

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 29, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the Seventh Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their Seventh Report. Your Committee has considered Bills Nos. 102, an Act to amend The Wildlife Act and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 133, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Interior Trust Company.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) introduced Bill No. 136, an Act to incorporate The Brandon Area Foundation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 36 Grade 7 and 8 students from Stoney Mountain School under the direction of Mrs. Lee. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. There are also some 75 Grade 11 students from Springfield School under the direction of Mr. Miki, Mrs. Lehn and Mrs. Mazur. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Springfield.

And in the Speaker's Gallery today we have as our guest, Mr. C. B. Koester, the Clerk of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly I welcome you.

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, I should like to make a statement to the House, if I may, about our Air Canada problem. The House will recall that I sent a telegram on April 7th, to the Prime Minister in connection with this matter of continuing moves of the highly skilled personnel from Air Canada in Winnipeg and I received a reply a short while ago to the effect that these transfers are being made in accordance with the Union agreements that existed, but I have sent a further telegram in connection with this matter which I think would interest the House, in the following terms:

"To the Prime Minister: Further to my telegram of April 7th, local opinion is strongly opposed to continuing transfers of Air Canada personnel. This is felt to be a violation of your promise to freeze situation pending receipt of Thompson Commission Report. Continuation of these moves is bound to prejudice policy decisions your government must take when Thompson Commission Report submitted to you. Earnestly request Transport Minister Pickersgill come to Winnipeg soonest to clarify situation with Unions, Municipalities and Provincial Government representatives." Signed by myself. I think the telegram is self-explanatory.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could just say a word on this. I thank the Premier for advising the House. As I understand it, some of the decisions by the Union people will have to be made in the course of the very next few days, about the 15th of May, and I would hope that action can be taken on this before this date so that these people will know what action they must take. Is it the intention of the Premier then to reconvene the Committee which has met on past occasions in this regard?

MR. ROBLIN: I think that Committee or something very close to it would be the proper body to meet with Mr. Pickersgill to discuss this matter if we can persuade him to come here.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, if I may I would like to join in saying "thank you" to the First Minister for sending

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the telegram of today. I sincerely hope and trust that the authorities at Ottawa will act with greater haste than apparently they did in answering the previous telegram of the Honourable First Minister. I'm sure all members of the House will join in the concern that we have here in Manitoba as to the present situation, and I think that the First Minister is correct to once again ask and to emphasize what I thought as one of the delegates was a rather more or less of a firm undertaking that transfers would cease pending the report of the Thompson Commission, and I certainly hope that the Prime Minister of Canada will see his way clear to allow The Honourable Mr. Pickersgill to come to Winnipeg in this matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the First Minister in this regard as well. Could he table a copy of the telegram that he got or read it into the record in view of the fact that we have his original telegram and the one he has sent now. That is the reply he has.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm in an embarrassing position. I got the telegram - I feel morally certain I got the telegram from the Prime Minister saying that these transfers were taking place in accordance with the Union agreement, but they've been turning my office upside down in the last 48 hours to find it and we're tracing it up with the telegraph company so I haven't got the document to produce. I'll have to undertake to produce it when it materializes.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has he received a request or recommendation for the setting up of a Marketing Plan or Marketing Board in the broiler industry?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Berville): Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Could the Minister indicate, Madam Speaker, when he received this request, and what action has been taken so far?

MR. HUTTON: I'd have to take that question as Notice. I'd have to check with the . . .

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I'd like to put a question to the First Minister. If possible, I would like to have the Order for Return in before I speak on the Constitution resolution. Would this be possible? How soon can I expect the Return?

MR. ROBLIN: I'll be glad to get that for my honourable friend. I believe it is ready now. I'll have to just see where it is.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the names of the firms retained to make repairs on pumps, etc., as shown in Return to Order of the House No. 42; and No. 2. Names of the firms retained to do well drilling in those applicable cases referred to in Order of the House No. 42.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of Crown land hay and grazing permits that have been terminated or not renewed by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources in the past 12-month period; secondly, the number of non-renewals in the Interlake area and the legal description of each parcel; third, the reason for refusing to renew hay and grazing permit applications in each of the above cases.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, in connection with this question, I should say to the honourable member that it will be most difficult for the department to get the information that he seeks here because our records really are not maintained in a way that would facilitate the quick turning out of this information. I dare say that if we put a couple of people to work we could turn it out after they have spent a good number of days or perhaps even weeks on it. I'm just wondering if he would be satisfied if we accept it subject to the condition that we give him the general information that we have without this detailed combing of the files which would be necessary in each case. It would necessitate almost combing each file with respect to each quarter section of land in the department. Now if he could be of any help in this regard, I would be happy to hear from him.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I think that the conditions laid down by the Honourable

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Minister are good enough. General information may suffice at this stage. However I would like to point out that I may resubmit a return giving specific parcels.

MR. LYON: That would be satisfactory, Madam Speaker. We will accept it then subject to getting the general information that is readily available from our files.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, before I move this Order for Return, I would ask leave to delete the first two words of the last line thereof. The words "to be". I would ask leave to delete those two words, "to be", in the last line thereof.

Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing a copy of the agreements between the Manitoba Power Commission and (a) the Town of Beausejour; and (b) the Town of Selkirk, which agreements provided for the takeover of local hydro-electric distribution and allied facilities in those two areas by the Manitoba Power Commission, and which presumably provided also for the purchase price paid to these two towns.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, we will accept the Order for Return subject to the provision that the Towns of Beausejour and Selkirk are agreeable to the release of the agreements.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: Details and results of all traffic studies and traffic counts conducted by, or on behalf of, the Manitoba Government, on roads and highways in Manitoba since April 1st, 1963.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, this Order has a familiar ring to it, I think we've been through the situation before. All of the traffic counts and studies are done by our departmental staff and as such I can't support the resolution as the item is not produceable.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I fail to see why the government should refuse this request, after all it's information that the members of the House surely are entitled to. When they're considering the estimates of the Department of Public Works this year and other years they have an idea what traffic is going over the different roads. I don't know why the government should refuse this, this is information that's provided to oil companies and other private interests so why shouldn't members of the House be allowed to. I think the Minister should reconsider and allow this order to pass.

MR. MOLGAT: that in the past this information was supplied to members of the House. I certainly recall when the previous government was in office that not only members did not have to request it but the Minister of Public Works actually gave that information and handed out maps and diagrams showing exactly what the traffic counts were. Surely this is perfectly in order to give the members of this House. How else can members decide whether or not the government is following a consistent policy with regard to road construction. The only assumption that one can make if the Minister refuses to give this information is that he is not following traffic counts in decisions to build highways. The obvious question then is what policy does the government follow in deciding which are going to be built and which are not.

I submit to the Minister that he would be saving himself a great deal of embarrassment if he were to supply this information openly to the House rather than to take the position that this is secret information because the obvious conclusion that the people of Manitoba will draw from that is that the government is not following traffic counts for road construction purposes and that surely this should be one of the main factors. Not the only one, true; we realize that there are other considerations; but other considerations being waived, surely traffic is an important factor and before members of this House are asked to vote the amounts of money for highway construction this information should be supplied. I suggest to the Minister that he will be improving his position if he agrees to supplying this information and he will be satisfying the people of Manitoba that he is proceeding in a proper manner.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on this question I'm interested in knowing why it is that the government refuses the Order for Return. The Minister of Public Works if I heard him correctly mentioned that this was detailed information for his department and I can appreciate this to a considerable degree, but I would like to hear if it's at all possible more concise reasons, Madam Speaker, that the department or the government feels that it should not produce the information requested. If there are valid reasons, other than those that were given by the Minister of Public Works just now, then I might consider that they have valid reasons, but I respectfully suggest Madam Speaker, that just on what the Honourable Minister said it isn't quite satisfactory as far as I'm concerned. I would like to hear more detailed reasons as to why the department feels that this information should not be made public because of course it does become public knowledge once it's tabled in this Legislature. If it's basic reasons that are satisfactory then I think maybe, providing the government can substantiate this, that I would understand their refusal more than I do at the present time.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, on Page 98 of the Annual Report of the Department of Public Works, there is a short paragraph under the heading "Traffic" and it says a traffic flow map and statistical information on average daily traffic and annual average daily truck traffic was prepared for the period January 1st to December 31st, 1963. The inference is, or I take it so, that we will be supplied with that map. Otherwise there's not much point in talking about it. Now the Order for Return asks for one since, asks for traffic counts since April 1, '63. Now perhaps the Honourable Minister could compromise then and just let us have the one that is referred to in the Annual Report. As the Honourable Member for Inkster says on so many occasions, a half a loaf would be better than no bread, and this would be a compromise. Just let us have what is reported in this annual report.

Madam Speaker, I might make one more comment because a business man, a recent business man in Neepawa, I'll keep my honourable friend guessing who that is, asked for some traffic counts because it was his intention if the traffic warranted it to make a further expansion in his enterprise and apparently they turned him down. Now it doesn't hurt my conscience too much or my feelings either if they turn me down, but to turn down a business man who intends to expand his business if the traffic warrants it then to me that's going beyond all reason and I suggest that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce speak to my honourable friend in terms that are recommended in his department's reports.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I understand presently this information is supplied to municipalities, to oil companies, to the police department so I can't see what's so secret about the traffic counts and I would like to know some reason why it cannot be supplied to the members of the House here.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I do hope that the Minister will accommodate the honourable member and provide the necessary information. I know on previous occasions I have asked for traffic counts as well and how are we as members to be able to know that the . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Assiniboia has closed the debate. I looked for the Honourable Member for Rhineland to stand up before he did.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I understood he just asked a question.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): On this point of order, might I call to your attention Madam Speaker that - I haven't the rule before me but I'm quite clear that it says that Madam Speaker shall apprise the House of the fact that the debate is being closed. Now this is something that we haven't been doing recently in this House but I would suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that it is something where the rule should be strictly observed because in what might be termed the heat of debate sometimes someone might not remember, especially if the debate has gone on a long time, just who had initiated the debate. I think that's the reason that our rule makes it plain that Madam Speaker shall apprise the House of the fact that if such and such a member spoke that the debate would be closed. So I make that suggestion only so that it would be observed in the future.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PATRICK: Yeas and Nays, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members please.

A standing vote was taken with the following results:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, Harrison, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; Nays 32.

MADAM SPEAKER declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba, since 1960, with regard to the proposed Spruce Woods Provincial Park.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, we're prepared to accept the Address for Papers subject to the usual condition of obtaining the authority from the Federal Government to table correspondence.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 118. The Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I will be short in what I have to say to add to the debate on Bill 118. While I feel the bill is timely I am concerned or question a few principles involved in this bill. I seem to have a little trouble basically with two little words in considering some of the principles of this bill.

I notice in the bill a report is requested by the appointed commission to the Minister. It seems to me it sounds too weak when it says in the bill that the Minister 'may' request the commission to make a report to the government. I think the bill should read "shall" request the commission to make a report to the government. And of course before a commission is appointed, a municipality has to present a resolution or a petition from not less than 20 per cent of the resident electors in regards to recommending boundaries by a commission. I could be wrong, but I feel that this percentage is too low. If such a situation becomes mature or necessary, and of course we all know that once the thing is really called for or required there will be no difficulty in obtaining a fairly high percentage, say at least one-third of the electors; because on the other hand, we all know that when a petition is started too often by people, and with no sarcasm towards this - a lot of them are signing for the sake of agreeing or not being miserable to the party or parties concerned seeking for the success of such a petition. Therefore I feel that the percentage required is too low.

I was very happy to see in the bill that the commission appointed 'shall' hold public hearings and the representatives 'can' present their views in respect to the proposed boundaries by future municipalities. While I feel that basically a very good job has been done with school divisions - although some will disagree with me - I feel that the danger is always there, that a lot of caution will have to be shown in the decision of establishing municipal boundaries. I think it would be well to try to uphold natural boundaries and also include where at all possible people of the same interest in one municipality. Also, I was happy to see in the bill that the commission 'shall' make a final report, but disappointed to see that the Minister 'may' refer any report of the commission back to the commission for recommendation. I hope that the Minister will think - in all cases that he will also "shall" do this, and I hope he will.

Madam Speaker, I'm also one of those that wonder if too much power can be given to the Municipal Board in this case, or in regard to adjusting boundaries by vote when such recommendations by the Municipal Boundaries Commission has been made. I believe the Leader of the NDP Party may have raised a very valid point, namely that this Legislature could be bypassed in establishing certain laws, either in this case or possibly even set a precedent, and possibly even nullify, as I think the honourable leader mentioned, or override the decisions of this Legislature by a Municipal Board or perhaps another board. But I am glad that the Honourable Minister mentioned that the bill would not be passed at this session. Therefore, I feel that this Bill 118 -- if I read the bill correctly, I hope these mistakes, if they are mistakes, will be corrected before the bill becomes law.

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

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 117, an Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is the Minister not going to

MR. LYON: Well, I'm quite happy to make an explanation. I thought we'd covered most of the points.

MR. MOLGAT: No, I think I had asked the Minister a special question on the resolution stage regarding Gypsum Mines, because of a particular situation that has occurred where one has closed, and I thought he was going to reply.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, we have covered I think most of the main substantive points on the bill. I will give a short rehash of them though just to refresh the memory of members present. At the last session of the Legislature this Act was amended to provide that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council might authorize the rates or royalty tax payable during the year in which a mine comes into production and the first and second years following that these rates be reduced not less than one-half of the rates payable. This bill takes away that discretion and provides that the amount of royalty tax payable by new mines shall be reduced, 'shall' be reduced by one-half of the first 36 months of production. The incentive in other words will be guaranteed to new mines for a period of 36 months.

We also in this bill amend the definition of minerals by adding oil shale to the substances which are subject to provisions of the Act and we exclude potash from these provisions, and that I believe was explained before as well. In connection of course with the oil shale business I can say, Madam Speaker, that three companies have recently acquired large areas of oil, Crown oil shale rights along the Manitoba escarpment, and investigations into the economic potential of these areas has commenced. As the extraction of oil from shale requires that it be mined and as large capital expenditures of extraction equipment are required, it is proposed that these operations should pay a royalty tax which is identical to other mining operations.

With respect to potash, it is being removed from the operation of this Act, because the regulations already provide that a royalty on potash production - they already set this royalty. The royalty rates set by this regulation are similar to those payable in the other provinces of Canada. However, the present definition of mineral in the Mining Royalty and Tax Act includes potash and in order to eliminate double taxation and to place Manitoba in of course a competitive position with other provinces, we delete potash from the substances subject to royalty tax payable under this Act, realizing of course that they will pay the tax already set forth by the regulations.

It is also proposed that the requirements that an operator must take a depreciation rate of not less than five percent be deleted. This provision is contrary to the established practices and could possibly reduce current revenues under the Act, so it is being taken out. And in addition, there are several minor amendments which deal with minor administrative procedures. One of these, Madam Speaker, was dealt with by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, with reference to the amendment dealing with gypsum, and I can tell him that this amendment in no way alters the present provisions of this clause. This change is made merely to make it abundantly clear that this mineral is "used in the manufacture of structural material". However, in view of the question asked, I can explain a little bit further the intent of the clause. It provides that where the same operator owns two or more mines which produce clay or any structural material including gypsum that they shall be deemed for the purposes of the act to be one mine. This means that where the operator produces this class of mineral from several mines, first, the aggregate of the incomes from the federal operations shall be considered to be one income, and appropriate rate of royalty tax shall be applied to this aggregate. I might add, Madam Speaker, that this has no effect on the tax payable as the profit attributable to mining in respect to all operations in this class is much less than the \$1 million to which the minimum royalty rate tax applies. Where a producer of this class of mineral brings a second or third mine into production, it will for the purposes of the act now be one mine. This provision is necessary as it is as practicable to produce this class of mineral from several locations as it is from a single and in fact this is going on.

This amendment, Madam Speaker, in the opinion of the department, certainly has no effect on the present tax payable by such mines and we do not feel it can have any effect on employment or will it make it easier for an operator to close down an operation, make it any easier than it was heretofore.

And while I'm on my feet, Madam Speaker, I believe the Member from Rhineland asked

(MR. LYON cont'd) me a question. I'm not just certain as to whether or not I understood it. It was something to the effect about when the tax was paid. I can assure him that there is no provision in this bill or in the act which provides that an operator will not be taxed until a year later. The act provides that quarterly payments shall be made throughout the year and that the final payment be made about three months after the end of the year.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for his explanation. What I was concerned about was the latter point that he brought up which on the resolution stage he was not prepared, or not in a position to give the information which I appreciate was technical. I don't quite see why the regulation is being brought in however because he says it is not going to affect revenue and it's not going to affect employment, it's not going to affect anything that the companies do, then why is it exactly that we are making this provision. Is this a provision that applies for example to other mining activities because there are after all other companies that do operate more than one mine. I think that is the case of, for example Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting who today are operating more than just the mine in Flin Flon. Now is this a rule that applies to other types of mining or is this special for gypsum. I appreciate the Minister has - well he may not be in a position to give the details and we may be able to get them at the Committee stage when it goes to Law Amendments presumably when the technical people will be there - but I'm not quite clear as to why this change is being made if it's not going to have an effect.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I think I mentioned earlier on . . .

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, may we proceed now with the debate on the Constitution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. In my opinion the amendment is in order. Any person wishing to speak may do so.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Next order Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I regret I had to be absent yesterday and I wonder if I could allow this to stand. I don't want to hold the debate up in any way and if anyone else wishes to speak I'll be prepared to speak on it the next time it comes up. But I frankly have not had a chance to check into what has been said yesterday.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, if I might make a few comments. I appreciate the introductory remarks by the Honourable Minister in connection with this resolution before us. I think it's a very timely resolution. After all we've debated matters of this type in the House not only this year but on previous occasions and I think this is a step forward. So I might have one item that I would like to refer to and that is this that I do hope that when this goes to committee that the scope of the committee will not be restricted too much and even if they at some time might have to go a little beyond what is actually asked for in the resolution. I am in support of this resolution and I hope that something good will come out of it.

MADAM SPEAKER: agreed to stand in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. EVANS: Next order Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Education. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, as I read the report of the committee on Shared Services and I come to the clause which says "Transportation may be offered as a shared service to children going to and coming from school though it necessarily operates outside the public schools proper provided that buses do not deviate from the regular service route to

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd) and from the public school" - when I read this, Madam Speaker, I must consider the 70 years of hardship and suffering on the part of the citizens of this province who have been following the curriculum of the Department of Education and who add something thereto according to the dictates of their conscience. These people for years have been hoping for some relief. Their hopes were bright when the Manitoba Royal Commission on Education brought in a unanimous recommendation for aid to private schools. But when I study the report on Shared Services, Madam Speaker, my hope for minority groups in this province become quite dim. Indeed, my belief in democracy in this province is at a very low ebb. It must be remembered that those who believe in private schools are not trying to force anything on the majority, nor are they trying to take anything away from the majority. Rather they believe in adding something to what the majority prescribes. What answers have these people been given? In general terms they have been told there is nothing wrong with what you are doing and so we will let you do it, but since you are a minority group we will force you to pay for the public school which you are not using and also pay the cost of your own school.

Madam Speaker, this government likes to say that it is interested in relieving the real property taxpayer. Well the greatest relievers of property tax right now are the people who support private schools. These people, Madam Speaker, are right now subsidizing the public schools. Let us take a look at the people sponsoring private schools. Are they promoting subversive ideas? Are they trying to scuttle the existing school system. No, Madam Speaker, these people just believe in adding something to the existing school system. In my own constituency there is an example of what I am talking about. There is only one private school in the area: The Steinbach Bible Institute located right across from my place of business in Steinbach and I am proud to say that I know personally most of the professors there.

What kind of persons do you find among the supporters of such schools? Dr. Melvin Loeven is a good example. He has given the best years of his life helping the people of Africa, and in the performance of his duties he and his family have lived through days of terror in fear for their lives. He does this not because of the remuneration he receives but because of his devotion to his belief. Now what does the government of this province tell people who hold such beliefs? The government say if you want to pass your ideas to the younger generation you can very well finance your own school and on top of that we will force you to pay for the public school. What does the report before us say? We'll let you share some of the courses with the public school, we'll give you textbooks and if you live on the bus route we'll take you along. But if not, just too bad. The committee further recommend that where shared services are already offered they be allowed to continue.

As I understand it from time to time the Winnipeg School Board has accepted a class from a private school in a shop course or a home economics course when the facilities for such courses were not being used by pupils from public schools. I am sure that the private schools are grateful to the Board for its generosity, yet it must be admitted that such an arrangement is always on a temporary basis subject to cancellation. I don't see anything in the committee report that gives a private school the right to count on the use of the facilities of the public school. The draft report envisages that shared services will be on a voluntary and experimental basis at the pleasure of the board. In other words, each school board will have to be persuaded to offer shared services. I suppose the offer will have to be renewed every year thus creating a continual state of uncertainty in the minds of the parents of children attending private schools.

Madam Speaker, I believe in it's present form this recommendation is unworkable. Madam Speaker, I believe that this report with all its complications and impractical recommendations gives little relief to private schools. We all know that this government has before it the report of the Royal Commission which contains practical recommendations which would have been helpful to the private schools and easy for the government to apply; but this government throws away the practical helpful report and in its place gives us the impracticable and unworkable one. I am at a loss to understand the aims of this government with regard to aid to private schools.

The Honourable Member from St. Vital tells us he speaks for the majority. I do not accept this statement. I have many friends in the majority who though they do not agree with all my views on minority rights they certainly do not hold the views expressed by the honourable member. He tells us that we should not complain too much because things are worse in Spain. How biased can one get to pick out a situation in a country that has been torn by revolution for years and then to tell us that the situation here is not as bad.

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd) . . . Madam Speaker, neither the majority nor the minority look to Spain as a model for good understanding.

Then, Madam Speaker, the honourable member tells us that there is a group in Quebec that is being badly treated, the French Protestants, and that we should have a look there before asking too much here. Well I have some information on that subject. Madam Speaker, I have here a clipping from a French paper "Le Devoir" in Montreal, which is dated the 7th of April, 1965, and I would like to read in the record here what this report says. This is a short report and if you don't mind, Madam Speaker, I will read it in French so that I cannot be charged for the translation.

"1,300 protestants francophones étudient dans leur langue dans 15 écoles anglaises du Québec.

"Quinze écoles protestantes de langue anglaise -- 14 du secteur public et une du secteur privé -- offrent actuellement l'enseignement complet en français à 1,322 élèves protestants de langue française au Québec. C'est ce que révèle un récent relevé statistique du ministère de l'éducation. "C'est pour répondre aux demandes de plus en plus pressantes des protestants de langue française désireux de recevoir, l'enseignement dans leur langue, que ces institutions offrent, depuis quelques années, l'enseignement en français de toutes les matières au programme, précise un communiqué du ministère.

"La majorité de ces élèves sont au niveau de l'élémentaire. En effet, 14 écoles donnent les cours de la 1^{ère} à la 7^e année; 2 écoles, ceux de 8^e et de 9^e année; une seule, ceux de 9^e, 10^e and 11^e années. Cinq de ces écoles sont à Montréal.

"Soixante professeurs dispensent l'enseignement dans ces classes. La plupart d'entre eux se consacrent exclusivement aux classes françaises. Par contre, les étudiants bénéficient aussi des services de professeurs de la section anglaise de ces écoles pour des matières comme l'anglais, la musique, les arts.

Translation: 1300 French-speaking Protestants study in their tongue in 15 English schools in Quebec.

Quebec - Fifteen English-Speaking Protestant schools - 14 public and one private - presently offer complete courses in French to 1,322 Protestant students who speak French in Quebec. This has been revealed by a recent statistical survey of the Department of Education. "It was in answer to more and more pressing demands of French-speaking Protestants anxious to receive instruction in their mother tongue, that these institutions in the last few years have given instruction in French in all subjects in the curriculum", states a press release of the Department. "The majority of these students are at the elementary level. Indeed, 14 schools give courses from the 1st to the 7th year; 2 schools, those of the 8th and 9th grades; one only those of Grades 9, 10 and 11. Five of those schools are in Montreal. Sixty professors teach in these classes. Most of them teach in the French classes exclusively. On the other hand, the students also benefit from the instruction given by the professors of the English section of these schools in subjects such as English, music and the arts.

What this briefly says, Madam Speaker, is that 1,322 French-speaking Protestant students are being given courses in all subjects in 15 English-Protestant schools. Sixty professors are teaching these pupils mostly in French, but the English-speaking professors in these schools are offering to the French student such courses as English, music and arts. Madam Speaker, the main reason for reading this in the records is to show that the accusations made by the honourable member on this matter the other day were not exact.

Madam Speaker, the subject is too important to permit spending time arguing about statements selected at random. There is before us the report of the committee and as members of this House we have to vote either for or against it. Madam Speaker, I will support this report, but not because I see in it a solution to the problem that face the private schools, nor because it provides adequate help to the parents who send their children to private schools. The only reason I support this bill is that because I cannot permit myself to refuse to these people the little bit of assistance that will be received through free textbooks and in some instances bus rides. I cannot refuse this to people who have suffered so much for so long. The acceptance of this report even though it gives little help has one consequence. It will serve to remind those opposed to aid to private schools that the problem will not solve itself if nothing is done and if something more positive is not done soon our province will gain the reputation of being the worst in the country as far as minority rights are concerned. Madam Speaker, I have faith in the people of this province, I believe that when they see that the supporters of private schools do not wish to take anything away from the public school that they wish only to add something which

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd) . . . is of value to them, then they will understand.

Madam Speaker, the thoughts that I have expressed in this speech are my own. Though I see little in this report that is of immediate benefit to private schools, I will support the bill. I trust that in the not too distant future real understanding will lead to a lasting solution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? All those in favour

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 72, 1. (a) (1) -- passed . . .

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on 1 (a). We listened to the Honourable Minister of Highways yesterday and I, too, wish to express my gratitude to the Civil Service. I have had a lot to deal with them and I find them always very co-operative in this respect. Maybe most of the members remember last year that I asked several of the gentlemen on the other side, namely, the Minister of Education who is a doctor, to get together with the Minister of Health and the Minister of Highways and to remove the hazard of eating and breathing dust on the highways of southeastern Manitoba. I hope that the three honourable gentlemen did get together and discuss this serious problem and decided that this discrimination of such certain areas in the province will cease in the future. I do believe that they must have met at least once because I notice that the program that the Minister announced yesterday said southeastern Manitoba and especially the constituency of Emerson wasn't entirely forgotten. I notice that there is some black surfacing and there is some construction in that area and I wish to express on behalf of my people my gratitude to the Honourable Minister, as I always do every year. We're grateful for that. I like to give credit where credit is due. But - there is always a "but!" - I would like the Minister to get together with these honoured gentlemen that I've just mentioned and further consider the plight of some of the other citizens of southeastern Manitoba; and since I represent part of the southeastern Manitoba, namely Emerson constituency for a few moments I'll confine my remarks to my own constituency.

Now I'm referring to the western - say about two-thirds of my constituency which comprises the western end of this constituency. In the program there is nothing for these people and I would still like to remind the Honourable Minister that the people in this area still breathe dust, they eat dust and they have to keep their windows closed to keep the dust out. I would like to see the government upgrade the highways and the market roads in these areas so that they will come very close to the good highways that some of the Ministers boasted they possess in their areas -- and especially since I spoke about Gimli, I would like to compare my own with that constituency, the famous constituency of Gimli where they do not eat dust, do not breathe dust. I would like to be able in a year's time to boast that Emerson constituency does not eat and breathe the dust anymore. There still is a lot of work to be done in southeastern Manitoba, not only in Emerson constituency but other parts, but I'm sure that there are members here who will speak for other parts of southeastern Manitoba, when they get up.

I would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Minister to the Morden-Sprague. We know, and the Honourable Minister is aware I'm sure, that this is a very very important road not only for the citizens there but for thousands and thousands of tourists who come into Manitoba from southeastern United States, or northeastern United States. I'm sure that the Minister is aware that in Ontario in June there will be an official opening of the Atikokan highway which runs somehow in the same direction as does the Morden-Sprague in the Province of Manitoba. The Atikokan highway will be completed this year. We'll have a good highway from the number one, from Atikokan all the way through to the corner of Manitoba via some of the American highways. Now it would be just natural to extend this highway along the border nine miles, or nine or ten miles, because it does parallel nine or ten miles just north of the United States border, all the way through Manitoba. Naturally west of 75 it is already completed but it is just this

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) short part there, a matter of about 58 miles, which is not black surface. And it is an important road. It connects No. 89 and No. 12 then it runs through Vita connecting with No. 59 and on to the No. 75. It is a very, very important road as far as tourist traffic is concerned and especially in view of the fact that the Atikokan road is now finished I am sure that this would be of very very great benefit to Manitoba as a whole.

I would like to say, also, that I am fairly disappointed that the Minister didn't see fit to accept the Mississippi Parkway as it was originally proposed and as we all know I've brought this up every year. The Americans at that time were willing to spend millions of dollars in Manitoba to open up the northwest angle territory that -- I said 'were', I see the Minister is shaking his head -- Yes, they were willing to spend that much money to open up that northwest angle. I know that last year, and I still believe that it is due to insufficient pressure from this side that that was shelved, whatever you call it, for another two years - that will be one year hence from now - but I would have liked to see that highway go north, the Mississippi Parkway. I think it would have cost us very very little money to open up part of southeastern Manitoba going north from -- north of Sprague.

There is something that I would like to boast about right now. The people in my constituency can't come in here and boast themselves and I don't think that I have ever seen it in the press at any time, but I think it is worthwhile that the members hear of this, because I believe this is a "first" in the Province of Manitoba. If I am wrong the Minister may correct me later. I think it is a "first" - and I am referring to the little town which is not incorporated yet, may refer it to a village, big enough for a town, I presume, of Vita. It is situated in a disorganized local government district. It used to be a municipality but it is disorganized. I think it is the very first village who has grouped, the people of which have grouped together through the local school district with a request to have all the streets in this village paved. I think the Minister is aware of that. The cost of this project will be something in the neighborhood of \$25,000.00. It involves at least 9,500 lineal feet of streets and cross streets in this village, and I believe this is the very first village in a disorganized area who undertook such a program. I think it's a wonderful program. These people at least in the village will not have to eat any more dust. True, we know that in the local government district disorganized the people only have to pay half of the cost, because any project of public works and so on, even drainage, excluding the main drains, the government subsidize by 50 percent of the total cost. I mentioned just about two miles of streets which are going to be paved in this area, but they feel and they have the permission from the Public Works that if there's any money left from that \$25,000, which they believe will be left, because the soil there is such that adapts itself very easily to construction and black surfacing, that they'll be able to pave a few hundred additional feet in this area.

Now, having said this, I have a plea to make with the Honourable Minister, and I am sure that the Honourable Minister -- well I shouldn't say "sure" -- I'll say "should" agree with me in this respect. At Vita, they're paving the streets on both sides of the Morden-Sprague on the south side and the west side. Then that leaves the Morden-Sprague, for which there's no appropriation, it's not even managed, because it is 100 percent government road - it leaves this road unpaved, running right through the middle of Vita. And my plea is this, that since the people of this village were good enough to sacrifice of themselves a little, I think that it would be just fair that when this is undertaken that the government pave the street at least, I would say, half a mile on the east side and half a mile on the west side of Vita, so that they would be assured of dust free roads travelling at least in the Town of Vita, because what use is there paving the streets and having them dust free when you have the main artery running through, the government road, which may cause dust. True, the government in the past has kept these roads salted down, but it only lasts about a year. If it happens to be very dry even that very first year there's a certain amount of dust that is raised by vehicles going through this area; but at the best it lasts for a year - next year the same thing has to be done again. And another matter that I'd like to bring to the - course, he probably knows that - to the Honourable Minister, is that this kind of surfacing or salting as you may call it - calcium - does not keep the road smooth. It doesn't take very long, just say a month or two months and holes shell out and then make very rough driving, and when it shells out it does get to the dry dust, the dust is raised. So I would like the Honourable Minister to take heed of this and see if something could not be done to have the streets through Vita paved.

And I'd like to make another suggestion here. As far as the rest of the towns in Manitoba in a similar position - I mean where the government road runs through - and it still has not been paved, to me it seems that it is a waste of money to keep salting it down. It does do a

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) little good, but it's just temporary, and if you have to keep on doing it every year - it seems to me that in the long run if the government was to pave the section of such highways or main market roads that run through villages, pave them and it would be permanent - the government would not have to spend so much hundred or thousands of dollars every year or every second year or every so many months. I would suggest that the government look into the advisability of paving through all these towns. It could be a very good start on these main market roads that the government has taken over, a very good start to show the people that they're getting something for their tax dollar, because in the past it's only been salted.

Now I would like to come back to the Morden-Sprague. I mentioned before, and I hope now that since we have the 59 treated, we have the 12 treated to the boundary, I seem to be in a very happy position that from now on I will only, I'll have to come here -- my constituency is only 18 miles wide and some 112 long, therefore there is only one road, a most important road, and it's running the full length, almost the full length of the constituency, and that's the Morden-Sprague road. It'll be very much easier for me now as far as highways are concerned when I make a request to the Minister I'll be only asking him for one road, and that is the Morden-Sprague, because that's the road which is uppermost, of greatest importance in our area at the present time, and also for many, many people living farther east. You have the Moose Lake, which has I think something in the neighborhood of 150 cottages, and many people from the west, say across the 75, west of 75, have cottages there - they're very interested in this road. It's an important road as far as forest products are concerned. A lot of lumber is being bought there. And another reason why this road is considered very important by Franklin municipality is that it is the source of supply of a lot of gravel that has to be moved east and west on the Morden-Sprague to reach the flat lands farther west across the 75. So in my opinion and in the opinion of the constituents of Emerson this road is of very, very great importance.

I noticed that on this program the Minister has released there's no appropriation, or no mention has been made I should say, about main market roads which the government took over this spring - the connector roads. I hope that the Minister will explain this during the course of the estimates, because I cannot believe, and I do not believe, that this means that nothing will be done on these main market roads, because as I did make an answer to one of the honourable gentlemen before who asked me about this, I said that if nothing is done this year and the \$10,000 has already been withheld by the government from the special grant to the municipalities, and on top of that if nothing is being done in say certain municipalities, then it would be a great loss to the municipality. But I am sure, I hope, that the Minister will have something more to add on to this and I hope that he'll be able to announce that further construction will be undertaken during 1965 on these connector roads or the main market roads which the government has constructed.

I think at the present time - oh, there's one more I'd like to mention, to bring to the attention of the Minister -- and that also has some connection with the flood that was forecast at Emerson. Thank goodness, it didn't materialize to the extent the government predicted. It's a very good thing. At this time I would like to say that the weather did co-operate with the people and they're very happy that the flood was not as serious in Emerson as was first predicted. Course, a lot of these residents here say that this occurs quite often. They had something similar in '52; they had something similar in '56 - maybe a little higher this year; and now again in '65. We like to refer to it as high water. But every year when there's high water, the newly accepted highway -- accepted by the government, full responsibility, the connecting road between Dominion City and Emerson - the first mile and a half is inundated almost every year. There's a bridge there and there's a part that runs through the golf course and the water was not even as high as this year, but in '52 it was inundated; in '56 it was inundated; and I think it is high time that this section of the road - it doesn't require too much - a bridge would have to be lifted and a section, say about a quarter of a mile should be lifted at least five feet. So that when an emergency arises - the central or the Civil Defence Office is located in Emerson, but during a time, even during the high water in Emerson last week, if they wanted to do something three quarters of a mile away, east of Emerson, if there was an emergency there, anybody or the officials of the Civil Defence would have to travel, instead of going a mile and a half or a three-mile return trip, they'd have to make a 60-mile return trip, would have to go through Letellier and all the way around to pick up sick people or people affected by whatever disaster there was to bring them into the centre there. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister that in case of an emergency like this, the Civil Defence who did a

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) wonderful job this spring, that the Civil Defence cannot function properly on account of this flooding or inundation of the existing highway. They've asked for that many years, many, many times, but nothing seems to have been done. I would like the Minister to check into this because - I think the Minister will get a report from the Civil Defence and probably from some other departments who were represented there. I am sure that the request will be similar to what I am requesting at the present time. I hope the Minister takes a look at that and I hope that I'll be able to make a better report a year hence.

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

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I'll only be a minute or two under the Minister's salary, because I don't expect to ask any questions during the consideration of each item for the reason is that I'm not feeling well and I don't know when I'll be absent.

In the first place of course, the situation of the door is already settled. I've got to have somebody to open the door for me every time, and I was very happy and honoured that the Premier of the Province was just ahead of me and he opened the door for me. So this is already settled, and I'm glad of it, so I'm not going to discuss it any more.

MR. PAULLEY: Is he going to be there all the time?

MR. GRAY: Who?

MR. PAULLEY: The Premier.

MR. GRAY: As far as the pink page is concerned, my constituency did not instruct me where the roads ought to be built. They have their pavements; they're quite satisfied. Rather than express an opinion on this which I have no interest whatsoever except the interests of the people of the province, I leave it for the members in the rural districts to fight it out and I'll enjoy the fight.

Now as far as the repairs of all the buildings which you have in your proposed estimates, are they being done by the department or you got to have special contracts and special estimates or hire somebody to do it. That's a very important question because the Minister of Public Works deals with so many buildings and they need repairs and they need rebuilding and improvement and make it more modern all the time. I am very anxious to learn whether he has his own staff with the exception of certain things to do this repair work. This is quite an item and I'd like to have the information on this.

Now we have on the estimates of the garage "less so much money". Where does the less come in, are the employees paying rent for their own parking cars or are they getting it from the Federal Government or from some other charitable organization. I'd like to have this if possible.

Now finally is this. I mention this every year. We still have in this city the so-called Hudson Bay district although it becomes less every year, but there's still a big population around this Parliament Building and the fountains and all on the corner here that cannot afford the bus fare to go to the city parks. They cannot afford the price of going to the summer resorts. The only thing they can do is go to the nearest park, or like the grounds around this building, and every year I urge that more benches be constructed or placed during the two summer months while the children are out of school and the parents also. In the evening, if they come here in the evening - and I suppose you are here all the time, the Minister is here all the time - they find quite a number of people around the grounds trying to get a little bit sunshine and fresh air and I see them lying on the grass which is not comfortable. On the other hand, I think it'll be cheaper for the department to have benches rather than have the grass being repaired and adjusted every day.

Of course the plan should be given in my opinion, whether it's done now or 25 years from now, to have a lower entrance to this building. We're all getting older and it's pretty difficult to climb the stairs. The building was put up in 1915 I believe, fifty years ago, and only this year, or last year they put up the rails which is very very handy and a great addition to climbing the stairs, but at the same time this building, I believe - and I hope it'll stay another several hundred years and carry on with our democratic principles and free country for many years - I think perhaps plans in the future should be made - - our architects could probably suggest or find a way of entering this building and not to have to climb all these stairs either on one side or the other side.

This is just one or two remarks, first of all in order to be on record that I have spoken on these estimates; and secondly, I'd like to have a reply if at all possible, if it's worthwhile, to these questions.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works and my neighbour Member from Minnedosa for the fairly healthy program for my area as set out in the yellow pages that are before us. Of course some of the work, I was told a year ago, would appear this year -- to have patience -- and that is in regard to Highway No. 5 and the 11.4 miles from Neepawa to Eden. I see they are going to proceed with grade widening base and bituminous pavement on it this year. Of course this will necessitate setting up the machinery in the immediate area to do the work and I understand that that is the reason that the Town of Neepawa -- the Mayor and the Council are planning on such a huge program in the immediate town, because it is hoped that the work will cost them much less by reason of the fact that the machinery will be in the area, and I think this is real good policy.

I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the connector road or the provincial road from Cartwright to Neepawa - I think it's even called that -- no -- Cartwright-Carberry Road is given a provincial number of 258 according to the yellow sheets that are before us and I think that is repeated on the map. Now for ten years at least, I believe, Mr. Chairman, there has been in existence what we know as a Highway 28 Association and it has been working for that number of years, for at least ten years to have this road put through, that is from Neepawa to Cartwright, and the purpose of calling it 28 is that it connects with Highway 28 in United States and I believe that U. S. Highway No. 28 extends from Cartwright to the Gulf of Mexico, and so the association felt that it would be a promotional idea for the Chambers of Commerce in this province to say just take Highway 28 and stay on it from Neepawa to the Gulf of Mexico if you're going that far. So I wonder if my honourable friend might have a comment to make in regard to that, or was there any particular reason for calling it the provincial road No. 258. I notice that there are two sections of this particular highway that are included in the yellow sheets that are before us and I want to thank my honourable friend for the continued work on this particular section of road.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed in a very recent issue of the Financial Post that Manitoba seems to be about the only province that this year does not intend to use all of the revenues resulting from the sale of gasoline, that is the gasoline tax, the drivers' licences, the other revenues, licence plates and so on, is not being spent on the roads. This article in the Financial Post lists the ten provinces showing the revenue from motor vehicle charges, that is the column that it is headed under - the revenues - and I would like to read them because it's rather interesting.

The revenue for motor vehicle charges in Newfoundland is 12.1 and they expect to spend 19.6 million on roads. Prince Edward Island, the revenue 4 million and they expect to spend 5.8. Nova Scotia, 27.3 and they intend to spend 31.7 million. New Brunswick, 22.7 and they intend to spend 26.5. Quebec apparently is the one exception here. They expect to collect 202 million and spend 187.3 million. Ontario, 276.9 million and they're going to spend exactly that, right down to the cent according to this. Manitoba expects to collect 35.6 million and spend 26.3; Saskatchewan, 39.1, spend 29.4; Alberta, 53.1, spending 60 million; British Columbia, 67, and spending 67. They are the other exception. They're spending exactly dollar for dollar. Well now this is for 1964 and then their '65 -- it is smaller for '65. These are estimated I suppose taken from the estimates of the various provinces.

Now I know that the revenues so far as Manitoba are concerned will likely be fairly substantial because we had a 25 percent increase in all of our licence fees and driver's licence, and then about a year ago a very substantial increase in the tax on gasoline. I wonder if my honourable friend could explain this situation because I always thought that in years gone by that the government argued that they were spending far more than the revenue received in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, I am rather disappointed in the absence of a program in the yellow sheets, and I refer to Highway No. 34 from Gladstone south -- from Gladstone south. When my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I attended the first anniversary of the auction mart there, I think that they tried to impress upon him that day, and probably prior to that day and since, the importance of having Highway 34 in a lot better condition than it presently is and certainly was at that time. In fact, I received a resolution and no doubt the government did in this regard. I think it's generally recognized that the success of the Gladstone Auction Mart has been excellent and there's a number of reasons for that, but the committee in charge, and certainly the Chamber of Commerce and the Mayor there, felt that they were missing a lot of business in the area because of the poor condition of No. 34.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)

Now back in 1958 in the good old days when we were able to get traffic counts, I got the traffic counts on this particular highway because I wanted to find out what the traffic was south of No. 1 on 34 and north of No. 1 on 34 to see whether there was really much change or whether the cars that entered No. 34 south or north continued through on 34, and to prove how interesting the traffic counts are, there was little or no change in the pattern of traffic on 34. One mile south -- this letter is dated September 18, 1958. No doubt the traffic has increased two-fold since that time and if it has this is all the more reason that they should be doing some work on 34. One mile south of the junction of 4 and 34 the daily traffic count was 280, and one mile south of PTH No. 1, Trans-Canada and 34, it was 287, so it looked like they were going right through on it. I have four or five different counts and the one is 280, 257, 287, 279, so it looks like there is just as much traffic at one end as the other. So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see some work, further work done on 34 as quickly as money will permit, and according to this Financial Post article the money is now available. It isn't all being spent according to this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Emerson, I believe, and probably one or two other members touched very briefly on the connector roads or the provincial roads. I suppose they're one and the same thing in effect, and I too would like to ask a couple of questions. The first one would simply be this. In consideration of the proposed work to be done in connection with connector roads or provincial roads, does this in effect mean that all grants on -- what do they call it -- secondary roads in the municipality will be discontinued completely, because if it does, I'm afraid that some of the municipal men are not going to be very happy.

I understand that in the past, going back some number of years, that the government had made a contribution of about 75 percent on what they called market roads, or main market roads I believe was the term that was used. Now if with the introduction of this connector road plan it means the end of provincial contributions to the main market roads, then, as I said, I question the dollar value of this. For instance, I have from the R.M. of Lansdowne a letter dated November 20th, and I asked them a question and I asked three or four or five other municipalities the same question, the number of miles of main market roads in the municipality and the number of miles as proposed connector roads.

I find that in the R.M. of Lansdowne, if my figures are correct and if their figures are correct and if I am interpreting their letter correctly, they had 170.5 miles of main--(Interjection)--R.M. of Lansdowne -- they did have 170.5 miles of main market and municipal roads and so on, apparently on which they were receiving grants in the past, and they now have, I believe in total, 54 miles of connector roads or provincial roads, whatever term you want to imply. Well if they were receiving 75 percent on 170 miles and now they are going to receive 100 percent on 54 miles and nothing on the balance, then it doesn't take a very sharp pencil to figure out that they are not going to be in as good shape.

I believe that the R.M. of Langford -- incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I see my honourable friend apparently has the same figures. I don't know whether mine agree with him or not --(Interjection)--they don't agree? Well I'll be interested in hearing his list. The R.M. of Langford -- "This is to advise you that the R.M. of Langford has 92 miles of government-grant roads." They use a different term. "The province proposes to take over 20 of these miles and to be responsible for them." The municipality will be responsible for the balance according to them. Probably my honourable friend has some answers and this is why I'm asking them. Well once again, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't take a very sharp pencil to figure out dollar-wise where you're going to be in this one.

The R.M. of Rosedale -- our honourable friend the Member for Brokenhead can check this one out. "This is to advise you that the R.M. of Rosedale has 95-1/2 miles of government-grant roads." You'll notice, Mr. Chairman, they call them government-grant roads too. "The province proposed to take over 39 miles and the balance" -- leave the balance of 56-1/2 miles with the R.M. responsible. Right on the nose, he says, that time. And so on.

Well I think I've read enough, Mr. Chairman, to point up that if I was the Reeve of any one of these municipalities I would wonder dollar-wise where I was going. I think another clear indication that the municipal men themselves don't really know where they're going is that I haven't seen too many big headlines in local papers -- and you know I read quite a few of them -- but I haven't seen too many headlines where it is reported that a municipality has slashed the mill rate -- has slashed the mill rate because of the implementation of some of the

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). programs. I know -- I know that the Michener Commission rather thought that this would happen. In fact I believe that they said that, that they thought that all of these recommendations would result in a reduction in the mill rate. Well it hasn't happened this year but it may happen next year, and I'd be interested to hear what my honourable friend has to say in this regard.

I dropped in to a municipal office a hundred miles from Neepawa the other day - certainly not in my constituency - I think it's in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin. I never met the Reeve in my life before, I don't know his name at the moment but he apparently knew who I was, and I questioned him on this, as to what his attitude was in regard to the new connector road program - I think that's what the government prefer to call it - and he said, "You know, on reflection," he said, "I don't think we got such a good deal." He said, "It sounded pretty good the way they told this to the municipal men when they met."

Mr. Chairman, I don't suppose you know, but the government front benchers and some of the middle benchers met with the municipal men all over the province to tell them about this program--(Interjection)--Well my honourable friend, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead questions the middle benchers part of my statement. Just by reason of the fact that my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works sits in the middle benches, I thought I should include him because I believe that he was one of the men that was present at one or more of those meetings.

But, Mr. Chairman, when they did meet, I believe that they gave every municipal council about an hour of their time, and I am told that it took about 55 minutes for the government to tell their side of the story, and then like a lot of politicians they said, "I'm sorry, there's only 5 minutes left, have you got one question?" Then it wasn't answered to the satisfaction of the members there present. And so--(Interjection)--my honourable friend the Member for Brokenhead and myself heard the same thing, so it's two against one up to now, Mr. Chairman. I was not present. --(Interjection)--Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain confirms what I said -- confirms what I said too, so there's three to one. Incidentally, when we're on this subject matter, "if Duff won't do it, the P. J. will," they tell me.

Now I understand that at the - I still have one of his calling cards and perhaps -- I was going to tell you about it but that would be deviating a little bit from the estimates and--(Interjection)--go ahead, he says. Well, all right. Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I will go ahead. I think we might as well hear about it because it is a little interesting side-light.

MR. CHAIRMAN: the estimates, please.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I got an invitation from the Attorney-General to tell this little story and it won't take me a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please keep it to the estimates, please.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Okay. Well it's quite evident that the other members know about this little calling card anyway, but all it said was: "If Duff won't do it, P. J. will." So, Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps it would be to the benefit of the members on this side of the House if my honourable friend the Minister would now proceed to answer some of the questions that we have put to him.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't suppose it would hurt to stretch out the parade of speakers just a little bit more. I listened with interest to the Honourable Minister introduce the estimates yesterday, and perhaps was even more interested in the case made by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains when he pointed out -- and I believe that these figures are important and should be refuted if they can be -- as the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains pointed out yesterday that in the four-year period 1955-58 inclusive, that there were 880 miles of provincial road constructed and graded and 800 miles of pavement laid, as compared to the four-year period 1961-64 under this government when 680 miles of provincial highways were constructed and 680 miles of pavement laid.

Now why do I think it's so important, Mr. Chairman. You could say, well more road was constructed in the late 50's than in the early 60's, so what? The point is, however, something that should be considered because it's a case of the public being informed of the pace with which this province is constructing provincial highways and roads. This government has succeeded in leaving the impression that it is making great headway and strides in extending the number of miles of provincial trunk highways. It has created a favourable public image in this respect, so much so that even I as a member of the Opposition was of the opinion that this government in fact had a very good record in terms of provincial highway construction. But

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). then when we see that according to the figures of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains that this is not the case at all, that in a relative sense, comparing the early 60's to the late 50's, that this government is not really making such great progress and is not really extending the mileage and quality of Manitoba roads.

Therefore, I start with that point as my very first point. It is something that the Minister must either refute or else admit as being true. If the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains is by any chance in error with his figures, it may well be because it is indeed confusing to follow the estimates of the Department of Public Works and to keep accurate track of just how much is being expended in any one given construction year because of the practice of the government of carrying over.

Now this has been debated in previous years so obviously this year is no exception, because on Page 1973 of Hansard the Honourable the Minister of Public Works is saying that the current estimates of the department predict a requirement of almost 23 million, and then moves on two lines later to say that the net provincial capital expenditure is expected to be approximately 20 million; and then he goes on to say in the next sentence that estimates for contracts contemplated exceed 24 million; and then at the end of the paragraph he makes mention of a carry-over of approximately five million into the next fiscal year and a carry-forward from the last fiscal year to this one of four million.

So there's carry-over both from the past into the present and from the present into the future, and when one is finished with his computations, he is not really sure what is the net expenditure on highway construction in the given fiscal year, and what was it last year and what will it be next year and so on. It seems to me that this practice of carry-over while sometimes it's unavoidable because of unusual weather - unfavourable weather - nevertheless when this practice takes place year after year it seems to lend itself to manipulation, manipulation of road construction so as to get a lot built in crucial years. I needn't elaborate any further as to what years become crucial, but it seems to me that the closer we get to an election the more crucial highway construction becomes.

I don't know if the Honourable Minister thinks that these comments on my part are unkind, but I believe that there is some doubt and confusion coming to rest on this matter of carry-over.

Then, too, I say even I in the Opposition was impressed with what I thought to be this government's record in road construction, in a relative sense I mean, and when you look, not just at the expenditure figures but look in the newspapers at the Province of Manitoba's notice of intention to tender, or calling of tender, and you see those special ads placed in the Classified Section of the daily papers it looks pretty impressive, and there's quite a few of them. But what I didn't catch on to until relatively recently is that this government has been placing the same tender in the newspaper on several occasions, that a tender would appear specifying a certain portion of road to be built calling for tenders and then, for whatever reason, these tenders would not be taken up or the project would be held in abeyance or cancelled or whatever, and several months later those same tenders, or notice of tenders would appear in the newspaper having to do with the self-same, with the precise same stretch of road to be constructed. So you have this duplication showing up in the Classified Section of the newspaper which further goes to enhance this government's public image insofar as highway construction is concerned. All I'm trying to evoke from the Honourable Minister on this point is, is it really necessary to have carry-overs and is it necessary to have quite this much duplication in notices of calling of tenders.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I noticed that the Honourable Minister when he was introducing his estimates made mention of the relocation of Highway 59, the partial relocation of Highway 59 between the Trans Canada and PTH 4 east, and I'm not quite sure what he means here. Does he mean a sort of a major relocation of PTH 59 or is referring to the relocation on the east side of the floodway and then the building of the four lanes from south of Birds Hill to Nairn Avenue, or is he referring to a major relocation somewhere east of the floodway straight out to the Trans Canada, half-way to Transcona sort of thing. Is it that major a change?

Another point that caught my interest, Mr. Chairman, was when the Minister made mention of the province assuming the full cost of provincial roads and trunk highway and sidewalks in the built-up areas outside of Metropolitan Winnipeg. I presume that he means by this that the province will assume the cost of shoulder work, of paving aprons wherever paved aprons are necessary because of drainage in villages and so on. I know that some villages have asked for provincial aid in the past to pave the shoulders and the aprons between the highways proper

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) and the -- you might say the sidewalk area. I presume that the province now stands prepared to deal with this sort of request and this sort of problem.

I think at this point it's also timely to bring to the attention of the Minister a problem which may be one that is not often met with by him or his department, and that is the matter of lighting along provincial trunk highways. I know that under normal circumstances the Department of Highways feels that this question of lighting is a municipal responsibility and the cost for that should be borne by the municipality, but since it is a fact that the province, the Department of Highways has gone in for an awful lot of lighting on some of the new bridges and so on, it doesn't seem too unreasonable to request the province, or the department rather, to assume the cost of lighting where the provincial highway goes through a hamlet or a small village.

If it's a town, the town can handle it; but where it's a hamlet or a small village with a very small tax base, it seems a pretty reasonable request for the department to assume the cost of this, especially when you compare this request, to lay it alongside the cost it must be to the department to light some of the new bridges like the ones over 15 at the Symington Yards and at Lockport and so on. I get the impression every time I drive over 15, the new bridge there, that it's lit up like Coney Island - lights in gay profusion all over the place - and then you drive through a small hamlet or village and they are reluctant to increase the lighting because the cost of lighting itself is a major drain on their small grant budget. Hamlets shouldn't be left in darkness when bridges are lighted the way they are.

Most of the honourable members who have spoken so far have made mention of their own constituencies and asking about one important road and about the omission of another road which they think important and so on. I have no such request to make really. Maybe it's because the department has in almost all respects done a good job in road building in north-eastern Manitoba. I have no major complaints in that connection except that Henderson Highway, which is PTH 9, Winnipeg to Lockport, is - or at least the half of that stretch is still very tortuous and winding and narrow a highway.

The problem really has to do with the summer months on week-ends, and even on week-day evenings during the summer it is actually a very dangerous provincial trunk highway. It's not built up to trunk highway standards. It's narrow, winding, and to complicate matters, along this road there are quite a few market gardeners who choose to build stands and sell vegetables to the people driving up from the city on these short work-day evening trips. So that a narrow and winding road compounded with the fact that there are cars parking on the shoulder, etc., I would merely ask, not for a four lane perhaps but certainly for the straightening out of some of the more dangerous curves like Coffin's Corner and Deadman's Curve - they even have names for some of those curves on the highway - and the possibility of widening the shoulders in certain selected places and so on.

I'm not too well acquainted with the Department of Public Works or the Department of Highways procedures and so on so I don't really know what should be done, but it seems to me that in the interests of the highway safety and public safety that something should be done, in at least certain selected places, if the department feels it does not warrant a complete upgrading of that highway all the way from Hoddinott Road to Lockport. Perhaps it doesn't warrant a complete widening all the way, I don't know.

I would ask the Minister if he could tell us anything about if there has been any breakthrough in materials technology. It seems to me that this is fairly important to his department. It's also I think important not just for the sake of building provincial trunk highways but for the sake of improving local and municipal roads. I know that up until this year when we were under the old 60-40 and 75-25 system that some of the municipalities were interested in hard-surfacing certain village roads, but then they found that the department would not give approval unless the hard-surfacing were done on a real thorough basis with so and so much bituminous mat and so on in order for it to carry a substantial load. I don't blame the department for that. The Department of Public Works does not like to give approval and sink provincial funds into skimpy work. It likes to do a job of things while it's at it, but I know that the effect of this has been to discourage the rural municipalities and villages from even attempting to hard surface some of the residential streets in the villages and so on.

I can recall one case in particular where a delegation came in to talk cost ratios and so on and it was found that to meet public works standards the expenditure would have to be somewhere in the order of \$20,000 for a mile's work of hard-surfacing, and after one or two of the councillors fainted and had to be carried out, that's where the matter ended. But I was

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). wondering if the Minister could report even the slightest thing in terms of material technology or material breakthrough. Is there some cold-mix process, anything to give a hard surface to the street at a very low cost even if it doesn't make that road suitable for carrying heavy traffic.

Years ago people could accept dusty gravel roads because they were used to no roads at all or trails, but now it's becoming just a recurrent continuous headache in many parts of rural Manitoba, particularly in the villages. People just are getting fed up with dust and there are more cars being owned -- I don't know the exact figures but one can make a reasonable guess as to how many cars per thousand these days in Canada. The ownership of automobiles has gone up so much that almost everyone has a car now which means more traffic on these gravel streets. I know that sooner or later -- sooner or later we're going to have to try and derive a policy where we can at least hard-surface or make dust-free village streets. Wherever there is any build-up of population at all, we'll have to do this.

Now the Honourable Member for Emerson made mention of one village in his constituency and he said that up until now the Department of Public Works has been putting salt on - I presume he meant calcium chloride - in order to keep the dust down, and he thought that this was a waste of money and didn't really solve the problem. Again I don't know enough of the problem, I don't know enough of the technology if you like behind this, but I too am not very impressed with this calcium chloride treatment business except that I would have to say that it is better than no calcium chloride at all.

Which reminds me, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister of Public Works did give an undertaking some time ago to keep the Henderson Highway north of Lockport - it's been relocated slightly - to keep it dust-free as is possible pending such a time as the department would be able to make it permanently dust-free. I am not suggesting that the Minister gave any definite commitment there as to hard-surfacing or anything, but a commitment was given to keep this road dust-free.

Now then, since that time it's true that calcium chloride has been applied pretty regularly and pretty faithfully, but because it's calcium chloride and because of rain and so on, it's been still unsatisfactory in many ways. So I would hope that the Minister and the department does not depend too heavily on calcium chloride as a solution to this problem of dust-free provincial roads and highways.

This becomes particularly important now that the government has taken over many of our former municipal market roads. In fact I would ask the Minister, now that these hundreds of miles of main market roads have been taken over as provincial roads, now what? What does this mean, this policy of take-over? I hope it means more than simply re-designating these roads and putting up a marker with a sign Manitoba 202 or 204 or 217, because if that is all that is going to be done in the next few years, there really wouldn't have been much point in making this policy change.

The Member for Gladstone suggested that maybe the municipalities didn't get such a good deal after all in this change in policy whereby the government takes over certain designated main market roads as provincial roads and leaves all the others, all the rest of the main market roads and lets it revert back 100 percent to the municipalities.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone was allowed the privilege of quoting some figures in some municipalities and I would like to do the same, just a couple to get somewhat of a picture on the record. For example, the municipality of Brokenhead, which is a compact municipality, had 124 miles of main market roads as of last year, of which 26 miles are being taken over as provincial roads now, leaving roughly 98 miles of main market road relapsing or reverting back 100 percent on the municipality's shoulders. In other words, the province has taken over 20 percent of the municipality's main market roads and let the other 80 percent revert back, where now the municipality will be 100 percent responsible for them and for the bridges, if there are bridges, and that can be pretty costly to a small rural municipality.

Now I know you can't have it both ways. In some ways the taking over of these roads by the province into an integrated grid system is a good idea, but I know -- well I shouldn't say that I know, but I'm quite sure that the municipalities are going to be pretty hard pressed in the next few years when they find themselves having to cope all by themselves with all of this road mileage that was formerly 60 percent provincial. The 60-40 sharing basis has now been wiped out, and the secondary roads that were 75-25 - not many municipalities had those - but wherever they existed they've either been taken over or else they've been allowed to revert back and the municipality is now completely responsible for them. What does it mean in dollars

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) and cents? I have tried to get cost estimates from the municipalities that I was concerned with. I haven't been able to do so. All I've been able to get is opinion, and the opinion is much as was suggested by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The opinion is not one that is favourable to the change-over.

And then I was just referring to municipal market roads, Mr. Chairman. Don't forget that every rural municipality has in addition to its hundred miles or so of main market roads, it has several hundred additional miles of local municipal roads. To that you must add now those roads that are being allowed to revert back to the municipality a hundred percent, and I can foresee municipal councils really saddled with the kind of road maintenance problems that they are not really in a position to cope with and that's what many of them are afraid of. However, rather than be too critical at this time I suppose we can wait and see how things work out.

But I know this, that the province did not give, did not give the municipalities quite enough time for negotiation and investigation. It is, according to my understanding, almost as bad as the Honourable Member for Gladstone said, that the provincial government officials told the municipal officials in each centre, they told them for 55 minutes and then for the last 5 minutes they asked. Fifty-five minutes of telling and five minutes of asking - 11 to 1 ratio. Therefore, if municipalities are dissatisfied, this government is not in a position to say "well why didn't you object then," because they never really were given adequate opportunity for investigation analysis and for objections.

Mr. Chairman, before I take my place I want to mention just one or two matters that have to do with procedures followed in the Department of Public Works. Of course I must say right at the outset that this is a big department doing a lot of work, maybe not as much work as I thought it was doing but still a lot of work nevertheless, and it would be surprising if everything worked smoothly and according to clockwork. But I would like to ask the Minister how it could be possible, just how could it be possible for road contractors who have a contract by tender with the department, how it could be possible for them to be allowed to enter on to private property, days, several days before that property was acquired.

Now this has happened on at least two occasions and for all I know may have happened on more occasions. You could say, well it's not really that important, the negotiations were in process, the department was in the process of acquiring that land and it was just a matter of time before they would acquire it, the owners knew that the department wanted the land and so on, so that it was not a clear and precise case of trespassing. Yet the fact of the matter is that on at least two occasions that I know of, the contractors went on to this property several days before the expropriation notices were sent, and mind you, since then - that's been months - and since then negotiations are still going on. The land has not yet been settled, but at least it was vested in the Crown after the expropriation notices were sent these people, but I'm saying that the contractors went on this land even before these expropriation notices were sent out. Now how could this be? It may not be the fault of the department at all. It may be that it was entirely the fault of an overly-impatient contractor, in which case the department has no blame to come to rest on its shoulders. But what does the department do or say in a case like that when it does find out?

Finally, I would like to put to the Minister a question which he may consider to be of small importance, more of an annoyance than anything else, and that is, the department has been instrumental in having a regulation placed on the books requiring people who want to construct homes along trunk highways, requiring them to build their homes or buildings a certain set number of feet back. All right, this might be perfectly justifiable in order to avoid clutter and so on and in order to expedite future expansion and so on, but what happens when people who have obeyed and lived up to that requirement find later that they are being expropriated by the department, by the Crown, and the Crown or the department runs another lane of highway, this time closer to the house and so on, and it leaves the people, the home owner, with a structure that is, where once it was 150 feet from the highway, after the new road has been pushed through or the service road or whatever you want to call it, it leaves the structure only 15 or 20 feet away. I've seen that happen, Mr. Chairman, where a structure once built according to the requirements of the regulation, 150 feet back at least, when the department got through with building a service road and a bit of a cloverleaf effect, the house was in the order of 15 feet from that road.

Now I know that the department in such a case would try to make compensation payment for all this with a certain amount of devaluation involved and so on. Now this is all right, but

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)..... it seems to me that the department is obligated even more than that. It seems to me that the department is obligated to move that house back if there is property or room left to move it back on, and if there is the department should move it. I don't want to mention names because for all I know one or two cases like that are pending right now. It's not the specific cases that are important, it's the principle whether or not an agency or department of the Crown should live up to the same regulations that it imposes or expect the citizenry to live up to.

With those questions, Mr. Chairman, I will take my place to hear what the Minister has to say, and probably will have some questions later on.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I note that the Minister has had many questions fired at him and it will take him considerable time, I'm sure, to answer all of the questions. While normally I would have asked my particular questions under the various sections, it seems to me that the waterfront for public works roads has been fairly well covered and it also may be, Mr. Chairman, that I won't have an opportunity this evening. I may not be here because of another event that's taking place in Winnipeg -- Tommy is coming -- I must go and greet him, and it may be that after the Minister has answered all of the questions that the accounts of the department will pass so rapidly that I wouldn't have an opportunity. So I do want to ask my honourable friend the Minister one or two questions, and if I'm not present when he answers them then I'm sure to find them in Hansard.

May I first of all, Mr. Chairman, say to the Minister that I appreciate his difficulties and the troubles that he has because I don't think that there's another department in the government that so many requests are made of a particular individual than his. Also, Mr. Chairman, may I at the outset admonish my colleague from Brokenhead for his reference to the overpass on Highway 15. I appreciate the fact that it is lit up like a Christmas tree, if that was the term that he used, and I would suggest to him that if he travelled it as often as I do, about 4 times a day -- although of course the lights aren't on all day long -- he will realize or would appreciate fully why the lights are there. Because of the present construction of the overpass, the two-lane highway coming over the bridge ends up into a one-lane at the present time at Burnsway Avenue in St. Boniface, and I'm sure that the Minister is aware of this condition. So we certainly don't want the Minister to take the lights off of the overpass on Highway 15 and take them out into Brokenhead. I would suggest that maybe additional lights are required at Brokenhead, but please don't take those, Mr. Minister, away from Highway No. 15.

One question I want to ask specifically of the Minister is what consideration, if any, is being given to the construction of a subway or overpass on Nairn Avenue where the CPR main line crosses. From time to time the residents in the area and the residents in my City of Transcona have lengthy blockages of traffic due to the situation there, and for many years requests have been made to this government and the one which preceded it, and also the City of Winnipeg and Metro, for the construction of a subway at this particular point. I'm sure the Minister will appreciate the fears that many people have respecting possible large fires or possible emergency cases to hospital, because this is the avenue by which most of the people or many of the people in Transcona use to get to hospitals, particularly Concordia Hospital, and also the people in the east part of Elmwood generally come down Nairn and use the underpass -- or would use an underpass if there were one.

From time to time we hear candidates for election in the City of Winnipeg and the City of Transcona and also Metro saying that they're all for a subway. I've also heard that Metro has made direct representation to the government for the construction of a subway at this juncture and I would like the Minister to kindly clear this up for my benefit and for the benefit of the other people who are concerned. I would like to know from the Minister what, if any, representations have been made from Metro council respecting this particular subway and the need for one.

Most of the members who have spoken so far, Mr. Chairman, have discussed various roads in their municipalities. I want to ask the Minister about one road that is not in my constituency, and I think that I can act at this particular time on behalf of the Honourable Member for Springfield. For years, many people in Springfield constituency and in the City of Transcona and other areas have been requesting the completion of Highway 15 so that it would link up with Highway 4 east at or near Rennie. This matter was discussed a year or so ago, if memory serves me correctly, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what happened to the Honourable Member for Springfield, whether his powers of persuasion are not too great with the Minister, but I do note the grave omission, in my opinion, of any further construction listed in the program

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) of the department for the extension of Highway No. 15. I might say, too, that a considerable number of people, I am informed, are buying small holdings further and further east and will be using this road more and more.

One other specific matter I wish to raise with the Minister, and in this case, Mr. Chairman, it concerns also the Department of Agriculture; I'm sure the Minister by his smile knows what I now am going to talk about, and that is provision on St. Anne's Road south due to the construction of the floodway. St. Anne's Road south serves a considerable number of people both in the immediate vicinity and also is used by a number of people -- I haven't any actual road count but maybe the Minister has one in his back pocket as to the use of St. Anne's Road south -- but a number of people coming in from the southern part of the province have been using St. Anne's Road as a cut-across into St. Boniface and other adjacent areas.

Now it's my understanding at one time there had been some consideration given either by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Public Works, that in the construction of the floodway provision would be made for crossing of the floodway during low water levels. I'm informed that such is not the case at the present time, and while I think that I'm correct in saying that the particular section of the floodway at the south end of St. Anne's Road will not be built for a year or two, word has already got around that there will not be any provision for a crossing of the floodway.

I don't think that I need to say to the Minister though that information also has been given to the effect that the department, either the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Public Works is going to have to make provision on both sides of the floodway for access onto Highway No. 59 due to the cut-off at the floodway on St. Anne's Road. This of course will entail a considerable expense in purchasing of land, the construction of the link between St. Anne's Road and Highway 59. We had a meeting with the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture some time back concerning this matter and the question of economics arose as to the cost of the provision of linkage roads as I just mentioned and the cost of a bridge, and I might say that I appreciate very very much that the government takes a look at economics now and again.

However, having said that, due to the expanding traffic coming in from the south down Highway 59, and as I say that this is a more direct link using St. Anne's Road, I think that the government should look at this matter on a more long range basis than it appears that they are at the present time. It has been suggested to me, as it was to the delegation, that there will be at some time a possible construction of an overpass or traffic interchange at the corner of 59 and No. 1 East.

I would like however, Mr. Chairman, to draw to the attention of the Minister that there is a large development going to take place adjacent to Highway No. 1 East on the old Speers Farm as they call it. There's going to be a development there, it has been announced by Mayor Guay of St. Boniface, somewhere in the neighbour of \$30 million. I think that this will aggravate the situation at the corner of 59 and No. 1 East and it may be that the government will find that a less costly in the long run solution would be the building of an overpass over the floodway on St. Anne's Road coupled with the broadening of Highway 59, because according to information that I have received, the State of Minnesota have plans for the not too distant future for the construction of -- or indeed I believe in some cases are proceeding at the present time with construction of a four-lane highway to join on to 59 in south Manitoba. This, if it comes about will, I'm sure, aggravate the situation.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that according to the timetable that I've had information of, that the floodway construction will not take place within the current year but possibly next year, and I ask the Minister of Public Works, will he talk to his colleague the Minister of Agriculture and take another look at this whole question as to the advisability of a crossing of the floodway at St. Anne's Road or, in the alternative, to reconsider what I thought was a former -- well former consideration of a low water crossing of the floodway.

I understand that from an engineering viewpoint there are two approaches to the construction of low water -- what I'm referring to is low water crossings of the floodway. This is appreciated, but I also understand from some engineers that such crossings are feasible and wouldn't present too much difficulty if constructed. So I ask the Honourable the Minister if he would take that into consideration with his colleague.

One other question I want to ask of the Minister, Mr. Chairman, deals with the questions of wage increases for the employees of the Public Works Department and in particular those employees who are working here around the building, the grounds of the buildings. It is my understanding, and the Minister I'm sure is in a position to correct me if I'm wrong, that these

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd), employees are not covered by the general wage increase awarded to the civil service. I'm told that they have not had comparable increases in the past. As a matter of fact, one bit of information was to the degree that there has been no increase for the last three years. I would like the Minister to consider this if in fact it is so and to grant to the employees - and I believe that they're on an hourly basis although I'm not positive of that - at least comparable increases with the rest of the civil service.

Now as I said at the offset, Mr. Chairman, normally I would deal with these points as we came to the item, but for reasons that I've suggested I may not have the opportunity. These are the only questions actually that I have at the present time and I know that the Minister will be able to give the answers not only to my questions but those that are being suggested by other honourable members as well.

Just one final point. I am concerned with the situation insofar as the overpass is concerned where there is the funnelling of traffic at the base of the bridge itself, particularly the west end of the overpass. Rumour has it that there are plans for future development in the general area and at that time maybe the construction of the overpass will be altered to accommodate future construction if such indeed takes place--(Interjection)--I say rumours have it that there will be additional construction undertaken shortly in respect of the area at the foot of the overpass on Highway 15 at Burnsway Avenue. This is where the funnelling of the two-way traffic takes place into a single lane, and this was the reason I said we need the lights there to make us aware of the fact, but I say that maybe the situation will be remedied. If the rumours that I have been told of construction of a highway or some new roads down on Burnsway there take place, this may solve that particular problem. So I wish the Minister all the luck in the world. I'm sure every member of the Assembly, with the possible exception of the Member for Radisson, will be satisfied with his answers.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, one specific question that I omitted to put to the Minister, that is now with the inception of the provincial road program, that is the provincial roads, what happens to the access roads program? Is it just going to be terminated or will it be continued on a somewhat reduced and limited basis? I am of the opinion that the provincial road program is not really a replacement, it doesn't replace the access road program need, because the access roads were to be of a standard comparable to the standard of the highway that they were giving access to. Now that the provincial roads are coming in they will be no doubt not of a comparable standard with the highways, and so many of these villages that have waited until now for access roads will be sort of short-changed if they get just a provincial road rather than an access road.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on the same subject matter, I wonder if my honourable friend could let the committee know, and I don't suppose that he has the figures right at his fingertip, but how many miles of access roads have been built in the last six or seven years. According to a Hansard that I have before me, in 1959 the Minister then was introducing the access road program -- no, it was introduced the year before because the Minister on July 20th, 1959, said, "We are now building" -- this was on July 20th, 1959 -- "into literally hundreds and hundreds of towns and villages in Manitoba, access roads from the highways up to a total mileage of four miles free of cost, so that they may have proper access to their towns and villages in general on the same basis as the highway which they left."

Well that was six years ago, and they had six years ago built access roads into hundreds of towns and villages, and in the last six years they must have built an equal number. So I wonder if my honourable friend could tell me -- well he could tell me how many hundreds probably and bring it up to date, or how many miles. Either how many miles of access roads or how many hundreds of towns and villages. Perhaps we could be supplied with a list - it would make a lengthy one I know - but a list of all the towns and villages into which access roads have been laid.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, following up in the same vein and not having been able to complete my remarks yesterday, my concern has been the same thing for these access roads. First of all I briefly would like to state that apparently the Municipality of Rhineland got a good deal from the government because they had 95 miles, if my estimation is correct, 95 miles taken over by the government, and under the access road program they would have been entitled to three access roads and these roads too have been taken over by the government through their provincial road program. But I'm afraid that these three communities that would have been entitled to access roads now will probably not get the type of road that they would have otherwise got had the access road program been left on the books and in operation.

(MR. FROESE cont'd).

But then I come to the Municipality of Stanley and here I find the matter is quite different. The part that is in my constituency, they only had 16 miles taken over and I think in total it amounted to less than half of what the Stanley Municipality had taken over. This is the big problem in my opinion, that in Stanley we had ten communities that would have qualified under the access road program because these communities had populations of one to three hundred and they were all situated close to the highway. None of them was further than three miles and a number of them were a mile and a half or two miles.

I would just like to read some of them. I think the Minister has a record of this because the Stanley Municipality at one time or another sent in a request and he must have a list of this because I got a copy of it at that time. For instance, there's Reinfelt with three miles, a population of 200 roughly; Friedensruh with 3 miles, population of 100; Portage with 3 miles, population of 300; Hochfeld, one and a half miles, population 200; Rhineland population of 250, roughly 3 miles - and here I must say this one has been taken over by one of the other roads that were listed before; Blumenfeld, 2 miles, population 200; Haskett, 2 miles - I don't know the exact population here but it must be more than 100 because they have a two-room school; Rosengart, 2-1/2 miles, 100 population - this one I might also add has been taken over by the government too; then there's Neuenburg, a mile and a half with 100 population; and Osterwick, 3 miles with 150 population, and the last one has been taken over too.

So out of the ten, three have been taken over by the government through their new road program but the other seven are left in the cold. They now no longer qualify under the former program and they've not been accepted by the government. So this is where I feel sorry about, because they are close to Highway 14 or the 32 and I would have loved to see them get these access roads. I'm sure that people coming from the south, the United States, tourists who come through that area would love to see some of these villages, and now they'll have to take the dirt road in order to see them, otherwise they would probably have had nice hard-surfaced roads leading into these various villages. All these villages are unincorporated and therefore the applications had to go through the municipality.

I would like to appeal to the Minister that he not leave these completely out in the cold but give some consideration to these former requests, and also to this particular request here, that they do give some assistance in these cases because it's only a matter of a few miles. The total mileage I understand in connection with all these villages was between 24 and 25 miles. The government has taken over ten miles of that so there's only 15 miles left, and yet I feel that the municipality on its own will not give the necessary improvement and I would appeal to the Honourable Minister to give some consideration to this matter.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose I might attempt to make a few remarks on some of the things that have been said and try and answer some of the questions. To start with, the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains who spoke yesterday afternoon made a few remarks as far as the miles are concerned in the Province of Manitoba, the construction of the number of miles of road for four-year periods. I note that he carefully selected the years that he used, and I haven't bothered, Mr. Chairman, to attempt to disprove his figures because I think that it's possibly correct. It's possibly correct that maybe more miles of roads were done in that day and age as far as miles were concerned.

I think if you go back to a statement that I made in my opening remarks yesterday, I indicated that in my opinion the money spent on Manitoba's highways is not a true criterion in either quantity or quality of construction during any specific period of time, and also that the best measurement is for one to look around at the road network that is developing in the Province of Manitoba and to recognize the progress that is being made each year. The best indication that I can give you is to the number of miles - some of the numbers of miles that the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains was talking about - he hadn't much more than taken his seat when the Honourable Member for Rhineland stood up and asked me if I wouldn't do something about them, and they have been built within that period of time.

So for the same number of dollars, building a different standard of road, it was certainly possible to do work on more miles of road at different standards. I don't say this altogether critically. People that were in power here at that stage of the game had decisions to make as to priorities and qualities and standards and they made them -- and they made them. In this day and age we have decisions to make as to quality and standards and values and priorities and we're making them.

In our view, with the type of traffic that we have today, the amount of traffic that we have

(MR. WEIR cont'd). today, the quality of road is definitely a necessity in Manitoba, and it may well be - it may well be that even in some of those years, if you want to compare back, there will be more mileage. I'm not concerned. The Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains wants to attempt to justify the things that were done in those years. I leave this to him. I'm not going to attempt to justify their position and I'm not going to try and condemn it, because they were aware of the facts as they were at that time and I wasn't here.

I could have gone into some totals and what not on dollars but I don't think that any useful purpose would be served by it. The same thing applies to vehicle registrations and revenues and so on and so forth. As a matter of fact the vehicle registrations, while our projections in the survey that was taken out in 1960 that were included in that survey are low, they're not significantly low. Some of these increases were determined. The increase in mileage, travelled mileage that the honourable member talks about, is up a little from what had been anticipated but not really significantly so. The fact is that it differs all over the Province of Manitoba. You'll find in some areas that the traffic has increased greatly; you'll find other areas where the traffic hasn't increased all that much; and on the over-all average it has about maintained within reason what we thought it was going to do.

And the talk about debt. This is a matter of policy decision where, as far as I'm concerned and I think as far as this government is concerned, the highways that are being constructed today, the capital money that is being spent on highways today is an investment. This is something that is a legitimate capital expense and do pay for themselves over a period of time, and it's a question of different people maybe considering different areas as far as capital investment is concerned.

He spoke of the previous administration and the use that they made of small contractors, the matter of works on rentals. I think that probably as far as the highway program in particular is concerned that the change in standard and the change in the development of the road program is something that necessitates a different type of a contractor because of the different types of equipment that are being used. The equipment that the honourable member mentioned, while there are still many of these people around and some of them still do work for us on small jobs, but while they may have had cats and scrapers and dozers and things of this nature, when it came to compaction and water-spraying and things of this nature they didn't have the equipment available.

Also, I think that it has been good business for the people of Manitoba in this type of highway program to go - well not into as large contracts as many other jurisdictions go, still into what I consider to be large and economical contracts that are in line and of a size that our local private enterprise people can go to. I would remind the honourable member that the government is really charged with the responsibility of letting this work by tender as much as possible except when there are good reasons why it shouldn't be done. I think that there is definitely going to be an area on the new provincial road system where the type of contractor that he mentions will be used to a much greater extent than has been the case as far as highways are concerned.

There is another factor that comes into this, because many of the municipalities have now established themselves with equipment throughout the province and where some of these small jobs are located, if their equipment is idle, as an assistance to them and make an economical proposition for the operation of their equipment, there are bound to be areas where municipal equipment used to good advantage by the Province of Manitoba on a rental basis is going to be the best thing to do, and I think that as we go along it will work out reasonably well.

The Honourable Member for St. John's enquired as to the location within the Public Works estimates of the extra funds, and I'll tell him quite frankly that it's not the easiest thing in the world to pick out the individual items because of the manner in which things have been moved around. But the department to the best of their ability have tried to pick out what they consider would be the areas, and in 11 (3) out of various appropriations, district offices I think primarily but certainly maybe planning and design and some of the others, they think \$250,000 is a reasonable figure in 11 (3) that could be chalked against this situation; and in 11 (4) and (5) they come up with the total of -- well the whole total is \$6,753,000 which may not be entirely accurate, a little bit one way or the other but certainly quite close. I think that that's not too different a figure than what the honourable member has come up with himself. I admit to it being maybe not exactly accurate, because of the switch of different types of roads to different appropriations and so on and so forth it is difficult to be exact.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland -- I'm glad that he got around to admitting that,

(MR. WEIR cont'd)..... I think it was Rhineland that had done reasonably well out of the provincial road situation, the provincial road take-over. I think that the honourable members can appreciate the difficulty that there was in attempting to establish a provincial road network. They criticized the fact that there wasn't a greater negotiation. I think that the remarks made by the Member for Gladstone, and to a small degree the Member for Brokenhead, were slanted a little bit too much one way. Obviously a great part of going around to see the municipalities was in an effort to explain to them what we were attempting to achieve, because the whole secret in all of these municipalities is not the same.

Quite frankly, the municipalities do not have financial records that can indicate to you, to us, to anybody else, the cost of these miles of road. In many instances the cost of one five mile stretch of road might equal -- the cost of maintenance and construction might well equal the cost of 20 miles of other roads that they may have because of the use that is made of that particular road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5: 30 and will leave the Chair until 8: 00 o'clock.