

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 17, 1987

EVENING SESSION

Transportation Agency of Saskatchewan - Vote 41 Item 3 Continued.

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Minister I don't know if I'm on the right item here or not but there was this little pamphlet that was put out on transportation by the 'Crow Can't Go'. Can you tell me the cost of that and what distribution there was?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — It was \$2,400.

MR. WIPF: — Have you put out any more pamphlets or information brochures like that? Other than this one, on any other topics and what were they?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Some Safety '77 materials.

MR. WIPF: — In Safety '77 materials, how many different individual pamphlets did you put out? . . . 10,000 of these, that is one type of a pamphlet. . . but how many different types of pamphlets?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I am trying to think here but there are two that come to our minds fairly quickly. 'The Seat Belt and the Law' and the 'Twenty-four Hour Suspension' pamphlets.

MR. WIPF: — At what cost were these put out, Mr. Minister, and have you got any of them there?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, we don't have the pamphlets here. We'll have to take a minute or two to find the cost. Perhaps I can send it over to the hon. member either later tonight or tomorrow.

MR. R. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you said earlier when you said you were working on four kinds of studies, the bus, trucking, rail and the industry. What is the industry study? Is it the needs, or what?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think the study would deal with the significance of transportation costs as related to the development of the industries.

MR. KATZMAN: — For an example, were you referring the trucking costs, the input that would be required to have an industry located in Nipawin versus an industry located in Lloydminster? Is that the type of thing you mean?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, not necessarily but I think one would look at the total cost of say, an industrial project and then look at the total cost of transportation related to the total cost of the development of the industry.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, using one that the minister over to the side of you is a little proud of, Zenon Park industries. It's just one set-up. Would you on their behalf recommend to them the problems that they will have in transportation or is it strictly within government that you make your recommendations?

April 17, 1978

MR. MacMURCHY: — They could come to us for that kind of a study and that kind of information, so that would give you an idea.

MR. KATZMAN: — I wish the Minister for Potash would give us all answers as quickly as he is willing to yell agreed all the time. We'll pull your chain when we want something out of you, otherwise sit there and be quiet and we'll get done tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would like to point out to the member it is not disrespectful to holler agreed.

MR. KATZMAN: — On the rail line study that you recommend here, are you involved with what's called the community transport, for example rail liners being used in Saskatoon, Regina and other areas, that type of concept — short haul?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think the study I referred to was the rail costing order and that deals with the CTC and it's a federal provincial study.

MR. KATZMAN: — On the trucking portion of your study, I don't know if this is the right place, I know you have mentioned it a little bit here, or do you want to do it under the other area, really weights on roads? When I say that, I don't want to get into the discussion you had with the member for Thunder Creek earlier. But, I'm referring to where I've seen trailers, the big trailers on the road now which have 16 tires on them, on the trailer itself rather than the common eight that we are used to. Are you doing any studies on that type of thing on road effect or is that in another department?

MR. MacMURCHY: — That would be Highways.

MR. KATZMAN: — You keep referring to Highways. Is he doing a specific project and that's where you recommend that we would bring it under?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think we talked earlier about a test lab being established under Highways and that's the sort of thing that would be going on there.

MR. KATZMAN: — You are not involved in the study then I understand.

MR. MacMURCHY: — The agency is not involved in the study.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Chairman, on this checking study that you are doing, are you doing any feasibility studies at the present time, or have you been doing any feasibility studies or are you going to do any feasibility studies that you know of for the Saskatchewan Transportation Company for their trucking fleet?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

MR. WIPF: — I would like to know the other expenses here, you said that one feasibility study on the Bruck bus, it was a \$10,000 study. What are some of these other expenses of \$271,900?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think I talked about the studies. In addition to that it provides for the province's contribution to Western Transportation Advisory Council. It provides the travel and sustenance of the Transportation Advisory Council members and their consulting services. It provides for the travel of the staff to the various meetings on transportation, both interprovincial and federal-provincial.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, just to shorten this up a bit. You mentioned the four studies that you are doing. Could you get us a copy of the studies that you have undertaken, the studies that you are doing now and get them for us at a later date. You probably have them listed there but itemize them for us and pass them over.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I can give you the information that is available to us at this time. The Transportation Advisory Council's work is not complete yet. As soon as it's complete that report will be made public.

MR. KATZMAN: — Earlier you made comments about, because of the Hall Commission and so forth, that you were doing studies re trucking of grain where the lines are being pulled out. Would you like to go a little further on that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, one aspect of the study would be in this area. The hon. member will recall that in Hall's recommendation he recommended compensation to municipalities for railways that were abandoned and for the extra costs of roads as a result of abandoned lines. One of its efforts will be to try to get an estimate of what kind of costs there might be and put forward a provincial position to the federal government in that area.

MR. KATZMAN: — You are saying that you will evaluate what will happen to the major roads where the rail line comes out and then you will submit a figure of dollars and cents for the federal government, asking for assistance in bringing those roads up to a standard to take the additional traffic or weight?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We'll be looking at grid roads and we will be discussing figures with SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and putting them forward to the federal government as it relates to that particular recommendation of Hall.

MR. KATZMAN: — Is there any assurance from the federal government to pick up any share of the costs or is it just recommendations at this time?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The most recent letter I had from the Minister of Transport, last Friday I think I received it, he said that the federal government is considering that particular recommendation.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, is this the agency that sets the load limits for — like up in my area we have a pulp truck hauling at 120,000 pounds; you've got a chip truck hauling at a lesser weight, or can't go over a certain weight on the same roads. You've got a grain truck hauling grain and somebody hauling fertilizer and they all have different weight restrictions. Is this the agency that . .

Item 3 agreed.

ITEM 4

MR. MALONE: — The Traffic Safety item here, this is the program for buckle up your seat belt, Safety '77 and so on, is that correct?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

April 17, 1978

MR. MALONE: — I wonder if the minister could explain to me why the government found it not necessary to post signs on the borders of the province advising tourists and people outside of Saskatchewan who live outside of this province, the law of this province was you must wear your seat belt.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Chairman, I think that is a question to direct to the Minister of Highways and I think the Minister of Highways has responded in the House to questions put forward, I think, by the member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan), as I recall, saying that they were going to take a look at it. I am not sure whether they have taken any action; one of the hon. members says in fact they have. But I think they are looking at it in a very positive way and if signs aren't up I think they are likely go up.

MR. MALONE: — Are you responsible for this program or is the Minister of Highways responsible for it?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well I suppose it is a co-operative effort of the government and it in fact involves the Department of Highways; it in fact involves the Department of Education. It in fact involves the Department of Health through the Alcoholic Commission, and so on. The co-ordination of the program, namely Safety '77 which is continuing on into this year, is out of the Transportation Agency with the position of the co-ordinator, Carl Shields, in this particular subvote and some of the advertising from this particular subvote. But it is a program of a number of departments of the government.

MR. MALONE: — Well that is what I was going to get to in a minute and I will get to it in a minute, but let me ask you this: This subvote is under your jurisdiction; now maybe the Minister of Highways has something to do with it and maybe other ministers have something to do with it but it is your estimate and I think it is entirely appropriate for us to ask you the questions and hopefully you can give us the answers.

Now, I want to ask you at this time, what instructions have been given to law enforcement agencies, RCMP, municipal police in connection with seat belts? Have they been instructed to stop people on a spot-check basis to ensure they are wearing a seat belt or are they just laying charges if they are stopped for some other reason? What kind of policy is the government proposing in this way?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think the hon. member will recall that when we announced the seat belt law, taking effect July 1, with prosecution to take effect as I recall, October 1, three months later, we talked in terms of it being an educational kind of approach to the use of seat belts and that the enforcement officers were to take that approach. I think now the fact that we have the seat belt law in effect and with pretty solid support for seat belt use in the province, we are seeing a shift by the enforcement officers from the educational aspect to more of an enforcement aspect, not losing at any time however, the importance of education rather than enforcement.

MR. MALONE: — Well you haven't answered the question. I asked you whether the law enforcement agencies had been specifically instructed to do spot checks on motorists to see if they were wearing their seat belts or not wearing them, as the case might be. Could you just answer that yes or no?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I don't think they have been specifically instructed but part of their routine work is the spot checks and obviously they will be checking on the use of seat belts. I have been stopped a couple of times on my way home from Regina to

Semans by the Southey detachment on a spot check. Of course I have been wearing my seat belt.

MR. MALONE: — Was it only the seat belt they were checking you for ..?

Let me suggest to the minister that there is an RCMP detachment that should be well known to the minister because it is within his constituency and that is Strasbourg. I was up there recently for a meeting and I was advised by all the people at the meeting that they were quite upset with this particular detachment because on certain nights they were setting up road blocks and stopping every single car that went by on the road from Craven to Strasbourg, whatever highway that is. I don't know the number of it. The people in the area were very annoyed about it and I don't blame them for being very annoyed. The law of the land still is that you have to have a reasonable and probable cause to believe that the offence is being committed. These people are being stopped regularly, most of them wearing their seat belts, and they are taking very great exception to it, so I am asking the minister once again, the detachment within the constituency of the Attorney General right now, have the RCMP been instructed to act in this manner?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well not as far as any specific instructions that have come from the Transportation Agency. I just checked with the Highway Traffic Board and not from there either. But I have not had the complaints that the hon. member has had. I do know that they do conduct spot checks both on that road and on No. 6 highway that I travel on. They were stopping cars and they were very, certainly to me, pleasant and very, very positive about the seat belt law.

MR. MALONE: — Let me ask you another question then. The government has said both in the Budget and in public statements that because of the new seat belt law, the accident rate in Saskatchewan has gone down. (inaudible interjection) Well that's . . . aha . . . that's exactly my point. Would the minister not agree with me that the accident rate has not gone down at all, indeed it has gone up? Perhaps more appropriately, the injury rate has gone down because of seat belts and let me suggest to you that anybody who says the accident rate has gone down is very badly misleading the public.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I have never said that the accident rates have gone down because the accident statistics show what the hon. member has said, that in fact they are up. What is positive is the number of injuries and the number of fatalities since seat belt law has been in effect. I think that is very, very positive and there is no question that seat belts don't prevent accidents but certainly they prevent serious injury and fatalities and that has been the case.

MR. MALONE: — One more question, Mr. Chairman, if I may. You have already indicated that the responsibility for Safety '77 and all of these government programs about safety (and I'm not critical of the programs) are being shared right across the government, that is the Minister of Highways has some responsibility, you have some responsibility, presumably the Attorney General has some responsibility. Why this particular method? Surely an efficient way to do it would be to put the responsibility in the hands of one minister. Probably the Attorney General would be the most appropriate one. Why is it that you have decided to spread this around the government benches? Is it because you don't want us to be able to ask a specific minister a specific question or why was the government moving in this way?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only respond by saying to the hon.

April 17, 1978

member that there were a number of safety programs going on within the government before we implemented Safety '77 and they should continue going on within the government. For example, there is a long term safety program in the Department of Highways. Driver training has always been in the Department of Education and the alcohol aspect of health is evident, SGIO and the Attorney General's Department, and for one year plus, we felt that our emphasis should be on co-ordination and still retain the efforts of each individual department. I would not be surprised to see the sort of traffic safety subvote disappear from the Transportation Agency as the co-ordination effort is no longer required.

MR. MALONE: — I would say to the minister by way of conclusion of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, that some things should disappear, that is the Transportation Agency of Saskatchewan should be put in with the Department of Highways, or another way of doing it would be to make you the Minister of Transport in reality as well as in name so that all of the transportation problems could be the responsibility of one particular person.

Now you told us earlier today that you have some responsibility for roads, some responsibility for the Hall Commission report but when it comes to highways and the building of them, it is not your responsibility. You have some responsibility for traffic safety but not all of it. Surely a government that was trying to operate in the most efficient way would put all of these responsibilities under one minister. We would not have to have the Minister of Highways saying one thing one day, and you getting up and saying a similar thing the next day.

Now would you not agree that if you are going to have a meaningful policy on transportation in the broadest sense — highways, rail, air, trucking, everything you can think of — it should be under one minister and one minister alone? Would you agree with that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think it is a suggestion worthy of consideration. The Alberta government has organized itself in this way and I know in conversation with the minister there, it is a fairly, fairly heavy load for one minister. I think to a degree, although I am not sure fully, the Ontario government is following the same example. But, I think, with what is happening in the transportation field now, I think that our approach is a satisfactory one. That is not to say that it shouldn't be considered for the future.

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Minister, I hope you don't become the Minister of Transport ..

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order please! I just want to remind the member and all hon. members that I know it is easy to stray from the rules and regulations of the House quite easily, but I do believe that in making your question I would ask you to make it to the Chair and through the Chair, to the ministers. I think this is the proper way and I know none of you would want it to be done improperly.

MR. WIPF: — You are talking to the right fellow, Mr. Chairman. That is one thing that I would not want to be, in this House, and Mr. Chairman, I will go through you to the minister and as I said, I hope you do not become the Minister of Transportation and follow the leads, as the Leader of the Liberal Party said, or we will have you flying all over this province in a big jet and we will never get you down to the ground to take a look at our roads.

Mr. Minister, in this one item, item 4, we have one post filled in this job. Did you say that that was Carl Shields?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. WIPF: — Does Carl Shields hold any other job or is this full time work?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, this is his full time job or appointment. I will report to the hon. member that he is on leave of absence from the university and therefore will be returning to his work at the university once this work is complete.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, what is the \$240,000 of other expenses here? You mentioned some were for education, driver training. Can you just outline all the programs that come under these other expenses?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, it is to a large extent advertising. The main emphasis of the advertising program, this year, relates to the problem of drinking and driving.

MR. WIPF: — How many hidden staff are under your other personal services? How many people do you have on part time or temporary?

MR. MacMURCHY: — One information officer and one part time clerk steno.

MR. WIPF: — That is one full time information officer, then is it?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. WIPF: — Why are they not in a permanent position?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, because of the terminal nature of this particular co-ordinating safety program. I indicated earlier to the hon. member that Mr. Shields is on leave of absence from the university.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Let's try one more time, Mr. Minister. You say you have one full time that is covered under other personal services, or are you referring to Carl Shields, on the first vote?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We have one temporary full time and a part time clerk steno. In addition to the one permanent position that is indicated.

MR. KATZMAN: — O.K. You are saying your permanent one is your one person shown up and your full time, how long has that person been on continuous service to your department?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We have had a position of research person in the last year attached to this particular subvote and this year, because of the emphasis, the heavy emphasis, on the advertising aspect, an information person will be attached to this particular subvote.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, I understood, the other day, in Estimates, we were told that anybody who had been on staff for a year would move into a permanent position. You wouldn't show them under other personal services. Now you are telling us that this

April 17, 1978

person has been there over a year and you haven't moved him to the other area.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think I answered the question earlier — that we had a research person and now we have an information person.

MR. KATZMAN: — You are saying it is the same person?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — O.K. You are telling me then that you reclassified the person from a researcher to an advertiser; therefore it is a new position; therefore his service is not a year and that is why he is not moving?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well the duties and the requirements are different this year from last year.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, what I am trying to get at, Mr. Minister — We went through this in another department and finally got it solved the other day. Is he, what I call, a 59-day employee again, a person who does not become permanent because you reclassify him, change his title, or move him out and bring somebody in? The job exists for a full year and you need somebody all the time doing this work. If, as you say, it is the same body in this case, why has he not been made a permanent employee?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well I pointed out to the hon. member that last year the work required was more on the research side — preparation of materials and treasury board submissions and that sort of thing. That work is complete. This year the work that is going on is more on the information side and, while the same person is carrying out the work, I point out to the hon. member that, under PSC regulations, there can be an extension to two years.

MR. KATZMAN: — You say the reason why you have not moved him up then is because you have asked for an extension under the rules and that is why you are still showing him in the other area?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek): — A question to the minister. I think you indicated earlier that there was a reduction of the number of injuries due to the wearing of seat belts. I wonder if the minister could indicate exactly in percentage what that reduction was and how that reduction compares to patterns during the last five years.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I am sorry. I cannot give the hon. members the pattern for the last five years since we do not have it available here. The statistics we do have here relate to the six months that the seat belt law was in effect, July 1 to the end of December. The accidents are up plus 15; the injuries are down 25.8 and the fatalities are down 14.6 for that six-month period. To provide the hon. member with a pattern over the next five years, we would have to do some work, but we can make that information available to him.

MR. STODALKA: — I was just wondering if we could just get some sort of report because during short periods like this, certainly some of these statistics could be almost questionable. It seems to be rather impressive but I was wondering how it

relates to the patterns that have taken place in the last three or four years.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Tell the member I have some information and I will send it over.

MR. KATZMAN: — Going back to these two people that we seem to be moving around here, we see one advertiser, I guess we call him now, and one secretary. Is that secretary a part-timer or why has that position not been moved up?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Part-time.

MR. KATZMAN: — A six-month period, three-month period? What are we talking about? Four hours a day?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, part-time in the sense that the secretary is shared with the Community Services Branch which would be under the Transportation subvote.

MR. KATZMAN: — Could you furnish me with a list, within Vote No. 41, of those staff covered under other personal services? I assume that you are telling me that she is partly under Vote Item 4 and partly under Vote 3 here. I do not want names; I just want positions because you seem to indicate that they are sharing, so that they are half here and half there. I can't understand if it is a full time in this department, even though it is charged to item 4 and item 3 if this person has been a secretary for over a year, why wouldn't they be getting their increments. Or have you applied for an exemption again?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The hon. member is asking for the positions under item 3 and under 4, we will make up the list for him and forward them to him.

MR. KATZMAN: — One more question. This is Traffic Safety, how much of this \$240,000 is advertising, TV, radio, printed media and pamphlets? Could you give me a breakdown.

MR. MacMURCHY: — The whole amount is the advertising. It's almost \$236,000 out of the \$240,220.

MR. KATZMAN: — Do you have a breakdown on TV, radio?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, I do not have that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Do you have any idea what part is for printed literature like the brochure Mr. Wipf talked about earlier?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I don't think it's developed to the stage where it is broken down into how much will be radio, television and print.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — How much money have you allotted to the training program for motor cycle operators under this vote?

MR. MacMURCHY: — There isn't any money allocated to the training program in this subvote or any in the Transportation Agency.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Chairman, you said that some of the pamphlets are being developed yet and some of the information on education which you are going to be putting out. Is this right, it is not completed yet and it will be presented in the near future?

April 17, 1978

MR. MacMURCHY: — That's right.

MR. WIPF: — Well, how much out of the budget last year of \$410,590 was spent? Was that completely spent, was there a lot of incomplete work left from that budget to be carried over into this one?

MR. MacMURCHY: — It was all spent and there wasn't any carried over.

Item 4 agreed.

Transportation Agency Vote 41 agreed.

SUPPLEMENTARIES

ITEM 21

MR. KATZMAN: — Could you tell us where you overspent that you require this \$17,500?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, our commitments to Skywest had to be made up through a special warrant and this is the amount that was required for the special warrant. Skywest meaning the proposal for air service, Winnipeg-Dauphin, Winnipeg-Brandon Dauphin, Yorkton-Saskatoon, which didn't take place.

MR. KATZMAN: — Is this for the study that you were working on, trying to get people to take that route? I still don't understand what you committed to Skywest?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Basically co-operation of Manitoba and Saskatchewan our role is to provide funds for operation for submissions to CTC and that sort of thing, that's where our costs were incurred.

MR. KATZMAN: — That has nothing to do with that aircraft that didn't work out that they were trying to develop in Manitoba.

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

MR. KATZMAN: — Can you tell us where the position is of the possible service to Yorkton, Winnipeg and Saskatoon. Is it possibly shortly to be heard in decision?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think the Air Transport Committee of CTC is deliberating now following the hearings that were held back in the winter.

MR. KATZMAN: — Is there any indication that you are working on additional service, for example, Yorkton, Regina or Moose Jaw involvement and so forth, or is that under a different area?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think as I recall, one of the options that were proposed to CTC was the service into Regina, but we have had no ruling by the committee of CTC and I don't know when a ruling will come down.

MR. KATZMAN: — Was any part of this brief going into Prince Albert via Yorkton. Do they have a third option?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I don't recall.

Item 21 agreed.

Saskatchewan Transportation Agency - Vote 41 agreed.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC BOARD - VOTE 15

MR. MacMURCHY: — I'll introduce the staff of the Highway Traffic Board — Chairman of the Board, Peter Glendinning, Terry Pollock the Director of Motor Carrier Administration, Louis Henbury who is Director of Driver Licensing and Paul Landry who is Administrator of Motor Vehicles.

ITEM 1

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I would hate to see Mr. Glendinning get a swelled head, but before we get into the estimates, I would like to thank him for all the co-operation that I have received from him for numerous problems which he has always been there to assist in his capacity.

Going on to the estimates now, on the executive administration, are any of these people staff related to the minister at all, any of the five indicated here?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

MR. KATZMAN: — Under other personal services, how many staff are covered there and duration of service.

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, there aren't any staff people there although the board members are paid out of that particular subvote.

MR. KATZMAN: — As the minister is aware, last year we were discussing the problem of individuals on special drivers' licences and the problem was not totally resolved at the time regarding working hours and so forth. Could you give us an idea how many people came before the board in the last year and in which areas did they appear for example — first offences, second offences and how many were granted special drivers' licences and how many were turned down?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Is the hon. member asking about 0.8's and the Driver Appeal Committee? The number of applicants last year was 855, the number of applicants who are eligible for appeal 725, the number of applicants granted hearings by the appeal committee 460, the number of restricted drive licences issued 238.

MR. KATZMAN: — What happened to the 27 in the mathematics that got lost; they just didn't continue through or something? The 460 and the 238 doesn't equal your 725. Are the other 27 turned down or what?

MR. MacMURCHY: — They withdrew their applications.

MR. KATZMAN: — How many of these now would have been those that have received a second offence and have become certified in some method of non-users of alcoholic beverages anymore?

April 17, 1978

MR. MacMURCHY: — Two appeared, one was granted.

MR. KATZMAN: — Two appeared and one - now are all these permits, the 238 you referred to — how many of them were specific hours and how many would have some other specification on them?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, there is a breakdown of the groups: farmers, businessmen, laborers, professionals, salesmen, chauffeurs and others. Usually the restricted licences are provided to accommodate their individual circumstances. It could be hours, it could be distances and so on.

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Chairman, I would like to . . . (inaudible) . . . receive your gains for franchise on a . . .

MR. MacMURCHY: — A quorum of the board is required, so it could appear to be a committee of the board but it is in fact a quorum of the board. The board does not all need to be present for a hearing and often a hearing is granted when there is opposition and often a hearing is granted even though there isn't opposition just to hear the situation.

MR. ANDERSON: — So the decision of a quorum of a board would be binding upon the applicant who is requesting the hearing. Is there any appeal from this?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, I am sorry to answer so quickly. There is appeal mechanism if there is new evidence submitted within 30 days.

MR. ANDERSON: — Is the appeal heard before a full board or before the quorum or is it back to the original board?

MR. MacMURCHY: — In that situation the board makes an effort to have the hearing before the full board, certainly before the quorum of the board that had heard the case originally plus other members of the board.

MR. ANDERSON: — Is there no appeal from the decision then that's made by this full board if it's there?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

MR. ANDERSON: — Do you give any reasons in writing to the applicant of why he was refused?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The only reasons in writing provided that the public interest would be promoted or not promoted.

MR. ANDERSON: — That is it, no other reason, just that the public interest would not be served or would be served?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: — Would not the minister feel that it leaves very little room for an applicant to know why his application was refused over another applicant, whether the

type of service he was going to be given or, I believe, you said the maximum rates would be charged, but if he was going to be a minimum rate charger, or supply different services, he would not know any reason, except you feel the public interest wouldn't be served?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, not through the written reasons, but the board makes itself available to discuss the situation with the particular person or persons, or applicants involved.

MR. ANDERSON: — The communities or the businesses who are to be served by the different applicants, would have no way of having any input or knowing why the results of your decision, of your Highway Traffic Board decision, was made then. They would have no way of knowing or of having input into this.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the input can come from the businessmen at the actual hearing, because the question was asked, or can come about through the work of Highway Traffic Board investigators in their work and, of course, the decision of the board is made available to them.

MR. ANDERSON: — The reasons that various applicants were turned down, or if applicants turned down, as I understand it then, is made available to the communities that are affected by your decision?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the information is available to all people or groups, or whatever, that appear at a hearing.

MR. ANDERSON: — That would mean that if you had various applicants that the reason you chose one applicant for the type of service that he was providing, be it a combination of passenger or freight, or the timeliness of service or the route, would be made available so that the local community could agree or disagree with your decision of the carrier that you license into the area?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think if they did not have the information available to them, they could request the information and the board would provide it to them.

MR. ANDERSON: — So that while the applicant himself could receive the information why he didn't receive his application he could go to the community and have them request the information and they would receive it. Is that how it would work?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The community would receive the same information that the applicant would.

MR. ANDERSON: — As I understand it this information would be that you felt that the applicant, who was turned down, was not in the public service and that is the reason that they would receive?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: — So you feel this sufficient information for both the applicant and the (after the appeal and everything) to make a decision whether it is in the public service, the public decision is strictly an in-close decision by the board, by the Traffic Board, and there is no recourse by the applicant, no recourse by the communities involved, to find out the reasons that you turned down the applicants. That there may be no

April 17, 1978

service provided because of your decision not to license, or the type of service may not be what the community itself would require and they have no way of knowing of all the different types of services were provided by the original applicant.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think that the hon. member should know, Mr. Chairman, that the applicant can reapply for an additional hearing. I think I indicated, earlier, that the board was prepared to sit down and discuss with the applicant, or applicants, their considerations. But in terms of providing a written response, I have indicated what the policy of the board is with respect to that.

MR. ANDERSON: — Is there any effort then being made - or it would be very difficult for a carrier who was turned down, to know what changes he would have to make to be acceptable. I am thinking not in consideration of opposing bids, but in areas where service would come in. You have partial runs, for instance, running into an area and you could have a carrier come in and apply to overlap on runs and he would be turned down and he would be told that it was not in public interest, but the communities involved and the carrier would have no way of finding out how your decision was reached upon and whether they felt it would be in their public interest.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I don't think the board can be asked to suggest or provide for an applicant, how to make an application. I think I did indicate earlier that the board is prepared to talk to applicants and probably out of the discussion assistance can come to the applicant in such a way as to assist him to provide a further application.

MR. ANDERSON: — What I was trying to get at is not that you would try to give them help in making an application but I'm specifically thinking of my area where we have STC running into Shaunavon. We have an independent truck coming through. We have, both are probably in the public interest to a great degree, we have an overlapping of services. We have had, at the time the applications were made, with the last go around, people coming in offering to run the whole service over. We're running into a private operator, an STC operator and an operator that would like to supply the whole service. And when you're turned down on part of your runs, your service is going to be difficult to apply, are unless there reasons given that either the cost is too high on a short run or that you would have to remove runs. And this doesn't seem to be provided in the way the information comes out; it's just as you say, in the public interest and it's very hard to differentiate whether the public interest is STC interest, or a private operator's interest or the community's interest. I'm not trying to disagree with how you do it. I'm just trying to find out how a guy can get around this conundrum.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the chairman reports to me, Mr. Chairman, that in the case of the Shaunavon issue which the hon. member has put forward, there was a hearing involving some 130 people and really more than a public meeting. When the board made its decision that in addition to the normal public interest response for its decision, it provided a rationale in that particular situation. And the board from time to time, I suspect being sensitive to community situations will in fact, do that. And did that, in this case.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, in an earlier answer to the member for Rosthern, you said that those who have been charged with a .08, there were some 855 applications to get their restricted licences back, is that right?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. WIPF: — How many .08 charges were there in the year?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The Highway Traffic Board doesn't receive those records. They just receive the applications for restricted licences under the Driver Appeal Committee.

MR. WIPF: — I was just wondering if you had an idea at all of how many .08 charges there were and what percentage are applying? You said 238 have applied for restricted licences, or received restricted licences out of that, is that right?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. WIPF: — What type of restrictions have they got on their licences and is there a breakdown? How many can drive only to work? What type of restrictions are there on the licenses? Is there a classification of restrictions?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I responded to the hon. member for Rosthern that we've got a number of different occupations involved and usually the restricted licence provided deals with the particular occupation involved. Farmers would likely have a different kind of restricted licence than the salesman or the chauffeur or in fact, the labourer.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, maybe you could supply a list of the type of restrictions that you have, the different classifications. How do you go about applying for these restricted licences? Is there a criterion that you have to meet in order to get a licence?

MR. MacMURCHY: — As soon as they are suspended under the law there is an application form attached to their suspension which they can fill in and apply, that is if they qualify under the drive licence appeal committee's criteria, which are basically .08 first offence or the changes that were made about a year ago, providing for appeals for three-year suspensions, those suspensions having served two years and providing a certificate from AA or some other organization or body which will provide information for the board to deal with, the sobriety in this case, over a period of time.

MR. WIPF: — You are talking about length of sobriety. What length of sobriety are you talking about in order to be received on an application that . . . how many days or hours or what is it?

MR. MacMURCHY: — For a period of one year.

MR. WIPF: — Many of these people go through the Driving While Impaired Program which is run in Saskatchewan here. Do instructors in those programs, at the end of the course, usually write out a recommendation? Some do write out recommendations anyway, whether they feel after spending 20 hours or 16 hours with the individual, whether he should be recommended for a restricted licence or maybe they will recommend that he never receives a restricted licence. How much weight does the Licence Appeal Board put on those recommendations from this DWI Program?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, more often than not it is reported to me, Mr. Chairman, that the applications come in before the Driver Appeal Committee before those courses are complete but certainly if they are complete and the recommendation comes from the instructor to the Driver Appeal Committee, that recommendation is considered.

MR. WIPF: — If this is right, you may have somebody that is slated to go to one of those courses and doesn't get in for three months. By that time he has probably gone before a

April 17, 1978

licence appeal committee and if the Licence Appeal Committee has found that he should have a restricted licence and this may be hypothetical but what if the instructor should find that the guy does not have a licence or recommend that it be held off for awhile, what consideration would be given to that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think the board has to make its decision; the committee has to make its decision itself and from my experience in observing the activities of the committee they have done a fairly commendable job, a very commendable job indeed. I think we leave them to their best judgments.

MR. WIPF: — Is it only in Regina that you can go to have your appeal heard?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, Saskatoon and Regina although I think more of the hearings are held in Regina than in Saskatoon. We broadened the personnel of the committee to include people from the north and the committee holds hearings in Saskatoon now as well as Regina.

MR. WIPF: — When did that start in Saskatoon, Mr. Minister?

MR. MacMURCHY: — About a year ago.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Minister, a moment ago you told the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Wipf) that you did not have records as to how many people were convicted on .08. Did I understand you to say that? That is absolute nonsense. You have records of all convictions that go through the courts. So would I ask you at this time how many people convicted of the .08 charge, the impaired driving charge, all alcohol-related charges under the Criminal Code in the past year?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is right. Information I had here dealt with the committee and that information wasn't provided but the number of Criminal Code convictions reported in 1977 was 12,535.

MR. MALONE: — That is not just the impaired ones. I suspect that you have all Criminal Code in there and you would have all sorts of other things mixed in. Is that the impaired driving charge or the .08 charge?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I guess that is the problem; we do not have those separated within the Criminal Code convictions. We have .08 impaired driving.

MR. MALONE: — Intoxicated, is that in the code now? It is .08 and impaired driving that I'm after. If 'intoxicated while driving' is still there, I would like those figures as well.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, they are guesstimating here and they are guesstimating that out of the 12,535 there would be at least 10,000 and that is as close as they can since they don't have the information.

MR. MALONE: — I will accept that — about 10,000 but let me pursue this a bit further with you. What figures did you have for 1976, was it more than 10,000 or less than 10,000?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Less.

MR. MALONE: — Well how many? Can you give me approximately?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well the total in 1976 was 10,723 and the total in 1977 was 12,535, so it is up. I'm talking about the total Criminal Code convictions.

MR. MALONE: — Well what I am trying to do is point out to the minister that your impaired, your .08, your drinking and driving related charges, whatever they come under, have been going up rather than going down. Now, you have in the Highway Traffic Board, several powers which have been exercised over the years. At one time it was a suspension by the board rather than a suspension by the court. That has now been changed. I haven't been practising law for the last couple of years and I'm not quite sure what the courts are doing, but I point out to the Minister, that all of the efforts that you had with the Highway Traffic Board, with the appeal procedure, that you haven't come to grips with the problem.

Now, I think members who have been in this House before me, the now Mr. Justice McLeod and others, have pointed out in the past that the way that you deal with the impaired driver is not so much through the government agency of the Highway Traffic Board or through the government putting points on a driver's licence or the government coming in and taking that driver's licence away. I suggest that the way you do is to let the courts do it. When people get behind the wheel after drinking and whether it is .08 or impaired or whatever, I believe that the direction the government should be moving through the Attorney General's office, is ensuring that those people are taken off the road for a significant level of time or period of time. Indeed it would work a great hardship on some people if they depend on a driver's licence for their livelihood, but perhaps more important than anything is that those people shouldn't be drinking when they are driving a car because they are the ones who are the most drastically affected. I'm not sure what your advertising program is going to come up with which you announced about impaired driving and so on for this year, but I don't care what it comes up with quite frankly. In my view (and I put this to the minister in the hopes that he will respond) is that the only way you are going to come to grips with the problem is for the courts to get tough and I suggest that the .08 level is far too high. It should be around .04 or .05 because to me the people who cause the accidents are not the ones who have had five or six drinks and are around .08 because those people have usually had enough to drink to realize that they have had too much to drink. It is the ones who have one or two drinks and don't believe that they are under the influence who really are the ones who cause the problems, so may I suggest to the minister (and I hope you respond to this) that the way you handle this problem is to get tough with those who drink while driving and not have the government do it through licensing or through appeal boards or points on licences and so on, but you put the responsibility where it belongs and that is in the courts.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well I think, Mr. Chairman, that I would share with the hon. member, a real deep concern about the problem of the drinking driver if there is any question about that. I think that one of the reasons for the higher record of Criminal Code decisions is the stepped up enforcement — that was a deliberate move by the government as part of 'Safety '77'. At the same time as the stepped up enforcement we are seeing the number of applications to the Driver Appeal Committee significantly down from 1976 to 1977, so the activities of the committee are less and the activities of the enforcement officers are in fact, more.

I don't know whether I agree with the hon. member that enforcement is the only solution to the drinking driver. I think that some significant education programs will perhaps be of benefit too. That is not to say that I see education as the solution to the problem but I

April 17, 1978

see education as one part of the solution to the problem. It should be improved and stepped up, both at the level of the school and at the level of the adult, through educational programs and, of course, through training programs of the 'driving while impaired' education process. So there has been an attempt to deal with the enforcement issue, as was pointed out, and we are moving in a significant way in this year's budget, under the transportation agency for the education aspect of drinking drivers.

MR. MALONE: — Let me ask you two things. Firstly, (maybe Mr. Glendenning could be looking this up) how many of the 10,000 convictions in 1977 were second, third or fourth offences? I trust you have those records. While he is doing that, would you please outline to us what the education program that is in this budget is going to consist of as far as the drinking driver is concerned?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The number of second offenders, in the information I have here in 1976, was 2,768. This year, 1977, 2,750. The number of third, 3,510 in 1976 and 3,455 in 1977.

MR. MALONE: — Did you say that second offenders, of the 10,000 were 2,500 and third offenders were 3,500?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. MALONE: — So what you are saying to us is that one third of the people who were caught in 1977 on a drinking and driving related charge were not only not first offenders, not second offenders, but third offenders. I suspect I should ask you how many fourth, fifth and sixth offenders you had.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, let me start through this again, and take the figures down, O.K.? The number of — let me get this right here. O.K., I am going to get this right yet, Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the members of the committee.

For 1976, the number of first offenders - 10,723; for 1977, the number of first offenders - 12,535. For second offenders - 2,768 and 2,750; third - 3,510 and 3,455.

MR. MALONE: — Again, I understand that in 1977 there were 12,535 criminal code driving offences. That is criminal code — more than just drinking and driving. Now you have told us that, of that 12,000, about 10,000 are drinking related charges, right?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Right.

MR. MALONE: — O.K., now of that 10,000, 2,750 were second convictions — (Interjection - inaudible) — That is what I am trying to get at. Within the 10,000 or in addition to the 10,000, 2,750 were second offenders and, within that 10,000, 3,400 were third offenders; so we can conclude that over half of the people that were prosecuted for .08 or an impaired driving charge in 1977 were there under second or third offence. Is that correct, Mr. Minister?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. MALONE: — All right, can you give me the number who are there for more than a third offense?

MR. MacMURCHY: — That would be included in the last figure I provided of 3,455.

MR. MALONE: — That's a third or more?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. MALONE: — Well, I realize you haven't been the minister in charge that long of this particular department but surely these statistics are absolutely shocking. Surely, we are now facing a situation where these people need more than a fine or need more than a suspension from driving for a period of time. Surely what is required for these third offenders is a jail sentence. Now I asked you earlier minister if you would outline for us what the government's plan is for 1978. I hope you are going to tell me it's more than an advertising plan. Would you please give us some general details tonight as to what you envisage for your plan for this year?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think the hon. member will know that there is provision in the Criminal Code for the jail sentence. I think the hon. member will know that the Budget provides for a significant expansion of driving while impaired courses. I think that there is provision not in the Highway Traffic Board Budget but in — and I'm not sure, I've got to think . . .

MR. MALONE: — You are in trouble . . .

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, that's usual when I have to think I get in trouble. It seems to me it is in the Social Services or Health for a rehabilitation program. That's the area which obviously needs the emphasis and it's provided for elsewhere in this budget.

MR. MALONE: — You are talking about two different things, with respect. You are talking about a program directed to those who have been apprehended and convicted, that is, the program you outlined the impaired driver and the law, whatever it is. That's after the event. I suggest to you that you have a double barrel duty as minister in charge of this particular program and that's to have some preventative aspects and to cut down on the recidivism rate and to cut down on the increase on the actual number of offenses that are being proceeded with. What can you tell us is in the government plans for this year to cut down on the number offenses themselves?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think in the discussion under the Transportation Agency, we talked about the emphasis in the advertising program of that particular agency relating to alcohol and the driver. I indicated to the hon. member when you get into the second and third and plus convictions, it is a requirement in the rehabilitation area as much as in the education area. I think I indicated to the hon. member of provision in the budget. I am not that familiar with its place of increased provision for a network in that particular area.

MR. MALONE: — I can't recall what department it was in either but there is reference in the Budget; I don't think it specified which department was going to have the duty. Let me just pursue this for a few more minutes then. Do your statistics show you how many accidents were involved in these particular 10,000 cases we are talking about, of a minor nature or of a major nature?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The only statistics that are available to the Highway Traffic Board. It is estimated that about 40 per cent of the accidents are alcohol related.

April 17, 1978

MR. MALONE: — That is not really answering the question? There could be charges laid, or not laid, depending on how much alcohol was there. You have statistics showing within this 10,000 figure you have given to us, how many accidents were involved within that 10,000 category?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We don't have the breakdown with us this evening. We can break it down and provide it to the hon. member.

MR. MALONE: — I normally wouldn't ask you to do that, but in this case I wonder if you would mind, because I think the figures may be very revealing.

Just one further question. I was trying to think of the other offence, that is refusing the breathalyzer. I assume that is included in the figure you gave us. The three offences, refusal, zero eight, impaired driving. When you are breaking these figures out can you also if you can tell me how many charges were impaired driving, how many charges were .08, how many were refusal within those figures you gave me and if possible - you may not be able to do this - tell me how many charges were laid, not just the successful prosecutions, but how many charges were laid in 1977.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you have any statistics on the drinking and driving problems. Which is the largest age group that is caught and what is the average education of that largest age group? Is it broken down that you have a certain age group that is charged more than others and certain education statistics?

MR. MacMURCHY: — We have the information on age groups, not here, but we can provide them for the hon. member, but we do not have the information, at least we don't think we have the information, on the breakdown of education which the hon. member requested. But if it is there we will provide it for him.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, the other information that would, I think, be interesting to have is, a person who gets caught for .08 or refusal or impaired driving and his case be set off for a year or 18 months, which is quite common, up to two years. I wonder if you have any statistics on the amount of people who had a pending court case coming against them and were caught again, and again through that period of time? Have you those figures at all?

MR. MacMURCHY: — If we have that information we will provide it to the hon. member.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, in the driver training courses that have been run in Saskatchewan, how many hours in driver education programs are used or utilized to teach the students about the drinking and driving aspects of our problems of winter driving?

MR. MacMURCHY: — About five hours out of the 30 hours.

MR. WIPF: — Of in-classroom instruction on that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. WIPF: — How long has that been going on?

MR. MacMURCHY: — About the last three years. It started when I was over in Education,

the latter part of my term over there.

MR. STODALKA: — ...having an accident and having to go through the process of writing the written examination and the driving test as such. Have you any sort of age limit when you decide whether or not a person has to go through the process of both the written and the driver test?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, no specific age limit.

MR. STODALKA: — Who determines then whether or not the person has to go through the process of driving the two testing procedures?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The board would make the decision and it would make it after the police report and the report from one of their field people.

MR. STODALKA: — You have no policy then, with regard to age. If a person gets to be a certain age and he has an accident, he must therefore have to have a road test?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Minister, I would like to submit something to your department and I would like your comments and what possible action could be taken. It's something that concerns many people and it really is happening throughout the whole of Saskatchewan. I am going to read it because I am not a lawyer and I don't attempt to memorize something like this but I think the whole thing is pertinent and I would like to read it to you.

The recent changes to the regulations governing appeals to The License Appeal Board has set out a new criterion, that a person who has lost his driving privileges due to conviction for drinking driving offences may apply for restoration of his privileges if he can demonstrate complete sobriety for one year. In doing this it is apparent that the criteria for designation of a recovered alcoholic, of the Department of Public Health has been adopted. In our view, unfortunately, the regulations still preclude a person who has been convicted of a refusal to take a breath test from so applying. If his convictions have been for impaired driving or for over .08 he may apply, but not if convicted for refusal. The Criminal Code does not differentiate between over point 08 and refusal, the penalties being identical. It therefore seems anomalous that The License Appeal Board should make this distinction. Common sense, we submit, would dictate that when a person refuses a test it is almost certain that he is over point 08 and that he is aware that he would fail a breathalyzer test. The police are scrupulous in advising the accused of the penalty and that is the same as the failure to take a breath test. Unfortunately they do not go beyond this point to advise of the discrepancy which will arise in their future rights governing driving privileges. We would advise that we discussed this problem with various AA members. It is the consensus that the removal of this discrepancy in the criteria for license consideration would tend to further provide an incentive to persons who have recognized their problem and are attempting to resolve it or have overcome it. We might further say that a refusal is made at a time when a person is under the influence. Therefore, it could hardly be expected that his decision to refuse would be a rational one. We would submit that any action

April 17, 1978

which would encourage people to deal with their alcoholic problem is commendable. Further, those recovered alcoholics who are restored to their driving privileges would be able to play their full part in and make their full contribution to our society. We make this submission in all deference and with the request and hope that you will give it your consideration and that you will find it has merit and will take action.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we can consider the proposal to widen the criteria for the Driver Appeal Committee. I would point out to the hon. member that it is just a year ago that we did review the criteria for the committee and one of the issues that was considered was the issue of the refusal to blow. We, in consideration, felt that it should not be expanded to take in that particular area because it seemed to us that to a certain degree at least, that these people were in contempt of the law and therefore should not be considered.

I think that the experience of the Driver Appeal Committee, while it has been an excellent one, I think it is one that we should follow very very closely. I can only say to the hon. member that we are prepared to consider his suggestion because I think that is what he is making. I will be discussing with the Driver Appeal Committee their work, as I do on an annual basis. I will put forward for their consideration which will be followed by consideration of the government of some change in the criteria.

MR. STODALKA: — As I listened to the discussion between the member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) and the minister I began to wonder whether the whole idea of the .08 was working, whether or not really this is any sort of a deterrent at all. I was wondering if the minister would care to comment on this. Another fact the member for Lakeview seemed to indicate is that jails seem to be a second remedy and I was wondering, is that working. Do you have these people that you commit to a jail and after a certain offence do they still come back and have the same problem? Does the jail sentence work or does the .08 work, what does work?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the pattern over the years since the introduction of the .08 and the six-month suspension you will see that initially there was a drop in the number of convictions. There was an awareness by the driver of the problem. But gradually things changed until we are faced with the statistics that we put forward this evening and I think that in our earlier discussion, I think the need for more enforcement is evident and that has been taking place. But also both the need for education and rehabilitation is evident and we are attempting to being to take care of that in this year's budget.

MR. STODALKA: — Another question with the advertising program. Have you devised any sort of mechanism to decide as to whether or not the advertising program is indeed successful at all? How do you measure any success from an advertising program of this nature?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think that normally in terms of an advertising program, surveys are taken on the effect of the advertising. I think that's the mechanism that was used extensively in the Aware Program. It was the mechanism that was used extensively by the Transportation Agency with respect to the advertising of seat belts, the use of seat belts and it will be one that will be used by the agency in dealing with alcohol education in this particular budget year.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Chairman, I hate to keep flogging the same point. What you are telling us is that your government's response to this tremendous rate of drinking and driving, second and third offences, is to launch an advertising campaign. Now you haven't told us what the advertising campaign is going to be. In the answer to the member for Maple Creek's question you talk about Aware, you talk about the seat belt campaign. I can draw to your attention as well, Mr. Minister, you had an advertising campaign for Safety '77 which cost several hundreds of thousands of dollars. Now, I suggest to you that if the figures for '77 for accidents are to be any indicator, that advertising campaign is a complete flop. As you yourself admitted a moment ago the accident rate has gone up rather than gone down. Injury rate albeit has gone down, the accident rate has still gone up. I suggest to you that just to spend some money through Dunsky to put some ads on radio and TV and the newspaper, is hardly going to come to grips with the problem. Now let me see if I can pry something else out of the minister. Are you prepared to recommend to the government that there be a separate offence of driving at .05 or .04? Do you feel that that would be a suitable type of deterrent to have people driving their cars while they are drinking?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think that there is more than the education program through advertising through the Transportation Agency. I think the hon. member recalls that we talked about that earlier, Mr. Chairman, in terms of rehabilitation money and he was trying to recall where it is in the budget and I suspect it is either in Health or Social Services, more likely in Health, to begin the program of rehabilitation. So it is more than the advertising program of the Transportation Agency. To say that the advertising campaign on the use of seat belts did not have its effect I think is just not cricket because it did have its effect both in the use of seat belts and in the statistics related to the use of seat belts.

In terms of dealing with .08 and .06, I think the hon. member knows that we did provide for 24 hour suspensions for .06 with the introduction of the alert device which provided for the enforcement officer taking away the licences for 24 hours in the .06 situations.

MR. MALONE: — I'm sorry, I think I'm not getting my point across to you and I'll just make it again and sit down. But you have given us some rather shocking statistics. I think you'll agree with that. You've told us that the government's main answer to this problem is an advertising campaign. Well, you say, no, but you haven't told us what else you are going to do and I suggest you have nothing else.

I say that you have just complete dereliction of your duty as a government, not you personally but as a government, in not having something more meaningful to handle this particular problem. I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars you are going to spend on advertising but I suggest to you that that money will just be poured down the drain unless you have some other program in conjunction with it whereby the people that choose to drink and drive will know that if they are apprehended, not only are they going to be paying a fine, not only are they going to be off the road for a while, but they are going to have more severe restrictions on their future conduct than just that.

Now I'm not sure what the answer is. I suspect the first offender should be treated in a much different way than the second and third offender. When you tell me that one-third of the offences, one-third of the offences for 1977 were committed by third, fourth and fifth offenders, I suggest Mr. Minister, to you, there is something wrong. I suggest to you that you should be now looking at the solution by incarceration, not giving people

April 17, 1978

courses on alcoholism, not giving people courses on drinking and driving and not to be advertising. Those 3,400 people or the vast majority of them should be put in the slammer for a period of time to let them know that their conduct simply won't be tolerated. As to earlier about the number of accidents involved, I suspect when you bring in those figures, you will find that of those 3,400 third and fourth offenders, that everyone of them will be involved in an accident of some description. So I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that your program as you have outlined it tonight is incomplete at the very best and is completely meaningless in coming to grips with the problem you have identified tonight.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member will agree that this problem needs an attack on all fronts, on the front of enforcement and incarceration and that is in fact going on, incarceration as identified by, I think, the Moore Committee Inquiry talked about the number of alcohol offenders that were in our institutions, but in addition to that, it needs an attack on the education aspect and I think that is well under way. You can argue that it's not as much as it should be but it's certainly well under way in our schools, DWI on a broad education program through the media and of necessity of rehabilitation and there is new emphasis. There has always been rehabilitation but not sufficient and there is a new emphasis in this budget on rehabilitation. So I think this government is approaching it in the right way by attack on all fronts albeit, it's not what we would like it to be but it's certainly a start and I for one welcome the start that's being made.

MR. MALONE: — Will you undertake to ensure that in the advertising campaign that the advertising campaign points out the ramifications of being caught while drinking and driving: (1) the possible loss of insurance, (2) the possible loss of driving privileges and (3) the possibility of incarceration?

Would you undertake to ensure that those sanctions are included in any type of advertising campaign that you launch and it's not just a matter of where people are going to wear an apple if they run around the block once a week like your other campaigns on keeping fit, but that the advertising campaign will deal with the law as it is today and point out to the possible offender the things that he is facing if he chooses to drink and drive?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — A few brief questions in regard to the role of the members of the Highway Traffic Board in regard to examinations for drivers, licences, both written and road tests. Is there a separate branch of the department that looks after this or is every member of the Highway Traffic Board asked to conduct these types of examinations and road tests?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, it's under the drive licensing and we have driver examiners who do the work of examining.

MR. WIEBE: — Those driver examiners, are they given any special instruction to prepare themselves for the particular job which they do or are they just selected, possibly holus-bolus or anyone that is willing to undertake that responsibility?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, they have six weeks of training plus a training in terms of public relations techniques, so they are fairly adequately trained for their task as driver examiners.

MR. WIEBE: — You have answered my next question which was, do they have a fairly substantial number involved in that particular training. The reason why I bring this up is that not only in my constituency but in other constituencies throughout the province having checked with other MLAs, that we have received complaints from constituents who have been treated rather badly from a public relations point of view, not so much in their written exam but in their driving test. I realize that it can be rather frustrating for a member of the Highway Traffic Board to be, day in and day out, attempting to examine some of the applicants who are applying for their first driver's licence. Mind you, I would like to recommend that a fairly intensive public relations course be undertaken in this regard. If not feasible, you select fairly carefully, the members of the Highway Traffic Board, who do conduct these examinations especially the road test and especially for first time applicants. I have had constituents, especially young ladies, come to me after a test, in tears, not so much because of the fact that they did not pass the examination but because of the rather uncourteous if that's the proper word to use, attitude of the particular instructor. Now, it might have been towards the end of the day, or towards the end of the week when these situations did arise but I'm just wondering if there could possibly be some greater effort extended in regard to the Highway Traffic Board in having a better selective process or a better training process for driver instructors, not instructors but examiners.

MR. MacMURCHY: — There have been changes in the selections and in the training process as a result of the concerns expressed to me and to the board by the public and by the MLAs and the public relations aspect of the training has got under way just recently as a result of those concerns.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, the Leader of the Liberal Party, a moment ago, was talking about getting more education and more facts in your media advertising campaign and I recall watching television one evening in an advertisement slipped across CBC from Manitoba and that's a year ago or a year and a half ago. It was advertising the .08 law at that time. In that advertisement it had the ramifications of what could happen to you after you got caught, being a criminal charge and having a record for five years and having to have your record erased or you would have a permanent criminal record. It all came across in about a one minute advertisement. It's maybe an opportunity to look at their advertising. It was very factual at the time.

A question I would like to ask and I don't expect that you have this information at your fingertips, but I am one that believes in the education system for some of these people who are getting caught for impaired driving. For the last four years now - four or five years we have had this DWI program in Saskatchewan which started up in the Prince Albert area and I wonder if you could get any statistics on the names of those people who went through that program. I was talking to some people this morning (I think there around 800 now who have gone through that program in Saskatchewan) and take a look back at those who went through four years ago and three years ago and see how many of them have been charged again or caught again with impaired driving.

My question, Mr. Minister, went to the licence examiners and last year we spent a fair amount of time talking about this and at that time we found that a 20 minute time period was spent by the examiner with the person that was taking the driving test. It was brought up at that time that there were people who got in the car, got in a traffic jam and just got around the block and came back and had passed their driver's test. There was a fair amount of discussion and I am wondering if that time limit has been expanded to one-half hour or three-quarters of an hour or are we still sending our driving examiners

April 17, 1978

out with a driver and spending 20 minutes with him in a car and giving him a licence to hit the road and not really getting a good idea of whether the man can drive or not? I realize that many of the people whom the licence examiners do see are those who have gone through driver education courses in schools or have taken them as adult education, but for those that are just coming in for their driver licence, I don't think it is really for the examiner to have only as last year a 20 minute time period in a car with somebody then have to sign his name to say the man (or woman) is capable of driving a car.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Because of the driver classification in answer to the hon. member's question, the Class I to Class IV - from 40 minutes to one hour; the Class V remains at about 20 to 25 minutes.

MR. WIPF: — Has there been any discussion in your department and do they really feel (I know you have an expert sitting with you there) Do you feel that 20 minutes is enough time to examine? If I got in a car and you got in with me and we got in a traffic jam, you figure that 20 minutes is enough time to go through the different manoeuvres that you have, to sign and say that I am an O.K. driver, to hit the road and go down a slippery road later on and meet somebody's family. I just don't feel that that is enough time, 20 minutes, even though you are not in a traffic jam.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think that the experts indicate to me, Mr. Chairman, that they think, on an average, 20 minutes is sufficient. It does not mean to say that it might not take longer with a particular driver, but if they take too much longer than that a particular driver is really not ready to be provided with a licence and will need some more training or more experience under the learner's licence. They think that 20 minutes about is sufficient.

MR. WIPF: — This maybe explains some of the problems that the member for Morse has run into with some of his constituents, where they do come back, and as he says, they are crying. Maybe at that point and it may be happening all over Saskatchewan, where as you say, people may not be trained, have enough training, to drive and you figure in the 20 minutes, I suppose, the pressure of putting them into a car with a trainer for 20 minutes, if they can handle that that is the criterion you use?

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Chairman, just a couple more questions on the .08 to the minister.

Could you tell me, Mr. Minister, how long a person who is convicted, first offence (he needs to drive for a living) how long does he generally have to wait for a temporary licence on the Review Board if it is passed? How long does it usually take to get that licence?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Usually, Mr. Chairman, it takes about four to six weeks. Six weeks at the outside, four at the inside. Four to six weeks.

MR. LARTER: — It is that long to get an appeal and get that licence?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. LARTER: — For a person who doesn't have to drive for a living, would you say that the general time, then, even if he is a first offender, would you say the general time runs from four to six months before he gets a temporary licence? Months.

MR. MacMURCHY: — It takes four to six weeks before the process of the Appeal Committee is complete, dealing with the appeal. I lost the question.

MR. LARTER: — Would you say, then, that most of these people who appeal for a licence, that are first offenders, that do not require the licence for driving, would you say most of their licences are not returned to them until after four months?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, if they don't get a restricted licence, Mr. Chairman, they don't get their licence until after six months, because that is statutory, the six months. If they get their licence it is, as I said, usually within four to six weeks after they appeal to the committee.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, though I wonder if you would ask the people in your department - even though they do come up in review, isn't it still possible that most of these people are not getting their restricted driver's licence until after approximately the four month period?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No. Now if there is a specific case, a specific problem, that the hon. member has where it has taken that long I would be pleased for him to provide me with the information.

The committee meets regularly and orders in council are signed regularly on the work of the committee. So if this is a specific problem, please let us know.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you would recall the dispute which arose last fall between the Highway Traffic Board and CNTL. They stated their argument that your rates that you were charging them were excessive, which was causing them to lose in the neighborhood of \$1 million annually to operate in the province of Saskatchewan. Your argument in reply was very simple that the rates were similar to those charged to the common carriers, the independent carries in the province and that their argument was not a valid one. I am wondering, Mr. Minister, if your position on that, today, is similar. Do you still have that same position?

MR. MacMURCHY: — If he is saying that our position is that the rates that CN can charge should be the same as the rates charged by other common carriers, yes, the position is the same.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I think we are not quite on the same wave length. Does the Highway Traffic Board not accept the rates which they are allowed to charge? What do you have to do, what does the Highway Traffic Board have to do in relationship to the rates charged by, at that time, CN, or now as is the case, the common carriers?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The board sets the rates for CN.

MR. BIRKBECK: — O.K. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, what are those rates that are being charged now in the province to the independent carriers?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well I think I would have to send across to the hon. member, the rate table because it is a fairly complex table. I can make that information available to him. I can give the increases in the general merchandise rates over the last, let's say since 1975. There was an increase of 9 per cent in 1975, two increases in 1976 of 12.5 per cent in shipments up to 5,000 pounds and 7.8 per cent, a general rate table

April 17, 1978

increase. Another increase in March, 1977 of 6.3 — per cent the majority of the increase applied to shipments below 2,000 pounds and another increase in 1978 in February, of 9.5 per cent, the minimum shipment table expanding as a result.

I can provide the hon. member with more detailed information but that gives you an idea of the response by the Highway Traffic Board with respect to rate increases over the last three years.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Minister, that would total since 1975, somewhere in the neighborhood of a 40 per cent increase in the rates that were charged, the increase allowed. Now do you not feel that that is quite a substantial increase? Surely it is, and what are the reasons for that increase? What were the basic reasons for that increase having to be met?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think it could boil down to increased costs in capital, increased costs in maintenance, increased costs in labor and increased costs in fuel.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Minister, what increases do you project now with the price of fuel as it stands in the province? Surely with the increases in the price of fuel we have had recently, these increases are going to be skyrocketing further. Would you not agree?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think that it will be just provided for as I have indicated to the hon. member, an increase of 9.5 per cent as of February which is to take into account the increase in fuel. Certainly the board will be reviewing the situation in six to nine months.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, the basis behind my questioning on this is quite simple, and in fact it is very well outlined the telegram to the manager of CN Transport by the Kipling and district Chamber of Commerce. If I might just outline very briefly, there are about five points here, the reasons for their concern and justly so and I think that it applies to all of Saskatchewan:

1. It is a loss of direct east-west freight service, to and from Winnipeg, which is supplied only by CN freight, no alternate service available.
2. Increased cost of goods if deprived of direct east-west freight service.
3. Increased delivery time due to alternate routing and carriers which are essential to Kipling, a farm service centre.
4. Present alternate west to east freight service is unsatisfactory.
5. Possible loss to CN employees in Kipling and, of course, that applies to all of the province as well.

As you can see the above will lead to higher consumer costs, delayed service and loss of competitive factor to larger centres, another kick in the so and so (I won't say it) to small rural businesses and communities.

Now that pretty much spells out the problem as seen through the eyes of the small communities in rural Saskatchewan and expressed by the Chambers of Commerce which did a good job in putting those views through to the government and, in fact, to

Canadian National Transport Ltd. Also there were efforts being made by other communities such as Melfort and it might be noted that the member for Melfort did not make any strong representation at any time that I was able to see. I note though, that the mayor of Melfort, Arnold Orr, had a considerable amount to say on this subject and very appropriately expressed the concerns. Now, very simply, Mr. Minister, these concerns that were expressed at that time, naturally — I want to know, have you resolved these problems? What stage are we at now? There are some 200 communities that were supposedly going to be left without a trucking service, or at least without a CN service, and they had to rely on common carriers or independent truckers. I would just like to know where we stand now in the province of Saskatchewan?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well I think we talked earlier, Mr. Chairman, under the Transportation Agency, about the work that is going on by the Advisory Council, on the long-term issue. I point out to the hon. member that CTC plans another hearing on May 2, relating to the CN withdrawal. In terms of being the immediate concerns of Kipling, a franchise was extended to Paul Grey, a trucker there, to provide service to that community and I think the same applies with Melfort where Richdale Transport was provided with a franchise. The board tried to react to the immediate short-term needs by providing franchises, and the government, through the Transportation Agency, is attempting to look at a longer-term solution to the problem.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, the chairman of the board at that time said, and I quote directly, 'The employment factor is one of the real tragedies of this,' said the Highway Traffic Board Chairman. Now, how many jobs were actually lost as a result of this withdrawal by CNTL?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I do not recall the exact figure but rough figures are 60 to 100 employees of CN.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, maybe just while you are checking a little bit further on those jobs that were lost to people living in Saskatchewan (residents of Saskatchewan), it was estimated that 113 people would be out of work directly and close to 100 more indirectly, depending on the service, would lose their jobs as well. That also was a quote by the chairman of the Highway Traffic Board and it is for that reason that I ask now what figures you have. Surely, after feeling that way at that time — that it was a very important issue and that in fact you used it as an argument to try to keep CNTL service in Saskatchewan, and I thank you for that, but nonetheless, I think we still have to look at what numbers of jobs were actually lost. There must be some figures there that you could come up with.

MR. MacMURCHY: — All I meant in responding to the hon. member's question directly is that it was reported to me that the carriers who picked up the franchises, following the abandonment by CN, did hire some of the CN drivers. We do not have the final statistics available and we would have to research them to provide them for the hon. member.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would thank the minister if he would provide those for me, as well as the rate structure, including the increases since 1975, up to date, and the projected rate increases that you have, that are not available now.

One more question, Mr. Minister. With some 200 communities being affected, I wonder how many trucking companies or independent carriers are there servicing those 200 communities now in the province? They must be licensed through the Highway Traffic

April 17, 1978

Board. Is that correct? If so, how many are there?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Approximately 60.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, on the bus runs in Saskatchewan, how many of them run this Brucks bus type of system? I am not referring to it being a special bus but, for example, I know Greyhound has run buses in Saskatchewan, not in the heavy peak seasons. You know, it is put on the extra bus, the fellow with the express, as a second unit with people. Is that allowed through the licence or is it just a loophole they have found?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The Highway Traffic Board does not have that information. I think the hon. member had better direct it to STC and Crown corporations about STC and their operation. We don't have the information with respect to Greyhound.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well my concern is, is it proper to do that or is it improper? Are they finding a loophole in their licence to do it under?

MR. MacMURCHY: — To answer the hon. member's question, they have a limit of 100 pounds on a parcel and that is the regulation applied by The Highway Traffic Board.

MR. KATZMAN: — So what you are saying is if the parcel is under 100 pounds they can run all the buses they want on their scheduled line and fill them up with express to the detriment of the local small carrier, is that correct?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the Highway Traffic Board licenses the bus and provides a restriction of 100 pounds on I guess it would be called express.

MR. KATZMAN: — On the buses again, my understanding is nobody can run charter services in Saskatchewan unless they have a scheduled line; is that correct? I should have added, originating in Saskatchewan.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Not necessarily. There is a general policy with respect to that but that it is not necessarily so. There happens to be a company in southern Saskatchewan which is not operating any routes and is operating a charter service.

MR. KATZMAN: — Is it because they are a Saskatchewan based company that that is the reason they are allowed to do it? I understand from STC people that you can't have a run. For example, there was an Alberta firm that just applied and was refused, a run that comes in from Calgary and the major reason that they were applying was so that they could come in and do charter work in Saskatchewan, I was informed.

MR. MacMURCHY: — There was an application from an Alberta company for a charter. The board held a hearing over some period of time and decided not to grant the franchise; I am not sure but I suppose it was based on the availability of equipment in the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. KATZMAN: — Am I wrong in my basis then, that you can't have a chartered service originating out of Saskatchewan then, unless you have a line or is the Alberta firm — and it is your STC drivers who have told me about this, I have been informed that that's not a fact.

MR. MacMURCHY: — The board policy is, upon application, to hear the application,

hold a hearing. Based on the information gathered out of the hearing they make a decision.

MR. KATZMAN: — Let's put the question a different way. Somebody comes into Saskatchewan, wants to go into the charter bus business; do they have to have permission from your board or can they just go into the business? They have no scheduled line, just straight charter.

MR. MacMURCHY: — They need permission for a charter.

MR. KATZMAN: — Okay, once you have permission for a charter do you have to apply individually for each charter or do you have a right to pick up as many charters as you wish and as often as you want to provide?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think the application for a charter is generally based on a geographic proposal. They might want to charter for all of Saskatchewan, they might want to charter out of Saskatoon or they might even want to charter out of Rosthern or Semans, but that would relate to the application.

MR. KATZMAN: — So what you are saying to me is that anybody can have a charter service in Saskatchewan as long as they are approved and they can run as often as they want. Therefore the protection that I was informed that the people that have franchises, there is no protection on charter except the Board's protection.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I am not sure if I follow your question, but if you're asking if a company from Alberta or Manitoba or from the United States applies for charter licence, to provide a charter service in Saskatchewan out of all of Saskatchewan or one of the communities in Saskatchewan, they have to apply to the Highway Traffic Board and have to get permission from the Highway Traffic Board before they can embark on a charter service and those are the facts.

MR. KATZMAN: — Another question here on portable weight scales, I believe your department is responsible, how many of these have you got running around the province?

MR. MacMURCHY: — 26 cars and each car is equipped with portable scales.

MR. KATZMAN: — Would you have any idea how many times you set them up on a back road and use them or is there any usage rate here?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, they are divided into 18 districts and they patrol within those districts and they patrol on a random basis within the district.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Minister, when you say these scales are set out at random, on a random basis, could you be more specific in explaining just what you mean by that? You know, what's a random basis, and then, once the explanation comes you could maybe tell me what the reason for that is?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I suppose the best way to put it is this, that they work at the scales about half the time and they are out on patrol half the time and I suppose that's the random basis on which I was making my comment.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well, I was wondering if you were referring to the location of the

April 17, 1978

portable scales in the various communities along the rural roads. Are these placed at random as well?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think that when they are out on patrol, if they see a vehicle which they think is overloaded they will stop the vehicle and weigh the vehicle.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well, I just wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the minister would agree that the scales were set out and the check is done something similar to a patrol car which is out setting up a radar trap. Is it along those bases, similar lines, would you agree with that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, occasionally, there sort of spot checks, but generally speaking, it's the observation of the vehicle approach.

MR. KATZMAN: — I keep hearing that voice over there that occasionally needs its chain rattled again and it's an echo.

Mr. Minister, on the drivers' licensing, there is a surcharge points-wise and so forth, could you explain to me where this money goes, is it all going to SGIO and why?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the licence fees go strictly to consolidated fund. Now, the demerit problem, that is an additional insurance charge and it would go to SGIO.

MR. KATZMAN: — You say it is a demerit system and it goes to SGIO. Could you give me an idea how much money was brought in last year under this system?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The hon. member will have to ask that question of SGIO, during Crown Corporations.

MR. KATZMAN: — It shows here that \$3 million is paid to SGIO in one of your estimates. Is that the surcharge or what is that?

MR. MacMURCHY: — That's the contract the government has through the Highway Traffic Board for the issuing of licences.

MR. KATZMAN: — O.K. The Department of the Highway Traffic Board receives the funds, the \$2 or \$5 or whatever the licence fee is and that goes to them and you pay to the insurance office the \$3 million for handling it. All additional money, which is for points or accidents, comes in and goes to SGIO. Is that correct?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The \$3 million pays for the licence issuing, cost of licence issuing. The issuers collect from the applicants for licence; the insurance which goes into SGIO and the licence fee, which goes directly to the consolidated fund.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, last year we had quite a bit of hassle over what you are paying the issuers. Could you inform this House what the issuers get paid, I mean the private issuers, for each licence? Do they get paid extra for the surcharges and so forth or not?

MR. MacMURCHY: — For a vehicle transaction the issuer receives \$1.50; for driver transaction 75 cents; for a permit 75 cents.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, why would you appropriate funds for speeding violations to SGIO when, in fact, there is no damage done to one's vehicle when they are caught for speeding?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think the answer is strictly that people convicted with speeding offences and that sort of thing are simply a higher risk.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Just one more question, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, as a matter of fact I don't agree with the minister's argument that those people who may have been so unfortunate as to have picked up a number of speeding tickets, possibly a series of very chintzy speeding tickets at that, surely cannot be classified and considered a high risk because I, for one, and I don't mind admitting it, have got quite a number of speeding tickets and I am not a high risk. I haven't had an accident in all my career of driving, not in anything. And, furthermore, I drive a motorcycle as well and I haven't had an accident yet. So I don't accept that argument and I wonder, Mr. Minister, on what basis you make that argument?

MR. WIPF: — In the pulp haul in the Prince Albert area, we have 18 wheelers up there hauling logs that are slated for 100,000 pounds. The chip trucks, the same size trucks can't haul the same size load but are on the same road but they are restricted to a lesser restriction or to a lesser load limit. What is the reason for this difference in weight restrictions?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I indicated earlier during questions under the Transportation Agency that Highways is the department which deals with weight limits on highways and the hon. member should direct his question during Highway Estimates. What the Highway Traffic Board does is, through its traffic officers, the policing for the Department of Highways and for the government.

MR. WIPF: — Is there any percentage over the weight limit that, say the guy with the chip truck or the log truck, is allowed because when you are loading wet chips or dry chips there is quite a difference in the weight and they don't load at a scale in some of these places — is there any variation or percentage that they can be over their load limit without having to pay these fines?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think that there is a small tolerance of 2 per cent provided on the permanent scales and about 5 per cent provided on the portable scales, so there is a very small tolerance provided.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Chairman, on item 1, do the local weigh scales, (the person in charge of the weight scales) like in Estevan, Mr. Minister, does the head man, the man with the most seniority at the weigh scales, does he make the decision as to where the weigh scale is to go whether the portable scale is to go in the country?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. LARTER: — Should he decide to go back to a certain town quite often that is strictly his decision and it is not coming from above. Is that correct?

MR. LARTER: — In the third item I am wondering if there is on this particular item (on other personal services you said there was no staff) on other expenses do you have any

April 17, 1978

part time or so staff?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

Items 1 and 2 agreed.

ITEM 3

MR. KATZMAN: — Under positions, how many part time or temporary staff?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well there are two groups in here — eight temporary driver examiners who come in when the pressure is on, and 12 temporary stenos.

MR. KATZMAN: — The eight temporary driver examiners — are these people people who work for somebody else and then whenever you require them you bring them in? For example in Saskatoon you used a gentleman by the name of Mr. Thompson to give bus driver tests.

MR. MacMURCHY: — For the most part they would be driver instructors who work with the schools where they take a special course with the Highway Traffic Board people.

MR. KATZMAN: — Last year, Mr. Minister, we were discussing under this estimate the possibility of having specialty people from outside (as I used the name, Mr. Thompson) who a bus driver can take his examination under rather than one of your people, if they are not available? Are you into this program any further or not?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think the answer is no.

MR. KATZMAN: — Do you mean you just have the one man or has he not been approved? Where did you stop with this tentative program?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I am not sure that we've got a grip on the hon. member's question. There are people who are authorized to test drivers and vehicles but that's not the case with respect to school buses. They require a driver examiner to both test and examine.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, I am not talking about school buses. I'm talking about the city of Saskatoon's transit system. It's the first one I was referring to.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes, I think my answer earlier provided the answer to the hon. member's question, that someone within the Saskatoon transit operation is authorized to test both drivers and examine vehicles.

MR. KATZMAN: — Do you have somebody for an example in Regina doing the same thing?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — How about STC?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — How many of them are with STC and do they do examinations in

other areas as well?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

MR. KATZMAN: — How many?

MR. MacMURCHY: — One with STC. No they don't examine elsewhere.

MR. KATZMAN: — Do you have the same program with any of the major truck companies, for example, Soo Security who have several hundred trucks around the province?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No, but we're negotiating with the major trucking companies.

MR. KATZMAN: — What is the time lag between application by somebody requiring to make his living and therefore waiting for a higher class of licence and the time he gets his test? (Interjections — Agreed!) Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind, I would like to wait for the minister's answer before the chorus over there decides to sing their regular song, with their general leader.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Chairman, maximum of four weeks.

MR. KATZMAN: — Are you making any special regulations where a person agrees to sit in the office waiting for his examination because his livelihood depends on it and therefore you fit him in if he has to sit there for three days, and you guarantee you will fit him in.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Chairman, if it is as urgent as the hon. member indicates it's urgent, then the examiners will fit him in.

MR. KATZMAN: — With the new program that you have for drivers' licences, I understand that everybody appears in the morning, they are told what time they take their test and they all have to come back again.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — It seems like the members on the other side are very impatient this evening. Maybe we should continue with questioning a little longer!

Item 3 agreed.

ITEM 4

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister what comes under this motor carrier administration? What is the purpose of this?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The enforcement branch, the research branch in terms of setting rates and the investigation people that go out to investigate the situations, and vehicle standards.

MR. WIPF: — Research people in charge of setting rates. Rates on what?

MR. MacMURCHY: — They don't set rates. They do some research, provide research

April 17, 1978

material for the board. The board sets the rates.

MR. WIPF: — The rates on what?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Your general merchant drivers trucking, etc.

MR. LARTER: — On other expenses, are there any employees listed under this who have been with this department for longer than a year?

MR. MacMURCHY: — No.

Item 4 agreed.

ITEM 5

MR. KATZMAN: — Is this the drivers' licence appeal?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — And the \$24,910 is going where?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Honoraria for the board and two temporary clerks for the summer.

Item 5 agreed.

Items 6 and 7 agreed.

Highway Traffic Board - Vote 15 agreed.

SUPPLEMENTARY HIGHWAY TRAFFIC BOARD

ITEM 8

MR. KATZMAN: — Could you tell me why the \$1 million charge and what did you overspend that you needed the additional vote?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think the additional amount involved an increase in the commissions to the motor licence issuers and an increase in the administration costs to SGIO.

MR. KATZMAN: — \$21,000?

MR. MacMURCHY: — The increase on the honoraria for the Highway Traffic Board and the Driver Appeal Committee and an increase provided to the driver examiners - the temporary people.

MR. KATZMAN: — Could you give me now the figure of the \$31,000 that goes into vote 5, that we just passed?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, the large amount went for the increased honoraria for the board, a very small amount in terms of the appeal committee since they're not as active as the board.

MR. KATZMAN: — Could you give me the figure and which vote it would fall into on the estimate 77-78 that we just finished doing?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I think about \$1,500 for honoraria, \$1,500 to \$2,000 and about \$28,000 for the temporary driver licence examiner.

MR. KATZMAN: — You would say \$28,000 in item 3 of the earlier figure, the \$95,560? That makes a reduction in the estimated amount of money for 1978-79 compared to what your actual seems to be for 1977-78.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I think the member would appreciate that estimating the requirements of the temporary driver examiners relates to the pressures on that system and decisions can't be made until you have an opportunity to review the situation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, Mr. Chairman, that considered what may be happening all through these estimates then, was the estimated expenditures for 1977-78, in this one case we find that the actual amount you say you spent is more than you estimated for 1978-79. If that was to carry through, through all the Budget Estimates, that all the supplementaries as we fill them in, it is very possible that the deficit that is indicated will be much larger paid through supplementaries.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, it is simply anticipated that we will not require the number of temporary people this year that we required last year. I think to estimate properly, it is the job of the government and that is what we have attempted to do here.

MR. KATZMAN: — So what you are telling me is that the figure that I am concerned with right now, under item 3, should not happen again. Am I right or wrong?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, I don't say it won't happen again, but we think it shouldn't happen again.

Item 8 agreed.

Vote 15 agreed.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD - VOTE 22

ITEM 1

MR. KATZMAN: — Does the minister have any idea how many communities came for approval with plans to this board in the last year?

MR. MacMURCHY: — It will be in the report of The Local Government Board.

Item 1 agreed.

Vote 22 agreed.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:57 o'clock p.m.