

I N D E X

Monday, July 20, 1959 - 8:00 P.M.

	Page
<u>Public Works, Highway Maintenance</u>	1123
<u>Municipal Affairs, Statement, Mr. Thompson</u>	1150
Discussion of Statement	1152

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, July 20th, 1959.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just as we were about to go to supper, we were considering the matter of the situation at Victoria Beach and over a cup of tea I had a very vile thought as far as the Minister of Public Works was concerned. Highway No. 12V is one of the highways which the Minister informed us was a highway in which the maximum of 72,000 gross pounds is allowable at the present time, and the thought that I had in mind was, here's at least one highway that we can put 72,000 pounds on but there's going to be an awful lot of carrying after you get to the end of it if we can't get into Victoria Beach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: E, E-1, we're on the Highway Maintenance, H (i) 8.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister just said that he's got some information...

MR. WILLIS: Before the dinner hour the Leader of the Opposition asked I think for the locations of the safety crossings that we have applied for. I think I have them here. CROA Highway No. 10, Village of Ashville, CNR Railway, PTH 59, south of Bird's Hill, CNR PTH 4, south of Gladstone, CPR Selkirk By-Pass south of Selkirk, CPR North Perimeter Road, Winnipeg Beach Line, CNR PTH 83 at Scarth, CNR West Perimeter sub-division at Charleswood, CPR PTH #3, (Interjection) the one for Charleswood is CNR, and the CPR PTH #3, west of Morden, CNR PTH #13 Oakville, CNR PTH 13 at Gervais, CNR PTH 4 at Neepawa, CPR South Perimeter the Soo Line, CNR PTH 10, North Brandon, CNR South Perimeter east of Lovis, I think it is. It's not my writing. CNR PTH 15 Dugald Road at St. Boniface.

In addition to that we were discussing the correction of increased taxes. We have increased taxes due to a new assessment by the City of Winnipeg in which they jacked us up by \$55,000.00, \$30,000.00 additional for these buildings and grounds and \$25,000.00 for the Law Courts, Central Power House and the old Kennedy Building. In addition to that we had to pay new taxes on two new houses which we bought on Broadway and also we had to pay taxes on the new convalescent hospital, Sherbrook and McDermot. Strangely enough, it appears that we won't have to pay it after it becomes a hospital but in the meantime while it's partly revenue bearing due to houses being there, we must pay the taxes on that. That makes a difference of approximately the total amount of the taxes. Last year, this is not an increase, last year we had a special warrant for \$75,000.00 in connection with these taxes, due to the fact of these increases which I have mentioned, so that this year compared with last year, is up not hardly anything at all. It is increased though, in the estimates because the special warrant does not show there of \$75,000.00 for taxes.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, under (i) I notice that there's a reduction of \$800,000.00 and I checked back in the old estimates and I find that in '58 Highway Maintenance was \$3,000,000.00 in '59, \$3,300,000.00 and other roads the increase was correspondingly great. I wonder whether or not the Minister has -- he's taken over more roads into Provincial Highways System, has he taken this \$800,000.00 or more into capital? Because Maintenance has dropped by \$800,000.00 and to me that's quite inconceivable, unless some other provision is made.

MR. WILLIS: What number is that?

MR. MILLER: (i) '59 - \$3,300,000.00, this year \$2,500,000.00; '58 - \$3,000,000.00; '59 - \$3,300,000.00. Although more roads have been taken over as provincial responsibility.

MR. WILLIS: Apparently, we're, aside from that slight increase, we are just paying the same amount. The note here is that the amount was reduced from the former one, a decrease of \$800,000.00 was reduced by Treasury.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, is that part of the capital? What I am suggesting is that if he extended the provincial trunk system, maintenance would naturally increase. What I'm asking is whether this discrepancy of \$800,000.00, I suggest there must be an increase, whether that has been charged to capital?

MR. WILLIS: Maintenance would of course be reduced by the taking over of more highways into a system in blacktop. The reduction of \$800,000.00 was due to the fact that special projects formerly paid out of this appropriation are now to be charged to capital account and a separate appropriation is being provided in the amount of \$350,000.00 on the capital account for Traffic Control Devices, Signs, for the main purpose in view of changing the type and increasing the number of signs.

MR. MILLER: Would the Minister then be kind enough to indicate what the overall increase

(Mr. Miller, Cont'd.) is, current plus capital?

MR. WILLIS: That makes a difference of three hundred and fifty there charged back—and the -- there are other roads too, there's increase of \$425,000.00 ...

MR. MILLER: Maybe I can help the Minister? There has been an increase in other roads, which I take it as those 100% roads that the government pays for 100%, which are not designated as provincial trunks..

MR. WILLIS: That's right.

MR. MILLER: Now what I can't quite understand is, while there's been an increase in other roads from 58 to 60, there has been a decrease of \$800,000.00. Now the Minister has indicated that there's \$800,000.00 might be charged to capital, but I suggest that an amount more than \$800,000.00 must be charged somewhere because he took over more trunk highways.

MR. WILLIS: That wouldn't necessarily be so, because we might have reduced the maintenance on the other. As I see it, this takes care of \$775,000.00. You may say there's a discrepancy there of twenty-five which may be a straight reduction.

MR. MILLER: Well, could the Minister indicate how many miles of other roads were designated as trunk highways in the last year, maybe we can get around it that way.

MR. WILLIS: It's 3,701 and I know there was quite a small amount taken over during the year, and the other roads has been increased, there are a thousand and two miles of the other roads, which accounts for an increase there of almost half a million.

MR. MILLER: Well, could the Minister indicate the increase in the maintenance costs of trunk highways, the \$800,000.00 which he deducted from current plus whatever amount he has in capital?

MR. WILLIS: The two amounts there which we mention are \$775,000.00, in other words, \$775,000.00 being \$350,000.00 under capital and the increase of \$425,000.00 over other roads which have increased to 1,002 miles. That would seem to take care of all but the twenty-five.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Minister that he can't take over 300 odd miles of road and not increase maintenance costs and I think that there must be an increase somewhere in the amount between \$3,300,000.00 and whatever amount he needs to maintain the old mileage plus the 300 odd.

MR. WILLIS: I suggest to the honourable member that that isn't necessarily so namely, that where you do take over blacktop and you make your ordinary gravel road into blacktop, you greatly reduce your maintenance costs immediately. In fact you, in many cases you reduce them down until you're just cutting the grass and that is the maintenance cost, and erecting signs if necessary. So that that's a close approximation in regard to this matter...

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think I may have the answer that the Honourable the Minister would like to give. In looking at the road map - I think it is a very nice road map - there's some good information given on it, because I notice here that it states that first-class all weather highways lead to several world famous goose shooting areas in the north central parts of the province. Now I think the Minister -- just a statement on there that these highways that he has been talking about so long really are first class. He's catching on to that now and he doesn't need as much maintenance as he had before.

MR. MILLER: I appreciate the assistance given to me by my Leader, but still I do suggest to the Minister that between this item and Capital Supply that he might be prepared to give a full explanation.

MR. WILLIS: I'll be glad to give that to you as and when it is made available, but it is a very complicated calculation, due to the fact that part of it has gone into Capital and there is a change in the mileage as far as the roads are concerned. I don't think it's material, but I'll be glad to get it for you.

MR. MILLER: Oh, I think it's very material, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WILLIS: I'll accept your word for it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if during the dinner adjournment, if the Minister had the opportunity to check up any further on just what tests were made on the highways before the weight limits were increased.

MR. WILLIS: I was unable to get that information due to the fact of the man who knows it was not here. I will get it for you.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, there is a matter that I would like to

(Mr. Hillhouse, Cont'd.)bring up, and that is the question of pedestrian crossing on PTH No.4 East and PTH No.9 East, particularly those portions within the Municipality of St. Andrews. On PTH No.4 East, from Winnipeg north to Parkdale, the last pedestrian crossing I believe is at the Veterans' Village at Riverside, but from there north there are no pedestrian crossings either on PTH No.4 or on PTH No.9. Now, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion that creates a very dangerous situation, insofar as pedestrians are concerned, because the town of Selkirk is serviced by an hourly bus service and there's a great deal of traffic on that road, particularly in the evening, and I would suggest to the Minister that a survey be made of that road for the purpose of determining whether or no it would not be in the interests of pedestrian safety to establish pedestrian crossings at all bus stops, at all intersections of municipal roads and at other strategic points along those two highways. I would also make this suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and that is this, that within the area where the warning signs are located, and I believe the warning signs are 300 yards on each side of a pedestrian crossing, that overhead lights be installed so that there be no excuse on the part of a motorist in not seeing one of those signs. During the last two or three years there's been several serious accidents on that highway due to the fact that there are no pedestrian crossings north of Rivercrest. And I would ask the Minister to give this matter serious thought and in the very near future take the necessary steps to establish pedestrian crossings.

MR. WILLIS: We'll certainly be glad to take that into consideration. May I say though to the member, that most of the complaints we receive in regard to that road are otherwise, namely, I am always hearing complaints, "Why do you stop the traffic every few hundred yards on that road?" "Why do you let the municipalities impose on you 30-mile zones through there where in some cases they are quite unnecessary?" We thought -- and perhaps we will still be able to do something about it -- we thought we could draw the traffic from No.9 over on to No.8, and we're definitely doing it. There is now a terrific traffic -- beach traffic -- on Highway No.8, which is new and which is new and which is drawing a lot of traffic there but strangely enough it doesn't seem to have reduced the traffic on the other one to the degree which we had hoped. Where the traffic comes from on No.8 in such large numbers, to go from end to end as it is in some cases on Highway No.8, whereas No.9, which is not very far away, still remains crowded. We had thought also that when we built the Trans-Canada Highway on its present location, that that again would draw off the east traffic and would lessen the traffic on Main Street north. We also thought that when '59' was built, that that would take it off again. These things -- they had in mind among other things to drain off that traffic, off Main Street north, but to date the traffic has so increased, I think, in the meantime, that it doesn't appear to have been changed greatly, but we are still of the opinion that if we had not drained off the traffic in about three different ways, that the traffic on Main Street north would by now become unbearable. But we have not actually greatly decreased the traffic on that location with the result, of course, that because of the number of 30-mile Zones there, it makes many people who travel those roads very angry that they have to travel that slowly through several miles and through several 30-mile Zones. It is not an easy problem. Definitely we are studying it and having others study it, to try and arrive at the proper solution. But by building a new Trans-Canada, we did take quite a large number of cars off that highway, we think. By building '59' we did it again; by building No. 8, which is now an excellent highway, we drew off some more at that time, but let me say to you that we have not yet solved the problem but that we're definitely working on it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that there is a very grave problem there and a very thorny problem, but now as to the 30-mile Zones that the Minister refers to, there are three 30-mile Zones on that highway from Winnipeg north. There's the 30-mile Zone in Old Kildonan, there's a 30-mile Zone at Middlechurch, there's a 30-mile Zone at Rivercrest - the Veterans' Village - but from there north to Selkirk, there is no other 30-mile Zone and it's the district between Rivercrest and Selkirk, where I suggest that we should have some pedestrian crossing. Because I know of several serious accidents that have happened there, particularly in the wintertime.

MR. WILLIS:drawn to my attention some of the hazards of that road and I went out there about a month ago and he pointed out a problem which they had there -- a safety problem-- which I think has now been solved. As soon as the construction is complete, it will solve that particular problem of the cross just west of Lockport. That will be solved, I think, and may I

(Mr. Willis, Cont'd.) assure him that we will work on this other problem as well.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to assure the Minister that I have no wish or desire to cut down the flow of traffic but I do suggest in the interest of pedestrian safety that we should have some pedestrian crossings.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, as the Honourable Minister said, and I think that there is no doubt that No. 8 will really help to relieve some of the traffic on 9 and it won't be easy to tell exactly how much until that road is finished. I think that's one of the reasons why the traffic is not going on 9 now. But another reason might be the condition of the joining roads between 8 and 9. I have in mind the one to Petersfield. Will the Minister tell me if he intends to do anything on those roads or keep them in the condition there are now?

MR. WILLIS: We intend to have a program of continual improvement until we get it solved, and I think we can solve that problem because it's not unbeatable but over night I think we would all agree that Winnipeg has had a terrific increase in traffic, and as a consequence though, we have done these things which are helpful that they haven't shown up the way they ought to do.

May I too, at the moment answer another question which I think the Leader of the Opposition gave me before the dinner hour. The flood-lighting system on these Legislative Buildings. Under the old system where we had 28 kilowatts for the lighting of this building, it cost us 90¢ per night. Under the new system of new style sodium which is 15 kilowatts with 4 spots on the golden boy of 1 kilowatt, a total of 16 kilowatts, the cost is 35¢ per night as compared with the former cost of 90¢ per night. The cost of installation was: materials \$2,156.10; labour \$1,440.80; and let me tell the member as well -- tell him the whole story, namely, that the electrical fixtures in permanent locations as they are now cost us \$6,430.60. That means a total cost of \$10,027.50, but the reduction, the daily cost is reduced from 90¢ per night to 35¢ per night and they tell me as far as the electrical fixtures are concerned the upkeep over the years is very small indeed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, when the veteran members across and particularly the First Minister was sitting on this side of the House there was a great deal of criticism about the roads in Manitoba, particularly those where oil was used on gravel surface. Now...the First Minister at the meeting I attended last year, condemned the #6 highway as being very bad. It's quite true that south of Lundar the highway has broken up considerably there but the purpose of this oil was for a two or three year period and then a bituminous mat was to be placed on it afterwards. Well we have seen no bituminous mat on #6 south of Lundar and I notice right at the present time on #6 that oil is again being put on. Now if oil was so bad for the roads and was a waste of money why was this oil being put on this section of #6 instead of a bituminous mat as promised by the First Minister?

MR. WILLIS: All things come to those who wait. (Interjection). Yes, we're fixing up Rhineland this time with a lot of water which is badly needed. But as far as the #6 south of Lundar is concerned, when we give it oil under ordinary circumstances we do it only to save the gravel. I have not changed my opinion in regard to it -- I think it is now the opinion of the department that where we normally we grade a road and gravel it, then we give it oil for two reasons (1) to save the gravel (2) to see if the highway is going to develop any weaknesses, failure the engineers call it, and having done that for one year then it would be our policy to put on asphalt mat as quickly as possible but as far as oil is concerned it does save the gravel, it does give us a road which is dust-proof and it does give us an opportunity to see whether there are going to be any failures in the road. Many failures in roads occur because of underground streams which have ceased to run and you get a collapse and on #1 highway, you remember, we got a collapse of 6 feet there -- the whole road collapsed and that underground stream was about apparently some 10 feet under the soil and we had no way of knowing it unless we dug it all up. Those things occur but that in general is the practice, and oil is only for that purpose and is not a substitute for an asphalt mat.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the remarks of the Minister in connection with oiling provincial trunk highways and I agree with every word he said. I believe it is highly essential that after the road has been constructed and the gravel laid that oil be put on in order to -- for a year -- and I was very interested, too, that he stated that after a year, it would be highly desirable to have an asphalt mat put on there. . I'm wondering whether provincial trunk highway #32 will benefit from his policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I (1).

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a question.

MR. WILLIS: Specifically I don't know whether that's on the program or not but completely that is our policy.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Now what.....in your department. I think it is a wonderful thing. It gets rid of the dust and it's, like you say, preserves the gravel but less than 18 months ago there was severe criticism on this very policy which the Minister is upholding today. Yes there was.

MR. WILLIS: May I tell the honourable member if he had listened to me I think he would have found out that I was not upholding that policy. All I was saying was that stating their policy was otherwise, that as quickly as we could get it done it would be done with regard to those highways and they wouldn't be just oiled surfaces. That's not a permanent policy at all.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It wasn't a permanent policy in the past either Mr. Chairman. It was done for the same reason that the Minister explains now and the roads on old #6 they were oiled and the southern parts were oiled first and gradually a bituminous mat was laid on them and I don't think there is any change in policy is there?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to go back a few items but due to the fact that the Minister gave us a reply to some questions that had been asked before the dinner hour I wonder if I may be excused? That is with regard to the taxes that he was mentioning. I notice he mentioned there, if I recall correctly a convalescent hospital at Sherbrook and McDermot. Did I hear that correctly? Which building is that exactly? I'm afraid I.....

MR. WILLIS: The new Department of Health building which we have taken over -- the property.

MR. MOLGAT: Where is that building, what...

MR. WILLIS: Sherbrook and McDermot.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it a new construction?

MR. WILLIS: It is and will be.

MR. MOLGAT: It will be, or is?

MR. WILLIS: Will be.

MR. MOLGAT: There is no building there now?

MR. WILLIS: No.

MR. MOLGAT: There's one going up?

MR. WILLIS: We're paying taxes on it.

MR. MOLGAT: Fine. Then further on the present item that we're on, Mr. Chairman, the Minister was speaking a few moments ago about the safety devices. My honourable friend from Selkirk was mentioning the speed limits on #8 is it, North or #4. I wonder if the Minister has done anything further on the matter of graduated speed signs that is from the standard highway speeds of 60 down to 50, 40, down to 30. It seems to me that this is a very important matter in safety. As it is now, you're going down a highway at 60, you approach a more populated section and you suddenly have to reduce to 30 and then back up again to 60 and this is particularly so on the piece of highway that we were discussing a few moments ago where there are three of these breaks just north of Winnipeg. As I recall it, the Honourable, the Minister previously, when he was in the Opposition had given us quite some conversations on this same subject of graduated speed zones. I must confess that I haven't seen any in the province as yet and I'm just wondering what progress is being done in this regard.

MR. WILLIS: Arrangements have been made for graduated speed limits on that basis. I don't disagree with a word that the member has uttered except that he is maybe just a little impatient in regard to it. I think it is undesirable that you should have a 60-mile limit which will come down suddenly to a 30-mile limit. Normally, the driver doesn't come down to a 30, he comes to a 30 and then he takes his foot off the accelerator and for the next 2 or 300 yards he's trying to get down to a 30 and he's breaking the law every yard. I think the proper system is one which gets down gradually 60, 50, 40 -- probably 30. We have made arrangements whereby that will be the case in several places in the province. Instructions have been issued in regard to it. One of them is on Portage Avenue west. There is one there - a 30-mile zone which you come from Headingley, suddenly travelling 60 miles an hour, you're into a 30-mile zone and possibly a funeral at the same time and consequently, instructions have been issued in regard to that and before the end of the season it is my hope and expectation that on several of these we will bring them down on that basis, on a graduated basis which is now the accepted American system.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could the Minister tell us briefly what sections of the perimeter route are completed sufficiently to permit highway travel and the subsequent question, when does he expect that the perimeter road will be completed?

MR. WILLIS: Starting on the west side, going south from highway #6, that's the north and south road down to Assiniboia Downs grading will be complete there in 1959. Concrete will be complete this year as well from Saskatchewan Avenue on the west side down to Oak Bluff, from Oak Bluff east to about Waverly Street, the concrete is now complete. From there eastward from St. Norbert to Maple Grove will be paved next year. From Maple Grove to Ste. Anne is now paved. From Ste. Anne east again to the eastern boundary of the perimeter road will be graded this year and paved next year. Going around the circle now, from the east end, from highway #1 north to highway 59 there is no construction as yet. From highway #59 west to highway #7 the grading is complete and from #7 to the western boundary of the perimeter highway the pavement is now in place. That completes the whole road around the circle, gives the dates of completion of the whole road. Bridges will be included in the same schedule and time table.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, there's one point that I'm not sure about. Just east of #7 highway where 6 and 7 meet, the new perimeter route seems to be over about 25 yards from #6 highway running east and west. Will the old section of #6 running east and west that is between #7 highway and the railway track be abandoned, or will that be part of the perimeter route?

MR. WILLIS: I'm not too familiar with that particular section there as to whether there is any change or not. In the map which I have before me there is no change indicated.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The reason I ask if it's going to be -- the old #6 is to be part of the new perimeter route then that involves, there would be a sharp curve just where 6 and 7 meet.

MR. WILLIS: If these is we will eliminate it.

MR. SCHREYER: Just for clarification, the Minister mentioned before 5:30 that the province would, as of this year, pay 80% toward the construction of the large bridges. Now, the question in my mind is, what constitutes a larger bridge? Does it go by the overall length by the number of pilings and the like?

The second matter -- are we to take it from the Minister's statement just a few moments ago that the bridges needed in the perimeter route as for example, the bridge crossing the Red between East St. Paul and West St. Paul will be completed by the same time that the actual road surface is completed?

MR. WILLIS: That is the expectation. Yes. In regard to the bridges it's rather a complicated schedule which I previous put on Hansard. You will see in last year's Hansard complete details in regard to the payments to be made for the building of bridges and it's on the basis of length, but it's a very complicated schedule, but I did put it on at the last session here exactly what would be paid up to 80%.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, does it take into consideration some possible extras such as stormbreakers and the like?

MR. WILLIS: Yes.

MR. WAGNER: Before dinner I asked the Honourable Minister of Public Works whether he intends to go with the access roads of bituminous mats to Kormarno and then oil to Fraserwood and the access road to Malonton, Meleb, Rembrandt, Silver and I also ask whether any consideration was given to the new side road building of 50/50 basis, and of building more market roads, if any consideration was given and I have a number of complaints that Inwood Road to Narcisse which had been serving for a long, long time as a highway towards Fisher Branch, but since the #7 highway detoured alongside Fraserwood it has been terribly neglected in grading and maintaining that road and still the bus runs through that. That has been in very poor shape.

And, there is one item I omitted before. It sounds very strange to me to see even today, and I have the complaint particularly from the Rembrandt people that the grader came up to town and the town is just on the side route about 100 yards away, and yet the grader wouldn't come to the post office and grade that little portion but he just turned around and he went out. And it happens in practically every town. But since the new government took office last year I believe through the whole summer the towns were graded twice. I would imagine that it should be graded a little bit more, whenever it's necessary to grade the street. It doesn't take so much time and neither does it involve a large cost.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for Fisher is one of the great road

(Mr. Willis, Cont'd.) builders of this legislature. He's becoming a little bit more conservative lately though. The last program he presented was one for 2 1/2 million dollars, and that's hardly conservative I think, but (Interjection) yes, modern, I guess so. That's what you call progressive conservative I guess.

But in regard to these details, he lives mostly in unorganized territory and therefore he has a great deal of requests, whether they're for unorganized or disorganized, it's the same thing. I don't know about that fellow who went to the post office whether he gets his mail there or not, but we are increasing the services to the area of the honourable member. I think we are spending more money there than has been spent in the past. We will be building access roads into those towns and the rule is a simple rule. Is it a trunk highway. Are you within 4 miles of it? If you do, then you're entitled to an access road. But you can't get them tomorrow nor the day after, because there are literally hundreds of them to be built and we're going to build a lot of them this summer but we can't build them all at once.

Now the honourable member asked me about six questions in one mouthful, in regard to various roads in his constituency there and I would suggest to him with all due respect if he would come in and we could discuss them and get an answer in regard to it. I don't know Narcisse road as an individual road but we will discuss that situation there. It will never be easy in Fisher Branch area because there aren't many people there, and there is a very long mileage of roads. Consequently as the district is outlying, I don't want to brighten you up too much by telling you that you'll always have problems in that area and those who go to outlying districts will continue to have problems in regard to roads even to a greater extent than they have in organized territory although in organized territory they have them as well. But I do suggest to the honourable member that although he has many requirements, that we have met many of those requirements and the general skeleton of roads we care for ourselves. And I know, and I don't blame him for it at all. I don't blame him for it, but he has come to me and said, "This man lives 9 miles off the road and he hasn't got a road out and I would like you to build 9 miles for Joe -- he is a good friend of mine," and I find the taxpayers' money is not available to build a nice road down to Joe's place. 9 miles, even though he is a good fellow and even though I would like to see him with the road. It just can't be done. The taxpayers can't pay that amount of money. You've got to get more people to travel Joe's road or we can't help him. Not to the same degree. We may get him out but at the same time we can't build pavement to his door even though he is a good fellow. And you will have to live with some of those conditions but our heart is with the member, but our finances don't permit us to do all of these things which he requests and we can't give you 2 1/2 million dollars in one year.

MR. WAGNER: I don't expect miracles, but I had . . . because I hate to fight the election all over but anyhow what was done -- the old government was always saying 'tomorrow, tomorrow, next year', and you can hope. I was even told to my own place, one official of the department told me, "You just hope for the road." Well hoping is not going to do anybody any good. It's got to be built and I don't know why those people have to be penalized that for so many years, 40, 50 years they have been there and they are getting to be disguised, and tired and old already, and yet they won't see daylight of the road. So the past government always said "Some other time, some other time." Now the people's hopes have arisen high that the new government is going to do definitely something for them, and whenever the speakers came out in that area the very first thing of all they said that you have no roads. And I must admit that even the Liberal speakers were out there and they said "If you re-elect us back again to office you will see the change in the road policy." My method is to bring that area into the same standard of road development as in other parts of the province. They are people just the same under northern area or under southern or eastern or western but it seems to me that highlighted into the of road building of that seems to be petering out and I am a little bit surprised already that such action seems to be taken and certain times I have been promised and I agree with the Honourable Minister that he says that I should come and see him. I must, with all sincerity and honesty say that whenever I tried to get an appointment with him he either was two delegations and three waiting in the waiting room or he is busy -- doesn't know where to put his hat on which table, and finally next thing I have to go back to Fisher Branch. I couldn't get an appointment with the Minister. Well now, how does the Minister expect me to go and talk to him on road business or ditches or whatever you may have when he is not able to see me most of the time?

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the honourable member that his difficulty is that he doesn't get an appointment but he comes and finds the waiting room filled with people who have appointments. They have telephoned me in regard to it. I have had many conversations with the honourable member in regard to roads. It is my anticipation that I will probably have many more and that is satisfactory as far as I'm concerned. I would just as soon talk to you as talk to those other fellows that I have to talk to, who come in also demanding roads but I think it is the correct policy that the department try to serve as many people as possible. Consequently, where you have the heavy traffic on a road, there are more taxpayers there and they're entitled to more services. I think you will have to have an immigration policy into your part of the country and get more people up there and then we can serve you better but in the meantime I do suggest to you that although you're very energetic in your regard to these matters, that you have been reasonably well served by this government, you're going to get some more access roads for free, and I would ask the honourable member to cheer up. You're doing all right.

MR. WAGNER: Just one point there. The Honourable Minister got me to my feet when he said 'appointment'. Well I had an appointment one time. I came from Fisher Branch — 110 miles and then my appointment was cancelled due to a surprise cabinet meeting and I had to go back.

MR. WILLIS: That has happened more than once.

MR. CAMPBELL: I hesitate to interrupt the interesting discussion but I wanted to ask the Honourable, the Minister, if he could give us the costs, if they're known now, or the estimates, if they're not known of the three bridges on the perimeter route. Two on the Red River and the one on the Assiniboine. I believe one of these is completed and one is well along toward completion. What is the state of the one on the north bypass?

MR. WILLIS: I don't have those with me in regard to them. The one is completed and I have been over it, maybe you have as well, and, but I don't have the final figures but if there are people who hear my voice they might get that information for me so that I would have it but I don't happen to have it with me. Also in regard to the others, but in regard to one there'll be no information available; there should be estimates in regard to the other one, and there should be just about the final figure in regard to the one that's

MR. CAMPBELL: I presume the north one, the contract is let, is it?

MR. WILLIS: Yes

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I received information that the contractor experienced considerable difficulty with the construction of that bridge across the Assiniboine River just south of Assiniboia Downs. Has that trouble been all cleared up now?

MR. WILLIS: I've heard of no trouble. I've driven over the bridge 3 or 4 times. It is open and in operation. While there may have been some minor difficulty, certainly it's not of any consequence.

MR. GUTTORMSON: This is a few months ago.

MR. WILLIS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1. (1). Passed.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): On the subject of access roads, the Honourable Minister suggested that in order to qualify the village, town or hamlet must be within four miles of a provincial trunk highway -- I believe that is correct. Now what would be the limitations on the size of a hamlet say. Like if there was a grain elevator and post office, would that qualify and automatically entitle them to an access road or what, what are the limitations in that regard?

MR. WILLIS: It's a matter of the traffic that it carries. If it just carries just ordinary traffic that one grain elevator and post offices does, the answer would be "no". It has to be of some consequence in order to build a road of that expense to serve it and those things have to be taken into consideration with regard to it. You can't just draw the line and say this is it, but we do draw the line and say that if it's a trunk highway and if it's within four miles it's entitled to an access road.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Subsequent question. On the matter of traffic counts -- and I do think that traffic counts should play a very important part in deciding the assistance that is given to a road -- will the department loan a municipality a traffic counter upon request to establish a traffic count to support their application? If a municipality is making application, and this could apply to secondary highways, market roads and so on where traffic does play the major part in determining the assistance -- would the department be willing to loan the municipality a traffic

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) counter if application were made for same?

MR. WILLIS: The ordinary answer would be "no", due to the fact that you have, is it 125 municipalities in Manitoba-- all of whom, I think, would like at some time to have a traffic counter, but where we have a consideration of taking over a road as a trunk highway, we very often do ourselves put on that road the traffic counter without cost to the municipality. We want to do it ourselves and run the machine ourselves as well, but that is a large feature in regard to determining the improvement of highways. You do, however, get a situation where traffic count is no good because there's no road, and consequently you have to take other means of deciding as to what the traffic will be. But ordinarily we don't have enough traffic counters to loan to the municipalities -- ordinarily we do not have enough. Ordinarily to the best of my knowledge, all traffic counters in the area are working full time for us to determine the traffic, and I should say after we get our planning a little further ahead we will be using them still more in the Province of Manitoba in various places. Under certain circumstances, if it had a chance of becoming a trunk highway I should think there might be the possibility of having a traffic count made by the Provincial Government, not by the municipality. You know there are means by which traffic counts can be accelerated a bit that we don't like to have in dangerous hands if that were so, so that we like to make the traffic count ourselves where our own money is to be spent. The general answer is that at the present time they would largely not be available because we don't have enough. Also that they're being used full time by the province.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman. . . . traffic counters I wonder if the Minister could tell us the cost of a traffic counter or would he consider it good business for a municipality to purchase one? It seems to me they're quite a small article -- or probably three or four municipalities combine and purchase a traffic counter. I wonder if the Minister could tell us the cost of a traffic counter.

MR. WILLIS: It would be my personal opinion that it wouldn't be advisable for them to do that, it might be advisable however for perhaps the municipal union to make such a purchase which could be loaned then to the municipalities for that purpose, because I'm sure they wouldn't use them frequently and I think under the ordinary terms you apply for a trunk highway or you apply for assistance in regard to it and we ourselves, the province, gets that so that to quite a degree you get the same results as you would do if you had one of your own.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Inkster.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, one brief question. To what extent does the department do their own road building?

MR. WILLIS: Practically not at all.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, just one point before we leave this subject. On the perimeter route has the government set down any policy as to what they're going to do where the perimeter route intersects at Highways 7, 8, 4, 9, 59 and so on? Are they going to build an over-pass -- some of them, all of them or what is the policy?

MR. WILLIS: The answer is I think - some of them.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Does the Minister know which ones?

MR. WILLIS: No. I don't think anyone else does, yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I - 2. Passed.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, under I - (1) I've no objection to this item passing providing the Minister will undertake when his capital supply bill comes in to re-open this question the decrease of \$800,000.00 and an explanation as to what items of maintenance under I - (1) is applicable to the capital.

MR. WILLIS: I'll be glad to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: J - (1). Passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, under J - (1) I want to check with the Minister. I presume that it's the policy with regard to secondary roads to treat the bridge as part of the road which means that they will now get, the municipality will now get 75%.

MR. WILLIS: They will.

MR. CAMPBELL: And even if it's out of order for the moment. In the next one that's where the special bridges that the Minister mentioned earlier would come in, would it Mr. Chairman?

MR. WILLIS: The which?

MR. CAMPBELL: The special bridges, the large bridges? They would come in as

(Mr. Campbell, Cont'd.)....special project, and that's where the formula can go to 80%.

MR. WILLIS: That's right.

MR. CAMPBELL: I remember the Minister did put the formula on record once before so what other special projects would there be besides bridges?

MR. WILLIS: There might be many, many roads.

MR. CAMPBELL: We might leave that until we reach the item.

MR. WILLIS: There might be many, many roads in regard to it and I should think there'd be certainly every year, many roads where they have the special projects which the municipalities desire.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain the -- or differentiate between secondary roads, secondary highways and market roads.

MR. WILLIS: A market road is 22-24 foot top, secondaries a minimum of 30 feet.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, what about the jurisdiction Mr. Chairman, that is to say -- second-are roads as such may be -- municipalities rather, may have secondary highways as well as market roads. I mean the Provincial Government does not have exclusive jurisdiction over the secondary highways?

MR. WILLIS: The secondary highways are under the jurisdiction of the municipality. We pay for 75% of the cost under the present regulations. Usually we maintain a secondary highway and charge back 25% to the municipality. In some cases we'll make a special arrangement with the municipality if they have a satisfactory outfit -- they do the maintenance and charge us 75%.

MR. SCHREYER: What about market roads, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WILLIS: We have no jurisdiction over the market roads. All we do as far as they're concerned is to make grants to market roads on a 60-40 basis.

MR. SCHREYER: That's construction and maintenance both?

MR. WILLIS: It does not include maintenance except that you may get grants for new gravel on your road. We don't maintain the market roads at all.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The Minister gave an incorrect answer regarding market roads. The engineers must approve the location of market roads before the municipality can build them.

MR. WILLIS: The engineers have a master plan for every municipality which indicates the market roads set up by the province, by the Provincial Engineer. They must approve it. A market road is created in effect by the province -- when they say that is a market road and on that we're willing to make road grants.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this is a maintenance for secondary highways. I think the Minister told us that was 361 miles and we just finished with provincial trunk highways that was 3,700. Now, I can't see anything on maintenance for other road, 1,000 miles. Isn't the government responsible for maintenance of these other roads - this 1,000 miles?

MR. WILLIS: We have there the maintenance of the other roads there in I - (2). A million and a half dollars.

MR. SHOEMAKER: With regard toroads isn't it a fact though that the government will generally approve a market road that's recommended by the municipality. I believe there isn't too much squabbling over where it will be if the entire council agrees on a market road and makes application for it, it's generally approved but is there a limitation on the number of miles that can be constructed in any given year.

MR. WILLIS: There is no limitation but on the contrary the department does not accept the word of municipality in regard to market roads. They want their recommendation it is true but the municipality always wants several hundred more miles of market roads than the government will approve. They'd like to see all of their roads market roads because then they could get, they think, more grants. Consequently there is constant conflict as between the municipality and this department and the department -- in practically every municipality from time to time refuses their request to have more roads declared a market road.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have any information at present as to how many miles of market roads there are at present, and also how many miles of market road it is expected there will be ten years hence?

MR. WILLIS: Your question is tens of thousands of miles of highways. I would even take us two or three days to calculate the amount of market roads we have because, you see in each municipality we have a complete grid of market roads -- two and three miles apart going across

(Mr. Willis, Cont'd.) every one of a hundred and twenty five municipalities in the Province of Manitoba. A terrific number of market roads. We don't consider them as our market roads, they're the market road of the municipality. It's their responsibility and it's their jurisdiction and therefore to the same extent we do not keep statistics in regard to roads which we don't consider our responsibility at all. One could calculate that but it would take quite a long time to go over every one of the 125 municipalities to measure out, probably with a rule, the number of miles they have.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, to pursue this point a little further. When I mentioned - when I asked this question I saw some honourable members opposite laugh or guffaw if you like. The point is Mr. Chairman, that even though market roads might not be exclusively or even partly under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Department of Public Works, nevertheless it should seem important enough to have some semblance of statistical information on this very important matter because it seems to me that provincial department, in that it gives grants towards construction of market roads, towards gravel grants and the like, surely we must have some statistical information. Now when I asked as to how many miles it is expected there would be in ten years, that might be a little more difficult to answer but even that, Mr. Chairman, because in some provinces the provincial governments are undertaking, in conjunction with the municipalities, a program of market grid construction. I realize that this province is doing the very same thing -- I realize that, Mr. Chairman, but it would seem to me that the construction of market roads in this province is not quite as thoroughly formulated as it perhaps could be. I wonder if the Minister would have any comment to make on that.

MR. WILLIS: In regard to the number of miles of market roads, it is obtainable no doubt but we don't have the same use for that particular type of information as we would trunk highways or secondary highways or other roads. I think we have a calculation some place as to how many thousand miles of roads there are all together in the Province of Manitoba but that would include many roads you couldn't drive down at all but market roads is not a difficult matter to obtain. Certainly we have had a good system in Manitoba for 15 years on which any municipality can get a plan of its own municipality with the market roads on it from the department and there's been no neglect in that regard and I will inquire in regards to , if anybody knows, how many market roads there are in Manitoba but they change every week or so -- being added to -- in some cases deleted and now under the new school system there will be many market roads added which will be bus routes as well, and we keep a close study in regard to these matters but I may say to him, I think under the new planning system that probably we would have more information, statistical information, of that kind but I think the honourable member will realize that we don't have the same use for that type of information due to the fact that market roads are under municipal jurisdiction, than we have to have for secondary highways and trunk highways and other roads which we control.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The Minister just said that in view of the new school plan that more market roads would be built. Are the municipalities going to get more money in order to be able to build more roads?

MR. WILLIS: They are.

MR. GUTTORMSON: On what basis?

MR. WILLIS: We were laying plans in regard to it. We had letters approved today to go out to the municipalities making suggestions to them in regard to their roads. In general, school divisions haven't yet decided where they want to run their buses, and to a degree a market road will depend on where they want to drive their buses. They may want to drive their buses in a certain place and the municipality might very well disagree with them because they might say that you should drive one mile west on the good road which is already there and we can still get you to the school by driving one mile further and these matters will take, I suggest to you, many of them will be solved this fall but they's take two and three and four years to decide -- until they finally decide where they want them, and there will be increased grants to the municipalities for that purpose and we're now working on the problem with the divisional board and with the municipalities to try and come up with a solution which will be reasonably satisfactory and one which particularly will get the children to school.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before dinner I asked the Honourable Minister why the decrease in this maintenance and he referred me to J-(1). Now he has the full program of

(Mr. Desjardins, Cont'd.).....maintenance and there's still a decrease of \$260,000.00 In view of what the Minister said to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that he felt that the roads, many roads were in bad shape but he thought that fairly soon this would be remedied I can't understand how you can expect to do that, decreasing \$260,000.00. I wonder if there's any explanation for that?

MR. WRIGHT: I believe I heard the Honourable Minister say some time ago that all that was needed to change a secondary road to a market road was to have an application sent in. Would the Honourable Minister explain the difference between a market road in view of the fact that the government pays 60% in that case and 75% in the case of a secondary road?

MR. WILLIS: I'm not doing very well. I just finished explaining that. The market road is ordinarily, first type of road 22-24 foot top which is still a municipal road and continues to be a municipal road to which the government may make grants of 60/40 - 60% government, 40% the municipalities. That is the market roads in ordinary-- they connect with the market roads of the next municipality with an attempt to have a through route as far as market roads are concerned. When you get into the secondary however that is in another group -- that is a highway with a 30 foot top and because it is a highway and because it is supposed to carry highway traffic, the province pays 75% of that cost with the municipality paying but 25% of the cost. And most of the roads in Manitoba, rightly or wrongly, became firstly an ordinary road, then they became a market road and they became a market road on the application of the municipality to the government to take it over to recognize it as an important connecting road. Then they proceed to build it to the proper road standards. Having done so they then apply to have it made a secondary highway and the basis of making it a secondary highway would be that it would have to carry much heavier traffic and if it was accepted as a secondary highway it would be rebuilt to a wider standard with the government paying 75% of the cost and the municipality paying 25% of the cost. Following which, and in nearly all cases, within a year or two, once it has established its traffic they make application to have it taken over as a trunk highway following which the government pays 100% of the cost.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Can the municipalities look forward to any additional grants this year to assist the school children to get to school?

MR. WILLIS: Yes.

.....Continued on next page.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would care to answer my question now referring to why the decrease of \$260,000.00 for the program of maintenance? In view of the statement that you've made that the roads were in rather poor shape, do you expect to have them in tip top shape as soon as possible?

MR. WILLIS: Which Item are you referring to?

MR. DESJARDINS: I was referring to Item I - (1) and (2) and J - (1) total cost, the total money spent on maintenance of all the roads - there's a decrease of \$260,000.00

MR. WILLIS: Aid to municipalities is away up by \$800,000.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well is that maintenance?

MR. WILLIS: That can include maintenance, yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well could you break that down and tell us how much of that is maintenance.

MR. WILLIS: No, I couldn't - that's just about an impossible task because 125 municipalities come in and each one of them have about six items they want and four of them will be for construction of roads and two of them will be for maintenance, gravel maintenance and to give you that breakdown is a colossal task although it's possible.

MR. DESJARDINS: Your answer then -- I guess I can take it for granted that the condition of the roads isn't as bad as the Minister led us to believe a little earlier this afternoon in answering the Leader of the Opposition then if it's only those roads. In other words the secondary roads and the main highways are in pretty good shape if we're spending less money?

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): The Minister mentions the number, 125 municipalities. Is he referring to only rural municipalities because that's about their number, but in total we have 190 municipalities and I understand that the towns and villages that are incorporated, do get the grants so I think the figure should be 190.

MR. WILLIS: to the rural ones and your quite correct. The total figure is about 190.

MR. SCHREYER: I wonder if the Minister could have the information with him as to how much is being allocated toward the building or the maintenance of market roads this year.

MR. WILLIS: Market roads are maintained by the municipalities, it's not here and we just make grants to the municipalities. Of course, part of which might become graveling.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, that's actually what I meant. How much is being allocated to the municipalities for use on the market road system?

MR. WILLIS: We don't allocate just in that way. Let me explain. A municipality may come in, it may have six items which it wants grants on - everyone of them might be maintenance. Another municipality might come in it has six roads and every one of them might be construction, and we do not break it down as between the two and they can ask for either, and usually they ask for both, and we can't break it down - we don't say that, of the amount which we put up some \$4,000,000.00 that \$1,000,000.00 is for maintenance and \$3,000,000.00 for construction - we don't say that. We discuss with the municipalities what their particular problem is and if in the previous year they have constructed market roads, ordinarily we urge them to gravel them the next time, which is maintenance, of the same road which we have helped them to build. We do not disintegrate the two nor do we divide them on a basis of percentage for maintenance and a percentage for construction but where we assist them in construction, we do urge them to gravel them and maintain them properly or else next time we say - now you want a grant with regard to construction but we're not going to give you that, you'll have to first gravel the road which you got last year.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, as regards school roads, as differentiated from market roads - will the same type of provincial assistance be given to school roads as market roads or in effect are they one and the same thing?

MR. WILLIS: The system in regard to school roads has not been worked out and we have to sit down with the municipalities and work it out, but it would be our anticipation that we would work it out on a 60-40 basis. And it may be that in some cases we would not necessarily have to have the standard which they have in regard to market roads because perhaps the particular road is going to be used for school purposes only and it doesn't carry much ordinary farm traffic, therefore we were discussing it even today in regard to meeting the municipalities in regard to it but in some cases it would not need that type of road and we're having the former

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) . . . man who was, Mr. Cameron, who is in charge of municipal roads go out and discuss it with the municipalities and with the school boards to try and arrive at a policy. If I might, for the purpose of the Committee, I have some figures in regard to the Assiniboine River Bridge on the perimeter which cost \$542,000.00 - the Red River perimeter cost \$799,000.00 and the deck has not yet been in place, with the result that the Red River perimeter road will probably be \$950,000.00. In regard to the Red River north perimeter, it has not yet been constructed nor is there an estimate as to the cost. — (Interjection by Mr. Orlikow) — \$542,000.00.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, just to get back to the market roads for a moment, I followed the Minister in his explanation of the difficulties in that the municipalities always asked for more than they can get but can the Minister tell us how much money is in the estimates to meet their requests? We know that there'll probably be two or three times the requests which the government can agree to, but how much is in the estimates for market roads?

MR. WILLIS: Market roads? \$4,366,000.00.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, we just recently learned that Manitoba has 190 municipalities, and it strikes me that each and every one of the municipalities receive a road grant of \$10,500.00. I think I'm correct on that - now whereas the municipalities vary in size from four townships to 24, I believe, whereas the balanced assessment varies an equal amount from, I don't know, probably one million to five or six million and the population also varies considerably. I wonder if the government has considered creating a new formula to base on those three factors, that is population, balanced assessment and the size of the municipality, rather than the straight across the board grant that is now given.

MR. WILLIS: The question of the grant to individual municipalities is a matter of some difficulty and although many of them get \$10,500.00 each, that is what they call the standard grant, but nevertheless they don't stick to that at all, and you'll find that in result, that they don't because there's a great difference in need. And this matter is a matter of some difficulty and while they have a formula in Saskatchewan in regard to it, they have another formula in Ontario and they have another formula in Alberta and none of these formulas are satisfactory either to the department or to the public, but they are a measuring stick in regard to the amount of grant which they are to receive.

I know of small municipalities in Manitoba - they are very wealthy and they have large amounts of money in the bank, but they are equally insistent that they get a full grant as another municipality gets. And there may be another municipality that has no proper tax base to get sufficient money to have a decent road system. They have a much greater need; perhaps they should be given more. I remember talking to one municipality where a man banged his fist on the table and said we've got to have so much money no matter if we are wealthy. And I said I was thinking that the province would borrow a little money from your municipality instead of you borrowing from us, because, relatively speaking, you have much more money than the province has and you have a very large sinking fund. I say these things only to indicate that it is a complex and difficult problem to which I don't think there has yet been a satisfactory solution. It's further made difficult by the various sizes of municipalities in Manitoba. If they were all somewhat the same size, it would help greatly. Maybe the ultimate aim would be to have larger municipalities; they might be able to be cared for in a different way. But normally, we have a municipal engineer who's had very long experience in regard to it, and while they mention always the amount of \$10,500.00, it is a matter of great difficulty to arrive at a proper solution that will suit the many cases. Then I remember one municipality that had three bridges go out one year, that was \$350,000.00 worth of bridges for a poor municipality. What do you do? Do you give them \$10,500.00 and have them so that they can't even travel across the river to go to school? You have to have a margin whereby you can help them under those circumstances to keep in operation. And so there are these many problems, but I know the department has looked at many of the systems that are in other provinces and some of them have good features but most of them apply only to those provinces and to adopt a system which they use in Alberta is probably fatal because there they have received \$700,000,000.00 from oil and they like to push it out to the municipalities.

MR. J.P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I haven't asked too many questions so far, but I noticed that nobody has discussed certain roads in disorganized territories. I -- under

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . in disorganized -- or unorganized -- the secondary highways and market roads are taken care of 100% by the government. I'm right there? Now there's another class of road that's called "School roads". In the past these were 50-50 proposition - 50% paid by the local residents and 50% by the government. I wonder if there is a change of policy regarding these school roads in disorganized?

MR. WILLIS: I'm sorry that the Member for Emerson didn't pay as much attention to the Member for Fisher Branch as I did, because he was talking about nothing else but those roads. He is in disorganized and unorganized, but however he is not listening to you so that makes it even.

MR. TANCHAK: school roads?

MR. WILLIS: No, we had not mentioned in regard to the school roads in unorganized territory. It is our expectation there will just be increased grants there, depending on the need in a particular locality and the number of pupils in the school. But as far as they are concerned, they'll have to get them to school. And we'll have to help them to get them to school. And the problem is just on that basis and I think there's going to be considerable sums of money spent by this government in order to get them to school. I recognize this as one of our responsibilities.

MR. MILLER: Does that mean a change in policy?

MR. WILLIS: Pardon?

MR. MILLER: Does that mean a change in policy from the 50-50?

MR. WILLIS: Well, we've had ---

MR. MILLER: Because the only organized people in the unorganized are the School Districts.

MR. WILLIS: Yes, we've had no particular policy there as far as school roads are concerned. It's been a variable policy as far as the school was concerned.

MR. TANCHAK: How about maintenance? In the past it was 50-50. Is there any change in that? Maintenance of the roads - school roads only.

MR. WILLIS: In all cases there will be no lessening in regard to it and there will be more maintenance than there was in the past years. And also I think that we must take a larger share as far as responsibility is concerned, in order to get them to the schools in those cases where it is necessary in that district.

MR. TANCHAK: in the past the residents complained that they had to collect; some person had to go out and collect enough to snow plow in the wintertime and there were certain residents that were willing to contribute, others did not, and it was not fair to some of those families that contributed. At quite a few meetings that I had out east in the disorganized, they stated that they were even willing to have a little levy so that they would be sure of having the roads snowplowed, especially in the winter, and maintained in the summer. So that might be something that would be worthwhile considering.

MR. WILLIS: Disorganized and unorganized territories will always suffer disadvantages in that respect. But they can help themselves greatly by being organized to decide as to what they want to do well in advance and also to decide what money they can make available in order to help themselves. Many of them don't get services which might otherwise be available because they are not organized in regard to it. Other districts are fully organized and they make their arrangements with the government in advance and they get reasonable service. But we come back to the same and if you had listened to me talk giving some fatherly advice to the Member for Fisher Branch, it is that unorganized and disorganized territories can't expect the same complete services because they don't pay the taxes, but they could get those complete services by moving into, back into, organized territories where the services are. And when they go out there to land which is probably cheaper, they get the advantage of cheaper land, but at the same time they have the handicap of less services and as long as the population is low, it must always be so.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, pockets in this disorganized that the soil is very favourable, the land is very good. You take around South Junction, in my particular constituency, and some even around Vassar and Sprague, the land is very good, but they are not large enough to form a municipality of their own, so I don't think that they should be penalized for that. Some time ago I asked the Honourable Minister about what steps were taken to organize transportation to schools in the remote areas. Even then the Minister answered me that it is up to the residents

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . to do it. This last weekend I happened to be out there and I asked them what they are doing and they seemed to be reluctant to organize any kind of transportation on account of the road system, the school roads. They're not adequate, and they say, "What can we do during the wintertime, we'll not be able to bring our students in." And they wondered what the government, what would be the policy of the present government regarding snowplowing during the wintertime, and that's why I asked the Honourable Minister.

MR. WILLIS: I'm glad the honourable member mentioned that because we are, as I told you about an hour ago, we have a man doing nothing else now but going out and talking to people in areas in regard to what they want to do and to try and establish a policy which will help them. And they should have a meeting in that regard and discuss what can be done in their area and what their recommendations are and in that way I think they'll get much more done than would otherwise be the case. This is new. Roads for divisional areas are new; they're going to carry them by bus; there has to be a re-orientation as far as school roads are concerned and we will have to work this out together, but the government is conscious that it has a greater responsibility than would otherwise be the case and that responsibility we will try to discharge.

MR. TANCHAK: I'm not criticizing the policy or anything. I just wanted to pass the information on that. I didn't criticize the Honourable Minister for what he had said and I did mention to them that there was a man out in the field that is investigating. Well, they keep on asking, "Well, where is the man; we haven't seen him." So I told them, like the Honourable Minister had stated to some of the members across here, "Be patient. We couldn't do everything in one day." But the time is approaching - September isn't far away - and they're really anxious there and concerned.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I rise not so much in a spirit of criticism to criticize the Minister and his government as regards its program to aid municipalities in road construction, but I do rise to voice some regret that this government which made such a big issue of offering leadership to local school boards and local government units, and a government which not only emphasized the need for offering leadership but also the need for expert advice and planning of our road system should not have seen fit to make overtures to the municipalities, if necessary through the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, with a view to implementing or starting a definite program with respect to the construction of good roads. Now I know that there has been a good road program of sorts in this province for the past number of years, but surely this government which emphasized the need for giving leadership so much, which emphasized the fact that they were going to bring in experts to help plan roads even 25 years into the future, as was mentioned by the First Minister about a year ago, has not seen fit to do this. Now that is one matter which I wanted to raise by way of conclusion.

And then there is one other, and that has to do with the actual construction of provincial trunk highways. I realize it is perhaps not too apropos under this item, but I think that it's perhaps fitting that I raise it at this time. When the Department of Public Works sends engineers out into the field to survey the possible or probable route that a trunk highway should follow, I would like to know if there is any ill-advised pressure brought to bear on the engineers, who I am quite sure are competent, pressure brought to bear on them with a view to changing the route of the road. I raise this matter because I think it is pretty well common knowledge, in my area, that highway 59 North had already been surveyed by spring of this year and in the vicinity of Libau it was supposed to have taken this route. But strangely just before election time, I suppose it was enthusiasm on the part of someone - I don't know who - the route of the road was suddenly changed. I don't have any particular views as a lay man on these matters as to which route the road should follow, but if it was surveyed to follow this route and if a good many of the residents in the area were completely in accord that this was the way the road should go, I would like at least some inkling of an idea as to why it was decided, about a week before May 14th, that the road should go right through the village, and as some of the people have pointed out, in that way it has to cross two railway crossing within a space of a quarter or half a mile. I think that even though I am impartial on this matter, I think we must admit that the fact that it has to make these two railway crossings destroys the efficiency of that road as a carrier of vehicles and vehicular traffic. It could be that there is still some confusion as to just what route that road should follow because certainly the people up there -- there is quite a bit of animosity between some of the people there and I don't think that it's called for. It wasn't there before May; it's there now. If there's any idea I can get about this, I'd certainly appreciate it.

MR. WILLIS: In regard to the location of roads, I think the problem is eternal. Towns want highways to go through the town; they don't want them to by-pass them, therefore they exert what pressure they can to try and get it through towns. The Town of MacGregor was an outstanding example. They insisted, I understand, that it go through the town originally. Then they got it down their Main Street and someone got hurt and they insisted that it leave the town and by-pass the town, and in general, highways departments very much desire to by-pass towns. But the argument usually is, the main service as far as this highway is concerned is one to the town. This is one which is similarly situated at the end of the line. And the argument was advanced that we should go in through Libau. That doesn't mean that it would be there eternally; Libau is entitled to an access road and it got one. And if perchance the traffic develops sufficient, then it will be south of tracks. But it so happens that there is a lot of muskeg south of the tracks. It was a simple matter to go through Libau for the time being and to switch back; Libau had to be served in any event and in the meantime they could decide as to the development of the traffic. And if the traffic develops sufficiently and if we can get by the detriment and handicap of the muskegs south of the tracks, then it would go south of the tracks. It is as simple as that. But Libau, in any event, was going to be served because they were entitled - served with an access road - so that road which we knew we were going to have to build, we decided to build through Libau and it would go across the track. And it depends entirely upon the development of that traffic as to how important that road becomes. At the present time it comes to a deadend practically at Libau and therefore it serves the Village of Libau and will continue to do so for the time being at least. There are still two problems at least -- will that road become the chief highway for Grand Beach - will it? Only the future can tell whether it will or not. If it does, then it will likely be that it will go south of the tracks, muskeg or no muskeg.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at this point? Does the department have any immediate plans to extend that road to No. 12 near Grand Beach? Any immediate plans to extend 59 past Libau?

MR. WILLIS: It is a plan shortly. I don't know what you mean by immediate; not this year, no. But it's in the plans - it's in the planning stage. So that's why you'll get them into - going through towns. We think that we can get away from that system of having to go down the main streets of towns which we have by this system of roads which we are adopting, whereby if it is close by a highway that you have an access road in, we won't have to go through, we'll just go in and that's why that service is being done and gets us out of a lot of trouble.

I don't understand the member in regard to a definite program. We do have a definite program; a grid system we have had for 15 years. As far as planning is concerned, we are quite satisfied that we have the best planners in America now planning our highway system, so that we do have those things well in hand, we believe, and a little better in hand than any government in western Canada, because the others haven't got a definite planning system. They haven't got professional planners, and Saskatchewan has been consulting with the same firm that we have employed for this purpose and they are now considering as to whether they would go into that planning system or not. So that as far as Libau is concerned, it's just one of 20 towns in Manitoba where you have that program - to go through or not to go through. Now we're about to go through Carman. We've been - I know that the department has been at that for 15 years deciding as to whether they would go through Carman or by-pass it and the arguments have been long and noisy on both sides for many years. Finally they have come to the conclusion that they want to go through the town and they will - we will go through the town and we think on a reasonably safe basis. But the problem is perennial in regard to whether to go through towns or not. When you say "Is there pressure?" Yes, there's plenty of public pressure and it's excited public pressure. But we of the department don't put any pressure on our engineers. As far as they are concerned, when they go out they give an engineering viewpoint - an engineering decision in regard to it. And under no circumstances do they bring back a decision which we dictate before they go out, that I assure you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (j) 2.

MR. MOLGAT: Before leaving (j) 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We passed (j) 1; we're on (j) 2 now.

MR. MOLGAT: I don't recall passing (j) 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we did. You can vote on it if you like.

MR. MOLGAT: This is the item under which the Minister introduced the Bill in the Legislature some time ago, increasing the grants from 66 to 75. At that time I asked him if he had an estimate of costs and he didn't have it then. We now see what the new cost will be, but according to the figures, it shows an increase of something in the order of \$115,000.00. Now, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether this is just on the secondary road system that was then existing or does it also include new roads being taken over as secondary roads, and if so, how much mileage of new secondary roads has been taken over?

MR. WILLIS: Secondary roads have been slightly reduced rather than increased.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (j) 3.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay the Committee --

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on (j) 3, Mr. ---

MR. PAULLEY: No, (j) 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (j) 3 now. We just passed (j) 2; I don't know how many times we have to pass it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, but we don't pass them just because somebody over there yells "Passed". And we don't --- indeed we don't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Should we have a vote then?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition - I think I can fight my own battles. A minute or so ago you informed the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that you had passed (J) 1. I didn't have an opportunity of getting in on (J) 2. I affirm to the Committee I'm not trying to delay but just seeking information in respect of a project that was suggested, it effects much of my municipality. That is, there was some newspaper talk recently as to the building of a subway on Archibald Street underneath the mainline of the CPR Railway. And I'm wondering whether the Minister has any information as to what progress has been made. Now this project involves the City of St. Boniface, and the City of Winnipeg. I believe the Transport Board comes into it too, I'm wondering if the Minister has any information in respect to the possibility of this subway. Because this is one of the areas that's creating a serious bottleneck serving the eastern part of the province through Winnipeg.

MR. WILLIS: There have been minor discussions in regard to it. There are no definite plans worthy of mentioning in regard to it. We just - it's -- (Interjection) No, to the best of my knowledge there has been no approach.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, just one more question. I would like the Honourable Minister to tell me what progress has been made in regards to the Mississippi Parkway.

MR. WILLIS: In regard to the Mississippi Parkway, I am to meet the Commissioner of Highways for Minnesota as soon as we get out of this place and to do some planning in regards to that Parkway. Minnesota has received Federal consent whereby they may now enter into an agreement with Manitoba to help pay the costs of construction within Manitoba of the Mississippi Parkway. That progress has been made this winter under their rather cumbersome system whereby the state government must get the consent from the Federal Government in order to spend monies in a foreign territory. And that was some difficulty, but that has been already passed. They have now the necessary authority to enter into an agreement with the Province of Manitoba whereby they share the cost of that highway into Manitoba, to the northwest angle which is part of the state of Minnesota. So that progress has been made and they are now in a position but recently, whereby they desire to enter into an agreement with us to discuss the exact location of the highway; to discuss possible costs of the highway; standards of construction and location. They await the rising of this House so that they can discuss those matters with us to establish the Mississippi Parkway and get on with the business of building that great road. This I think is a matter of great importance to Manitoba as it is to the State of Minnesota, because as you will know by looking at your roadmap, the northwest angle is in the Lake of the Woods area and is really an Ontario territory. But in order to get to it, they have to come through the Province of Manitoba. Otherwise they would have to travel over water. And so after many years of effort in which the previous government took a part, they have now come to a position where they have the necessary jurisdiction and money in order to enter into an agreement with this government for the building of the Mississippi Parkway within the boundaries of Manitoba. As far as agreement is concerned, there have been no definite terms in regard to it. We have not exchanged terms; the question of the exact location is still a matter

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.)

to which is uncertain, but this summer should do a great deal in regard to consummating that agreement as between Manitoba and Minnesota for the building of the Mississippi Parkway in the south-eastern corner of this province.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, while we're on that subject, although I didn't think it came under this particular item, but it seems we are discussing it, is it not the intention of the Provincial Government to continue the Mississippi Parkway in connection with the Trans-Canada Highway somewhere in the vicinity of Falcon Beach?

MR. WILLIS: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: I had understood that that had always been the plan. I would say to the Minister now he is just referring to the section of Minnesota making an agreement with Manitoba to build into the northwest angle.

MR. WILLIS: The Mississippi Parkway - the joint effort will be between Minnesota - the Government of Minnesota - the State of Minnesota and the Government of Manitoba up to the northwest angle. From there it will be carried through the Trans-Canada Highway by the Province of Manitoba in a location close to Falcon Beach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: to pass 3?

MEMBERS: Pass.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, Item 3 - I would combine it with Item 4. And as the Honourable Minister likes to choose fatherly advice, I want some fatherly information in here. The roads in school districts - unorganized territories \$200,000.00, works in unorganized territory and disorganized municipalities \$874,000.00 - some clarification in there. Is the \$200,000.00 as it used to be referred, that is money expropriated for 50-50 basis?

MR. WILLIS: As far as the \$200,000.00 is concerned, that has been the ordinary basis. There's no law which says it must be on a 50-50 basis. The next item, of course, is works in unorganized territory and disorganized municipalities, quite a few of which are built by the province 100% - the main roads as you know. There are others where, because we are expending quite a bit of money in order to go into your friend Joe's place that we must get something from Joe to help us along. We can't just build him a good road into his place 100% when he has a quarter section nine miles from the highway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.

MR. MOLGAT: On the matter of construction in school districts, I must say I'm extremely surprised and most disappointed that there is no decision on the part of the government yet as to what assistance they will definitely give on the construction of roads for school divisions. After all, this government brought in the matter of larger school divisions some months ago and the school divisions are now faced with the responsibility as of the first of September when the term opens of transporting children. They have no choice. That is how the Act reads. And I know the Minister has indicated that they would give it every sympathetic consideration and all the rest, but that's all well and kind to say. The fact is that there is no policy established at the moment. There is no formula. And these people are waiting to find out what is going to happen. And this applies as well with the municipalities as it does in the unorganized areas. You take the situation in the unorganized districts where the roads previously were built to a school; for example, on a straight 50-50 basis. Will the government take it over on a 100% maintenance for snow-plowing this winter? Will the people there be expected to continue their share as they have in the past? As far as I know there's been no decision in that regard as yet, and certainly in the discussions so far the Minister has not indicated what the policy is. I'll admit he said "sympathetic consideration" but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that at this date - the 20th of July, barely a month to go until the schools must open - this isn't enough for these areas. They must know where they stand and the decision must be made that should have been made quite sometime ago when the larger school divisions plan was undertaken because this was an obvious responsibility falling on the government and the local areas. I think it is high time that the Minister should inform this Committee and inform the people in Manitoba exactly what the policy is going to be, and that has not come out as yet.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, why doesn't the Minister simply tell us that transportation isn't available at this time? That the roads aren't in shape and that it will take at least another year before any effective assistance will be given to school districts in disorganized or unorganized territories as well as in a great many municipalities.

MR. WILLIS: Because that isn't the truth.

MR. MILLER: The Minister must work awfully awfully fast if he wants to make it true.

MR. WILLIS: As far as the roads in school districts are concerned, we are now working on the problem. We now have a man out discussing it with them.

MR. MILLER: How many?

MR. WILLIS: I haven't received an application in regard to school roads yet. This might be a surprise to you two gentlemen, who come from where you come from. We realize that this is a matter which is going to have to be -- we have to sit down with them and discuss their problems. Also there's going to be a contribution in regard to school roads from the municipalities concerned. And they have to have a say in it as well, and we are discussing it with them as well at this time. We have asked the school divisions to state their needs to the municipality. We have asked the municipality to go with their proposal to the district engineer. When they get that proposal we have asked the district engineer to report to us in regard to their needs and as to what the possibilities are. We think that's a reasonable and methodical method of approaching this problem. Let me warn you of two things: (1) that there will be a real effort to do quite a great deal this year; (2) there will be no finishing of the job this year, or the next year, or even the year after. They'll want to change their school routes. A big family has moved into a certain location where they have to serve them and pick up the children. Therefore they will go to the municipality and say, "We have to have a better road"; the municipality will come to us and say, "We've got to have assistance in regard to that". This is not a simple problem. We are trying to meet it in a reasonable way by asking the municipalities to do this. By asking the school divisions to do this, in order that we may help them in their problems. These things, we think, we're meeting in a reasonable way. We shall continue to do so and we're setting the engineers aside, who will be doing nothing else but this to try and get better school roads for the school divisions.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What are you doing unorganized and disorganized territories in relation to the same problem? Where there are no municipalities?

MR. WILLIS: Pretty much the same thing although they don't have the same people to deal with, but they have their schools, and the schools are organized. And we have district engineers in all those areas, and it will be a matter of the school districts discussing it with the district engineers and working out the best possible solution.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I fully realize the difficulties that the Minister mentioned in settling this matter of school roads and certainly we can't settle it all this year. There will be changes as we go along. But after all, he is a member of the Government that set up this larger school divisions matter. This was set up six months ago. Surely, he sat in on the discussions at that time. Surely, it was obvious at that time that there would have to be decisions of policy made on this matter of roads. And I submit that to date there has been no policy established on the assistance that will be given. And here we are just a month to go -- how can we expect municipalities, or the unorganized territories to do anything now insofar as getting roads ready for transportation this fall? And yet that very Government there, charged them with that responsibility when they wrote the Act, and they have not provided the policy that will permit them to do that work this year. I'm not suggesting that all of it could be completed in one year but I certainly think that a policy could have been established long before this so that the municipalities would know where they stand, so that the unorganized territories, if they are expected to make a contribution as they have in the past on a 50-50 basis, would know where they go. As it is now, the construction season will be finished before any work can be undertaken unless the Government makes a great change in its decisions as to this policy of roads. This matter is urgent. In the unorganized territory, in particular, this matter of snowplowing has been in difficulty in the past, and unless something is done before the coming winter there will be periods then when there are great possibilities the children instead of getting the better education that is anticipated on the larger division by being transported to a central high school will not be going to school at all because the buses and the vans to take them there will not be able to get through. And this question of an established policy is essential before the people in the the local areas can make a decision as to what roads they shall ask for and what exactly they want to have done.

MR. SCHREYER: The matters which I raised before under the other items, the Honour-

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . able Minister seemed to have answered adequately well. However, there's one exemption, and that is with regard to practically the same matter which has just been raised by the member for Ste. Rose. It is true and the Minister said that we have in this province a semblance of a program for the building of good roads but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this policy is not slanted, it's not suited to the needs of the present, because since this Government has encouraged the people, and rightly so, to set up the divisional organization of secondary schools, this has put the onus on the Government of the Province of Manitoba more than has ever been the case. And certainly it seems now quite obvious that this Government must come forth with a policy with a much more aggressive policy as regards the building of good roads. Now I realize that the Minister can say, well this is primarily a municipal responsibility but I submit again, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come for the Government to offer leadership, if you wish to use that expression, and come forth with something much more definite. Perhaps something in the way of saying to the municipalities through its collective association, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, that this Government will offer assistance on the basis of 50-50, or 60-40, or 70-30 based on the equalization of the municipalities -- equalized assessment, rather, per grid mile and that we are going to build say, 40,000 miles of good roads in the next eight years, if you see fit to come along with us. It's a policy such as this, Mr. Chairman, that seems to be the need at the present. And certainly, after listening to the Minister this evening, we have no indication that the policy as regards grid roads is going to be any different than what it has been in the past fifteen years. At least the former Government had one argument. At least they did not put the people in the position whereby they would require better roads because there was no secondary division set-up. But now there is and so it would seem that the onus is all the more on this government to take a little more aggressive steps as regard th is matter.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, there never was a time when the Government of Manitoba voted so much money for the purposes which the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has spoken about. Never before have we asked the people to tax themselves in order that we might have the money to solve the problems which he puts before this House. To that extent, we are better prepared than any government previously was in the Province of Manitoba. As far as the divisions are concerned, most of the divisions haven't even established their bus routes at this date. In other words, at this date they don't even know where the roads are which we are to build for them. Nor have they asked for them. And so, we're sending out men now to discuss with them. Firstly, with the divisions to say, "Where do you want your buses to run?" because that's their responsibility and, secondly, to have them discuss it with the municipalities to see what the municipalities will do in regard to that problem with which we will assist them. And we have found that as far as the divisions are concerned that they have not fully discussed this matter as far as the division roads are concerned and where they're going to go, and that we're going to urge them to sit down with the municipalities to see what is possible under the circumstances. We want to do what is reasonable. If we superimpose now a policy on the municipalities and also on the divisions, it may be entirely unacceptable by them, then the whole thing breaks down. We want nothing else. We're trying to work that out -- a policy which would be acceptable to the divisions and to the municipalities. It is not as if we had tried to avoid our responsibility in this regard. We have voted more money than was ever voted before for these purposes. We've always said it was our responsibility to have more money than would otherwise be the case for the purposes which we have in mind. That money will be voted; that money will be available and as a consequence we think that we can do a satisfactory job in this regard but we do say that as far as the school divisions are concerned, they should come to grips with the question and decide as to where their routes are going to be. Following which, they should discuss with their municipalities in organized territories what the municipal-ity views in this regard. The roads which would be improved and built would be roads which would serve not only the school divisions but also the municipalities as well because they will have a share in the contribution. This is a matter which they should work out together. To-date we have not received, to the best of my knowledge, any plan from a division supported by a municipality asking us for assistance on a definite line. Therefore, while we have a responsibility and while we are going now out to the municipalities to try and get decisions in regard to it, nevertheless, we think that these things can be helped by the three bodies working to-

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) gether. We've made provisions by way of money, by way of engineers, by way of a grid system so that we are in the position to help the municipalities and school divisions in regard to this important problem.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't in any way want to speak for all the school divisions in the province, but for the two school divisions that are in the constituency which I represent, I can tell the Minister that they have made their plans, they know what routes they want, they have discussed it with the municipality, but the municipality doesn't know what to do with it because they don't know what assistance they are going to get. The municipality is there and simply can go over the plan with them but there's no answer they can give the school division because the Government has not given them an answer. The Government has not placed the municipality in a position where it can give the school division an answer. And that to me was one of the things that had to be done when this plan was set up. It wasn't enough to do what the Department of Education did. If they're going to insist on transportation then it had to be set up so it could be provided. From what the Minister tells us now -- what is the Department of Education going to do this winter if the roads are not open for transportation? Are they going to insist that the school divisions carry on with the schedule that has been set for them? Are they going to have to follow the schedule that has been established when it's obvious that at this state if there are roads to be built that they cannot be built because no policy has been established? What does the Government propose to do about that?

MR. WILLIS: We'll look into these cases. They got to school last year. They will be able to get to school easier this year because we will help them to do it. But I suggest to those

MR. MILLER: How? How?

MR. WILLIS: By helping them with roads and snowplowing and spending money.

MR. MILLER: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has just indicated that he hasn't had any requests for roads from the divisions. How is he going to help them?

MR. WILLIS: We're going to go out and get them. And I told you three times we have done that -- that we are doing it. And so I suggest to the Member for St. Rose that his municipality should call in the district engineer and discuss their plans with him. Particularly that's the policy of the previous Government to have study groups and commissions, we act. (Interjection) Well, if I were you boys across there, I wouldn't say too much in regard to this educational division plan which was on your platter for about ten years and you did nothing about it. (Interjection) I would just let that drop if I were you. (Interjection) Well, I think we better clean up the roads first. (Interjection) Thank you, thank you. (Interjection). I think we're being 'egged' on here. But it is a problem which we are meeting in a sensible way, I think, in regard to these roads. And many of them have had transportation last year which they will have this year. There are quite a large number that won't because they'll have new problems to meet and will continue to be solved. We don't minimize those problems but we say that we're willing to help them with engineers, with some new roads but they better make their plans first and decide where the routes are going to be and also they're going to have difficulty, no doubt, with the municipality because, in many cases, some of the roads are going to be strictly school roads and not municipal roads. And, consequently, they may not get the support of the municipalities, there's nothing we can do.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that the Minister of Education has never had the qualms that my honourable friend has had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon me, I was telling the Member for Brokenhead that you had the floor.

MR. MILLER: That I had the floor -- I'm finished now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, certainly I would not want to say that this Government is tight fisted as regard its road program. As a matter of fact, insofar as its trunk highway, P. T. H. program is concerned, there seems to be a reasonable amount of activity but what I cannot see is, insofar as the municipal road programs are concerned, the more particularly -- specifically the grid system, now that we've got the secondary divisions with us, why does this Government -- and actually they should be commended for this, they took a very active part in having the secondary divisions established, but insofar as their provincial trunk highways are concerned, there again they've taken a fairly active role but insofar as the grid systems are

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . concerned, they've seem to have just given themselves up to a rather placid role. They're waiting for the municipalities and the divisions to take the first step. Certainly this is almost the exact opposite of their activity when they went out to sell the divisional plan to the people of this province. Now for the sake of consistency and for that matter to clear things up for the benefit of the people of this province, it would seem not illogical to ask this government to, once again, that's for the third time, to take a more active role and make overtures to the municipalities as regards getting to grid system well on its way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on this matter of school roads in unorganized territories -- to get down to a specific instance one of the school divisions in my constituency wishes to have approximately four miles of road built -- that is in the unorganized territory. What exactly is the procedure that that school division must take in order to get that done?

MR. WILLIS: That school division should make up the roads that it desires. Should discuss them with the district engineer. Ask the district engineer to report to us with his recommendations.

MR. MOLGAT: One district did exactly that approximately a month and a half ago and nothing has happened since. The construction season will soon be over and if something isn't done soon, we won't get that road built. How will they operate their van system next winter?

MR. WILLIS: If the honourable member would tell me the school division. He hasn't been in to see me about or discuss it with me. I don't know whether he's discussed it with the rest of the Department or not but if he would do that and tell me what the school division is, I'll be glad to go into it. This is the first I've heard of it.

MR. MOLGAT: Exactly the channels that you've outlined are to be the correct channels, and nothing has happened but I'll be glad to go and see you and give you all the details.

MR. WILLIS: Good, good.

MR. MOLGAT: The division is Turtle River.

MR. WILLIS: This is the first time I've heard of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 -- Pass 5 -- Pass 6 -- Calling 6 now

A MEMBER: No. 5.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, you don't just call them as fast as you can, and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN, Well, we've waited a long time to get them (Interjection) . . . positive. But when we ask a Pass and if it's passed, it's passed. But, I think, no one charges us of being impatient . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, you're very patient but the difficulty is that if you continue to call the numbers as quickly as you do after having been patient, for a certain length of time, then the poor members on this side of the House have to leap up in unseemly haste . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: With all due respect to the Leader of the Opposition, the one thing is, we got up here today and we started with secondary highways and we got down to unorganized territories, disorganized municipalities, we had a free-for-all and I thought by the time we called the numbers, we'd have a discussion of every one of them.

MR. CAMPBELL: Now, Mr. Chairman, if there has been any discussion on ferries, I missed it. Has there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine.

MR. CAMPBELL: Has there been? Did you hear some discussion on ferries . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm saying, we are going to speak on 5.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, 5. But you had already called 6. That's the point I'm making. I missed all the discussion on ferries, if there was any

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5, I'm calling now.

MR. CAMPBELL: May we ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, just how many ferries there are and what the program is with regard to them this year?

A MEMBER: Give him the works.

MR. WILLIS: I haven't got time. The estimated expenses this year of \$22,000. The Narrows -- Ste. Rose unorganized -- the rural municipality of Siglunes estimated expenses this year -- \$22,000. St. George in Rupertsland and St. Clements unorganized estimated expenses this year -- \$6,000, total -- \$50,000.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, where is that last ferry?

MR. WILLIS: St. George. Aren't you the member for St. George?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I want to know where that ferry is not the one Narrows, the other one. What ferry is that?

MR. WILLIS: This is spelt -- F-E-R-R-Y

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes, but where is it?

MR. WILLIS: It's Rupertsland and St. Clements -- unorganized. And last year's expenses \$5,000, and this year it is up by \$1,000 to \$6,000/

MR. GUTTORMSON: Therefore, you're not speaking of the constituency of St. George?

MR. WILLIS: Well, I thought St. George was all in the one area. St. George and England.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I think you are referring to a local district of St. George on the Winnipeg River, aren't you?

MR. WILLIS: St. George

MR. GUTTORMSON: That's fine. Thanks for the information. Mr. Chairman, what are the present hours on the ferry at the Narrows? Have they changed at all?

MR. WILLIS: I don't know of any change in the hours on the ferry. Do you have a suggestion?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I think they should be longer, because there was talk that they were going to reduce them and they asked for hours last year and they gave some extension, but if my memory serves me correctly they're from 7:30 in the morning and a lot of the truckers have to wait when they are coming across the ferry until the ferry starts to run. I thought, perhaps, you might lengthen the hours of the operation of the ferry.

MR. WILLIS: We'll take that into consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5 -- passed. 6 -- passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: On 6, Mr. Chairman, I presume that there's no change in the mileage here that the Minister has to report?

MR. WILLIS: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then the grants apparently are the same?

MR. WILLIS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Last year there was an item roadside development. Now we'll be through the Minister's estimates completely in a moment and this item does not appear. Was it transferred to another department and if so which one?

MR. WILLIS: Mines and Natural Resources have it.

MR. MOLGAT: You mean we've had it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 81. Passed. Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Read down to the Capital.

MR. WILLIS: I'm going to give you the program on it.

MR. MILLER: That's what I thought.

MR. WILLIS: The members opposite have been asking for programs. Here's one. (Interjection) Yours is water. (Interjection) -- Water. This is the highway program -- Capital Account -- some \$19,000,000.00. You have it before you. I'll read it to you. Highway No. 2, 50 miles, Rathwell P. T. H. 18 base

MR. PAULLEY: before he goes ahead with them. This \$19,000,000.00 there's nothing included of the appropriation that we last -- voted last fall. This is entirely different.

MR. WILLIS: Entirely different. Let me say this to the Committee as far as the program is concerned. Quite a large part, the vast majority of this, will be built next year and that as far as the program is concerned, we will follow to a degree, the same policy that we did this year, namely to let many of these contracts in the fall and winter for construction in next year. In effect, we are planning one year ahead because we think we can get more work done that way as we did before -- let more contracts and do a better job.

Highway No. 2 -- 50 miles Rathwell to P. T. H. 18 base course and bituminous mat.

Highway No. 3 -- 22 miles Carman-Winkler corner -- seal coating.

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.)

Highway No. 3 -- 4 miles P. T. H. 17 west -- additional gravel and double prime.
Highway No. 3 -- 21 miles P. T. H. 10 to P. T. H. 21 -- base course and bituminous

mat.

Highway No. 3 -- 24 miles P. T. H. 18 to No. 10 -- seal coating.
4 E -- 22 miles -- Lockport to Beausejour -- seal coating.
4 West

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may interrupt. Is that -- that's presumed that it'll be black topped this year, does it?

MR. WILLIS: Yes.

4 West -- 11 miles Russell to the Saskatchewan boundary -- grading, gravelling and structure.

Highway No. 4 -- 23 miles Gladstone to Neepawa -- base course and bituminous mat.

Highway No. 4 -- 28 miles Shoal Lake to Foxwarren -- seal coating.

Highway No. 5 -- 40 miles Norgate to Ochre River -- seal coating.

Highway No. 5 -- 12.3 miles Ochre River P. T. H. No. 10 -- base course and bituminous mat.

Highway No. 5 -- 25 miles Gilbert Plains to Shortdale -- seal coating.

Highway No. 5 -- 3.5 miles Assiniboine Valley -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 6 -- 35 miles St. Laurent to Eriksdale -- widening of the shoulders?

Highway No. 6 -- 5.2 miles north Eriksdale to Mulvihill -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 7 -- 11.5 miles Komarno to Fraserwood -- seal coating.

Highway No. 7 -- 6.9 miles Broad Valley to Fisher Branch -- additional gravel and chloride.

High No. 7 -- 11 miles Fisher Branch to Hodgson -- grading, gravelling and structure.

Highway No. 8 --

MR. WAGNER: Fisher Branch to Hodgson.

MR. WILLIS: As I told you much of this will be next year.

8 -- 30 miles Clandeboye to Gimli -- seal coating.

9 -- 2.5 miles south boundary of St. Paul to Hodinott Road -- base course and bituminous mat.

Highway 9 -- 5 miles Selkirk by-pass -- seal coating.

Highway 9 -- 5.3 miles Gimli to Camp Morton -- seal coating.

Highway 10 -- 19 miles junction P. T. H. 23 to junction of No. 3 -- seal coating.

Highway No. 10 --

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, what does the Minister mean by widening of shoulders? They're supposed to be complete.

MR. WILLIS: We just widen the road.

MR. GUTTORMSON: No but the road is supposed to be its full width now.

MR. WILLIS: Well, if many roads

MR. GUTTORMSON:are preparation for a bituminous mat.

MR. WILLIS: Many roads are wide enough, but they don't have shoulders so we put them on for a safety feature and also in order to make the road stronger by giving it lateral support.

Highway No. 10 -- 19 miles P. T. H. 23 to No. 3 -- seal coating.

Highway No. 10 -- 15 miles Brandon -- Rapid City Junction -- grading, gravelling and structures.

18th Street -- Brandon -- construction of Assiniboine River Bridge. 2.6 miles there gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 10 -- 17.2 miles P. T. H. 45 to Cameron School -- seal coating.

Highway No. 10 -- 15.5 miles Birth River to Mafeking -- seal coating.

Highway No. 10 -- 58 miles Mafeking to the north of Bog -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 10 -- 25 miles Atik to Cranberry Portage -- additional gravel and

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) chloride.

Highway No. 10 -- 5 miles Cranberry Portage to Sherritt Junction -- grading and gravelling and rock work.

Highway No. 10 -- 16 miles Sherritt Junction to East Bakers Narrows -- base course and bituminous mat.

Highway No. 10 -- 20.3 miles East Bakers Narrows to Flin Flon -- seal coating.

Mr. Campbell; May I ask the Minister was concerned in the bet that took place a year ago.

MR. WILLIS: I'll have to stop those discussions in regard to those big bets. That was that skiing bet, I guess.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. WILLIS: We'll discuss that tomorrow.

Highway No. 11 -- 15.8 miles Brookfield to McArthur Falls -- seal coating.

Highway No. 11 -- 12.2 miles McArthur Falls to St. George -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 12 -- 12 miles to Trans-Canada Highway to Steinbach -- seal coating.

Highway No. 12 -- 13.5 miles Piney corner to South Junction -- seal coating.

Highway No. 12 -- 10 miles Sprague to Middlebro -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 13 -- 19 miles P. T. H. No. 2 Trans Canada Highway -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 15 -- 13 miles Transcona to Anola -- seal coating.

Highway No. 15 -- 12.1 miles Anola to Nourse -- additional chloride and gravel.

Highway No. 15 -- 12 miles Nourse to Lewis -- grading, gravelling and structures.

Highway No. 17 -- 9.6 miles T. P. H. No. 3 to United States boundary -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 18 -- 12.2 miles Ninette to T. P. H. No. 2 -- additional gravel and double prime.

Highway No. 19 -- 3 miles P. T. H. No. 5 -- Riding Mountain Park -- additional gravel and prime.

Highway No. 20 -- 7 miles Ochre River to Dauphin Beach -- additional gravel and double prime.

Highway No. 20 -- 16.5 miles Winnipegosis north -- additional gravel.

Highway No. 20 -- 23 miles Cowan to Camperville -- additional gravel.

Highway No. 20 -- 12 miles Camperville south -- grading, gravelling and structures?

Highway No. 21 -- 12.3 miles P. T. H. No. 3 -- United States Boundary -- additional gravel and double prime.

Highway No. 21 -- 4.7 miles Kenton corner to south boundary of Hamiota -- additional gravel and double prime.

Highway No. 21 -- 11 miles McConnell Corner to Shoal Lake -- additional gravel and double prime.

Highway No. 21 -- 8 miles Shoal Lake to Oakburn -- grading, gravelling and structures.

Highway No. 23 east -- 17 miles Morris to La Rochelle Corner -- grading gravelling and structures.

Highway No. 23 west -- 19.6 miles Morris to Myrtle -- additional gravel and double prime.

Highway No. 23 west -- 19 miles Baldur to T. P. H. 18 -- grading, gravelling and structures.

Highway No. 23 west -- 16.4 P. T. H. 18 to P. T. H. No. 10 -- additional gravel and double prime.

Highway No. 24 -- 25 miles Rapid City to P. T. H. No. 21 -- grading, gravelling and structures.

Highway No. 34 -- 18 miles Gladstone to Austin -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 41 -- 14.8 miles -- St. Lazare to McAulay -- grading, gravelling and structures.

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.)...

Highway No. 41 a -- 21 miles Birtle to Shoal Lake -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 45 -- 14 miles Angusville to P. T. H. No. 4 -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 52 -- 13.5 miles Steinbach to P. T. H. 59 -- base course and bituminous mat.

Highway No. 59 -- 16 miles south of Libau -- Gull Lake -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 83 -- 14 miles United States Boundary to No. 3 -- base course and bituminous mat.

Highway No. 83 -- 42 miles Melita to Virden -- seal coating.

Highway No. 83 -- 25 miles Assiniboine Valley to Birtle -- Bituminous mat.

Highway No. 83 -- 22.5 miles Inglis Corner to Roblin -- additional gravel and chloride.

Highway No. 83 -- 15.5 miles Madge Lake to Benito -- Additional gravel and double prime.

Highway No. 83 -- 23 miles Benito to Swan River -- seal coating.

Highway 89 -- 5 miles Piney to United States Boundary -- seal coating.

These are in additional:

23 miles P. T. H. 21 to P. T. H. 83 via Goodland and Waskada -- grading, gravelling and structures.

23 miles Pilot Mound to Neelin -- grading, gravelling and structures.

21 miles -- Manitou to Notre Dame -- grading, gravelling and structures.

Seddons Corner to Milner Ridge -- base course and bituminous mat.

8 miles -- Letellier -- Dominion City -- additional gravel and double prime.

4 miles -- Fisher Branch east -- additional gravel.

6.4 miles -- Hecla Island Ferry Road -- additional gravel.

1.04 miles -- P. T. H. No. 4 -- Saskatchewan Ave. -- Concrete pavement.

6.8 miles -- Saskatchewan Avenue -- P. T. H. No. 6 -- grading, gravelling, structures and overpass.

7.3 miles P. T. H. Nos. 6 and 7 -- P. T. H. No. 4 -- completion of grading, and gravelling.

1.9 miles P. T. H. No. 9 -- P. T. H. No. 59 -- gravelling and chloride.

8 miles -- Seine River -- C. N. R. Overpass -- concrete pavement, completion of structures, grading, drainage and seeding.

That's the conclusion of the program.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I know that we're not going to have a discussion on this now but the one question -- is that all that's on the Trans Canada Highway -- that last page?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, I think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Municipal Affairs -- 1. Administration.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister explain why -- of all the program he just read, the only place, No. 6, where there's widening of shoulders. Certainly there are other roads in the province that are no wider than this one, why is this one singled out for widening of shoulders?

MR. WILLIS: Because the shoulders are narrow.

MR. GUTTORMSON: This road is wider than many other roads in the province. Why is there widening, at St. Laurent for instance, the road is certainly just as wide north of St. Laurent? There are many roads built in the Province that aren't as good as this road and this one is ready for a bituminous mat. Why isn't it getting a bituminous next year?

MR. WILLIS: Do you suggest that we should cancel this item.

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, I don't, I think you should put a bituminous mat on it.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister one question. I'm told that the road is going to be built which is called the Sarto -- Grunthal -- St. Pierre Road and I don't see any item there under which this money is appropriated for this construction but

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . it's supposed to be done this money is appropriated for this construction but it's supposed to be done this year according to hearsay. I'm wondering if the road will be built and if so, out of what appropriation?

MR. WILLIS: the decision from the municipality in that regard and there would still be Aids to Municipalities, other ones out of which they could be built. It is our expectation that it will be built.

MR. PREFONTAINE: May I ask then, if the municipalities will be asked to pay a part of the construction of that road?

MR. WILLIS: They have been so asked.

MR. WAGNER: I don't know whether this is a proper question to ask but this road that has been built from Ashern east towards Hodgson -- it's not completed, and I understand it's not a highway as far as your department is concerned -- it's only a forestry road and yet I received the work order the other day that you are continuing to build a few miles of that road and I don't see on the estimates here or on the program whether you are going to continue it next year?

MR. WILLIS: Such roads are never on this program. This is a trunk highway program.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I take it then that the individual items will properly be discussed under the Capital Supply Bill?

MR. WILLIS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Municipal Affairs -- 1. Administration. (a) Salaries

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief remarks. I will not be very long because I trust that we will be able to complete this estimate this evening but I would like to say a few words in commenting on the general activities of the department.

Of course, we are concerned in municipal affairs with the order and good government and the localities and communities of Manitoba but in this task I must say that we have been greatly aided and assisted by the hundreds of municipal men and women of the province. I would like to commend in these opening remarks, the voluntary contribution to public service which is being made by the men and women in the 190 municipalities of Manitoba. We have, in fact, 112 rural municipalities, 35 towns, 37 villages and 6 cities, in addition to that of course, this department supervises 14 local government districts. In all these areas, many hours of public service have been freely donated by a large number of men and women. I feel that we must commend their work -- through the years a great number of those who have been engaged in municipal politics have been serving for a long period of years and it's good to see also a considerable number of younger men entering the municipal field and playing their part in the affairs of the community.

The finances of the municipalities appear to be in a relatively sound position. Taxes have increased slightly between 1957 and 1958. In the rural municipalities, suburban villages and towns we find that in 1957 the tax imposition was \$24,430,674.00 and in 1958 the estimated figure was \$25,150,981.00 or an increase of -- a slight percentage increase amount in dollars to \$720,307.00. It is interesting to note that tax collections have maintained a satisfactory level. Collected in excess of the 1958 levy, we find that 62 rural municipalities, and collecting those reporting to date -- that is of 71 reporting to date, 62 collected in excess of their '58 levy and only nine collected less than their '58 levy. Of suburbans reporting, one collected in excess of their '58 levy and one collected less. Villages -- 11 collected in excess and 17 collected less than the '58 levy. Of towns -- five collected in excess and 15 collected less than their levy for the year 1958. The collections have ranged close to the 100% mark throughout the province and some of course who have collected arrears of taxation have collected over 100% in the past year.

The general economic picture of the province is revealed in the increased equalized assessment for the years 1959 - 1960. By reason of new buildings and improvements and increases in value due to advances in prices of property on the market, we find that the equalized assessment for the years '59-'60 compared to '57-'58 in the two-year annual computation of equalization of assessment, we find that in the previous period there was a total equalized assessment of \$989,840,800.00 and in the 1959-'60 period there is a total equalized assessment, including all the municipalities of the province, including cities as well, of \$1,078,439,700.00, or an increase in equalized assessment in the two-year period of

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.) . . . \$88,598,900.00.

Now one or two of the matters which have engaged the attention of this department in the past few months include the new policy of the elected Advisory Committees in local government districts. That bill has already been approved by this Legislature. We have established elected Advisory Committees to bring a greater measure of local self-government to some of the local government districts, and we have also provided for council administration. Of course, the Elected Advisory Committee, I believe, will be used in most of the mining centres of the province, if not all, they will be used in Snow Lake and Lynn Lake and in Thompson perhaps -- I fully expect it will -- we already are taking steps to bring about the elected Advisory Committee in Snow Lake and in Lynn Lake. The council administration form of government simply means that the administrator will be replaced by an elected council. That the elected council has the same duties and responsibilities and powers as the local administrator has. The local administrator will become the Secretary-Treasurer in those areas in which council administration is adopted and an elected council will replace the local administrator and assume his authority and responsibilities.

One of the other matter which we have developed in the past year has been the question of a municipal bonding. We found that bonds of municipal officials were much too low, having regard to the amounts of money which they handled in a year. In one case, in this Province, of course, there was in one rural municipality, there was a defaultation of \$48,000.00 and I believe the bond was \$7500.00. So that resulted in a tremendous loss to the municipality. We have made an enquiry into a new system of bonding of municipal officials and we have adopted a plan which will be put into effect, of increasing substantially the amount of bonds, the amount of bond coverage of all employees of municipalities. We find that not more than double the present premium, we can obtain a bond for all municipal employees amounting to \$225,000.00. The bond covers each individual to the extent of \$25,000.00, that is each individual employee, and provides a general coverage of \$200,000.00 so that in effect, each and every employee of any municipality in the province will be covered to the extent of \$225,000.00. Now this, of course, is more in line with the increased monies which are being handled by all municipal officials throughout the province. In addition to that the bond will provide a coverage on theft and burglary amounting to \$10,000.00. With an increase in premium which is not large, it's double, but it's still not large, we can provide adequate and suitable protection for all the municipalities. Under this system, under the present annual cost of bonding to rural municipalities, we find the expenditure amounted to \$2,942.50. Under the new premium it will be \$6,170.27, that is for 109 rural municipalities or in other words, an average of about \$60.00 per municipality for that bond. In five cities the cost was \$947.50 -- the new cost will be \$2,256.32. In three suburbs the present cost is \$255.00 -- the new cost will be \$1,006.34. In villages, the present cost is \$505.00 -- the new premium cost will be \$994.28. And in towns, the present annual cost is \$1,009.80 -- the new cost will be \$2,079.51. Towns, village and villages appear to increase about double -- some of the others, the cities go up more -- they're handling more money, they have greater revenue and the rural municipalities increase more than double but of course it is noted that the cost is still for them, just an average of about \$60.00 per annum. So that this new bond we feel will provide an adequate measure of protection for all the municipalities and is needed to meet the increased sums which come into the hands of municipal people.

Now on the matter of assessment. On the matter of assessment I would like to mention that the assessment program of the province conducted by the Provincial Municipal Assessor is proceeding. Assessments have been completed in several municipalities including Old Kildonan, Brooklands, Woodlands, Lakeview, Rosburn, Westburne, Lansdowne, Langford, Rosedale, Winnipeg Beach and Dunnottar and the Provincial Municipal Assessor is conducting assessments at the present time in Assiniboia, Ethelbert, Winnipegosis, Minitonas, Benito, Dauphin, Ochre Municipality, Ochre River, Silver Creek, Russell and Bowsman and it is anticipated that the Municipalities of Glenella and McCreary and Clanwilliam, St. Rose, Gilbert Plains, Grandview, Hillsburg, Shellmouth, Boulton and Swan River will be commenced within the next few months. So that it is expected by the department that the whole of the assessment program for Manitoba will be completed next year.

Now there is one other feature which we have under consideration which we trust will be an improvement in the affairs of the municipalities of the province, that is the introduction

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.) of the mechanical production of tax assessment rolls. We hope to bring into being for the year 1960 the central production by the government, by the department of the tax assessment rolls of all the municipalities of the province. Now that actually will mean a saving in dollars to all the municipalities. The figures indicate that it will be less costly to provide these tax assessment rolls in this manner mechanically than have them completed as they are being done at the present time and in the past, so that we are introducing the mechanical production of tax assessment rolls and the total cost is estimated to be about \$27,500 per annum. That figure, if it is divided equally between the government and all the municipalities will mean about 13 to 14 thousand for the government and a similar figure for the municipalities of the province divided according to their assessment rolls. Now this will also, of course, produce much greater efficiency in the annual assessment rolls of all the municipalities. It will be done mechanically, it will be done annually. The Act requires of course, that assessment rolls be reproduced annually -- I'm not positive that that is being observed in all municipalities in the province, but under this scheme it will be observed, will lighten the load, the technical load on the municipal officials, it will produce greater efficiency and it will be done at less expense to the municipalities of Manitoba.

Now these are a few of the items which we have had under consideration and have been working on in the past few months. I think that I'll not say anymore at the moment but I will be pleased to attempt to answer any questions which the honourable gentlemen may wish to put.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I was just looking at some notes I have here. Since July of last year I have been carrying on with the Minister discussions probably some correspondence with regard to the problem of some of the local residents in the north country. I must say in beginning that the Minister has always treated me courteously, he has always listened with a good deal of interest and I think with concern; I must say however, that I can't say that he has satisfied me that the situation up there is as it ought to be. I can't say that it's his fault because he has to work with the agreement which the former government, in the case of Thompson, he has to work with the agreement which the former government made with International Nickel and I have it here, and it's an agreement which I know creates a good deal of difficulties for him but I suggest Mr. Chairman, that it creates even more difficulties for these people up there because if you look at the agreement, and if you know some of the problems which those people have had to put up with and are still having to put up with, one wonders if really they are part of the province of Manitoba. The last incident, of course, that I could mention is one which was raised here by the Leader of the CCF; there's the incident with regard to the fact that only 50 people out of a thousand in the town of Thompson voted in the provincial election. Now if we have the agreement, Mr. Chairman, turn to page 1 and the agreement is signed by the government on December 3rd, 1956 with International Nickel says on the first page "(1) A local government district will be established comprising all that portion of the province of Manitoba," and further on "containing by measurement 975 square miles more or less". Turn to page five, it says "A resident administrator will be appointed for the district". Further on it says "If any resident administrator proves to be unacceptable he will be removed and a new resident administrator will be appointed in his place". Here I think is the key clause, Mr. Chairman. "Any resident administrator appointed for the district must be acceptable to the province and the mining company". In other words, Mr. Chairman, even if the Minister is dissatisfied with the job which the administrator is doing and wants to replace him he has to find somebody who is acceptable to the company.

Now, I'll come back to that later, Mr. Chairman, to the work which the administrator is doing. My information is, and if I'm wrong I'm sure the Minister will correct me, my information is that the administrator is being paid \$4,000 by the province of Manitoba and he is being paid \$6,000 by the International Nickel Company and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very important point because in my opinion at least, the local government administrator is the employee in fact of International Nickel and not of the province of Manitoba. His loyalties are to the International Nickel Company.

Turn to page 17, you find clause 25 of the agreement "no property real or personal of the mining company constructed, owned or used for any of the purposes mentioned in paragraph 23 and 24 hereof, will at any time" (anytime Mr. Chairman which I presume means forever) "will at anytime be subject to municipal districts, school districts or local govern-

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) ment assessments, taxes and rate of any nature or kind whatsoever".

Mr. Chairman I thought we had a bad agreement in the City of Winnipeg when the -- approval of the C. P. R. an agreement which was made on the vote of a few hundred people back in the 1800's but I think this one is even worse.

If you turn to page 27, clause 35 says "(1) The townsite will not be incorporated as a municipal district, city, town or village until in the opinion of the province and the mining company the time will have arrived when such action should be taken".

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the people who call the tune are not the province of Manitoba but the International Nickel Company.

And then you turn to page 28, section 2, of that same clause says, "No property of the mining company will, without the consent of the mining company, be at any time included within the boundaries or, of or next to any municipality or school district within the district howsoever created" etc.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the agreement which the Minister had to work with and I want to submit, Mr. Chairman, that the local government administrator is in fact, and I'm not blaming this government, except that in relating this story, I'm hoping that the government will take some action, because, Mr. Chairman, in fact the company through the local government administrator has complete control of that area. Now this agreement was signed in December of 1956 and construction of the property there began very shortly after. It was not till, I think, January of 1959.

MR. MILLER: Shouldn't that property be discussed under Resolution 84? I mean, we're not discussing general administration, we're discussing something about local government districts aren't we?

(continued on next page)

MR. ORLIKOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason I'm discussing it here is because we're on administration and I have had frequent discussions with the Minister, as have

MR. ROBLIN: I think probably in the strict sense that the member for Rhineland may have a point but nevertheless we have tonight been having a very general discussion all through the estimates on the Minister's salary, and if the Honourable Member will promise not to re-discuss it, when it comes up against the other items I'm sure there would be no objection to him proceeding now. He's made a good start, he might as well be allowed to finish it.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, the reason I am discussing it now is because I have discussed it on many occasions with the Minister outside the House. It's the first occasion I've had to discuss it in the House, and I will not be discussing it again after this particular item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. ORLIKOW: Now, Mr. Chairman, I can take my time. If the members want to interject, I've got time.

Mr. Chairman, I haven't discussed this item and as a matter of fact it seems to me I haven't been on my feet very often in the last two or three days, and even if I were, I don't think I have to apologize to the members. I can discuss the items that I think I have something to say on. (Interjection) Well I think it's under the item because we are discussing the Minister's salary and this item has to do with the administration.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The item here charged to administration, the Minister had made a general statement, so I would suggest that the

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I became interested in this problem because I was told, unlike the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities told us yesterday that everybody working in Kelsey, as they used to tell us everybody working at Thompson was very satisfied with working conditions and everything else, I became very interested in this matter when I was told by various people in Winnipeg interested in Labour Union Organization that they had found it impossible to get into Thompson to discuss with workers in Thompson, the problems which they had. Now immediately after the June, 1958 election I called the Vice-President of the International Nickel Company, who has his office in Winnipeg, and I told him who was speaking and told him that I wanted to go to Thompson to see what the situation was there. He told me, and I must say that I was surprised, that he doubted very much that they could find the facilities to put me up in Thompson, although they had 1400 people working there. Now, I thought this was a peculiar sort of situation. I called in turn, Mr. Chairman, the Deputy Minister of Labour, who referred me to the Deputy Attorney-General, he referred me to the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Deputy Minister of the Minister who is now reporting. He was surprised, Mr. Johnson, and he told me that he didn't understand how they could keep people out because Thompson had been completely the property of the International Nickel Company but just at the time that I spoke to him, which was in the week of June 20th of last year, this had been returned to the jurisdiction of the province and Mr. Johnson told me he had no objection to my, or anybody else going to Thompson. He suggested I check with Mr. Cowan, the Deputy Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and I did, and Mr. Cowan said he had no objections. I then phoned the CNR and they told me they couldn't sell me a ticket, and I started at the passenger office and went all the way up to the Vice President and after about ten days, he told me that beginning July -- August 1st, that they would sell tickets to Thompson. We then went back to Mr. Cowan, of the Mines and Natural Resources and we got a plan of the site and got further assurances from him that he had no objections to our going up there. I then called Mr. Johnson to tell him we were going and he suggested that in order to clear everything, we contact the local government Administrator, Mr. Nesbitt. He assured me that Mr. Nesbitt was an employee of the Provincial Government and to the best of my knowledge this was so. And when I called Mr. Nesbitt, I found that he had his office in the office of the International Nickel Company. This surprised me and I should say it perturbed me. I went back to Mr. Johnson, who said, oh don't worry about that. This man is an employee of the Provincial Government. And when we went back to see Mr. Nesbitt, Mr. Nesbitt said that he wanted to know why we wanted to go to Thompson, and I told him that I didn't think it was his business, it was public property, but we told him that we wanted to go there in order to see whether the men were interested in joining trade unions. Now, Mr. Nesbitt said that of course he wasn't concerned with whether people joined unions or not but he was concerned with the fact that the townsite of Thompson should not become

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) . . . as he called it, a shack town. And he showed me the plans which had been drawn for this site and they were excellent plans. He told me they had plans last year for 200 homes, of which 75 would be built last year. Now, he made it very clear that they had a long list of people who wanted homes there, people who had been there for as long as a year and a half or two. And so I asked him whether that meant that people who were interested in organizing unions could not go there, of course he said, well, that's obvious. I said well how about camping, well he said I have nothing to do with camping on Crown property - you get the permission from the Deputy Minister but I do have control of the kind of facilities which you use or anybody uses and I can tell you right now that I will not permit the use of tents anywhere in this area. So I says to him in effect what you're saying is, while you have nothing -- you are not concerned with whether the workers join unions or not, they will not be able to -- union organizers will not be able to buy homes nor will they be able to pitch tents. And he said, well, if that's -- and therefore they can't go there -- he said if that's the way you want to interpret it, that's your business. Well, at this point, Mr. Chairman, we realized that there was not much point in discussing matters with Mr. Nesbitt and so we went - I asked for an appointment with the Minister, and the Minister saw me with representatives of the Building Trade Union - we saw Mr. Thompson last July 11th, and I must say we got a very fine hearing. He was very sympathetic. And he assured me that day that this was very unfair and that he agreed with me completely that there ought to be no bars to anybody who was interested in organizing unions going up there. Now he was going out of town that day and I was going out of town three days later and we agreed that I was to 'phone the Minister in two weeks. But the Minister assured me that within two weeks the matter would be worked out so that people could go in there to do the job which they can do in any other part of the province - to organize unions. Now I called the Minister in July and it wasn't settled. I came back to the city and it still wasn't settled and I went up to Thompson myself. When I came back, I suggested to the unions that they do a number of things. And one of the things that I suggested to them was that they ask the Local Government Administrator for the right to buy property in the business section in order to build a union hall. And on September 9th of last year, they wrote a letter to Mr. Nesbitt, in which they asked for permission to buy a lot to build a hall according to any specifications - any general specifications which the Administrator has laid down for all building in that area. And a copy of that letter went to the Minister and to the First Minister. Now, they received a reply from the Administrator, dated September 12th, in which he acknowledges their letter and he says and I quote, "We should be able to advise you very shortly as to the location you would be permitted to establish in and the cost of the land." They waited a month and they didn't hear from him and so they wrote him on the 15th of October. And on the 16th of October, the local Government Administrator, the resident Administrator, Mr. Nesbitt, replied and he said, and I quote, "I would ask that you bear with me although I understand your anxiety and will certainly advise you as soon as these plans have been fully passed and approved." Incidentally, the First Minister on receipt of the first letter from the Union - copied the first letter from the Union to the local Government Administrator also replied assuring of his interest and promising his co-operation. I'm not suggesting that they didn't get it. But strangely enough, Mr. Chairman, the Union never received a reply from the local Government Administrators and it was in the last session of the House, in this spring session - I haven't got the Hansard here, it would only make the record longer - but when I asked the Minister a question about this, he said, and I'm just speaking from memory but I'm sure I have the content of what he said right, he said, "Oh, that's been settled, they should have gotten that a long time ago." Yet the local Government Administrator despite his promises that he would notify them immediately as to when they could go in there, in fact, did no such thing.

Now, this is the situation which exists in Thompson and I submit, Mr. Chairman, nothing has been changed. It may be that nothing may be changed until the agreement is re-negotiated. And this is what I suggested to the Minister a number of times and yet when I ask him precisely that question on the 8th of July, the Minister replied in regard to this question that I might say we have not at the moment considered any re-negotiations in this respect. Now, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to this Committee and to the Minister that these people are as entitled to the same rights as citizens of this province and as citizens of that particular area in which they live, as anybody else. And yet the treatment which they have received until now, in my opinion, does

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd)... not -- makes them into second or third class citizens, and tonight the Minister says, in announcing that there will be advisory local committees elected in some areas, as I remember, what he said and I may be wrong but I doubt it, he mentioned specifically Snow Lake and several others but he did not mention Thompson. Now, Mr. Chairman, I take this time and I do this not in a critical way of the Minister: The Minister has always treated me and treated the other people who came to see him - and I'm not the only one, this I know, who has come to see him; he's always treated us considerably but his consideration has not yet been followed by action. And, as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, these people are entitled to the same rights as anybody else. Now, we had a discussion the other night apropos to problems of those companies - I'm not suggesting that an agreement with International Nickel was not necessary. Of course, it was necessary. But I cannot agree, Mr. Chairman, that an agreement which, in my opinion, has so restricted the rights of those of the people who live there and who are going to live there because this is going to be a much larger town or city than it is now, should be restricted in the way in which it is at the present time. Now, it may be that the Minister and the Government will have difficulty in renegotiating the contract. Once the contract is signed, I suppose the company can sit back and say, this is the agreement which we have and it suits us fine. But it certainly seems to me that this matter, amongst others, needs to be given a good deal more consideration and a good deal more detailed reports to this Legislature than has been given up until this time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, ---- intention of the First Minister certainly I'm not going to propose a motion that the Committee rise and report unless we do.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think we should have the Minister to reply to the important points just made and after that reply, I think the Committee would prefer to rise, I would say. But perhaps it would be just as well to get the reply tonight.

MR. PAULLEY: The only reason I raised the question, Mr. Chairman, for the information of the First Minister, I thought the Chairman was going to pass the item and I didn't see the Minister.....

MR. ROBLIN: No, I don't think we should pass the item. There may be other speeches required tomorrow but I think the reply ought to be made now.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I've listened to the Honourable Member for St. John's and I certainly cannot criticize his attitude with respect to this matter. The agreement which was made, as he stated in '56, did contain the provision that the Administrator - the resident Administrator of that area - would be under the control or subject of the appointment of both the province and the company - and the International Nickel Company. We, of course, have a respect for contracts. It is not our intention to break valid contracts entered into by this province with any private firm or corporation. We think it would be wrong to attempt to sever or break any provisions of a legitimate contract. I might say with respect to the Thompson contract - or the Mystery Lake arrangement - that if the company at any time seek renegotiation of this contract which was entered into, that we would definitely insist that one of the provisions should be that the province - that the Department of Municipal Affairs - would have control and absolute control of the resident administrator and that no other person or corporation or party should be able to engage him as their servant. That is a matter of policy with us. But we do not want to - we do not want to ask that this contract be altered as I say, if there is any renegotiation, that will be one of the provisions - the administrator will be under our full control; he will be fully paid by the province and no one else will be able to contribute to his salary or to give him other work to do.

Now with respect to Thompson, I fully anticipate - I fully anticipate that there will be an incorporated town there within a very limited time. I expect to see Thompson as an incorporated town by 1962. I think we can fully anticipate that it will be incorporated so that the issue in itself will not drag on indefinitely. There will be an incorporation. The local administrator will be replaced by an elected council and total self-government will operate in the area. I might say that with regard all these contracts and mining centres our policy will definitely be, with respect to any contract which we negotiate under this government, that the local administrator will be entirely the servant of the province and that we will not permit him to be paid by any other corporation. That is our policy and any contract which is entered into in the future or renegotiated, I can say will include that provision. Because we fully agree that no man can serve two

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd) . . . masters and if the local government administrator is the employee of the province, he should be entirely the employee of the province and should not be paid by anyone else. And as I say, in any contract which we negotiate with any mining company, we will insist on that clause. We will fully pay the administrator and he will be our employee alone. As the honourable gentleman has pointed out, we did not make the contract with International Nickel; it was made three years ago. We had -- it wasn't our contract and we did not decide the policy of that time. I do not know what circumstances pervaded the scene in that day, whether this type of contract was necessary or not, but I can only say that we, in this government, will not enter into such a contract in the future. And if there is any renegotiation of an existing contract that that provision which permits dual control of an employee will be entirely eliminated.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bring the Speaker in.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker put the question and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker put the question and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.