

DAILY INDEX

Friday, March 11, 1960, 2:30 P.M.

<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> No. 120, re School Act (Mr. McLean) .....	1445
<u>Second Readings:</u> Bill 51, re Margarine (Mr. Seaborn) .....	1448
Mr. Smellie .....	1449
Mr. Tanchak .....	1452
Mr. Johnson (Assiniboia) .....	1454
Mr. Wagner .....	1457
Mr. Desjardins .....	1459
Mr. Groves .....	1460
Mr. Stanes, Mr. Scarth .....	1462
Mr. Weir, Mr. Johnson (Gimli) .....	1463
Mr. Prefontaine .....	1464
Mr. Orlikow .....	1465
Mr. Corbett .....	1466
<u>Bill 82,</u> re Dental Association (Mr. Christianson) .....	1467
Mr. Paulley .....	1468
<u>Bill 83,</u> re School Act (Mr. Schreyer): Mr. Lyon, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Paulley .....	1469
Mr. Roblin, Mr. Speaker .....	1470

DAILY INDEX

Friday, March 11, 1960, 8:00 P.M.

<u>Condolences:</u> Re George Milne, Francis Ferg, Q.C. ....	1471
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Public Works, Highways, Aids and Public Works .....	1473
<u>Municipal Affairs, Administration</u> .....	1496
Local Government Districts .....	1507
Municipal Assessments .....	1512



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Friday, March 11th, 1960

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee of Supply.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with our usual business, there are two matters which I should like to bring to the attention of the House at this time. These are subjects which are usually referred to on the Orders of the Day, Sir, but I would like to mention them now, in view of the time of the week to which we have arrived.

I would like to mention first of all that we received news of the death of George Milne, who was for several years Sergeant-at-Arms of this House and for many years before that was well known to all of us as one of the guard-custodians of this building. I think that all of us will agree that Mr. Milne was an exceedingly pleasant and affable person who was a friend of all of us here, and discharged his duties, particularly as Sergeant-at-Arms, in a way in which would excite the admiration and approval of all members of the House. And I would like to take this opportunity, Sir, although I will not move a formal resolution, of expressing what I know to be the view of the whole Assembly, one of sympathy and condolence, indeed, to his widow and to members of his family.

And I should also like to bring to the notice of the House, Sir, another event that took place, I think yesterday, and that is the death of a former member of this Legislature, Mr. Frank Ferg, Q.C., who for a number of years was the representative of the Constituency of Cypress. Now, Frank Ferg was a very valuable member of this House. He had a pleasant and easy personality. I'm sure that he was equally well regarded on all sides of the Assembly. He had a keen knowledge and an interest that went back many years, I know, particularly in the field of agriculture and those matters which affected the smaller communities of the province, because he had made his name and his reputation and his career in the rural part of the Province of Manitoba. And he was, I believe, an eloquent and able spokesman for his people. A man who was extremely well-liked and thought of by the members of this House. And so, Sir, in this case I would like to move and I should like to take the opportunity of associating, if I may, the Leader of the Opposition in this motion as the honourable member who represents Cypress at the present time is not in the Chamber, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that this House convey to the family of the late Frank Ferg, Q.C., who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service. And that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the occasions, as the Honourable the First Minister has mentioned, when we find it fitting to pause in the work of the Legislative Assembly in order to pay tribute to public servants who have done their work well and who have passed to their reward. And I would like to do as the First Minister has done, and before speaking of the late member to whom the motion applies, to say a word of appreciation about our former Sergeant-at-Arms, George Milne.

George was a veteran of both world wars. He had served in World War No. I when he was under age. He had served in World War II when he was over age. And knowing George as well as a lot of us did, I know it's a certainty that he served well in both capacities. One of his brothers, as well, was a veteran of both world wars and was lost at Dieppe. George was there too. I well remember when he first came to Portage la Prairie. Everybody would know he was a Scotsman, of course, and I never held that "agin" him. And he became a civil servant there, and became one of the most highly respected citizens of that community. And then he came — in the nature of his duties he was moved into this building and became one of the guards and later on the Sergeant-at-Arms. I am sure that all of us join with the First Minister in expressing our sympathy to the family and our appreciation of the excellent contribution that he made in every sphere of life in which he operated. I happen to know Mrs. Milne and the family quite well, too, and I can appreciate the great loss that they have suffered.

Then, Frank Ferg has just passed away. He, too, was a veteran of World War I, and as the First Minister has mentioned, he had lived mainly in the rural part, in the small town

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) . . . . of Glenboro where he practised law for more than 40 years and had served as a member of this Legislative Assembly. Actually Frank had not wanted to enter public life, having the feeling that he was too old at that time to start in, but he was prevailed upon to do so and he served here for a time. He was one of the few members of this House that retired voluntarily. The most of us don't ever get around to retiring in that way, but Frank did. He hadn't been anxious to serve in the first place, but as the First Minister has said, he did a fine job while he was here. I think the members who sat with him would agree with me that he was one of the few remaining of the old time style of flowing oratory. And he was certainly a fine character and greatly beloved by all the members who knew him. Then he had been pressed back into public service; just last year, I believe, again had become the Mayor of Glenboro. So, we mourn his loss, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that there are others in addition to the First Minister and myself that would like to express their appreciation of one or both of these public servants who have gone before us. Mrs. Ferg, I am sure, will be particularly bereaved because the family has grown up and is away and I am sure that she will be, to some extent, comforted by the fact that this House and a lot of friends that Frank thought so much of, take the time to extend their sympathy to her and their appreciation of Frank.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate our group with the thoughts of condolences to both of these gentlemen.

First of all, it was my pleasure to have many a chat with the late George Milne during the time that he was here and I was here. I always found him to be an upright and honourable gentleman. At any time we had any problems that he was concerned with, we found him most co-operative and I am sure that it is with great regret that all of us in this group who knew Mr. Milne will miss him.

So far as Francis Ferg is concerned, Mr. Speaker, even today when I heard of the tragic news of his passing I looked over at the seat which is now occupied by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet and pictured a fine gentleman who was very correct and precise in everything that he did. And as the Leader of the Opposition has said, I think that Frank Ferg was truly a member of the old school. I wonder sometimes whether it wouldn't be better if we had more of that type in here because of the fact that everything was right and everything was precise. I recall on many occasions when the honourable gentleman stood up, he wanted to be and was so exact in how he addressed Mr. Speaker, how he referred to any member of the House as the member for this constituency or that. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, his very able contributions to the debates in this House. I am sure that those who had the privilege of sitting with him, and he only entered the House the same year as I did after the election of 1953, but during the period of his tenure of office in this Legislature he did make a very valuable contribution to this House and we of our group would associate ourselves with the Honourable the First Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in extending to his widow and to his sons, our regrets at his passing. And as is well known, I believe he has two sons, both of whom are distinguishing themselves in their respective fields. We join in the tribute to the late Frank Ferg.

MR. SPEAKER: Members rise in token of respect to the late member.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Before putting that question I have something to bring to this House which I think is of utmost importance to the farmers who have been making applications under the Storm Emergency Fund. It was during the debate, Sir, that the regulations of this fund was brought to your attention that certain conditions took the individuals out of the capacity of being eligible to collect under this fund. One of them was the farmers that were in the PFAA districts. It was during that time that I held my reservations in regards to this because sometimes in theory it doesn't work out just the way you figure it does. But today it has been brought to my attention on very reliable sources that a farmer, a young farmer, starting up this year, farmed on a quarter section of land which I can give the Minister of Agriculture if he was here and his name, but this farmer put in 30 acres of wheat and 100 acres of flax. I mentioned last night that there was lack of rain -- in places there was too much-- but this farmer had to plow his wheat under for lack of rain, the 30 acres, and left him 100 acres of flax.

(Mr. Dow, cont'd) . . . . The snow came, and that 100 acres was covered. It's still there. He is in a PFAA district and the amount of money that he has received from PFAA is \$100. He has returned the cheque to PFAA and wants to apply under the Provincial Storm Emergency Fund and if he could get away from the regulations of PFAA he could collect \$390, so I point this out to the House, Sir, that there is a discrimination in the regulations of those farmers collecting under PFAA and not being eligible. I would wish that the government would take under consideration some scheme whereby the individuals under PFAA would get at least as much as they would have, had they not been in the area. I have other examples -- this is a fairly exaggerated example, I'll admit, but this is a case, an actual case, of which I can give the First Minister his name and the section if he so desires, but it's something that's creating a very great hardship to this particular individual and others. This chap, this is his only livelihood, this farming, and he is in that position, Sir, and I bring it to the attention of the House.

MR. ROBILIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not at liberty to speak in this debate because I have already taken part in it but my honourable friend can be assured that we'll take note of his remarks.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Last night in the number 3, two or three items were left to stand.

One was the (a) Administration and Operation -- the yellow sheet that was placed before us was going to be gone into and I think the Minister perhaps will proceed from there.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON, Q.C. (Minister of Public Works) (Virden): Mr. Chairman, are we starting at (j) (3)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Administration and Operations, that's the one we're going to deal with.

MR. THOMPSON: No, I have no further comment at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . (1) and (2) of (a) was left over. We didn't discuss it at all. (Interjection) 25.

MR. PAULLEY: Well we're on 3 (a), is that what it is, and then we'll go back to the (j). That's fine.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I believe there were also a number of questions that the Minister was to get further information on. Does he want to deal with the information on that first or does he want to go into new material first? It makes no difference to me.

MR. THOMPSON: I would be glad if the honourable members would carry on the discussion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I understood that the reason for letting Administration and Operations stand was so that either there or on the Highways or Planning or some of those on the next page that the program that the Minister had laid on our desks could be discussed and it was decided that it would be best of all to let the Administration and Operations item stand and that the highway program would be discussed at that time. I think perhaps what the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose had in mind was perhaps the Minister wanted to answer some of the questions or would he prefer to go on with (j) and then come back to the road program. I think either would be satisfactory.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, on (j) (3) some questions were raised on the decrease in the amount of the estimates. I want to point out that in the fiscal year 57/58 \$711,556.06 was spent on this item, and on 58/59 \$896,265.21. Now it is anticipated that the expenditure for the current fiscal year, that is the one now closing, will be \$850,000 so that the estimate for the coming fiscal year is \$75,000 higher than the amount which is being expended in the fiscal year closing; therefore, I would like to point out to the honourable members that there will be no reduction in expenditures this current year. It is likely that expenditures on market roads in unorganized territory will be increased to a certain extent. But there will certainly be no reductions. The amount actually expended is lower than the vote of last year but the amount which we are estimating this year is \$75,000 more than will be expended by the end of this month, so that I believe honourable members, especially those who represented ridings which included unorganized territory, were worried that we were cutting down on the program, there

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd)...is no such intention. We feel that it will be somewhat higher but we're bringing estimate more in line with the amount which is actually being used.

MR. TANCHAK: .....spending the amount estimated in the last year. Could the Honourable Minister explain -- no demand or ...?

MR. THOMPSON: It simply wasn't requested. Of course these expenditures are based on the requests of the school districts and citizens in the areas. There was no -- I don't know of occasions where requests for market roads or school district roads were rejected. There have not been the requests to equal the amount of the estimate.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, if I heard the Minister say correctly that there was no request. I have been putting in petitions ...

MR. THOMPSON: There were no more requests than the amount which has been expended.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I misunderstood the Minister but since 1958 I've been presenting petitions and delegates were in, for having more market roads. And as a matter of fact I was promised that some will be built in 1958 which they were not even built in 1959, and I'm somewhat sorry to hear that the Minister is even cutting the estimates down because as far as the Fisher area is concerned, and I can say Interlake area is concerned, there is a lot to be done. More to be done than there is done at the present.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly surprised at the reply that the Honourable Minister gives as the explanation why this amount of money wasn't spent because having represented a large part of unorganized territory for several years I know of no lack of demands for roads in those territories, and I'm sure those members here who have unorganized territory will agree with me in that regard. There seems to be an almost insatiable need for roads in those areas. Actually when I rise in this matter, I'm not complaining about the treatment in my own specific area, while we have further requests there that we want to have done, there has been a great deal of work done in the past and if the same policy is continued we'll soon have a good road system in our unorganized territory, but surely that cannot be the explanation for this because to my recollection, every year the requests from the unorganized territory were higher than what was finally appropriated. Certainly in my own district that was the case, that there were always some projects put over to the following year or portions of projects deferred because there wasn't sufficient funds. Now I simply can't understand how come now we didn't spend all that. Surely there must be some other explanation than the fact that there weren't requests. Insofar as the requests from the school districts that the Minister mentions, this is only a small part, I believe, of the total appropriation, as I remember it from last year's figures here, if this is correct. It amounted to \$200,000 out of the \$1,074,000. The big amount there is the \$874,000. Now this I believe is established largely by my honourable friends' district offices; they are the ones who decide and recommend what the construction should be, and I'm sure that they have many more recommendations which they could put through every year, if there was surplus money. Frankly it appears to me here that the same thing is in the road program. It was built up to a bigger amount than what the government really had in mind spending, because if that's not the case I don't know why they didn't proceed to do it. I'm sure the projects were there.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I wasn't here last night and in the afternoon I had asked the Minister some questions which I said that I was quite willing to wait until we get to the item for the answer. I understand that the Minister did not make comment on these questions as yet although I might be wrong, and if he hasn't I realize that we're considerably past the item, but there were only six specific questions and if he has them there would he mind answering them before we leave the department.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, there were a few questions that I wanted to ask and I thought would come under this project schedule and I just realized that that was only the Highway Branch. I feel that they should come under (j) (2) and that is already passed. I wonder if the Honourable Minister will let me ask these questions? It was on the help to different municipalities.

MR. THOMPSON: I'd ask them under the heading -- under the first item on this part when we get to it. We're going back to the first part.

MR. DESJARDINS: To the project.....

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we go back, I wonder if it would be possible for the Minister to give us in the case of the unorganized territory -- I'm not asking for it in the case of the school districts, because I realize there that some requests may come in which he may not have at this time -- but in the case of the unorganized and disorganized territories, could he give us the same type of report there as he has given us for the provincial trunk highways, that is the approximate mileages on the various projects concerned? Because I would think that in order to establish this appropriation, there would have to be a fairly detailed estimate in any case and if he could supply us with that -- I don't ask for it now -- if it could be supplies to us after I think it would be of considerable value to the members insofar as knowing exactly what is going on in this particular appropriation.

MR. THOMPSON: . . . . give those figures to the honourable member but I should point out that I think that until last year these items were under two separate numbers in the list -- they were (j) (3) and (j) (4), I believe -- so that if I give the honourable member the items which I can do, I think I haven't time at the moment, perhaps to add the two, but the (j) (4) item, of course, includes the market roads in unorganized territory as of last year and the (j) (3) includes the school district roads. Now in grading, there is 215.26 miles of (j) (4) and 149.42 of (j) (3), and the total of that would be the work done; and gravelling 136.10 and 107.55; and additional gravelling 138.6 and 96.75; and drains 44.43 and 7.30; and number of bridges was 13 under the first part -- under the market roads part (j) (4). Those are the figures which are now included in this particular item representing the mileage done in the past year.

MR. MOLGAT: What I was really wondering about, Mr. Chairman, is whether it would be possible to have a project schedule, such as is given to us here in this green sheet for the provincial trunk highways. Now as I recall last night the Minister told us that now there is something in the order of 1689 miles of 100% government roads. I think that's the figure he quoted us now -- that means that the 100% government road is quite an extensive item. It doesn't quite approach yet a provincial trunk highway, but still it does mean a great number of miles, and if we could have the same information for that type of work as we have on provincial trunk highways, I think it would be very useful to the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (j) (3) Passed (4) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister was to give us some information here on how -- what was the reason for the decrease in the appropriation?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, under (j) (4) this covers the ferries. The old ferry at Hecla Island was replaced with a new ferry and it is anticipated that as a result of the replacement of the older one with a new ferry that there will be quite a considerable reduction in maintenance costs, so that this item has been reduced on that account because of the new instalment which has taken place there.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . these are covered by this item now, Mr. Chairman, is there any change from last year?

MR. THOMPSON: No, other than the replacement there, there are no other changes. The ferries are at the Narrows on Lake Manitoba known as the Lake Manitoba Narrows Ferry and the Hecla Island one which I have mentioned and crossing the Winnipeg River at St. George known as the St. George Ferry.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised that a change in a ferry can account for that much of a decrease because the previous Minister last year gave us the figures that when he appropriated \$50,000 in June that the Hecla Ferry would cost \$22,000 to operate; the Narrows Ferry would cost \$22,000 to operate; the St. George Ferry would cost \$6,000 to operate. He based his \$50,000 figure on the basis of those three, now in order to reduce the appropriation from \$50 to \$39 which is a drop of \$11 -- if it all comes out of the Hecla operation then that would mean that that would be reduced from \$22,000 to \$11,000, cut exactly in half?

MR. THOMPSON: No, the Hecla Island Ferry is now estimated at \$18,500, the Lake Manitoba Narrows at \$16,000 and the St. George at \$4500.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What accounts for the reduction in the operation costs of the Narrows Ferry, Mr. Minister?

MR. THOMPSON: We're replacing -- we're making a considerable change there in the ferry, a remodelling job if you might call it that or an improvement which will take less maintenance costs.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm quite prepared to accept my honourable friend's figures but then the ones that the Minister gave us last year were certainly off the bat because this is what he told us under estimates in June of last year when we were discussing these; and I realize that it's not this Ministers but his predecessor; but the figures which he gave us then when we asked him why the increase, he told us that those were the estimated costs. However, that's not too important. What I'm really concerned about is that there will be no reduction in the service given on the ferries insofar as hours of service, frequency and so on -- that there is no plan change there.

MR. THOMPSON: No; service will, I expect, be better than ever.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, last session I asked the Minister to consider extending the operation on the Narrows Ferry and if my memory serves me correctly he told the house at that time that he would give it consideration. Would the Minister tell us now whether they are planning to increase the hours of operations of the Narrows Ferry?

MR. THOMPSON: No, I'm sorry I can't make any comment on that. I regret, that I have no information on any proposed change -- you mean the hours per day, not the season of course, but the hours per day? No, I'm unable to comment on that at the present time, I will look into it.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, there is just one item yesterday I asked the Minister but I don't think he had the figures -- what is the total trunk highway in this province, the secondary highways and other roads that are maintained by this province? I think you just gave me the figure for the trunk highways, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ....finishing these items when we come to them. (4) passed, (5) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Last night on (5) Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has the report on that one?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, this covers a grant which is paid to towns and cities and suburban municipalities, and is received by those municipal centers who chose to maintain their highways within their limits. The government pays in this grant the sum of \$1,000 per mile; the alternative, of course, is that the government does the maintenance themselves, the municipality doesn't wish to do it; and in that case, of course, there is no grant but where the municipalities pay the -- or choose to maintain the provincial highway within their limits they receive that \$1,000 per mile grant. Of course the reason here is simply that under the present highway standards municipalities normally haven't the equipment to maintain these roads so they choose to let the government do their own maintaining rather than accept the grant of \$1,000 for that maintenance purpose. In the last year, I think, the sum paid under this was \$37,882.52, which is lower a little bit than the amount that we are estimating at the moment, so that there is no indication of any need in increase over the amount which is now actually being expended in this matter.

MR. CAMPBELL: The big item in this one is Greater Winnipeg, is it not? Does the Minister, Mr. Chairman, have the figure for Greater Winnipeg, and then any of the other larger centers like Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Dauphin -- any of those? I don't care about all the smaller ones but the bigger ones.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, I will be glad to give the figures for the City of Winnipeg; that is the figures I have are for the fiscal year '59-59, which indicates, I believe, the use which is made of this type of grant. The City of Winnipeg is \$29,960, North Kildonan \$2,000, City of East Kildonan \$1650, the City of Brandon was \$5,160, St. James city \$3560, town of Dauphin \$1490, town of Flin Flon \$1690, and the rural municipal of Fort Garry \$776.52.

MR. CAMPBELL: ..... Mr. Minister.

MR. THOMPSON: Apparently they wish that the government do their own maintaining.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item passed. Now we revert to 3 (a).

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, before we ..... that there, there was another question that I had asked on the item just before the last item of (i) I had asked the Minister if he would be able to produce the correspondence between the former Minister and the

(Mr. Campbell, continued)... municipalities concerned with regard to the Goodlands-Waskada-Coulter road; and has he been able to look that up, Mr. Chairman?

MR. THOMPSON: No, I haven't had an opportunity to obtain that information. I will be glad to endeavour to supply it on an order for return.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll supply it anyway, and with an order or informally.

MR. CAMPBELL: I had asked the Minister last night if he would be willing to supply it, and I took it that he had no objections -- so I don't like putting it on an order for return if it is agreeable to supply it anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: a (1) Salaries.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I have before the last year's estimates here and the program of the road building and I here don't see Fisher Branch Highway to Hodgson which in July the former Minister promised 11 miles of grading and gravelling and structure and here -- this year is doesn't say. Isn't that highway going to be built in 1960? Highway No. 7 -- it's 11 miles from Fisher Branch to Hodgson. In July program the former Minister had it on the program and I don't see it in this year's program and I also would like to bring to the Minister's attention the road east of Fisher Branch which was built last year four miles and it is only reading here on this program, 1960 program, it says it's going to be only additional gravel. Isn't the.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: ..... is it going to take this Highway and start down, the questions may come as you come to those different roads.

MR. WAGNER: As far as the opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister said that there was no re-shuffle of the schedule or anything. It's going to be carried on as was in the July road program but it isn't in the 1960 March program now.

MR. THOMPSON: My honourable friend misunderstood my remarks at the beginning. I thought I made it clear that in view of the various circumstances which were mentioned at the time, that certain roads in the July program which was presented last summer would be re-scheduled; some of them are in this program; some will be moved forward to the next year. The road you mention is one of the ones which is being forward to next year. (interjection) Whichever term you wish. I think we're always moving forward.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, could I ask what was the reason for delaying one year behind when the former Minister had it on the schedule and as a matter of fact I believe he would have been going through with it if it wouldn't have snowed. He would have started even last fall, but it snowed and everything was paralyzed. I agree with that but somehow it's very odd to me that in 1960 summer since it was scheduled more or less for '59 fall by the former Minister and now it's out completely. Is there any certain reason for it?

MR. THOMPSON: No, my honourable friend is quite correct. It certainly is not in the list but in his area we have especially -- at least not directly in his area but in his engineering division, we have a huge program which is going forth this year especially the one from Gypsumville north and it was simply found by the -- or recommended by the department that it was impossible to complete that road this year and it was recommended that it be re-scheduled till the coming year. That is the reason it was done, we were simply unable to include it in this year's program.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I will find myself awkward explaining to the people and since they are out there waiting, they take it for granted it's going to be 1960 and Gypsumville is in the St. George constituency and that will sure surprise them. It really is a surprising thing for me to find out tonight that it isn't on the program. I never expected -- I took it for granted that since it was in July 6th, 1960/61, it is going to be carried on and here we have 1960 and 61 program and it's not even on the list, on the program.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I asked this question last night and if the Minister would like me to ask it under this item. I referred last night to Highways running northerly and northeasterly from the city. I refer to Highways 6, 8, 4, then No. 9 and No. 59 on the east side of the Red River and on the northern perimeter road there's been considerable work done this past two years. I notice that the signal lights have been installed at the CPR Beach Line; this road has been used this last few weeks; I would like to know whether it's officially open or whether it's being used unofficially, and inasmuch as it's now shown on the works program for hard surfacing for 1960, I would like to ask the Minister does his department contemplate

(Mr. Wright, continued).... doing this work this summer. And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the government and the department for its interest in taking over the six miles of the River Road, this very scenic road which is enjoyed by a lot of people, is for the first time this year, to be taken over and looked after by the government .

MR. MOIGAT: Mr. Chairman, when we were discussing highways yesterday, I did not make any general comments on the matter as I was waiting until we got to the item which is what I understood the Minister preferred us to do. Now I want to say at the outset that I feel extremely sorry for the Minister. I sympathize very deeply with him. The task that he has taken is a very difficult one; the promises of his predecessor and of his leader have certainly put him in a most difficult position and that is exemplified perfectly by the breakdown which was handed to us here last night, because when one goes through this to see what is here that is new and see what is being completed from the previous program it is certainly a very revealing situation. By my estimate, there's something in the order of 183 separate items at least listed under the remarks column - that's the total I get -- and out of those, I find that 78 are merely completions of previous contracts. Now that is, I know, and the Minister said was on account of weather conditions and so on but as was pointed out by the speakers yesterday, we have weather conditions coming up every year. I well remember back in 1955 and 56 the time of certain by-elections that my honourable friend the then Leader of the Opposition and the now Premier, had a great deal to say about what was not being done in roads and I think if there were bad years for construction one could hardly find any worse than 53, 54, and 55 when there was extensive flooding in various parts of the province; tremendous rainfall and so on, so while we're all prepared to admit this difficulty of weather, I think it is a continuing one - it comes up every year and the real explanation, it seems to me, for this situation here is that the previous Minister simply went ahead and bluffed and promised a great deal more than he himself or at least I'm sure the department could accomplish. And in this regard I certainly don't blame the department in the least. I believe that they have done an excellent job. It's the government that has made the 'boob' in this respect. If one looks and goes back to the program that was presented to us in the fall of 1958, and I won't run over all the roads there, I just want to consider the ones in my own area which I know best. For example, at that time on No. 5 highway there was to be seal coat from Eden to Norgate; then base course and bituminous mat from Norgate north of Laurier; and base course and bituminous mat from north of Laurier to Ochre; then in June, July the same area again appeared and this time it was to be completely seal coated from Norgate to Ochre. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that at this stage the base course and bituminous mat is not yet completed, let alone the seal coating which was to be done according to the July estimates and as I recall the situation, it wasn't a question so much of weather it was the contracts were not let until fairly on into the summer; the work certainly wasn't started until the season was quite on. Naturally when the fall came along, the work wasn't completed but the whole purpose of voting \$33,000,000 in the fall of 1958 and according to my honourable friends was so that they could start this program first thing in the spring and yet it didn't seem to materialize.

To go on from there to the other constructions in my area -- there's to be three miles from PTH No. 5 to the Riding Mountain National Park on No. 19 highway. That was to be graded, gravelled and structures -- that's fall of 1958, Come along to summer of 1959, my honourable friend then was going to put additional gravel and prime on that same piece of road, and as far as I know the road was never even started. All that was done on it to my knowledge was that some stakes were put up. I regret that my honourable friend the Attorney-General isn't here, because he is a specialist in this matter of stakes and I would like him to come and check on these because I found no work and now when I look at the new projects for next summer I don't find No. 19 highway on it at all. It's disappeared; it's been moved forward I presume; re-scheduled, like my honourable friend's from Fisher. Well, it was to be built as I say back in this 33 million fall of '58; it was to be completed in the summer of 1959, and yet nothing has been done.

To go on then from there -- the next piece of work which I remember was to be done was on No. 50 highway. Now on that part of it I have to give the Minister or the Department credit, there was gravel and prime -- I believe that part of it was completed on 7.5 miles. Then there was to be another piece of 6 miles of grading and gravelling; that's again the fall

(Mr. Molgat, continued). . . . of 1958 - grading and gravelling 6 miles. We come along to the summer of 1959 and the same piece of road, and it was no longer included; it wasn't there. Well the work was to be started. The fact of the matter is the work again was not completed and it appears this year again under gravelling completion of contract. Now that is insofar as the provincial trunk highways -- I think the total of the work that was to be done in my constituency. Now, when we look at that not one of them, with the exception of one 7 mile piece, none of the others were completed; all of them were left in the air, and yet when the Minister spoke to us yesterday he told us that the complete construction as I have the figures here for 1959 were 2,245 miles completed. Is that correct? Well I must ask them that where that completion was because it certainly wasn't in my constituency and if mine is any sample of what was done elsewhere in the province then I question this figure of 2,245. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that the whole fall 1959, 33 million was strictly a propaganda move at that time because the results certainly haven't been there and what this appropriation in the summer of 1959 was for, then I cannot see because it was to do work which, or to finish work which wasn't enacted under the first program. And I think the question arises here that the department asked for 33 million, an appropriation that is to borrow 33 million in the fall of 1958, and then again at the summer session of 1959, they asked us to appropriate another \$19,381,000. My question is, was this money borrowed and if so, how much of it was spent? What is left over from that 33 million and 19.3 million because I presume that the Minister will be presenting us again with a Capital Bill when we come along to that item and I think we have to have the information as to what went on these previous ones because if the completion isn't going to be any better than it has on the past two, then I question the point of much more analysis. Now coming back to the appropriation for this year I want to ask this specifically to the Minister, what about No. 19 highway -- 3 miles but -- a short piece, 3 miles, but it happens to be a very important piece of road because it connects our No. 5 highway with the Riding Mountain National Park. It's the eastern entrance to the park, receives a great deal of traffic and that one little piece of three miles is in poor condition; because of shale difficulties with the Riding Mountain a section of the road floods regularly with even a small amount of rain and it's urgent that the work be done. Now it's been removed completely from the program and I would like to know why, and when is it going to be done, because it was specifically put in in the fall of 1958. So I would appreciate from the Minister his comments. Now I want to repeat again, I feel very sorry for him in this regard; I don't want to insist on information which I don't expect him to have instantly. I am prepared to wait for the information. He is new in the department but I think that the committee should have this information before we proceed to discuss further capital appropriations.

MR. THOMPSON: Do I understand my honourable friend to mean that the information he requires is a breakdown of the mileage? I thought I had given that more than once.

MR. MOLGAT: Insofar as the amount of money I would like to know, was all that money borrowed? The 33 million and the 19 million 3. If it was borrowed, how much of it was spent? And how much of it is being carried over. In dollars and cents, not in mileage.

MR. THOMPSON: Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether we should discuss such matters as the monies voted and so on, under this item or under Capital Account. Certainly the honourable member is fully entitled to the information which he asks, but I have the impression at the moment that that particular phase of the subject perhaps would more properly be discussed under Capital Vote. If that's acceptable to the --

MR. MOLGAT: That will suit me, Mr. Chairman, providing that the Minister will have the information at that time. As I say I can't expect him, and don't expect him, to have all these details ready now. Next year we may be a little more difficult on the honourable gentleman; for this year I am quite prepared to accept that. What I would like at the time then when we discuss the new Capital Supply for this department is to have the details on the past Capital Supply at the same time so that we can make a thorough disussion.

MR. THOMPSON: I would be prepared to discuss now, the monies voted and relate them to the monies which have been expended in the past two years, but I do feel that it is a subject for Capital Supply.

Now, on highway 19, I have checked that road, I notice it was one of the ones which was listed in last summer's statement and not in this year. I am advised by the department that the

(Mr. Thompson, continued)... construction of this road has been delayed pending the solution of the drainage problem on the east slope of the Riding Mountain National Park. Now that is the reason why that particular road has been delayed. I want to assure the honourable member that it is not wiped out. As I said, I think, at the beginning of these estimates, these roads are not cancelled, they will be proceeded with, but in his case on No. 19 there is a particular reason as in these other cases. Now in 5 of course, in this year's statement he mentioned highway 5. I see it in here in the program, two strips on 5, 18 1/2 miles from Norgate Corner to north of Laurier and 19.7 miles north Laurier to Oak River, both cases base and bituminous mat which are completions of contract. Those were part of the many programs which he mentioned which await completion this coming season and we were unable to proceed with the seal coating of course, simply because the former step, the base and bituminous mat has not yet been fully laid.

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, I notice in the sheet presented to us last night that there is a seal coat job between highway 23 and 3. It's not included in the sheet. That job was started last fall. Some part of it has been done. Is there some reason as to that being held over or is it being continued with?

MR. THOMPSON: Is that 18?

MR. DOW: Pardon me? On No. 10 from highway 23 to highway 3. It was in last summer's estimates.

MR. THOMPSON: In last summer's estimates the item of seal coating was included. Is that true?

My information is that a bituminous recap is to be placed there in conjunction with the paving of PTH 3 from PTH 18 to PTH 10 and that will be done in place of the seal coating, in lieu of seal coating. There will be a bituminous recap in conjunction with the other work which is going on in the area.

MR. DOW: Does that include No. 10, Mr. Minister?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, that's 10.

MR. DOW: That is it will include 3 to 23 to 10.

MR. THOMPSON: The junction of 3 to the -- yes on 10 from 3 to 23.

MR. DOW: On 10?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. DOW: As well as from 18 to 3?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. DOW: I mean it doesn't read that way. I was just wondering if there was -- because that particular work was started last year and they have been working on it all winter getting ready for the spring. I was just wondering if I read it wrong.

MR. THOMPSON: Which item -- you're reading under item 10.

MR. DOW: On highway 10.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. DOW: On highway 10 there's no mention made of from highway 23 to 3 which showed last year. And then it shows on highway 3, there is the bituminous mat from -- well it's from actually highway 18 to 10. That's two distinct highways.

MR. THOMPSON: On 3 there's 18 1/2 miles from Killarney to PTH no. 10 base bituminous mat and that is the advice I have on the subject that a bituminous recap will be placed in conjunction with the paving which is in the book in lieu of the seal coating.

MR. DOW: Now what I mean, Mr. Minister, is, is it from 3 to 23 on 10 because if you give that answer I could explain it a little more? From 3 to 23.

MR. THOMPSON: The 19 miles strip on 10.

MR. DOW: Well where do I get that item, Mr. Minister?

MR. THOMPSON: It's not in there.

MR. DOW: Oh, it is included though?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. Did you have some comment?

MR. DOW: No. I was just going to say it was started last year and there is part of it done in a kind of mixed-up way, and was caught in the bad weather, and I was wondering if it was going to be one of the ones left over or be done this year because as you know that highway is the second highway of approach for tourist trade into Manitoba and I didn't want to see it left

(Mr. Dow, continued) . . . . in that condition for the summer months.

MR. THOMPSON: It will be recapped yes. It will have a coating placed on it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, on page 11 of this green pamphlet, in the middle of the page, PTH 59 south — east to Grunthal. Now I'd like a little clarification if I could, please. First of all it says 15 miles, whereas it is only half that distance from 59 to Grunthal, running east from No. 59 highway, 15 miles would take it over to No. 12 highway. I was wondering which is correct. Is the highway running to Grunthal or is it running the 15 miles east of 59 highway? And secondly is this an access road or provincial trunk highway, or a 100% road or just what is the designation of this road?

MR. THOMPSON: That will be a 100% road from 59 east. The mileage given is 15 -- yes it will be 15 miles. That is provided in the statement here.

MR. ROBERTS: The question, Sir, was, it says east to Grunthal, whereas it is only 6 or 7 miles east to Grunthal. If it is 15 miles it will carry it all the way to Sarto or No. 12 highway. Now I wondered whether the 15 miles was correct or the description east to Grunthal was correct?

MR. THOMPSON: Well, I am afraid I'll have to check on that. I quite agree with the honourable member. The 15 would cover from 59 to Grunthal at least 7 would cover that distance, 15 would cover right to No. 12 past Sarto. The location will be via Grunthal although the complete location has not been decided. It will be a 100% road. I am unable to say whether this is intended to mean for this year the full 15 miles or whether that figures should be 7, I'll advise the honourable --

MR. ROBERTS: You will get that information for me please, because that probably is the hottest subject in southern Manitoba at the present time.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, there is a conflict in the distance there.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, at the last session of the Legislature the House passed estimates for 35 miles on No. 6-- miles of road widening, or shoulder widening as it's called here between St. Laurent and Eriksdale and the Minister told the committee this work would be done next year. At the present time the stakes are all up along the highway and in this year's program there is no mention of the shoulder widening. Could the Minister tell us if it's going to be done or the reason it isn't in this year's program?

MR. THOMPSON: No it's not in this year's program. My advice is that that road is going to carry a tremendous volume of traffic this year in view of the construction of the Gypsumville-Grand Rapids road and it is deemed advisable to leave the widening of the shoulders there because it may be a possibility that the road in the area which the honourable member mentions will have to be rebuilt. It is felt that it perhaps is not timely to broaden shoulders in a case where the entire structure may have to be rebuilt as a result of the tremendous volume of traffic which will of necessity be permitted over that road in the coming year to build a northern road.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The Minister's answer is understandable. I was wondering when they decided this because the road is already staked out for widening and we knew this road to the north was going up when this estimate was passed.

MR. THOMPSON: When was it staked?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Pardon?

MR. THOMPSON: When was this staking done?

MR. GUTTORMSON: During the past few months, after the road building season.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, of course the decision on the Grand Rapids road came to our department in December. Now I don't know whether the stakes were put in after that, I wouldn't think so because it is my advice that this should be held up until the decision is made on what has to be done after the road north is completed, or started.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I accept that answer because I'm not prepared to say whether it was before December or not, I know it was during the winter months, after the snow had come on the ground.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I don't see 14 (a) on the list. Is there no consideration given to the widening the shoulders out on 14 (a) at all?

MR. THOMPSON: It's not included in the list, no. I have no information on that particular road but I'll certainly ask the department to investigate it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, this one question on No. 6 highway, the Minister said that in view of the heavy traffic that's anticipated, the road might have to be rebuilt. Would that mean the entire road from Winnipeg to Gypsumville or just sections of it? Just last summer parts of the road between Mulvihill north of Eriksdale to just north of Mulvihill was reconstructed. Could he tell the Committee if it's the entire road or just sections of this No. 6 highway that might need rebuilding?

MR. THOMPSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell the honourable member just what parts of the highway should be reconstructed -- if any -- that matter will be determined after the effect of the heavy traffic to the north location is determined; after we know what has been done and after the situation on various parts of the road is known -- after the northern heavy traffic has been over it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, in this project schedule on the first page the last item 5 miles Ste. Anne's Road No. - 1 to junction of -- should that read junction of 59, or is that further than that -- is that to this proposed overpass?

MR. THOMPSON: Which number?

MR. DESJARDINS: The last item on the bottom of the page, page 1.

MR. THOMPSON: Oh! Ste. Annes Road to junction of ....

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes. No, because No. 1 is the alternative Trans-Canada.

MR. THOMPSON: No. 1... that's the amount there, that's not... I'm not just sure. I can get that information just in a few minutes if you wish to carry on.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, another thing I would like to ask the Minister on this 50-50 basis government share for the different municipalities -- some of these public works projects that have been approved last year but not finished, will the municipalities have to have that approved again? Well, could the Minister tell me then what project has been approved this coming year for the city of St. Boniface? They haven't been informed as yet.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think I have that information. I haven't had an interview with the city of St. Boniface to date. The department has but I haven't. I'm not just sure what projects are included in the St. Boniface list for this coming year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Would it be possible to find out at a later date because apparently they wanted to meet with the department and it's been next to impossible at this time, of course. They made their request quite a few months ago and have been advised they can come after the estimates. Well I think that's a bad time as there's no money in there and I don't know how this thing can be approved if the money is not voted. Now under (j) in this help to municipalities there is a certain amount of last year. What about the money that hasn't been spent, does that go in a special fund or does that go back to the treasury?

MR. THOMPSON: No, it goes back to the treasury.

MR. DESJARDINS: Therefore that money would not all be spent then. Well, Mr. Chairman, could the honourable Minister find out for me at a later date, the project approved for the city of St. Boniface?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, I will be glad to.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, we don't seem to be following the sequence here so in that case I would like to ask the Minister with regard to those same questions I asked the other day, with regard to 4 east, from the second page. Twenty-two miles of base bituminous mat, some of this has been done, has been completed and part of it hasn't. How is this accounted for here, and in connection with this same item, what about the-- does the Minister have information there as to whether or not access roads to villages of Tyndall and Garson will be completed this year at the same time as #4 is worked on?

MR. THOMPSON: No, I haven't seen the, actually seen the list yet for the coming year on access roads. It's under consideration at the present time but there is a possibility that the roads mentioned by my honourable friend might be included if there is construction in the area. That is one of the governing factors in access roads this year. But I am not prepared to say there may be reasons for not doing it or for doing it. If my honourable friend wishes to consult a little later when they get the list in shape, I'll be able to advise him. Now on the Lockport to Beausejour road - that's #4 east - yes, the grading there I am told started in 1958. The complaint was that it's in bad shape -- is that it?

MR. SCHREYER: The substructure of that road, is of course, in bad shape and despite that, surface bituminous mat and base was put on it. I made that complaint the other day. However, right now the point that I'm asking the Minister is I notice here that you have 22 miles base bituminous mat. Now I'm quite sure that if part of the road is complete, it wouldn't be 22 miles, Mr. Chairman. So unless the department intends to do it all over again -- I'm wondering.

MR. THOMPSON: No, that 22 covers the completion of the contract. It doesn't necessarily indicate that we're intending to do that road over again. I might say that that road was begun, I believe, before we assumed office as far as I know. It was certainly instigated before we had the responsibility in connection with it; and it was proceeded with according to schedule without making any particular changes in structure, but our responsibility simply was carrying on the project which had begun there.

Continued on next page

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I really have to say something about that statement of the Honourable the Minister because it's true that that project was laid on before my honourable friends took over the government of the province but we had plans for that road that entailed the raising of it, and the black topping of it; and those plans, I'm sure would be available to the department but even so these statements of the Minister who succeeded our Minister was that the road work was going to be a lot better done from them. Now my honourable friend, the Minister, can't now say that they were carrying on the project that we had started because that was one of the key points in their policy -- was that they were going to build better roads. My point is that on this particular road -- it's one of the examples -- that it's not a better road, it's a worse road, than we were building, and that the 8 miles that are completed are as wavy as all get out with "bump" signs up on them already. Now I know that the modern machinery can put on what they call a levelling course and take some of those bumps out instead of putting more in -- and there were enough in that road to start with; and that's one of my causes of complaint, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not blaming this Minister. But the profession was made from that side of the House time and time again that they were going to build better roads. "We're never again going to build," said the former Minister, "roads like 6 and others like that." This road that has been built since my honourable friends went in, is nothing like as good as #6; and it has nothing like the grade that #6 has; it's down in some cases to prairie level and yet they're putting black top on it. Now that's just one of many cases, and I hesitate to have to appear to be criticizing my honourable friend because he is such an amiable gentleman, and I don't want to blame him for the failings of his predecessor because it was his predecessor that left him in this position. And I become -- what was the word this afternoon? -- a bit "emotional" when I talk about this matter because for so long we heard about this program of better roads -- and some of the roads that have been built are good ones -- but they were all going to be good ones and this is a very main thoroughfare; this is a very important road.

Now I want to say something the same as the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose did a minute ago, and although you may think there was collusion between he and I, the fact is that we didn't work on these at all together. We took a different approach to them, separately; I haven't the same figures that he has but I went over all of these items with the exception of the miscellaneous. I left the miscellaneous out because they appeared to me to be largely new projects -- not entirely, but largely so I left them out; but I went over the regular road program up to 89 and I won't guarantee my count. I won't guarantee my additions and subtractions but at a very rough figuring of them there are 112 projects as I listed them mentioned in the part up to miscellaneous and I just made a check. I went through the program of 1958, the program that was laid before this committee in the fall of 1958 and took out the projects that were mentioned by the Minister at that time, and Mr. Chairman -- and this is subject to correction, if anybody can correct me, because this was a quick job that I had to do on it -- but as I checked it -- and I'd be delighted to have the officials of the department check me because that's why I'd like to give all the information out in advance so that my honourable friend can bring in the answers -- as I add them up there are 55 items out of the 112 projects here, 55 of them were mentioned in the 1958 session, the fall session, to be done, some of them that fall still, said the Minister, and the rest of them in the coming year. 55 out of the 112. 57 that I esteemed to be new. Now what I would like the Minister to tell us, apart from the shoddy work in some cases, and some of it is definitely shoddy, what I would like the Minister to tell us is that when practically half of these are completions and in many cases like this one that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has mentioned, the major part still to be done, when something of that nature from a part to a lot of half of these projects remain still to be done, what extra work was done to make up all that program that the Minister told us about. I'd like to have that, Mr. Chairman, and I can't expect the Minister to anticipate all these questions, that's why I'm giving them to him in advance so that he can get the information, and if he prefers to bring the information in at the time of the Capital Estimates it's all right with me because I don't want to hold him up. I'm not trying to hold him up; but I am trying to make the point that item after item after item in here, practically one-half of the work on the regular highway system apart from miscellaneous, practically one half of them are projects that were laid before this committee in the fall of 1958. And so, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister prefers

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....to go into that question in detail at the time of the Capital Estimates that's all right with me, because certainly I do not want to embarrass him by asking him about the individual ones now. But I would like him to give the answer at that time to this road that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has mentioned and I mentioned it earlier myself. I would like him to tell the committee why the, not one of the roads mentioned on the perimeter routes, not one of them was finished according to the program that was laid before us in October of 1958. Not one of them completed. Why? I'd like to know that. I'd like that information with regard to No.4 and I would like the Minister to take note of the complaints that I registered yesterday when I spoke because I don't want to take the time to go over all of them again. I'd like him to take note of them as they appear in Hansard. There may be an answer to some of these questions. I may be wrong in some of them because I haven't the facilities of the department, now, to get me the information. I have to try and dig this out for myself.

I would like to know what has happened with regard to this other particular road that I mentioned on No.12 and I give these examples so that the Honourable the Minister can get the information about them. I'm not going through all of these, but No.12 -- Oh yes, before I come to No.12. I was certainly a day early in talking about Highway No.10 and attempting to deal with my honourable friend. Here was my honourable friend from Swan River and I was wasting the committee's time about whether the work was completed or not, and all the time the Minister had a green book prepared here settling the argument completely between the Honourable Member for Swan River and me, because while we were arguing over whether it was completed or not, here is the Minister sitting there with the document already prepared to show that section No.1, grading and gravelling still to be completed; section No.2, grading and gravelling still to be completed; section No.3, grading and gravelling still to be completed; section No.5, No.6, No.7, still to be completed. And here we were arguing about whether it was completed or not. If the Honourable the Minister would just have stood up and said, "well, but boys, I have the answer to that in my document here that I'm going to lay before you in a few minutes and it shows that practically none of it is completed, so don't argue." But No.10-- I guess that settles that one. I wanted to mention No.12 and here I'm indebted to my friend and colleague the member for Emerson because I had been talking about the fact that I was so glad that this one road had been completed, Piney Corner to South Junction, and some more work in there as well was completed, and I had been over that road two or three times last fall after it was completed and I was delighted to see that there had been just as conclusive an answer given with regard to these "better roads" that the Honourable the Minister now furnishes us with, with regard to the No.10 highway; because there was a road finished last year that certainly has not stood up well at all -- hasn't stood up anything like as well as the piece that we did just immediately this side of it. And so I asked the Honourable Member for Emerson if he could dig up the figures as to comparative costs, and the figures that he got from my honourable friend the Minister -- and I thank him for his courtesy in making them available -- has been nothing like as good as the piece that joins that we put in, cost 25% per mile more than ours did, and it's nothing like as good. I don't wonder that my honourable friend from Roblin exclaims over that; it's reason for it. And what could possibly be the reason for such an increase as that and a poorer road, much poorer road. The only reason was that this big boast about that we were going to have so much work done in the winter time, and they must have had those people out digging out in the ditches in order to run their levels and this sort of thing, on that great winter program and then an expensive construction job with a great deal of extra men on the project out there, with the result that our "good road" cost \$7,487 per mile, if my arithmetic is correct, and this "poor road" that my honourable friends built cost \$9,413 per mile. Now I'm putting this in front of the Minister now so that he has an opportunity to get the explanation from the departmental officials and if these figures that I'm giving are not right then I would like him to correct me when the time comes. I'd like him to tell us the story.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to take the time to go through all of these but I did want to ask a particular question in connection with Highway No.10, and it's not up on the famous 100-mile section -- it's long before we get to that. I notice there's a lot of work to be done on No.10, and we have starting the very first of the sheet on No. 10 we have the 18th

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . Street in Brandon, the grading and gravelling. I presume that that's right through Brandon or right from the edge of Brandon City; and then Assiniboine River crossing. I would like when the Minister gets the information or if he has it now, to tell us if that's a new bridge or a widening of the present bridge. And then we have north Brandon, the railway overpass structure -- I presume they're widening that one or something of that nature. But then we go right from there up to the the Minnedosa River Valley, and I was wondering what about the section in between. It seems to me that the section in between there is one of the most heavily travelled roads in the province of Manitoba. That area leading in from Minnedosa to Brandon, picking up the Rapid City traffic as it goes, and that's one of the few parts of No. 10 that has not been reconstructed as I remember it. I was wondering why there isn't some appropriation for work on that road. And then I was wondering if the Minister would also let us know, Mr. Chairman, what they are doing with regard to going straight through from Rapid City corner to join No. 4 on the other side of Minnedosa. Has there been any decision made on that? Perhaps the Honourable Member for Minnedosa is familiar with that area that I'm speaking of, and that's a part of the highway -- all the way from the Rapid City Corner, in fact all the way along that road from Clear Lake in -- that's tremendously heavily travelled and I would think that the department would be wanting to take out the bottle-neck that exists in the Town of Minnedosa and to shorten up the distance for the huge numbers of people that use that road the year round and especially in the summertime. I think that the Minister will bear me out and the Honourable Member for Minnedosa will too, no doubt, that that is one of the heavy travelled roads in the Province of Manitoba, and I would be interested in knowing what the plans are with regard to it.

I've many more questions that I would like to ask on these different roads but if the Minister prefers that they be dealt with at the time of the Capital I have no objection to doing that, otherwise I would like to go right through quite a few of these, Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item.

MR. CORBETT: Before the Minister answers that, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made some reference to what I said yesterday. He intimated that I told him that this section was all completed. If he had listened to me yesterday he would have heard that I said on section 1 there were 6 miles incomplete; on section 2 there were 2 miles incomplete; on section 3 there were 2 miles incomplete; section 4 there was 2 miles incomplete; and section 5 was complete. I made a slight error on No. 6, but it's not quite -- there's a little trimming to do on that -- but I said it was complete; and 2 miles on section 14. I did not say that the road was all complete. I was speaking from my personal examination of being over the road and I would ask the honourable gentleman has he been over the road lately?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't been over the road at all -- not during this year, not during the year 1959 at all, nor this year, but I would say that I have the program of the department in front of me and it is the program of the department that I am quoting from and it says that it's not complete. My honourable friend says that he made one little mistake. He did just make the one little mistake, he made the mistake of getting up to say anything about this at all.

MR. CORBETT: Mr. Chairman, I think I'd ask for a slight apology there. I think as a member of this House I have the privilege of getting up here just as often as the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CAMPBELL: He made the mistake of starting to tell that it was practically completed, practically completed, Mr. Chairman, and the fact is that we now have the information from the department itself, and it shows that not one of these sections is completed.

MR. CORBETT: As ex-Premier of this province you have no right to tell any member of this House that he has no right to get up and talk, that I shouldn't get up and talk out of place.

MR. CAMPBELL: It would be OK to get up and talk, the thing that he hasn't the right to do is try to pretend that it's practically completed, when it's nothing of the sort, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMPSON: I could give some of the figures on that section of the road, just to clarify the issue. From Mafeking to Red Deer River, that in the new program -- (Interjection) -- From Swan River to Birch River the seal coat project 27.3, that has been completed 27.3 miles. Birch River to Mafeking base course and bituminous mat project miles 15.5 completed, 15.5

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.).....miles of bituminous surfacing and gravel stabilization (Interjection). From Mafeking to Red Deer River, section 1, grading and gravelling. The project was 14.1 miles 12 miles of grading has been completed out of 14.1 and 12 miles of gravelling. Red Deer River to the Overflowing River, grading and gravelling, project was 14.4 miles, 11.3 has been graded and 11 gravelled. The Overflowing River to north of the bog, grading and gravelling, project 13.7 miles; 7.2 has been graded and 7 gravelled. North of the bog to Township 52, grading and gravelling 14.9 and the project 14.9 has been graded and gravelled.

MR. CAMPBELL: How many miles?

MR. THOMPSON: 14.9.

MR. CAMPBELL: All of it?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. Township 52 to Township 54 grading and gravelling, 14.7 was the project and 14.7 has been graded and gravelled. Township 54 to The Pas grading and gravelling, the project was 14.2 and 10 miles has been graded and 10 gravelled. Bituminous surfacing in that same division of the road, bituminous surfacing 14.2 was the project; 3.5 has been completed.

Now we get over to on the Simonhouse. (Interjection) Section 4 of the highway? That's Cranberry Portage to east of Baker's Narrows. Is that the ....?

MR. MOLGAT: No.....

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, yes, well that probably is not included in this sheet.

MR. MOLGAT: .....Member from Swan River just told us that everything but 2 miles of it was completed.

MR. THOMPSON: Of the bog? Yes, it will be completed very soon in a matter of a couple of weeks.

MR. MOLGAT: My two honourable friends aren't in agreement. He says everything but 2 miles, the Minister says it isn't completed.

MR. THOMPSON: It will be completed in a very short time.

MR. MOLGAT: What is the situation now? My honourable friend says that everything but 2 miles has been done — is completed. Is that correct?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, I think it would be less than 2 actually. I think it is almost completed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Does that include gravelling, Mr. Chairman?

MR. THOMPSON: No. I don't think so. Now the other division. Cranberry Portage to east of Baker's Narrows is grading and gravelling; 14.8 was the project, 7 miles of grading and 14.8 of gravelling, it says here. East of Baker's Narrows to Flin Flon, base course, bituminous mat 20.3 miles of gravel stabilization, 20.3 of bituminous surfacing.

Yes, as of two weeks ago, roughly, the first of March the bog was 86% completed in construction of the grade. I have the figures here on the excavation and so on and the quantity of materials moved and so on. It was 86% completed as of March 1st. It will be completed actually, ahead of the schedule set.

Now, by the way on that subject of the bog, it seems to me it has been mentioned that the contract was not let in the fall of '58. Well the surveying began in the fall of '58. I think it must be understood by all that in that area, the most reasonable and perhaps the only time suitable to work is in the winter, in the winter months. So in the winter of '58-59 the surveying was done, the surveying was done through that winter in the bog when they were able to do it because it was winter. And the contract was let in time for the winter work to be done this year, because the only reasonable and practical and economical time to do the work of building the road was in this winter and so there was no time lost as has been suggested in this House and in the press by the fact that the contract wasn't let 'till late in 1959. The work couldn't possibly be done until this winter and that is why the contract wasn't let. The surveying was done last winter when it could be done, the contract was let this last autumn and the work is being pushed through this winter when it is the only reasonable time to do it. Now, I want to repeat again on highway 4 east that according to the information I have that this project was in the program submitted by the former administration in the spring of '58 and the preliminary engineering and design had been finalized at that time. It was felt impossible to change the design in time to proceed with the project in that year and it was proceeded with according to the planning and designing which was in effect before we came into office. It has been

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.).....constructed as planned by the administration of my honourable friends.

Now similarly, in connection with highway 6 from Piney to South Junction, that grade was built -- or not 6 -- What's the number? 12, yes. From Piney to South Junction, that grade was built in 1954 and 1955. It took 2 years to build that grade, those two years. That's when the grade was constructed. Now, we have recently, I understand, as my honourable friend mentioned, built a grade -- at least put a surface on it, but I do want to say this; that that surface -- that black road which you call surface there is not intended to be the surface. That is intended to be -- that black surface is intended to be a base course, rather than a pavement or a surface. It is a form or road mix, it is intended that it will carry traffic on only a temporary basis. That road will need and will receive a bituminous mat. The surface which has now been laid is a step -- a base course I am advised, which is a step forward to the final steps in the construction of that piece of road.

Now, there may have been certain other matters mentioned by my honourable friends -- that is, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. One was No.10 highway and I believe, as I heard him, that everything he said respecting the 18th Street construction, and the bridge and so on, through Brandon of No. 10 is correct. I believe that is what is intended by this list that there will be a bridge and the construction of what is known as 18th Street through Brandon to join with No.1. Now the construction of No.10 north has been mentioned and as the Leader of the Opposition has stated that is a heavily travelled road and it is certainly a road in need of improvement. It is a road in need of reconstruction, there is no doubt about that. We are scheduling it forward 'till next year for a reason after what I have heard from the Member for Gladstone, I don't see here at the moment, from him and from others, that we're doing too much at one time. Sometimes apparently we're doing too much and other times we're not doing enough. Sometimes we're spending too much and other times we're spending too little, but apparently not. But on No.10 north from Brandon to Minnedosa or whatever location that route take -- and the location has not yet been decided through to the area mentioned -- we have decided to leave that construction until No.4 highway is completed because we've heard so much here in the last day or two even, and of course we've heard before the House even met about the construction on No.4 and the inconvenience which is caused by constructing a new road, so we're finishing this year, we're finishing as you'll notice by the program No.4 highway through to Neepawa, so that it will become a hardtop road and can carry the northern traffic. It is thought inadvisable to proceed with the construction of No. 10 north at the same time as the construction is going on on No.4 because they both, they both are locations which carry northern traffic. And therefore we feel that it's proper to leave No. 10 till next year and finish No. 4 this year. That is the reason Mr. Chairman why it is not in the schedule of project for the current year.

MR. CAMPBELL: ....reason Mr. Chairman. I'm very, very glad to get it, but I'd like to come back to the discussion about Highway No.12 down here Mr. Chairman. The Honourable the Minister says that this is not the permanent road, this is just a sort of a base course, but I think he has seal coating in this year's program for it. Seal coating usually goes on the blacktop road does it not? And if it's not a completed road, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister get the information as to why it would cost more than \$9,000 per mile compared to just something over \$7,000 for the part that joins it just on this side, that was built by these "other folks" that didn't know how to build roads anything like as well as the present government does. Why would there be that discrepancy in the cost and with one a much -- with the cheaper road a much better one than the other?

The same remarks apply to the No.4 Mr. Chairman. Surely the former Minister was not reticent about changing any plans that we had. After all he had said about our roads, surely he wouldn't adopt a program that we had laid out. Why he was "never" going to build that kind of roads again, and yet he would go and adopt ours. That's as bad as him raising the standard of all ours to carry half as much weight again as it had been allowed to carry just before he took over the department. Now Mr. Chairman I think we'd have to have a better answer on both No.12 and No.4 than that.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for the figures that he provided me with on No.12, I feel a little guilty but I'm sure that the Honourable Minister

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . .knew at the time when I did ask him for the figures that these figures will be used in estimates and I wish to doubly thank him for that, because he did give those figures, he could have held them back from me, I did it at the request of our leader. Coming back to -- (Interjection) -- coming back to No.12, the South Junction road the suggestion was made by the Minister that the road, the bituminous mat should be placed on it or reconstructed. I think it was a very good suggestion; I believe that that road should be completely, the top should be completely reconstructed before the seal coating is put on. Probably he could do both this year; we would be very happy about it.

I think that it will be quite in order here to commend the government on a few of the different roads that were done in my area. We mustn't speak disrespectfully of the former Minister, we know that, and it isn't my intention to do it, because I'll have to admit here that my relations with him while he was in office were very good, I was very happy with some of them, although I have some projects that were promised that were not completed, but in lieu of that I had another piece of road done in that area which was not even mentioned in the -- when it came to estimates. A little shorter but still we had it done. I wish to commend the government in that part of my area for carrying out the program originated by the former administration as regards No.12, extending it, bringing it closer to completion and also on the Morden-Sprague, which was started by the former government. The present administration did not extend the road a little farther last year and I understand that portion of it will be completed this coming year. I hope so, and I hope that relations with the present Minister, I'm sure of it, because the way I size the Minister up he doesn't wish to hurt anybody, and I'm sure he'll try to do the best. I hope that next year when we do meet here that the Minister will have all the answers for us on the fingertips, not like this year, although we cannot expect him to do it because the former Minister who's presently holding a higher position was officially administering the department almost till the construction season was over, so whatever remarks I make here, I want to assure the Honourable Minister that I am not trying to put the Minister on the spot.

I wish also to commend the civil service connected with this Public Works. I think they as far as they could in carrying out the policies of the government, they co-operated splendidly. I sympathize with the Honourable Member from Fisher; evidently he was promised a road for 1959 and now the way I understand it will not come until 1961. Kind of reminds me of a joke about a child coming into school late, about two sessions late, coming in at 11:00 o'clock in the morning. So he promised one day, "I'll be in time tomorrow for sure," but next morning the pupil came in just as usual, about two hours late and the teacher asked him, "now what is your excuse." He couldn't think of one but he was a smart lad and all of a sudden says, "please teacher the wind was so strong that everytime I took a step forward the wind pushed me two steps backward." He says the teacher asked him how did you get here, he said "I turned around and walked backwards." So although you'll be two sessions late, but I hope he gets his road, I'm in the same position with regards to one road on Morden-Sprague, but let's hope that even although a little bit late that we'll have some progress in here. The Government was supposed to be a forward government, 20th century roads. Some of them are not in perfect shape even in my area. We have the road 2 1/2 miles from 75 to Letellier Bridge that was left in a terrible mess last fall; there were trucks stuck there for two, three days at a time. Especially one truck I remember. Of course probably you couldn't blame maybe the department, he might have -- probably could have walked over that road and seen to it, but it was during the rain, I admit that -- (Interjection)-- Pardon. The road from the 75 to Letellier Bridge. It is mentioned in the present estimates on this little green booklet that it is going to be completed this year. (Interjection) Not 33. . . .

There is another question I would like to pursue here, the road between the railroad track west of Vita, to Vita about two miles. The school district is complaining there that their road, the school district road was used as a detour extensively last year. It was left in a terrible shape, it was graded in the fall but it's pretty well broken up and it's softened up quite a bit and I think there has been representation here asking the government to do something about it to leave it in at least as good a shape as it was when this detour road was started. I would like the Minister to consider the completion of Morden-Sprague right down to Piney, connected with the famous No.12, maybe in the year 1961. And I hope that the two

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . . gaps now that exist, a gap at Stuartburn and the gap between Caliento which I think was supposed to be constructed between Caliento and Vita last year -- but probably the rain or lateness of the -- the contract wasn't awarded -- I hope it will be completed this year. I also wish to commend the civil service in other action that they took. I understand from the people around that there was some irregularity on the Birch Point road. In fact somebody tried to take a little money, a little more money there than was coming to him, but Public Works servants did catch him, catch the culprit and I understand that that has been straightened out, so I'll not go any farther than that; I think it's the right thing to do, for our civil servants to watch the peoples' money. I understand that that has been settled. And there were several other complaints that I had, especially -- that's why this one was brought, the No. 12, because there was very many complaints, the people felt that there was an awful lot of money spent on that road between Piney Corner and South Junction, that so much money was spent and not a proper road, a good road built, and we didn't like, the people didn't like to see the money wasted in that way and that's why they asked me to bring this up in the House. I'll have some further comments later on but I'll leave it at this point.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us -- during the past winter a number of contracts were let for the clearing of the road between Gypsumville and Grand Rapids. Some of the contracts stipulated that the work had to be done by hand clearing. Could the Minister say -- tell me where, how many of those contracts were let where the hand clearing clause was in the contract and the approximate location of those contracts.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I recall there were about four or five divisions of clearing between Gypsumville and Grand Rapids. All the contracts have been let and the work has all been under way for some time. They all provided for hand labour for clearing in order to give employment to a great number of people, especially a number living in the area, especially those in the area. So that they have all been hand clearing.

Now on the construction, two contracts -- the construction is divided into three stages, into three sections. Tenders for the first two sections from Gypsumville north have been advertised; I think they -- either tomorrow or within a few days the tenders will close on those -- on the actual construction of the -- (Interjection) -- Yes. The third one has not yet been let but it will be shortly. Two have been advertised so that that work I expect will get going just as soon as possible.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister to say that all those tenders for clearing had the clause for hand clearing? Was it just not one or two of them?

MR. THOMPSON: I have the impression that -- certainly the last three in the northern end were -- and I have the impression that they all were. I know that -- I feel pretty certain the last three north were. I think each division in clearing as I recall, covered about 4 townships; perhaps 24 miles or so was the length of the section for the clearing contracts. As I recall they were all advertised for hand labour.

MR. GUTTORMSON: . . . . I understand that the tenders for the northern section of the road provided for hand clearing but not the southern section nearer -- closer to Gypsumville. I'm in agreement with the idea of having hand clearing to provide employment for the Indians, but I was wondering why the contracts near Gypsumville where there are three reserves, didn't have this clause -- I could be mistaken but it seems to me they didn't have this clause in it. But I know one or two contracts that didn't have it all. It was just done by machinery.

MR. THOMPSON: On that location? Did you say you know of a contract that did not have a clause for hand labour -- (Interjection) -- If not all -- I would certainly check on that -- but I have the impression that they were all let for hand labour, and certainly I can recall well that the northern three were I believe. Yes, the northern three and I thought they all were but I wouldn't swear to it at the moment.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is it the intention of the government to let all the contracts for the construction of this road this summer -- I mean between Gypsumville and Grand Rapids? Is it -- If the weather permits do you expect it will be all completed during the coming summer?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, that is the objective during the coming year.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Including gravelling?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: On the green booklet here on #6 highway, the provision is made

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.)....for a bridge and water control structure. Last evening I asked the Minister if he knew where that bridge was going to go located. The reason I'm interested in this, Mr. Chairman, we have been advocating in this House that a control dam be placed on the Fairford River so the level of Lake Manitoba could be controlled. Is this bridge being designed or are other works going on as well as this bridge for control of Lake Manitoba?

MR. THOMPSON: I don't know of any other projects that are going forward in that connection. I know we're going to -- propose to build a bridge over the Fairford River on the highway there. I have no information on what other associated projects there might be.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, it says in the booklet water control structure.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't seem to have the information which my honourable friend has asked on that point. I'm afraid .....

MR. CAMPBELL: On any of these cases where it is difficult for the Minister to find the information at this time, wouldn't it be a good plan for him just to take note of it and have it available when the Capital comes up? I have one or two questions that I could put in that category if the Honourable the Minister wishes. I think I asked yesterday, if I didn't I'd certainly like to put it on the record today that is; what contracts -- road contracts, have been let during the present winter season, that is fall of '59 or winter of '60 up-to-date. If the Minister hasn't got that at the moment; he's mentioned on the Gypsumville to Grand Rapids road; I'd like to know what other ones have been let in the way of highway contracts. Then, Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister at the present time -- I see some projects here dealing with the north perimeter route -- is there any information as to the bridge in connection with that north perimeter route, that is the Red River bridge on the road going east and west?

MR. THOMPSON: I have the contracts.

MR. CAMPBELL: Have the contracts been let on those?

MR. THOMPSON: I'm not sure that I have the perimeter information here but I can give the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition the number of contracts which were advertised and awarded from October 1st, '59 to February 29, 1960 - 45; from June 1st to September 30th '59 (we are going backwards) -78; from April 1st to May 31st - 47; there is a total in the 59-60 period or 170; in the previous year there was 57 let in the first period which I mentioned October 1 to February 28; and 88 in the second period, they're in reverse order, of course; and 39 in the third period, or a total of 184 projects. Those are the figures for the last two years.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, would the Minister when Capital comes down have the facts with regard to the north perimeter bridge?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, I may have it tonight but I'm not just sure.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister to say that there would be three contracts let for the Gypsumville - Grand Rapids road?

MR. THOMPSON: For the construction of the highway in addition to the clearing.....

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is that right?

MR. THOMPSON: Right.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The former Minister always criticized the policy of putting oil on the highways? Has the present Minister a different view on this, because I notice in the green booklet on highway 28 and highway 31 they are using double prime, and the former Minister said that this was very poor policy using double prime -- I wonder if this present Minister has a different view of that?

MR. THOMPSON: Double prime is not the most desirable type of road surface but it is used where fiscal policy may not permit the bituminous mat or more expensive types of surface. I certainly can't say that I like double prime. It's useful. It serves a purpose. It's certainly better than dust. It has a service to render. It's cheaper than hard-top. It's a temporary method of surfacing a road over a period, but as the most desirable type of surface we certainly could not pass upon it as such. But as I do say it certainly as a surface it's much cheaper than bituminous mat, and, of course, a great deal cheaper than concrete, and it is dust resistant, and therefore is important as a surface on the highway.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that that's true because we've had a lot of double prime used on #6 highway and it's proved very satisfactory for two or three years as a temporary surface. I notice in this year's estimates that they're planning to do 5.2 miles of

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.).....gravel and chloride. Is that a cheaper dustproofing of the roads than the oil? Can the Minister tell us at this time what the intentions of the government is regarding the perimeter route, where it meets the highways like #6 highway and #1 highway by the racetrack? Are they going to put overpasses at those particular location?

MR. THOMPSON: Which location was that? That was at#.....

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well I'm interested in all the highways that intersect. The ones that I'm particularly interested in are #6 and 7, but I'm also interested in the others.

MR. THOMPSON: I think probably it might be in order to present a few remarks on the perimeter. I possibly will include the questions of the Leader of the Opposition. From Portage to Oak Bluff, construction of reinforced concrete pavement and bituminous shoulders on this 6.9 mile section is well under way. It should be completed early in the '60-61 construction season. Some portions of this concrete pavement consist of four-lanes while others consist of two-lanes, otherwise this section is completed. The bridge over the Assiniboine River and the structure over the Canadian National Railways Gladstone subdivision and Wilks Avenue have both been completed. In the area from Oak Bluff to Waverley Street two-lanes of concrete pavement and a bituminous shoulder on one side have been completed on this 6.7 mile section. From Waverley Street to St. Mary's Road the construction of a concrete pavement on this 3 mile section of highway including the ramps of the Pembina highway overpass will be undertaken very early in the summer. The Letellier overpass structure, the Pembina Highway overpass and the Red River Bridge of course are all located on this particular section. At the present time, of course, that section is gravel -- that portion is gravel. From St. Mary's Road to St. Anne's Road all work on the two lanes of reinforced concrete pavement on this 2.3 mile section has been completed. From St. Anne's to the existing Trans Canada Highway, two contracts for the grading of this 6.5 mile section of highway have been awarded and work on the same is underway. Contracts for the overpass over the Canadian National Railways and the Trans Canada Highway have been awarded and work is going ahead on that particular part of the perimeter. Construction of a reinforced concrete pavement on this section will be commenced as soon as grading operations permit. From the Trans Canada to PTH 59 some preliminary survey work has been done -- that's what has been done in that section, some preliminary survey work on this 10.5 mile section, but no construction has as yet been undertaken. I believe the Honourable the Leader of the CCF was enquiring about that. On PTH 59.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, might I interrupt the Honourable the Minister there to ask if a contract has been let there?

MR. THOMPSON: No. According to my information no contract has been let on that portion of the road -- that's on Trans Canada to 59. From 59 to PTH 9 grading and gravelling has been completed on this 1.9 mile section. From 9 to PTH 4, the major work required in this section is a bridge over the Red River and an overhead and cloverleaf at PTH 4; no contract has been let on this particular portion. From PTH 4 to PTH 7 grading on this 7.3 mile section is completed; gravelling is under contract and should be completed early in the coming summer. Now of course the section from PTH 7 west, there is no construction under way. That includes, of course, part of the PTH No.6 and it possibly is considered not quite as urgent as some other portions of the perimeter. From PTH 6 south to Saskatchewan Ave. survey and design work on this 6.7 mile section of the highway is practically completed. Some preliminary work has been done on the proposed overhead over Rosser Road and the Canadian Pacific Railway mainline; and the section from Saskatchewan Ave. to Portage Ave., section of highway from the two points which I mentioned, Saskatchewan to Portage Ave. is completed with four -lanes of reinforced concrete pavement.

MR. CAMPBELL: That a very, very good description of the work, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate having it placed on the records. So far as the perimeter route is concerned at the moment then we have dealt with 59 as being the east perimeter I would think, Mr. Chairman. I was wondering if there has been any decision yet as to an outer-perimeter road along the east; instead of 59. I think there is some consideration to picking out a location further out as the ultimate perimeter road on the east side. Has the Honourable the Minister anything on -- to report on that.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think there's any intention of -- probably I don't understand the question, Mr. Chairman. I just don't see how 59 becomes part of the perimeter road. Did you suggest that it may?

MR. CAMPBELL: As the Chairman read them off, he detailed the perimeter road along the south and he went right out to the Trans Canada Highway but then he jumped from there up to the north perimeter road, and I was wondering if there's any thought of a connection other than 59 between — along the east side?

MR. THOMPSON: No. I read them in the manner in which they've been divided on the map. From the Junction of No. 1 and the perimeter, the proposed route goes straight north for quite a distance and then angles northwest and crosses 59. There's no other association between 59 and the perimeter other than the perimeter crosses 59 in the south and again in the northeast corner of .....

MR. CAMPBELL: .....projected it east of 59.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, east of 59.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister will bear with me for two minutes I'll be able to clear up these last two questions that I had. On page 3 with regard to Highway No. 9, PTH 9, I notice that 2.5 miles of grading, base and bituminous mat are slated to be done from the south boundary of East St. Paul to Hodinott Road, and my question is, is it the intention here to provide for extra lanes of traffic, or merely to put an additional surface on the existing road? That's No. 9, page 3. That's one question. Would the Minister prefer to answer each one?

MR. THOMPSON: ....get that one located, that was on Highway 9 and the ---oh yes. East St. Paul to the Hodinott Road. It appears to be grading, base and bituminous mat, the works in other words.

MR. SCHREYER: Just follow this up. I realize that you might not have the information but the department is in the Municipality of North Kildonan going ahead with the widening of the highways so that in effect there'll be two-lanes of traffic each way. I'm wondering if the intention is to extend this to the case of East St. Paul to Hodinott Road. In other words will it be two-lanes of traffic each way or will it be simply one-lane each way?

MR. THOMPSON: I understand that the municipality are conducting certain construction in the area. Is that what you're telling us?

MR. SCHREYER: Under the former Minister, a delegation from North Kildonan came in to see your predecessor and an agreement was reached to the effect that the PTH No. 9 running through the Municipality of North Kildonan, would be widened so that there would be two traffic lanes each way. Now, some thought was given on the part of the East St. Paul council to having this extended to East St. Paul so that in effect you would have a four-lane traffic road or highway all the way through North Kildonan up to Hodinott Road. I'm just wondering if this particular item here is doing just that or if it's merely for the improvement of the existing two-lane road. That's my question.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. We may have that information in a short while.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Now the other question is on page 8 with regard to PTH No. 59 — this is on page 8. The item has it that there will be 16 miles of grading, gravelling and structure -- new work -- south of Libau to Gull Lake. Now the question here is that will this work commence south of Libau to Gull Lake or right from the centre of the Village to Gull Lake? The Minister is aware that there was some controversy about this.

MR. THOMPSON: I would have the impression that it commences at Libau and proceeds in a southerly direction for 16 miles. You're concerned about the last mile or two immediately south of Libau?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, a year ago it was the intention of the department to construct this road from Libau to Gull Lake, that is from Libau northeast to Gull Lake, and then -- I understand there's been a change of thinking here and that the road will be constructed not from Libau, not from the Village, the centre of the Village but that Highway 59 will swing off just south of Libau, a quarter of a mile or so, and thence to Gull Lake northeasterly. The question here to put it in short terms is: Will highway 59 run right through the Village of Libau or will it swing off to the northeast just before the Village is reached?

MR. THOMPSON: I have no information that that location around Libau has been decided. The construction will be from immediately south for the distance given, but I'm not sure

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.)....that that location has been finally determined from there north.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped for some confirmation from the Minister. However, I realize he might not be in a position to give me such confirmation. Judging from the schedule itself, it says south of Libau. I would take it, Mr. Chairman, that the road will be built to go on the south side of Libau. However if the Minister is not in position to....

MR. THOMPSON: If I may interrupt, I don't think I could be expected to give an answer to that question. It concerns a road which is not in the program at all. It concerns the area north of the proposed location. The schedule says, from south of Libau to Gull Lake and I don't think it would be possible to give you what location is contemplated for a road to be built in the future which is not even in the schedule.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, all right I shall leave this particular item. The last question I have is on Page 11, it has to do with the north perimeter. I would ask the Minister if he has any information as to what date is contemplated for the construction of the north perimeter road bridge across the Red in the vicinity of Middlechurch? Does he have any such information?

MR. THOMPSON: I have no information on when that bridge will be built. It certainly is a structure which is required but there is no information on just when that will be done.

MR. SCHREYER: Could the Minister give an estimate, Mr. Chairman, within the department?

MR. THOMPSON: I am not prepared to make an estimate on -- I think I referred to that area and mentioned the bridge when I was giving the review of the perimeter a moment ago. Other than that I can give no information.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a short time ago what the government plans to do about overpasses for the perimeter route in these trunk highways. I had in mind Portage west, near the Assiniboia Downs, Number 6 highway, No. 7 highway and others that he may have information on.

MR. THOMPSON: These matters are under consideration but there has been no final decision and I am not able to give any report on that at the present time.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I was called to the telephone a moment ago. Is any work proposed on the perimeter route north of Portage Avenue towards No. 6 highway?

MR. THOMPSON: It's on the record you will find it there (Interjection)--Yes the -- I mentioned that the survey and design work is practically completed. Some preliminary work has been done on the proposed overhead over Rosser Road and the Canadian Pacific main line. I gave a complete statement, which, if you were out, you will find recorded.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, earlier I was discussing with the Minister, No. 19 highway and he interrupted my conversation at that time. He explained to me that it had been taken out because of drainage difficulties with the Riding Mountain, with which I am aware. My only point is, that surely when it was put in the program in the fall of 1958, by his predecessor, the drainage problem existed at that time as well. And I think it is just another example of the padding that his predecessor did in those two proposals which he presented to us.

On another subject. The Member for St. George was asking with regard to the proposed bridge and control structure over the Fairford River. Now this is south of the section that is being rebuilt from Gypsumville north. Now on that portion of Gypsumville north it appears under our roads to resources, I believe. Now it seems to me that following on our discussion of last night with regards to Federal Government assistance, that they should participate in this particular bridge because it is certainly leading to roads to resources. Now has an approach been made to Ottawa with regards to assistance on that structure?

The next point is this matter of roads to resources. Last year, as I recall, these were presented to us by the then-Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, if I remember correctly. I don't quite recall if they were presented under the Mines and Resources Department or if it was under Industry and Commerce, but I'm certainly I think right in saying that he was the one who gave us those details last year.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I missed the question that my honourable friend was discussing.

MR. MOLGAT: Last year the roads to resources, I believe, came under your department. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: I did announce the plan at that time, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: I notice that this year there are some of these at least included in this particular outline, and my question is this: Are there other roads to resources in the program this year or is this it, as is outlined in this schedule?

MR. EVANS: I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that they are all in this schedule. My honourable friend will understand that I have lost contact with that program since. But I am informed now that all of the roads to resources program is now contained in this schedule.

MR. MOLGAT: I just wanted to verify that there would be — if we looked at this and went through this that this was the final figure, that there were no others to come from other departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) Passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe I had a couple of questions for the Minister on this item which Mr. Chairman, in the agreement with the Federal Government on the Guttormson-perimeter route I understand the Federal Government pays 90%. Is that correct? When does that period terminate that the offer is still good? Would he tell us?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes they pay 90% of that portion of the highway. I think the formula is I believe as I mentioned yesterday, 90% of -- 10% of the total mileage. The agreement is good for quite a time yet; I think it is good for a year more.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Does that include a two-lane or a four-lane highway on the perimeter route?

MR. THOMPSON: I think it's a two-lane. There has been a portion, four, on the west side. The agreement is a two-lane road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) Passed. (2) Passed. Resolution 64, Highways, Aids to Municipalities.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe there are some questions left outstanding in the department from last night. I don't ask that they be answered now providing that we will get the answer. This one I just asked about the Fairford Bridge, whether the Federal Government had been contacted. I am willing to wait for the answer as well. But there were some others outstanding last night.

MR. THOMPSON: We are endeavouring to get some contribution on that bridge. Now were there some other questions. I might have the answers if you care to ask them.

MR. MOLGAT: There are some outstanding on the matter of access roads. I had asked the Minister then if he could tell us which ones had double access. There were some questions at that time on one of the items (g) (2) which the Minister was to explain the increase for. Those were two of the notes I have outstanding. Items (g) (3) -- (g) (2). Questions were asked last night about the substantial increase in this item and I believe the Minister said that he would be providing the information. Again I don't ask that it be done now, if he hasn't got the details. As long as we get the information later it's satisfactory to me.

..... continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64.

MR. MOLGAT: I would just like to have the assurance of the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that we will get the information, that's all.

MR. THOMPSON: I think possibly I could have some of the information. I thought I had the information on the access roads which were mentioned. I don't--one was the question of Warren. Was it not?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, Warren was one of the . . . . . questions as a matter of fact, and I wondered if there were others. That may not be the explanation for Warren. I don't know, but it appeared to be. If two miles or whatever it was is the access road for Warren, it seems . . . . .

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, on Warren, I understand the original highway went through that centre and I believe the commitment was, when the highway was moved around it that the road would be built through by the province. I think that commitment was possibly made by the former administration, that the road go through there. And that is not what you would call an ordinary access road. Now in the Killarney case, as I recall the mileage given includes certain contributions to streets to the highway; I think it's \$1,500 a mile or something, there was some contribution in the Killarney case to apportion more than is measured in the actual extent of the access road. That is, it includes more, it includes other items than the actual construction of the access, so that the mileage there shown is higher than the actual length of the access road from the highway into the town. I had the items what it did include and I don't seem to have them here now.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is it the policy of the department then that where a highway previously went through a centre that the department will be prepared to provide two accesses?

MR. THOMPSON: No, not necessarily. I think the matter would be given consideration in each individual case.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that is the case apparently in the case of Warren although I had understood when the member for Brokenhead had asked that there would be only one access. I suggest then, Mr. Chairman, that there are many other villages in the province which were in the same position where the highway previously went through. In my own constituency for example the village of McCreary, No. 5 highway previously went through the village. The access has been built now from the south side and it would appear to me in that case that the access on the west side should be provided on the same basis if exceptions are made elsewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 64, \$11,809,985, passed. Department 12, Municipal Affairs. Appropriation 1, Administration; (a) Salaries.

MR. RIDLEY: Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like first of all to thank all the civil servants in the Municipal Affairs Department for the co-operation which they have given me since I have been sworn in as their Minister. I've also received very good co-operation from the Union of Municipalities, the urban associations. And I want to add also that I have received very good co-operation from the Opposition members of this House. Some of them have come to me in regards to things which they could have brought up at the House and that information was certainly well accepted by me and I wish at this time to tender my appreciation for that also.

I would just like to go through a short review for the year 1959, what has happened and projected programs of the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year 1960. Statistical information respecting municipalities of the province for the fiscal year 1958 was tabled for your information and consideration on February 5th, 1960. Three major changes may be observed in the method of tabulating these statistics. Number one, current assets are presented in somewhat greater detail than in former years by indicating the main sources through the sub-headings; (A) investments; (B) due from other governments; (B)(1), province; (2) dominion and other municipalities; (C), due from other funds; (D) due from other sources. Similarly current liabilities are shown in greater detail through the subdivision of the former heading of "other payables" to the sub-headings of "due to other governments". Number one, province; 2, dominion and other municipalities; B, due to other funds; C, due to other liabilities. Number two, the current assets and current liabilities shown have been compiled from combined balance sheets which incorporate all operating departments of the municipalities, namely, general funds,

(Mr. Ridley, cont'd.) . . . B, utilities; C, boards or committees. The operating results of the utilities and boards or committees have been included in the statistical report for the first time. A summary of these data by type of municipal corporations is given on page one of the statistical report. Forty-nine municipal corporations have operated departments in addition to the general fund. This figure is composed of (A), rural municipalities, five; suburban municipalities, three; village municipalities, six; town municipalities, 29; and (E), city municipalities, six; a total of 49. These operating departments involve the supplying of the following services: water and sewers was supplied, 47; parks board, seven; library, six; electric power, light, four; telephone, three; other operating services were six; making a total of 73. Municipal taxes imposed in 1958 exceeded those imposed in 1957 by \$2,281,000. This represents an average of 4.2%. The greatest percentage increase occurred in suburban municipalities which indicated an average of 7.9%. The lowest percentage increase occurred in rural municipalities where the increase averaged 1.4. Now the increase in taxation in 1958 was as follows: in rural, \$211,600, that's an increase of 1.4; the villages was \$81,300, an increase of 7.5; the towns was \$330,000, an increase of 6.5; suburbs was \$263,300, 7.9 increase; and the cities was \$1,421,500; making a total increase of taxation of \$2,281,000, a total average of 4.2 over the province.

Slightly less than 42% of the taxes imposed in 1958 were allocated to educational purposes. Just over ten percent was allocated to debenture debt and deferred levies. The remaining 48.11% was allocated to general municipal and miscellaneous purposes. I'll just give you the total figures now of the whole tax collection and how it was paid. The general school tax allocation was \$5,709,172, 10.19% of the 1958 tax imposition; special school was \$17,643,171, 31.48%; debenture debt was \$5,399,591, 9.64%; deferred, that's primary hospitals, \$323,682, .58%; general and miscellaneous, \$26,964,227, 48.11%; that makes a grand total of \$56,039,843.

Now our tax collections in 1958 were more favourable than any year since 1949. Collections amounted to 103.23% of the current year's '58 tax levy. Rural municipalities were high, having collected 106.21% of their levies; while villages were low, having collected only 98.79% of their levies. Other urban areas collections averaged 101.32%--between 101.32% and 102.28% of their current tax impositions. Municipal revenues exceeded expenses by almost \$2 million. This surplus in revenues coupled with favourable tax collections resulted in 142 municipalities excluding cities, ending the year in an improved position. Excluding cities, 119 municipalities have cash resources in excess of all their current debt. This is the largest number of municipalities attaining this financial position since 1953, when 122 municipalities were reported to be in this category. Tax arrears in 1957 were the highest reported in a ten-year time, between 1949 and 1958. The very favourable tax collections in 1958 reduced amounts outstanding as shown in 1957 by \$561,000.

Municipal government business has been expanding steadily; the volume of money handled by municipal employees and municipal officials have almost doubled during the past ten years. A municipal schedule bond providing bond coverage in respect of municipal secretary-treasurers has been provided for many years, but the coverage afforded under this bond was shown to be inadequate in the light of our expanded municipal economy. Bond coverages of 5,000 and 7,500 were common to most municipalities although a very few carried higher, still inadequate coverages in relation to the volume of business conducted.

During the past year agreements were completed which made it possible to provide more adequate protection, not only for municipal secretary-treasurers, but also for all municipal employees except those of the City of Winnipeg. A blanket position bond affording a coverage in respect of each municipal employee in amount of \$25,000 and a blanket excess bond provides an excess coverage in the amount of \$200,000 in respect of each municipal employee was procured in the respect of employees of all municipal corporations except those of the City of Winnipeg. These bonds came into force and effective on November 1st, 1959. While the premiums in respect of these bonds were approximately twice the premium in respect of our former municipal schedule bonds, the protection afforded by the new bonds is far in excess of those provided by the former bond. The new bond affords protection to the municipalities even against catastrophic loss arising through default, malfeasance, misfeasance, non-feasance, dishonesty or neglect of duty committed by any one or more of the employees of the municipal corporations. Moreover those bonds indemnify the insured municipalities against any costs, charges and expenses which shall be incurred or sustained by or associated to the insured

(Mr. Ridley, cont'd.) . . municipality during the process of investigation of such loss of monies or securities or other property, real or personal.

Municipal administration in the province has been considerably affected in recent years through the loss of the services of experienced municipal secretary-treasurers. Retirements, deaths and acceptance of alternative employment by municipal secretary-treasurers affected the administration of eight percent of the municipalities of the province in 1958. Many of these municipalities were unable to procure replacements with previous municipal training and experience. In many instances they were able to obtain only the service of personnel interested in the field of municipal administration. These new secretary-treasurers require training, assistance and guidance in municipal office procedure and municipal administration. This service can most efficiently be provided through the administration branch of the department. Consideration is being given to the employment of a full-trained and competent person who will be charged with the duty of preparing a manual of office procedure which will set forth those procedures which have proven most efficient in the conduct of municipal office management and administration. It is intended that this manual will be supplemented by personal visits to the municipal offices so that both the secretary-treasurers and the councils may have the benefit of this advisory service.

Like all other municipal expenses the cost of municipal audits has increased as the volume of municipal business has expanded. Present procedures require that full and complete audits be made in all municipalities. It has been suggested, and possibly with some justification, that full and complete audit procedures might be replaced satisfactorily by modern commercial test audit procedures. It has been suggested also that this change in procedure would tend to limit the ever-present increase in cost of municipal audits. While the desirability and advisability of these changes in procedure is under consideration, no final decision has yet been reached.

At their annual conventions last fall, delegates of the Union of the Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association convention endorsed resolutions requiring the executive of these bodies to appoint representatives to a joint investigating committee charged with the responsibility of investigating the entire field of municipal government, organization and administration. It is hoped that this committee will also survey the questions of municipal government, responsible and municipal reorganization. Now we have all--this committee has been formed; the Union has appointed their three men; the Urban has appointed their three men; and I had word yesterday from the President of the Union Municipalities where Dr. Murray Fisher has accepted to be Chairman of this Board. We have also asked them to look into the matter of tax exemptions which is quite a problem in this province right now. I have had delegations in that have asked me to consider allowing the municipality to tax all farm buildings, and they're quite justified in their arguments--very good arguments. And then as we know, we have the matter of the 40 acres, whether it should be contiguous or not, a fact brought up first in this House by myself and I'm certainly asking them to look into these things. And then if you read the paper the other morning I was severely criticized for one part of Manitoba in turning down the request that a certain industry would have all tax exemptions thrown by the side, and of course when that is contrary to the School Act and everything, I give a decision of "no". But I'm having this Enquiry Commission--it's going to be called the Municipal Enquiry Commission of Manitoba. Now that is set up strictly by the municipalities; they chose the men and they run it themselves. Advisory committees have been elected from among the residents of the mining townsites and the local government district of Lynn Lake and Snow Lake. These committees meet and confer with and advise the resident administrator on matters pertaining to local government in the district. While an advisory committee has not yet been established for the townsite of Thompson in the local government district of Mystery Lake, provision has been made for the establishment of such a committee when the permanent population located in the townsite is sufficient to warrant the action being taken. Advisory committees have also been elected in the local government districts of Stuartburn and Piney. As in the case of the committees established in the mining townsites, these committees are meeting regular with the resident administrators and serving a very useful purpose.

The Provincial Municipal Assessment Branch has been continuing its work of re-assessment. Assessments were completed in 12 municipalities during 1959, and work is well

(Mr. Ridley, cont'd.) . . advanced in eight more municipalities. Work on several of these would have been completed except for the very early and heavy snowfall experienced last October. So my department gets into trouble with roads and snowplows just the same as the Minister of Public Works does. In addition to those municipalities under re-assessment in 1959, the Assessment Branch in the course of its normal maintenance work has completely re-assessed several municipalities where conditions within the municipalities had changed to the degree that re-assessment was imperative. Work has not been commenced as yet in 13 rural municipalities which will be serviced by the provincial municipal assessor program. Work will be commenced in many of these during 1960 subsequent to the re-assessment work being completed in those municipalities where the work is in progress.

Now I would just like to give you the summary of the Assessment Branch. In the city there's a total unit in the province of six city, and they are excluded from the program; the same with the suburban cities. They are not under the provincial assessors program. In the towns, total units in the province, there's 33; number excluded from the program is four; number included in the program is 29; there's 28 of them completed and one the work is in progress now. In the villages there's 37 under the program; there's 36 of them completed; one in the progress of being completed. In rural Manitoba there's a total number of units of 108; there's 108 of them in the program; 86 have been completed; nine is in progress of being completed and 13 have to be started yet. You have been informed that an electronic processing bureau has been created in the government service for the purpose of processing data electronically. The Union of Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association both have agreed that this equipment is to be used to provide new assessments to municipalities annually. Programming for this operation is now under way and it is expected that all municipalities which have been re-assessed under the provincial municipal assessment program will have this service made available to them in respect to their assessment roles and tax roles for the year 1960. Preliminary assessment roles will be produced first and these will be forwarded to the municipality so they can hold their Court of Revision and the annual Courts of Revision. Subsequent to the Courts of Revision and as early as possible in the new year, the data from these revised assessment roles will be processed on assessment tax rolls forms--these final rolls will then serve as the collectors roll for the municipality.

Now that is a quick review, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee of the situation of the municipalities in the Province of Manitoba. Yesterday when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking he warned me to watch the Minister of Public Works to see that there was lots of money for the municipalities, and I accept that advice. I will be glad to do it. He didn't mention my two good friends sitting in front of me, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health and Welfare, that digs into that treasury pretty hard. But I cannot criticize either one of them because they're pretty good to the municipalities and we want them to continue to do that, but I will accept your advice, Sir, and watch the Public Works very closely in the interest of the municipalities of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, a moment or so ago, I sent a note over to the Honourable the Premier, asking him whether or not after the Minister of Municipal Affairs had made his statement whether the committee would rise, and my answer was in the negative so apparently we're going to continue on 'till the wee small hours once again.

I want to first of all say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that I appreciate very much the statement of the condition of the municipalities for the last fiscal year that we have the report thereof. I'm sure that all of the people of Manitoba are gratified to know that there has been some improvement in the position insofar as the municipalities are concerned, and also that the net amount of tax arrears are being reduced. And having said that, Mr. Chairman, of course there is also the other point that the Minister drew to the attention of the committee that isn't quite so good in respect of the municipality in that their tax burden is ever-increasing, insofar as the local taxpayer is concerned. I'm sure that the Minister may agree with me that it may not be too long before we will have to have a re-assessment of all of the responsibilities of municipal government and the affect of the ever-increasing burden on land in our municipalities. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that there are increasing amounts granted from provincial authorities; it is true that there are some aspects of municipal government that are being taken over by the provincial authority; but notwithstanding all of that, it's still true that the burden

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) .. on real estate in our villages, towns, cities and municipalities is ever increasing. What the answer is, I don't know, unless it is to have the municipalities placed in a position where they may receive greater contribution from the other senior government, namely the federal. There has been some suggestion by some municipalities that they should receive a portion of our gasoline taxes and taxes of that nature. But I do think in all seriousness that with the huge programs of road expansion and the necessity of huge amounts of borrowing for the purpose of highways such as we have before us this evening of some \$33 million odd, that the ratio of the revenue insofar as gasoline taxation is concerned, is really only a drop in the bucket insofar as the road program itself is concerned, and it doesn't seem very likely that there will be any monies forthcoming to municipalities who are suggesting a portion of the gasoline tax.

Now then, Sir, I'd like to talk for a minute or two on what to me is a very disturbing situation insofar as one of the suburban municipalities in Greater Winnipeg is concerned. I have the honour, Sir, to be in this Legislature as a representative of part of the suburban municipality of St. Vital, and I must say, Sir, I regret very much the publicity that is being given in respect of St. Vital. I think that it is having a very detrimental effect on that municipality. I have been informed, Mr. Chairman, that not only is what I term adverse publicity been given to St. Vital in our own area here, but that it is being carried throughout the length and breadth of our dominion through mediums of radio, TV and other mediums of news releases. We even had it, Sir, in this House when one of the members of this House referred to at least two members, one of whom was a member of the council and one who still is, as screwballs. And it's been that type--and he says, "hear! hear!" I'm amazed, Mr. Chairman, at that attitude--definitely very much amazed, Sir, because this is the type of propoganda or spoken word which is leading to the adverse affect on the municipality itself. It is not my purpose tonight, Mr. Chairman, to in any way, shape or form to attempt to justifying the actions or the inactions of any member of the St. Vital council. I think that that is a problem that they will have to iron out themselves, but when I see each evening in the papers irrespective of what pretty well any individual connected to the municipality does, it becomes headlines. I think it's a sorry state of affairs.

This all started or at least it was brought to a head because of the fact that the municipality was going into a land development program, and it appears that some members of council made objections to the manner in which action had been taken in respect of this development. I'm not saying that they were right. I'm not saying that they were wrong. But I do say that they had a perfect right to draw this to the attention of their council, even, Sir, in the manner in which they did, because there is a difference in the manner in which this matter has been brought before this House--one by virtue of calling the individuals who were councillors, screwballs, and another the approach that I'm trying to take at this particular time. So irrespective of how they did it, there is the difference of approach.

It's my understanding, Sir, that at the present time in respect of the Pulberry subdivision, that there is at the present time before the courts a libel suit directed against two individuals of St. Vital. And in accordance, Sir, with the rules of the House, that precludes me from going into any of the details in respect of that--and I try to respect the rules of the House and will not refer to the details concerned or to the statements of any individual either for or against the matter of Pulberry--but I want to say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that a request was made prior, as I understand it, to any action of a legal nature, that there was a request made of the Government of Manitoba, passed as I understand it unanimously or by a majority of council, that the Government of Manitoba should investigate thoroughly into all aspects of this. Now then, there was delay; they even called it procrastination, because it was not done. It was not done, Mr. Chairman, until the very same day, if my information is correct, the announcement of the fact that there was going to be some investigation by the municipal board was not done until the day that the suit for libel entered the court, which was some month or so after the request was made. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government through its delay in action, has placed the two people who are under suit at the present time, in a rather unfortunate position, because had the investigation been carried out at the time of the request of council and not these two individuals, the matter may have been so investigated and the air cleaned that there would have been no follow-up of the suits, because I believe that the two parties concerned in the libel suit today, had they have been assured of an investigation, they'd

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . have been satisfied at that time to hold their fire until the investigation had been made.

Another point in connection with this. As I understand it, the request--at least it was suggested at one time--that the request should be of a judicial character rather than by the municipal board. And I think that that was logical, Mr. Chairman; logical for this reason, that the municipality in St. Vital like a few others are under the general financial supervision of the municipal board itself. So where we're going to have the municipal board--and in respect might I say of Pulberry, and I can say this, I'm sure--that in respect of Pulberry, there is financial considerations entering into it--and here the board which is charged with the general overall supervision of the finances of the municipality, are going to sit in and judge it, and I think the Minister should have, if he did not, give consideration to the appointment of some board or some person other than the municipal board to investigate this particular matter. Now what has happened? I say, Mr. Chairman, and I say this in all sincerity, that the internal matters of St. Vital are their business, but as a result, I'm sure of ever-continuing disagreements between individuals because of the fact of any real firm initiative on the part of the government in the first place, that it has now gone beyond the bounds that are acceptable to any person who is concerned with the state of municipalities in the province.

Just the other day there was another flare-up in respect of the conduct within the municipality--I'm not going to judge whether the new Mayor was right or whether he was wrong--but it does appear that at least two long-time employees of the municipality have been relieved of their positions. It does seem that no matter what happens in respect of the municipality, it's adverse publicity. Even as we read in tonight's paper the possibility of the Honourable the Attorney-General entering into the picture of the affairs of St. Vital--(interjection)--Pardon?

MR. LYON: Provincial or municipal?

MR. PAULLEY: You as the Attorney-General. I don't know if you noted it, but even tonight in connection with an alleged automobile insurance--automobile accident--I should say, Mr. Chairman, that the Attorney-General may have to come in on the deal. . . . --(interjection) --Yes, just an accident, but the point that I'm getting at, Mr. Chairman, is simply this, that the thing has become so blown up that no matter what happens there is the reflection on the municipality. Now I don't blame for these aspects the Minister, except that I'm convinced that had the government taken action at the time for a full investigation of the matter, that the situation would not be as it is today. I say that if the government had of taken action at the proper time, there is the likelihood that there would not have been any pending libel suits as we have. And I want to ask the Minister what has happened in respect of any activity of the municipal board in connection with this enquiry. How many times has the municipal board met? Have they met at all? Because from any information that I can gather as of this evening, there has been no witnesses called before the board. Did the Minister really mean it when he said over TV some weeks ago or shortly after he was appointed the Minister when this matter was drawn to his attention, that he was going to have an enquiry conducted into this? So I asked the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs--if he can't answer me tonight I'd be glad to receive the answer on Monday--how many meetings has the municipal board had in connection with this? What investigation has gone on? And I say, Sir --

MR. ROBLIN: May I ask you in connection with which I missed, that about which my honourable friend talks.

MR. PAULLEY: What the-- the point is Mr. Chairman that the council requested an enquiry into the affairs.

MR. ROBLIN: You're still on the Pulberry case.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon.

MR. ROBLIN: You're still on the Pulberry matter.

MR. PAULLEY: Well that was what the enquiry was asking. I'm asking the Minister now how many meeting the board has had because as far as I'm aware as of this particular time, no witnesses have been called before the board to give any evidence or testimony, and I also would like to know from the Minister how many meeting of the board, if any, have been held in respect of this investigation. I think I'm quite within the permissive legal technicalities of the House in respect to those questions. But I do appreciate and realize that there is a border here in which--that I've tried not to transgress.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....Now then Sir, as I have mentioned, that it is my opinion and it's only my personal opinion, and I might say that I haven't received any delegations, it's just through observations that had action been taken to consider this whole matter earlier we wouldn't have had the adverse publicity in respect of the municipality which I represent, at least part of it, that we've had. And I think Sir, that it is bad. Not only bad for St. Vital, I think it's bad for every municipality in the Province of Manitoba. So I say to the Minister if the board hasn't met that it should, that it should investigate all of these aspects. There has been on the council itself suggestions of resignations, charges and counter-charges laid. That is the business of the municipality concerned and nobody I think would think any differently. And I think Mr. Chairman, that the differences that exist at the present time will resolve themselves. But I would appeal to all who may be within sound of my voice to allow these differences to be settled on the home front. Just because of the fact that there are differences -- and we've had this, Mr. Chairman with other municipalities that I can think of in the suburban areas where they've had their flare-ups, where adverse publicity has been given and eventually it resolves itself. So I would like to say in respect of this, that I do not take sides, because I have no axe to grind, insofar as the municipality is concerned. My main criticism and my main reason for speaking at this particular time and in all due respect to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, it is my firm conviction that had the appeal and the request of the municipality for an investigation been acceded to at the time of the first request that the matter may have resolved itself by this time.

I know it would be improper for the Minister to attempt to impose any restrictions in respect of the council and its conduct, but I sometimes wonder whether a little fatherly advice might be worthwhile, and I'm sure that my honourable friend shares with me many of the feelings and thoughts that I have been trying to express tonight. I'm not trying to take sides, I don't know fully the two sides, and I doubt if any other member in this House does. I do say that it's most unfortunate, and as a representative of part of that municipality I deplore the adverse publicity that is being given to it and greatly fear that if it continues that it will be detrimental not only to the municipality itself but to all of the municipalities in the province. So I say in all sincerity to the Minister please find out whether or not the Municipal Board is acting on this request; I appreciate the fact and there may be a conflict, I'm not a lawyer, I don't know, there may be a conflict as to whether or not the Municipal Board can act because there is the question of the libel suit before the courts or at least initiated. I don't know. But if there's no conflict let the Municipal Board dig into this and try and resolve the whole picture because I think that if that were done it would clarify the whole situation. I rise on this part not in any critical sense at all but only in an endeavour to have this matter that has been given so much publicity aired and cleaned up so that we can continue to go on in the municipality.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed just for a minute or so to say a few words in this respect. I rise to agree with most of what the Honourable Member from Radisson said. I represent the major part of the municipality of St. Vital; I have lived there for many years and I have served for four years on its municipal council. And there's nobody more than I that regrets and abhors the publicity which our municipality has been getting lately in the press. I, in my contribution to the Throne Speech debate mentioned this in what I thought were very carefully phrased terms. I would suggest that those member who are interested might re-read what I said at that time because it was all true, and I might venture that if I might have at that time made any predictions I would say that those predictions are beginning to come true.

I would just love to be able to spend some time commenting on many of the things that the Honourable Leader of the CCF has said, but I don't intend to do so, because I feel that by my entering into a controversy that is purely the responsibility of the Municipal Council, that I would not only be rightly accused of interfering with the affairs of the municipality but I would be contributing to some degree to this publicity campaign that at the present time is doing the municipality no good. So that beyond that I'm not going to say anything that's going to make the situation worse than it is at the present time. I can't agree however with the Honourable the Leader of the CCF that things would have been any better had certain action been taken when the first request was made to the Public Utilities Board. However again, I have no intention of going into that in detail. But I would like to say this and I would like to say this very emphatically, and that is that I have complete confidence in the five members of our municipal council that are honestly and diligently trying to clean up this mess. And I have complete confidence that

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.)....they along with the other decent and respectable people in the municipality are going to resolve this matter to the best advantage of us all.

And in closing I might just point out that the Municipality of St. Vital has a population of some 23,500 people. At the most there has been I think 92 people attending the council meetings, and of those 92 perhaps 20 or 25 have been causing the trouble that has been getting the municipality the publicity that it has. So that we can't judge a municipality with a population of 23,000 by the actions of 20 or 25 irresponsible people who turn up at council meetings for the sole sake of making trouble. Nor on the irresponsible actions of members of council itself. So that again I would say that I have complete confidence in those that are trying to resolve this thing and in my opinion it will be resolved satisfactorily and I hope in the not too distant future.

MR. PAULLEY: ...Mr. Chairman, if I might. I tried to approach this on a different plane and I made an appeal that that is the plane in which this should be handled. My honourable friend then gets up and tells me that he agreed with most of what I said and then continued on the type of plane that has brought all of this --subjected all of this to the publicity. Because he mentioned the fact again by implication, yes, by implication again, that there were only certain ones there that were honestly and conscientiously trying to resolve it. Mr. Chairman, it may be the truth insofar as my honourable friend is concerned, but my appeal is that this matter should be attempted to be resolved by all of them. He mentioned the fact, and excluded two members of the council. By his inference an implication could be made from my honourable friend's remarks, and I trust and hope that he will read them when they're before us, that there were only five who were seriously and honestly performing their duties on that. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that that is the type of publicity that has put the municipality in the position that it's in at the present time. And I want to say this to my friend that I would not have raised this question in this House had he not made reference to it at the time he did, and I regret it very very much and I trust and hope that no more statements of any of our municipal governments of that nature will be made in this House.

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to get a little ways away from St. Vital for the moment. First of all I would like to commend the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I might say from a rural point of view the Minister has given the various municipalities wonderful cooperation in his short term of office and we are very appreciative of his efforts.

I was more than interested in the decisions that he said that he has recently made in regards to tax exemptions. And I would like to just for a few moments come back to this tax exemption which has been a bug-bear in the eyes of the municipal men over the years, and due to the fact of recent years more particularly, towns and villages within the powers of the municipal commissioner have been developing and modernizing, and in that they have been setting themselves up as competitors for industry -- and it is very easy for municipal men to try and attract industry to give everything in the book for free at the expense of various taxpayers.

I was interested just a short time ago, I picked up an excerpt from The Listening Post of March '59 "Effect of new industries on community growth" and this is from it: "The impact of industrial expansion on a community is assessed in a study designed to show what increased manufacturing employment means to a community growth." The study has been published in a booklet form by the Canadian National Railway prepared by the railway economics and development branch. The study is based on 9 communities in central Canada, examines the increase in manufacturing employment which occurred between 1941 and 1951 and reviews its effects on various facets of the communities economic life. The study shows graphically what 100 additional manufacturing employees can mean to their community. Some of the possible affects are: in increase, 427 in population, 117 more non-manufacturing workers, 66 more school children, 131 more households, 187 more vehicle registrations, 393 more telephone, and 3 more retail establishments, and an annual increase of nearly one million dollars worth of retail sales. I submit, Mr. Chairman that this is the basis of competition that has developed between various towns and cities--exaggerated in cities-- to a point that they feel justified in going out and asking the minister to agree to these tax exemptions.

I would like to go back to a statement made by Mr. Rex Grose, the assistant deputy minister of Industry and Commerce at an annual conference of the Manitoba Urban Association on January 6th, 1952, and he quotes, "invariably the matter of inducements come up in any

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) . . . . discussion of industrial development and many arguments can be advanced both for and against the practice, and in my opinion, however, by far the best inducements to new industry in any urban areas are favourable economic conditions, equitable taxes and fair treatment." Now Sir, if you wish to go back to the provincial-municipal committee's report of 1953 on page 147 — they made the following recommendation: "That the authority under which the municipalities can now grant fixed assessments should be repealed and no fixed assessment should be allowed in the future." Up to date I don't believe that has been incorporated in The Municipal Act and I for one would like to see it in there. And then, again in section 994, subsection 5 of The Municipal Act, states "the basis of equalization made by the board should be the full value of all real property and two-thirds of the value of all buildings subject to assessments and taxation including the amount of the assessment, of any property, or any industry or utility that has been fixed by agreement or statute below its assessed value at the amount so fixed."

I believe, Sir, that a fixed assessment reduced the equalized and balanced assessment of the municipality which grants the exemption below its proper figure, and this results in that municipality obtaining an advantage in the distribution of grants for education over a municipality which has not granted any fixed assessment to industry and has its equalized assessment computed on a basis of a proper assessment of the value of lands and buildings in the municipality. And it has been pointed out many times by these various commissioners, industrial commissions and so on that that is a fact. I would concur very much in the view expressed by the provincial municipal committee because by permitting assessments to be fixed the result is competition between municipalities attempting to induce industries to locate within their boundaries. This in effect acts to a detriment of all municipalities. A fixed assessment in a municipality means that other ratepayers in that municipality subsidize the operations of the company receiving the fixed assessment. Quite often companies obtaining fixed assessments — and I might point one out just recently is The Campbell Soup Company of Portage la Prairie — required the municipal corporation to go to a great expense for additional municipal services and because of the fixed assessments other local ratepayers contribute more than their fair share towards the cost of services required by a company which enjoys the fixed assessment. And I believe, Sir, that fixed assessments create inequity in the education grant structure. Education grants are based as you all know on the balanced assessments and the balanced assessments are equalized assessment of the municipality plus the business tax.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I commend the Minister of Municipal Affairs on his stand, and I would suggest too, that we in this House could do well to provide legislation that had no option but "there shall be no exemption from taxes to industry and there shall be no fixed assessments." This Municipal Act was revised in 1954. I'm not a lawyer and I maintain Sir, from a municipal point of view that this Act is a lawyer's dream, and I would suggest that the Municipal . . . . .

MR. HILLHOUSE: You mean a nightmare.

MR. DOW: Well, a nightmare or a dream or a mighty good thing. I would suggest, Sir, that it would be well for the office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to take that Act and write it so the average fellow could read it and understand it. I have one question in my mind that I would like to ask the Minister — this has caused a lot of confusion throughout the rural municipalities and I understand in the suburban areas too — one section of the Municipal Act, section 303 subsection (d) says that "an individual is disqualified for office if he is an assessor, collector, a treasurer, a clerk, or other paid official of a municipal corporation." Now, Sir, a clear-cut definition, because I can cite many examples that has caused confusion not only to the municipalities involved but I understand they have — there has been communications towards the Minister of Municipal Affairs office as to ruling on this, and I know that there are, particularly in cases that I can recall, of secretary-treasurers of a municipality sitting on a council of an incorporated town within the municipality, and if I interpret it right they're not supposed to be there. But the Minister of Municipal Office states that that is not the right interpretation, and I would like to see a clear-cut ruling that you are either allowed or not allowed. If I am a secretary-treasurer or a paid official of any municipality, I can either hold office in some other municipal office or I can't hold it at all.

MR. RIDLEY: I would first like to answer the Leader of the CCF party. In his remarks

(Mr. Ridley, cont'd.)..... in regards to the bad advertising of St. Vital I am sure that we all agree with him, that no one likes this advertising for any community, any municipal council, or anything else. The council that is over there was elected by the people and I am glad that he did not suggest that we do anything about that. Any senior government I don't think should do anything about the elected officials -- I think democracy will work out that point all right.

Now in regard to the Pulberry investigation. When I took over I received on the 30th of December -- now there had been a brief sent before that of some 60 or 70 pages I understand, then I was sent a brief on the 30th of December; and after looking over it and getting the other brief also that had been sent to the former Minister, I sent it to the Attorney-General's department and had them look over it. I received that back on the 13th of January and we studied it again and looked over it. Then on the 15th of January I wrote Mr. R. L. McDonald, chairman of the municipal board and ordered an enquiry into this investigation of the Pulberry area. I can read that letter if somebody wanted to hear it, but I informed him that we would carry that on. Now after that he started his committee, got them together I know -- I don't know just what date but I was speaking to him this morning and yesterday morning, and his committee is now prepared to go ahead and carry out the investigation.

Now in regards to the other suit I'm not a lawyer but I don't think there is any conflict in the two suits at all, as far as the investigation regardless of when it had started or when it does start, I don't think it has anything to do with the other libel suit--probably the Attorney-General can answer that much better than I can. But I can assure the Leader of the CCF that the investigation will be starting very very soon.

In regards to the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain, the question, I believe that he asked, was in regards to section 303 of the Municipal Act. Now the Act is there and as he will know, when he was citing certain cases of clerks or secretary-treasurers, section 236 provides for an election petition. The election petition may be presented by four or more persons, then the election petition is presented to the judge of the County Court. The petition shall be presented within 21 days after the election is held. Now we do not anticipate changing 303 of the present Act at this time. The law is there and if there's somebody acting and there's four or more people want to sign a petition to unseat him, I think that's the procedure which they will have to use and we don't anticipate any change at the present time.

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, adding two letters would clear it or add "or other paid official of any municipal corporation", instead of "a", "a municipal corporation", "of any municipal corporation".

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that the first item the Minister's salary be allowed to stand. I am sure the Honourable the Minister won't have any fears at all that it is either my intention or any of my group to oppose him getting his salary. It's only that the Honourable the Member for Carillon was unable to be here this evening and I know he would like to take some part in this discussion. I think he would prefer to take it on this item if it's agreeable to the Minister.

MR. RIDLEY: I haven't any objection to that, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I might, I'd like to make just one further remark in connection with the enquiry. It is my information that the first letter was transmitted to the government or to the Minister of Municipal Affairs the latter part of -- or in November, and then apparently through inadvertence or for some other reason possibly, there was no reply or no record of a reply to the request at that time. And then subsequently when the present Minister took office.....

MR. THOMPSON: Who was the request from?

MR. PAULLEY: I believe it was from the Council. And then a further request was made shortly after the present Minister took office. (Interjection). Yes, December the 30th, that's correct. Now then the Minister has told us that he considered the matter and I just forget what date it was that he mentioned that he ordered the board to make the enquiry in accordance with the Act.

MR. RIDLEY: 15th of January.

MR. PAULLEY: 15th of January, Mr. Chairman, and now tonight on March the 11th the Minister tells us that he has been in touch with the Board or members of the Board, yesterday or the day before, and he tells me that on March the 11th at about midnight, that the Board has

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....assured him they are going to start looking into the matter. Now I say, Mr. Chairman, I think it's regrettable, this long delay from the start until the time, if I recall the Minister's statement correctly this evening, that the Board has assured him that they hope to start soon or will be starting very, very soon on this investigation. Now the point—did you wish to say something?

MR. RIDLEY: There is one thing I think that maybe I didn't make this clear to the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party when I said they would look into it. They have been studying it thoroughly. They are ready to start the enquiry very shortly. They have studied it and they have been studying and looking into it. When you get a brief of 60 or 70 or 80 pages you just don't start it next week or the week after. It takes considerable studying and I think this was worked on very fast. I didn't have the thing in my office for two weeks 'till the enquiry was ordered. And when you get a brief of that size with your Board it takes a lot of studying before they start to work and call in any individuals.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would also apply that in respect of the criticism of the 62 or 72 page Bill in respect of Metro and some of the complains of some of the municipalities of the lack of time in studying that. Now then, Sir, the other point that I raised in connection with it was a conviction rightly or wrongly, that had an investigation been started -- rather quickly ---

MR. ROBLIN: You've got no right to that assumption, we don't .....the people.

MR. PAULLEY: I have the right to any assumption that I want and I certainly am not going to be dictated to by the Leader of this House insofar as my convictions or what I think is concerned.

MR. ROBLIN: That's right, I can't prevent my honourable friend from making a fool of himself.

MR. PAULLEY : I am perfectly at liberty without any interference from my honourable friend to stand up ---

MR. ROBLIN: I can't prevent my honourable friend from making a fool of himself all by himself.

MR. PAULLEY: No, of course you can't.

MR. ROBLIN: He does that very well.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, why certainly I do. After all my honourable friend should well know that that's possible because he has been doing it for years himself and he still continues.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman on a point of order I presume that both you and I, speak for myself, I am not a supporter of Sunday sport and I don't think this sport should go on at this time. I object to sitting on Sunday.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'll admit it seems like a mighty long time since the Leader of the Opposition started to talk about highways the other day, it still isn't Sunday yet.

MR. PAULLEY: Now that the tiff between my two honourable friends is over I am simply going to restate whether I am a fool or whether I am not.

MR. GROVES: Let's vote on it.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, let's vote on it. All in favour say Aye.

I merely say, Mr. Chairman, that I am convinced, rightly or wrongly, foolishly or otherwise that had this government taken prompt and proper action at the time of the controversy much of what has been said would not have been said and I am not speaking of what has been said tonight. And despite the remarks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs who I have every confidence in and every respect for, I do say that the period between the time of the first request some time in the latter part of November and March the 11th -- March the 12th, is far too long of a case of this nature. There are many implications in this. I sometimes wonder whether some of the implications in the whole deal would not be very satisfactory to the present government and some of their supporters.

MR. ROBLIN: Now, Mr. Chairman, I just simply can't allow that completely unjustified, unnecessary and superfluous remark pass without a comment. I am not going to say much except to tell my friend that he is completely, absolutely and utterly mistaken, wrong and in error.

MR. PAULLEY: That's your opinion.

MR. ROBLIN: It is indeed my opinion and I hold it firmly and not only that, I think that

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....in justice that it's a remark that my honourable friend would not have made was he not feeling a little worked up on this subject. I think it should be pointed out however, in defence of the government if it need any defence on this matter, which I doubt, that as far as I know there hasn't been a murmur in St. Vital for the last 90 days or in the last little while about Pulberry. The present situation that is bothering them is apparently on another track altogether. I don't think the charge of delay, of procrastination applies. I also say that in my opinion the government had nothing to do with the question of the libel suit. It's a matter in the hands of the individuals concerned who knew that the government was considering the question of a review by the Municipal Board before the suit was launched because it was public knowledge and if they had any--- if that had been capable of influencing their conduct why I am sure that it would have. The facts were available to them as they were to everyone else at the time. And as far as the government is concerned I am sure that we are under no feelings of hesitation or apprehension as to the outcome of this particular report, whatever it may be. All that we're concerned is that the facts should be examined and whatever report arises from those facts should be presented. That is our sole concern and we have no apprehensions on the subject in any way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 (a) (b) Passed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we leave number 1. The Minister mentioned a bonding program of the municipalities. I was wondering, under this excess coverage are the officers of the municipality also bonded under it? And in some other years apparently there were defaultation. I would like to know from the Minister were there any .....during this past year or who checks on them? Is it up to the municipal boards or does the government have any authority over them?

MR. RIDLEY: No, with the bond, the bond is carried by the Canadian General Insurance Company and it covers all employees of the municipality, everybody who is employed,

MR. FROESE: And the officers

MR. RIDLEY: What do you mean by officers?

MR. FROESE: Well the Reeve and the officers of the municipality.

MR. RIDLEY: All employess of the municipality that handle the money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 66, Municipal Board \$69,350 Passed. 3. (a)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I understand that there has been an agreement signed in respect of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company and Local Government District of Snow Lake. I wonder if the Minister could table a copy of that agreement for our information. There have been some questions raised in the past in respect of the situation at Snow Lake and I understand that there was prolonged negotiations between the government and the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company in respect of an agreement. I'd like to ask the Minister whether or not there were representatives of the inhabitants of the area other than either the government or the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co. who either witnessed the signing of the agreement or were fully consulted before the agreement was consummated? I'd like to know what is the position of the individual home owners in the Snow Lake area. Have they the same opportunities as anyone else has that owns a home, that after it is paid for that they'll have a clear title to the property and have the rights and privileges of anyone else of the disposal of that property or must they sell back to the company or to any other person designated by the company? I'd like to know whether or not because of the agreement whether there are any caveats placed against the property in order to prevent the ready disposal of it by any individual who so desires to do so, to whom ever he likes? I'd like to know from the Minister who the local representative is; whether the undertaking of the government as I understood at the last session of making the appointment itself was carried through or whether the present administrator of the area is a joint appointee between the company and the government?

MR. RIDLEY: I'd like to ask just one question, are you talking of Snow Lake now, are you?

MR. PAULLEY: As I understand the legislation that was passed last year there is provision for the election of a semblance of a council with very limited power. I'd like to know whether or not the elections have taken place and whether those powers are still as restrictive in the present agreement as they were apparently with the previous agreement. I'd like to know whether or not all of the building regulations in respect of construction of homes are still

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . under the general control of the company or whether individuals can build a home, subject to NHA specifications, the way that they like? I'd like to know if the Minister can tell me what fire protection is provided at Snow Lake and whose responsibility it is for that provision? And I'd like to also know from the Minister, and this is just a repeat but I think very vital, to what degree did the residents of the area enter into negotiation before the signing of the agreement?

MR. RIDLEY: First of all I will be glad to table the agreement for the Leader. I think that will answer quite a few of the questions which he asked in regards to the local government district. The man up there is Mr. Itterman and he is paid by the local government district at Snow Lake.

MR. PAULLEY: How was he selected?

MR. RIDLEY: Well he was already there as far as I know. There was no change. He was selected by the government.

MR. PAULLEY: Is he the same one that was there prior?

MR. RIDLEY: Yes, and I will table the agreement very shortly.

MR. PAULLEY: Was there any consultation between the residents there and the government before the agreement was signed?

MR. RIDLEY: Well now you must appreciate I was not the Minister then, probably the former minister could answer that.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, we heard several representations from the residents of the area and from those who were intending to become residents who were moving from Flin Flon and we paid very careful attention to their representations in negotiating the agreement, but they were not in on the signing of the agreement of they didn't pass on the agreement as such after it was drafted but we did take into consideration their representations and any comments they made by correspondence or by delegation.

MR. PAULLEY: In other words I take it then, Mr. Chairman, that they were not shown a draft of the final agreement before it was signed. They did not have any opportunity, in respect of that, to make any further representations.

MR. THOMPSON: No, we felt that we had done everything that could possibly be done. We were negotiating an agreement with another party and it didn't appear proper to have a third party come in and look it over before it was signed. They were not a part of the agreement but we did give full consideration to whatever they said in connection with it.

MR. PAULLEY: You would agree that they were vitally concerned even though they weren't an organized body and as the First Minister said there was no organized body but there was in the terms of the Act however, provision. If I recall correctly the provision of setting up a council to act in a more or less advisory capacity to the administrator. (Interjection)

MR. PAULLEY: No, but we knew that there was provision to be made for that.

MR. ROBLIN: Well we listened to them.

MR. PAULLEY: Yet my honourable friend tells me that there was no body. Now he tells me they listened to them -- now what does he mean?

MR. ROBLIN: We listened to anyone who wanted. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I may be foolish you know but not all of the time.

MR. ROBLIN: I wouldn't be too sure of that.

MR. PAULLEY: No, but. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: The point I'd like to make Mr. Chairman, is that we were glad to give and did give the most extensive consideration to any body interested in that matter that took the trouble to come and talk to us about it and we took their representations as seriously as we could and weighed them up as carefully as we could and did our best to secure those that we thought possible or feasible under the circumstances in the agreement. I don't want my honourable friend to think that we did not do our best to make sure that there was arrangements made that would be as far as possible meet the wishes of those who might be concerned.

MR. PAULLEY: By the same token before the agreement was signed, they didn't know what was in it.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, that's an entirely different proposition.

MR. PAULLEY: Well I think it's a very valid one and I think they should have been.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's the hour or the long day, but my two honourable friends the Leader of the House and the Leader of the CCF Party seem to be getting short tempered and to preserve proper decorum in this fine state of affairs and having made such progress today, I would like to move that the committee rise and report.

MR. ROBLIN: No, we're not going to rise for a minute yet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee rise and report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will put it then. Those in favour say aye; opposed say nay. Nays have it and I declare the motion defeated. Have a standing vote.

MR. CLERK: Yes, 11; nays, 19.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, last year in this item the then Minister informed the House that there were some changes planned in the matter of local government districts that the government was going, as I recall it, to endeavour to have more local administration and more representative administration in the local government districts. I wonder if the Minister could comment on this at this time, and advise us what changes have been made in the past year in this regard, and what proposed steps he has for the future in this item.

MR. RIDLEY: I haven't changes I can inform Mr. Chairman and the committee. There was 16 working last year and there's 16 working this year in this administration.

MR. SCHREYER: In case repercussions should arise, I must confess that I'm--by oversight or shall I say having forgotten, I'm guilty of a rather horrible breach of faith here. I promised the member for Lac du Bonnet that I would pair with him and I forgot about it and I voted so I convey my apologies.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister quite understood what I was asking for. It appeared to me last year from what the Minister said then, that there was to be a new policy in local government districts whereby there would be advisory councils or something of the sort established where there would be more local interest development. I just wondered what has happened to that policy because in the local government districts--I'm actually concerned with one only--I know of no change having been made and I wonder what happened to the policy and what is proposed.

MR. RIDLEY: Just to answer the honourable member's question, I said in my opening remarks that advisory committees have been elected from among the residents of the mining townsites in the local government districts of Lynn Lake and Snow Lake. They have been elected. These committees meet and confer with and advise the resident administrators on matters pertaining to local government in the district. While an advisory committee has not yet been established for the townsite of Thompson in the local government district of Mystery Lake, provisions have been made for the establishment of such a committee when the permanent population located in the townsite is sufficient to warrant this action being taken. Advisory committees have also been elected in the districts of Stuartburn and Piney. They have been elected and as in the case of the committees established in the mining townsites these committees are meeting regular with the resident administrators and serving a very useful purpose.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege and I know it was a privilege shared by other members of the front bench to go to--I was particularly involved in the Pine and Stuartburn area and to address meetings of local residents down there in terms of wards which have been laid out. The two or three meetings that I attended, I forgot the exact number, were extremely well turned out by the local residents and there was a high degree of interest among all of them down there in these proceedings and in the elections for the Advisory Board. I think it was moved that it was much appreciated by them. I know from discussions with persons in the constituency of the Honourable Member from Emerson that they took to this idea quite well and they elected. . . . people. . . . I didn't know them personally--they seemed to elect men of good character and ability from their communities to represent them on the Advisory Board. But I thought the honourable member being interested in this should know of the situation. I don't know exactly how many meetings were called. I think there was something in the area of--

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . oh, half a dozen to a dozen meetings. I know I attended two of them in company with officials from the Department of Municipal Affairs. But it certainly was received with enthusiasm by the people in the areas and I'm certainly confident that these advisory committees will be doing a good job in conjunction with the local government district administrators.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs whether caveats were placed on the properties that are being built or are built at Snow Lake. Could he answer the question?

MR. RIDLEY: It will be all in your agreement anyway when you get it.

MR. PAULLEY: The question of caveats is in the agreement? Is also the question as to the reason of the caveats in the agreement?

MR. ROBLIN: I think the agreement will show that no caveats apply, so I think that's what it will show.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us what the salary is being paid to the administrator of St. Laurent as compared with the salary paid to the administrator who died last January?

MR. RIDLEY: Yes, in answer to the honourable member's question, we have an administrator at St. Laurent now that is being paid \$300 a month. The previous administrator, I understand got \$200 a month, and we found it just physically impossible to replace a man at \$200, at the salary that's going today. So he is receiving \$300 per month.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly agree with the Minister saying that this man should receive \$300 a month because it's a very important job. Could the Minister explain why, when the previous administrator asked for a pay increase, he was always turned down? The job was just as important when he was doing it.

MR. RIDLEY: Well the previous administrator, we did not hire him in the first place; what deal was made with him was nothing to do with us. Now if he asked for a pay increase, that could be, but since I took over I hadn't received any such a request from him; and we just found it physically impossible to hire a man to do the job that was to be done out there, and I think the honourable member will agree with me that it's a big job; and there's a lot of relief out in that area to look after and a lot of work to do, and I think \$300 is not too high a salary.

MR. GUTTORMSON: No quarrel with the salary being paid; I think that the job certainly calls for a salary of that or possibly more, but my question is, why was the other gentleman not paid a comparable salary? He asked for it and he asked for it during the period of this government. He asked for an increase. He said he couldn't--he felt he should get more and I think--I felt he should. And I think that the Minister thinks he should.

MR. RIDLEY: . . . . . if he has ever asked for it from the previous government?

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, I say why didn't he get the increase when he asked for it?

MR. RIDLEY: I don't know.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this matter of local government districts, I appreciate the statement made by the Minister and the Attorney-General. I regret I missed the comments of the Minister in this regard. I have been very engrossed in my honourable friend, the Department of Public Works, and at the moment that he was speaking, I didn't get that--(interjection)--I beg your pardon? Oh, well now I don't know why? If I want to discuss it now I have every opportunity to do so and you gentlemen--(interjection)--so, oh, yes, but I want to discuss it now. I don't want to read it. What--(interjection)--. . . . . What plans has the Minister for extending this matter of advisory boards to other local government districts in the province? What plans has the Minister for the extension of these advisory boards to other local government districts in the province?

MR. RIDLEY: Mr. Chairman and honourable members, I think you will all agree that I'm a fairly new Minister. My plans are very short right at the time; I haven't had a chance to look into them. I just got into this job when the House opened and I'm sure everybody will agree that I haven't had much time to make any plans. So I'm sorry I can't answer your question in that regard.

MR. MOLGAT: I didn't expect the Honourable Minister himself to have had any time, but his predecessor who was in the office for some months I imagine must have developed a policy in this regard, due to the fact that he had announced it here in the House before and that

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . has been made in some local government districts. Now, I assume that my honourable friends don't suddenly depart from one department to the next and leave no policies existing. I don't know if that's how they operate their government, but I would assume that my honourable friend, his predecessor had some plans. Now he must have passed along to his successor, so could he possibly tell us what the plans of his predecessor in that case . . . . ?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I only want to say that the plans which were announced have been carried out to the fullest extent. All these districts have been established, the local advisory committees, they--the plan can be expanded when it is thought feasible and reasonable to do so and on the request of any particular area it will be expanded, I would expect. But the plan is there. It can be used in other localities as required.

MR. MOLGAT: While I'm not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the proposal that my honourable friend made had not been lived up to, I was just wanting to find out--I am quite prepared to believe that his department, what he told us would do, he did. I can't say the same for all departments, but in this one I accept the statement. What I'm really concerned about is this. In the case of, for example I think you mentioned Stuartburn and Piney; the initiative there, I think came from the government. Did it not? Is it not the government who suggested that these advisory boards should be set up? Now is the government going to suggest this in other local government districts, or was the intention strictly to do this with Stuartburn and Piney? I can think of, certainly in my own area, the local district for which I am concerned, may be a difficult one to handle because it's very sparsely settled and covers a tremendous territory. At the moment the road connections are not lined up in the same way as the territory lies, so it would make it difficult possibly to have one overall advisory board to do the whole work. But, as it is now some of the communities in the area, for example the village of Amaranth, has set up a local committee, and they are handling, through the local committee the unconditional grant, or part of it at least; they've made an arrangement with the administrator of the schools, the official trustee, and he transfers this local committee part of the unconditional grant and they proceed then to do, plan, some road work and snow plowing and so on, on a local basis. But this was established purely on a voluntary basis locally. We did it there through a local committee and chamber of commerce group, but this has no status except a purely voluntary one in the area. It could create some difficulties in the future if a local group were to decide that these people really don't represent anyone; they haven't been elected in any formal fashion, and so on. So is the government planning on going to other local government districts; holding meetings with a view of setting up advisory boards? And if so, which local government district? Now, if the present Minister hasn't got that information possibly the previous Minister could tell us.

MR. RIDLEY: Well, in answer to the honourable member's question, we have set up these other advisory committees and I'm sure they're going to be successful; and I can assure him that we'll be looking at the other government districts also. At present we have no plans to set up these committees, but we will be glad to look into it further on the request.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 51, passed; 52, passed.

MR. MOLGAT: The request, I take it then, Mr. Chairman, must come from the local area. Is that the present situation? If you get a request you--

MR. RIDLEY: No, no, I wouldn't say that there would have to be a request from the local area, but if the local area wants to send in a request, we'll be glad to look at it.

MR. MOLGAT: Do these local groups, Mr. Chairman, have to be set up to cover the whole of the local government district, or can it be split up into--that is, can one section be operated under such advisory board and in other parts of the same local government district not be included?

MR. RIDLEY: Well, I would certainly think that they should be under the one advisory board. They're elected by the ward the same as the councillors.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, the difficulty, for example, with one like the LDG of Alonsa is that it starts south of the village of Amaranth and runs all along the western shore of Lake Manitoba. Then it skips across the municipality and carries on north again into the territory of my honourable friend from Rupertsland and the distance from the southern limit of that local government district to its northernmost would be I would think almost 100 miles. Now to set up an advisory board to cover that whole district where the parts are not, actually have no immediate road connection, in very many cases have no economic relationship, is a very difficult point.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . I'd be more than pleased to speak to the people in the area; I have assisted in this one in Amaranth; I've approached the people in Alonsa to set up a local group there as well, but to set one up that would do the whole thing would be almost impossible I think and wouldn't achieve the purpose that I think my honourable friends had in mind. Now that is why I asked, could it be split up and certain sections be taken in on a separate basis.

MR. RIDLEY: I'll be pleased to look into that matter for the honourable member.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, some people have expressed the desire or an interest to set up a council in the municipality of St. Laurent. What is the procedure if the interest continues to grow?

MR. LYON: . . . . . in the Local Government District Act.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

MR. LYON: Part three of the Local Government District Act.

MR. MOLGAT: That isn't the local government district though, Mr. Chairman; it's a disorganized municipality. Isn't it?

MR. LYON: Disorganized is it? I thought it was local government.

MR. MOLGAT: Isn't it? Or is it a municipality under administration?

MR. RIDLEY: The St. Laurent district is a municipality under administration. I think we have two of them in the province; Lawrence and St. Laurent. Yes, it's under administration by the government.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under Item 3 (c), the recoveries from local government districts, what constitutes these recoveries? Are they tax monies? Or what? Just what is constituting those recoveries?

MR. RIDLEY: That is the recoveries here of \$121,575? Yes, well at the top here it's salaries, supplies and expenses, which comes to \$106,000; that's all recovered from the local government districts, and also half of this, salaries and supplies under field assessments--half that.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the recoveries from the local government districts, going back up to Snow Lake for a second, does the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company pay full taxation on all of its properties in Snow Lake? And is that part of these recoveries?

MR. RIDLEY: Well, I think that you'll find that all in the agreement when it's tabled.

The Leader of the CCF--

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask my honourable friend when the agreement will be tabled?

MR. RIDLEY: Very soon.

MR. PAULLEY: Soon.

MR. RIDLEY: This is Friday, but not sooner than--

MR. PAULLEY: No, this is Saturday--

MR. RIDLEY: Not sooner than soon, but it will be tabled soon.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could the Minister indicate why there is a decrease in the salary in 3 (b)--\$23,000 to \$19,000?

MR. RIDLEY: 3 (b)--that's in the field assessments salaries?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes.

MR. RIDLEY: Yes, there is a reduction there of \$4,280. Well, for this coming year we've got a field assessor not provided for which was \$5,580; we've got a clerical assistant not provided for which is \$500; that comes to \$6,080; and then we have extra expenses which is income increases and pay adjustments not included last year, come to \$1,800 and leaves a difference of \$4,200. And the explanation of the field assessor, a suitable field assessor as provided for last year could not be found and since we planned to merge the local government district's assessor into the provincial municipal assessment program, it is not now desirable to increase the local government districts' staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Passed, \$15,100, passed; probation, 4 (a), passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I notice that we haven't been getting the number covered by salaries. Now does the Minister want to give them all at once?

MR. RIDLEY: I can soon do that. Administration--you can start right at the top--this year, 11, last year 13; municipal board, this year, 12, last year six; local government districts, this year, 16, last year, 16; field assessments, this year, four, last year, six;

(Mr. Ridley, cont'd.) . . municipal assessments, this year, 40, last year, 35.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b), passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, as far as (a) is concerned, I would just like the Minister to tell us as I understand it, the field of municipal assessments or the municipalities that have been assessed is gradually becoming less. Is that not so?

MR. RIDLEY: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: The municipalities under the arrangement which was made by the former government for the provision of municipal assessors, the areas concerned are gradually--they're getting less and less. Is that correct? Now then, we note though that there's an increase in the salaries. Is it because of the fact that they've taken on additional work? Or is there a greater concentration in an endeavour to have the job done quicker that would account for that?

MR. RIDLEY: In the salaries of the (a)?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. RIDLEY: Municipal assessments--well, it is up as you know \$42,060. I'll just give you the rundown of that.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I don't want you to go through that, Mr. Minister.

MR. RIDLEY: Well, I'll just give you the salaries if you want.

MR. PAULLEY: No, no, my question was, it appears to me as though the municipalities that were to be assessed are gradually, the number is being reduced, that have to be done.

MR. RIDLEY: Yes, but in this, I must inform the Leader of the CCF that you've got your IBM operators which amount to \$11,745.

MR. PAULLEY: In other words the increase isn't because of assessors. It's because--

MR. RIDLEY: No, no, no, it's the IBM operation.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, that's fine. Thanks a lot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (A), passed; (B), passed; (C), passed.

MR. DOW: Wait! Wait! In Item B, there's an increase of approximately \$19,000 for supplies and expenses. Could the Minister tell us how that comes about?

MR. RIDLEY: Yes, included in that is the IBM installation, \$17,290. There's rent, \$400; postage and telephone is up, \$800; equipment is up, \$600; fees is up \$300, bringing a grand total of up in that department of \$19,390. Now off that you can take periodical savings, \$10; freight savings, \$10; household savings \$10; printing savings \$600; and deduct that from \$19,390, brings the department up to \$18,760.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 68--\$138,262.

MR. MOLGAT: Under Item D there, how come this appears in this department? I don't know of any other departments where we have a similar item, purchase of automobiles. Now I may be wrong but I don't recall any other department where this was set up separately. What is the explanation for this?

MR. RIDLEY: Well, we had in there last year \$8,600, less cars to be purchased, \$4,200; saving \$4,200; brings it down to \$4,400. It's down \$4,200.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . I was just wondering how come this department shows its purchase of automobiles whereas no other department does. What is the difference here in the operation? Because all other automobiles--

MR. RIDLEY: I couldn't answer that. All that I did was look at this and they put in for \$8,600 last year and this coming year we only need \$4,400 because we have less cars to be purchased--

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, but what I'm wondering is why is it there? Because every other department that owns automobiles and none of them show them in this way. Now why does this particular--is there a difference here? Is this automobile used for a different purpose? Is it owned--Is it not handled the same way as the other autos owned by the government? Or why is it there?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, I should have asked this question earlier. Would the Minister be kind enough to tell me the--give me the names on the Municipal Board and the salaries paid to them, please?

MR. RIDLEY: You want the whole salaries, aye? Fine. The Chairman, \$12,000; one member full time, \$6,000; member part-time, \$4,000; H. B. Scott--R. L. McDonald is the

(Mr. Ridley, cont'd.) .. Chairman; H. B. Scott, full time, \$6,000--(interjection)--Yes. Part-time, Mr. McGirr of Dauphin, \$4,000; Finance Officer, \$6,000--I haven't his name. He's not a MLA, I'm sure of that. One Secretary to the Board, \$6,000; Administration Officer I, Finance, \$4,560; a steno IV, Secretary to the Chairman, \$4,020; Steno III on Finance, \$2,970; Steno II, \$2,880; steno on Assessments, III, \$3,060; a typist II, Assessment and Telephone, \$2,430; a steno II on Planning, \$2,580; making a total of \$66,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . Department, we're letting number one stand open.

MR. ROBLIN: We are going to allow the item on the Minister's salary stand in order to permit the Honourable Member for Carillon to make his contribution to this discussion at another time. The rest of the department I take it, is passed. So I will move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and 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 from Winnipeg Centre that the report of the committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the house adjourned and stand adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.