

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 29th, 1965.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, as you called it 5:30, I think that I had been talking a bit about provincial roads and I had wandered a bit from the order in which I had taken the notes. If I try and pick up that track, I'm liable to get lost so I think probably I had better move back to the order in which I took the notes. And I may have the habit to wander a bit as I carry on, but I'll do my best to try and answer some of the questions that were put to me.

I come now to the Honourable Member for Emerson and some of the comments he made and he was the first one to discuss what is probably, in my opinion, the most difficult problem that faces the Highways Branch today, not just in Manitoba but probably a good many highways' departments throughout the country, and probably other countries, and that's dust. We find ourselves in the position where to cure what is really a dust problem, spending quite considerable sums of money to improve the surface of the road where really the surface of the road isn't all that bad if you were able to control the dust. I must frankly say that there has been no low-cost dust treatment, effective dust treatment, found to date. The best low-cost dust treatment so far that we have been able to come up with is the calcium which has its disadvantages from the fact that it is a victim of the weather. In a dry year it's not very effective and it does wear out. But by the same token, oftentimes the cost of calcium and the relief that you get from the use of calcium is more than offset by the difference in what it would cost you for the interest on borrowed money alone, to say nothing of the depreciation on a more expensive surface treatment.

And when you talk about this, the honourable member talks about dust in certain parts of the province. I don't know whether he hasn't been around the rest of the province but in case he hasn't I have news for him, that a gravel road is just as dusty in another part of the province as it is down in Emerson constituency. The people in Swan River and the people in Minnedosa constituency and some of the other fine constituencies that we have around the province, when they eat the dust, they have the same attitude towards it as the people in Emerson and the people in the other constituencies.

At this point, Manitoba has only applied calcium in solid form out of the bags. At the present time, tenders have been called in an effort to get comparative prices to see if with the program that we have this year there won't be volume enough to make an experiment of liquid calcium which they are using in other areas. . . . have been called in different areas and different quantities and so on and so forth, and we sincerely hope that as the prices are received that we will have an experiment this year, at least one experiment, with liquid calcium to see if we have better luck in some of these areas with liquid than we have had with the solid forms.

The honourable member talks about the Atikokan highway and the impression that it will make on the Morden-Sprague highway. I do appreciate the fact that the Atikokan highway is expected to open this summer and I do think that there will be an influence on the Morden-Sprague highway; however I really don't feel that there will be as great an influence on the Morden-Sprague highway as there will be on Highway No. 12. I think that this connection on the Atikokan highway is going to increase the desire of a great number of people to use Highway No. 12 and up to Winnipeg and on on the Trans-Canada as well as -- as well as whatever increase there is on the Morden-Sprague because with all due deference I think that there are more drawing attractions north and west than there are directly west of this particular point from people that are travelling from as far away as Atikokan and farther east. But certainly it will be felt in all areas.

The honourable member spoke about the Mississippi Parkway and his regret about the fact that we are designating a route on existing highway and not doing anything about the location that had been originally agreed to between Minnesota and Manitoba. He also says that he feels it's because there's been insufficient pressure from the Manitoba side. I hasten to point out that in my opinion, in my opinion, it would be indiscreet -- it would be indiscreet of the Province of Manitoba to attempt to place any pressure, any pressure at all, on the Government of the United States to spend money in Manitoba to develop the Northwest Angle. We have an agreement and the Province of Manitoba has indicated its interest in living up to the terms of that agreement to the State of Minnesota and the Government of United States.

I might say for his information that the resolution that I had the privilege of making at St. Louis, Missouri, was seconded by representatives from the State of Minnesota who are

(MR. WEIR cont'd) quite happy to see the Mississippi Parkway marked on a location in Manitoba and for my money, and for the publicity that can be obtained from this area in 1967, we want to sell the Mississippi Parkway in this area, not just in Manitoba, but to sell the Canadian section of it. We have a circle around the Lake of the Woods, granted it's a little further around, a little further away from the Lake of the Woods than what had originally been contemplated. But we do have a circle tour around the Lake of the Woods with a choice of going by Pine Falls, etc., or by taking the Trans-Canada Highway and back the other way and through Ontario. And I think that the publicity that can be gained from this is quite good indeed. I also know that if advantage is to be taken from having this route marked on all of the various maps prior to 1967, no delay could be contemplated. We had to start now if we were going to achieve any of the success by that time.

The honourable member mentioned Vita and its street paving program. The treatment within Vita on the Morden-Sprague highway is being considered and certainly will be given every consideration in conjunction with the program that they are working on.

The honourable member indicated he thought that this salt, as he called it, was a waste of money. I really can't see it that way. I recognize that it would be better, it would be more desirable if we in Manitoba could afford the treatment that we would like to have, but it is a reasonable substitute and does help to eliminate quite a bit of the dust hazard that we do encounter on our gravel roads.

Now the Honourable Member for Inkster was good enough to change the subject and get away from highways for a little while and move over to the public buildings side. He inquired as to the repairs of government buildings and I might say for the most part the staff is employed by the department and they're on duty and looking after the government buildings. This is not always the case for major repairs and major renovations. At times it's done by contract and in manners of that nature. But for the most part the repairs and renovations that are carried on are carried on by departmental staff.

He inquires about the recoveries from the central provincial garage. Those recoveries are moneys that are received from all of the various departments. The services that are rendered by the garage, actually now the central provincial garage owns all of the cars and pays all of the bills and leases the cars to the departments at five cents a mile. The five cents a mile repays the replacement cost and the repairs and the gas and the whole works of the operation of these cars. So therefore it's a nil expenditure and the actual expenditures show up within the estimates of the other departments.

He mentions park benches; he mentions people lying on the grass; and the fact that probably the Minister gets down once in a while in the evening and I must admit that I have been down in the evening and that there have been occasions when I've seen people lying on the grass when there were lots of empty benches. So it appears that the use of the grass isn't solely, isn't solely because of the fact that there are sometimes not enough benches. This problem will be considered by the department and as benches are required they will be looked after.

The honourable member mentions a lower entrance to the building. No solution yet has been found for a stair entrance into the basement but I would remind him that there is not one but two ramps into the Legislative Building. There is only one that is used and it is possible for even wheel chair people, as we've pretty good example of within the Chamber, to make their way into the Legislative Building.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Gladstone -- I come to his points. I don't know what ones really to dwell on and what ones not to. I think I'll start probably with his suggestions as far as provincial road No. 258 is concerned and the purpose for calling it 258 is purely and simply a matter of accounting within the department, and as soon as the road in general gets to the point that we feel it is of a standard that can be proclaimed a provincial trunk highway this will be done; our present intention is not to number it on the map as a provincial road, to indicate it as a road, until such time as construction reaches the point that we feel we wouldn't be possibly misleading the public by putting a trunk highway number on areas that haven't reached a standard that would be of that standard.

Now he talks about what he reads in the Financial Post and I regret that if I saw what he read in the Financial Post I didn't pay as much attention as he did to it because I only need to look at Manitoba and for whatever year he's talking about in the recent past. Talking about a total expenditure on roads as \$26.3 million obviously this is incorrect and there has been more money spent on roads than that in the Province of Manitoba. The possibility exists that this is the capital figure that has been presented to the Financial Post either by somebody in

(MR. WEIR cont'd) my department or somebody outside of it. I don't know where their figures come from but there is an incorrect statistic there.

The honourable member inquires how many miles of access roads have been built, or how many towns have been serviced. I'll have to get the information. I don't have it readily available and I will see that it is supplied to the honourable member.

Then we come to Highway 34. Highway 34. Well I do remember -- well do I remember the day that the Honourable Member for Gladstone came in, supported with the other members up and down Highway No. 34 and all of the municipal councils from the area, to request of me that we make a start on improving Highway 34 with a surface and in that start it was unanimously agreed that we would start at the bottom, at No. 3 Highway and work north. I might point out that the only people that I have heard of any change in this approach from have been the people at the north end. Obviously they have changed their mind and they feel that maybe we should be working both ways but certainly we shouldn't be just starting at the south and working north. I have no objection to them accepting this point of view except to say that the Province of Manitoba and the department have been carrying a program on each year on No. 34 Highway and we've been working north and I hope that the honourable member will have the patience to be with us until we do reach Gladstone because that is our aim to get there and get there as quickly as we can.

Now the honourable member talks about 75 percent grants on main market roads. I don't think he was really serious. I think he knows better than that. That was the grant on secondary highways, and as far as secondary highways were concerned my memory -- just from memory I think we only had 200 and some odd miles of secondary highway in the province on which 75 percent was paid by the province of both construction and maintenance and 25 percent by the municipality. The grant on main market roads has been 60 percent for some time in the original years and before I came in here I guess maybe in the early days of this government, or certainly in the latter days of the former government, it was a 50-50 grant on main market roads.

And he indicates that the municipalities did not slash their mill rate. I don't think really that anybody had really anticipated that the municipalities in rural Manitoba would slash any mill rates and it's been extremely difficult to try and establish a provincial road network that is equitable to all municipalities. As I say there have been no statistics kept on the actual cost of maintenance of the individual miles within the municipalities. There had to be some arbitrary decisions made. Negotiations were held. Apparently they weren't held for a great enough period of time with the Honourable Member for Gladstone but I hasten to advise him that negotiations are not over, that negotiations are going to be continuing and that as I indicated yesterday that many miles that were suggested by the municipalities are presently being considered by the planning division of the department and some of these will no doubt be recommended and some no doubt will not be recommended. There are areas that have been agreed on as provincial roads by the department and by the municipalities that the municipalities themselves have had some second thoughts on. And as well as additions and deletions there's going to have to be amendments where they're moved a little bit to ease with the traffic flow. Anybody that might have thought that a provincial road network of this magnitude could have been brought in without hitch and without differences of opinion I'm afraid just doesn't understand the situation very well. I'm sure that honourable members opposite do recognize the difficulties and they do recognize that we are going to have to be flexible on this program as we go along and attempt to develop a network of roads.

The honourable member mentioned an area up in the Honourable Member for Roblin's constituency and I may say I don't think that there was an area in Manitoba that it was as difficult or is as difficult to attempt to tie in provincial roads, because the places for you to take them from and to or to and from are a lot more scarce. The traffic generators are not as well defined so some arbitrary means had to be established. The honourable members appear to forget that even in the development of the highway program, as the highway network is established in the Province of Manitoba today there are inequities. I didn't realize until I started out to negotiate a network of provincial roads throughout the province that we had municipalities in the Province of Manitoba without any highways, without any highways, who had paid either all or 40 percent or 50 percent of every mile of road that they had within their municipality, and this is the case with one of the municipalities in the constituency of my honourable friend from Roblin. Now there have been inequities. The Honourable Member from Gladstone in the last year or two has been commenting on the inequities that existed in the grant

(MR. WEIR cont'd) . . . and aid formula where there was the flat 10,500 grant, if it was matched by the municipalities, regardless of the size of the municipality and the demand on the roads.

So outside of the fact that in my opinion there has been a reasonable distribution of provincial roads throughout the province, although granted not perfect, I think that the skeleton is there to develop a very good network of roads and to attract traffic that will travel on these roads, that will concentrate on these roads, and will relieve pressure on the ordinary municipal road throughout the province.

Some of the honourable members enquired about the program as far as these roads are concerned and you will have noticed by now that the program that has been distributed covers the trunk highway program and the provincial road program as it was prior to January 1st. The estimates that are found in the current estimates are set aside for the maintenance and the development of the provincial road network — largely this 4,000 miles of road, and there is no general upgrading program to be presented to the House. The funds are going to be distributed throughout the district with the idea in mind of attempting to make as good a network out of this with as many small improvements as possible throughout certainly the first year and maybe even into the second year. As I indicated yesterday there are many areas in the province where, with the connection of a mile here or a half mile there, the improvement of a bridge, knocking down a hill, evening out some very sharp turns, where you can tie together several fairly significant sections of road into a pretty good road that is going someplace and has a tendency to improve the traffic, to say nothing of knocking down brush and things of that nature.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead discussed quite a number of things; some of them I think I've already covered in talking of some of the other members' questions. But to try and pick out some of the things that he was talking about — the mileage, I think, has been generally covered. I know certainly he's got one municipality in his area where in my opinion there is need for another provincial road. I'm not just so sure that I know exactly where it should be but I think that there is need in that area for another provincial road. There may well be more like it and these things will have to be sorted out.

He talked about the advertising that the government happens to get out of tendering in the classified pages of highway programs. I just question the number of people that really read the classified section this closely, as closely as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead does. However, I am of the opinion that the people that we're trying to reach do read it. The reason for the duplication is that in the last two or three years we've been trying to get a greater percentage of our road program advertised in the fall, either October or November before the snow comes, so that the locations and the type of work can be made known to the contractors. The contractors can take the advantage of going out and having a look at the location before the snow comes, so that the province and the department can advertise the tenders during the winter months and secure reasonable bids from the contractors. In this way I can get double the work without a crash program from the staff within the department. The same people that would normally have had to have been preparing tenders just during the busy season of the year are now able to spread their work over a larger number of months and just the improvements within the department alone are significant and worth this type of duplication.

I gather this is the duplication he was talking about because he mentioned several months apart. Besides that, each tender is advertised twice, twice in a row. Once the tender is called, it's advertised — we advertise in Wednesday's and Saturday's papers so that the contractors throughout the Province of Manitoba, in case they don't take the papers regularly, know what day they have to buy to keep up with the tendering practices within the department. If the first tender is on a Wednesday it's also advertised on the Saturday. If it's advertised on the Saturday, it's also advertised on the following Wednesday.

He spoke about the relocation of Highway 59 and I think that I might say that it's a rather significant relocation, although not relocated the distance that the Honourable Member indicated. It's not east of the floodway, by any manner of means; it's someplace, for the most part, between the floodway and the old 59. The old 59 as he well knows, runs through a very congested area of the city and would be almost impossible from the standpoint of drainage, right-of-way acquisition and so on and so forth, to develop the kind of a facility that is required and has been required for some time in this area. Actually the best description I could probably give is that it will — at the point of No. 15 Highway, No. 59 Highway will be located just west of the overpass on No. 15 Highway — the well lit overpass on No. 15 Highway. You'll recall

(MR. WEIR cont'd). how you come down off the top of the highway; No. 15 will be raised fairly significantly and the Honourable Member for Radisson was enquiring about that stretch of road west. We feel that the majority of the traffic will turn onto 59 and there will be an improved intersection here and that the same pressure will not develop on the part of 15 Highway west of the new 59 that is there now. The honourable member mentions the lighting on the bridges and just as he has mentioned and complained about the amount of lighting there is on bridges, I know of another member in the House that approached me the other day about a structure that we haven't got lit at all, or well enough lit, and I might say that we have every intention of lighting the structures on No. 4 Highway and the north perimeter bridge and things of that nature. You talk about it being lit up like a Christmas tree. The lighting engineers tell me that once you light it you have to light it to a certain degree or you're worse off than if it wasn't lit at all because you get light patches and dark patches, and you're running into a blinding situation. I haven't used the excuse on No. 15 that is probably there. The reason I haven't used it is because I'm not really aware of it -- the fact that it's so close to Symington. We have other areas within the city where Symington Yard in itself has forced us to light areas of our road system because the lights that light the Symington Yards blind the motorist coming from whatever direction he may be coming, and it's a definite hazard. I imagine to some extent the same thing applies on the overpass of 15 highway. I don't use it as an argument because I'm really not sure. The fact that it's that close to Symington makes me believe it may well be correct.

He mentioned Henderson Highway and all I can say is I realize the problem that there is there. I think he recognizes that some money has been spent within the last couple of years in attempting to straighten out some of the more dangerous areas of this road. I don't know whether he's aware of the difficulty that you have if you attempt to take down a tree or to get a little property off somebody who lives along that road. I can only say that I live in hopes that the completion of No. 59 Highway not too far to the east will remove much of this problem. The day may come, when 59 is completed, where by removing the signs - the No. 9 highway signs - from Henderson Highway and letting it serve the local area rather than attempting to concentrate traffic on it from a wider area, may well solve some of these problems. It's not probably the answer he is looking for but I hope that he recognizes some of the problems that we face with it.

He talks about materials for surfacing. I think that I've indicated the problems we have there. I think that I could convince my colleagues to pay a fairly significant prize to the engineer that could come up with a low cost formula with relatively maintenance free operation that would lay the dust and maybe hold down some of the flying stones so that we don't have to buy near as many headlights and don't have to buy near as many windshields and things of this nature. Unfortunately I have no solution to offer. We are trying experiments. There are experiments going on under varying lifts of blacktop etc. of lime stabilization and cement stabilization and things of this nature. It may well be that as time progresses we will find the answer, but the breakthrough isn't here yet.

Now several of the members have indicated that the various municipalities felt they had been told exactly what was going to happen, and I suppose this is probably true in some municipalities. It's entirely, I think, within the imagination to understand that as the plans were drawn up by the planning division to have something to talk about when we went out, some of the roads were fairly distinguishable to the planning division as connector roads, so that when you got to see the municipality most of the roads that qualified were looked after. The power of suggestion by this municipality to the planning division did not have as much influence as maybe some municipalities where this wasn't as possible and there were areas of negotiation and discussion back and forth, and I don't think that this sort of thing can be eliminated. I really see no other means of developing the program than what was done. I will say that I think, having asked each of the municipal councils, that 90 percent, a good 90 percent of the municipal councils indicated that they felt it was a reasonable place to start, from the spot -- from their particular position. I frankly say that there were some that didn't think it was too reasonable a position to start it off, and I think this was to be expected and certainly those municipalities may well be right. I have committed myself to take some of my staff and myself and go out and see these municipalities which are in the areas that are hardest to determine again this summer, to see if any of these things can be improved on.

The Honourable Member from Brokenhead mentioned that in addition to the main market roads that are going back to the municipalities, that they also looked after quite a number of roads of their own. I just ask him not to forget that as well as the roads we are taking over, that

(MR. WEIR cont'd). we have all of the roads that were provincial roads before, all of the trunk highways that were trunk highways before, and all of the large capital investment that there was in this area. I'm of the opinion that the roads that have been taken over, or will be taken over by the province, are the roads where the capital costs are going to increase. The capital costs are going to increase as time goes on. We are going to be encouraging these costs to increase because we are going to be attempting, through signing and other means, to attract traffic off of the municipal roads and onto the provincial roads, so that we will be able to determine those roads that should be improved first, and there's going to be differences of opinion. If this government is here, or if it's another one, I daresay that there's going to be differences of opinion as to which one should be done first, between those that sit on this side and those that sit on that side, and a lot more differences still with those that don't sit inside at all; and I think this is to be expected and I really think that we will be able to proceed at a rate that is quite significant.

I think, Mr. Chairman, those are the major points as far as this area is concerned for the Member for Brokenhead, with the exception of the problem that he seems to have in his area, with our 125 foot limit requiring permission of the Highways Branch. He seems to have the idea, I don't know -- there was a while when I wondered if he understood the reason for the 125 feet, if it was to really stop the clutter and to keep people back from the road, but in his comments this afternoon I really believe he did understand that the real purpose for the 125 feet is to leave room for the improvement of that road, or of that facility, whether it be telephone, hydro, utility road or what have you in this area, without having to pay high costs of building structures that are located too close. At one stage of the game I thought he was enquiring if we lived up to it ourselves, if he meant with buildings that we erected within the department within 125 feet of the road, which of course we do live up to this regulation; but as far as agreeing to move somebody that ends up by being within the 125 feet automatically when they are within this area or approaching it, then of course this isn't the case or we would defeat the main purpose for having it within the Act. Now, damages are paid. It's a matter of relativity I think. When you reach a certain point, some people will choose the damages rather than have their house moved, even when it comes up real close. Other people will prefer to have their house moved. We enter into an area of negotiation here which I'm certainly not a specialist at. I've got people on my staff who I think are really pretty good, really pretty good at dealing with people who find themselves in this position, and they don't like taking things away from people -- they try and be as reasonable as they can. But when you reach an area where there is absolutely no agreement, then I think that we have really reached the point where we find ourselves in arbitration to either pay the damages or something like that. The Honourable Member I know has some specific cases out there. One he talks of with 15 feet -- which is 15 feet. There is another one that he is referring to that if it's the one I think he's referring to, it's not 15 feet at all but, as close as I can come, approximately 40 feet. You get into areas of this kind, and again, I don't want to mention names. I think we understand one another in this line of thinking.

Now the matter of trespassing, as he calls it. I really think that -- there's probably some criticism coming to the department. There probably is. But if there is criticism coming to the department -- and I've looked into I think the case that the Honourable Member is discussing -- and I think that if there's criticism coming towards them it's for attempting to negotiate too long, attempting to negotiate too long, because they hesitated to take force, and while he talks about trespassing under the Act, the minute the plan is filed in the Land Titles Office the province has right of entry. It doesn't necessarily require that immediately this man get notice. On enquiry I found that the paper work -- they negotiated as long as they could. The equipment was almost -- it couldn't be stopped before the plan was filed. The plan was filed before entry was taken, but it was some particular time before notice was received, written notice was received by the person with the land. So really I think probably if there's any criticism to the department it might have been that they might have recognized they weren't going to come to terms maybe a day or two or a week before they did, after having negotiated for some weeks, and gone ahead with the plan before this stage. There was certainly no intention on anybody's part to make it difficult for the individual concerned, and I apologize on their behalf if this has happened, because it certainly would not be desired in any way.

Now the Honourable Member for Radisson, the Leader of the NDP, who's got the privilege of going and spending the evening with Tommy while I have to stay here and accept my responsibilities here, I'll attempt to answer some of his questions. He enquired about a subway on Nairn Avenue and the answer is the same as was given last year, that there has been no official

(MR. WEIR cont'd).....request by Metro for an overpass or underpass, a grade separation with the railway on Nairn, not that it hasn't been considered, but it is being postponed particularly because a firm of consultants have been retained by the Metropolitan Corporation and they were also retained by us when Metro was retaining them, to attempt to co-ordinate the development of No. 59 highway on our behalf and a road and street network on behalf of the Metropolitan Corporation in the east part of the Metropolitan area, and there is the possibility of another location being chosen which would probably make Nairn not as important, not as heavily a trafficked thoroughfare as one that is possibly going to be developed, so until you can approach the Board of Transport Commissioners to pick up the largest part of the tab, it would not be reasonable to attempt to make decisions on Nairn Avenue.

Highway 15, its extension to Rennie - all I can say is that there's been no decision made on this at this stage of the game. The best advice I can get, and I haven't looked at it very closely, is that if this area had been conducive to road construction back in the days before I was here and I think before this government came into office, that probably would have been the location of No. 1 Highway. Maybe the Honourable Member from Lakeside can help me out. But in this area, I'm advised that there's some very very high cost area which certainly will have to be considered before any extension of the existing No. 15 directly east to Rennie is contemplated.

The Honourable Member asked about the crossing of the Floodway at St. Anne's Road. The last information that I had from my department from Water Control which is - they are both interested, but it's certainly a Water Control responsibility - is, the present thought is that there will be no crossing of the Floodway at St. Anne's Road, that the distance between St. Anne's, between St. Mary's and 59 is not that great, and that if this were to be required there's probably other areas where the bridges are farther apart on the floodway where this would be required even more. However, having said that, I'll ask the members of the department to have another look from their point of view and to discuss the matter with Water Control again to make sure that they're still of the same opinion.

The Honourable Member from Radisson enquired about a wage increase for staff on the grounds. The best information that I have is that the fair wage is paid for all of those employees, the fair wage is set once a year to be renewed again on April 1st. If there's a change in the Fair Wage Act on April 1st, there will also be a change reflected in the staff that the Honourable Member from Radisson was talking about. And I think that I answered his question as far as the construction west of the overpass on No. 15 Highway was concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, I may have missed some; I've tried to hit the major points.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest about the deplorable condition of No. 6 Highway. Before I go into my remarks, I want the House to know that I'm fully aware of the work that is planned for this road this year, and that the road work planned this year is far greater than we have ever had before since this government came to office, and the Minister of this present department has been far more considerate of this highway than any other minister in this government serving before him, and I'm grateful for the attention that he has given No. 6 since he took office. However, I must point out to him that the people of St. George have exhausted their patience as a result of the negligence of the government prior to this present Minister taking office.

We've had a number of government representatives describe the Interlake as a depressed area, as a poverty-stricken area, and there have been other uncomplimentary remarks made about this area. ARDA has been described as a possible solution to the Interlake area. Well, I'd like to tell this House that if that portion of the Interlake that I represent had a proper highway, it would go an awful long way to solving the ills of the constituency. People have been told that the tourist industry could be developed for fishing and parks and hunting. The horrible truth is that the people won't venture into the area because of the highway, and many people who once go into the area, many will never return because of the abuse their vehicle takes as a result of the road.

Unlike so many other areas, No. 6 Highway is the only means of transportation serving that whole area from Winnipeg to Grand Rapids. A few years ago, we used to have a train service. This train, as the Minister and the members of the House - most of them - will know was discontinued a number of years ago and the only means of hauling our freight and passengers is to go in on No. 6. Interlake has often been described as a wonderful cattle country and I agree with this. Most people do. The Minister of Agriculture, I think, will agree with this. But the problem is, people lose on their animals as the highway is so rough - it's amazing the

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd). . . . amount of abuse they take. People are reluctant to settle in the area because they haven't got a highway to come out on. The dust hazard is unbelievable. Now the Minister has said there are other areas have dust problems; I'm sure this is correct, but I'm sure no area is worse for dust than No. 6. The damage that the vehicles suffer from the roughness of this road is unbelievable. I know that on one trip I have broken three headlights on my own car. Windshields are being broken regularly. Shocks are broken frequently. The cost - the truckers are at their wits' end because of the maintenance costs that they are faced with as a result of the rough highway.

Now, it may be considered that I'm the only one concerned with this. Well the Minister is aware now that I am not. There is a committee known as the Ashern - or the Camper - Gypsumville Development Board, who on their own initiative, without any prompting from me, have written the Premier - and a copy was sent to the Minister of Public Works - complaining very bitterly about the condition of No. 6 and the proposed plans of the government with regard to No. 6. The Municipality of Siglunes on their own initiative have written a letter, and I feel free to read it because it has been published in its entirety in the newspaper. It is written to the Secretary of the Area Development Board, Camper-Gypsumville. And I think I should read it just to indicate, show that the people - what their reaction is. This letter was unsolicited and it says -- its addressed to the Board and it says: "Dear Sir: Referring to your letter of date March 10th, I would like to mention first of all that some time in the fall of 1963" - this is, the Minister will remember this was August of '63 - "representatives of several municipalities in our area, along with Mr. E. Guttormson the MLA, met with Premier Roblin and Mr. Weir, Minister of Public Works. The purpose was to discuss the condition of No. 6 Highway and to ascertain if the government had any intention to finally make some improvements. During the discussion we were assured that there was definitely a better chance now to put hardtop on this road since there will not be as much heavy traffic on No. 6 Highway as there has been during the first part of the Hydro construction at Grand Rapids, and the government was prepared to complete No. 6 with blacktop from St. Laurent to No. 68. I would like to add here that we are anxious to see No. 6 completed, and fail to see any reason for not continuing north of Eriksdale. There is as much and more traffic on No. 6 as on any other highways in the province which have blacktop, and it is ridiculous to expect the public to ruin their vehicles when using this road, especially with the ever-increasing tax on gas and high licence fees. Much has been done to accommodate tourists along Lake Manitoba and elsewhere along this road, and much more can and will be done providing the tourists find a road they want to travel on. Unless No. 6 is made attractive, all efforts will be in vain. We are therefore prepared to support any move dedicated to insist that the government carry on this work north of Eriksdale without any delay until No. 6 is completed. Yours truly, K. F. H. Coleman, Reeve of Ashern."

The Minister will recall that he was good enough to meet with these municipalities and myself in September of 1963, and at that time he gave us an undertaking that No. 6 would be completed from St. Laurent, where the blacktop ended at St. Laurent to No. 68 Highway. And everything the Minister had said at that meeting he has carried out, and I am grateful to him for that. Up till now, the schedule that he gave me, he has lived up to the word, and I appreciate his frankness and the attitude he has taken with respect to keeping his word. However, what concerns the people, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the government indicated they were only prepared to go to No. 68 Highway. This is a long way off from Gypsumville and it's a big area yet to be served - such towns as Ashern, Steep Rock - and these people are the ones that are primarily concerned because of the government's plans at the present time not to go beyond Eriksdale.

Now I would like to advise the Minister that we have another problem which he may or may not know of. For years the rocks in the mines at Spearhill, Gypsumville and Steep Rock have been hauled out of the area by rock trains. Now, on a limited scale at least, some of this rock is being hauled by truck, and the Minister will realize what this will do to the highway if some work isn't done on it immediately. The Minister might say - there would be some degree of truth in it if he did - that they couldn't because of the Grand Rapids road. However, I'd like to point out that No. 6 that was built in the last two years from Fairford south to Hilbre has all been on new location and could have been done regardless of what is going on on the highway because it wouldn't have interfered. When I point out to the people the government's reasons for not building No. 6 - the answer that has been given me, the former Minister, Mr. Thompson, said -- he told this House and he's on record that he felt they couldn't do the work on No. 6 because of Grand Rapids. Well, many people in St. George are not prepared to accept this argument whether it's true or not. They're very disgusted because of the delays.

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd)

What is irritating them even more is the fact that in the by-election of 1956 when I first ran for office, the First Minister was in the area and decried the terrible condition of No. 6 Highway. As a matter of fact, he named it "Campbell's Soup" and I might tell him that No. 6 Highway in those days was a far superior road than it is today, and although the First Minister made an issue of the condition of No. 6 at that time, it wasn't an issue with the people. But the road has gone down very badly since that time. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources appeared in Ashern at a public meeting a few years ago and decried the condition of No. 6 Highway and gave assurance that something would be done. It wasn't until this Minister took office that anything has been done on No. 6. The blacktop that we are going to get on No. 6 this year is the first we have had since this government came to office. At the present time, we have a petition - it's not my petition; it's a petition that is being circulated in the Interlake and it's being signed by thousands of people, many of those that live in the Interlake and others who travel in the Interlake and have to use No. 6 Highway. And this petition, I expect, will be presented to the Minister by the representatives of the board when they meet with the Premier and the Minister at a date to be set by the Minister.

I know the Minister may feel that I'm being ungrateful in view of the fact of the work that he has given us -- the work that we are going to get this year. I want to point out to him I would be remiss in my duties if I didn't point out to the House the situation on No. 6. Members in the House who have never travelled on No. 6 may think I am being very parochial by discussing this matter at this length but until you've travelled on No. 6 Highway, you haven't travelled on a cow path. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? You haven't lived then. Two years ago when I learned that the Hydro was planning to invite all the Members of this Legislature to visit Grand Rapids and look at the dam, I wrote the Premier a personal letter. I didn't publish it or I didn't make it available to the press. I didn't want him to think I was trying to make a political issue of it. I wrote in a personal letter and invited him, or suggested to him, that he have the Members of this House travel to Grand Rapids by car or bus so they could see the condition of No. 6 for themselves. Unfortunately, the Minister didn't accede to my request and I'm sorry to say he didn't even acknowledge the letter I sent to him.

I think what's irritating the people also is the fact that the government has mentioned crash programs on certain highways. They have a crash program now on the road to Portage la Prairie where we have an excellent road; I'm not suggesting that perhaps it needs a wider road. But No. 6 is a very heavily travelled road and the people up there feel that they're entitled to at least one road with hardtop because it's the only road they have. The government has announced another crash program, I believe it's on 59, and it's nonsense like this that is really irritating the people because they feel that if ever a road needed a crash program it was No. 6 Highway.

I just came in from the constituency twice during the last three or four days and I can tell him that the road is just awful. The highway - the potholes in it - it's just unbelievable and the truckers are at their wits' end because of the damage they are incurring to their vehicles as a result of the rough condition of the highway. I've never seen any subject which is such a bone of contention in any area as the condition of No. 6 highway. I think that it's even considered a bigger, a far bigger issue, than the increased taxes imposed last year. Everywhere you go people discuss No. 6 Highway and particularly in the area north of Eriksdale, because people at Eriksdale and south have now received a commitment from the Minister, and they can see that he plans to carry out his promise, to have blacktop but they've had no assurance at all that anything will be done beyond Eriksdale where, as the Minister knows, there's a long distance to be served after you pass Eriksdale.

There are a number of centres, we have a number of mines. So I would suggest to the Minister that he reconsider, if he can, to try and do more work on No. 6 Highway. If he wants to do the Interlake a service of providing a proper highway with hardtop it will do more than all the other programs combined.

I'm sure that many of the people would feel that the government could scrap ARDA if they would give them assurance that they would be provided with a highway in a short time, because nothing, I'm confident, as many other people are, that nothing will do the area more good than a highway. It is said, and I'm not exaggerating, people refuse to come to even visit their relatives after one trip because of the abuse their vehicles suffer. Tourists are reluctant to come to cottages because of the highway. So I would suggest that the Minister give this

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd).....matter every consideration and ease the minds of the people of the Interlake about what's going to be done. something that's favourable, so that they will feel that all is not lost. So when the Minister replies I would hope that he could perhaps give me some assurance that blacktop will not stop at 68 and perhaps that he can see his way clear to speed up the program in this area.

.....Continued on next page

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have three specific questions that I'd like to ask the Honourable the Minister to give me information on. I wouldn't expect that he has the figures with him now - perhaps he has - perhaps he can get them during the evening or if not, as soon as he can.

The first question that I would like to ask my honourable friend is, what was the total highway expenditure in the year that just closed a month ago? That is, the year ending March 1st, '65. My honourable friend just a few minutes ago, commenting on the remarks of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, the Minister said that the figure that the Honourable Member for Gladstone used was not a correct figure, that much more than that had been spent. Well now, when I checked the figures as to what has been spent, the place that I go to is the report of the department itself where they give the actual expenditures per fiscal year in the report but, as happens with all the departments, the reports are away out of date by time we get them and it is nice to know what the actual expenditure is when we're dealing with the estimates. So I'd like to know first, how much was spent in the year that just closed a month ago because I'm sure that, even if the figures aren't completely finalized, that the Minister will be able to give us a very close approximation.

Then, secondly, I'd like to know what is the total that's being appropriated for this year that we're in now? That is, including current and capital, because this program as given in the annual reports, telling what has been in fact completed in the year under review, is the total of current and capital and I think that's the right way that it should be presented. And so would he tell us what amount is being appropriated for this year that we're in now?

Now I listened carefully yesterday when the Minister was giving the figures, and I haven't had time to check them exactly, but as I listened to them it would appear to me that he said that something in the neighbourhood of \$23 million was being made available in current and something in the neighbourhood of 20 in capital which would indicate to the person that added those two figures together that there was a program for the current fiscal year of \$43 million. Now I'm quite sure that the program isn't that large and I know that my honourable friend isn't intentionally using any figures to confuse either the members of this Committee or the public, but presented that way it can appear that this is a \$43 million program. Then I am aware too of the fact that there usually is some carried over work, as the Honourable the Minister mentioned. There usually is some carried over money as well, or some money standing in the appropriations that can be used, but what I'd like to get is first, how much is in the present estimates and will be presented in capital, and then the third question that I'd like to pose is, what is the cost of the program that the Honourable Minister expects to complete this year? And I know that there again there can be a variation because of the fact of how the season works out. But I happened to notice a press report that I just glanced at this evening and the press report seemed to say that it had read the program as being \$39 million, and when I had added up the current estimates of the department it had looked to me as though the highway roads were about \$19 million rather than 23. So I'd like to get a clarification of those figures from the Honourable the Minister.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I were inclined to be critical of anything in the department my job would be rendered very difficult by the fact that the Honourable the Minister handles his estimates so nicely, replies to the questions in such a gentlemanly fashion and refuses to be drawn into any realm of controversy, even when almost challenged to do so, that I would certainly find it difficult to attempt to argue with him. I could gain a lot of encouragement from the fact that even my honourable friend the Member for St. George whom I don't frequently find throwing compliments at the other side of the House, seemed to be saying that he thought, even if he wouldn't say anything good about the Minister, at least he wasn't as bad as the rest of them, and I think I could pretty largely subscribe to that text myself.

And it's not directed towards the Honourable the Minister himself but rather towards some of his colleagues and the information services of the government that I feel it necessary to once again put on the record as I see it, some of the facts about highway expenditures and I'm always anxious to have my figures checked by the Minister himself and by the experts of the department whom I know are listening in, that if the ones that I give are not correct, I'd be glad to have the revised ones because there has been a program by the government supporters, and I do not say my honourable friend the Minister in the present instance, because I was quite impressed by the nice way in which he replied to what my honourable colleague the Member for Ethelbert Plains had said about comparisons, by saying that the former administration had a program to put into effect and it no doubt dealt with it as it saw fit in those

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) days and we have our program to deal with and we do the same thing.

If all of my honourable friend's colleagues took the reasonable attitude that he does, I think there would perhaps be less criticism emanating from this side of the House. But the fiction has been continued by my honourable friends or the government benches, not only the ministers but the private members, that there has been continuing expansion to the highways program of this government. As a matter of fact, just a year ago or maybe it was two, two such well-informed gentlemen as the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Honourable the Minister of Welfare challenged me when I quoted some of the figures and said they weren't right because they - even they - were victims of the propaganda of the department that the huge expenditures that did actually occur, for a couple of years in the highways branch, were still being continued. They really I think believed that that was the fact and so I wanted to review these figures from a little different angle to what the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains did but I'm going back no further than the last year that the former administration completed. Now I know that somebody will say to me, in reply to this that oh sure, but there was an election coming up. Well, Mr. Chairman, there's always an election coming up in this country. There's one coming up now. There was one coming up last year. There'll be one coming up next year and regardless of when we talk about there's one coming sometime, and I think good programs of any kind have an effect on elections no matter when they are put into operation. But though I'm dealing with the last year that our administration completed, I would mention that the following year, for which we put in the estimates and my honourable friends rather than we had the administration of them for nine of the 12 months, we had increased those estimates in that year -- yes, an election year but if they will go back a few years they'll find that they had been steadily increased in an equal proportion; back a few years, not back all the way that our administration was in office, that's true, because it can be recounted any time here that during the war years, when men and materials were needed for other work that certainly the road program fell behind what lots of us would have liked it to have, but if you will take the increases from the year that the war ended and follow them through you will find that the increases were not only continuous but they were sharply graduated regularly. And even at the time that one of my honourable friend's good friends was the Minister of Public Works and in charge of highways in this province, the same thing happened, and I'm not -- this is of no particular consequence but when my honourable friends criticize the program of the former administration -- and again I'm not blaming the present Minister at all, he has not followed this line, but when some of his colleagues do, I would remind them that the gentleman who was their colleague at the time that the so-called new program was introduced, had been the minister in charge of highways for ten years, under our administration, and a great many of these roads - in fact the foundation work of this road system that we put in was laid during the years that that gentleman was the Minister of Public Works. Then he was the man who a few years later, on the coming into office of this government, said that the program before had been too restricted and I would be remiss, Mr. Chairman, if I didn't remind honourable members of the fact that just a very few years before we went out of office, that the present First Minister of the province, when we were laying before this committee a program of highway expenditure of \$16 million, suggested to us that it was too large and that one million should be cut off of it.

So that those of my honourable friends, and they do not include the present Minister of Highways, when talking about the program of the former administration should remember some of these things and take them into consideration.

Now as far as the last year that we were in office, that is, the year ending March 31st, 1958, the highway expenditures as given in the Public Works Department annual report were \$29-1/4 million. In all cases I'm giving round figures. Now it's true that in the next year, this was jumped; this was increased \$5 million but, Mr. Chairman, it was the former administration that put in the estimates and the estimates were bigger than the expenditure that the incoming government put on the highways. We had provided more money than what was actually expended under the new incoming administration. The expenditures that year were 34,600,000 odd. In 1960 there really was a big increase because it went up to 41,800,000 odd. and that was a big year, but by 1961 it was down more than \$3 million, down to \$38,600,000. By 1962 it was down to \$29,672,000; by 1963 it was down to 28 million, well practically \$29 million. That was the year that I was quoting when I reminded the House of the similar figures and my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, my honourable friend the Minister of Mines

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) and Natural Resources, hooted at me from across the hall for suggesting that in that year that the expenditures were no larger than they had been under our administration, and they said almost as one voice from over that side, yes but take current and capital together and I said, yes, taking current and capital together. And these are the figures that are given in the annual report of the Department of Public Works and these are the right figures as I understand them, because what we should give I think, what we should go on, is the actual program that is carried into effect -- not the money that is voted and that does of course carry through from one year to another as far as the capital is concerned, and not the amount of work that's still to be done from one year's program to another, but the figure of how much in a given year was actually expended by the department on highways. A table used to be included for some years after my honourable friends came into office and I show you one here, the trunk highway system development from '52 to '62 with the ascending scale going up here, pretty steeply, and getting pretty high. That table was continued until the next year, going up still higher, but after that it stopped and it stopped for the reason I am mentioning in these figures because the expenditures started to go the other way and the table has been discontinued.

Well now this is not of any great consequence, but the fact is that there is a recognition there both in the figures and in the table that the increase had stopped and had tailed off. Now to go on; 1963 it was down to practically 29 million, a little bit less. By '64, the last report that we have, it was back to 30-1/2 million which I am quite free to acknowledge. What I would like to get is the comparable figure for the year that just ended a month ago, so that we can see exactly what the total expenditures were.

Then the point that the Honourable Minister mentioned just today when replying to what my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains had said. The Minister mentioned the fact that roads were being built to what was considered a higher standard now than they were before and that you can't consequently compare exactly the miles of grading and the miles of paving and this sort of thing, we must look at the quality. But you can compare, in my opinion, you can fairly compare the total expenditures on the highway branch and this is what I want to get the correct figure for.

And then there is the other comparison that my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains mentioned and that's the comparison of the revenues that are obtained from what I think are properly regarded as the road taxes, the gasoline and motive fuel users' tax, the automobile and truck licences and the drivers' and chauffeurs' licences. That quartet I think of taxes could be properly delineated as the road users' taxes.

And here's an interesting point and I don't intend to take the time, Mr. Chairman, to trail all through these various years because I'm sure I can make the point without doing it, that in 1958 when we spent, as a matter of record, \$29-1/4 million in the Highway Branch, the revenue from those four taxes was less than \$20 million, less than 20. In other words there were \$9-1/4 million odd more spent on the highways than accrued to the province from the users' taxes. In 1964 the annual report says that there were \$30-1/2 million spent on the highways of the province, but the revenue, as I have figured it out - and the estimate of the expenditure is the department's own - the revenue that I give as my own figuring from the Public Accounts, and I hope I have figured it out correctly, was almost \$35 million - in other words, nearly \$5 million more than was spent on the highways; and this, I think, is a correct measure of the attention that is being paid. And the revenue as estimated for this present fiscal year from these taxes will be \$48 million odd. Now, even if the 43 were going to be spent for the program - and I greatly doubt that it's anything like that big - I would guess from what I see of the program that it's again roughly in the nature of \$30 million, or a little more, as far as the amount that's going to be completed, actually completed in this fiscal year, is concerned. So this is what I would like to get, because, Mr. Chairman, I have no wish whatever to continue to refer to what happened in the old days, and I do it only when it's raised from the other side of the House, and I perhaps would not have gone to this extent in my present remarks had it not been for a mention that the Honourable the First Minister made last evening when some question was being asked by my honourable friend from Rhineland, and my friend the First Minister rather slightly and snidingly referred to, "that was one of those fine 'Grit' roads that we hear about," or words to that effect.

Now, for the edification of my honourable friends on the other side of the House, I would simply say that if more of them would eschew the program of the First Minister in making such remarks, and follow the personable approach that my honourable friend the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) Minister of Highways has and generally employs, that likely the estimates would get through a little more quickly, because I can only blame continuing propaganda that goes out to the province as though this great road program that did happen for a couple of years was still being carried on, and as though it were a lot bigger than what was carried on by the former administration, and the kind of remark that was thrown in yesterday, for the fact that I have to once again stand in my place and put on the record these facts as I see them.

So, if my honourable friend will furnish me with the information that I have asked in those three questions, I'd be very grateful, and I perhaps won't have to go over this statement again during the present estimates.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, before we get too far into the estimates, I think it would be most helpful to the Committee for the Minister to tell the members of it what is the new definition of provincial roads, connector roads, secondary highways, main market roads, municipal roads, school roads, and there used to be what they called 100 percent roads. That many at least, and any other new adjectives that have appeared since we last met; and then I would like to know what the provincial contribution is to each one of these roads. Now if we had that, we would then know - everybody would know - what we were talking about, the provincial contribution to each, and we would all be on the same basis. I think that it would be most helpful to every member of the Committee to have that.

MR. SCHREYER: the Minister answers, I have some points here which will help to clean up whatever questions I have on this department -- on highways, rather. I was glad to hear the Minister say that the provincial road take-over is not exactly a hard and fast thing but is subject to revision, addition, etc., as the municipalities make their wishes and needs felt, and I was glad to hear the Minister leave it open-ended at least to that extent.

There are some aspects of this provincial road program that I feel do need clarification, perhaps not now but some time soon, and that is for example that the province is now responsible for hundreds of miles of gravel road which the department was not responsible for before, and I get the impression that the Department of Public Works in the past has been geared to dealing with road maintenance of roads that are hard surfaced for the most part. Now, having taken over hundreds of miles of gravel roads - I think that's correct; hundreds of miles of gravel roads - will the province, in order to maintain these roads, grade them etc. to keep them from getting too rough? Will they have to go into purchasing a couple of dozen of patrols? Will they have to hire quite a few more patrol operators? Do they intend to work on a contract basis with the municipalities, and let the municipalities do the gravel road patrolling with their machinery or what does the Minister have in mind, or the department have in mind in this connection? It seems to me too that whereas in the past the municipalities were either well-equipped or getting well-equipped to do this patrolling and snow-plowing in the winter, now I presume that the province is completely responsible for this. They'll have to buy patrols, snow-plows. I assume that they don't have the equipment to do all this at the moment and I don't think that they will have it either, unless they go into quite a substantial program of acquisition of the machinery for this.

I want to say that I believe that the cost to municipalities is going to rise sharply now. The cost of road maintenance is going to rise sharply even though the province is taking off their hands certain designated roads. Losing the 60 percent grant is bound to have an upward effect on their road costs, road maintenance costs, particularly with regard to bridges. I think the Honourable Minister's perhaps more aware of this than I am, that to a small rural municipality, when the cost of bridge construction or repair is allowed to go back completely to the municipality, there's no more 60 percent grant from the province on that. This is worrying many municipal officials, particularly when the bridges that have reverted back to their responsibility are bridges over major creeks and rivers, like - I understand that in Brokenhead, the municipality of Brokenhead had six bridges revert back to them completely, and some of these bridges are quite dilapidated which will necessitate bridge construction over the Brokenhead, which is a pretty big river, if I must say so myself - it's not as big as the Mississippi but it's still quite a cost in bridges; it runs in the order of \$30,000 - and six such bridges have reverted back to the municipality with no more provincial grants on them. Well, I don't expect the Minister to answer on that point because I'm more or less making a statement on that rather than asking a question, but I want him to be apprised of that point.

The Minister did answer my other questions very well - I'm thankful to him. Except one point he left out entirely and that is, what happens now to the access roads program? It seems

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) to me this requires clarification. I know that the Member for Rhineland probably was going to follow this up in any case. I'm of the opinion that those villages which were waiting patiently for access roads are now probably going to be told that "Well, now we're going to put a provincial road through here, designated now as a provincial road, so you have what you were asking for." But, Mr. Chairman, that's not quite correct, because a provincial road can be left in the gravel state or condition for several years and that's not the same as being provided with the access road which meets the same standards as the trunk highway or as the highway to which it connects.

Closely allied with that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what happens now - now that we have the provincial road program - what happens now to those village and town streets? I understand that there was a village and town street cost-sharing program in the past. For example, the Town of Beausejour, a few years back, had some of its side streets - not its main street, but its side streets - dug down. The street bed was compacted better and a bituminous surface was put on and it was cost-shared with the province. Certain villages have been hoping that they could have some of their so-called village main market streets, if you can use that expression, improved, possibly hard-surfaced, on a 60-40 or 50-50 basis. Now I have the suspicion that now with the provincial road program coming in, the Minister may think that all this can lapse, but the provincial road program doesn't really substitute for these things that I'm talking about.

Finally, before I take my place, I think that honourable members here should take some interest in the departmental report which takes the provincial highway construction program for the last year and gives a breakdown of the various work orders, the number of project miles, the kind of work undertaken and the expenditure for work order. And I find something in there a little bit disturbing, Mr. Chairman; something that certainly requires clarification; and that is when you look at the access roads program starting on Page 61 of the report, you find there that there's quite a variation in the cost, in the expenditure for base course and bituminous surfacing in the various towns and villages. Now I understand, of course, that some soil conditions are such that require more excavation and compaction than others, but the description in the report refers strictly to base course and bituminous surfacing. That is to say, I assume that this has nothing to do with the cost of grading or compaction - this is strictly in each case the cost of base course and bituminous surfacing; and we find quite a discrepancy. For example, in Deloraine, base course and bituminous surfacing per mile, 19,500 - per mile of base course and bituminous surfacing. Then you move on down the page and you find in Newdale that it works out to 26,000 for the same kind of work order - 26,000 per project mile. And further on down the page we find Fraserwood, 44,000 per project mile for base course and bituminous surfacing - nothing there about compaction or cost of digging down with excavation of the road bed. And at Gretna - I guess the Member for Rhineland probably has an explanation; I hope the Minister has - at Gretna, 86,000 per project mile for base course and bituminous surfacing and so on and so forth. And then some are considerably lower, for example at Miami and at St. Malo and at Goodlands, it works out to about, oh, less than 10,000 per project mile, one or two being as low as 6,000.

Now I don't know if I've made myself clear, I understand full well that if you must take into account the road bed treatment, compaction, etc., you could have a big differential of cost, but bituminous surfacing is bituminous surfacing. Once you lay it down it doesn't matter if you're laying it down in swampland or in land where there's good drainage - it's bituminous surfacing; it's the same material; and why should there be such a big differential?

That's not quite all, Mr. Chairman. Finally, I say, you compare the cost being expended on access roads. Let's say that it runs at about 19,000, or let's say 15,000 per project mile for base course and bituminous surfacing. This is for access roads. Now compare that with the cost on trunk highways, base course and bituminous surfacing. You would think -- I think any reasonable member here would assume, lay man would assume, that, if anything, the cost of base course and bituminous surfacing on a trunk highway is going to be a lot more, a lot higher than on an access road. This is what one would expect and yet I can find quite a few instances here where a provincial trunk highway - for example, No. 4 East. A base course and bituminous surfacing was laid down for ten miles at a per mile cost of \$1,600.00. I find this either is a typographical error that should be cleaned up or else, what? Or else it simply doesn't make sense when you compare this \$1,600 per mile for a trunk highway, when you lay that beside 26,000, 19,000 and 15,000 for access road base course and bituminous surfacing. It should, if anything, be the other way around, it seems to me. Now

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) the one I picked out, admittedly - the \$1,600 per mile - is by far the lowest, but I can find other examples where trunk highway hard surfacing has been done much more cheaply than for access road, and I just can't understand that, Mr. Chairman.

Finally I would say to the Minister that this example of 1,600 has to do with the highway from Beausejour east of Seddon's Corner, No. 4 East, and maybe the cheapness with which this project was done is already showing itself, because that road surface there is already weaving, undulating, and recognizably of poor quality. Now I hope that the Minister will have some logical answer for the price differentials on these projects involving bituminous surfacing.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister answers, I would just like to follow up on one or two matters. I think the Honourable Member for Brokenhead already continued further to what I said previously in connection with access roads. Are those roads that would have normally qualified for access roads before this new legislation came in, will they be put up to a standard that -- as the highway to which the road leads onto? Will they be of that quality and of those specifications? Or are they now a new type of road and there will be no relation at all to the type of road that they will be built into?

Another matter is the maintenance of these provincial roads that the government has now taken over. As the Minister probably knows, the rural municipality in the past years has won awards and prizes for taking good care of their roads. They've won several awards in different years for good roads, and now they find themselves in the position where these roads are not properly maintained. We've had citizens from the area call the department to get maintenance on these roads. Then, apparently as I understand it - and the Minister can correct me on it later if I'm wrong - the department then contacts the municipality and finally the reeve gives instructions to their men with the equipment to go out and maintain the roads. This sometimes takes days before they can get any service. Does the department intend to acquire its own machinery to maintain these roads, or are the municipalities going to maintain these roads in the future as they have in the past, with the government paying the cost? What is the program set up for? What does the government intend to do in this respect?

Over the weekend when I was home, I had people call on me and also today I saw some of our people from back home. They tell me Highway 32 at the present is in very poor shape and it's almost impassable because of the many pot-holes and so on, and that they would like to see some maintenance on these roads. Mind you, we hope to get the blacktop and we appreciate that, but at the same time these roads have to be used during and until we get that hard surfacing, and I would like to know from the Minister just what is the program, what do they intend to do, who is supposed to service these roads, and how they intend to carry out the whole program?

Then also, I hope the Minister does make some remarks in connection with the access roads and the questions put to him previously. Applications were made a year or two ago - I think two years ago already - for access roads from these various communities, and while some of them have been termed now as provincial roads, others haven't, and these that haven't, is there still legislation on the books as far as the access roads are concerned? Will these others that are not qualified or haven't come under the program of provincial roads, will they still be able to be brought in under the access roads so that they can get the improvements made? I certainly would like to hear from the Minister on this.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I can answer a few of the comments that have been made again. I think that there's no point in me making too much reference to the remarks made by the Honourable Member of St. George. It's not the first time we've discussed No. 6 Highway. He's told me privately, I think, everything that he's said here tonight. I have no further good news that I can give him than I've already given him, and I think that he knows that until such time as I can, that I'm certainly not going to make statements that I'm not sure where I'm going. It may well be that something can be done from Eriksdale north, but at the moment I have nothing definite that I can say about it. I, too, got a copy of the petition which -- or I guess you'd call it a petition that formed the basis of his remarks, the brief, and I do intend to meet with the group as soon as I can after the session is over.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside wanted to go back and talk about the old days again a little, and I noticed he just talked about the one year, at which it was 29 million total, the year ending March 31, 1958. That's correct. If you go back the year before it's correct, that it had come up \$4 million. But if you go back the year before that, you go back into a period of several years where you were in the 15 and 16 million dollar bracket. However I have no

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) desire to dwell on it. I haven't in the past and I see really nothing much to be gained from it. He asked for the total expenditures for the year ending March 31, 1965 as close as we could come to them, and the figure as close as we can come at the moment is \$32,539,000.

As far as the estimates for this next year are concerned, I thought that I had been fairly clear in my remarks last night. However, the way they've been interpreted I wonder how clear I was. But then I thought I was clear on some other things and some of the questions that have arisen in the House this afternoon and this evening make me wonder how clear I was about some of those things that I had said too. So I'll see if I can straighten the figures out for the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

First of all, I started out by saying the current estimates of my department predict a requirement of almost \$23 million, which is the Department of Public Works, total. And that is the way I expressed it and I thought it was clear. Obviously some people have added the figure together and called it all highways program. The next statement was the net provincial capital expenditure for highways for '65-66. It is expected to be approximately \$20 million. The estimates for the contracts contemplated within the program are about \$24 million. Yes, the estimates in there as close as can be estimated, total approximately \$24 million. There is a recovery of something in the neighbourhood of 2.5 million dollars from interested third parties. There is expected to be a carry-over into next year out of this year's program of about \$5 million, and there's a carry-over coming from last year into this year to offset that of about \$4 million, which should, all things sorted out, if my arithmetic has been correct, boil down at about a net of something in the neighbourhood of \$20 million.

Now the Honourable Member for Gladstone, I think we have reached the point where he will be able to understand the terms and the names that we have for our roads because as of now, in the organized areas of Manitoba, we've only got two - just two - it's as simple as that - provincial trunk highways and provincial roads, and as far as the payment is concerned, the Province of Manitoba pays the full bill, construction and maintenance. The remainder are municipal roads. In unorganized areas there has been no change; we have the same situation as we had before, of the school roads and the main market roads and the provincial roads and the provincial trunk highways. There's still that area and the same sharing formula is to continue in the unorganized areas that continued before. The areas that provincial roads come out of organized areas and into unorganized areas, on main market roads, will mean that those that used to have to pay 50 percent of their snow clearing, will now have their snow clearing provided by the department.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead goes into the matter of maintenance, along with the Member for Rhineland, and I guess probably I hadn't been too explicit about it but I had thought I had left the impression there that the district offices are co-operating extremely closely with the municipal offices. There is every effort being made to get the best use out of every machine that we have in the Province of Manitoba. Provincial machines are going to be made available to municipalities on a rental basis. Municipal machines are being provided on provincial roads on a rental basis. They are making an effort to try and establish beats for the machines, so that there is regular periods of time for these municipal machines to go over and look after a given beat. We are in the process of organizing some foremen's districts throughout the province, filling in the holes where they were before, and I think probably it's understandable that there's still a few holes in the organization, considering we are only three months from the date at which the change actually took place. But relatively speaking, for the most part, municipalities in areas where they have equipment to handle it, will be looking after the roads within their municipality, working on a rental basis and the department paying regular government rentals on their equipment. There will be areas -- there's a real effort being made to attempt to keep machines from running up and down the road with the blade up. I don't know whether any of you people have had the experience of driving for a few miles along behind the maintainer and you see the darn thing going down the road, and the road is pretty rough but the darn maintainer is going up, and all it's doing is wearing the rubber out on the machine.

I have asked the districts and I have asked the municipalities to co-operate to attempt to lay out a routine, so there will be as little deadheading as possible. I'm the first to recognize that it's impossible to eliminate all of it, but I have asked all municipalities and all of the district offices to do everything in their power to eliminate deadheading of machines, whether it's our machines working on their roads -- you boil down to where you've got a book account of the same type of a machine owned by the department or the province and it's a lot cheaper to keep

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) a set of books to separate the work than it is to send two machines out to do the same job in the same area and while I fully expect that even after this year we'll have areas that we won't have fully organized, I'm led to believe throughout the country that is is operating fairly efficiently for the most part.

As far as bridges are concerned, all of the municipalities are quick to remind us of the bridges that are going back on their roads. There is none of them are too anxious to indicate the number of bridges that we have happened to get, some of which are almost falling down, the same as what some of theirs are, and if the bridge had to be rebuilt on the grant formula that they would have been picking up a bit of the tab. Now it's altogether too early to know exactly how this thing is going to work out. A period of time has to go by and sort the thing out. I recognize that regardless of what I say or do, regardless of how much I take over, I can't control the municipal mill rate. It's set entirely by the municipality on all of the roads that they have left. If I take over a little more, if they want to collect the same mill rate, they can just end up by doing a little more work in another location and it's going to take a certain period of time for each of us, for each of us to find our stride in this program but I do anticipate the co-operation of the municipalities. I see no reason why it won't come. Each one of them as we went around indicated that they were prepared to give this thing a real try and let's see if we can't make it work.

Now he talks about cost of access roads and he compares the cost of access roads and highways. The one figure that he uses of 1,600 per mile is so far out that I'm inclined to believe it's because that there was only a certain amount of work done on that road in that fiscal year and that the balance will show up in the Public Accounts the following year -- if you get what I mean -- a part of the job was done one year and a part of the job the following year.

As far as access roads are concerned, or blacktop in general, paving in general, your prices vary quite drastically with, first of all, the number of contractors that are available that bid when they're called and you try and have it organized so that there are available contractors to get competition in your good system as you go along. The other thing is the size of the project. You can understand that when a contractor moves a hot-mix plant in to do a small job it costs him just as much to move his plant in and get set up and established as it does to go in and do a big job, so you have a certain fixed cost that reflects itself in a mileage cost on a small job. But even at that, I think these are relatively inconsequential because the one variable factor costwise all over Manitoba is the major ingredient in any road and that's the granular material. The Honourable Member for Rhineland happens to come from that area where, well really copper and zinc aren't any more valuable than what gravel is. Probably the gravel for that project that was worked on there had to be hauled 40 or 50 miles. If you get areas where you can get gravel at .75 cents, \$1.00 or \$1.25 a yard, and you go someplace else and it costs you \$3.50 or \$4.00 a yard, you can get an idea of the difference that you have in costs. This is the experience pretty well I think on this type of project.

Now there has been some questions asked about access roads and you will have gathered from the remarks I made about only being two types of roads, but they won't be referred to as access roads any more but the fact that they are not referred to as access roads doesn't indicate that there is any change in thinking. The road from the town, even though it's a provincial road and has a number on it, which is an indication to people where to turn off and how to find their way, doesn't change the kind of traffic on it. As a matter of fact, it should tend to increase the traffic that's on this road and while it may, it may affect the priority at which some of these individual roads are upgraded to the -- well, what we've always called the access road standards, because of other pressures for a similar type of service, bringing up to a gravel standard or improving certain things within the specific area because of something being more important really than that particular section. There may be changes in priority on it but the intention will be, the intention would be that that portion of the provincial road that is the access road, certainly if it can be worked into programs and things like that, that it can be tied into highway programs, it is the intention to attempt to serve as many of these places as possible.

My honourable friend there has some areas off No. 32 Highway that might under some circumstances have been included in No. 32 Highway but with the other priorities that there are in the area -- a gravel short area -- and some of these roads that haven't even any gravel, in that particular area there is going to be a demand for more things in that area than the kind of money that it takes to pave into that kind of a road. Now I'm not saying that some or all of these will reach that standard or when they will, but it will be the intention, for those that qualify on a provincial road, that we'll be attempting to maintain similar standards to what we've

(MR. WEIR cont'd,) had in the past.

As far as the ones that aren't on the access road program or aren't on the provincial road program now, this is bound to be an area where there is going to be probably suggestions from the municipalities for inclusion as a provincial road. We have attempted to keep from having stubbed provincial roads. We've attempted to have our provincial roads going some place -- if you get what I mean -- and the way access roads work out, normally you find that the road into the town carries on and goes to another town. This isn't the case with the towns that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is talking about. They must be in an area where it would be almost a stub road, a couple of miles in and that would be it, you wouldn't be going on in the other direction. There are liable to be some of these as time goes on but there again it's a matter for study.

Now the Honourable Member for Brokenhead asked about streets in the towns and villages and I recall some comments where I didn't think he was very much in favour of this program when he was speaking on the new highways bill and the powers that were involved as far as providing grants for this kind of a street within The Highways Act but if he read that Act real closely he'll find that the power is still there, to provide grants to towns and villages.

There was the area before where they used to pay 40 percent of the flankage on provincial roads or provincial trunk highways; now this will be carried on by the province in areas that it is felt necessary. There are other streets though that we feel have an inter-municipal flavour. They won't be on the same basis as probably exactly the same basis as what it was before, although it won't be -- experience has proven it's not too much different because access to schools, hospitals, elevators, creameries, things that attract quite a good deal of inter-municipal traffic, where there is a responsibility for somebody to take some of this load off the town or village concerned, a 50 percent grant will be provided towards this type of project; the maintenance to be looked after by the province.

I don't know how many of you people have noticed in some of the towns, some of them are fortunate because they are of such a size that they can provide proper maintenance for the kind of a street that they now have, but we have many towns in Manitoba that now have black-topped streets and the sum total of the equipment that they can afford to keep that street clean is a stiff broom, a shovel and a wheelbarrow, and it doesn't really go too far on the size of streets that we have in some of these towns.

So the Department is going to this year experiment and get some street sweepers like we see in the urban areas and which Steinbach, and the odd community like it, are able to afford because of the amount of work they have and the tax base that they have, that we are going to try and have two or three of them located strategically within the province and make a clean-up periodically of these streets. I can take you I'm sure to quite a few of our small towns where the community is say 40 percent and we pay 60 percent of the flankage, and you'd never know that it was a paved street. The area in the centre, because of the traffic up and down it, keeps clean. The province's share is always kept clean.

While we recognize we won't be able to do it as regularly and keep it as clean as is able to be done in a place like Steinbach or Winnipeg or Portage or some of the other places, this is going to be done as well as we can. We'll try and catch fair days, days of celebration at the towns there, and we can help them clean their streets and spruce up on those occasions. The province will be responsible for provincial roads. There will be a rental established on the equipment, so if the towns want the streets that are their responsibility, for a very limited cost and no transportation costs, at so much an hour they can have the streets done on this basis while the machines are in the area. This is an experiment that was looked forward to, I would say, with some interest by most of our smaller towns and villages throughout the province.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that answers most of the questions that I had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) --

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want my honourable friend to think that I deliberately misinterpreted his statement. I'm sure he wouldn't, but if I misinterpreted, I think he's partly to blame for the way he introduced this part of the program because I'm reading - I looked it up in Hansard - I'm reading now from what he said yesterday: "I propose to confine my opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, to the Highways Branch since it is this section of the department that generates the most interest among the members of the Committee." Then he goes right on: "Current estimates of the department predict a requirement of almost \$23 million, an increase of \$7 million over last year." So I -- it was completely unintentional, but I thought he was referring to the Highways Branch as he had stated at the beginning. But, Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I still find trouble in reconciling the figures. Am I right in saying that in the current section of the estimates there are \$19 million approximately appropriated for the Highways Branch?

MR. WEIR: I believe that's correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: Nineteen. Is it true that my honourable friend's total program that he expects to complete in the current year is just a little over \$20 million?

MR. WEIR: That's correct. That's right.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that he thought his statements were clear and I must agree. I was not here when he made the statement but I made sure that I read it today and he confirmed again that the net provincial expenditures are going to be \$20 million, and this then covers this program and I presume will be both capital and current together. The cost of this will be \$20 million, some of it will come out of costs and some of it will come out of capital.

MR. WEIR: That's pretty well all capital.

MR. MOLGAT: Pretty well all capital. Well the confusion it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, arises from the news reports which we then read, because if you pick up one newspaper - this is the Winnipeg Free Press, Thursday, April 29th - and the headline is not very large but it's clear: "Road work outlined". It says, "\$39 million to be spent."

Now presumably this covers some other things that are not in here and I would like to know from the Minister what it is, because then I'm thoroughly confused when I pick up the Tribune and they have a very large headline which says that "Weir Announces Roads Program of \$48 million". So we have the Minister who tells us it's going to be \$20 million; the Free Press who tells us it's going to be \$39 million; and the Tribune goes another \$9 million better and they are up to \$48 million. Now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, this probably won't sit with my friend very well, but I would suggest he listen to the Minister.

MR. MOLGAT: So the correct answer then is \$20 million -- \$20 million on highways.

MR. WEIR: No, capital and current.

MR. MOLGAT: But that's the highway construction program.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, that is the program as you have it here in the yellow pages. Over and above this in the current estimates are all of the improvements that will be going towards the provincial road program -- the new provincial roads. In other words, no program has been established for it on an itemized basis. This program involves the trunk highway and the old provincial road program on which we anticipate spending \$20 million. Besides this is whatever happens to be in the current estimates that is spent for construction on the other roads, much of which will be of a relatively minor nature, very few items of the magnitude of the items that we have in this program.

MR. MOLGAT: The one I'm interested in this stage is the highway program, and this basically is it. What we'll find here in the estimates, the other things, will cover the maintenance presumably. There's a figure there of some \$3 million, almost \$4 million on provincial trunk highways. That presumably will be largely the maintenance of the highways - not construction. When we're talking about construction and grading, gravelling, surfacing, we're talking about these sheets which I presume are comparable to the previous years, and this program which is the construction program for the season will be some \$20 million. That answers my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) (1) --

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one detailed question relating to the employment by the department of temporary help for a period of years as I understand it. I have a copy of a letter which was sent in November last to the editor of

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). the Winnipeg Free Press and the Minister - a letter was sent to him as well - complaining about a summary lay-off of 37 men last November with only one day's notice. The matter that interested me most about this was the statement that these 37 men were all men who were not entitled to notice because they were temporary employees, and I would like to get some clarification of just what their status was in view of the fact that they claimed that many of them had been steadily employed for over 10 years by the department. Could we get some clarification on that?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, because I was as much upset by those circumstances as were many others. It's true that the men were laid off on one day's notice, and following an investigation by myself, instructions were issued that it was not to happen again, that a minimum of seven days' notice was to be given to anyone who was laid off. Somebody 'boobed', somebody slipped, and it's the first time certainly since I've been Minister that there's been any lay-offs of this nature. I think we have been in a period where we've been employing these people for a year or more, all of those, and some of them up to a considerable term of office. Over a period of time we managed to work it out on a seniority basis. Some of the long-term were off for a little while pending the completion of a job that somebody else was on, at which time as soon as it was sorted out the men with seniority stayed and the others were out. In the meantime, instructions have been issued that any lay-offs are to have seven days' notice.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, just what about the statement that they were temporary employees. Is that correct?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is correct. They had been hired on a temporary basis and the work had continued off and on. Some of those people may be laid off from time to time. They haven't been in the last year or year and a half or two years. I think the work has been such that there has been work to carry them all the way through, but all of those people are on the basis that when the work plays out, that there's no more work there, they are really temporary help, but the work has been more or less of a continuing nature and I think most of them were only off a period of -- some of them two or three weeks, some of them maybe a month or something like that. I think everybody got back to work with the exception maybe of some who had been employed a year or something like that.

MR. CHERNIACK: In order to get clarification, are these men entitled to vacation with pay? Are these men entitled to pension rights? There seems to be some recognition as to seniority rights, but if they are temporary employees do they qualify in any way as civil servants to gain the benefit of the various additional benefits that come in addition to an hourly rate of pay?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'll have to look for detailed help on this situation. They are covered the same way as temporary help is covered under The Civil Service Act. Those that work so many hours a year for so long are entitled to it, but I'll have to get an answer for you.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, about two months ago on the Orders of the Day, I directed a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce relative to a news item that appeared in the press concerning a multi-million dollar park proposed at Macdonald, and the same article reported that the province had recently acquired the air base for the sum of a quarter of a million dollars. The Minister of Industry and Commerce got up and said in fact that the Minister of Public Works should answer this and he said, the Minister of Public Works, that upon reaching his estimates that he would make a major statement in this regard and explain to the committee the whole program for this multi-million dollar park as referred to here. I wonder if he would prefer to deal with it on his salary or on some other item under his estimates?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, it doesn't make any difference to me. I don't recall having left the impression that I would make a major statement. I think I left the impression that I would be glad to answer questions and to discuss the situation on my estimates.

The Province of Manitoba purchased Macdonald Airport and the Department of Industry and Commerce has been making an effort to find suitable occupants for some of the buildings. There are some of the old H-huts and what-nots that are not fit for industry. They are really more of a fire hazard than anything else and are to be sold by auction. To give everybody an opportunity at the same time, it's being widely advertised throughout the province so everybody will get an idea of it and that type of building is being auctioned for removal from the location. The houses and the hangars and the big buildings that are good possibilities for being put to some industrial purpose are still being held. I have nothing firm that I am aware of, and I'm not aware that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has, although he may be more up-to-date on it than I am.

(MR. WEIR cont'd).....

The other item that is involved is an item of quite a bit of land which I know the Member for Lakeside has some interest in, and maybe others. We've been concerned as to what to do about it because I and others feel that if it's to be disposed for ordinary farm lands, that it should be done in such a way that the people that had the land taken from them in the first place should be given some opportunity at competition to attempt to purchase this land back. I think that probably we'd all agree though, that if the development of that land into something else would encourage the development of an industry in one of the buildings, that this might have some priority. We have come to the conclusion that for this year the property, the farm property, will be farmed by the mental hospital as a holding operation for one year, pending the results of further negotiation and study for attempting to encourage the development of these facilities in the ground.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) (1) passed --

MR. TANCHAK: There are just two specific questions I'd like to ask and I don't think anybody answered the Minister. He said he didn't know where these statistics in the Financial Post came from, and the statistics in the Financial Post come - the source, it says, is Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Canadian Tax Foundation - referred by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. And I note in here that this is the order that the provinces come in: The one that spent the least money in 1964 was Prince Edward Island with 5.8 million; next lowest was Newfoundland with 19.6 million; and then the third came, Manitoba, with 26.3 million. And it's interesting to note that Nova Scotia, very much probably smaller province and not as - I'd like to consider Manitoba richer than Nova Scotia - they were higher. They spent 31.7 million dollars - higher than Manitoba. And then other provinces come next. I always like to think that Manitoba is better off than Nova Scotia because it's my home province, but this is -- I am just mentioning this so that the Minister would know where these figures come from.

Now, I have listened to the explanation on access roads and it seems to me that now, instead of coming to the Minister, it would be the responsibility of the regional officials to take care of these access roads as provincial roads, in the different areas. Of course the Minister is still responsible. We have several roads in my constituency. It is noted that St. Joseph has consistently asked for an access road from Letellier to St. Joseph, and I am sure that the Minister has numerous resolutions asking for this road. Another one that was asked for was the road to Ridgeville, my own home town, a matter of four and a half miles. In fact that road has already been surveyed; I think everything is ready to go. And I hope that when we go to the people responsible that they will accede to it. There is still another, a third one, is the Wampum road - people have asked. And then the St. Mary's road from Arnaud on. Now the specific questions. I don't expect an answer to what I said so far because I think I am right in my thinking that we should take it up with - try to convince the regional people that we should have these roads, as far as the priority is concerned. Am I right in that, I presume? Well I'll ask my questions and he can answer.

Now there's one specific question I'd like to ask and that's in regard to projects which have been agreed upon, or agreed to, by several municipalities on a cost-sharing basis with the provincial government. It could be bridges, it could be highways, and so on, but projects which were not completed and some of them in fact have not even been started but the government officials had agreed to go into this contract, but they have not. Now this grant -- and they have expired March 31st, and I would be interested to know whether the government would be flexible enough in regards to this. Some of these projects which were agreed upon, would the government consider completing these, because I understand that there is no more grant in aid as of March 31st -- maybe I am wrong in this case.

And my other specific question is this: Does the road or the Provincial Highway No. 217 which goes as far as Rosa -- just two and one-half miles beyond that is a community pasture which road is a very important road. The residents of that area would like to know who is responsible for the upkeep and construction and maintenance of this road. It's only a matter of about two and a half to three miles - the community pasture piece of road there. Is it the Provincial Government or is it the Federal Government? Who is responsible for that? They'd like that 217 extended at least to the gates of the community pasture.

Now for the sake of clarification, I noticed the Minister quoted me as saying that putting salt on the roads was a waste of money. Well what I really meant - maybe I didn't express myself clearly - is that relatively to the benefits that we would get from surfaced roads, in the long run it is a waste of money. But I have to agree that temporarily it is better because it keeps the

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....dust. But what I referred to, that I thought it may be a waste of money over the longer period, because you have to continue to do it every year. And I would certainly encourage the government to, rather than pouring liquid calcium chloride, or dry, on the road, to try some of these through the larger towns anyway. And the Minister did not answer my question on the No. 200 provincial road. That's the one leading into Emerson, that part of it that's always being flooded when there's high waters in Emerson. I presume the same answer would apply to this, that deal with regional director.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Before the Honourable Minister rises, I only have one question. In the projects listed here, on No. 5 Highway right at the bottom on the first page, you have eight miles PTH No. 10, Gilbert Plains - second lift construction gravel and calcium. As far as -- this would be, I believe, north of the junction of 5 and 10, would it? North of the junction of 5 and 10?

MR. WEIR: West.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: West. Well it wouldn't be on No. 10 then. It should be on No. 5 probably.

MR. WEIR: Well Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member will read starting from the outside it's Highway No. 5, eight miles from Highway No. 10 towards Gilbert Plains, second lift construction gravel and calcium.

The Honourable Member for Emerson mentioned again the note in the Financial Post. Well the only thing that made me wonder about it is that in any recent period there hasn't been any expenditure of less than \$29 million in Manitoba. That obviously says 26 -- there's something just a little fishy some place. The figures that are used with the other provinces may be equally as fishy for all I know. But the other thing that might be kept in mind is that with all of the provinces in the eastern part of Canada, they have been fortunate enough, being Atlantic provinces, to have the Government of Canada extend the Trans-Canada Highway agreement to provide 90 percent of all the Trans-Canada Highway that's uncompleted, and a very large percentage of the money that is being spent in Newfoundland, I know, and in Nova Scotia to a quite large extent, is federal monies which will probably be showing up as the gross figure within that area. I'm not trying to discredit the figures. I just say that it's difficult to compare them unless we know all of the circumstances, which I don't pretend to.

The Honourable Member for St. John's, I have a message now here as far as the men are concerned which tells me that the hourly rate of employees, and the department contribute, both of them contribute, to vacations with pay through the Department of Labour, and if they work the full year they get the two weeks pay; if they work the portion of the year they get pay for the portion of the year that they worked. The men do qualify for superannuation. The thing they do not qualify for is sick leave, which a civil servant would.

MR. CHERNIACK:.....ask is the only distinction - the sick leave - is the difference between a temporary employee and a permanent employee?

MR. WEIR: That's the information I have.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say a few words in view of the fact that we're handling the highway estimates at this time. I well recall, and I'm sure other members of the House will remember, those who were here in those days, that very shortly after the present government took over, and the first highway program that was presented, my then colleague, the then Member for Rhineland, exclaimed himself at the size of the program and said, "millions for everyone but not a penny for Rhineland." Well, I was in those days not in the same position as the Member for Rhineland because there was actually included in the estimates some work for my constituency. The unfortunate part of it was that I ended up really in the same position as that honourable departed gentleman, because the work wasn't done, and since that time I have been after my honourable friend the Minister, urging him to do it, and I suppose one should be thankful even for small gifts. It took some time because in other estimates - for example in '62 there wasn't a single penny for Ste. Rose and in '63 there wasn't a single penny for Ste. Rose, but finally in '64 we did get around to that little piece that had been in the original program, that 3.1 miles of No. 19 Highway. And that has proceeded and I'm pleased to see that the Minister this year has a bit more work on it, strictly, as I read it, the matter of additional gravel.

Now I notice that in this, a number of cases, the Minister indicates second lift construction gravel for a lot of cases, and then others read, "second lift construction gravel and calcium." I'd like to know from the Minister why is it that they're not all calcium and why are some that way and some not. Insofar as that particular piece of highway, it's the entrance, the east entrance

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) to Riding Mountain National Park, and does have a very considerable amount of traffic in the summertime. It is an important tourist entrance because at that particular point the escarpment is very steep and a lot of people come, use that route at least, as one of the entries to the National Park because it is probably the -- well certainly the most steep of them all and the more scenic one. So I would like to know why it is not being treated with calcium, but I'm pleased to see that at long last we are going to get it completed.

I note too, that in this year's program the Minister has added a section that I had been urging him to do and that's the entrance to the Agassiz Ski development. Here again it's a very important tourist road, being used more and more. The success of the Agassiz Ski slides has been remarkable and this will tie in with the federal road within the park and I'm pleased that the Minister is proceeding with this. However, I would like to appeal to him that after having at least three series of estimates in which there wasn't a penny for Ste. Rose, and having moved up to 3.1 miles last year, this year we moved up to 4.3 miles whether he could -- I'm gaining, I'm gaining I'll admit -- I'd like to suggest to him that he might have a look at some of the other roads in the area. I know that he's had a number of requests in the past from the municipalities concerned and I have spoken here, for example, about roads like the Plumas-Waldersee. The southern part of that road to No. 4 Highway is hard-surfaced at present; the north part is gravel. There have been a number of serious accidents, fatal accidents in fact, where the hard surface joins the gravel and there is a real demand for that road to be extended and completed and surfaced. Similarly the crossroad from No. 50 Highway at Amaranth over to Glenella and No. 5 Highway.

There is a third road, which I know the Minister has under consideration and requests have gone in, and that's No. 50 Highway. This is a numbered highway. It is completed and hard-surfaced for a good length of it from No. 4 Highway up to the Silver Ridge corner but then again the cross piece east and west is not surfaced and there has been no further work done on it for some years. It's a numbered highway and I would appeal to the Minister that he might look back over the years and I think he'll see that the requests of the constituency have been very modest, or at least I should say that what has been granted to the constituency has been very modest and that these are roads that do deserve consideration. They are carrying a fair amount of traffic and are important roads insofar as that area is concerned.

I would just like to say a word on what my colleague, the Member from St. George was saying regarding No. 6 Highway. Some two years ago I received a number of complaints from that area and I arranged to go up and meet with the councils along the road, covered by No. 6 Highway. I met with a series of these people and found out from them their views on the situation and travelled the whole of the highway myself and I must confess that the condition was most deplorable. Even the southern part of it, the hard-surfaced end, was breaking up, particularly on the one side where the heavy trucks which had been using it for Grand Rapids traffic, had pretty well punched it through. I know that the Minister has it under consideration but I would urge him to move along with haste on that one. I suppose I could arrange to go and have another series of meetings with the councils in the area, because I think that the last series did have some beneficial effects because some two weeks after I had had those series of meetings, the Premier and, I think, the present Minister of Public Works had a similar series of meetings with the councils and that we've had some progress. Now if that's the technique, then I'll be very happy to go around in the areas that require such assistance and hold meetings with councils if my honourable friend will tell me that this will help move things along. But I think that the Member for St. George has a reasonable claim here. It's not a purely local problem, it does serve as the Minister knows, the Grand Rapids project plus an increasing amount of traffic going west and using either the ferry or the new road at the north end of Lake Manitoba.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman if I can just say a word or two here. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition really feels that he has this kind of effect might I suggest that he start with the next series of meetings with the councils of the Rural Municipalities of Harrison, Saskatchewan -- (Interjection) -- no, I'm thinking of areas up there, where 45 Highway goes through Minnedosa constituency, where 24 Highway goes through Minnedosa constituency and some of the difficulties that I have at home; some of the -- I find myself you know, in the unenviable position where the Member for Ste. Rose has a darn sight more on this program than I've got. He's got more in it than I've got and he's got more in it than I had last year. I must say that in the first year or so that I was in the House, and before I was in the House, the constituency wasn't badly treated and I'm not suffering, but I just point out that those of us which gets, sometimes have to sit around and wait and there's really not too much wrong with No. 5

(MR. WEIR cont'd). . . . Highway. It provides a pretty good artery through the constituency of Ste. Rose and that was one that I didn't hear mentioned while he was on his feet. Somehow or another after we get these roads we tend to forget that we've got them and look only at those areas that haven't been done yet; but I don't say it critically at all, I just want to point out that there's more of us have similar problems to what he has and I don't think I can add anything more to it than that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I temporarily, very temporarily, accepted the statement of the Honourable Minister that temporary employees only lose sick leave, otherwise they are the same as the others. I don't think he said it with enough certainty in his own mind for us to just let it go at that, and assuming that that's right, then I'm wondering why should they lose sick leave. If they are in all other respects treated like other employees, permanent employees, then it seems to me they ought to get sick leave. That should be something they are entitled to. Assuming they are sick, then they ought to have the opportunity to be paid during that time. I'm afraid there is much more to this.

Now the Honourable Minister suggested that seniority was made to apply, but is that just an inner-departmental ruling or is that a principle which is established and to which they are entitled as a matter of real practice? Is it that they can be laid off at any time and is it that they need not be re-hired except that the Minister wanted that there should be a form of seniority. Suppose a younger man or a stronger man or a harder worker comes along. Could he supplant one of these men? Is it because there are temporary seasonal jobs rather, that are given to these men. Do they have income or work at other places during the year or are they, as was suggested in the newspaper report last fall, are they fully dependent on this job for their annual income, and if they are, it may be that the department looks at them as being temporary whereas they themselves look on themselves as being fully employees of the Provincial Government. I'm wondering whether the Minister would rather not leave this until he learns more about just what their rights are rather than just casually tell us something which may not be the full picture.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are some differences because certainly a straight two weeks with pay may be - this is a difference because the chap would have to take the two weeks off or he can work the two weeks and get pay, but the -- I think to all intents and purposes most of these people do count on the Province of Manitoba as their full-time job. They are, or have been in the past, and to some degree, some of them in any event, will be in the future, temporary help because we haven't at a good many times that kind of work, that kind of steady employment for some of these people. There are times we have to increase and times we have to decrease. We attempt to keep the fluctuations as low as we can, so that we can give as full-time work to those that we have as possible, this is something that has been going on. I never ran into laying off these people before, because from the time I came into office all the way up until this happened we had been in an area where we hadn't been doing any laying off - it had been all the seasonal people coming on; and because of two or three of the major repair jobs which pressure had on, that absolutely cut off at the same time, which for the sake of the efficiency of the departments couldn't be re-scheduled to have more work all the time, it just had to happen that this cut-off date came.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't for a moment suggest that these men have to be kept working when there is no work for them to do. The Honourable Minister of Labour, who also received a copy of this letter, is well aware of the fact that throughout industry there is a recognition that there are times, for various reasons, that a man cannot be employed full-time, but he would still be a permanent employee and acquire the rights that a permanent employee has as to seniority and as to security of tenure, and if there were a labour contract that person would be a permanent employee even though he may not be employed full-time, but there are rights acquired that way which a temporary employee does not acquire. A temporary employee could be let go without cause. He could be discharged, he could be laid off, he could be re-hired or not, and doesn't have any right to complain in any way that he was unfairly dealt with. I'm speaking now of industry and I'm speaking of organized industry. A person who is laid off and not brought back onto the job has a right to make a complaint when in his seniority he isn't called back in time, but if he's a temporary employee he does not acquire that right. A temporary employee can be fired for no reason other than his foreman doesn't like him, but a permanent employee - and again I'm speaking about organized industry - cannot be fired for an arbitrary reason. There has to be just cause.

Now I'm not suggesting for a moment that the government as such would deal casually or

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). arbitrarily with an employee, but I am suggesting that as long as an employee is called temporary then the foreman can decide this man's future, and it may never percolate through up to the Minister or to the Civil Service Commission which may not have any jurisdiction over temporary employees unless it were something done so wrongly and to such a scale that it is drawn to the attention of the Minister in the way this letter was addressed to him, and that's the concern that I have in the relationship between temporary and permanent, and I suggest that it deserves a real good look at. Now government employees I think do not qualify for Unemployment Insurance, do they? I think not. Do these men, because they are temporary, qualify for the Unemployment Insurance? That might be a matter that would be something to which they are entitled, because if they work for the government and they are temporary and they don't have security of tenure, do they have the ability to come back to the Unemployment Insurance Commission and make a claim? I think these are questions that would help us figure out just what is the difference.

MR. WEIR: Well Mr. Chairman, there are some of these people that do have Workmen's Compensation benefits. I'm not clear enough in my own head to attempt to describe them. If I can get any more information I'll be happy to provide it to the committee.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'll leave it at that. I'll just mention to the Honourable Minister, he said Workmen's Compensation. I'm glad he did because I didn't say it and I should have mentioned that. I referred to Unemployment Insurance, which is another benefit which could be investigated.

MR. WEIR: Well, and Unemployment Insurance as well.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes. Thank you.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask the Minister one question for purpose of clarification. On Page 2 of the yellow sheets, on the top item in regard to No. 6 Highway, it says "complete grade widening and gravel" and then the next sentence below it says "commence base and bituminous pavement". Now it is my understanding, and I think I'm correct, that the contract has been let and it means they're going to complete from St. Laurent to Clarkleigh - as I understand the contract that was advertised in the paper - but reading this it would indicate that they're going to start it but not necessarily finish it. Now this would really be misleading, wouldn't it?

MR. WEIR: I don't think so, Mr. Chairman. It looks to me as though it's consistent with what I've always said that the grading will be completed to Clarkleigh. --(Interjection)-- Oh, it is finished now? Well, it's probably - that's right; I have a note here says "Grade complete, and commence the base and bituminous pavement," which is the first item of a three-year program to get to Eriksdale. The contract has been awarded and there's been no work done. Nelson River Construction have the contract.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes, that's my information that Nelson River Construction was awarded the contract but the contract that they were awarded was the paving from St. Laurent to Clarkleigh, I think this year. That's the contract they've got. Is that correct?

MR. WEIR: I don't believe it's all the way to Clarkleigh.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It's my information that the advertisement in the paper called for that work to be done from St. Laurent to Clarkleigh. That's what made me ask.

MR. WEIR: I think probably what it would read is St. Laurent-Clarkleigh, so many miles, because the contract as it's set out, the only distinguishing marks that you've got are St. Laurent and Clarkleigh and I'm just going from memory now but I'm under the impression that we go better than half-way to Clarkleigh and we go beyond Clarkleigh the next year and then to Eriksdale to break it into three jobs of approximately the same size.

MR. GUTTORMSON: If that's the case then I have misled an awful lot of people because, as you know, the interest is quite high and I have said that paving would be done to Clarkleigh on the basis of information that was provided to me earlier, that there would be paving from St. Laurent to Clarkleigh, and I'd appreciate it if the Minister would have that point just clarified for me.

MR. MOLGAT: ask the Minister regarding the matter of gravel and calcium, and how come it was that in certain areas it was second coat of gravel with calcium and in other areas not, and what was the deciding factor?

MR. WEIR: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I forgot to answer that. I forgot to mark it down as a matter of fact. There can be two or three reasons and I don't know the reason in all cases. Some cases the department don't recommend it because of the soil types in areas and other times they feel that the traffic in the area doesn't warrant -- in other words, the dust doesn't create

(MR. WEIR cont'd). that much of a hazard to warrant the calcium being put on.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister about another subject and that's one he was investigating some time ago. That's the abutments on highways and I think it was in the very early part of session, or just before the session, there was a serious accident at the Lockport intersection. The Minister at that time said that he would investigate this and I think the general situation of abutments. I've had complaints from other sources as well about some of the divider strips that are being installed in various places. For example, one complaint I received was from the Town of Portage la Prairie, the strip in the centre. Now what is the policy of the department regarding these abutments? Are they going to be continued or is it the intention to remove them? Has the Minister completed his study? Is it likely that those that are presently in place will be removed and no further installments? Exactly where are we going?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the results of the study conducted by the department -- and I might say that there haven't been any abutments installed for the past couple of years; and following the investigation, the recommendation which I have, which I approve of, is that the abutment be removed as work can accommodate it within the areas that they are, and I don't know whether -- I think the best location to describe a similar installation which will be put up in most, if not all, of these cases is the one that is found at St. Norbert on No. 75 Highway - a post with a big sign and double lights.

The study indicated that while the accidents hadn't been heavy, this one was certainly a drastic one. All of the accidents had occurred at night. In all cases the lights had been working. In all cases the car had to go out of control before it happened. There are some arguments on the other side, because if the car goes out of control and the abutment isn't there and there's a car coming from the other direction, some innocent people can find themselves pretty badly roughed up. But on balance, and considering the whole thing on the best information they can get from other design sources, the recommendation has been made, and I have approved the removal of all of the abutments with the exception of one which is located at St. Charles Street in Assiniboia on No. 1 Highway. In that case, and I'm not clear now whether it's our responsibility or Metro's - it's right on the very borderline and whether it's a Metro street or whether it's the provincial part as the extension of where the cloverleaf will be - but the abutment is protecting the stop lights and the danger from electricity and things like that, also it's a heavy pedestrian crossing, and the recommendation is that that one remain and the others be removed.

MR. MOLGAT: I thank the Minister for his statement on this. What will be the situation where abutments are on what is a provincial trunk highway but within a city. Let us take, say, the case of the City of Winnipeg. The Minister just now mentioned Metro, the same would apply, and say Portage la Prairie, where it's a provincial trunk highway but it goes through a built-up area. Will the same thing apply and will the Minister see to it that the abutments are removed there?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not that easy to make that kind of a statement. I think that it'll have to be studied in each individual case because, while these roads are designated as highways through these communities, they are not declared. In other words, the local officials still have the jurisdiction over the streets and it's going to have to be a matter of negotiation between the department and the municipalities concerned. They may well have reasons like pedestrian crossings and so on and so forth where it may be considered that some of them should remain.

MR. MOLGAT: Would it be the intention also to remove the narrow divider strips where they exist? I think that's the case, for example, on the one we were talking about at Lockport where, if I recall correctly, there's a cement divider - quite narrow. Will that remain, simply the abutment be removed, or will the divider strip go as well?

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Chairman, the divider strip remains.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed.

MR. TANCHAK: I was called away by a long distance call and I gave those two specific questions and I can't - I don't know whether the Minister answered them. That is, certain projects that were agreed upon on a cost-sharing basis and not completed by March 31, 1965, whether the government will consider extending this privilege to have them completed. That's one. And another one, who's responsible for extension from provincial roads to community pastures? If the Minister answered, I'll read his answer.

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Chairman, I didn't. As far as the grant-in-aid is concerned, the grant-in-aid is discontinued and I might say that while we aren't going to give grant-in-aid

(MR. WEIR cont'd). there we're not going to ask the municipalities to put up their 40 percent. On the other roads that have to be improved we're on the same basis, because this situation isn't a one-way street. The areas where the grant-in-aid will be considered are in -- and it's only a matter of a very small number of projects, where a contract had been let, financial arrangements had been made, the town or municipality or such like was committed, and because of either weather conditions or because of shortage of material -- for instance, we've got one or two bridges which were unable to be completed because of the heavy snows in some areas and the right dimension of timber wasn't available and they couldn't be completed on time, that kind of a project the grant-in-aid will be continued. As far as a town or two that had a contract let on the 60-40 basis and all their financing done, it wouldn't be right because of weather conditions and whatnot that they should have to change all of their financing because of an unfortunate circumstance. --(Interjection)--

Oh, I'm sorry Mr. Chairman, the road - the extension from Rosa to the community pasture, I don't know. I'll check it. Can you give me the name of the community pasture?

MR. TANCHAK: The one at Rosa --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I think it was established, after some questioning, the cost of the program for the ensuing year. A statement was made that the road taxes produced a revenue, or will produce a revenue in the current year of something like \$48 million. Is that figure about correct?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I haven't added it up; apparently the honourable member has. The revenues aren't raised within this department. They're raised within the department of my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities and the Treasury Branch, and, well, it's a nice exercise to call it a road user's tax and all of these things. It is not a dedicated tax. It goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the expenditures towards roads come out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the honourable member's estimate on revenues would be equally as good as mine I would presume.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed; (2)--passed; (b) (1)--passed; (3)--passed. (d) (1)--passed; (2)--passed; (e)--passed. Resolution No. 72 passed. Resolution No. 73 2(a) (1)--passed; (2)-- passed.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, on Resolution 73, I wish to speak briefly about the Legislative Building. It has been my custom over the last few years to make certain recommendations and I must say I appreciate that many of them have been carried out, so it's not with the idea of criticizing but rather to make some constructive suggestions.

We must realize, Mr. Chairman, that this truly is a beautiful building, having been built so long ago, and we have to respect the people who designed it, but we must also realize that it is not truly an administrative building; it hasn't got the utilitarian aspects that one must have today in an administrative building. We mustn't allow it to get like the Bank of England, sort of a musty atmosphere just because of tradition, so it is that we have to have constant review of this situation. For instance, Mr. Chairman, I can visualize the day when we'll be forced possibly to take some of the greenery around this building in order to provide perhaps more parking.

As we approach the building, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a suggestion because I have noticed many motorists turning left when the sign says, "Keep Right", and I would suggest that people pay more attention to an arrow with "One Way" on it than they do to the sign "Keep Right", because many times I have noticed them turning left and if you don't watch pulling up in front of the building, you find the traffic going in the wrong way. This may be a minor point but I think that it wouldn't mean placing a larger sign, or a more ugly sign, but simply an arrow with "One Way" because many people are going to the left.

My colleague from Inkster, I believe this afternoon mentioned something about the railing. I think he said he appreciated the addition of the railing on the front steps, and I too think it was a wonderful thing, but when we stumble out of here around midnight and we look at the beautiful lighting directed to the building, I'm just wondering whether we have enough light on those stairs, even though we do have a railing to find our way down. I think that perhaps those in -- could take a look that the lighting is actually on the stairs as you go down at night.

I think the Honourable Member too, mentioned the ramps for wheel chairs. The trend today is to give more consideration to the handicapped, and I notice out at the University, there's much emphasis now being placed on ramps for people who are suffering these disabilities. I know we have a ramp here but I'm just wondering how many people know about coming into the building

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd)..... and asking one of the attendants just how they can get into this fine building.

The Chamber itself, Mr. Chairman, I made mention of the lighting on this beautiful mural here some time ago, and a light was placed back of Madam Speaker's Chair, but I believe that the heat from the lamp made it more or less of a hazard and it was taken away. But it certainly did enhance the beautiful mural there and I'm just wondering if we shouldn't give some consideration to some indirect lighting up along the cornices here, of a more permanent nature, that would bring out the beauty of these murals.

I also notice, Mr. Chairman, that the cushion that supports the mace, the symbol of the Throne, was made in the old days, and, unless it has some historic value, I would suggest that this is the age of sponge rubber. I noticed one day, when the Sergeant-at-Arms has difficulty sometimes he has to be very careful when he places it there. I think that while we're doing that, making one of sponge rubber, we could very well make it a little larger because I think this one is a little too small. Perhaps some attention, too, should be given to the drapes behind the Speaker's Chair. I think that we could certainly enhance the look of the Chamber by getting a different colour and renewing them.

This evening I noticed one of the members of the press gallery walk over to that flag and touch it, and I took the cue from that that he was sort of wondering why they hadn't been dry-cleaned, but I remember raising the issue once before and I was told that it just isn't done. A flag is never dry-cleaned. Now I accept this if this is tradition, but I thought I'd better let the member know that I did notice what he did.

I haven't appointed myself, Mr. Chairman, as the shop steward of the place, although many people seem to think that I want this job because -- but I do go around sometimes looking at things, wondering, because I take quite a pride in the building. I think it's a wonderful building, and when we think that this was built in the days when we had to do it with teams and scrapers rather than bulldozers, I think it speaks well for those who planned.

I noticed the Press Room, Mr. Chairman, is very small. It certainly needs washing and painting. I'm told that there's a shortage of phones there. I didn't solicit the information because sometimes the members of the press come down to the Members Room to use the phones. Of course this is a little awkward at times too. There is a booth in the Press Room that was placed there for the radio boys and I understand now that they have quite a large room. There has been some suggestion that - I'm not making any definite suggestion because I have quite a bit of faith in the people who administer the building work here, and I think if they took a look at this, they may want now to remove that booth that was placed there, and make more room for the members of the press.

I think that something should be done to our caucus room. In our caucus room, Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult to see if you want to sit there and write. For one thing, the covering on the caucus room table is very uneven. It's as bad as No. 6 Highway that the Honourable Member for St. George spoke about, so that it's pretty difficult to write and you have to get into a corner with a little table lamp in order to do that. Now I don't think this would be costly. I think that someone should just -- I think fresh eyes looking at the thing perhaps would agree with what I have to say. I think too that a \$6.00 clock in the Members Room would attach the -- many times people come in there and want to know what time it is and it might -- we have clocks in other rooms; I think that we should put one there too.

I don't think that I should say too much more, Mr. Chairman, but I do want to voice some appreciation of the service we get from the restaurant downstairs in the basement. I think that these people do a wonderful job. We're here quite a bit and the variety of meals you can get there for the price we have to pay and with the cheerfulness with which they dispense it, I think shouldn't go without being mentioned. I too want to say how much I appreciated the plugs because we had extremely cold weather the beginning of this session. We have assigned parking space now with a plug, and I appreciate it. So I keep my remarks brief, Mr. Chairman, and I throw this open for -- these are just suggestions. Thank you.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to express my appreciation to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks for his annual suggestions, and to again tell him that every one of them will be checked out with care.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 (a) (1) passed; (2) passed; (b) (1) passed; (2) passed. (c) (1) passed; (2) passed. (d) (1) passed; (2) passed. (e) (1) passed; (2) passed. (f) (1) passed; (2) passed. (h) (1) passed; (2) passed. (i) (1) passed; (2) passed. (j) (1) passed; (2) passed. (k) (1) passed; (2) passed. (l) (1) passed --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on (k), I notice that this item is still under Manitoba Teachers College, Tuxedo. When is the change going to be made over? Is it not coming in this precise year that this will become the new facilities, and are there not changes then being made in those buildings? I understood that some of the temporary buildings were to be removed or used for other purposes.

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the changes will come in this year. I think that the target date will be to try and have the School for the Deaf open for September 1st, the education year. The monies, of course, for that are found in capital estimates; they are not in this estimate. This is the normal routine maintenance to keep it going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (k) (1) passed; (2) passed. (l) (1) passed; (2) passed. (m) (1) passed; (2) passed. (n) (1) passed; (2) passed; (3) passed. Resolution No. 73 passed. Resolution No. 74 3 (a) (1)---

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under this item. What is the policy of the government insofar as contractors and hold-backs? I'm still getting complaints, and I'm sure the Minister has been as well, about some events and holdbacks that apparently were not held insofar as work on the east perimeter route where some sub-contractors are still unable to get their pay, and where apparently there was insufficient hold-back on the part of the government. Now what is the situation on the whole thing of hold-backs? What is the policy and how does it apply?

MR. WEIR: Well Mr. Chairman, it's just the same; it's 15 percent. And the difficulty there is that there's a difference of opinion as to what was actually owing to the contractor, and there's a court case involved, arguments have been held, and we're sitting awaiting a judicial verdict. So there is no change. There's an argument about the measurements of the completed job in the case, and I've been as much concerned about it as anybody else in attempting to get the matter cleaned up, and I'm hoping that any day we'll have the answer.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, in all cases, the 15 percent holdback then is definitely applicable. Is that correct? Now, let us assume a case where there's been, say, an error in the calculations, and the department has paid - over-paid, or paid beyond the 15 percent. Does the department then accept the responsibility of the 15 percent and protect the sub-contractors?

MR. WEIR: Well, I've never known us to be in the position where we've had to make that decision, Mr. Chairman. We may well be any day but I really can't answer the question.

MR. MOLGAT: So the facts are then that in all cases there has been the 15 percent, and in this particular case, once the court situation is settled, the 15 percent at least will be available for the sub-contractors?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I can't remember the details of the actual amounts but - it's very vague in my mind now - but some of them are protected by varying means and I've forgotten even what it amounts to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 (a) (1) passed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make one point here and this has to do with the access to highways. During this last year I was contacted by several people who had applied for access from their properties onto the highway, and these applications are made and then heard. I think we're too strict in not allowing sufficient number of accesses. I think our highways are constructed for people to drive on and if we don't want to allow them to get onto the highway, I think this is wrong. I don't think we should limit these accesses too much. I think we're overdoing it.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, concern the access to highways is under the control of my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities, under whom falls the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board, and I just would point out the reservation that every time you get traffic coming together you get danger of an accident, and you have to be reasonably cautious in the areas in which you allow them, not having too many of them too close together and coming on from too many different directions. My experience has been, by and large, that it's been fairly reasonable. There have been individual cases where there's been disputes and it's a matter of opinion who was right; and any time you have an arbitrary situation like this, I would suggest that we're going to continue to have the odd case like that. I would point out that any decision of the board is subject to an appeal to the Public Utility Board for anybody that feels they're not being dealt with correctly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(a) (1) passed; (2) passed. (b) (1) passed; (2) passed. (c) (1) passed; (2) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under Surveys and Titles. I don't know if this is the proper place to bring this in, but the new department or the branch that will be established insofar as land acquisition, will be coming under the Minister of Public Works, I understand. I see no provision in the estimates for this particular aspect of his work. Where will it come in?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, it will show up in the Public Works side rather than on the Highways side. It doesn't show up as an item. The costs are pretty well contained, I think, in other varying departments spread out throughout the service and they'll have to be brought together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed. (d) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed. (e) (1) -- passed; 2 -- passed. (f) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, in regard to District Offices, my honourable friend the Minister will know that I wrote him a couple of letters on a couple of occasions at least, suggesting to him that if it was the intention of his department to establish further regional offices in the province by reason of the fact that the new connector road system would require it, that he should consider Gladstone or Neepawa, and the reply that I received was that there were no new ones being contemplated at the moment or words to this effect. I notice, however, in the estimates that there's quite a substantial increase here of around \$200,000, I believe. I wonder if he would care to make a comment at this time. Is it the intention of the government to establish regional offices throughout Manitoba this year?

MR. WEIR: Well Mr. Chairman, there are some new offices being established, for instance in areas where there haven't been before. There is the intention, I think, for an Assistant District Engineer to be at Steinbach, an Assistant District Engineer at Arborg, and an Assistant Engineer at Portage la Prairie, areas where there haven't been before. Other than that, just off the top of my hat, at present plans are for the extensions in staff to be allocated throughout the existing offices. I might point out that the honourable member mentioned some fairly important towns along that line. I notice he didn't go just quite far enough West when he was recommending towns that might be considered. Certainly if there is one for that area there will be several communities need consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed, (g) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under (g) Planning and Design, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether a decision has been made insofar as the location of No. 10 Highway in the vicinity of Minnedosa.

MR. WEIR: No it hasn't, Mr. Chairman. It's being studied but it hasn't been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed. (h) -- passed. Resolution No. 74 -- passed. Resolution No. 75 4 (a) -- passed . . .

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, when I spoke yesterday on this department, I promised then that I wouldn't deal with the municipalities until we came to this item. The field has been pretty well covered. However, it hasn't covered the points that I had in mind. In fact, Mr. Chairman, what I was going to do is review the division of responsibilities between the municipalities and the provincial government on the construction of roads, starting with 1880, but I'm not going to go back that far tonight because it's getting rather late, so we'll make it quite a bit shorter.

Mr. Chairman, our municipal men are giving very serious second thoughts to the new proposal of the government, and in my opinion, with a very good reason. I think that it will only be a matter of a year or two before they realize that they got the poor end of the deal, and the poor end by a long way. I don't think it was the intention of this government to make that deal turn out in that fashion, but it will.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for at least 30 years, part of the revenues from the gasoline tax and the automobile tax and so forth, was used to assist municipalities in their road programs. This is going to be the first year in 30 years that they are going to get no assistance from this revenue, and in spite of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that our revenues are continually climbing. We estimate that this year's revenue from those sources will be \$48,000,000 approximately. How much of this is being spent by the government on roads and highways? There is the \$12,000,000 item here plus the carrying charges on the capital outlay, so you are actually spending approximately 25 percent of the revenue that you receive from roads, on roads in the Province of Manitoba, and I want to repeat that the municipalities are going to get no share of this \$48,000,000. Now are they entitled to a share, Mr. Chairman? I think that all the municipal councils will realize that they are and they'll be asking for it, and rightly so; because

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd) what are they left with? They are left with all municipal roads except the so-called connector roads and these connector roads that are being taken over by the government are the roads in the municipalities that were of the highest standard of municipal roads. What are the municipalities left with? They are left with the balance of the so-called main market roads and bus routes that were established because of the division system in education. These will have to be kept up to a high standard. But in addition to this, Mr. Chairman, we are having a program of consolidation of elementary schools and I forecast, Mr. Chairman, that the expense of constructing and maintaining the roads to serve the consolidated school will far exceed what the division demanded and here the municipalities will be saddled with 100 percent of the cost.

The Minister mentioned tonight it is up to the municipalities to hold the line. They can't hold the line, Mr. Chairman, it's impossible. Until now they received a 60-40 grant on the main market roads and the bus routes, plus a little extra in special projects or where the situation called for a little extra assistance. If they are to hold the line, then they will construct only half of the roads they have constructed in the previous year, because they will get no grant from the province, which was on the 60-40 basis. So they cannot hold the line, because they'll have to carry on their construction at the pace at which it was if not a greater pace. I have spoken to some of the municipal men and they figure that this will mean anywhere from 8 to 10 mills increase in the tax load insofar as municipal roads are concerned, and I believe that that's just about what it will come to.

But there is another aspect to this whole setup, Mr. Chairman, and it is this, that no municipal road is a strictly municipal road today. For example, you have government agencies using these roads, telephone service, hydro service, and we have a tax on both of these facilities now, the 5 percent tax on telephones and hydro. These vehicles use those roads. The residents of the municipality, especially the farmers with trucks will be making more use of the municipal roads than they will be of the provincial roads and they have to buy a license from the province, and they pay tax on the gasoline they use in those trucks. The same applies to the automobiles or any other vehicles. I would think that they were entitled to a part of the gasoline tax of this \$48,000,000.00. If the government was using the whole of the \$48,000,000 the argument wouldn't be so strong, but since they are only using a small fraction, approximately 25 percent, then the argument is strong, it is justified and well founded.

What about the PSV's and the commercial trucks that pick up feed and livestock on these municipal roads? They will add to the cost of maintenance and construction. The municipalities get nothing from these revenues collected by the province and they should be getting. What about the places where we'll have discontinuance of train service? If any of these branch lines are picked up the municipalities through which these branch lines run will have a tremendous load to carry in the construction of roads. There is no provision anywhere for them. When we consider all these points I think it won't be long before the government will have to change its attitude. The mere picking up of these connector roads is a small thing as far as the municipalities are concerned. When you are arguing from the provincial side of the picture, well you say we picked up 4,000 miles of road. As far as the municipalities are concerned, this is insignificant because those roads already are built. All it takes is maintenance and what they are left with is roads that have to be constructed - and we all know that the construction of roads is the costly thing, not the maintenance. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the municipalities are not getting a fair deal here and it won't be long before they will be all clamoring at the door of the Minister of Highways.

This year we don't see the lift in the mill rate, because I think that most of the councils haven't realized what they are saddled with, but by the end of this year, they will realize just where they stand without the grant they used to get. And we know what those grants meant. In many instances, those grants because the municipality use their own equipment, meant it cost the municipalities very little to build those roads. The 60 percent was almost sufficient to cover the cost of construction because municipal equipment was used. But that will no longer be true. Every mile that any municipality will construct will have to be paid out of the treasury of that municipality without any assistance and I say again that this is one side of the coin that we must look at very seriously because we will put our municipalities in real bad shape in a very short time. And this all without mentioning the fact that the cost of schools, the municipalities are going to be saddled now with the additional costs of schools of education, because of the new policy of the government. They will have to carry the extra burdens and I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that our real estate, our farm lands cannot carry that burden. The vast

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd) majority of our farms are being taxed to the limit now and every additional mill is a hardship and I do believe that within a period of two years we will see the mill rate in the rural municipalities of this province climb anywhere from 10 to 20 mills.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (a) -- passed.

MR. WEIR: I think I should say just a word or two. There is obviously no point in trying to express the other side of the argument and to point out again that I think I've indicated on more than one occasion that nobody had the opinion and nobody had the impression that when we started out in the first day of January this year that we would had all of the solutions to the connector roads or the traffic generator roads, or the provincial roads, or whatever name you want to tag on them. But this term just, just the connector roads. I'd like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that there are very few people, not too many people in the Province of Manitoba, who live any further than three miles from a road that is built and maintained by the Province of Manitoba. There are some in the lesser populated areas, there are some, granted, and some of those will have to be straightened out from time to time because those have been the areas where it's been difficult, where it's been difficult to establish the roads that should be taken over. It may be true, I won't deny it; it may be true that the first year the odd municipality, if they were going to keep up with their road program that they had before, that it would cost them some more money. I don't know. The statistics that are available won't prove it to me. But I'm willing to bet my bottom dollar; I'm willing to bet my bottom dollar that there's some municipalities it won't cost as much, if they just continue at the same rate.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: If.

MR. WEIR: If they continue at the same rate. I know that they were getting government rates before and their equipment for building roads. They're getting government rates now on their equipment for maintaining roads for the Province of Manitoba. They're both set on the same basis. I presume if there's a profit in one for the municipality as the honourable member indicates that there was, although I've never heard of a municipality admit it yet, that the Honourable Member for Ethelbert says that there is, and I've always indicated that I thought there might be, the rates are established in the same manner as far as the maintenance equipment is concerned for these roads.

So the proof of the pudding is going to be in the eating and anybody that thinks that I'm not aware of the fact that there's going to be more difficulties yet in getting a complete provincial road network, just doesn't understand me because I've said it 104 times to 104 different municipalities in the Province of Manitoba and I think they all know where to reach me. I think we'll be surprised if we find out how well it works out in some municipalities. I think it would be difficult to know - I don't know how you could go about finding out how inequitable the old main market road system was. It worked well, it developed a network of roads throughout the Province of Manitoba, I think probably second to none in any province of our kind. I think that we've got a good network of roads and most of them, most of them have been built, the main market roads, and now what you find - or what you've been finding the last few years is after the roads are built then comes the request to change the location of the main market road. There's nobody driving on the road we just built, we'll move it over a mile - everybody's going the other road now. This has been done over a period of time, there have been changes made and quite a number of the roads have been built.

I'm the first to acknowledge that there are areas in Manitoba that aren't as far ahead with the construction of the main market roads as other areas in the Province of Manitoba. Some of the areas with the highest cost, granted they have higher maintenance, have less main market roads on six and eight township municipalities than some of the small municipalities that have fewer townships in them. The request for main market roads initiated with the municipality over the years and if the request didn't come in for consideration of the establishment of main market roads there wasn't the same consideration given to them as there was from those that did present their case. I think that as this thing sorts itself out and we have our growing pains - and I hope be able to get over them - that we will have an effective reduction, an effective reduction in the amount of traffic that is on municipal roads.

I think that we'll find, I hope that we find, that the municipalities in Manitoba as far as road building is concerned, give up the old ward system. I've recommended it 104 times to 104 municipalities. Some of them don't use it now. They establish a road program and develop the roads on a municipal basis rather than picking their eight mills or whatever the

(MR. WEIR cont'd) case may be, and the ward that happens to have the high assessment gets the money to spend; the ward that gets the low assessment doesn't get the money to spend. I just say that if we had taken the assessment basis in the history of Manitoba in developing our provincial trunk highway system or our provincial road system, that there's a lot of the areas that are serviced with pretty good roads today that wouldn't be serviced with good roads.

Now what the honourable member says about no assistance towards roads, no direct assistance towards roads from the gas tax, he is correct. But to say that there is no money coming out of the gas tax going back into the municipal roads as they were prior to this year, this is not correct. I know there's a very fine line - and the honourable member stayed on his own part of it - but I would point out that compared to last year there certainly are moneys going out of the Provincial Treasury into an area of former municipal responsibility, and the maintenance of these some 4,000 miles of roads is a part of it as well as any upgrading that we manage to do.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, a question that's being asked by the municipalities with regard to the government's new policy is what is going to be spent this year on the roads which have been declared provincial roads? For example, can the Minister indicate in any given municipality what money is going to be spent on the roads which were taken over this year as of January 1st?

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Chairman, I can't right now. The district office are working on it. They are going to have to be very much on their own in establishing this year's program. There are probably a few fairly large projects that will be undertaken, but for the most part, for the most part, they will be the small areas linking up other roads and I expect a multitude of projects in quite a widespread area of the province. They are working on it and they are developing a program to this end.

MR. GUTTORMSON: In other words then it's quite possible that the amount of money spent on these provincial roads taken over as of January 1st, will be much less than the money spent in grants let's say, last year.

MR. WEIR: On the whole?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes.

MR. WEIR: On the over-all picture?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes.

MR. WEIR: The answer is absolutely no.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Then the money that you plan to be spending on provincial roads this year on those roads as I say that have been taken over since January 1st, will be just as great as the grants you gave to the municipalities last year on that 60-40 basis?

MR. WEIR: It'll be greater - close to double.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is it correct that all municipalities will benefit, or just certain ones?

MR. WEIR: Some will - all municipalities will benefit to a degree because there will be the maintenance of all roads. There will be gravelling I would imagine on sections of roads in all municipalities. There will be some municipalities that will have bridges. A municipality for instance that has a bad bridge that costs fifty or sixty thousand dollars and they may have had a grant last year for twelve, they end up with quite a hunk more. But if you get into a municipality that has thirty-five and there's no major or good sized project in it this year, the one year, it may well be down, but on the over-all my guess is that in most municipalities there will be money spent.

MR. MÖLGAT: Well I wonder if the Minister could indicate where this appears in the estimates, then, the amount for this. I see, for example, under Item (b) here that last year - and then there's the change here in the items from last year's estimates, I presume that the new figure on the left-hand side is the accumulation of comparable figures for last year. It was 5 million 2. This year we show 7 million 7. The difference then is 2 million 5. Is this completely attributable to extra expenditures on these roads that have been taken over from municipalities or does it apply to other items as well under that same heading, that is towns and villages, Metropolitan streets, and so on?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, the breakdown pretty well is, in the (b) figure there's \$675,000 for a maintenance grant to Metropolitan Winnipeg, estimated; there's in the neighborhood of \$600,000-\$625,000 estimated what the grants-in-aid may amount to for the cities, towns and villages outside the metropolitan area. There's a million dollars for metropolitan grants and the balance of five million odd is directed towards the general maintenance and construction

(MR. WEIR cont'd) of the provincial road system.

Then under Item 5, the current item chargeable to capital is another \$4 million which it's estimated will be split evenly, or approximately evenly, between grants to Metropolitan Winnipeg and construction on the provincial road system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed;

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the total comparable figures for last year are this \$4 million under Item 5, plus the 7.7, giving us 11. Right? I think we have to take these together to be able to get a comparable - that will give us 11 as against \$5 million last year, so an increase of six. Would that be correct? Well, this seems to be short of a million dollars from the statements made by the First Minister when he introduced Bill No. 2 at the summer session because at that time he said that the implementation of these policies is expected to increase the current budget of the province by about \$7 million, 3 million for Metro - that's about right because the Minister says 2 million here and 1 million under Item (b), so that's all right -- and \$4 million for the balance of the province. Well that 4 million doesn't materialize. It only adds up to three.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would like to check Hansasard, I think I gave the figures as close as we could come to them to the Honourable Member for St. John's, which comes to approximately six and three quarters millions of dollars. Some of them are distributed throughout Item 3 in the Planning and Design and District Offices and so on and so forth in additional staff which is required and the - I don't have the figures at my finger tips but the items in here come to something above the \$6 million if you add them all up.

MR. MOLGAT: But it doesn't top the 7 million that the First Minister was talking about so there'll be some - of the new tax bill that came in - there will be some of this money that will go to general revenue.

MR. WEIR: . . . very close if our breakdown is someplace accurate.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, under Highway Maintenance I wish to speak briefly about the six miles of river road that the government took over some four or five years ago. Now I think they have done a splendid job and I also know that they have met with considerable disappointment in regard to river bank stability. I believe last year some \$22,000 was spent trying to shore up the banks of the Red River. But the road is in good shape. The only thing now is that people, many many people from Winnipeg use this road - is the dust situation, a perennial problem. Now much has been said tonight about the use of calcium chloride, Mr. Chairman, and I want to say that having a little flair for public works myself through the years, I think that the job that was done there two years ago on the six miles of road on the Red River, whether or not it was because of the moisture that would be acquired by the calcium chloride from the river, I don't know, but to me this was an example of a good job of the use of calcium chloride. Now I know that it costs a little money but I suggest to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that it be done again because there's little use in taking this very scenic drive if you have to follow the car ahead in a cloud of dust. I would suggest - two years ago you did a good job, last year you waited a little too late in the season - and I would suggest that the same good job be done again this year because many many thousands of people are using that road right now.

MR. WEIR: We'll do our best, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on (c). I notice there's a slight decrease here. I wonder if the Minister could indicate why that is so, but more important to me really, is the over-all policy insofar as the unorganized territory is concerned. The take over of roads with the municipalities has clearly set up a number of roads as being purely a provincial responsibility. Previous to this, in much of the unorganized territory there was a network of roads which was a strictly provincial responsibility. Some of those roads no longer appear on this map that's supplied by the Minister. Does this mean that some of these roads that were previously a pure provincial responsibility and which have appeared in the past on the provincial road map, no longer appear on the new numbered map that he gave us, now are going to return to be a local responsibility; or will he maintain in the unorganized territory exactly the same network of roads that he previously had?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, there is no change in the unorganized territory with the exception that some of the provincial roads as they go into the unorganized area and they show up on those maps, carry people through the unorganized. Those roads show up under the provincial road program; therefore there is a slight reduction as far as the estimates are

(MR. WEIR cont'd) . . . concerned here for the roads that are in the provincial road program.

MR. MOLGAT: There's absolutely no change then, whatever roads were previously accepted as a provincial responsibility in the unorganized will so remain.

MR. WEIR: Same thing.

MR. MOLGAT: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (c) -- passed; (d) -- passed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I think this would be the appropriate place to discuss the situation of The Narrows on Lake Manitoba. In previous years, I have pointed out the need for a bridge or a causeway at the narrows and I've urged the Minister to give every consideration to this project when he's considering priorities in his department. The fact that we have a ferry there is holding back the area, because people are very dissatisfied with the performance of the ferry because at numerous times it breaks down. The Minister was good enough last year to put in a system whereby signs that notify people of the ferry being not in operation when it broke down last year, but still people won't use the ferry or rely on it because of the numerous times that it's breaking down. It's preventing a lot of travel in the northern part of the Interlake and the area towards Dauphin because people are just reluctant to use the ferry which is out of use so often. I'm told that the present ferry is so dilapidated that consideration is being given to perhaps putting on a new ferry. I don't know now whether this is true or not, the Minister perhaps can clarify this. But I would suggest that the Minister give his serious consideration to putting in a causeway on the narrows so that the two mainlands can be linked on a year-round basis. As it is, you can only travel certain hours of the day for a short time of the year. You can't travel during the winter months and therefore it's been an awful inconvenience to the people living on both sides of The Narrows.

Recently the hydro strung a line across the ferry and the indications are that from the work they did, that building a causeway mightn't be nearly as costly as previously thought. So I'd like to see the Minister look into this matter and see if he can't see his way clear to putting a causeway, or a bridge, whatever is suitable, at this point. I know one of the things that might be considered is probably a toll bridge at this place. I don't think the people would object to this because at the present time if they use the ferry they've got to pay for it anyway. And they're paying for something which isn't reliable because last year, even when the ferry was in working condition, many times they couldn't use the ferry because of the high winds - not that the ferry couldn't operate in the winds, but because the wind drove the water so shallow on one side that The Narrows was too shallow for the ferry to operate and they just had to suspend operations. So there are so many factors which make the ferry a rather unsatisfactory crossing at that particular point and I think it's just about time that we had a causeway or a bridge at that point.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the ferry is depreciating and various alternatives are under active consideration at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with what my colleague the Member for St. George has said that there was a particular problem last summer due to the low level of the lake. There were many occasions on which people simply could not get across. I'm sure the Minister received some of the irate letters that I received from people who travelled some distance hoping to get across and then were held up for several hours. Is it intended that for this - I presume for this coming summer, we'll have to operate with the ferry. I can't foresee any change that quickly - is it intended however to do any dredging so that in the low water period the ferry can at least still come up to the dock and provide continuous service, which was not the case last summer? And when is it that the Minister may be in a position to announce the bridge or causeway?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'm in no position to say when I may know what the result of our present considerations might be. As far as the dredging is concerned, I'll have it investigated. I'm not sure what the plans are but I'll have it checked to see what can be done to improve the service of the ferry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (d) passed. Resolution No. 75 -- passed. Resolution No. 76 --

MR. CHERNIACK: On this resolution, I'd like firstly to have clarification just what this "chargeable to Capital Division" means. Is this the \$20 million which the Honourable Minister referred to earlier as being work that was capital, but that in this case the current revenue is being used to contribute to that capital? I just don't understand it and I'd like clarification on that.

And while I'm on this point, I understand that under the item that we discussed 4 (b), there would be larger grants made to municipalities for the work which they are doing. And in

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) the City of Winnipeg, for example, there's an engineering department which does its own work, and I would assume that the grants given under the previous item 4 (b) would still be left with the city, or metro, whoever is responsible, to do the work and pay for it. I think I notice the Minister shaking his head, so now I have no right to assume what I've just said. Under this item 5, where otherwise the city or metro would have seen to it that in the City of Winnipeg the City Engineering Department would have done the work, does this now mean that this work will be planned by the province, executed by the province and done by tender or will it be still let to the municipal body to decide how to go about doing the work?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I misunderstood my honourable friend. I thought he meant grants directly to the city and of course grants to the municipalities within Metro have been discontinued and all of the provincial monies will be going towards the metropolitan street system. This was the misunderstanding that I had.

First of all to start out with, the \$4 million is separate altogether from the \$20 million capital. This is money that's raised in current and charged to capital - some of these projects may not be completed and the money doesn't lapse. All of the other money in these estimates lapse at the end of March 31 next year, if it's not spent. The money that is in capital does not - if it's raised in current and charged to capital, carried on the capital estimates, does not lapse. And as far as the grants are concerned, outside of approving projects, it will be up to the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg to decide by what means the construction is done. If there are tenders let, they'll let them. Their present procedure, as the honourable member has indicated, within Winnipeg, is to have the Winnipeg Engineering Department do the actual work within Winnipeg and I certainly have no present thoughts that I should request any change in that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Does Metro now know what work it will be empowered to do under this item?

MR. WEIR: Yes.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad the Minister gave the explanation here on chargeable to capital division. He also mentioned earlier that we had a carry over from last year of 4 million. That came out of a similar item, also chargeable to capital? Is that right?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, that was under the capital itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution Number 76 -- passed. Resolution No. 77 6 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed; (d) -- passed. Resolution No. 77 -- passed. Resolution No. 78 -- passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on 78, could the Minister indicate what there is accumulated under that item that is unexpended, because this is another one of those that's chargeable to capital. It's been in the program for years what are unexpended?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I can't right off the bat. I think probably it's capital - this is all spent each year, I think, relatively speaking, very little carry forward in this particular item. There will be some carry-over of buildings in the regular capital supply building, or in the regular capital supply vote from year to year, but these are all for relatively minor jobs, like improving grounds of mental hospitals and things like that, and the program is usually pretty well caught up or may be completed in the spring, or summer.

MR. MOLGAT: Well these I presume will be reflected in the accounts would they not? In the Public Accounts book, this figure will appear? Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 78 -- passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and requested leave to sit again.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the report of the Committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Before I move the adjournment may I remind the members that the House will meet at 9:30 tomorrow and that we will go into Law Amendments at 11:30 and then continue on our usual course in the afternoon and evening.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, may I put a question to the Minister? Does he remember that the Dental Committee is called to meet at 9:30 tomorrow and Votes and Proceedings has indicated that Law Amendments is going to be called at 10 o'clock.

MR. ROBLIN: In the Committee this morning I think it was agreed that it would meet at 11:30 instead. I presume the Dental Committee will meet at 9:30 tomorrow.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Friday morning.