with my colleague the member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans) on this matter on several occasions, and I know he has met with the former Minister of Highways on this issue. They have discussed this with the owner of Riverton Boat Works, and maybe members of the staff were in on some of those meetings as well.

But it is my understanding that the individual involved from Riverton Boat Works is very much willing to put aside, in fact to stop all legal actions, to withdraw from that if there is a willingness on the part of both the provincial government, because they were a party to the ERDA agreement, and the federal government through its department that was responsible and signed the original agreement, to sit down at the table to talk about this issue. It would remove the legalities from the discussion so that there should not be a concern on the part of the federal government or the provincial government to discuss this, because the matter would then not therefore be before the courts.

So there is that willingness on the part of the owner of the Riverton Boat Works to undertake to do that because he wants to resolve this issue once and for all so that at least it is not hanging over the heads of everybody and creating a problem for this person who has obviously lost a great deal of money.

\* (2240)

I know the minister made reference to the fact that there were some penalties that had kicked in. It was my understanding from talking with the owner of Riverton Boat Works, my colleague the member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans), and reading the documents involved that there were substantial changes that were made on the part of the federal government in the contract itself for the way the boat was constructed, some structural changes and some electrical control changes in the contract. So if there were some changes by the federal government, it would seem to me that they on the first part rendered that contract null and void for

the changes they made unless there was an all-party agreement there to make those changes.

So there has to be a show of good faith here on the part of all the parties to sit down. The Riverton Boat Works owner has made the first step in that show of good faith in that they would put aside any legal actions. They would, in fact, stop that if both the provincial government would sit at the table and the federal government would sit down and discuss the matter. That is why I am raising it here today.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, I would like to introduce Rolly Savoie, Director of Transportation Policy, who has joined us.

I think the member realizes this is not an easy issue. It is relatively complex. The provincial government is not directly involved, but the department has discussed with him—our understanding is that the federal government will not sit down to any discussion as long as the court action is pending. So it is a chicken-and-egg situation, I guess. We are not directly involved, but the department has attempted to talk to both sides.

It seems that the federal government, particularly, has dug its heels in; there is no discussion as long as there is pending court action. So at this time it is at a stalemate, I guess is the bottom line. Since it is in front of the courts, it is difficult to be talking any further on the issue, but we have attempted to, it is fair to say, continue to attempt to get the two sides to come together.

**Mr. Reid:** In my opinion, for whatever it is worth, it seems to me to be reasonable and fair, that since the Manitoba government was a signatory to the original ERDA agreement under which Riverton Boat Works was awarded the contract for the tug's construction, we can play a mediator's role here in bringing the two parties together to sit at the table.

Now, I know the minister says it is a chicken-and-egg situation here, but Riverton Boat Works' owner has indicated to us that they are willing to take the first step, and I am wondering, has this message been conveyed through the department to the federal Ministry of Transport to allow them to know that there is a willingness on the part here, because Riverton does not want to

take this, something which would obviously be a very serious action on their part, to withdraw from any legal direction or course of action without having some thought that there might be some willingness or some earnest discussion take place on this matter.

That is why I am asking the minister's department to undertake to play that mediator's role, and ask whether or not he has communicated with the federal government on that.

**Mr. Findlay:** Well, this clearly is a chicken-and-egg situation. The department has discussed with the federal government if they would do precisely as the member has indicated. Our understanding is that their position is adamant that they will not discuss the issue until the court action ceases.

**Mr. Reid:** Has this information been conveyed to the owner of Riverton Boat Works by the minister's department?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, the department has informed him of that. He wants some guarantee that the federal government will talk to him if he terminates the action, and the federal government will not give that assurance. They will not talk about it as long as it is in front of the courts, period. That is the position they are taking.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chairperson, I know what the minister is saying, and I am not disagreeing that that is the federal government's position on this matter, but it seems to me to be unfair to this company and to its owners that the federal government wants to have everything. They want to have their cake and they want to eat it, too.

In other words, they want to get rid of the court action, but they will not give any assurances that they are willing to sit down at the table and even discuss the issue or at least in some way get the message through that they are willing to undertake that, which seems to me to be a totally unreasonable and unfair way for any government to treat any of its people or any of its companies within the country.

I think that the message should be conveyed to the federal government in the strongest possible terms that whether the position that was taken by

them was right or wrong or the position taken or the actions taken by the company were right or wrong, that is not the point here. The point here is how we treat our people and whether or not we give them the opportunity to sit down to dialogue between the two parties. Even then, at the end of the day, if they come to no agreement or no understanding, at least they have sat down at the table and tried.

I am just wondering if we have conveyed to the federal government in the strongest possible terms that we do not want and we do not expect that our people should be treated in this fashion.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, I cannot disagree with what the member is saying. It is quite an unfair situation to put Riverton Boat Works into, refusing to talk in any fashion.

I do not know what all is behind the scenes that causes them to dig their heels in and to be totally unreasonable in terms of saying, do this and we will sit down and we will resolve it. There must be something more than we know.

I agree with him; it is quite unreasonable. Nobody could defend that sort of action in treating an individual. The comments made earlier about changes in the contract and all that kind of thing, true or not—there is probably some truth. There must be a rational way to resolve it. Why they are so dug in, I do not know.

We have attempted to bring the parties together. It is not uncommon to sit down and discuss a process and resolve it before it goes to court. For some reason, one side absolutely refuses to in this instance.

I think it is fair to say we will continue to bring resolution to the process, but rest assured, as we are relating here, our understanding is the federal government is exceedingly dug in.

**Mr. Reid:** I will just leave that with the minister then. I do not expect him, for a minute, to have a full or complete understanding, having come into the department not that long ago.

Maybe, if he has an opportunity to confer with his staff on this matter, he can find if there is some

common ground between the two parties to get them to the table to discuss the matter.

Then maybe at that point if the minister can determine whether or not there are any conditions for which either Riverton Boat Works, my colleague the MLA for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans) or myself am unaware of what we should know, maybe a cause or condition for which the federal government does not want to discuss this issue, maybe the minister can then relate that to us. Then we will be further educated on the events surrounding this unfortunate incident for this company and for Manitobans.

I want to switch and talk a bit about short-line railways. We had short-line railway legislation introduced in this province last session. I think it was Bill 33.

\* (2250)

At that time, when we were going through committee debate, the former Minister of Highways said that he was taking this move to introduce this legislation in anticipation of interest that might come forward from parties looking to start short-line or to take over short-line railway operations.

Can the minister give me some update on what activities are taking place with respect to short-line operations, since the previous minister had said that there was some interest in, I think it was, the Waskada line? Has there been any movement on that? Are there other short-line operations, or are people interested in starting short-line operations within the province?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, I would also like to introduce Mr. Don Norquay, Assistant Deputy Minister of Transportation Policy Planning and Development Division.

The most current activity in terms of interest in short-line operation would be the recent CN announcement that they are calling for proposals on short-line operation of the Neepawa and the Rossburn subs. That is that stretch of track from Neepawa to Russell. Anyway, it is the turkey trail, along the turkey trail. It is about 111 kilometres of track. That call for proposals went out, I would

say, approximately a month ago or maybe right at the end of May.

CN had indicated at the time that they were interested in determining if there was somebody prepared to make an offer that they would consider attractive. If there was not an attractive offer, they would continue to operate it as it is currently operated. That would be the best example that we know of at this time.

The mention of Waskada, I think, comes more from the community or people in that area saying this should be run as a short-line operation as opposed to—whether it is CN or CP, I am not sure—being interested in turning it over to a short-line operation.

The department is currently drafting the regulations that will go with the Manitoba railways act, and as far as we can see at this point, the most likely application would be the turkey trail if CN accepts any of the proposals that are put in front of them.

**Mr. Reid:** Is this the only line that is currently being considered, or have there been other applicants come forward expressing an interest? Have the railways mentioned any other lines that may be candidates for short-line operation within the province?

**Mr. Findlay:** There is one other that we are aware that some discussions are occurring around, and that is the Lyleton sub. It is a CP track. There seems to be some degree of interest on behalf of CP and the potential operator of that short line, but how close it is to concluding an arrangement, we are not aware at this stage.

**Mr. Reid:** I would imagine the department would have to be involved in some way if the regs have not been drafted for the legislation that was from last year. I would hope the department would be aware of, whether or not there was any sense of urgency on the part of either of the main railways or any potential short-line operators to assume those operations, that we have the necessary regs in place prior to the application for transfer from the main lines to short-line operators. So is the department—have they been apprised of any sense

of urgency of any of those potential short-line operations?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, at this stage, the department is developing the regulations. We do not believe there is an immediate sense of urgency. If an individual approaches the department, they will be given some idea, some general understanding of what the proposed rules and regulations will be. There is a meeting in Toronto next week dealing with railway safety, rules and regulations for across the country, it is fair to say, looking for standardization. Coming out of that meeting, we may be in a better position to know what we might consider as appropriate for the province.

\* (2300)

We understand that in Saskatchewan and Alberta, though they do not have any rules or regulations for short-line rails, they are operating them in those two provinces, so I guess it is fair to say there is a precedent set. If we were not totally ready, there would be a mechanism to accommodate somebody, but we do expect that we will be ready with rules and regulations by the time anybody's application is formally before us.

**Mr. Reid:** Has either of the main railways given the department any indication on what they sense could be appropriate candidates for short-line operation?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, no, they have not.

**Mr. Reid:** So then the department is unaware, I guess, until the applications come forward on what lines would be candidates then. From my understanding in the last Estimates, the department was involved with some studies with the federal government dealing with rail line shipments on what would constitute a national rail network. Have the results of that study come out yet, and can the minister tell me what portions of the Manitoba rail network would constitute the portion of the national rail network?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, the discussion on the national rail network that the member refers to has broken down in terms of discussion, and we are not aware that there has been any discussion for the last nine months. It broke down over a number of

issues. At the council of ministers meeting at the beginning of July in Alberta, we are expecting some status report on that, but at this stage the discussions are in limbo.

**Mr. Reid:** Can the minister tell me on what points the discussion broke down?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, two of the issues that appeared to cause the discussions to come to a halt were the designation of lines across the country, and secondly, the line to Churchill.

**Mr. Reid:** Obviously, both of them would be important to Manitoba. Since those were two of the stumbling points, what was the position that was taken and who took the position that caused the line to Churchill to be one of the stumbling points where they could not come to an understanding?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, the member is right. Both of those issues would be critically important to Manitoba, and certainly the Churchill line, we deem it as a line that should be declared as of national strategic significance.

I think it is fair to say that most every province has a line that they consider as pretty important to them for which there is disagreement by some of the other players around the table. It is fair to say there are several lines that certain provinces think are important and other members think are not important, and on that basis, there was agreement not to continue the discussions.

**Mr. Reid:** Is the minister saying then that it was other provinces of Canada that were opposed to the continuation of the Churchill line, or was it the federal government that was taking that position?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, when you are in meetings and people take positions, I think it would be very inappropriate to comment on who said what in a particular meeting, particularly when I was not there. It is fair to say that there was disagreement around the table amongst the various participants, and I would assume the negotiations will commence again in some fashion.

Another item of concern in the process was, if you declare a national network, what does that mean for any line that is not considered in that

network, like branch lines? I think before you commit to saying, that is in the national network, that is not, you have to know what the outcome is for those that are not; what kind of process does that kick into motion. There are an awful lot of unanswered questions, so it is difficult to make decisions on some items until you know the outcome down the road for that decision.

I would prefer—I think it would be fair to all parties not to say these ones are for and those ones are against. It would not serve any useful purpose at this stage. I would hope that negotiations can recommence so that we can strengthen our network across the country.

**Mr. Reid:** I do not want to jeopardize the negotiations. What I am trying to say here is that if we have opponents to our position here in Manitoba, for which I sense that in this House we have some understanding or some agreement amongst all the parties as to the importance of Churchill to the province, at least to this point in time—I mean, it remains to be seen what happens this shipping season with Churchill, but if we knew who our opponents were and what our opponents were saying, then we could take a position that would be in support of what activities the government was trying to undertake to facilitate a continuation of the Churchill line operating well into the future and the port itself.

\* (2310)

So that is why I asked who the opponents are, because if you know who your opponents are and what they are saying, then you can formulate a position that would be in support of what it is that the government of the day is trying to do from an opposition standpoint. So if we could do something that was supportive of what you were trying to accomplish, if we agreed with that, then we could do that in a public way, but if we do not know who our opponents are or what our opponents are saying, then we cannot take that position. All we can do is take a general position, which we have many times over the past number of years.

So that is why we asked that question. I hope it does come up at the minister's meeting, to resume

that. I know the railways for a number of years now have been looking at going to a core network of rail lines across the country, and I have never understood the term core network of rail lines, because there were never any lines or anybody saying what those lines were going to be.

So it creates some confusion for the people who are even a little bit knowledgeable of the industry, of what the intent or the direction is going to be.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, I prefer to leave it this way, that we know we have support from the western provinces at the western Premiers' meeting. Routinely and continually, support to Churchill has been endorsed and re-endorsed, but beyond that, I do not know of anybody that stands up and says Churchill has a long-term economic significance for western Canada or Manitoba. So I would have to say that the Territories and the four western provinces have continued to reconfirm their support for the national significance of Churchill.

**Mr. Reid:** I get a better sense of the picture now that the minister has explained it in those terms, and it is the same problem that Manitoba has been facing for a number of years from certain opponents of this. So I appreciate what the minister is saying on that. So conditions have not changed in that sense.

I asked last year if there were any studies that were done relating to potential cost to the department with any rail line abandonment, and for some time I had been contacting the NTA in Saskatoon, finding out if there were any applications for abandonment in the province. For a long period of time there were none.

Now, I am not sure what the most recent position is, whether the main line railways have applied for abandonment orders. Maybe the minister can make me aware if the department knows of any. Have there been any studies undertaken by the department to determine, first, what the anticipated costs are going to be by way of either capital or maintenance programs for any rail line abandonment which would ultimately cause a transferring of the traffic from rail to road?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, the department has certainly attempted to quantify the costs of shifting traffic from rail to road. At this stage, it is fair to say there has not been agreement from the federal government on what those costs are. I know in a former life that federal governments continue to say there is no cost or impact. We all know that is not fully true.

**An Honourable Member:** Even the railway said that.

**Mr. Findlay:** Yes. I think it is also fair to say that is why we passed the short line railway act, because if they do not see it economically viable to continue to operate a line, as opposed to abandonment, why not convert it to a short line so you continue to move the commodities down that track, as opposed to on the road, in a more cost-effective manner.

So that is why short line railways are seen as a significantly viable option. It saves us the cost of those commodities travelling down the roads, in an increased sense. So we are not aware of any abandonment orders at this stage in the province, and it is an ongoing discussion point, negotiation point. Clearly, Saskatchewan faces, probably to a greater extent, similar problems, a lot more miles of line that could be abandoned and a road network that is much larger than ours and not in anywhere near as good a shape, their secondary roads, to what ours are. So there is an impact, there is no question. If we can operate short lines in a cost-effective manner, it will definitely save the roads in the future.

**Mr. Reid:** I asked if there were any hard facts that the department has, and whether the federal government agrees with those numbers or not is of no consequence to me. I mean, I am interested in what the experts in our department are telling the minister of what the potential costs are going to be. The federal government can have their own set of books and their own set of figures, and how they arrive at those is up to them. I am impressed with what our experts are telling us here in this province.

**Mr. Findlay:** As somebody who lives in the country—the member has probably lived most of

his life in the city and needs to have— [interjection] Rural Transcona, okay.

An awful lot has changed in terms of how commodities have moved over the last, I would say, 20 years. We have gone from a position—we have to go back maybe 20, 25, 30 years ago—where almost everything of bulk commodity that came into a rural community came by rail. Fuel went to trucks; fertilizer went to trucks; special crops went to trucks; equipment coming from manufacturers comes in by trucks; cars that come to dealerships come in by trucks. So, over the course of time, we have seen a continuous movement of commodities off of rail onto trucks, probably for a variety of reasons.

The progression from rail to road is not new; it is not something that is about to happen. I am just trying to relate, it is a fact that has been happening in an ongoing way. As that has happened, it is very clear shift of the cost of maintaining that infrastructure that has been shouldered by the province.

There has always been talk about the grain moving from rail to road, and I personally wonder if there is going to be any greater significance in what I have just described as the movement of commodities off of rail onto road. It is a good question.

\* (2320)

There have been studies done. There was one done by ADI Engineering. We are just not clear whether it has been released publicly at this point or not. It was done in the late '80s. It was not commissioned by this department. I am just not sure by whom it was. We have done some work within the department, too.

As time has evolved, there has been a lot of change in movement of commodities. Do not think for a moment that it is something new or it is something about to happen. It has been going on, on an ongoing basis.

If one has watched what is happening in grain commodity movements this last year with the tremendous movement to the United States, trucks have really been moving large volumes of wheat,

canola and barley into the United States, and that will probably continue to happen.

There are a number of reasons why that is happening, but it is happening. It is also efficiency of pickup and delivery. Just to tell you from a grain point of view, if a truck is hauling from a farm to a location, the truck can pick it up right in the farmer's yard and save the cost of transporting it to the elevator, save the elevation costs, which you are forced to pay if it is going into a rail car. If it is going into a truck, you avoid those costs.

It is not just a matter of the rail competing with the truck in terms of transportation costs. There are some other associated costs that can be avoided, and the same at the other end, in terms of handling costs. The truck pulls right into the buyer's yard and unloads. There are no in-between costs.

So there are a number of factors at play as to why this is happening. [interjection] Well, I pay taxes and that is how it is done.

Also, in the bulk commodities coming to the farmer—as I mentioned, fuel, fertilizer, equipment and all that—we are paying for that road wear and tear of getting them there.

It has just been an evolution that is continuing, and one would wonder why the railways have not been more aggressive in trying to recapture some of that lost volume. I do not know.

**Mr. Reid:** I still did not get any numbers out of this, and I am still left wondering if there are any numbers or any studies have been undertaken by the department.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, we can supply what numbers we have.

**Mr. Reid:** Even off the record is fine.

**Mr. Findlay:** As I say, the ADI study, we know it has been done. We are not sure that it has been publicly released. We will make the member aware of what we have in whatever fashion we can.

**Mr. Reid:** Thank you for your indulgence, Madam Chairperson.

There had been some discussions, and I know the minister and his colleagues and I and my

colleagues disagree on the issue of whether the payments should be continued to the railway or to the producer. But even the head of CP Rail is now saying that, if you change the method of payment, there are going to be significant losses for the railways, with a shift of the traffic-flow patterns, and that a lot of that is going to move into the trucking market.

This is a position that obviously the railways do not want to see, and this is one of the reasons why we have been saying for such a long time now that we have to maintain the payments to the railways, not that we want to see the railways get the money, because it would be more advantageous for them—obviously, it would help them in some degree to offset their costs—but we are doing this because we think that it is both in the best interests of the producers and in the best interests of the railways and the best interests of the provinces. So everybody is in a win-win situation by continuing that.

In that sense, I do not understand why the department and why the government is taking the position of move the payment to the producers versus the railways, because what we are in essence doing here is, from my personal opinion at least, taking the position of supporting the producers of western Canada at the expense of rail operations because they will ultimately be the loser in losses of bulk shipment of grain products. Even the head of CP Rail is now saying that publicly.

**Mr. Findlay:** Well, Madam Chair, this has been an item for discussion that has been going on for years and years, and this Crow benefit dates all the way back to 1897.

**An Honourable Member:** Before my time.

**Mr. Findlay:** Before all our time. As I said in the letter that we sent to federal Minister Young, this is a right of Confederation. It was a trade-off for the federal effort to put the manufacturing processing sector of Canada in Ontario and Quebec.

It is a God-given right that we have this out here to decrease our costs as producers of getting raw commodities to export. We have a long way to go to get to salt water, which was the way of the past. Pretty well all our exports up till very recent years

went to Thunder Bay or to the west coast or to Churchill to move to the world market.

There has been quite a change in recent years in terms of where a lot of those bulk commodities are going, and more and more of them are going south, which do not attract the Crow benefit. The Crow benefit is for moving east and west.

There is a considerable dispute in the farm community and in the industry as to where that should go. It has been an ongoing point of discussion and the producer payment panel has been set up, after several other studies and analyses and discussion processes have occurred, to bring forward some recommendations as to how to evolve the method of payment or whether to evolve it at all. They have not reported, at least I am not aware that it is publicly available, their final report. Whether they reported to the federal Minister of Agriculture or Transport, I am not aware at this point. It is close to being finalized, if not done.

I think the member would be well advised to await their ultimate recommendation as to what to do, given the fact that a lot has changed, particularly in the last five years, as to what commodities are moving, where they are moving.

The option that the federal Minister of Transport seems to be floating as a trial balloon is elimination of this right. That is what we are most violently opposed to. Absolutely not. It was never a serious discussion point. I will have to admit that three or four years ago the federal government kind of lofted it onto the table and we quickly kicked it off the table. It was a totally unacceptable option. If they had left it on the table any longer, the discussions were over. They removed it from the table.

Now for Mr. Young to come forward and make the comments he has made, not once, not twice, but three times, and the third time was pretty strong in his speech in Toronto, we are totally opposed to any principle of elimination. We are opposed to any reductions, and there have been 15 percent reductions in the last two federal budgets, because we think it will have a significant negative impact on not only the farm community and the

transportation industry, but an awful lot of rural communities across western Canada.

Until you have really lived and dealt with this, I do not think anybody in eastern Canada can have any understanding of the emotion around this issue, but it is one of those issues that has to evolve, given changes in circumstances, and certainly there have been some changes in where commodities move. It is one of those items that is called, particularly through the west coast, an export subsidy, and under the GATT process, reductions do occur, some 36 percent over six years. They say they have already reduced it 15 percent, so Mr. Young's comments, that you have to eliminate it to live up to international trade agreements, is absolutely wrong—absolutely wrong. Again, he just does not understand the relationship between the two issues, so we responded as we saw fit, representing the transportation industry and the agriculture industry of Manitoba.

So the option of elimination, we reject. I am prepared to await the recommendations of the producer payment panel that we will put before the federal government and take it from there.

\* (2330)

**Mr. Reid:** The minister is correct. It was a right of Confederation. I know even some of our past leaders—going back a number of years, the former Premier of Saskatchewan Tommy Douglas made reference to that fact on many occasions, that never, never, never will they ever give up the Crow benefit. Even way back in those years, it was obviously coming under attack by certain forces outside of western Canada. That obviously has not changed over the years.

The minister made reference to the fact that he was having a meeting with the other Ministers of Transport in July. He has made reference to the fact that there will some meetings dealing with discussions that had broken down nine months ago dealing with the national rail network.

What other items does the minister know of that will be on the agenda for that meeting, that will be of Manitoba importance?



**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, I will give a brief answer, but as soon as I finish the answer I would ask for a four-minute recess, not five but four.

I just want to add a little more to my last comments, the member being from Transcona. I want him to be aware that although certain people make representation to him that the method of payment has to stay the way it is because you do not want to impact the farmer, I want him to know that since WGTA was changed in 1983-84, the cost that the producer paid at that time was around \$4 a tonne. It did not change much until '86-87, and since then, it has gone from \$5 a tonne up to over \$11 a tonne. So the impact on the farmer has been consistently more, more, more, and the actual cost that the federal government is paying has actually come down over that course of time. So there has been a cost shift of the costs from the Crow benefit paid by the federal government to the producers' pocket.

I do not know that many producers have really been aware that there has been that shift. It is kind of one of those costs that is in the grain ticket that he does not see, because he has not been paying attention for so many years, can nothing change, and there has been a change. The increased cost, if it continues that way, there is a continuous cost impact on the producer.

The issues on the agenda: I am sure that the comments of Mr. Young will be on the agenda, several of them; impact on the WGTA issue; the National Highways Program is going to be on; the air bilaterals will be on there; the CN-CP merger will be on there; VIA Rail will be on there; weights and dimensions; the rail network, as I mentioned earlier, should be. There are a few more issues, but I would imagine those are the major ones.

**Madam Chairperson:** Is it the will of the committee to take a four-minute recess? This committee will reconvene at 11:39 p.m.

*The committee recessed at 11:34 p.m.*

---

#### After Recess

*The committee resumed at 11:38 p.m.*

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Chairperson, I thank the minister for the information relating to the agenda for the upcoming meeting. Obviously, all of those items will be and have been for a long time important to Manitoba. So it would be interesting to hear if—and maybe I should ask the minister, are those meetings due to take place within the first week of July, and will there be an opportunity for the minister to report back to the House by way of ministerial statement on any discussions or any progress from those meetings?

**Mr. Findlay:** The ministers' meeting is scheduled for July 7 in Calgary. On July 6, there will be a meeting of what we refer to now as Team West, which comes out of the Western Premiers' meeting, which has asked the four provinces and two territories to work together progressively on transportation-related issues. They have asked Manitoba to be the lead on that, and clearly, there are enough issues there for us to get very active on the western Canadian point of view. So it will be the 6th and the 7th. If there are issues of major decision that warrant a ministerial statement, it will happen, but I will commit to the member, I will report back to him on the broad scope of what is discussed, the issues, to give him an update.

\* (2340)

**Mr. Reid:** I appreciate that from the minister. I would be interested to hear if any progress could be made on any of those issues. The minister made reference, too, to two points. There is a meeting on rail safety taking place where his assistant deputy, I believe, is going to attend the meetings. How did that come about? Is that an invitation from the federal government, and what issues, specifically, will be discussed relating to rail safety? I always thought that fell under the federal government's jurisdiction, or is it something new, a new change that is taking place?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, the rail safety meeting that the member refers to is sponsored by the Railway Association of Canada, and the issue is to discuss harmonization of rail safety across the country. We will have one person present.

**Mr. Reid:** Rail safety has always been important to us considering the magnitude or the potential

magnitude of consequences that can happen as a result of rail accidents. I mean, we have witnessed those here in Manitoba on more than one occasion, and I know in northwestern Ontario, the area with which I am familiar, even to this day equipment is sitting in the bush not picked up by the railways. There seems to be a problem on the railway in how they react to and clean up after some of their derailments. I am sure that would enter into part of the discussions, or, at least, I hope it will.

It was my understanding that the University of Manitoba Transport Institute has in past years received some grant money from the province, and that has been slowly eroded over the last few years. There have been always ongoing concerns on the part of the railways with respect to the costs that they have to pay or bear by way of taxation levels either through the property tax on their holdings or their right of ways, as well as their fuel tax, and I know this government has made some changes on the fuel tax aspect, although we have expressed our concerns because it was never tied to any job retention for Manitoba.

Has the U of M been utilized, or is the minister contemplating utilizing this facility to do any studies to determine the differential that exists in operations between rail and trucking, to determine whether or not the playing field has been levelled so that both modes, or all modes, can compete on an even basis?

**Mr. Findlay:** I am glad that the member acknowledges that we have reduced the fuel taxes for railroads, and the figure is actually 13.6 cents down to 6.3 cents. So it is a fairly significant reduction, but the member would like to have a caveat on it. Well, I wish the world was that simple.

I think the member will recognize—knowing that they do complain about the taxes they pay—when the taxes decrease it does make you more competitive as a place for them to do business, and therein it is an automatic caveat if somebody in some other jurisdiction does not reduce it. I think they pay a penalty in terms of potential jobs, potential movement of trains through their area.

With regard to UMTI: instead of a \$50,000 grant we moved to fee for service for our services up to and around \$50,000 per year. So that is the so-called level of funding, but on a fee-for-service basis for various types of projects that we might have them undertake for us over the course of the year.

**Mr. Reid:** So has the department undertaken any studies then to determine whether or not the playing field has been levelled between the railways and the trucking to allow them to compete on an equal footing? Because it was my understanding that the railways were still concerned about the level of taxation that they are paying, not only on their property holdings in larger centres by way of yards or shop operations, but also their rights-of-way, which to my understanding they have to pay taxation to the different R.M.s.

Has the department undertaken any studies to determine what level of taxation exists in that area, because I know the railways have made representation to us? They want to eliminate that. I am wondering if there has been any discussion on that aspect of it.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, we have not commissioned any studies directly with UMTI on the issue. A study was carried out by the Transportation Association of Canada, and I will give the member some figures. The study does show that, and I probably preface the figures by saying that the federal government, I guess is fair to say, does not accept the figures fully because they do show a considerable difference, and the railways have argued that they are competitively disadvantaged relative to trucks and relative to the United States.

I will give the member percent of revenues paid as taxes by railroads and by trucks. In the United States, in both cases, about 8 percent of their revenue is paid as taxes by both railroads and by truckers. In Canada, the truckers pay approximately 8 percent of their revenue towards taxes, and this study would indicate that the railways are paying about 14 percent of their revenue as taxes. Now this is on a Canada-wide

basis, and our recent reductions in fuel tax would have narrowed that gap or narrowed that difference in Manitoba. To what extent, I do not have the figures here.

Those are figures that exist. Not everybody accepts them, but even if they are off by 50 percent, they do show that there is a competitive disadvantage to railroads in Canada versus trucks and versus rail in the United States.

\* (2350)

We all know everybody likes to pay less tax, but I do not know where we get the revenue to run all the activities everybody wants government to participate in.

**Mr. Reid:** That is a valid point or comment that the minister makes. That is why it has always been our position that if you are going to give up something by way of a loss of tax revenue, that you get something in return so that at least there be some, as my Leader called it, a quid pro quo, you get something in return for it. We wanted to get jobs in return so that if people are working, they are paying the taxes. They are taking that money, and you have the spin effect or the multiplying effect on it. It creates other opportunities and maybe offsets a better portion of the losses that revenues of the railways would have been paying, so we have had, at the same time, people employed. That is why we have taken that position.

I guess, if I wanted to find out about the policy with respect to rural municipalities, I would contact the minister's colleague and find out if there are any decisions or any discussions taking place with that department, and I will do that at some future point.

I want to switch a bit here to talking about Churchill. There had been some negotiations that had been ongoing back in September of 1991 wherein the Premier (Mr. Filmon) signed an agreement with Russia, the Arctic Bridge agreement. It was dealing with trade between Russia, in particular through Churchill and Murmansk. We were hopeful that it would create some economic opportunities for Manitoba, but to this point, I am unaware of any changes in there.

It was my understanding in the last Estimates, when I asked the former minister about who was representing whom in the exchanges that were taking place, the minister then referenced Caribou Ventures, I think it was called. Can the minister tell me who Caribou Ventures is? Are they representing a provincial government department, or are they representing Russia in these matters?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, the member does not have the sequence of events quite right but not too far off. The Premier had gone to Russia in '91. A subsequent trip, I believe it was September '92, I was there with a group of business people from Manitoba looking at the economic opportunities in the Ukraine and Russia. I was there as Minister of Agriculture, and Mr. Stefanson was there as Minister of I, T and T. He actually signed the Arctic Bridge agreement, which was the result of the Premier being there the year before.

The purpose of the agreement was to see if there was the ability to stimulate two-way trade between the two northern ports in some commodities that maybe had not been considered in the past. Caribou Ventures is a consultant retained by the Manitoba government to come up with an analysis of what other opportunities might exist for trade between Churchill and Murmansk, and we would hope that in the process of that study some meaningful opportunities are identified.

In terms of departments involved: Northern Affairs is involved, I, T and T is involved, Highways is involved.

**Mr. Reid:** If all those departments are involved, then the minister must know who they are and who are the representatives of Caribou consultants or Caribou Ventures, whatever their name is. I am not sure what the actual name of the company is. I have attempted to look it up in the phone book, through the Henderson Directory, in any source. I mean, after the minister told me of this last year, I had no way of knowing who these people are.

Can the minister tell me—because there has obviously been some face-to-face contact within the department with the representatives of Caribou Ventures—who are the representatives of Caribou Ventures? What are their names?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chair, we do not have the list of names here today. We will bring it back the next time, of the individuals. Our understanding is they are Manitobans, that the individuals of Caribou Ventures are Manitobans, but we do not have the list of names here. We will supply them the next time.

\* (0000)

**Mr. Reid:** Maybe the minister then could bring back information relating to any Order-in-Council that might be in place hiring this company, since there is obviously an agreement, to the part of three or four government departments hiring this Caribou Ventures to act on our behalf? I mean I have not located any Order-in-Council on hiring this company, and I want to know how they are

getting paid for the services they are performing for the government. So maybe at the same time when the minister brings back the names of the Caribou consultants or Ventures representatives, he can bring back how they are getting paid, as well.

**Madam Chairperson:** Order, please. The hour being past 10 p.m., committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

#### IN SESSION

**Madam Deputy Speaker (Louise Dacquay):** The hour being after 10 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**

Monday, June 20, 1994

**CONTENTS**

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**Committee of Supply**

<b>Status of Women</b>	<b>3760</b>
<b>Highways and Transportation</b>	<b>3790</b>